

G L O B A L C L A S S W A R

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	by Communist Cadre	1
Memorandum on the Unfolding War and the Tasks of the Proletariat in the New Phase of the World (Permanent) Revolution	by Sam Marcy (October 29, 1950)	33
The Global Class War and the Destiny of American Labor	by Sam Marcy (May 20, 1953)	45
Letter to the SWP National Committee Re: Weiss Article On Clark	by Sam Marcy (September 25, 1957)	67
Internal WWP Documents	Introduction to the Global Class War by Vincent Copeland (July 1973)	74

1979

WORKERS AND OPPRESSED UNITE
204 West 20 Street
New York, NY 10011

INTRODUCTION

by Communist Cadre

In the early 1960s a new political formation appeared in the U.S. left, based primarily in New York City and with an active presence confined to the northeastern United States. This new tendency, Workers World Party (WWP), through its action arm Youth Against War & Fascism (YAWF) played the leading role in the militant demonstrations of the anti-war movement during that period, as against the Communist Party (CP) and the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) with their "peaceful mass actions" and their alliances with the capitalist liberals.

Few people in the movement at that time, including most of YAWF's membership itself, troubled themselves very much with the questions of WWP's origins and political character. While YAWF's militancy was never the adventurism that its non-struggle opponents claimed, WWP's apparent lack of interest in theory and polemic allowed the epithet of "mindless militancy" to seem deserved to many. And yet this political tendency had taken shape during very serious theoretical battles and its leaders, far from being mindless, were veterans of the "old left" with political careers beginning in the 1930s.

WWP's organ, Workers World, by the mid-sixties looked to the casual observer like a Maoist paper, filled with praise for Mao and Lin Piao. Only the self-identified Maoist Revolutionary Union and at times the CP bothered to remind anybody that YAWF was "Trotskyite." But WWP indeed had its origins in the Trotskyist movement; WWP had emerged as a split from the SWP in 1959 and in fact had a pre-party history as a factional grouping inside the SWP that goes back to at least 1948.

WWP never called itself Trotskyist. The first issue of Workers World in 1959 bore Trotsky's picture on the editorial page--a token gesture to the past that was never to be repeated. Inside WWP, however, Trotsky was read and the leadership claimed to be pursuing a policy that was based on Trotsky's politics. The words Trotsky and Trotskyism were, according to the leaders, publicly avoided simply because of the success of the international Stalinist slander campaign, as well as the bad name given to Trotskyism by the SWP in the 1950s and 1960s. As was to be expected, some members took this appeal to Trotsky seriously and when WWP openly broke with its own militant, anti-popular frontist traditions in 1974, a split took place which led to the formation of Communist Cadre.

The Heritage They Have Renounced

Communist Cadre has critically examined WWP's history and pre-history. We do not characterize ourselves as "Marxists" nor is our aim to reconstruct the YAWF of the 1960s. We do not believe WWP was ever Trotskyist. But in the WWP of the 1960s there was good mixed with the bad. YAWF's militancy during the 1960s, which stood in such contrast to the conservatism of the SWP and CP, its enthusiasm for boldly championing the revolutionary struggles against its "own" country, in contrast to the shame-faced pacifism that characterized so much of the "peace" movement, is an integral and absolutely necessary component of Trotskyism.

But we believe that the most important lessons to be drawn from the WWP/YAWF tradition lie in WWP's pre-party history when, as a tendency very much in the minority, those who were later to form WWP waged a theoretical and political struggle against the growing anti-Sovietism and developing degeneration of the post-WWII SWP. That struggle was bound up primarily with the efforts of two men, Sam Marcy and Vincent Copeland.

Communist Cadre has already published Vincent Copeland's *Class Character of the Hungarian Uprising*, written under the party name of V. Grey as an internal SWP

document in 1957, a document which remains to this day the definitive Trotskyist examination of the Hungarian counter-revolutionary uprising of 1956. With the present pamphlet we publicly publish for the first time two documents circulated internally in the SWP in the early 1950s. The first, *Memorandum on the Unfolding War and the Tasks of the Proletariat in the New Phase of the World (Permanent) Revolution* was published internally in October 1950; the second, *The Global Class War and the Destiny of American Labor* in May 1953. Both were written by Sam Marcy, a member of the Socialist Workers Party since the 1930s who went on to become the undisputed leading figure of WWP. Marcy, along with Copeland, led the SWP factional grouping which has become known as the Marcy/Copeland faction--the pre-party formation that was to become WWP.

These two documents of 1950 and 1953 were referred to inside WWP as the "global class war documents" and to the extent that they have been read and discussed in the left at large, they are known generally by that name. Prior to 1973, when internal factional exigencies forced their *internal* publication for the very first time, the overwhelming majority of WWP's members through the years had never read them and many indeed had never even heard of them. The reader will soon see why. The references to Trotskyism as "the only valid and consistently revolutionary Marxism of today," the references to "the virus of Stalinism," the condemnation of the Chinese Stalinist party as representing "in every way a negation" of the ideas of revolutionary Marxism, the call for the political defeat of international Stalinism as a requisite of the prosecution of the revolutionary struggle-- all this does not sit very well with a party that asserted in 1967 that "the Chinese Communist Party has been the strongest, truest, and most devoted of all the parties in the struggle for Marxism and socialism" and which often told its members that the Chinese and Vietnamese Stalinists were carrying out Trotsky's program "in practice."

Why We Publish These Documents

Communist Cadre believes that what was correct and necessary in the practice of YAWF in the 1960s-- its militancy, its defense of the Palestinians and the Middle East liberation struggle, its opposition to the popular frontism of the SWP and CP, its defense of Rob Williams and the Panthers, its critical support of the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia in 1968-- flow from the "global class war" perspective. (But it must be said that in each case what was correct and necessary was mixed with opportunism and tailism--street militancy went hand in hand with a failure to criticize SDS leaders like Mark Rudd; defense of Middle East liberation was coupled with ideological capitulation to Arab bourgeois nationalism; the absolutely correct military defense of the 1968 Soviet intervention went without any programmatic orientation towards political revolution, even at a time when Marcy considered Brezhnev a "neo-bourgeois restorationist"!) But had WWP and YAWF never existed, these documents would still have a significance and be deserving of serious study today.

For the reader with some acquaintance with Trotsky's writings, what Marcy has to say in these two documents may not seem at all unique or new. But the seeming familiarity is just the point. In 1950 Marcy was simply trying to hold fast to the principles that were once well enough known to all in the Trotskyist movement. To truly appreciate Marcy's reiteration and defense of the ABCs of Trotskyism-- especially on the "Russian question"-- it is necessary to know just how far the SWP's leadership under Cannon had departed from that ABC. It is for that reason that in this introduction we will go over in some detail the history of the SWP, going back as far as the Trotsky conversations of 1940 and Cannon's conduct during the 1941 Minneapolis sedition trial. Marcy's polemic was a response to the degeneration of the SWP, which had become highly visible as early as 1948. But that degeneration had been prepared long in advance by the practice of the Cannon leadership-- something Marcy points out with accuracy.

A New Word

But Marcy's documents, especially that of 1950, are not only a defense of orthodoxy. They outlined the application of Trotsky's theoretical approach to the new post-war era. Marcy was the first -- and the significance of it simply can not be over-estimated -- the first to identify the new Chinese Peoples Republic founded in 1949 as a workers' state. This assertion, made in the traditional language of the Trotskyist movement, may not impress today's reader, since it is so patently obvious that China passed under the dictatorship of the proletariat in 1949. But in 1950 no one, simply no one in the entire working class movement -- including the Stalinists -- saw it and said it except Marcy and his supporters.

Also new is the conception of global class war. Marcy saw that the hegemony of U.S. imperialism over the capitalist world following World War II on the one hand, and the "Sovietization" of Eastern Europe and the spread of proletarian revolution to China on the other, meant that the inter-imperialist rivalries of the past would now be subordinated to the struggle of a united imperialism against the spreading revolution. The "cold war" signified a new epoch in which the international class struggle between the two great historical classes -- the bourgeoisie and the proletariat -- would now dominate all international events. This profound shift in the world balance of forces between the classes was also missed by the Trotskyist movement because of its initial failure to see the character of the transformations in Eastern Europe and China, and it was a fact the Stalinists were desperately trying to under-rate in the interests of "peaceful co-existence." But the understanding of this new world reality had to be the basis for the development of U.S. and international Trotskyist policy -- and one will look in vain for a grasp and characterization of the post-war events comparable to Marcy's. Let us now turn to the history of the SWP in order to better place the significance of these documents.

The Degeneration of the Socialist Workers Party

When the New York Times in its editorials praises the SWP as a responsible political formation committed to change through peaceful electoral means and criticizes the FBI's harassment of its activities, the social democratic character of the SWP becomes all too obvious. For serious revolutionaries, the important question is, how did the SWP become what it is today? How did the promising U.S. Trotskyist party of the 1930s, whose leaders had the enormous benefit of ongoing contact with Trotsky in Mexico, arrive at its present position of New York Times-approved candidate for mass social democracy?

Only a thorough examination of the real history of the SWP will show up the significance of the "global class war" perspective of the Marcy/Copeland faction and only a critique of the past practice of the SWP from the viewpoint of "global class war" will make it possible for today's revolutionary Trotskyists to avoid the same path of political degeneration.

The SWP and the Browder Presidential Campaign of 1940

The first significant breach between Trotsky and the SWP, which because of the assassin's blow also proved to be the last, was the little known issue of the 1940 elections. Because the SWP had failed to arrange for the running of its own presidential ticket, Trotsky argued the necessity of giving critical electoral support to Earl Browder, the Communist Party presidential candidate, in order to participate in the elections in the crucial year of 1940.

Cannon and other SWP leaders who traveled to Mexico in order to discuss this and other vital questions with Trotsky were uniformly and adamantly opposed to Trotsky's proposal. What is extremely important was not only the disagreement, but the fact that while the contents of earlier discussions with Trotsky were made known to the SWP ranks through the internal publication of the stenographic notes,

the discussions of 1940 concerning Browder were suppressed by the SWP leaders. Only in 1953 because during a faction fight the leaders of the Cochran grouping demanded their internal publication, did the stenographic transcripts see the light of day. The Browder question might be explained as an honest dispute between Cannon & co. and Trotsky; but the suppression of Trotsky's views by Cannon in order to avoid political embarrassment and possible support for those views from the ranks was indicative of the worst sort of dishonesty and opportunism.

The significance of this suppression should not be underestimated. It is comparable to the suppression by the German Social Democracy's leaders of Marx's criticism of the Gotha Program, or their later censorship of certain key passages concerning violence in Engels' introduction to the 1895 edition of *Class Struggles in France*.

What exactly did Trotsky have to say which proved to be political dynamite for Cannon and the other SWP leaders? And what of their replies to Trotsky's demand for an aggressive turn towards the Stalinist workers? (The following is from a rough stenographic draft--uncorrected by the participants--of discussions with Trotsky held on June 12-15, 1940. Cannon's first remarks refer to the Stalinist left turn following the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact.)

Cannon: ...The general perspective is quite optimistic. The Stalinists are the problem. By their change in line they dealt a heavy blow. We were forging ahead when they made the switch, paralyzing our work. The workers are unable to distinguish the real difference between us, especially with the faction fight compelling us to give undue emphasis to our defense of the Soviet Union. We need a line of agitation to distinguish ourselves from them. The Stalinist party still has a powerful cadre of militants. It has a strong trade union machine which draws the workers. The pact seemed to disintegrate them, but it was losing just the democrats. The old militants are more devoted than ever. They believe that the party now has the 'real revolutionary' line. We need a more effective counter-attack against the Stalinists.

Trotsky: We don't participate in the presidential elections?

Cannon: There are very rigorous election laws which prevent small parties from getting on the ballot.

Trotsky: And the CP?

Cannon: The CP buys its way on to the ballot...

Trotsky: What do we tell the workers when they ask which president they should vote for?

Cannon: They shouldn't ask such embarrassing questions....

Trotsky: Theoretically it is possible to support the Stalinist candidate. It is a way of approaching the Stalinist workers. We can say, yes we know this candidate. But we will give critical support. We can repeat on a small scale what we would do if Lewis were nominated. ... It is necessary to find an approach to the Stalinist party. Theoretically it is not impossible to support their candidates with very sharp warnings....

Of course, we would suffer the indignation of Burnham. Shachtman would say, 'See, I predicted it--capitulation to Stalinism.' There would even be considerable aversion in our ranks. But the question is

the Stalinist workers. The working class is decisive. With guarantees, warnings, why not consider it? ...

Cannon: ... The Stalinists are hated by the militants. It is not the psychological attitude of our members but the broad anti-Stalinist movement. If we started to play this kind of politics we would run into this indignation of these militants. For example, the food workers in New York. Our comrades succeeded in creating a strong progressive faction. They may possibly be elected to posts. We built our strength on opposition to Stalinist control of the union. Such a line would disrupt our work. ... The Stalinists are the main obstacle. A policy of maneuver would be disastrous. ...

Trotsky: ... Imagine the CP without holding a specific hatred toward it. Could we enter it as we did the SP? I see no reason why not--theoretically. Physically it would be impossible but not in principle. After entrance into the SP there is nothing that would prevent our entrance into the CP. But that is excluded. We can't enter. They won't let us.

Can we make this maneuver from the outside? The progressive elements oppose the Stalinists but we don't win many progressive elements. Everywhere we meet Stalinists. How to break the Stalinist party? The support of the progressives is not stable. It is found at the top of the union rather than as a rank-and-file current. Now with the war we will have these progressives against us. ... We can't depend on these elements or their sentiments. We will lose them and isolate ourselves from the Stalinist workers. Now we have no attitude toward them. Burnham and Shachtman opposed an active attitude toward the Stalinists. ... If persecutions should begin tomorrow, it would be first against them, second against us. ...

