

# VANGUARD newsletter

Published monthly by independent revolutionary socialists

Editors — Harry Turner, Hugh Fredericks

P. O. Box 67, Peck Slip Station, New York, N. Y. 10038



Vol. 3, No. 7 Price 20¢ (\$1.00 per year) Labor donated July/August 1971

Contents: On the American Capitalist Crisis	
--Part II .....	p. 85
<u>Nixon, China and Indochina</u> .....	90
War and the NPAC Convention .....	95
War and the Fourth International .....	100
Bangla Desh and Leninism - Part II	
--Nation and Class .....	104

## ON THE AMERICAN CAPITALIST CRISIS - Part II by Harold Robins

In May 1940, Leon Trotsky, writing the Manifesto of the Fourth International On the Imperialist War and the Proletarian World Revolution, described the major contradictions of American capitalism.

Capitalist property relations were strangling the development of the productive forces, and American capitalism had chosen the path of war to revive the reactionary capitalist order. Trotsky wrote:

"Two-thirds of the world's gold is concentrated in the American vaults. The remaining third is flowing to the same place...

However, the industrial, financial and military strength of the United States, the foremost capitalist power in the world, does not at all insure the blossoming of American economic life, but on the contrary, invests the crisis of her social system with an especially malignant and convulsive character. Gold in the billions cannot be made use of nor can the millions of unemployed. In the theses of the Fourth International, 'War and the Fourth International,' published six years ago, it was predicted: 'Capitalism in the United States is running head on into those problems which impelled

Germany in 1914 upon the road of war...' (HR emphasis)

Except for the description of the vast gold holdings of the US and the trend for further accumulation of this international money commodity, it is already clear that for Trotskyists, the crisis of American capitalism has returned.

We now face an even deeper and far sharper crisis situation. This time, the army of unemployed, although reckoned in the multi-millions and still growing, is not comparable in social weight to that of the employed workers. Organized workers in the US are engaged in a fight to retain their living standards as the capitalist inspired inflation destroys the former relative class peace and the political backwardness of the workers which prevailed for the past two decades.

Class peace is replaced by class struggles. The workers organized in strong trade unions fight for a better share of the declining national income. But, those trade union-

ists in weak organizations fall behind, despite small wage gains. And the vast majority of the workers, who are still unorganized, are increasingly crushed by the economic scissors. This stratum awaits trade union and working class political organization. The question is, who will organize these workers?

If revisionists and class collaborators do the job, then the reactionary capitalist system will emerge from this crisis as it emerged from those of the past. Mankind then will find itself once again involved in another, third great imperialist slaughter. Meanwhile, the means of production are increasingly idled by the developing capitalist crisis. Revisionism and class collaboration prevent the revolutionary resolution of capitalist crises and block the march of humanity towards the socialist road and a classless society.

That is the repeated lesson to be learned from history. The historic opportunities for taking power by the revolutionary proletariat only come with periods of deep capitalist crises. The favorable situation must be utilized to regroup the revolutionary Marxists. The lesson to be learned from the victory of Bolshevism, is, as Lenin taught us, that, "Bolshevism hardened and grew strong in the struggle against Menshevism". This major criterion of Lenin's must be applied in the present crisis of American capitalism. We must begin the task of winning the working class for the victory of the socialist revolution in America and throughout the world.

Let us briefly review the conjunctural crisis developments and note the revisionist character of many petty-bourgeois politicals who try to pass their politics off as Trotskyist.

Cde. Trotsky stated in the 1940 Manifesto:

"...the chief cause of war as of all other social evils--unemployment, the high cost of living, fascism, colonial oppression--is the private ownership of the means of production together with the

bourgeois state which rests on this foundation."

Every Trotskyist and every would-be revolutionary would admit that this quotation is fundamental.

Trotsky wrote in the same 1940 Manifesto:

"In contrast to the nineteenth century, when the competition between capitalist countries developed on an expanding world market, the economic arena of struggle today is narrowing down so that nothing remains open to the imperialists except tearing pieces of the world market away from each other."

and more:

"to count upon holding the United States to neutrality by means of newspaper articles and pacifist resolutions is like trying to hold back the tide with a broom. The real struggle against war means the class struggle against imperialism and a merciless exposure of petty-bourgeois pacifism. Only revolution could prevent the American bourgeoisie from intervening in the second imperialist war or beginning the third imperialist war. All other methods are either charlatanism or stupidity or a combination of both." (HR emphasis)

Is there any resemblance between Trotsky's anti-war position and the political views of the SWP today?

Three elements of Marxist doctrine are fundamental in arriving at a Marxian political "line": first, the theory of the class struggle of the modern proletariat as the instrument of human progress; second, the very broad historic frame of reference which we refer to as the materialistic conception of history; third, the employment of the Marxian dialectical method. According to the latter, the most fundamental law of nature is change; all phenomena must be evaluated in connection with the record of and the history of its development. Abstract, isolated impressionism is rejected as a

counter-method.

The broad frame of reference employed by Cde. Trotsky in all his writings proceeds from the general proposition that the struggles of the working class to overthrow capitalism and abolish capitalist property relations, i.e., capitalist ownership of the means of production and exchange is central to Marxian strategy. All areas of work, such as general propaganda directed towards all social layers of society, all trade union work, all parliamentary and electoral political activity, all work with oppressed national minorities and all work in fraternal organizations are considered as "tactical" areas of work. The political line employed in any and all of these tactical areas must be both harmonious and subordinated to the "strategic" line, i.e., must be subordinated to taking power away from the capitalist class by means of the class action of the workers. Every SWP and CP member must ask, who says so?

Cde. Lenin wrote, in answer to this unformulated challenge, the following pertinent observation:

"People always have been the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and they always will be until they have learnt to seek out the interests of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises. Champions of reforms and improvements will always be fooled by the defenders of the old order until they realize that every old institution, however barbarous and rotten it may appear to be, is kept going by the forces of certain ruling classes." (Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism, p. 71, Selected Works, Vol. I, Moscow 1960. HR emphasis)

In his article, Marxism and Revisionism, Lenin wrote:

"In the sphere of politics, revisionism did really try to revise the foundation of Marxism, namely, the doctrine of the class strug-

gle." (Ibid, p. 76)

Again, in writing on Bernstein's revisionism, Lenin wrote:

" Bernstein expresses ...the substance of revisionism better than many long disquisitions. To determine its conduct from case to case, to adapt itself to the events of the day and to the chopping and changing of petty politics, to forget the primary interests of the proletariat and the basic features of the whole capitalist system...for the real or assumed advantages of the moment--such is the policy of revisionism."

Does or does this not describe the politics of the CP, the SWP and their methods? Lenin continues:

"And it patently follows from the very nature of this policy that it may assume an infinite variety of forms, and that every more or less "new" question, every more or less unexpected and unforeseen turn of events, even though it change the basic line of development only to an insignificant degree and only for the briefest period, will always inevitably give rise to one variety of revisionism or another. (Ibid p. 78, HR emphasis)

A Marxian approach towards American capitalism must begin fundamentally by recognizing the class conflicts and struggles of the working class as the primary arena of work and with the goal in mind of winning it politically for the primary objective of overthrowing capitalism. Any and all tactical considerations must be consciously subordinated to this primary objective. Any other course is objectively a revisionist adaptation to the ruling class.

The basis of revisionism arises from a petty-bourgeois socio-political outlook in the workers movement. Because they recognized this problem, Lenin and the Bolsheviks continuously fought these political trends. The split in the Russian socialist movement began in 1903. It continued

through two decades and three revolutions. On Lenin's death, Trotsky and the Bolshevik-Leninists continued the fight against the petty-bourgeois Stalin-led bureaucracy in the Soviet Union.

In his 1908 article on revisionism, Lenin wrote the following:

"It is quite natural that the petty-bourgeois world-outlook should again and again crop up in the ranks of the broad workers' parties...What we now frequently experience only in the domain of ideology, namely, disputes over theoretical amendments to Marx; what now crops up in practice only over individual partial issues of the labor movement, as tactical differences with the revisionists and splits on this basis--is bound to be experienced by the working class on an incomparably larger scale when the proletarian revolution will sharpen all disputed issues, will focus all differences on points which are of the most immediate importance in determining the conduct of the masses, and will make it necessary in the heat of the fight to distinguish enemies from friends, and to cast out bad allies in order to deal decisive blows at the enemy."  
(Ibid, p. 79, HR emphasis)

The gap between the politics and working class strategic orientation found in the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, on the one hand, and the pacifist, class collaborationist "single issue" peace line of the SWP, on the other, carries over as a consistent anti-proletarian line on the part of the SWP. These revisionist policies in substance conform to Bernstein's formula, "The final aim is nothing, the movement is everything."