Cannon: ... It is a terrible danger to risk the condemnation of non-Stalinist workers for the sake of a maneuver that would win little. The progressive movement is composed of anti-Stalinists and legitimate rank-and-file forces organized by us. The Stalinists even buy old-time fakers. They provide a legitimate movement of protest which is our main source of recruitment and which comes during the struggle against the CP. In the Los Angeles auto movement, for example, some ex-CPers organized a counter-movement from which we recruited. The Stalinists have built up a terrible hatred against themselves. Seventy-five percent is genuine workers' grievances and consists of many former Stalinists animated by a terrible bitterness. A complicated maneuver giving the possibility of identifying us with the Stalinists would be wrong. Our main line must be towards the non-Stalinist workers. ...

Trotsky: ... The politics of these so-called progressives is determined by their need to meet the needs of the workers in this movement, on the other hand it comes from fear of the Stalinists. ... Their existence is a reflex of this new movement, but it is not a direct reflection of the rank and file. It is an adaptation of the conservative bureaucrats to this situation. There are two competitors, the progressive bureaucrats and the Stalinists. We are a third competitor trying to capture this sentiment. These progressive bureaucrats can lean on us for advisors in the fight against the Stalinists. But the role of an advisor to a progressive bureaucrat doesn't promise much in the long run. ... These bureaucrats are Rooseveltians, militarists. We tried to penetrate the trade unions with their help. This was a correct maneuver, I believe. ... But it is necessary to know incomparably better the Stalinists and their place in the trade unions, their reaction to our party. It would be fatal to pay too

much attention to the impression that we can make on the pacifists and on our 'progressive' bureaucrat friends. In this case we become the squeezed lemon of the bureaucrats. They use us against the Stalinists but as the war nears call us unpatriotic and expel us. These Stalinist workers can become revolutionary, especially if Moscow changes its line and becomes patriotic. ...the question is how to approach the base? We encounter between us and the base, the Stalinists.

Kay: To support the Stalinists in the presidential campaign would kill us. They shift their line--

Trotsky: Nothing can kill us, Comrade Kay. ...

June 14, 1940

Trotsky: I believe we have the critical point very clear. We are in a bloc with so-called progressives--not only fakers but honest rank and file. Yes they are honest and progressives but from time to time they vote for Roosevelt--once in four years. This is decisive. You propose a trade union policy not a Bolshevik policy. Bolshevik policies begin outside the trade unions. The workers is an honest trade unionist but far from Bolshevik politics. The honest militant can develop but it is not identical with being a Bolshevik. You are afraid to become compromised in the eyes of the Rooseveltian trade unionists. They on the other hand are not worried in the slightest about being compromised by voting for Roosevelt against you. We are afraid of being compromised. If you are afraid, you lose your independence and become half-Rooseveltian. In peace time this is not catastrophic. In war time it will compromise us. They can smash us. Our policy is too much for pro-Rooseveltian trade unionists. ...

What I propose is a manifesto to the Stalinist workers, to say that for five years you were for Roosevelt, then you changed. This turn is in the right direction. Will you develop and continue this policy or not? Will you let the leaders change it or not? Will you continue and develop it or not? If you are firm we will support you. In this manifesto we can say that if you fix a sharp program for your candidate, then we will vote for him. I see no reason why we can't say this with these ifs. Does this signify that we have changed our trade union policy? Not at all. We continue to oppose them as before. We say, if you seriously consider your attitude to Roosevelt you would have such and such policy in the trade unions. But you don't have such a policy there. We can't go along with you in the trade unions.

I would be very glad to hear even one single word from you on policy in regard to the presidential election. ...

The 'progressive' rank and file are a kind of semi-fabrication. They have class struggle tendencies but they vote for Roosevelt. They are not formed politically. The rank-and-file Stalinists are not worse. They are caught in a machine. They are disciplined, political. Our aim is to oppose the Stalinist worker to the machine. How accomplish this? By leaving them alone? We will never do it. By postponing? That is not a policy.

We are for an independent labor ticket. But we don't even have this expressed in our press. Why? Because our party is embarrassed. It has no line on the elections.

Last January we discussed a campaign in the unions to have our own trade union presidential candidate. We were to propose to him that we would vote for him if he were nominated. Even Lewis. We were to begin the campaigning for a labor president. But not a thing was done. Nothing

appeared. Nothing in the *Northwest Organizer*.

... But nothing was done. Why? It signifies an immediate clash with the Rooseveltians--not the rank and file--but a clash with our allies, the machine, the conscious Rooseveltians, who would immediately attack, a clash with our own class enemies such as Tobin. ...

... I ask two or three hundred Stalinist workers. That is the minimum requirement. We can get them by holding their leaders to a class struggle policy. Are you ready to impose this class struggle line on your leader, we ask. Then we will find common ground.

It is not just to write a manifesto, but to turn our political face to the Stalinist workers. What is bad about that? We begin an action against the Stalinists, what is wrong with that? ...

Cannon: Support for a labor candidate can be justified, but the CP is entirely different. The CP is not a genuine workers' party.

Dobbs: ... We will do anything short of supporting the Stalinists in order to go against Roosevelt. ...

June 15, 1940

Hansen: Yesterday Comrade Trotsky made some remarks about our adaptation to the so-called progressives in the trade unions, he mentioned the line of the *Northwest Organizer* and also our attitude in connection with the elections and the Stalinists. I wish to point out that this is not something completely new on Comrade Trotsky's part. More than two years ago during the discussion over the Transitional Program, he discussed exactly these same points and had exactly the same position, with due regard for the difference in time and that then it was not the elections but the farmer-labor party that was to the fore. Comrade Trotsky has also written some letters regarding the Stalinists and the need for a more positive line toward them. In the past faction fight too, Comrade Trotsky mentioned in his polemic 'From a Scratch to Gangrene' the following point, which he underlined: 'More than once the party will have to remind its own trade unionists that a *pedagogical adaptation to the more backward layers of the proletariat must not become transformed into a political adaptation to the conservative bureaucracy of the trade unions.*' I am wondering if Comrade Trotsky considers that our party is displaying a conservative tendency in the sense that we are adapting ourselves politically to the trade union bureaucracy.

Trotsky: To a certain degree I believe it is so. ...

Of course, the Stalinists are a legitimate part of the workers' movement. That it is abused by the leaders for specific GPU ends is one thing, for Kremlin ends another. It is not at all different from other opposition labor bureaucracies. The powerful interests of Moscow influence the Third International, but it is not different in principle. Of course, we consider the terror of the GPU control differently; we fight with all means, even bourgeois police. But the political current of Stalinism is a current in the workers' movement. If it differs, it differs advantageously. In France the Stalinists show courage against the government. They are still inspired by October. They are a selection of revolutionary elements, abused by Moscow, but honest. If they are persecuted in the United States and remain anti-patriotic because Moscow delays its new turn, this would give them considerable political authority. Our revulsion from the Kremlin will not destroy this political authority. We must consider them objectively. We must consider them from the objective Marxist viewpoint. They are

a very contradictory phenomenon. They have great courage. We can't let the antipathies of our moral feelings sway us. Even the assailants on Trotsky's house had great courage. I think that we can hope to win these workers who began as a crystallization of October. We see them negatively: how to break through this obstacle. We must set the base against the top. The Moscow gang we consider gangsters, but the rank-and-file don't feel themselves to be gangsters, but revolutionaries. They have been terribly poisoned. If we show that we understand, that we have a common language, we can turn them against their leaders. If we win 5 percent, the party will be doomed. They can then lead only a conservative existence. Disintegration will set in, because this 5 percent connects them with new sources from the masses.

--from *Internal Bulletin* of the Socialist Workers Party, April 1953.

(The story was often told in NWP that Marcy, ignorant of Trotsky's position, also advocated in 1940 that the SWP support Browder and that he was later "exiled" by Cannon to Buffalo for the trouble he made around this issue. The truth of this apocryphal assertion has never been documented, to our knowledge.)

This adaptation to conservative anti-Stalinist sentiments in the working class in general and the formation of "blocs" with anti-Stalinist "progressives" in the trade unions --i.e., pro-Democratic trade union functionaries-- runs like a red, or rather a pink, thread through the history of the SWP up until the late 1950s when the SWP dropped any pretense of a trade union orientation and began to adapt instead to the new radicalism emerging from the petty bourgeoisie.

When the "progressives" turned to the right with the coming of World War II and then the Cold War, the SWP was taken in tow behind them, as we will now show.

U.S. Trotskyism Without Trotsky

In 1940 Stalin's henchman delivered the worst blow the Fourth International was ever to suffer. In the years that followed, it was to become more and more evident that the Fourth International was unable to replace Trotsky with an individual or collective leadership with the capacity to meet the challenges of wartime and the post-war period. The Socialist Workers Party in the U.S. was simply not equal to the demands of a truly revolutionary prosecution of the struggle without Trotsky's active leadership. Some may consider this assertion a malicious swipe at the traditions of our movement. But centrism is not a moral question or a question of intent; centrism begins simply as incapacity and confusion in the face of great events.

The Bolshevik Party of 1917--had it been deprived of Lenin and Trotsky, but especially Lenin--would have most certainly failed to carry out the insurrection. The obstructionism of Zinoviev and Kamenev, the wavering of Stalin and others would have meant a centrist paralysis in those critical days; the opportunity for the seizure of power would have been lost for years. And who would care to suggest that the SWP of the 1940s, no longer under Trotsky's guidance, was possessed of a leadership even equal to Bolshevism without Lenin? Had Trotsky been removed sooner, it is unlikely Cannon would have even been able to maintain a majority against Shachtman, Burnham, and Abern. Trotsky's polemics against Shachtman, contained in *In Defense of Marxism*, so essential to that struggle, could never have been duplicated by Cannon.

While the degeneration of Trotskyism in Europe can *in part* be explained by the physical elimination of virtually all the leading cadres during the Nazi occupation, the SWP passed through the war in legality and above ground, and its development during this period must be considered on the basis of its own inherent tendencies,

tendencies already displayed prior to 1940.

The 1941 Minneapolis Sedition Trial

The first test of U.S. Trotskyism without Trotsky was the 1941 trial of Cannon and other SWP leaders who had been indicted under the Smith Act for sedition. It is a sad fact that Cannon's defense (we speak of his own testimony and the general political thrust of the defense as prepared by the SWP under his leadership) was not a communist one. Cannon appealed to the patriotic and bourgeois-democratic sentiments of the jury and the U.S. working class as he knew it to be. His remarks, whenever possible, were confined to a mild defense of "socialism in general" and he did not refrain from disowning Marx and Lenin during questioning by the prosecution. If anyone doubts the accuracy and honesty of these assertions, the following extensive quotes from the trial record should be considered:

Defense Attorney: In case of a conflict between the United States and Germany, Italy, or Japan, what would the party's position be so far as the victory or defeat of the United States, as against its imperialist enemies?

Cannon: Well, we are certainly not in favor of a victory for Japan or Germany or any other imperialist power over the United States. ...

Defense Attorney: And you remember--I think it is the last clause of the *Manifesto*, where Marx and Engels, co-authors, say: "We disdain to conceal our aims," and mention something to the effect about violent revolution. Do you remember that?

Cannon: Well, it says, "We disdain to conceal our aims. We openly say that they can be achieved only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social institutions."

Defense Attorney: When was the *Communist Manifesto* written?

Cannon: 1848.

Defense Attorney: Subsequent to the writing of the *Communist Manifesto*, did Marx ever write anything with reference to the possibility of a peaceful revolution in democratic countries?

Cannon: Yes.

Defense Attorney: Where was that written, and explain to the jury what was said.

Cannon: Well, the most authoritative place where it is stated and explained is in the introduction to the first volume of Marx's masterwork, called *Capital*, the introduction by Frederick Engels, who was his co-worker, who was the co-author of the *Communist Manifesto*, and is recognized universally in the movement as completely identified with all of Marx's ideas and theories. Engels as a matter of fact edited and compiled the second two volumes of *Capital*, after the death of Marx.

Defense Attorney: What did he say in that introduction?

Cannon: This was the English translation of *Capital* and the introduction was presenting the volume to the English public. Engels stated--

I think I can quote almost literally--that he thinks the work of a man who during his entire life was of the opinion that the social transformation in England, at least, could be effected by purely peaceful and legal means--he thought such a book should have a hearing from the English public. That is very close to a literal report of what he stated in this introduction.

Defense Attorney: And why did Marx have that opinion with reference to England?

Cannon: Well, he had that opinion with reference to England as distinct from the autocratic countries, because of its parliamentary system, its democratic processes, and civil libertarian method of political procedure.

Defense Attorney: So at the time that Marx and Engels wrote the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848, there was no democracy in existence on the European continent, is that right?

Cannon: The whole of Europe was seething with revolutions at that time.

Defense Attorney: And no democratic processes were available?

Cannon: At least not in the stable system that had been established in England. I think I should add, to get the whole picture of this introduction which I am speaking of, that Engels said, after he had made this remark which I have reported, he said: "To be sure, Marx did not exclude the possibility of a proslavery rebellion on the part of the outmoded and dispossessed ruling class." That is, after the transfer of power. ...

Prosecutor: Mr. Cannon, I want to read to you a clause from the *Communist Manifesto*, about which Mr. Goldman interrogated you on Friday, or whenever it was: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions." Does that represent the party's view or not?

Cannon: Insofar as it is incorporated in the Declaration of Principles it does. We have interpreted that, as all other Marxist writings, in our own way, as it appears in the Declaration of Principles.

Prosecutor: You will agree, will you not, that, taken as it stands, and without anything else, it amounts to advocacy of the overthrow of the government by force?

Cannon: No, I do not interpret it that way.

Prosecutor: You do not agree that that is what it means?

Cannon: We do not interpret it that way, but in the Declaration of Principles--

Prosecutor: I am asking you whether or not, taking this language alone, and without anything else, do you not agree that it amounts to advocacy of the overthrow of government by force?