The American capitalist system is moving into bankruptcy. The American capitalist government has been spending more than it takes in. In dealing with this major development, the leadership of the SWP continues to ignore the qualitative character of the conjunctural crisis of American capitalism for the seeming

"advantages of the moment".

The American capitalists have precipitated five major financial-world trade crises within 3 years. For the last hundred years, it was truthfully asserted that the American dollar was "as good as gold". A dialectical change has now taken place before our eyes. For the past three years, such an assertion has been absolutely untrue. It was precisely because the paper dollar was "as good as gold", and the only currency after World War I that was "as good as gold", that it was accepted as the equivalent of gold in international trade. Now the gold stock has declined to less than \$10 billions and the dollars in international trade and banking amount to six times as much.

The dollar is a glut on the international financial and trade markets. It is a "fiat" currency, redeemable only in paper equivalents issued by the Federal Reserve Bank or the Treasury. Underlying the international dollar crises is the relegation of American industry to an unfavorable competitive position. What does this development mean?

It means that the impending refusal of the capitalist nations of the world to accept US paper currency in payment of US capitalist debts --which keep skyrocketing despite all promises of Washington to the contrary--leads to a breakdown of world trade and a reversion to a combination gold and barter method of trade and international payments. This would adversely affect production in every country where foreign trade is a major factor in production. A slowdown in production in industrialized countries such as Japan, Britain, West Germany, etc., would create an economic-social crisis of vast proportions and cause a breakdown of the capitalist system of production and exchange.

At this point, production in countries such as Japan, Canada, Britain, Italy and the US has slowed down. The production "boom" has ended. In the case of the US, even the balance of trade has become chronically unfavorable. This phenomenon is another dialectical change of

things into their opposites, and another indication of a qualitative change in the position of US capitalism. There are significant indications that the capitalist world market has reached the limit of expansion. This means that the capitalist nations must begin competing for a greater share of the market by all sorts of devices. Within the US internal market, inflation has been used to cut the living standards of the workers. Workers "real" wages are diminished while their money wages are increased, thereby for a time, concealing the operation of the wage cutting drives. Today, inflation is a sharp spur which propels the workers into struggle in defense of their living standards. On the world market, inflation makes US commodities less competitive. Thus we see that, nationally and internationally, US and world capitalism demonstrates that its property relations are obstacles to the continued development of the productive forces.

All of this is "old stuff" to the leaders of the SWP, and yet they choose to ignore the need to review a political orientation for a revolutionary working class perspective.

The capitalists of the industrialized countries are forced into wage cutting drives, either open or concealed by inflation. When the fruits of this policy are exhausted, then war must necessarily replace economic competition.

What good then is the "peace" policy of the SWP? We are now at a turning point, a change of direction, brought about by the end of capitalist prosperity. To deal with the war danger as something separate and apart from the existence of capitalism is not only a monstrously shallow view of things, but, obviously, has nothing in common with Trotskyism and Bolshevism.

Lenin wrote:

"The women of an oppressed class that is really revolutionary... will say to their sons, "You will soon be a man. You will be given a gun. Take it and learn the military art. The proletarians

need this knowledge not to shoot your brothers the workers of other countries, as they are doing in the present war, and as you are being told to do by the traitors to socialism, but to fight the bourgeoisie of your own country, to put an end to exploitation, poverty and war, not by means of good intentions, but by vanquishing the bourgeoisie and by disarming it." (Ibid, p. 821, HR emphasis)

Does Lenin's voice sound like the political voice of Harry Ring? Or of Fred Halstead? Or of George Novack? Or of Joe Hansen? Or like the political line of the "Militant" during the past decade or more? These politicals nowadays "cozy up" to the "anti-imperialist" capitalist politicians like Vance Hartke and Company, in the same manner as the Stalinist enemies of the proletarian revolution. We do not read or hear the anti-war politics of Lenin and Trotsky these days from these traitors to Leninism.

The professional economists of the ruling class have reacted to the growing crisis of American capitalism with increasing alarm. As I reported in VANGUARD NEWSLETTER's June issue, the astute Leonard Silk, writing in the NY Times two weeks before the May 1971 dollar crisis, warned the complacent American monetary officials, who felt that the Europeans had no alternative but to continue to accept dollars, that they were about to receive a shock. He predicted that the continuing US balance of payments deficit would trigger a collapse of the world monetary system.

Professor Robert Triffin of Yale wrote the following in the NY Times, May 14, 1971:

"Foreign central banks are now forced to finance the unlimited accumulations of our IOU's [American fiat dollars] as international reserves, whatever deficits we [the US] may incur in our international transactions... they are compelled to extend credits to the US..."

(to be continued)

## NIXON, CHINA AND INDOCHINA

President Nixon's sensational announcement that he had accepted Chou En-lai's invitation, delivered at a highly secret meeting to his chief foreign policy advisor, Henry Kissinger, to visit China before May 1972, has delighted his personal entourage, won the support of "moderate" and liberal Republicans and Democrats alike, and produced consternation in the "China Lobby" and among "conservative" Republicans.

It has also alarmed the Soviet Stalinists. Their "New Times" magazine has charged their Chinese counterparts with "an accommodation with imperialism", and with selling out the "national liberation movement" in order to advance Chinese "national interest". This accusation, by the original advocates of "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism, was made, it seems, without so much as a blush!

North Vietnamese officials at first withheld the news of the invitation, only later, through their press, to inform Nixon that he had "gone to the wrong place", and that they would not allow the "big powers" to impose a settlement on the Vietnamese. An "exit door" had been "opened" for him through the new 7-point proposals of the chief negotiator for the Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) of South Vietnam, Madame Binh.

According to the PRG declaration, these proposals are based on the NLF's "10-point overall solution". The PRG agrees to release all US prisoners in exchange for a "terminal date", hopefully in 1971, for the withdrawal of all US troops and equipment. It will also undertake as a separate question, immediate discussions with the present Saigon administration, to achieve "peace and national concord" in South Vietnam in "a new administration favoring peace, independence, neutrality and democracy".

As VANGUARD NEWSLETTER's readers have long been aware, the NLF's original 10-point program explicitly guarantees the continued and prosperous existence of the South Vietnamese capitalists and landlords.

Pres. Nixon, however, had been able to ignore the "exit door", and the increasing pressure from the liberal imperialist wing of the

American ruling class to "exit" from Vietnam, by eagerly fastening onto Chou's indicated willingness to take part in a new Geneva-type meeting on Indochina. Chou's invitation further strengthened Nixon's hand. He was able to hold out the promise of a general settlement in the East, in which the Vietnamese war would be a part, through the "normalization" of relations with China.

"Tricky Dick" also, evidently, hopes that his trip to China will have as important an impact on the 1972 elections as had Eisenhower's pledge in 1952 to "go to Korea".

The Nixon Administration clearly hopes to utilize the sharp differences between the Soviet and Chinese practitioners of "socialism in one country" to advance the interests of American imperialism.

Some business interests have indicated a desire for a by-product of "normalization"--trade with China.

The high cost of functioning as world imperialist gendarme, coupled with the erosion of its competitive position on the world market has for years resulted in a negative international balance of payments, which now threatens to destroy the dollar as a world monetary unit, and bring on an international financial crisis. The soaring inflation, which the US is exporting to the rest of the world, is an expression of this growing contradiction. Now, as Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans has stated, the US international balance of trade for the year will probably show its first deficit in this century.

Can trade with China alleviate the current "recession"? The fact that cyclical crises are non-existent in the degenerated and deformed workers' states has, no doubt, played a role in dampening economic downturns for world capitalist economy in the post-

war period. However, the productive forces in the advanced capitalist countries have expanded, and are still continuing to expand at a rate which outstrips the limits of the world market. The intense and increasing trade rivalry between the US, West Germany and Japan is one concrete manifestation of this basic condition, as is the formation of the "Common Market" in Europe.

Moreover, the Chinese require industrial products which will be paid for in raw materials, semi-finished and consumers goods, much of which is either in surplus in the US or imported from other sources. China would certainly require long-term financing, but the maturing world financial crisis, which is an expression of the crisis of productive forces in revolt against capitalist relations of production, will preclude the granting of sufficient US long-term credits as to seriously affect the world market.