Cannon: No, not necessarily because the authors of that same document, in the statement that I cited the other day, stated specifically that

they thought their aims could be attained, at least in England, by the process of parliamentary democracy.

Prosecutor: Now, you know that that is not in answer to my question, don't you, Mr. Cannon? Let me ask you this, please: Taking that language which I just read to you alone, and without anything else, don't you agree that it amounts to advocacy of overthrow of government by force?

Cannon: No, I don't think so, because the authors themselves have interpreted it differently at least in the case of England. ...

Prosecutor: Now, I find this line in *The Revolution of 1905* by Lenin: "It is our duty--"

Defense Attorney: That was not admitted in evidence, Your Honor.

Prosecutor: I am not saying it was. I want to ask the witness something about it.

(Continuing) "It is our duty in time of an uprising to exterminate ruthlessly all the chiefs of the civil and military authorities." Does that represent the party's views?

Cannon: No, we have never made any such declaration.

Prosecutor: You disagree with that?

Cannon: Yes, I don't know that that is in any way a statement of our party policy.

Prosecutor: That is part of the philosophy and dogma of Lenin with which you do not agree--is that correct?

Cannon: We do not agree with the extermination of anybody unless it is in case of an actual armed struggle, when the rules of war apply.

Prosecutor: Then in the event that your party leads an uprising, would you agree then that the chiefs of the civil and military authorities should be exterminated ruthlessly?

Cannon: I do not want to be made responsible, or I do not want the party made responsible, for such statements that are not in our official declarations.

Prosecutor: But you have told us that the basic views of Lenin are the basic views of the Socialist Workers Party, have you not?

Cannon: That is right and I told you at the same time that that does not mean that we take every letter and line written by Lenin as dogma. ...
(Cannon concludes his testimony with the following remarks.)

In this All-Russian Congress of Soviets were present the other parties who had been the majority of yesterday. They spoke and debated there. When the vote was taken, the Bolsheviks had the majority. The Bolsheviks offered to give proportionate places in the government to the other parties. They refused and walked off. The Bolsheviks did, as a matter of fact, incorporate into the government, a section of Kerensky's party, the left wing of the Social Revolutionary Party.

It seems to me that here is an excellent illustration of how a

revolutionary party, after long propagandistic work, succeeded in a political crisis in winning over to its side a majority of the population represented in the most authoritative body, the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. And the Bolsheviks, adapting themselves to the legality of this authoritative body--

Prosecutor: Now, just a minute. Are you still telling us how it occurred, or are you just telling us now that you think it was a mighty fine thing?

Cannon: No, I am explaining the legality of the development, as against your interpretation that it was illegal. And it seems to me--

Prosecutor: I don't want your opinion on that. If you want to go on and tell us what happened, all right. Don't characterize it.

Cannon: I don't think you will ever get a more legal revolution than that.

(see *Socialism on Trial*, Pathfinder Press, pages 52, 72, 102-104, and 114)

In his testimony, Cannon rejected revolutionary defeatism with regard to the U.S. in the imperialist second world war ("...we are not in favor of a victory for ...any...imperialist power over the United States..."); he presents Marx and Engels as advocates of peaceful transition to socialism and states that he does not interpret the famous concluding passage of the *Communist Manifesto* to "necessarily" mean the advocacy of the violent overthrow of capitalist governments by force of arms; he even suggests that Lenin's view on the need of the proletarian revolution to smash the capitalist state is a "dogma" and he depicts the October overturn in Russia as a "legal" revolution!

What led Cannon to disassociate his party from even the *Communist Manifesto*? It was not a question of Cannon's personal courage, of course; the question of the SWP's wartime legality was without doubt an important consideration, just as it had been with the German Social Democracy in 1914. But given all that had gone before, given Trotsky's criticisms and Cannon's replies, we can only conclude that what took Cannon to these "extremes of moderation" was his desire to avoid the isolation of the SWP from the U.S. working class which he knew from his own experience during WWI would soon be swept up in the war hysteria the bourgeoisie was preparing. Simply put, Cannon was more willing to burn his principles than the SWP's bridges to the class he had spent his life trying to organize and which he empirically knew as well as anybody.

The Cold War and Red Purges Begin

When World War II ended, the SWP burdened itself with a mistaken orientation based on a false analogy with the post-World War I period. Just as the earlier world war had been followed by insurrectionary upheavals and stupendous class battles in the imperialist nations--both victors and vanquished--so the SWP thought that the second world war would be followed by developing revolutionary situations in the West.

When the U.S. was swept by strike waves following the end of hostilities and the lifting of the no-strike laws, the SWP took these struggles as the opening battles of the "coming American revolution." And with such a perspective--a general labor upsurge leading straight to revolution--that old question of questions--"how to get the Stalinists out of the road"--became even more urgent.

The SWP, disoriented by the "coming American revolution" perspective, failed to see the developing reaction that followed the war and failed to see, or chose not to see, the rapid rightward swing taking place in the unions. Consequently the SWP

viewed the beginning of the "witch-hunts" in the unions as a golden opportunity to get rid of their Stalinist competitors. The most damning illustration of this political attitude as it was translated into practical policy was the SWP's approach to the 1948 National Maritime Union presidential elections.

Even though Joseph Curran, an ex-Stalinist, had advocated the indefinite continuation of the "no strike" pledge after the war, even though this renegade had already voiced his support for the Marshall Plan, nevertheless the SWP gave "critical support" to Curran in the union elections. Curran's chief campaign slogan? *Smash the Communist Party Machine!* When the CP attempted to defend its position in the union apparatus by raising political issues like the Marshall Plan and support for Henry Wallace (a left Democrat, third party candidate) in the 1948 U.S. presidential elections, the SWP praised Curran for refusing to "fall into that (CP) trap" since Curran raised only "organizational" issues (how to purge the Stalinists) and avoided "divisive" international and domestic political questions. The *Militant* repeatedly expressed support for Curran and even claimed his campaign was "singularly free of red-baiting"!

When Curran won, the *Militant* continued: "The defeat of the Stalinists makes the unity of all seafaring unions a real possibility for the first time... The period of Stalinist rule of the waterfront is ended!" Within months after his victory Curran began an even wider and more vicious purge of the union conducted under the slogan of "Dump the Aliens and Kick Out the Reds!" Even in retrospect the SWP could not admit the utter unprincipledness of their policy.*

While the SWP did make a verbal civil libertarian defense (as opposed to a joint working class defense) of persecuted CP members, the SWP attitude toward the "witch-hunts" outside the unions was essentially the same. In the 1948 SWP electoral program no specific mention was made of the necessity of defending the CP--not even a demand to drop the Smith act indictment of twelve CP leaders. Throughout this entire period only one united front offer around defense was made to the CP, and that was purely pro forma, designed primarily to embarrass the CP for its abandonment of the SWP's leaders in 1941. The sluggishness of the SWP's defense of the Rosenbergs was the logical result of this earlier unwillingness to mount an energetic defense of persecuted Stalinists.

The SWP positively gloated at times over the CP's inability to draw any sort of mass support in its own defense against the red purges. The following quote from Cannon's *Road to Peace*, published in November 1951, is a telling example of this attitude towards what was, after all, another working class formation under attack:

"It isn't planned that way in the present scheme of things, but every once in a while virtue is rewarded; and sometimes bad luck catches up with those who deserve it most. We have an example of the latter before our eyes right now. I am speaking this time about the American Stalinists--not the honest workers they are taking for a ride, but the professional functionaries at the head of the crooked and treacherous outfit operating on behalf of the Kremlin in the American labor movement under the name of the Communist Party and numerous other aliases and fronts.

They prospered in the last half of the Thirties before the newly-organized workers in the CIO got their number. And in the first half of the Forties--the period of the war and the Stalin-Roosevelt Pact--they really rode high with governmental favor and immunity. But look at them now. They are in all kinds of trouble for sure, and nobody seems to care.

Never, I daresay, have victims of misfortune gone unattended by so many people, with sentiments ranging from indifference to delight, for so many different reasons. The home-grown Janizaries of the Kremlin

* See "Henry Wallace Campaign of 1948: A U.S. Popular Front" in *The Hammer & The Sickle*, Summer 1977, available from Workers & Oppressed Unite.

monster find themselves in the position of a scouting party of foreign legionaires, cut off in hostile territory and marked expendable by their high command. Never before in the history of the labor movement has a group under persecution been so discredited, despised and abandoned-- with their claim to the honor of martyrdom disallowed and even the grace of commiseration deliberately withheld. These Ishmaels of the labor movement, with every man's hand against them, have to go it alone."

Trotsky had insisted, and more than once, in discussions with Cannon that the SWP must face the Stalinist workers. The whole intent of the above quoted passage from the *Road to Peace*--which was a major piece of SWP propaganda distributed extensively throughout the 1950s--was obviously not to express solidarity (despite all political differences) with the tens of thousands of worker Communists facing blacklisting and persecution. Hardly! The whole point was to make it clear to the "average" worker, who after all was extremely fearful of the all-pervasive red-baiting campaign, that the SWP, too, stood aside from the Stalinist pariahs, was asking no one to share their sorry and "well deserved" fate, and most certainly would not ask anyone to do anything "un-American" or to be the "home-grown Janizaries" of an enemy power or the "scouting party of foreign legionaires, cut off in hostile territory."

The 1948 U.S. Presidential Elections

One of Marcy's crucial criticisms of the Cannon leadership of the SWP was the policy it pursued in the 1948 presidential elections. And Marcy's greatest single error of this whole period under consideration (1948-1956) was precisely his advocacy of electoral support for Henry Wallace, Progressive Party candidate for president in 1948. Marcy dismisses with a sweep of the hand the suggestion that the Progressive Party formation was a popular front "of the Blum type" (which it certainly was) and instead argues that it was a "working class movement" deserving of support. Marcy was wrong; but Marcy's explanation of *why* the SWP chose not to support Wallace was another matter and here he was dead on target.

Marcy was motivated by the desire to face the Stalinist workers during a period of persecution and reaction, by the desire to apply Trotsky's 1940 position of support for Browder to 1948 conditions. And Marcy saw, and very rightly saw, that all of Cannon's talk of principles and political independence was simply a good excuse to avoid sharing the fate of a movement that truly was, as Marcy pointed out, "literally red-baited to death."

In several towns and cities the capitalist newspapers published the names of everyone who signed petitions to get Wallace on the ballot. Wallace rallies were subjected to physical attack by right-wing provocateurs and at least one Wallace supporter was killed in such an attack. Those advocating support for Wallace were literally driven out of the unions in a near lynch-mob way. It was the frightening and hysterical torrent of red-baiting that descended on the Wallace movement that Cannon wished to avoid at all costs by running SWP candidates for president and vice president in 1948--the first such candidates in SWP history. As Marcy wrote in 1953:

"The Wallace Plenum...laid the basis for the party's adaptation toward the reaction in the following period...the line was an adaptation to the red-baiting opposition to the Wallace movement... It (was) not a sectarian, pathological fear or hatred of Stalinism which (motivated) the Majority. It (was) fear of the reaction, and fear of the generally reactionary mood which pervades most strata of the labor movement... The American workers are temporarily permeated with the mood of reaction. Unfortunately, the Majority is showing a tendency to cater to this mood."

In 1940 it was fear of isolation from the mainstream of pro-Rooseveltian indus-

trial unionist workers which kept the SWP from supporting Browder. In 1948 it was the same fear of isolation from the mainstream of U.S. labor--now succumbing to anti-communism and reactionary moods--which kept the SWP from an active defense of the democratic rights of the Wallace supporters. That adaptation and fear of isolation would lead at the outbreak of the Korean War to the SWP's open failure to defend the revolutionary side in a revolutionary war against imperialism.

The Korean War

In 1948 the SWP issued a pamphlet commemorating the hundredth anniversary of the *Communist Manifesto* called the *1948 Manifesto Against Wall Street and the Kremlin*. The whole conception implied by that title was third campist. The 1948 SWP electoral program fell all over itself in its rush to unqualifiedly condemn "Stalin's reactionary foreign policy" at a time when "Stalin's foreign policy" in bourgeois propaganda meant first and foremost the "enslavement" of the "captive nations" of Eastern Europe, that is to say, the "Sovietization" of Eastern Europe which had already resulted in the formation of new deformed workers' states requiring unconditional defense on the part of the SWP. The progressive aspect of the contradictory character of Stalinism had led to social revolution in Eastern Europe, carried out in a military-bureaucratic fashion. It was this fact which set the world bourgeoisie howling about "Stalin's reactionary foreign policy", and the SWP chose to adapt itself to that aspect of bourgeois opinion.

In the July 3, 1950 issue of the *Militant* the SWP took an open position of neutrality following the outbreak of the Korean war. This position of neutrality and defeatism on both sides was expressed in the headline slogans of *Hands Off Korean Peoples Right to Decide Own Fate* and *Let Korean People Decide Own Fate Free From U.S. or Kremlin*. The SWP argued that the working class had no interest in the victory of either the North Korean "puppets" of the Kremlin or the South Korean puppets of U.S. imperialism. Here is the full text of this first article presenting the position of the SWP towards the Korean War:

The "calculated risk" taken by the American imperialists in connection with the Korean events has at a single stroke revealed their true character. They have acted in a way that leaves no doubt about their immediate and predatory aims. Meanwhile, of course, they continue to mouth phrases about "safeguarding world peace," "defending the rights of small nations against aggression," "acting to implement UN's ceasefire order."

Through the moves of his puppet regime in North Korea, Stalin has supplied the capitalist rulers in this country with the desired pretext. They have eagerly seized upon it not only to force a showdown in Korea "up to the 38th parallel," but also to take simultaneously a whole number of steps, summed up in Truman's enunciation of his "new foreign policy" for the whole of Asia. These new moves go far beyond what they are already doing in Korea.

There American air and naval squadrons--under MacArthur--are now engaged in combat actions. It has been officially announced that not only North Korean armed forces but all cities occupied by them, which naturally includes the South Korean civilian population, will be considered as military targets and bombed.

As we go to press, AP dispatches report the first landings of U.S. ground detachments. Previously announced was the establishment of the first "GHQ echelon" on Korean soil and the appointment of Brigadier General Church as head of all the South Korean forces. A complete war censorship on all news about Korea from Tokyo has been clamped down by MacArthur.

All this has been done without the approval of or even consultation

with Congress, let alone the American people as a whole.

But this war in Korea, which some dailies have inadvertently termed an "illegally declared war," is only part of what the people of this country have been committed to by Truman's decrees and arbitrary acts.

There is Formosa, a territory only yesterday acknowledged by the State Department itself as outside U.S. jurisdiction, now encircled by American naval units.

There is the announcement of "more help" for Indo-China, where the people are now fighting arms in hand against the French colonial despots and their puppet Bao Dai, and who are now to be confronted also with the full might of American military intervention.

There are the Philippines who are supposedly independent but over whom Washington has now imposed what amounts to a military protectorate.

Not since the days when the old colonial powers rushed to dismember Asian territories, has any single power moved so aggressively and with such force as have the American imperialists. In plain language, they are now openly making their bid to supplant the old colonial powers as the unchallenged ruler of the Far East and to reimpose the system of colonial exploitation against which virtually all of Asia is now in open revolt.

This series of events is taking place within the broader framework of the struggle for world domination which is the essence of the cold war and of the current new phase of developments.

It is only within this wider framework that the full meaning and implications can be understood and correctly evaluated.

LIES ABOUT KOREA

As for Korea itself, both sides have been and will continue to lie as only those who pursue great-power politics are capable of lying to their respective peoples.

The contention that either side is concerned with the self-determination of Korea is as foul a lie as Hitler ever concocted. The 30 million inhabitants of both North and South Korea have had no say whatever, especially since their "liberation." Their country was sliced into two segments by secret agreement between Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin in the course of their "great friendship" during the last war. Ever since then the population of the South as well as the North have been manipulated like so many cattle by their respective "governments," that is by Washington and the Kremlin.

The American-sponsored regime of Syngman Rhee in the South is a Korean replica of the corrupt and evil Chiang Kai-shek regime in China. It is so discredited that it had to persecute savagely even its most conservative opposition and polled only a small minority in the May elections.

As late as June 27, Hanson Baldwin, military specialist of the N.Y. Times, flatly stated that the "chief danger" to South Korea was "internal weakness rather than external assault." He stressed the "unpopularity of the Syngman Rhee government...and the questionable political and military reliability of the army and the police force."

It is this government, hated by its own people and which even its own soldiers and police refuse to fight for, that Washington is seeking to reimpose by resort to war.

The last world war was a predatory war which led to an equally predatory "peace," which in turn planted all the seeds of future conflict, among which is Korea.

Each side is now busy accusing the other of having provoked the Korean hostilities. It still remains to be seen just who did "provoke" whom and the likelihood is that there was no lack of provocation on both sides. But the most important "provocation" is rooted in the dismembered condition of Korea itself whose living body has been severed in two, like Germany and Austria, and the European continent as a whole.

This division of countries and even whole continents into "spheres of influence" was heralded as the surest basis and firmest guarantee of world peace. And none was louder than Stalin in spreading this criminal lie.

Stalin and his regime bear direct responsibility for the tragic plight in which Korean people now find themselves.

Nothing could be viler than the lie now being spread that the military subjugation of Korea by the might of American imperialism will, after all, "safeguard peace."

LET THE KOREANS DECIDE!

There is only one way in which the Korean question can really be solved and that is by permitting the Korean people to settle their own fate. Let them decide, free from both the Kremlin and from Washington.

Neither side, of course, has the slightest intention of permitting this. In the UN even the moderate proposal by Yugoslavia that the North Koreans be allowed to present their case was voted down, obviously by command of Washington.

What the Kremlin proposes to do now about Korea remains unclear. It has proclaimed its "neutrality," that is, left open for itself an avenue of retreat. *If they decide it best suits their interests and purposes, the Stalinist bureaucracy will try to convert Korea into the same sort of testing ground for war techniques and weapons as was the case in Spain before the last war.*

Or they may ruthlessly sacrifice their own native puppets along with the whole Korean people, as they did not so long ago in the case of Greece. If they decide to reply in kind, even if on a far more modest scale than has been done by Washington, it means, of course, world war.

But there is a power in the world today other than either the power of the ruthless American billionaires or of the monstrous Stalinist bureaucracy. That is the power of the mass of the people themselves. The example of Yugoslavia shows that it is possible for people even in a small country, caught in the very middle between these two giants, to pursue a course independent of both.

U.S. WORKERS' DUTY

The duty of the workers in this country is to see to it that the Korean people are given that chance, which they will never get unless the American imperialists are made to keep their hands off Korea.

Much more than Korea is actually involved: there are also the people of Formosa, of Indo-China and of the Philippines who are now confronted with the same threat of subjugation as the Koreans, even though in a different form.

The fate of these peoples, singly and collectively, is tied up directly with the issue of world peace or world war. The stormy movement of national liberation which has swept the whole of Asia has been one of the most powerful blocks in the way of the imperialist warmakers. If they succeed in stemming and crushing this liberationist movement in Asia, the American imperialists and all their allies will be all the more impelled to plunge into World War III.

from "Hands Off Korean People's Right to Decide Own Fate!", *Militant*, July 3, 1950, our emphasis.

Of course the SWP called for getting the U.S. troops out, but the SWP also called for getting the Kremlin out, when the fact was, only Soviet and Chinese military assistance and troops could possibly provide the means to drive U.S. forces out.

How is it possible that the SWP, only ten years after Trotsky's death, could take such a position? We have sought the answer for the SWP's degeneration in its adaptation to the mainstream of U.S. labor, a criticism Trotsky himself raised in 1940. But this conscious or unconscious adaptation in practice was mirrored in theoretical confusion, and if the matter is considered on the level of the SWP's theory, then the SWP in fact took the only position consistent with that theory.

In 1950 the SWP did not believe either China or North Korea to be workers' states and consequently saw the war initially as a reactionary struggle between two *capitalist* puppet regimes--one a vassal of Wall Street, the other of the Kremlin. For a full month while the war raged the SWP held to this position, while trying to cover itself by baiting the CP with Henry Wallace's announcement of support for the U.S. in the Korean war.

Only in the July 31, 1950 issue of the *Militant*, containing a front page open letter to the president and congress by Cannon, did the SWP come out *in defense* of North Korea as opposed to *defeatism on both sides*. Both the wording and the method of argument are extremely interesting and we quote the full text:

To the President and members of the Congress:

Gentlemen:

I disagree with your actions in Korea and in my capacity as a private citizen I petition you to change your policy fundamentally, as follows:

Withdraw the American troops and let the Korean people alone.

I am setting forth the reasons for this demand in detail in the following paragraphs. But before opening the argument, I beg your permission, gentlemen, to tell you what I think of you. You are a pack of scoundrels. You are traitors to the human race. I hate your rudeness and your brutality. You make me ashamed of my country, which I have always loved, and ashamed of my race, which I used to think was as good as any.

The American intervention in Korea is a brutal imperialist invasion, no different from the French war on Indo-China or the Dutch assault on Indonesia. American boys are being sent 10,000 miles away to kill and be killed, not in order to liberate the Korean people, but to conquer and subjugate them. It is outrageous. It is monstrous.

ATTITUDE OF THE KOREAN PEOPLE

The whole of the Korean people--save for the few bought-and-paid-for agents of the Rhee puppet regime--are fighting the imperialist invaders. That is why the press dispatches from Korea complain more and more about "infiltration" tactics, increasing activities of "guerrillas," the "fluid" fighting front, the "sullenness" and "unreliability" of the "natives."

The Korean people have a mortal hatred of the Wall Street "liberator." They despise unto death the bestial, corrupt, U.S.-sponsored Syngman Rhee dictatorship that made South Korea a prison camp of misery, torture and exploitation.

The high morale and fearlessness of the north Koreans and the hostility of the south Koreans toward their U.S. "liberators" alike testify to the

unity of the entire Korean people in their unflinching opposition to the imperialistic domination.

The explosion in Korea on June 25, as events have proved, expressed the profound desire of the Koreans themselves to unify their country, to rid themselves of foreign domination and to win their complete national independence. It is true that the Kremlin seeks to take advantage of this struggle for its own reactionary ends and would sell it tomorrow if it could get another deal with Washington. But the struggle itself has the overwhelming and whole-hearted support of the Korean people. It is part of the mighty uprising of the hundreds of millions of colonial people throughout Asia against western imperialism. This is the real truth, the real issue. The colonial slaves don't want to be slaves any longer.

CIVIL AND CLASS WAR TOO

This is more than a fight for unification and national liberation. It is a civil war. On the one side are the Korean workers, peasants and student youth. On the other are the Korean landlords, usurers, capitalists and their police and political agents. The impoverished and exploited working masses have risen up to drive out the native parasites as well as their foreign protectors.

Whatever the wishes of the Kremlin, a class war has been unfolding in Korea. The North Korean regime, desiring to mobilize popular support, has decreed land reforms and taken nationalization measures in the territories it has won. The establishment of people's committees has been reported.

These reforms, these promises of a better economic and social order have attracted the peasants and workers. This prospect of a new life is what has imbued a starving subject people with the will to fight to the death. This is the "secret weapon" that has wrested two-thirds of South Korea from U.S. imperialism and its native agents and withstood the troops and bombing fleets of mighty Wall Street.

American imperialism was quite willing to turn northern Korea over to Stalin in return for control over south Korea, which it ruled through the bloody dictatorship of Syngman Rhee. Now Washington is seeking, against the resistance of the Korean people, to reimpose its imperialist puppet rule, to enforce the division of Korea and to maintain it as a colony and military base for future war on the Soviet Union.

RIGHT IS ON KOREAN SIDE

There is not an iota of concern for the wishes and rights of the Korean people in this brutal invasion. The attempt to prop up the Syngman Rhee regime by armed force is part of Wall Street's planned program to dominate and exploit the whole world. Your undeclared war on Korea, Mr. President, is a war of enslavement. That is how the Korean people themselves view it --and no one knows the facts better than they do. They've suffered imperialist domination and degradation for half a century and they can recognize its face even when masked with a UN flag.

The right in this struggle is all on the side of the Korean people. Like the colonial peoples everywhere in Asia, they want no part of U.S. or even UN "liberation." They want the American troops to get out of Korea. They want freedom from all foreign domination. They want to decide their own fate.

The American people well remember the War of Independence that brought this nation its freedom from British tyranny. In the spirit of this revolutionary and democratic tradition of ours, I call upon you to halt the unjust war on Korea. Withdraw all American armed forces so that the Korean people can have full freedom to work out their destiny in their own way. I submit

this to the Congress as a motion.

"A Letter to the President and Members of the Congress" by James P. Cannon, *Militant*, July 31, 1950.

While Cannon here speaks of a revolution taking place in the wake of the advancing North Korean armies and characterizes the war as a civil war, the SWP's new position of defense of the North Korean forces rested on a very shaky theoretical foundation. Even with the new position of defense, the SWP did not regard either China or North Korea as workers' states; China was not to be identified by the SWP as a workers' state until 1955 and even the date of the "mutation of state forms" was placed sometime during the extensive nationalizations carried out after China's entry into the Korean war and not in 1949 when the Chinese red armies under Stalinist leadership took power throughout the mainland. The extremely nebulous conception of an "unfolding revolution" was all the SWP had to go on.

While it might have been hoped at the time that Cannon's open letter meant a return to a rock-hard Trotskyist position of defense of the Soviet Union and the new state formations in Eastern Europe and Asia, which shared the same fundamental class character and social markings as the Soviet state, this was not to be. Reference against must be made to the *Road to Peace*, published in 1951 during the Korean war. This pamphlet was designed to provide the SWP with a propaganda tool that would differentiate the SWP's opposition to the Korean war from that of the Stalinists, who based the whole political thrust of their opposition on the call for "peace."

As Marcy emphasizes in his 1953 document, this pamphlet--which was after all a major piece of SWP propaganda for years and was produced during a period when the likelihood of war between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. was constantly stressed in the whole bourgeois media--this pamphlet does not contain a single, explicit, unambiguous statement of the SWP's longstanding position of defense of the U.S.S.R. in war Marcy correctly pointed out that while the pamphlet scored needed polemical points against the Stalinist fraud of "peaceful coexistence," nowhere does Cannon point out that in the event of war U.S. Trotskyists are programmatically bound to seek the military defeat of the U.S. and the military victory of the Soviet Union. Cannon identifies as the only road to peace the necessity to pursue the class struggle in the U.S. and to make the revolution here at home. Why a socialist revolution in the U.S. would remove the fundamental antagonism between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., why war is otherwise inevitable, Cannon does not explain.

Instead, Cannon chose what he no doubt thought was the very clever polemical device of taking the Stalinists to task for their "peaceful coexistence" and their stated ambition of winning peace with U.S. capitalism still intact while he skirted the Soviet question altogether, except for one reference to the "heritage of October" which, as Marcy pointed out, no one except a party member would know alluded to the Soviet Union of the 1950s.

It is not very difficult to see the contortions through which Cannon and the SWP went in order to avoid a clear public position on the "Russian question." Cannon's complaint to Trotsky in 1940 that the split with the Shachtmanites forced the SWP press to give "excessive emphasis" to the Soviet question in hindsight takes an added significance.

The Post-War Fourth International

Had a new revolutionary leadership emerged in the post-war international Trotskyist movement adequate to the new political reality, Cannon and the vacillating SWP could have been brought to task. Such a new leadership did not appear. Marcy and Copeland, for all the correctness of their fundamental position, never moved in a decisive manner against the Cannon leadership with an aggressive campaign to reach the ranks, and made no attempt to look beyond the U.S. section and develop links

with possible international co-thinkers.