The sharpening contradictions of world capitalism will not permit a détente with the Soviet bloc and/or China for long, but, on the contrary, ensures an exacerbation of its relations with both.

The contradiction between world capitalism and the degenerated and deformed workers' states, between capitalist and collective production relations, is more fundamental than that between individual capitalist countries and opposing imperialist blocs. But, as World War II showed, conjunctural pressures can act to temporarily subordinate this more basic contradiction.

Stalinism's role in disorienting the international working class, in preventing it from winning state power and exercising political power in the advanced and under-developed countries, is an essential factor in determining the course of the imperialists.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER recognizes that an industrially backward workers' state, under conditions of capitalist encirclement, must use the contradictions between the imperialist camps to improve its relative security. Its only real security, however, lies in a soci-

alist revolution in the advanced countries and throughout the world. But, not the security of parasitic bureaucrats! The world revolution means their doom. Each bureaucratic excrescence, therefore, seeks to safeguard "its" own "socialism", through counterrevolutionary deals with the imperialists, while also propping up Bonapartists of all stripes against the imperialists and against their own working masses.

Chou has also "enthusiastically" endorsed the new North Vietnamese-NLF proposals to maintain capitalist relations in a "neutralized" South Vietnam through a government of "national concord". It is clear, therefore, that by "normalization" of relations "between the Chinese and American peoples" achieved through Nixon's visit, the Chinese Stalinists, just like the Soviet variety, offer to guarantee a counterrevolutionary "peace".

Coming directly after its brazen endorsement of the butchery of the Bengali people, and, together with the US, military assistance to the Pakistani oppressors, the present "right" turn toward "peaceful co-existence" with US imperialism by Chinese Stalinism has thrown the Maoists everywhere into disarray.

As VANGUARD NEWSLETTER has pointed out, the basis for understanding its "right" and "left" turns was advanced by Trotsky in the struggle against the bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet Union and its international manifestations, and in articles and correspondence on the Chinese revolution.

In December 1966, Harry Turner, at that time a member of the Spartacist League (SL), in a memorandum criticizing the article "Maoism Run Amok" in Spartacist No. 8, stated the following:

"The political conflicts within the Soviet bureaucracy were always minutely scrutinized by Trotsky. The Transitional Program... makes the point that these conflicts 'mirror the contradictions between the bureaucracy and the people as well as the deepening antagonisms among the "people" themselves'...

the Mao faction stands in a similar relationship to the capitulatory elements of the Chinese CP as the "Stalin Bonapartist clique" stood to its right wing in 1938... Trotskyists would have to firmly oppose the capitulatory wing... However, it is the counterrevolutionary policies of Mao which has helped bring the Chinese workers' state to its present isolation and danger. The chief political task in China as in the Soviet Union remains the political overthrow of the ruling bureaucracy."

Had the world Trotskyist movement in the post-war period understood and been able to apply the dialectical method of Marxism, had it not ignored the lessons of the past and the contributions of Trotsky for the "new" reality, it would not have been mesmerized by the seemingly instant transformation of the counterrevolutionary Stalinists into "revolutionists-despite-themselves" in Eastern Europe and China. It would have understood the Chinese "left" and "right" turns as the expressions of a Bonapartism in an under-developed country, balancing between classes internally and internationally, and always directed toward keeping the workers from exercising political power. It would have understood the development of the Castro regime in Cuba as a similar expression of this law. It would have had the inner strength to cope with the "prosperity" of the post-war period. Instead, first the European Trotskyist parties and then, in less than a decade, the American Socialist Workers Party (SWP) became opportunist, abandoning a proletarian orientation for shortcuts to "socialism". The Stalinists, the Castros, the Ben Bellas, the peasant-guerrillas of the "revolutionary" nationalist "third world" were to achieve the break-through to socialism, not the working class!

The Bonapartists maneuver with the masses to free the productive forces from the contradiction between capitalist and collective property within their borders, in order to preserve their power. But,

the contradictions between "their" nationalized property and the world capitalist market still has to be resolved. The problem of acquiring the necessary capital with which to rapidly overcome and replace the backward means and techniques of production still remains. Moreover, the old "fetters" are removed, only to fashion new ones.

As Turner's memorandum stated:

"The bureaucracy because it controls, not only the state but production, bears a heavy responsibility for the success or failure of the general plan of production. Its tendency to try to bulldoze its way through difficulties without taking into account all aspects of the situation, including the psychology of the producers, and its tendency to violate the requirements of labor power and technique, plus its proclivities toward the consumption of an inordinate portion of total production, continually acts to produce, not an optimum development of industry, but rather enormous dislocations, disproportions, and waste waste."

As the economy becomes more complex, the contradiction between a bureaucratic layer and the socialized means of production becomes increasingly acute. The convulsions within the degenerated and deformed workers' states express the struggles of sections of the bureaucracy: of the "center" to maintain its collective property base against the "right" which tends to return to capitalist relations, and "left" which, in the words of the Transitional Program, tends to "reflect, passively it is true, the socialist interests of the proletariat".

The historical record fails to support the contention of Mao Tse-tung and his sycophants that he functioned as an independent and "creative Marxist" who, on occasion, even disagreed with Stalin "himself". Mao followed every "left" and "right" turn which the Kremlin signaled until his "socialism" was



threatened by "the spirit of Camp David" which Khrushchev and Eisenhower had invoked in 1959, and for which the Kremlin's incantations had been audible years earlier.

Stalin's and Bukharin's policy of subordinating the CCP to the Kuomintang and Chiang Kai-shek, under the slogan, "the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry", was reluctantly followed by Ch'en Tu-hsiu, its leader. There is no indication that Mao, who was also a founding member of the CCP, had ever objected to this right Menshevik line, which resulted in the slaughter of thousands of CCP members and followers by Chiang's troops in Shanghai in April 1927.

Nor is there any indication that Mao opposed Stalin's subsequent call for the CCP to subordinate itself to the "left" Kuomintang Wuhan government under Wang Ching-wei, which then abjectly capitulated to Chiang with the resultant massacre of many thousands of workers and peasants.

With the second Chinese revolution in extremis and the CCP completely isolated, Stalin decided to retrieve the day by a "left" turn, and called for uprisings and the slogan of Soviets. The Canton uprising which followed, once again resulted in the slaughter of the CCP cadre. In the aftermath, the ties of the CCP with the working class in the cities were completely broken. It erected a "Soviet" republic guarded by a peasant "Red Army" in agricultural hinterlands, and, became, in fact, a peasant-based party similar to the Social Revolutionaries of Russia.

This "left" turn, in harmony with Stalin's international ultra-left "third period" policies, was not only unopposed by Mao, but was to enable him to make his mark as one of its most fervent supporters.

The bankruptcy of Stalin's "third period" policies, which ensured the victory of Hitler, was followed by a "right" turn to the "people's front", of collaboration with the "democratic" imperialists and "liberal" capitalists against "fascism". Obediently following the baton, Mao called for a "united national-revolutionary front" with the butcher

Chiang and the Chinese "national" bourgeoisie, and managed to procure it after effecting Chiang's release from kidnapping at Sian in 1936.

The "Soviet" republic of China was then quietly interred and the slogan of the "People's Republic" unfurled. With it, the policy of confiscating landlord holdings for distribution to landless peasants was exchanged for one of reducing peasant rent and interest.

"True! But didn't Mao finally break with Stalin's policies by defeating Chiang and taking power", a reader might well ask?

Stalin's deal at Yalta with the imperialists called for the CCP's subordination to Chiang's regime. Mao did everything in his power to arrange for its representation as a minority in a Chiang coalition government. But, "it takes two to tango", Chiang reneged on the deal, and launched a full-scale attack against the CCP forces.

The subsequent formation of the People's Republic of China in October 1949, as a bourgeois coalition government, a "bloc of 4 classes", would indicate that the CCP was operating well within the guidelines set by Stalin and enthusiastically endorsed by Mao. Moreover, with the "Cold War" temperature rising, Stalin could not have been too unhappy with Mao's assumption of the role of caretaker of the Chinese bourgeois state machinery--a role identical with that of the Eastern European CP's--instead of the US satellite, Chiang.

As was the case in Eastern Europe, the CCP caretakers were forced to break the coalition with their "national" bourgeoisie: the former, by the onset of the "Cold War"; the latter, by the "hot" war in Korea.

With their arrival at political power, their quantity as docile and obedient servants of the Soviet bureaucracy, became transformed into a new quality. Now Bonapartists in their own right, their concern was increasingly with the "socialism" in their "own" country! Although East Europe has a much higher level of industrial development than China, both are under-developed as against

the advanced capitalist countries.

In all under-developed countries, the masses are in motion against bureaucratic layers which protect the old "fetters", increasingly clash with those which become new "fetters", and especially against those bureaucratic layers which function as intermediaries for Soviet extortionists and outrage their national feelings. In these circumstances, the pressure of the masses acts to prod the Bonapartist satraps into achieving a new point of balance--between their masses, the Soviet bureaucracy and imperialism. The differing sections of the Stalinist bureaucracies "reflect" these interests in differing proportions in each country.

In Eastern Europe, the presence of the Soviet army, has limited and prevented subordinate Stalinist bureaucrats from achieving a more "independent" role--except for Albania, Yugoslavia and Rumania.

In China, however, this restraint is non-existent. The extreme backwardness of its economy, moreover, cannot help but be reflected in a sharpening of antagonisms between the mass of workers and peasants and the bureaucracy. In addition, the continuing threat from imperialism compels the bureaucracy to strive unceasingly for modern weapons which require an advanced industry and technology.

As long as the Soviet Union assisted Chinese industrial development, the CCP gave full backing to its every move, including the sell out at Geneva in 1954, which returned the southern half of Vietnam to capitalist and imperialist exploitation and oppression.

With the US military threat to China undiminished, Khrushchev's overtures to the US, while refusing to assist Chinese nuclear development took on a sinister significance. The Soviet bureaucracy seemed ready to sacrifice Chinese security on the altar of its "socialism in one country", just as the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies had sacrificed the Vietnamese.

The disastrous "Great Leap Forward" of 1958 expressed the Chinese

bureaucracy's haste to acquire a modern industry by a forced march, to achieve an independent strength against the US military threat. In 1960, the Soviet breach with China became irreparable as the former abrogated its contracts with the latter, and withdrew its technical personnel leaving hundreds of factories unfinished.

Since then, both Bonapartist castes have continued to betray the international working class in behalf of its own "socialism".

The Indonesian CP together with several hundred thousands of workers and peasants were sacrifices by Mao and his willing assistant, DN Aidit, in 1965 on a "people's front" program of unity behind Sukarno and the Indonesian "national" bourgeoisie against "imperialism", in a manner reminiscent of the sacrifice of the second Chinese revolution by Stalin in 1927.

China became much more vulnerable to imperialist attack with the Indonesian debacle and other set-backs to the "third world" in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The isolation of China, together with the catastrophic state of the economy after the "Great Leap", was to force Mao into a new "left" turn, which also paralleled Stalin's "left" turn after the Chinese debacle of 1927 --the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" of August 1966.

The Liu Shao-chi "right" wing of the CCP, evidently a majority, was ready to return China to the Soviet embrace, i.e., to place the Chinese "deformed workers' state" at the mercy of Soviet "peaceful coexistence" deals with imperialism. The Mao "center", determined to protect its base of power, and in control of the army, appealed to the militancy of the unsophisticated youth, and then unleashed it against the "right" faction, but also with injunctions against "annoying" the industrial workers. Having completed its task of securing the Maoist faction's control of the state apparatus, the youth were shipped to rural areas.

Today, the Chinese army keeps "order" in practically every social and political sphere, under a "cult"

of Mao which makes Stalin's seem palid by comparison.

China has had good reason to fear a "preventive" attack on its nuclear facilities from the USSR with, perhaps, US assistance, since 1966. At that time, Soviet troops were massed along the Chinese border. Gromyko had hurried to Washington to confer with unnamed US officials in a secret meeting. The news of it was then "leaked" to the press along with the information that Soviet "special units" had been sent to the Chinese frontier because of the Soviet Union's purported "fear of a nuclear attack" from China. It is possible that the Soviet Union was then considering a military intervention in China to save the Liu faction and to depose Mao.

Mao's present "right" turn to "peaceful coexistence" with US imperialism, was not only heralded by "ping pong" diplomacy and Mao's interview with his literary sounding board, Edgar Snow. The logic of

#### WAR AND THE NPAC CONVENTION

The National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) convention, held July 2nd to 4th at Hunter College in NYC, set the stage on which radical and even "revolutionary" organizations could demonstrate their essential qualities.

NPAC, in which the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) plays a predominant role, like the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice (PCPJ), which is under the influence of the Communist Party (CP), is wedded to the proposition that bigger and better peace demonstrations will succeed in pressuring the right wing of the ruling class to end US imperialist intervention in Indochina. Both coalitions have been formed on the basis of this program, are blocs of social-reformists with liberal Democrats and Republican "dove" ruling class representatives, which attack certain manifestations of imperialism, but certainly not capitalist relations in the US or elsewhere. The presence of liberal Democrat Vance Hartke, as keynote speaker at the NPAC opening session, is a clear indication of the more open involvement of the SWP in class-

Chinese "socialism in one country" has also lined up Mao alongside Nixon in support of the Pakistani butcher, Yaya Khan, as we have already said. It has also meant Mao's aid and comfort to the Bandaranaike regime in Ceylon in the butchery of the Maoist "People's Liberation Front", in the company of both the US and the Soviet Union.

Both the Soviet and Chinese Bonapartists continue their counterrevolutionary function of defending their "socialism in one country" by disorienting and betraying revolutionary struggles throughout the world. The political revolution in the degenerated and deformed workers' states is linked to the social revolution against capitalism, and in the advanced capitalist countries in particular. The developing crisis of world capitalism is moving the international working class in all countries into struggle. Its vanguard party, the party of Lenin and Trotsky, must now be built to lead it to a final victory.

collaboration with the soft wing of imperialism for "peace".

Attracting approximately 2300 anti-war participants from 42 states, the convention became an arena for political struggle in which a physical component was also present.

At the opening session, Progressive Labor (PL) and its adherents from the now defunct Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) engaged in a demonstration against the scheduling of Hartke and Victor Reuther of the UAW as speakers. PL, "SDS" and the Spartacist League (SL) continued to disrupt after a majority had voted to continue the meeting as scheduled, and an "SDS" spokesman was given the floor, in the hope that this democratic gesture might quiet them. When PL members, using bullhorns, continued to harrass first Hartke and then Reuther, the NPAC leaders instructed their marshals

to eject PL and its SL helpmates. A few of the PL'ers had come armed with mace, and sprayed the marshals at the doors on their removal.

Some insight into the SL's behavior at the convention may be gained by examining its introduction to an internal bulletin dealing with the present division in the United Secretariat (Usec). The SL was also able to distinguish between the guerrillaist orientation of the European "centrist" sections and the "reformist" SWP on the basis of the latter's "extreme legalism"! It does not attempt to explain how the "extreme legalist" Mandel of the 1961 Belgium general strike was transformed into an advocate of something "so illegal as guerrilla warfare". Neither does it explain how the once-enthusiastic supporters of guerrillaism in Latin America became "extreme legalists".

It would seem that the SL is trying to re-establish its credibility as an organization by tail-ending PL. It evidently hopes to pose itself as the glamorous alternative to the SWP "legalists" by parading itself before the radical milieu as the practitioners of "derring-do".

On the following day, PL'ers, armed with rocks and bottles, tried to storm the convention, and were beaten off by the NPAC marshals. Although police appeared afterward to disperse the PL'ers, there is no evidence to indicate that NPAC had called them in.

The Workers League (WL) was the sole political formation to the left of the SWP to defend the NPAC convention from the disruption. It was also alone in voting for the NPAC presiding committee motion to commend the marshals for the manner in which they had handled the disrupters. This motion had been made to counter a PCPJ resolution which, while disapproving of PL's actions, condemned the "repressive and violent actions" by "some" marshals, and by marshal Fred Halstead of the SWP in particular for having initiated the violence.

The WL has justified its defense of the NPAC convention on the basis that the PL adventure was essential-

ly motivated by its Stalinism, its hatred for "Trotskyites". The SWP has made the same point. It is quite clear, however, even from the account in the "Bulletin", July 17, 1971, that PL had attacked the class-collaborationist essence of the NPAC coalition, which the SWP had been instrumental in forging. Although the SWP has strictly demarcated itself from NPAC, both it and the WL can blur this distinction when they find it useful to do so.