But well before Marcy presented the first Global Class War document in 1950, the attempt to come to an understanding of the post-war political developments was under way in Europe. And on the basis of the debates in the European Trotskyist movement on the question of the Eastern European "buffer zone" under Soviet occupation, on the question of Yugoslavia, and on the question of the present and future role of Trotskyism, it can be said that the theoretical bewilderment and methodological poverty of the most politically advanced sections of the Fourth International were highly apparent well before the SWP betrayed its profound political disorientation in 1950 with regard to Korea.

The debate on Eastern Europe was especially telling. Ernest Mandel (Germain) who was the leading figure in the immediate post-war period attempted to hold to a position which he believed to be "orthodox." Even after 1947 when the Eastern European countries had undergone extensive "Sovietization" with banks and industries nationalized and with the various national Stalinist parties in governmental control, Mandel continued to insist that the Eastern European states were capitalist. He further insisted they would remain so (despite the virtually total nationalization of all industrial enterprises and the dismantling of the bourgeois political parties) until such time as these countries were actually assimilated into the Soviet Union as soviet republics. Until then the buffer countries were "capitalist states in the process of structural assimilation" and in the event of war between these states and other capitalist powers (the U.S., Britain, France, etc.) the "strictest defeatism" must necessarily be observed despite the obvious fact that the occupying Soviet army would be involved in any conflict. The official position of the Fourth International at this time must have logically been military defense of the Soviet army only when it was driven back to the borders of the Soviet Union itself!

The exception in this schema was Yugoslavia, which had not undergone Soviet occupation but had a Stalinist government, that of Tito, since 1944. Mandel also asserted Yugoslavia to be a capitalist state. But in order to defend Yugoslavia against growing Soviet hostility to the Tito regime, Mandel reformulated the question of defense of the Soviet Union: he asserted that defense meant defense against *imperialist* attack and not defense in any war with any capitalist state!* In the event of Soviet attack on Yugoslavia, the Trotskyist movement must defend Yugoslavia even if it be capitalist!

The political sentiment which underlay Mandel's refusal to recognize reality, the sentiment which was often enough plainly stated as a weighty argument, was this: If Stalinists can make revolutions, is not our whole political evaluation of Stalinism mistaken? And further, if Stalinism can oversee such transformations as in Eastern Europe, what need is there of Trotskyism as an independent political force?

One of the great misfortunes of the post-war discussions on political orientation and strategy was the locking of the debate into this either/or proposition. In this context, it was only logical that some of those who argued that the Eastern European countries had become deformed workers' states would be driven to draw political conclusions that attributed to Stalinism the leading role and reduced Trotskyism to an auxiliary position. That is exactly what Michel Pablo did.

Pablo, whose name has given us the epithet "Pabloism," disagreed with Mandel on Eastern Europe, arguing that the "buffer" countries had become deformed workers' states. But he also argued in his War/Revolution thesis that the coming world war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union would see the repeat of what occurred in Eastern Europe, Yugoslavia, and China, with Soviet Army occupations and Stalinist-led insurrections resulting in new workers' states even in the imperialist West. This led Pablo to speak of "three hundred years of deformed workers' states" and to advocate that Trotskyists "enter" (i.e., liquidate) into the Stalinist parties where-

* *International Information Bulletin*, January 1950, p. 37, 38.

ever they were of mass proportions. Pablo's perspective reduced Trotskyism to a pressure group to drive Stalinism leftward. Having won Mandel to his own position, Pablo became the leading figure in the International of the early fifties and his views became official policy and program.

The Global Class War Perspective

Long before Pablo asserted China had passed into the same camp as the Soviet Union, Marcy identified the new Peoples Republic as the dictatorship of the proletariat, "though not chemically pure, as no social formation ever is." Marcy, as we have said, was in fact the first in the whole workers movement--and not only among the Trotskyists--to assert that China had become a workers' state. The Stalinists generally, taking their cue from Mao himself, claimed China to be a "new democracy" where a "bloc of four classes" shared state power. Among the Trotskyists the claim was first made that China remained a capitalist state under Mao; later China was included in the new category of the "two class state", dual power supposedly existing *within* the state (a theoretical revision clearly derived from the Stalinist "new democracy"; to this day there are Trotskyists--*Lutte Ouvriere* in France, the Spark in the U.S.--who deny the category of the deformed workers' state and assert there exists only one workers' state, the Soviet degenerated workers' state).

It should not be forgotten that when Marcy wrote his 1950 document, the Korean war was well under way. And while his position did not become the official party viewpoint, the fact is that his characterization of the Chinese state and revolution alone could put the SWP's changed position of defense in Korea on a firm class basis, going beyond the hazy notion of an "unfolding revolution." Marcy's document rejected the crazy-quilt, patchwork view of the world held officially by the SWP, a view that divided the world up into one workers' state, "in-between" states like China, and capitalist states. His document returned to primacy the international class struggle between the two great, world historical classes *and their states*.

There are those pseudo-Trotskyists who bait the global class war documents as Pabloite. Let us see what exactly Pablo was saying in the early 1950s and compare his with Marcy's views:

It is inevitable that the genuine revolutionary elements engaged in the decisive and final struggle now begun will arrive at a clearer conception of the means and aims of the proletarian revolution, that is to say, to the conception of authentic revolutionary Marxism.

This ideological clarification, facilitated by objective events, will promote the creation of a stronger revolutionary vanguard which will subsequently speed up and completely guarantee victory. The nuclei of revolutionary Marxists which already exist throughout the world can play an immense role in this process. They can greatly accelerate and expedite the acquisition of a clear understanding in all those genuinely revolutionary elements which are now being shaped in the most revolutionary flood-tide history has ever known. *The condition is that these nuclei of revolutionary Marxists learn how to integrate themselves henceforth in the real mass movement of their countries, work patiently within it and assist it, in accord with the rhythm of its own experience, to arrive at a rounded revolutionary conception of its tasks.*

In those countries where the basic movement of the working class is independent to a certain extent, where neither reformism or Stalinism constitute a major obstacle to its forward march, the task of the revolutionary Marxists from now on is to conduct themselves as the core of the authentic revolutionary party which in its programme and daily activities expresses the genuine needs and aspirations of all the oppressed masses of the nation: workers, peasants, middle classes.

The very real possibility for these groups of revolutionary Marx-

ists to become fairly rapidly important political forces in their respective countries resides in the scope and the audacity of such a conception of their programme and activity.

On the other hand, in countries where the chief political movement of the proletariat is channelized either in reformist organizations, as for example in England, Belgium, Germany, Australia and Canada, or in Stalinist organizations, as in numerous Asiatic countries or in France and Italy in Western Europe, the task of the revolutionary Marxists is to work within these movements in order to expedite the maturing of their authentic leftward-moving tendencies, from which the essential forces of the revolutionary Parties of tomorrow will emerge.

The fact that the revolutionary Marxists have already acquired such an understanding of their essential tasks and the specific way to accomplish them is proof of the high level attained by the revolutionary vanguard as well as a pledge of its certain victory. For nothing is better, and nothing can better succeed, than action which proceeds in harmony with the tasks posed by History.

from Capitalism versus Socialism: The Coming World Showdown by Michel Pablo, emphasis ours.

This of course was Pablo's explicit program for the liquidation of Trotskyism and capitulation to Stalinism: *where mass Stalinist parties exist Trotskyists should enter.* And in the extreme bureaucratic centralism of the various CP's that meant political suicide. What did Marcy have to say on the questions of the character of contemporary Stalinism, the need for political revolution, the need for the independent Trotskyist party? Consider the following passages:

While petty bourgeois philistines and centrists of all shades and hues will undoubtedly point to the symmetrical character of the armies in combat as proof of the reactionary character of the war on both sides, we must on the other hand ceaselessly proclaim that: whereas *one army* is driven by the engines of class despotism and social strangulation, the other is a locomotive of historical progress. Never, however, even for an instant, can the revolutionary vanguard neglect to courageously and energetically expose the congenital propensity of the temporary and cowardly custodians of the locomotive to obstruct and wreck, all in the name of their own narrow, selfish, and caste-like interests. Their replacement before the end of the journey is absolutely necessary and inevitable. ...

The great tragedy of the world proletariat and the Russian proletariat in particular is that this struggle is distorted, mangled, and mutilated by the parasitic interests of the Thermidorian bureaucracy. ... Stalinism can attempt to nibble away at imperialism, can even willy-nilly consent to a daring offensive, but cannot hold its ground in the face of the united, concerted, worldwide imperialist counter-offensive. Why? Because this in its turn threatens to inevitably convert itself into a global class war, a new phase of the world (permanent) revolution, which would surely sweep away not only imperialism but the debris of Stalinism as well. ...

This hypothetical stage of the Chinese revolution projected by Trotsky more than two decades ago corresponds precisely to the reality of China today. ... Of course Trotsky had in mind a genuine Communist Party grounded in revolutionary Marxism and geared to the perspective of the

world revolution, rather than the party of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, which in every way represent a negation of these very ideas. But then the latter have not been the architects and guides of the revolution, as was the case with the party of Lenin and Trotsky. On the contrary, the present Chinese leaders have been *catapulted* into power by the torrential revolutionary pressure of the Chinese peasants and workers. But theirs is nonetheless a dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry no matter how distorted and mutilated by Stalinist practices, dogmas, and perspectives...

The world proletariat in a *social and historical* sense, holds power in Russia, China and Eastern Europe, but at the cost of its complete political expropriation. It lost its revolutionary vanguard and succumbed to ideological strangulation. This resulted in the complete atrophy of the revolutionary Marxist spirit, its traditions, its heritage, not to speak of its revolutionary methods of struggle and its liberating principles. ...

Neither Russia nor China nor Eastern Europe nor Yugoslavia can build "socialism in one country" or even together "in one zone." If in the period which opened in 1924, when a relatively more stable equilibrium prevailed, the building of socialism in one country was a reactionary, nationalistic utopia, then today it is completely fantastic, and a cruel deception of the masses. ...

Our movement will triumph over all its ideological enemies, and lead the world proletariat to ultimate victory by remorselessly and relentlessly exposing before all the world the inherent contradiction and ultimate separation of the *virus that is Stalinism from the bacillus that is the revolution*, inherent in the structure of a whole group of workers' states comprising almost half the population of the world. The latter demands of us that we passionately, loyally and devotedly defend them against all their enemies from within and from without. ... Equally imperative is the consistent, energetic and absolutely uncompromising exposure of the perfidious role of Stalinism all over the world. In the daily prosecution of these tasks as part and parcel of the general worldwide prosecution of the class struggle we will grow strong and soon count our followers by the millions.

*from Memorandum on the Unfolding War and
the Tasks of the Proletariat in the New
Phase of the World(Permanent) Revolution.*

When these explicit statements of political viewpoint are coupled with the fact that Marcy blocked with Cannon against those in the SWP (the Cochranites) who claimed they wanted to carry out Pablo's program in the U.S., the continued charge of Marcy's "Pabloism" is shown to be either vicious dishonesty or willful ignorance.

What Marcy attempted to do was simply to revive a combative, orthodox Trotskyism in the new post-war period. He refused to deny reality in order to win a purely verbal victory over Stalinism; the Soviet Union supported by indigenous Stalinist forces had overturned capitalism in Eastern Europe and the Chinese Stalinists had undeniably been at the head of a great mass movement that catapulted them into power. But Marcy explicitly denied that Stalinism could play the same role in Western Europe, the U.S. and the other imperialist centers. The overturns in Eastern Europe and in China, however momentous, remained peripheral. Stalinism would continue to betray the world revolution.

Marcy wanted the Trotskyist movement to understand the post-war reality and to effect an unwavering, unconditional, rock-hard defense of the Soviet Union and the new deformed workers' states in Eastern Europe and China in the new epoch of global class war. He called it a new epoch because the inter-imperialist rivalries that had characterized World War I and II would now be thoroughly subordinated to the imperialists' prosecution of the struggle against the expanded workers' state camp.

But nowhere in the global class war documents does Marcy draw the conclusion that the global class war character of the new epoch demands a subordination to the Stalinist leadership of the workers' state camp. Especially in the 1953 document does Marcy argue for what he calls the "hard" line with regard to Stalinism: the commanding necessity for Trotskyists to engage the Stalinists in ruthless political struggle in every political arena where they present themselves, and to conduct that struggle with the aim of winning the undisputed hegemonic position.

In the 1953 document, *Global Class War and the Destiny of American Labor*, Marcy argues that the U.S. labor movement could have no destiny "independent" of the international class struggle, and that the fate of the U.S. labor was inextricably bound up with the progress or failure of foreign revolutions and especially tied to the fate of the Soviet Union; that the working class in the U.S. is part of the world proletariat and consequently part of the global class camp of the proletariat and that the real world-historic interests of U.S. labor are decided by, and subordinate to, the interests of that global class camp; that the Korean War was the opening battle of the global class war, and that this battle will be followed by others more extensive and intensive which will ultimately lead to world war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union unless proletarian revolution destroys imperialism first; that the SWP was attempting to cheat history and evade the responsibilities and necessities imposed by the epoch of global class war; that the Cannon leadership was definitely attempting, as displayed by the *Road to Peace*, to evade the "Russian question" and conduct a political policy that avoided an uncompromising defense of the Soviet Union. Marcy stated plainly:

Aside from the initial error that was made in our approach to Korea, the clearcut character of the struggle on the Asian continent as a class struggle, as a struggle between imperialism and the worldwide working class and its allies among the oppressed colonial peoples is still not being made clear enough or sharp enough to demarcate us from all varieties of pacifists, liberals, or Stalinist supporters. We must make plain that in the struggle in Korea, or any other place on earth, between the two class camps, we pursue a line of *revolutionary defeatism*. Moreover--and this is very important from the point of view of our differentiation from the Stalinists and all sorts of pacifists--we wish to *facilitate* the victory of our side, our class side, regardless of its temporary leadership. At the same time, we mercilessly expose all the reactionary, wrong, inadequate policies pursued by the Kremlin and foisted upon the leaderships of the colonial masses in Asia, and counterpose the revolutionary, Leninist-Trotskyist line to victory.

from *The Global Class War and the Destiny of American Labor*.