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER, in September 1969, pointed to the opportunism intermixed with PL's "third period" Stalinist "ultra-leftism". We attacked its theory of stages, of a "united front" in the trade unions, in which the "Left" determined the differing "levels of struggle" in relation to the "Center", as, in reality, an attempt to revive the "popular front" period bloc of the '30's and '40's with a section of the labor bureaucracy which the CP had then been able to achieve.

PL has correctly concluded that NPAC represents a bloc for counter-revolutionary purposes of the liberal bourgeoisie, personified by Hartke, of its labor-lieutenants such as Reuther, and of such social-reformist servitors as the SWP. Its "ultra-left" adventurism, however, hides its opportunistic acceptance of the sell out by the Soviet, Chinese and Vietnamese Stalinists of the Indochinese revolution on the altar of "peaceful coexistence" with US imperialism. In this respect, there was little to choose between the positions at the conference of the "ultra-left" PL, the SWP, IS, LC, and also, the WL.

The latter has set itself forth as the revolutionary alternative to the revisionist SWP. Yet, it and the Socialist Labour League (SLL) with which it is in political solidarity, have, under cover of the slogan, "Victory to the NLF", studiously avoided calling attention to the North Vietnamese-NLF program of betrayal of the Vietnamese and Indochinese revolution. This betrayal is an essential part of the betrayal of the international working class by Soviet and Chinese Stalinists in

behalf of their respective "socialism in one country".

After the NPAC convention, the WL discovered that Madame Binh's new 7 point offer to US imperialism was a betrayal. But, as we have indefatigably pointed out, the 10 point NLF program, originated in 1960 and reaffirmed by the PRG which was formed in 1969, constituted the fundamental betrayal.

The earlier NLF and PRG programs guaranteed the maintenance of a capitalist and neutralist South Vietnam under a government of "national concord". The present willingness to incorporate elements of the Saigon puppet regime into such a government is a quantitative addition which does not change the original quality of the program. It would seem, however, that the WL and SLL have decided that the time is now "ripe" to "expose" the Stalinist "conspiracy" with US imperialism on Indochina. But its opportunism on this question which directly aided the Stalinists cover up this "conspiracy" over a number of years will not be soon forgotten.

As to its political "accomplishments", the NPAC convention, not unexpectedly, voted for a joint campaign with PCPJ designed to produce more "massive" demonstrations in a number of cities on November 6th, to be preceded by Hiroshima-Nagasaki memorial actions August 6 - 9, "moratorium" actions on October 13th, and Veterans Day actions on October 25th, in building toward the November 6 demonstrations.

The CP dominated PCPJ evidently believes in cooperating with NPAC in behalf of a liberal imperialist-Stalinist counter-revolutionary "peace", while also utilizing every opportunity to "knife" its SWP rival in social reformism.

The convention managed, as expected, to eliminate all resolutions which attempted to redirect it toward the working class. Thus, the WL's proposal that NPAC call a "Congress of labor, minority peoples and youth" for the construction of a labor party in time for the 1972 elections, and that it support

"strike actions" while encouraging a "general strike", was excluded together with 16 of the other 20 major resolutions submitted before a final vote.

The International Socialists (IS) supported "Militant Action Caucus" called upon NPAC to establish a trade union division which would, with the support of "anti-war union leaders", initiate anti-war "rallies" on Labor Day, and hold lunch hour "rallies" at work-sites which could be built into "work stoppages" against the war, unemployment and inflation. It also proposed a conference to consider "political action independent of the Democratic and Republican Parties and oriented to the needs of Labor and its allies: the Black, Brown and Women's Liberation movements". Its resolution was easily defeated, as was that of the Labor Committee (LC), which called for NPAC support to strikes and for "independent political action" similar to that of IS.

It should be recalled that in 1968, IS organized a "Peace and Freedom Party", which like the CP creation, the "Freedom and Peace Party", raised "issues", but never the issue of socialism. Both IS and LC have opposed a struggle for an independent labor party within the unions, which would be based on the transitional program of revolutionary Marxism. Both are for an "independent" party, which would, evidently, generate radical rhetoric while avoiding a clear, revolutionary working class program.

But, as a result of the ruling class split on the Indochinese war, some liberal politicians, and with them the CP, are also posing the possible launching of an "independent" party for 1972 on the "issue" of "ending" the war, if a Democratic "peace" candidate cannot be secured. The liberals are also capable of occasionally using "radical" populist verbiage. Now, when a class party is urgently needed and can be achieved, IS and LC, in typical centrist fashion, urge a half-way house, which plays into the hands of the CP and liberal bourgeoisie!

The reaction of the WL to the dis-

ruptive tactics of PL and the SL discloses a great deal about its political and organizational "METHOD".

It has reversed its position toward the "peace" coalition twice in the past two years, without once having explained its gyrations to its "Bulletin" readers. In 1970, it participated in the Washington demonstration organized by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, emphasizing the increased support by trade union leaders. In April 1971, in spite of an even larger trade union support for an identical petty-bourgeois program of pacifist protest politics, the WL found that the demonstration organized by NPAC-PCPJ was then counterrevolutionary, and decided to hold counter-demonstrations. Now, two months later, it again found the presence of six union vice-presidents at the NPAC convention of extreme importance, and not only took part in it, but also found that its political duty --not unmixed with pleasure, we believe--lay in assisting NPAC in ejecting PL and SL "hooligans". It should also be recalled that five years ago, members of the WL--then named the American Committee for the Fourth International--refused to carry unsigned Spartacist placards calling for "Victory For the Vietnamese Revolution" and the "Immediate Unconditional Withdrawal of All US Troops" because of NY Peace Parade Committee discipline which had restricted the marchers to seven less "radical" slogans.

Despite all its chatter about "the drawing of class lines", the WL continues to demonstrate its inability to understand where they are drawn. This is why its approach to "popular front" "peace" coalitions continues to be erratic, as again demonstrated at the NPAC convention.

The WL acknowledges that the platforms of both NPAC and PCPJ express their "popular front" character as alliances of social-reformists with liberals. Despite the presence of and even control by the SWP and CP, both are multi-class coalitions on the other side of the class line.

It is necessary, of course, for revolutionary Marxists to work on

and to utilize any forum which such a coalition may provide to expose its nature and to counterpose a revolutionary perspective and program to its liberal bourgeois "peace" program. The Marxists, however, always make clear to the workers' movement that they are not part of that coalition.

As we have previously stated, it is essential that organizations which are part of the working class movement, no matter how marginal--including all varieties of opportunists--be defended from Stalinist and other hooligan attacks. Gangsterism of this nature is used to prevent an examination of the ideas of political opponents, to hinder the development of consciousness. We would, therefore, defend the SWP from attack, as we have offered to defend the WL.

Although we would have helped defend the NPAC convention from an attack by fascist elements--clearly differentiating the revolutionary basis of such a defense from that of the liberals--we consider the WL actions in defense of NPAC to have crossed the class line. It has attacked organizations on our side of the class line in behalf of a multi-class coalition. The WL has thereby encouraged future hooligan actions against working class tendencies by Stalinists and other organizational opportunists.

It is not our responsibility to defend "popular front" conventions, which place mass anti-war sentiment at the service of the liberal wing of the ruling class, from organizations on the "left". They can either defend themselves or call upon forces from their own side of the class line, the "cops".

We do not evenhandedly attack "hooliganism in all its forms", as did the LC's Lyn Marcus in the best liberal tradition. We examine every action--including a "hooligan" disruption--from the criterion of the interests of the working class. On this basis, we condemn PL's and the SL's disruptive tactics as a disservice to the task of politically defeating the NPAC "popular front" coalition, and of winning its more

radical adherents to revolutionary politics. Their antics only antagonized the convention's participants, thus helping the SWP from the "left".

The WL's organizational opportunism, which is consistent with its eclectic and impressionistic method, is clearly visible in its approach to the trade union bureaucracy.

According to the "Bulletin" of July 12, 1971, the presence of trade union officials at the convention was "extremely important...reflects the entrance of millions of workers into the anti-war movement". "It is the movement of these ranks which forces the leadership into the peace movement". And yet, there was "the absence...of strong rank and file trade union forces", "...workers were present...in relatively small numbers". "Most of the trade union spokesmen...had affiliation now or at one time with the Communist Party or...are full time officials...with hostility to 'ideology' [and to the] rank and file."