Simply *no one else* in the SWP was talking like this at that time. In the 1953 document Marcy also considered the SWP's response to the Rosenberg case, indicating that the Cannon leadership had betrayed an inclination to abstain altogether. It is important to note how Marcy himself approached the Rosenberg trial.

Marcy argued that aside from the importance of this case in itself and the necessity for the SWP to participate in and strive to play a leading role in every struggle for democratic rights and working class defense, the CP could have been dealt a very serious blow and badly compromised in the eyes of its own militants if

the SWP had moved to vigorously defend the Rosenbergs before the CP, which had hesitated and then took up their defense on a purely civil rights basis. This is the truly *hard* line against Stalinism, Marcy argued, to seek the Stalinists out and compete with them on precisely those issues which they try to make "their own."

Marcy also addressed an issue which has largely been forgotten in the Trotskyist movement, and that was the gross opportunism committed with regard to Yugoslavia. Marcy relates how the Yugoslav revolution and the subsequent opposition of Tito to Stalin was praised as the second greatest event of the century, and even of how the Tito leadership was described as moving closer towards Trotskyism every day! It is very interesting how those who correctly criticize the opportunist tailing by the SWP in the early sixties of the Castro regime (which, be it said, was mixed with a thoroughly correct attempt to solidarize with and support the Cuban revolution) fail to criticize the truly toadying posture of the SWP towards Tito. Marcy rightly saw Titoism as a variety of Stalinism, even while he upheld the necessity of defending Yugoslavia against Soviet chauvinism.

What Marcy tried to do was give the SWP (one cannot say the international Trotskyist movement, for Marcy made no attempt to circulate his polemics outside the U.S.) the sense of its global class camp, and an understanding of the necessity to develop the strongest loyalty towards that class camp while still regarding Trotskyism as an international tendency in ruthless competition with international Stalinism for hegemony in that class camp. In reply to those who try to dismiss the Marcy of the 1950s as a crypto-Stalinist, a semi-Pabloite, his best defense is his own words:

In our struggle to vanquish Stalinism, we cannot chart out an *illusory independent road* whereby we would avoid them. Our path towards the masses on a world scale, and to a narrower extent in the USA, is blocked by the Stalinists; and it is *in mortal combat* (and not aversion) that we will come out victorious. That of course does not depend on our efforts alone but on the turn in the objective conditions, which are ripening all over the world. An attempt to chart out on the American arena an independent road is just as illusory as on the world arena. As Comrade Cannon said in 1940 to Comrade Trotsky, "The Stalinists are our problem. We've got to get them out of the road." We cannot do this by circumventing them, by secluding ourselves, by seeking an illusory independent road toward the American workers. We must meet them in mortal combat, in irreconcilable struggle, with the recognition that they are a global class current, and that their defeat will be the product of the joint efforts of all the workers and oppressed peoples in our entire class camp. This will be done and it can be done.

from *The Global Class War and the Destiny of American Labor*.

These are the words of a fighting Trotskyist.

The Historic Betrayal of 1956

The confusion in the SWP during the outbreak of the Korean war was followed in the SWP and the whole Trotskyist movement by confusions and grave errors with regard to a revolutionary development in Latin America. In Bolivia in 1953 under the pressure of mass upsurge, a popular front formation took control of the government, and the Bolivian Trotskyist party supported that popular front and even entered it. The leadership of the SWP and the Fourth International in Europe failed to condemn this policy. So far as we know, only the Vern-Ryan faction of the SWP took the Trotskyist position in a series of documents and made the necessary criticisms. While

those who mythologize the "grand tradition" can apologize for the SWP's vacillations over Korea by claiming the unprecedented nature of the events, with Bolivia the situation lent itself easily to understanding solely on the basis of Trotsky's writings.

Nevertheless, the cardinal principle--no political support to popular fronts; ruthless criticism of those who support popular fronts--was forgotten. The Vern-Ryan faction left the SWP over this question. And it is highly significant for the understanding of later events that Marcy/Copeland--so far as we know--did not speak up on this issue.

But the great turning point came in 1956. From 1950 the SWP had believed Hungary to be a deformed workers' state, requiring unconditional defense. Yet the SWP jumped to support the Hungarian uprising of 1956 *from the first day* on the basis of the scantiest reports in the capitalist press and when it was obvious that the revolt had the sympathy of the first bourgeois observers.

Communist Cadre has written at length elsewhere on the revolt (see our pamphlet *Hungary 1956*) and we solidarize with the position taken by Marcy/Copeland at the time (see "Class Character of the Hungarian Uprising," by V. Copeland, reprinted in *Hungary 1956*) that the revolt was a bourgeois-democratic counter-revolution and that the Soviet intervention prevented capitalist restoration. We will not reproduce the arguments of V. Copeland in this introduction. Let us simply point out that the support of the SWP for a popular and "democratic" counter-revolution is far more consistent with its earlier centrist history and later reformist development than the myth of the SWP in its "orthodoxy" championing a "political revolution"--a "revolution" so dear to the whole world bourgeoisie.

In our view the support of virtually the entire Fourth International (with no opposition anywhere except Marcy/Copeland) for the Hungarian uprising signaled its end, much as Hitler's victory in 1933 showed the Stalinized Comintern was beyond reform. This was the great turning point. Marcy, Copeland, and their supporters ought to have left the SWP in 1957 at the close of the Hungary debate instead of marking time for another two years. Only one more issue was to present itself during this last period--the issue of "regroupment."

Regroupment

Following Khrushchev's 20th Party Congress denunciation of Stalin and then the Soviet intervention in Budapest, large numbers from the U.S. Communist Party and its periphery left in demoralization. Many if not most left politics altogether, but some attempted to establish a new political existence outside the Stalinist party. While it is patently obvious that this movement away from Stalinism was rightward, towards right-wing "democratic socialism" or into the mainstream of bourgeois politics, the SWP believed the opposite.

Given the SWP's analysis of the Hungarian uprising as a political revolution, the leadership believed these drifting elements had been "disillusioned" in a progressive direction and were ripe for "regroupment," that is, collaboration with the SWP and eventual recruitment.

We reprint here Marcy's letter of September, 1957, to the National Committee entitled "Re: Weiss Article on Clark." This letter was a polemic against Murry Weiss, the chief advocate of "regroupment." Marcy's main argument is that the general reactionary political climate of the times precludes any possibility of quantitative growth for a revolutionary party and that the general trend of the various disaffected elements breaking from Stalinism is towards capitulation to U.S. imperialism.

This was Marcy's last political fight. His faction, based in Buffalo, New York, was to leave the SWP in 1959. Their split had not been prepared by any immediately preceding factional struggle nor was it occasioned by any striking change in the political conjuncture. Marcy and his co-thinkers had simply decided the

possibilities in the SWP had been fully exhausted and that an independent existence held more promise.

Workers World Party, Then and Now

As mentioned earlier, the first issue of *Workers World*, the organ of the new formation, had Trotsky's (along with Lenin's) picture on the editorial page. That proved to be a final gesture. By the mid-sixties, *Workers World*, with its frequent reprints from *Peking Review*, would indeed look to a reader unfamiliar with WWP's origins to be the paper of a Maoist party. At one point WWP even entertained the idea of fusion with the Progressive Labor Party (PLP), early during PLP's period of very "hard" Maoism; at least one discussion between the leaderships of WWP and PLP took place to consider the possibility of fusion and it was PLP, not WWP, that broke off the discussions. What had happened to Marcy's Trotskyism?

Communist Cadre, regarding itself as politically descending from Workers World Party and believing that the continuity of revolutionary Marxism, of Trotskyism, passes through Workers World (although not embodied by WWP's practice as a whole at any time), has considered the question of WWP's development at length, and has written and spoken on this question often. Obviously we do not believe WWP's political capitulation to Stalinism was inherent in the global class war concept, as our opponents in the self-identified Trotskyist movement claim. We have pointed to Marcy's advocacy of support for Wallace and his failure to share Vern-Ryan's polemic on Bolivia as possible indications of a tendency towards a full-blown popular frontist deviation at a later date.

Yet WWP and YAWF throughout the 1960s maintained a left and at times an ultra-left opposition to the popular frontist combinations of the CP and the SWP in the anti-war movement. Only in 1974 with WWP's Emergency Coalition Against Racism, where WWP sought out former U.S. attorney general Ramsey Clark and Massachusetts state senator William Owens to front for the "coalition," did WWP announce its popular frontist ambitions. Marcy's position on Henry Wallace was a serious error, but given the times it was a well-motivated mistake that showed a willingness to swim against the cold war pressures, something that cannot be said of Cannon, however formally correct his arguments.

But on closer examination, an attitude in the 1950 and 1953 documents emerges which does prefigure WWP's later course. And that is Marcy's conception of how to compete with Stalinism for hegemony in the working class movement. Marcy's "hard line" against Stalinism is confined in every case--defense of the Soviet Union, the Rosenbergs, Wallace, Taft-Hartly--to besting the CP on its own issues, of demonstrating that the Trotskyists are more militant and more willing to get there "firstest with the mostest."

All this is quite correct and necessary. But it remains essentially a negative prescription, an aggressive competition that in fact reduces to a vigorous defense of issues where the Stalinists are also forced to commit themselves. Nowhere is there a sense of a real policy of offense that proceeds along the lines of transitional demands, that flows from a transitional method. How communist work in the trade unions differs from trade union militancy pure and simple or from Stalinist trade union practice; how the struggle for hegemony with the Stalinists in the working class movement is to pass over to the struggle for hegemony with the bourgeoisie in society as a whole; how propagandistic defense work around various issues is to pass over to an agitational assault on capitalist rule in the U.S.--there is nothing of this in Marcy. And this certainly does prefigure WWP and YAWF.

WWP/YAWF of the 1960s fought to demonstrate that it was the best defender of Vietnam, of the Palestinians, of the Panthers, of Puerto Rican independence--and that was correct. But it only sought to be the loudest and strongest voice in the "me too" chorus of the new left. WWP/YAWF never presented a program to link these

issues with a struggle to politicize the U.S. working class, to link up defense of struggles "over there" (and WWP most certainly regarded the black movement as "over there," as taking place in the "third world") to a policy of at least *programmatically* orienting towards fighting for even an initially isolated but vocal oppositionist role in U.S. labor struggles. WWP/YAWF in the 1960s never went beyond the bounds of anti-imperialism.

As many well know, WWP's politics of today are no longer characterized by that anti-imperialist militancy. Following the end of the Vietnam war, WWP began to turn towards trade union and economic issues. This was the result of the dissolution of YAWF's ongoing constituency of the 1960s, the militant anti-war youth. The end of the anti-war movement placed WWP in an impasse from which it tried to break out by finding new constituencies to which it could appeal. WWP in the 1970s has looked to many social groupings--veterans, prisoners and their families, consumerist women--and in each case has politically adapted itself to the social grouping in question, in most cases by constructing a "mass organization" to handle the issue.

The Prisoners Solidarity Committee was for prisoners, with mostly non-white members of YAWF involved in its work; the attempt was made to transform the American Servicemen's Union into a veterans' advocate, with WWP members instructed not to alienate pro-war veterans with talk about Vietnam; Women United for Action was a thoroughly reformist consumerist organization for "housewives and mothers". In each case a non-communist (and with the vets even passively anti-communist) approach was tailored to accommodate the prejudices, backwardness, bourgeois-democratic illusions, or nationalism of the separate constituencies. This political method (poly-vanguardist or particularist-pluralist, as it is called) had also marked the 1960s YAWF. There, however, the militancy and pro-communist sentiments of the best of the anti-war youth allowed YAWF to pursue an aggressive anti-imperialist line (though YAWF had also adapted itself to that constituency and even trailed behind it to a certain extent, especially with regard to SDS, where YAWF could have easily carried out the entry maneuver brought off so successfully by PLP). The question of how the left-centrist, Stalinist YAWF of the 1960s passed over to the right-centrist, popular frontist Stalinist WWP of the 1970s can be answered only by an examination of WWP/YAWF's changing constituencies and its unchanging poly-vanguardist, pluralist method. More important for the purpose of considering the "global class war" documents, however, is how the Trotskyist Marcy/Copeland faction became the Stalinist, semi-Maoist WWP/YAWF of the 1960s.

WWP/YAWF's whole political perspective, its sense of how to proceed was confronted soon after its inception with a political event that proved to be its undoing as even a possible contender for the regeneration of Trotskyism. And that was the break-up of the "Stalinist monolith." While Marcy had been able to correctly criticize the SWP's toadying to Tito because Tito's break from Stalin proved to be to the right, in the 1960s the left-Stalinist trends that began to develop in international Stalinism greatly confused Marcy and WWP. The Chinese polemics with Togliatti and then with Moscow, the subsequent development of the Cultural Revolution, Castro's criticisms of certain Latin American CP's and later Guevara's efforts in Bolivia, the protracted struggle of the Vietnamese despite the sabotage by Moscow--this development of an international left-Stalinist trend proved to be what derailed WWP.

Marcy in his (commendable) eagerness to solidarize with the Cuban, Vietnamese, and Chinese Revolutions (and especially with the mass upheaval in China in the mid-sixties) went over to an expression of political support and political confidence in the Stalinist leaderships of those struggles. Marcy took the break with Moscow on the part of the Chinese, took the limited independence displayed by the Cubans and Vietnamese to be a break with Stalinism itself on the part of these political forces. Marcy believed and said quite plainly that these leaderships were revolutionary Marxist and abstained from all but the mildest and most fraternal expressions of difference. WWP refused to even discuss the role played by the Chinese

Stalinists in the catastrophic defeat in Indonesia, a defeat made inevitable by the popular frontist policies Peking urged on the Indonesian CP.

WWP made some efforts to act upon this international perspective. Ties with the Chinese proved impossible after PLP Trotsky-baited WWP in Peking. The Vietnamese showed a far greater preference to establish relations with liberals. The North Koreans were politely friendly only so long as the American Serviceman's Union appeared to be a real force (which it truly was for a time) in the U.S. military. But in each and every case the Trotskyist origins of WWP proved to be the chief barrier to WWP/YAWF being accepted into the left-Stalinist fraternity. WWP/YAWF has gone so far in its quest to politically adapt itself to this current that it has informed the Cuban regime (Cuba today being WWP's favorite "socialist" country) that the question of Trotsky is not an issue affecting membership in WWP!

How does WWP see its own history today? Or better put, how does the leadership of WWP explain away the contradiction between its history as a pre-party formation in the SWP and its present practice? Of course, as much as possible the ranks and cadres are kept ignorant of the past or presented a highly distorted view. But from time to time internal factional difficulties as well as the embarrassing questionings of individuals who are nevertheless regarded as valuable (and who must consequently be placated and pacified) force WWP to reveal something of its past. The excellent documents written by V. Copeland ("Class Character of the Hungarian Uprising", "Class Character of the Chinese State", to name two) have never been publicly or internally published by WWP. Only xeroxed copies of the original mimeographed internal bulletins are available and then with some difficulty. Marcy's global class war documenta have never been publicly published and were internally published *once only* and, at that, only in July 1973.

This publication came after years of political support for left-Stalinist governments in Vietnam, Cuba, North Korea and China and just as the Marcy leadership was preparing a sharp right turn which required to a great extent the liquidation of the YAWF tradition of the sixties. Vincent Copeland's introduction to the 1973 internal edition is therefore of considerable interest and we reprint it here.

First and foremost, Copeland had to explain why "Stalinist" was used in a derogatory sense in the 1950 and 1953 documents! Copeland explains that Trotsky never called himself a Trotskyist and that in WWP's opinion the terms "Stalinism" and "Stalinist" have come to mean something else today. Copeland speaks of the "old sense" of the term Stalinism as it was used by Marcy in 1950 and 1953 and that what was meant was "a characterization of the conservative, revisionist and occasionally even reactionary wing of the world communist movement."

And further, "but the first document, that of 1950, needs to be viewed with the thorough understanding of the words 'Stalinism' and 'Stalinist' in their original context as meaning in the document the bureaucratic degeneration of the revolution--and nothing else."

This second formulation, with its definitive *and nothing else*, is clearly meant to convey to newer members that WWP restricts the meaning of the term "Stalinism" to the official Soviet party and government (and its military-bureaucratic extension into Eastern Europe). Otherwise Copeland would not speak of *the* revolution, i.e., the Russian revolution. Copeland makes sure you don't miss this point when a few paragraphs later he refers to the "Chinese revolutionaries," i.e., the Chinese Stalinists of the present period. Copeland no doubt hopes the reader will simply pass over the passage in Marcy's 1950 document where he writes of the party of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai representing in every way a negation of the ideas of revolutionary Marxism.

During the discussions of Marcy's 1950 and 1953 documents in the late summer of 1973 WWP leaders were also forced to take back Marcy's formulation that "the present Chinese leaders have been catapulted into power by the torrential pressure of the Chinese peasants and workers." One WWP leader at an internal meeting was obliged to soothe the semi-Maoism of some members by saying something to the effect

that "of course we didn't believe that Mao was driven to take power against his own intentions; this formulation was simply an accommodation to the terminology and anti-communist prejudices of the SWP at that time"!!

Whither Workers World?

Workers World Party is today a right centrist, Stalinist grouping whose political trajectory for the time being will be further rightward. That does not mean, of course, that WWP, under the pressure of a labor upsurge, could not execute a sharp turn to the left; but in any case, WWP's gyrations will remain within the limits of the classic Stalinist zigzag.

WWP's continued movement to the right is dictated by the disappointment of its fanciful hopes of becoming Havana's party in the U.S., as the CP is Moscow's and the October League is Peking's. WWP, in attempting to win the favor of the Cuban regime, came out against the Eritrean liberation struggle and constructed the most shameless and lying apologies for the reactionary Ethiopian military junta. But to no avail. WWP's Trotskyist origins, despite all disavowals, remain a considerable obstacle. And so long as the Cuban regime pursues a policy of detente towards U.S. imperialism, it is highly unlikely that Castro would antagonize the present U.S. administration by endorsing and actively supporting a political formation that has traditionally stood to the left of the CPUSA. For the time being the Cuban regime can feel itself adequately represented by the "Tricontinental" wing of the CPUSA.

But WWP's propaganda in favor of the Dergue, the Ethiopian junta, indicates a new trend if it is carefully examined. WWP's praise for Mengistu, the Dergue's leading figure, is so fulsome--WWP has described him as a combination of Lenin and Castro, a super-revolutionary, etc., etc.--and goes far beyond the obligation to justify the Cuban regime's actions in the Horn of Africa. Indeed, it must not please Havana to see WWP present Mengistu as a superior figure to even Castro. One can only speculate that WWP is transferring its hopes from the Cuban to the Ethiopian regime, which precisely because it is capitalist and stands outside the Stalinist movement does not have any objections to making use of ex-Trotskyists. Like an inverted version of the old left joke about the cop beating up a man who protested that he was an anti-communist and the cop replying, "I don't care what kind of a communist you are"--Mengistu also does not care what WWP was or is, so long as his counter-revolutionary policies are praised, justified and supported.

Our opponents argue that what WWP is today condemns these early documents. Just as Plekhanov's groundbreaking work when he was truly the "father of Russian Marxism" is not negated by his later opportunism and his chauvinism during World War I, so Marcy's contribution is not negated by his later degeneration. All that is left to say of Marcy is what Trotsky said of Rakovsky after the latter's capitulation to Stalin--let the sixty year old capitulator be replaced by three twenty year old revolutionaries. The great worth of the global class war perspective still remains. Let today's revolutionaries learn from it.

* * * * *

Memorandum on the Unfolding War and the Tasks
of the Proletariat in the New Phase of the World
(Permanent) Revolution
by Sam Marcy

1. The immediate significance of the Korean war lies not merely in the fact that it unleashed a momentous upheaval of the colonial masses on a new front of the ever-widening and deepening Asiatic Revolution, but marked a qualitative change in the character of the whole international situation. It has definitely and irretrievably ushered in the first though brief phase of the Third World War. Even if the Korean War should be followed by a more or less protracted interlude of "truce," it would only prove that a further preparatory period was necessary for the next and absolutely inevitable phase of the developing general conflict. But the die has already been cast. It was prepared, not merely by the Korean war, but by the entire preceding course of historical development, and flows logically and inexorably from the unbearable antagonisms between the growth of the productive forces and their rebellion against the forms of capitalist property as well as the fetters of the outmoded national state.

2. To the degree that the new war is waged as a struggle between the USSR and imperialism it differs from its predecessors in that it is essentially a conflict between two mutually antagonistic and irreconcilable social systems based on diametrically opposed class structures. Herein lies its broader historical and sociological significance.

3. But the struggle between the Soviet Union and imperialism is not a simple conflict between two self-contained and independent entities, suspended in mid-air and gravitating under their own impulsions. While it is unquestionably true that the conflict between the Soviet Union and imperialism is truly titanic and world-wide in scope, it is anything but simple or merely two-sided. Rather it is manifold and extremely complex. The combatants on the arena are not arbitrary entities but living social forces. Nor are they self-contained or independent. On the contrary, they are organically inter-connected, indissolubly anchored to and absolutely dependent upon the two great class pillars of contemporary society--the world proletariat and the world bourgeoisie.

It is from the historic antagonism of these two classes, whose interrelation constitutes the whole fabric of the bourgeois social order, that the conflict between the Soviet Union and imperialism originated and developed. And it is from the unendurable tenseness of their social contradictions that their life and death struggle must sooner or later be joined. This is the root content of the whole problem. This is the quintessence which has been hidden beneath the motley web of alternating international events, conjunctures, and catastrophes. Its presentation to the world under the mask of the "cold war" is one of the most insidious elements in the mechanics of class deception--equally necessary for the self-preservation of the reigning oligarchy in the Kremlin as for the perpetuation of the rule of finance capitalism with its citadel in Wall Street.

It is the class character of imperialism with its nerve center in the USA, which draws together all bourgeois states and all kindred social layers and mobilizes them for the war against the USSR.

It is the class character of the modern working class as the grave-digger and revolutionary successor to the bourgeoisie which is the umbilical cord that ties in the fate of the USSR with the fate of the world proletariat. If we conceive the mutual relations of the USSR and the world proletariat as flowing from their social connections what emerges between them is not an arbitrary contraposition but an inseparable interdependence. This flows from their common class denominator, from

the sameness of their basic social substance and from their relation to each other-- not as mere fragmentary and disparate parts of the same social reality, but as separate stages of an uneven process of development. Not all the disavowals of Stalin, not all his base denunciations and cruel betrayals can break the social nexus between the Soviet Union and the international working class. Nor can he dissolve their historic fate in the maelstrom of his bureaucratic politics. The course of the unfolding war cannot but make the historical destiny of the USSR and the international working class more plainly congruent, the identity of their social and historical interests more visible, and the path of their development and direction more clearly outlined.

4. Hence the deepest and most profound significance of the coming war is that it will mark the opening phase of the all-out, supreme, and final conflict between the world bourgeoisie, which long ago exhausted its progressive historical role, and the world proletariat, which must seize control of the productive forces of society and organize them on a rational basis.

5. By the very nature of its objective dynamics and the irresistible sweep of its momentum, this war must necessarily develop into a global class conflict: greater, sharper, and more decisive than all the social and political conflicts of the past. Historically and sociologically, it will be a resume of the more than one hundred years of revolutionary warfare waged by the proletariat and its allies against the bourgeoisie.

6. The fact that the opening phase of the war may manifest itself (or rather conceal itself), even if only initially and temporarily, as a war between nations, should not in the slightest degree obscure its clearcut class character. It is not a war between the nations but a war between the classes! The transfer of the main burden of the struggle from the shoulders of the immediate protagonists (the USSR and the USA) to its most direct ultimate protagonists--the world bourgeoisie and the world proletariat--is as inevitable as the rising sun. The bourgeoisie has everywhere recognized this war as the great and decisive one of its long and bloody career, and has therefore invested it with an immeasurably greater acuteness than all its past struggles combined. Its fury and rapacity will know no restraints. The proletarians and oppressed of all lands will soon know this, but all too well! While petty-bourgeois philistines and centrists of all shades and hues will undoubtedly point to the symmetrical character of the armies in combat as proof of the reactionary character of the war on both sides, we must on the other hand ceaselessly proclaim that: whereas one army is driven by the engines of class despotism and social strangulation, the other is a locomotive of historical progress. Never, however, even for an instant, can the revolutionary vanguard neglect to courageously and energetically expose the congenital propensity of the temporary and cowardly custodians of the locomotive to obstruct and wreck, all in the name of their own narrow, selfish, and caste-like interests. Their replacement before the end of the journey is absolutely necessary and inevitable. The revolutionary vanguard must make it clear to the whole world that in this war the geographical boundaries are social boundaries, the battle formations are class formations, and the world line of demarcation is the line rigidly drawn by the socialist interests of the world proletariat. Every worker must know his place as well as his duty.

7. That the first phase of the unfolding war exploded on the Korean peninsula is neither accidental nor arbitrary, nor primarily propelled by subjective or diplomatic considerations. Not even Stalin or Truman or the Pope make history wholly out of their own cloth. And since the Korean war is not a transcendental ripple on a vast sea, but a momentous event in the evolution of the worldwide class struggle, and a turningpoint in international relations, it can only be understood in the light of sharply defined and objectively determined causes. That

does not mean that the perfidious role of Stalin's politics is not reflected here as well as everywhere else where he maintains a treacherous stranglehold on the masses--only here it is reproduced on a more monstrous and catastrophic scale.

But just as little can we say that the Korean war was wholly and exclusively generated by the elemental revolutionary outbursts of the Korean masses. This would be just as false as to conceive Korea as a mere pawn in the struggle between two arbitrary powers. While it is incontestably valid to affirm that the revolutionary ferment of the Korean workers and peasants was the most indispensable social ingredient in the composite interplay of class forces in that corner of the Asiatic crucible, it would be entirely wrong to regard it as a unique phenomenon divorced from the historic process of our time. To probe its significance to the very depth, we must first of all view it as an inseparable element in a constantly evolving world process whose social mainspring and driving force is and can only be the present struggle of the basic classes for hegemony over society.

8. This struggle finds its partial though acutest expression in the developing class war between the USSR and imperialism. The great tragedy of the world proletariat and the Russian proletariat in particular is that this struggle is distorted, mangled, and mutilated by the parasitic interests of the Thermidorian bureaucracy. But to deny that this struggle exists or to deny its class character would only facilitate the deceptive politics of Stalin rather than prepare for his downfall. Korea was not a struggle between Stalin and Truman or MacArthur, nor was it a struggle between the "barbaric East" and the "democratic West," but between the upper and lower strata of a convulsed social organism which could no longer endure the restraints of class stratification.

It is in this social setting, where global class currents and antithetical crosscurrents, always in constant evolution and uninterrupted strife, meet and collide, that we see Korea in all its enormity and stark tragedy. Korea was a temporary but untenable nodal point in this struggle of the giants, the mirror where the contending antagonists momentarily measured their strength, but where one of them ignominiously retreated. It ended temporarily in a major catastrophe, above all for the Korean people, a setback for the Soviet Union, for all of the oppressed of the Orient, and for the working class in general. But it is only the beginning!