It is obvious today that the workers make up a large part of the majority of the American people who no longer support the war. But, in spite of the WL's idyllic portrait, they are not yet pouring into the "anti-war movement", or even "forcing" their bureaucrats into the "peace" movement. This level of struggle will be reached and then surpassed as the revolutionary Marxists carry out their responsibility to build a vanguard party in the working class capable of uniting its daily struggles to the struggle against war and the system which breeds it.

The labor bureaucrats who support the "peace" movement today reflect, not "pressure" by the workers, but the interests of the liberal imperialist bourgeoisie, either directly or through the medium of the CP, as both the WL and the SWP well know.

The WL's double-talk reflects its ambivalent attitude toward the petty-bourgeois bureaucratic layers in, on and around the workers' movement.

It seems that the SWP's Harry Ring, in repudiating Hartke's slander that PL was equally responsible with

Nixon for the war, inadvertently made a motion that "Nixon and his class" were alone responsible. Ring immediately and unsuccessfully tried to eliminate the phrase, "and his class". This accident, occasioned, no doubt, by Ring's need to talk a certain amount of "Marxese" to the growing left opposition in the SWP, is seen by the WL as a highly significant action by an "anti-war convention".

The SWP, it seems, may yet carry "through on the line of struggle against 'Nixon and the class he represents'". Its "leadership" may yet choose to "make such a break..."

The union bureaucrat may represent a "privileged strata", may be a "sell out", but, oh, happy thought, may he not also be pressured like the SWP into carrying "through a line of struggle against 'Nixon and the class he represents'..."?

It is, evidently, by sowing illusions in the potential of the SWP and labor bureaucracy to lead a struggle in the interests of the working class that the WL intends to fight against Pabloism!

There is only one anti-war program -- the revolutionary struggle against war. Only VANGUARD NEWSLETTER has proposed a consistently revolutionary program, which can defeat US imperialism through the victory of the Vietnamese and Indochinese revolutions as an integral part of the revolutionary struggle of the international working class.

Our four-part program calls upon the international working class to launch a world-wide campaign to:

1. boycott American products and blacklist all cargo which can be used by the American imperialists against the Indochinese.
2. demand that the Soviet Union and China give the Indochinese sufficient military assistance for defensive and offensive actions against US forces there.
3. call upon the masses in Indochina for a revolutionary struggle, which alone can end their quarter-century of bloodshed and suffering.

A coordinated military offensive in all Indochina, not the limited defensive actions which wait upon a Soviet and/or Chinese counter-revolutionary deal! Not guarantees to the "national" capitalists and concessions to the landlords in a government of national "concord", but the program of the Permanent Revolution--the overthrow of capitalism, socialization of the means of production and the land by the working class at the head of the peasantry. Workers' power! The "dictatorship of the proletariat"!

4. We call upon the revolutionary Marxists in this country to build a network of rank and file caucuses in the trade unions on our transitional program, which unites the racially divided working class

#### WAR AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

As Trotsky often stressed, it is because war speeds all social processes that wars and revolutions tend to be closely linked.

War also accelerates and makes more visible the inner decay of once-revolutionary organizations and exposes the "revolutionary" pretensions of others.

The 1940 Manifesto of the Fourth International On the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution has been reprinted by the SWP as an unavoidable part of its assumed function as Trotsky's publishers. This activity serves it today as a useful cover for its break with his entire revolutionary outlook.

Now to be found in Writings of Leon Trotsky (1939 - 40), it is dealt with as an historical curiosity for the cognoscenti, and certainly not to be given mass distribution. The 1934 declaration, War and the Fourth International, the foundation for the 1940 Manifesto, is presently consigned to oblivion. It will at most also be treated as another curiosity by the SWP, when and if its reprinting can no longer be postponed from purely "literary" considerations.

To these and other latter-day "Trotskyists", Trotsky's program

in the struggle against special oppression, and which links their daily struggles, not only to the struggle against the American imperialist war in Indochina, but also to the socialist revolution.

The program of the NLF and North Vietnam, the deal with American imperialism, blessed not only by the Soviet Stalinists but also by their Chinese counterparts, prepares greater misery, death and destruction for the masses in Indochina and Southeast Asia. Only the program which VANGUARD NEWSLETTER upholds can prevent world Stalinism from consummating a new and more disastrous betrayal.

It is in the struggle for our program that an American section of the international working class vanguard party will be built.

on war, which VANGUARD NEWSLETTER upholds, is "sectarian". "Single-issue"ism, the new banner of the SWP, was a necessary least common denominator for its "peace" coalition with the liberal imperialists.

Between the "right" centrists of the SWP and our revolutionary position on war, oscillates assorted "left" centrist organizations, ranging from the Labor Committee (LC) to the Workers League (WL). The programs of all these groups on US imperialism's war in Indochina are only notable for their qualities of inconsistency, eclecticism and timidity.

These "revolutionary" socialists criticize, but they also join the liberal-CP-SWP "peace" coalitions --the more erratic WL is sometimes in and sometimes out, as we noted --and rest content with urging them on to more "proletarian" attitudes.

Not one of these organizations, as we have also noted, has had the integrity and courage to expose and oppose the liberal-Stalinist counter-revolutionary program for Indochina, although they are by now all



well aware of its nature. That would be "sectarian"!

What the "anti-war" movement requires, it seems, is a more "transitional" program than that of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER. The left centrists are all opposed to the SWP's "single-issue" stance. The latter, would, no doubt, also justify this tactic as "transitional".

All centrists who have had even a nodding acquaintance with Trotskyism try to conceal their opportunism behind terms such as "transitional", by verbal juggling, by attempts to substitute a question of pedagogy for one of principle.

It is, of course, always necessary for revolutionary Marxists to take account of the level of working class consciousness in their propaganda and agitation for the socialist revolution. It is for this reason that Marxists beginning with Marx have refused to pose their program ultimatically, but have instead advocated transitional measures which enable the workers to relate their objective conditions to the socialist goal.

To the revolutionary socialists, therefore, transitional measures are concrete programmatic demands which, in the words of the Communist Manifesto, enable them to "represent ... the future of that movement" in the struggle for the "momentary interests of the working class." The transitional measures which that document upheld, did not, needless to say, in the least contradict its avowal that, "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims."

To the centrists, however, "transitional" becomes a useful word to enable them to avoid saying what is, to avoid fighting for a revolutionary position on the war in an assemblage largely composed of radicals and would-be revolutionists, to conciliate other opportunists who in turn conciliate the liberals.

The hallmark of social-opportunism is the undervaluation of the working class. All varieties of centrism make opportunistic adaptations to political backwardness. To the extent that they have roots in the working class, they compromise its

"future" for its "momentary interests". In so doing, they, of course, reflect bourgeois ideology. "Our centrists, however, have roots almost entirely among the students, and more directly adapt to the ideology of its liberal bourgeois wing.

Revolutionists who are based in the working class soon learn, if they wish to retain that base, that transitional demands must also be posed in a "transitional" manner, and not mechanically or ultimatically; that these demands must be related to the concrete situation in which they are required to function. As revolutionists who have ever been workers know, or should know, particular sectors of the working class lag behind or are more advanced than the prevailing level of consciousness. Every such revolutionist knows that it may not be possible to successfully pose a particular transitional demand in a particular shop or even industry until conditions there and in general have reached a certain degree of maturity. But real revolutionists will, under all circumstances, continue to strive to advance the consciousness of the workers to the level of transitional demands, and in this process, to the full program of the socialist revolution.

They will, of course, work at the optimum pace which conditions permit, and will function with an eye to every opportunity, and in a way which will enable them to create new opportunities to win adherents to their program.

We begin with program, and not with subjective moods. The centrists do the opposite.

As Trotsky stated in May 1938, in discussing the labor party:

"'scientific socialism'... signifies that the party... departs not from subjective wishes, tendencies or moods, but from objective facts; from the material situation of the different classes and their relationships. Only by this method can we establish demands adequate to the objective situation and only after this can we adapt these demands and slogans to the given

mentality of the masses."

Both the Manifesto and the earlier document relate the question of war to the international objective reality; to the contradictions of world capitalism--to the developing economic and political relationships of national states, between imperialist blocs, between the advanced and under-developed countries, and to the conjunctural manifestations as well as the fundamental contradictions between world capitalism and the Soviet Union.

It was on the basis of Trotsky's understanding of the "material situation of the different classes and their relationships", nationally and internationally, of the nature of the epoch as one of "wars and revolutions", in Lenin's phrase, that he presented his program on war.

"The defeat of your own (imperialist) government is the lesser evil", states the Transitional Program (original emphasis). Both documents set forth this "basic principle" as the task of the revolutionary Marxists in the advanced countries.

It is almost four decades since Trotsky wrote War and the International. Although its specific expressions differ, the fundamental traits of centrism have not changed. Consider the following:

"Right centrists are concerned with...glossing over the question of the class character of the state, evading the problem of the conquest of power...left centrists whose...internationalism...bears a platonic character...fear to break away from the right centrists; in the name of the struggle with 'sectarianism' they carry on a struggle against Marxism...in the final analysis the centrists put a break upon the revolutionary re-grouping within the proletariat and consequently also upon the struggle against war."

"Our centrists also have "international" pretensions. In reality, they suffer from a national myopia, from a chauvinistic predilection to a narrow focus upon their "own

scene", the present "subjective mood" of their workers--at bottom, their labor bureaucracy and petty-bourgeoisie. Our program which calls upon the international working class, including its American sector, for class solidarity in a campaign against US imperialism's war in Indochina, is, obviously, "sectarian" to the centrist mentality.

SWP members who can manage to get their hands on a copy of the 1934 document on war will find a blistering indictment of their party's present "peace" policies. As Cde. Robins shows elsewhere in this issue, the 1940 Manifesto levies a devastating attack against pacifism. The 1934 document similarly attacks:

"the replacement of revolutionary class struggles by the petty-bourgeois policy of ostentatious demonstrations, showy parades, Potemkin villages."

Trotsky continues:

"The slogan of peace has a pacifist, that is lying, stupefying, enfeebling character only when democratic and other politicians juggle with it; when priests offer up prayers for the speediest cessation of the slaughter; when 'lovers of humanity', among them also social-patriots, tearfully urge the governments to make peace quickly on the 'basis of justice'. But the slogan of peace has nothing in common with pacifism when it emanates from working class quarters and trenches, intertwining itself with the slogan of fraternization of the soldiers of the hostile armies and uniting the oppressed against the oppressors. The revolutionary struggle for peace which takes on ever wider and bolder forms is the surest means of 'turning the imperialist war into a civil war.'"

"Sectarian"? Only to centrists! Trotsky makes clear that principle must be fought for, however, through the application of correct pedagogy. He emphasizes:

"To conquer revolutionary positions in the trade unions and other working class mass organizations, it is necessary to break pitilessly with bureaucratic ultimatism, to take the workers where they are and as they are, and to lead them forward from partial tasks to general ones, from defense to attack, from patriotic prejudices to the overthrow of the bourgeois state." (original emphasis)

We expose world Stalinism's counter-revolutionary role in the context of a revolutionary program for the defense of all of the social gains of the international working class -- the only real and lasting defense. "Sectarianism", cries the centrist.

We call for an international campaign to awaken the Indochinese masses to the program of the Permanent Revolution instead of the neo-Menshevik program of the NLF and PRG. The worst kind of "sectarianism", obviously!

Why, it might harm the "cause of peace" by breaking up the liberal-Stalinist-reformist coalition! It might alienate some demonstration supporters, whose militant action slogan is, "Peace, now!", or even, "Ho! Ho! Ho Chi Minh! Besides, who are we Americans to tell the Indochinese how to conduct their war for "national liberation"?! And, not to be excluded from consideration, would not the truth "harm the cause" of the NLF?!

Some of those who are capable of voicing such sentiments even suffer from the delusion that they are "Trotskyists"!

War and the Fourth International states, as if in answer to "our" centrists, that:

"The proletarian vanguard will be the better armed for the struggle against war the sooner and more fully it will free its mind from the web of centrism. A necessary condition for success on this road is to pose clearly and irreconcilably all questions connected with war."

As VANGUARD NEWSLETTER has tried

to do! Moreover, said Trotsky:

"...the unconditional support of the USSR against the imperialist armies must go hand in hand with revolutionary Marxian criticism of the war and the diplomatic policy of the Soviet government, and with the formation inside of the USSR of a real revolutionary party of Bolshevik-Leninists."

The parallel with our position on Indochina and the struggle against the present policies of Stalinism should be clear.

To "national" socialists, Trotsky addressed the following words:

"It is indisputable at any rate in our epoch that only that organization which bases itself on international principles and enters into the ranks of the world party of the proletariat can root itself in the national soil. The struggle against war means now the struggle for the Fourth International!" (original emphasis)

As to the "harm" which the truth about the NLF program can do, a parallel exists with Spain of 1936. At that time, Trotsky and the Fourth International were attacked as agents of fascism for calling for the socialist revolution. The Stalinist "popular front" program of "defending" Spanish "democracy", however, actually did betray a proletarian revolution into the hands of Franco and fascism.

The "Friends of the Soviet Union" also attacked the Trotskyists for exposing the degeneration of the first workers' state. Trotsky's answer to them applies today. Only the enemies of socialism can benefit by the policies of the Stalinists. The working class, on the other hand, can only benefit by the truth. Only through a full awareness of its class interests, can it overthrow the exploiters and eliminate the parasites which infest it.

In January 1926, a few months before the British general strike, Trotsky wrote a letter in which he made the following observation:

"The ideological and organizational formation of a real revolutionary party on the basis of a mass movement is only conceivable under conditions of a continuous, systematic, unwavering, untiring and naked denunciation of the muddles, compromises and indecision of the quasi-left leaders of all shades."

As our readers know, the policy of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER has been entirely in accord with Trotsky's advice. We shall continue to bear with equanimity the criticisms of the centrists of all kinds, while continuing to carry out this policy to the best of our ability.

### BANGLA DESH AND LENINISM - Part II, Nation and Class

At this writing, more than 7 million Bengalis, approximately 10% of the original population of East Pakistan, have fled across the border to India, with thousands still arriving daily.

Conservative estimates accepted by the US government are that 200,000 to 250,000 Bengalis have been brutally slain by the 70,000 Pakistani army of occupation.

Accounts of the atrocities visited on the population of East Bengal, including those of observers from a number of countries, indicate that the Pakistani dictator, General Yaya Khan, has launched a campaign of a genocidal character especially aimed at driving the 10 million Hindus out of the country.

Although the Hindus are a particular target, approximately two million refugees are Moslems. The army is attempting to destroy any possible source of opposition to Yaya Khan and the Pakistani ruling class. It has imprisoned and executed all known or suspected Moslem supporters of the bourgeois Awami League (AL). Led by Sheik Mujibur Rahman, who had declared, "I am the only one who can save East Pakistan from communism", the AL received a majority, 167 of 313 seats for a National Assembly which was never convened, in elections last December.

Mujibur Rahman, who was negotiating with Yaya Khan for a measure of autonomy for East Pakistan on the eve of the slaughter, is now on trial for his life before a special military court on charges of treason.

West Pakistanis have replaced Bengalis in government jobs. The army has removed the names of Hindus and Moslem Bengali nationalists from street signs, discourages the use of the Bengali language and demands

that Urdu be used instead.

The economy of Bangla Desh is now in a catastrophic state. As a result of the terror, a large part of the working class of East Bengal has dispersed into the countryside. However, the army has managed to keep the key ports of Chittagong and Chalna in operation.

Agriculture is completely disrupted. The looting, killing and burning of villages, and the concentrated terror in the cities and towns has caused a drastic decline in the marketing of produce. Large scale planting and harvesting are practically non-existent. The specter of famine now looms, with millions of Bengalis slated to die of starvation and millions more driven by hunger into India.

The influx of refugees into West Bengal province, where the bulk of the original Indian inhabitants eke out a precarious existence, has strained all existing facilities. The refugees are barely kept alive on a below starvation diet with little if any shelter. Cholera is still a serious menace in the refugee camps, with disease taking its greatest toll of the weak, the young and the old.

In response to the national oppression, a Vietnamese-style guerrilla movement has been formed, the Mukti Fouj or Liberation Army. The former East Pakistani Rifles, the Bengal Regiment and the East Bengal police are the core of this force which is presently operating in the border regions. The guerrillas now number

20,000 with another 30,000 receiving training in India, and have the support of the overwhelming majority of the population of Bangla Desh.

In addition to the Awami League, organizations reported to be active in the guerilla resistance movement are the pro-Moscow East Bengal CP, two sections of the National Awami Party, and several Maoist groups. According to the report in "Inter-continental Press" of June 28, a new "national liberation front" to be known as "Sangram Parishad" is being formed, "comprising all allies, to provide unified leadership of the 'people's war'".

Information about the reaction of the Pakistani masses to the oppression of the Bengalis has not been reported. The controlled press there has pictured events as a massacre of Bihari Moslems, with the Pakistani army functioning as their protector as well as acting to preserve a united "nation".

It should be remembered that in 1968-69, the growing crisis in West Pakistan had produced a surging mass movement of strikes and demonstrations which forced Ayub Khan to grant such democratic concessions as a "free" press. Yaya Khan, to whom Ayub turned over state power was also forced to allow elections for a National Assembly.

The reaction of Pakistanis in Great Britain indicates that the masses in Pakistan may well have succumbed to a nationalistic mood.

According to the NY Times of June 12, one of the most compact "Pakistani" communities is in Bradford, England. Approximately 30,000 East Bengalis and Pakistanis work in its textile factories. Four of five night shift workers and 20% of the male labor force are Bengalis and Pakistanis. The men live in pairs in furnished rooms and work six and seven nights a week for the extra pay to enable them to send for their families. Before the bloodbath in East Bengal, the two were one "community". Now the Bengali and Pakistani workers tend to see each other as enemies. The Pakistanis are angered at the Bengalis for not "understanding" that Yaya Khan and

the Pakistani army were "forced" to take "action" as in a "mutiny on a ship". The prevailing judgment among Pakistanis is that the "trouble" was initiated by India, British interests and the US CIA.

The Soviet Union's new "friendship" treaty with India--actually a security pact against an attack by Pakistan assisted by China--will undoubtedly help fortify the nationalistic reaction of these workers.

In a recent election in Bradford, Pakistanis helped defeat a Labor Party candidate of East Bengal origin by casting their votes for the Conservative Party.

In its May 1971 issue, VANGUARD NEWSLETTER made the following statement:

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

Lenin's position on the national question was proven in the negative in Pakistan and Bangla Desh. A Leninist party in these countries would have fought to win the workers of West Pakistan to the struggle against the special oppression of East Pakistan and for its right to self-determination, i.e., to secede. It would have sought to win the workers in East Pakistan for a united struggle with the workers of the west to overthrow the comprador capitalist and semi-feudal landlords which the military dictatorship protects, and in this manner, end their national oppression.

The scheme of Tariq Ali, a London based spokesman for the United Secretariat of the Fourth International (U Sec) for a "united socialist Bengal" would not unite the workers of Bangla Desh and Pakistan. This "great idea" logically expresses the U Sec's opportunism on the national question. "Revolutionary nationalism" replaces the Leninist position which strives for the unity of the

working class of oppressor and oppressed nations for the socialist revolution. Tariq Ali's conception would unite the masses in Pakistan behind Yaya Khan and the Pakistani ruling class and divide the masses in India in the name of "socialism".

Marxist theory is a "guide to action" even in the most difficult circumstances. Opportunist organizations such as the SWP and U Sec, the Workers League (WL) and the Socialist Labour League (SLL) "forget" the ABC's of Marxism with each new turn. All the opportunists of the "left" are now raising the neo-Menshevik banner of "national liberation first, and then 'socialism'".

Tariq Ali's double-talk about a "united socialist Bengal" is only a screen to cover the nakedness of the U Sec. So also, some "Marxists" and "Leninists" now part of the "national liberation front" propose that the Bangla Desh government promise to distribute land to the "tillers" and also raise other "economic" issues. The WL and SLL also try to exhibit a "more left" image through greater bluster about giving "support to the armed struggle".

The revolutionary Marxists in Bangla Desh will not, however, discard their class banner and program. Even in the present situation of extreme national oppression, they will swim against the stream and not yield to the tide of bourgeois nationalism. They will maintain whatever ties are still possible among the organized and unorganized workers of Bangla Desh, and will re-establish them wherever they have been severed as soon as possible.

The main weapon which the revolutionary workers will train on the Pakistani army will be that of revolutionary fraternization. The morale of the Pakistani troops has noticeably declined. The revolutionists will further attack the morale of the "peasants in uniform" which is the Pakistani army rank and file with the artillery of the land question. They will thereby draw a revolutionary line between the ranks and the officers. To national antagonisms rooted in poverty and

exploitation, in colonialism and semi-colonialism, the revolutionary Marxists will counterpose the elimination of poverty, the development of the productive forces through a socialist federation of the entire sub-continent, of Pakistan, Bangla Desh and India, united by the international socialist revolution to the advanced countries. They will raise the banner of the socialist revolution in the national liberation movement, and attempt to win its workers and peasants for their program and away from the bourgeois nationalist program of Mukti Fouj.

The revolutionary Marxists of Pakistan will also struggle against the patriotic stream. They will fight for the right of Bangla Desh to independence. They will unite this struggle to the class struggle and to the land question in overthrowing the military dictatorship in a socialist revolution.

Revolutionary Marxists throughout the world will expose the roots of the present struggle in Bangla Desh in the ongoing manipulations of imperialism to maintain its power and privilege in the under-developed countries. They will expose the counterrevolutionary role of international Stalinism, thus destroying illusions among their own masses about the "revolutionary" qualities of either its Chinese or Soviet varieties. They will demand that the Chinese Stalinists end their support to Yaya Khan. They will organize united front actions in support of the right of Bangla Desh to independence and for the withdrawal of Pakistani troops. They will blacklist all cargo bearing arms to Pakistan. In so doing, they will fortify the class consciousness of the Bengali workers, and help insulate them from the appeal of bourgeois nationalism.

Only the Permanent Revolution, a socialist revolution under the leadership of the working class at the head of the peasant masses and linked to the international socialist revolution can achieve "democracy and national emancipation" in either Bangla Desh or Pakistan.

## SPARTACIST LEAGUE SPLIT

The political positions of a minority within the Spartacist League, prior to its ouster from that organization, are set forth in the enclosed pamphlet.

This minority attempted to transform the SL from a propagandist circle, orientated mainly to student radicals, into an organization which would root itself in the working class and proceed to build a Leninist vanguard party. As this record makes clear, Robertson and his majority were able to retain control of the organization by bureaucratic measures. In so doing, they ensured that the SL would remain a small isolated sect, concerned, in the main, to provide an occasional expression of opinion by the cult leader to the intellectual milieu.

In developing its perspectives for work in the class, the minority attempted to apply the theoretical knowledge and practical experience acquired by its revolutionary predecessors to present reality. The pioneering activity of the early Communist Party in the Trade Union Educational League (TUEL), a transitional organization led by William Z. Foster, the Transitional Program of the Fourth International, and Trotsky's contributions of the Negro question, constituted the most essential elements of its approach, as formulated in the Memorandum on the Negro Struggle.

Whither the Spartacist League, The Internal Struggle Continues and Ideology and Practice represent a defense and further elaboration of the minority's outlook in the heat of factional struggle. In depicting this struggle, the pamphlet reveals the bankruptcy of the SL, its lack of perspective, and its narrow circle character. More importantly, the pamphlet focuses on the problem of building a Leninist party in the most industrially developed country in the world, which is, moreover, divided on racial lines.

The upsurge in militancy of black workers, and the growing number of strikes by, and rank and file actions within the organized labor movement, was viewed by the minority within the context of the sharpening crisis of world capitalism. It recognized that the growing contradictions of the world imperialist system meant increasing attacks on the political rights and the living standards of the working class as a whole. It concluded that opportunities for the building of the Leninist party were increasingly to be found.

The minority understood that the present winning of black workers meant, not only rooting the party in the most exploited sector of the class but also, the acquisition of future leadership for the class as a whole; that a vital stage in the process of building the party was now at hand, with the radicalization of black workers; that the struggle against the special oppression of black workers, within the context of a struggle for the interests of all workers, led to the winning of black and white workers to socialist consciousness; that, conversely, neither black nor white workers could acquire this consciousness without an uncompromising struggle against white chauvinism and its mirror image, black nationalism.

We believe these insights to be increasingly valid today, and necessary to the construction of a party of the Leninist type in the U.S.

We welcome your comments and criticisms.

Harry Turner  
Hugh Fredricks