It did prove however, if further proof were still necessary, that Stalinism can attempt to nibble away at imperialism, can even willy-nilly consent to a daring offensive, but cannot hold its ground in the face of the united, concerted, world-wide imperialist counter-offensive. Why? Because this in its turn threatens to inevitably convert itself into a global class war, a new phase of the world (permanent) revolution, which would surely sweep away not only imperialism but the debris of Stalinism as well.

It is entirely probable that the planners in the Kremlin conceived Korea as a stealthy venture which would strengthen their influence in the Orient and test as well as cement the alliance with China. But Korea evoked the most violent paroxysm of imperialism and set the stage for the fullest political, social and military mobilization of all bourgeoisdom. Its class character is most vividly shown in the fact that not a single bourgeois layer anywhere on the globe even as much as professed to see the "other side," the side of the North Koreans.

The Kremlin swiftly took all this into its calculations and beat a retreat--a retreat that was still possible, without material injury to its interests, but a retreat that has paved the way and made absolutely inevitable the new offensive by imperialism under conditions which cannot but be much more unfavorable to the Soviet Union and the working class in general. Again and once more, the next phase of the struggle will show that it is the whip of the counter-revolution which

will urge the revolution onward.

9. The events in Korea could only have begun on the basis of the new correlation of class forces in the Orient and the consequent alteration of the international position of the great powers. The mutation of state forms on the mainland of China is indubitably the most decisive cause of the consequent changes. Itself issuing from a mighty revolutionary wave, originally impelled by the great October Revolution, the coming to power of the Mao Tse-tung regime is the greatest rupture in the imperialist chain since the victory of the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. Whoever does not see that the bourgeois-landlord-merchant-compradore class alliance, the main and fundamental prop of imperialism in China, has been broken and shattered, and a new class power erected, cannot hope to understand the evolution of present day society. A new class power, basing itself fundamentally on the workers and peasants, has seized the reins of power, and is now attempting to shape the destiny of China in a new direction. That bourgeois relations still predominate in industry and agriculture is incontrovertible. But what is of the greatest moment is that the political power of the former ruling class has been shattered, their "body of armed men" disarmed or destroyed, and their main source of strength and recuperative power, their nexus to and dependence upon imperialism, shattered. China is a workers' state because the main and fundamental obstacle to the rule of the workers and peasants, the bourgeois-landlord-imperialist alliance has been swept away and a new alliance--based on workers and peasants--erected in its place. It is not a chemically pure dictatorship of the proletariat, as no social formation ever is, but its fundamental class content is beyond doubt.

10. But shall we characterize the new Chinese revolution "by the class which achieves it or by the social content lodged in it?" To this question posed by Trotsky in one of his letters to Preobrazhensky Trotsky gives the following answer:

"There is a theoretical trap lodged in counterposing the former to the latter in such a general form." Why? Because, says Trotsky, "The 'social content' under the dictatorship of the proletariat (based on an alliance with the peasantry) can remain during a certain period of time not socialist as yet, but the road to bourgeois development from the dictatorship of the proletariat can lead only through counterrevolution. For this reason, so far as the social content is concerned, it is necessary to say: 'We shall wait and see.'"

This hypothetical stage of the Chinese revolution projected by Trotsky more than two decades ago corresponds precisely to the reality of the China of today. The revolution's "social content"--the full nationalization of the means of production as well as collectivization of agriculture--has, of course, "not yet" been achieved, although small but significant beginnings have been made, especially in Manchuria. But the road back "to bourgeois development from the dictatorship of the proletariat can lead only through counter-revolution," i.e., the re-emergence of the Chiang Kai-shek regime or one of similar social stripe.

Of course Trotsky had in mind a genuine Communist Party grounded in revolutionary Marxism and geared to the perspective of the world revolution, rather than the party of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, which in every way represent a negation of these very ideas. But then the latter have not been the architects and guides of the revolution, as was the case with the party of Lenin and Trotsky. On the contrary, the present Chinese leaders have been catapulted into power by the torrential revolutionary pressure of the Chinese peasants and workers. But theirs is nonetheless a dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry no matter how distorted and mutilated by Stalinist practices, dogmas and perspectives--unless we are willing to assume that the Communist Party of China is a non-working class organization and does not base itself on the workers and peasants. In such a case we shall, of course, have to revise our whole theoretical approach to this question.

But what about the contradiction between the present political structure in China and its economic base? Here again the words of Trotsky offer a faultless guide:

"The gist of the matter lies precisely in the fact that although the political mechanics of the revolution depends in the last analysis upon an economic base (not only national but international) it cannot, however, be deduced with abstract logic from this economic base. In the first place, the base itself is very contradictory and its 'maturity' does not allow of bald statistical determination; secondly, the economic base as well as the political situation must be approached not in the national but in the international framework, taking into account the dialectic action and reaction between the national and the international; thirdly, the class struggle and its political expression, unfolding on the economic foundations, also have their own imperious logic of development, which cannot be leaped over."¹

In the light of the above passage it is clear that the objective dynamics of the Chinese revolution can find its fullest expression only on the international arena. The fate of China even more than that of the Soviet Union can be determined, not within the narrow confines of its national boundaries, but on the broad highway of the international proletarian revolution.

11. No approach towards a real understanding of the intricate relations between China, the Soviet Union and imperialism is possible unless one previously takes into account the class character of their regimes.

"The USSR, as a workers' state, has no imperialist interests or aims in China. On the contrary, it is in the interests of the USSR to help smash imperialism in all its colonial and semi-colonial strongholds by rendering the fullest possible aid to the oppressed peoples in their struggle against imperialism."²

This statement of Trotsky's, written in 1938, retains its fullest validity today. In the diplomatic relations of Moscow and Peking are not only interlaced the sordid interests of the two bureaucracies, but also the inner needs for development of their respective states. We must draw a sharp line between the conflicting needs of Stalin and Mao for the perpetuation of their privileges, and the imperious demands for mutual development of China and the Soviet Union as geographically contiguous and socially harmonious state formations. The frictions and conflicts are all between Mao and Stalin, not between China and Russia.

The alliance between the Soviet Union and the Chinese Republic is an alliance between social classes having identical social aims. Inherent in this is their irreconcilable hostility to imperialism. The world bourgeoisie is supremely conscious of this. In its effort to break the alliance it is not promoting a "new democratic order in Asia," but is seeking to promote a new form of apostasy among the leaders of the Asiatic revolution, while at the same time preparing to mount a new military offensive.

The rapprochement between Peking and Moscow, a truly remarkable achievement in itself demonstrates that the laws of history are stronger than the bureaucratic apparatus. The class bonds between China and the USSR have at least for the moment triumphed over the narrow clique politics of their ruling hierarchies. The alliance between the USSR and China has partially decided the fate of the USSR, and definitely ended more than a quarter of a century of isolation. While it has solved one problem for the USSR as well as China, it has put into sharper focus another, and made its solution more imperative than ever. The elimination of more than half a billion people from the strangle-hold of world capitalism in the period of its death agony cannot but aggravate all of the contradictions of capitalism anew, and impel

the bourgeoisie towards a forcible solution of its problems at the expense of the millions of the Asiatic continent, the last safetyvalve for world imperialism. The co-existence of the Soviet-Chinese alliance side by side with imperialism cannot but be conceived as a preparatory period for the next phase in the global class struggle.

12. The law of uneven development and its supplementary expression, the law of combined development, have brought it about that Europe, the cradle of that socio-economic formation known as capitalism, proved too narrow and cramped either to serve as the basin for capitalism's fullest expansion in its youth or even as a cemetery where the proletariat can at long last perform the final rites for its stubborn and tenacious old foe. In this respect, capitalism shows a striking similarity to at least one other preceding universal social formation. We refer of course to the classical civilizations of antiquity. They too attained their fullest flowering, not in their cradles, the fertile valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates or the Nile, but on the broader expanse of the Mediterranean.

13. As long ago as the turn of our century, the economic center of gravity, which was slowly shifting from Britain to Germany, also showed signs of moving further westward towards America. This was graphically illustrated, not merely by the uninterrupted stream of migration, as well as the export of capital to America, but by a multitude of other factors, not the least of which was of course the unparalleled expansion of American industry itself, which developed in practically ideal social and natural surroundings, untrammelled by Europe's feudal obstructions. Nor were there formidable capitalist rivals directly blocking its path of development.

The fires of the 1848 revolution on the European continent could not be revived in the wake of the discovery of gold in California, a fact which Marx and Engels refer to as of "even greater importance than the February revolution." With prophetic vision the youthful authors saw more than a century before our time that unless Europe took the road of social revolution "it would fall into the same industrial, commercial, and political dependence as Italy, Spain and Portugal." Only if Europe "transformed its mode of production" would it "maintain the superiority of European industry and counteract the disadvantages of the geographical situation," in relation to America.

14. At about the same time that signs were discernible of the shift of the economic center of gravity further West, signs were multiplying that the center of revolutionary gravity was shifting East and away from Western Europe. Kautsky, the chief theoretician of the Second International, did not entirely overlook this interesting social phenomenon. And Lenin, almost two decades later, in a none-too-polite manner, recalled it to his attention after Kautsky had turned renegade and denied the validity of the October Revolution.

15. The first imperialist holocaust delivered a shattering blow to European capitalism and marked the definite passage of the economic center of gravity to America. Ludwell Denny's notable book, "America Conquers Britain," which appeared a decade later, was merely a statistical tabulation of Trotsky's brilliant prognosis that America "would put Europe on rations."

Meanwhile, the revolutionary center of gravity which was steadily moving Eastward gave objective and monumental verification of its existence with the outbreak of the October Revolution, breaking the imperialist chain at its weakest link, Russia.

The establishment of the first Workers' Republic and the founding of the Communist International electrified the whole world proletariat. It did not, however,

break the back of European capitalism, but did make a significant dent further East, in China. The Chinese revolution of 1925-27 was drowned in blood with the indispensable aid of Stalin, but left smoldering embers in the form of intractable armies.

16. The close of the Second World War established American finance capital as the nerve center of world imperialism and marked its fusion with the most diverse forms of European and Asiatic reaction. It also signified the end of European capitalism's political sovereignty in domestic and particularly in foreign affairs. The center of revolutionary gravity moved further East, finding explosive confirmation in the culmination of the Third Chinese Revolution, and setting in motion the millions of oppressed and exploited in all of southeast Asia, and even as far as the Philippines.

17. To arrive at an approximation of the direction of social development since the October Revolution, let us identify anew the driving forces of that development, namely, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Proceeding thus, we isolate them in "pure" form; that is, we separate them from such secondary phenomena as national boundaries, political parties, bureaucracy, democracy, fascism, reformism, and Stalinism. These are superstructural elements, which in a given situation may operate to bolster or hamper the structure as the case may be, but are strictly derivative in character. Sometimes they serve as palliatives for reviving a decomposing social structure, and again, as encrustations which paralyze a live and growing structure. In a broad and general way, history indicates that, ultimately, every new social structure which arises out of the needs of development of the productive forces will in time bring into correspondence its superstructure, or, failing that, will overthrow it.

If we abstract all superstructural phenomena from the structure, that is, from the sum total of the inter-relation of the classes, we find that the residue is still the same--the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

What then is new? If we still view the structure--the sum total of the inter-relations of the classes--in "pure," naked form and divorced, particularly, from the blinding effects of the multitudinous national boundaries, we see then that there has taken place on a global scale a most remarkable social regroupment of the basic classes, a redistribution into newer and larger geographical basins of the material and social power of the bourgeoisie and proletariat. "East" and "West" have become the geographical receptacles, the depositories into which old Europe, poured out its rich social protoplasm in opposite directions--resulting in a shift of the revolutionary center of gravity to the East and the economic center of gravity to the far West.

The proletariat established its first workers' republic in the East, where imperialism was weakest and where capital found the greatest social resistance to its reproduction and further development. The bourgeoisie on the other hand reproduced itself on a materially sounder foundation in America, where it not only encountered the least social resistance but also found the most favorable natural surroundings.

18. "America is the foundry where the fate of Man will be forged." In this profound thought of Trotsky's is lodged not only a great historic conception but also a revolutionary prognosis and guide to action. Ingrained in it, too, is the final hope for all humanity.

The law of value, that ultimate arbiter of all things both splendid and shabby, has evinced in America an all too-one-sided interest, and even partiality towards the owners that be, and rather scant attention to the powers who will be. Our point is not to quarrel with the law, but to show her other, kindlier side.

The law of labor value showed that a couple of American destroyers could terrorize all Formosa, and completely subdue it, were that also necessary. That occurred fully three-quarters of a century ago, in 1876. Today, when America is equipped with the atomic bomb, the "absolute" weapon, Formosa presents a formidable and even terrifying project for the banker-general fraternity in the Pentagon. That too is a demonstration of the law of labor value--that it may yield different results under changed circumstances.

"Five miserable divisions," as Trotsky called them, seemed entirely sufficient for the Japanese war clique to hold all of China's millions in subjection. But the bookkeepers of the banking houses of Mitsui and Mitsubishi took too narrow a view of the role of technology in its relation to the prosecution of a predatory war on a seemingly helpless people. That the miscalculators broke their necks in the relentless pursuit of their mad adventure was also an expression of the law of labor value--only they had not reckoned with this side of the law: its conditional, dependent and relative character.

The law of value regulates the organism of capitalism, and illuminates the relations between labor and technology. It shows that the productivity of labor is determined, among other factors, by the state of technology. But from this does not follow the utterly false and spurious military doctrine, now especially current after Korea in the ruling summits of Wall Street, that the technological status of any particular country at any given moment is an absolute criterion of its strength and viability in modern combat--that is, total war.

19. American finance capital is the center of the imperialist system. It is moving at a faster tempo all the time, but its heart beats even slower. True, the war doubled the national income--raised the productivity of labor, and expanded the productive forces to unprecedented heights. But American capital is living on borrowed time. It is nurturing volcanic eruptions everywhere. The terrestrial globe appears to it as one gigantic piece of real estate, in a terribly bearish market, where the overlords of finance can garner the most fabulous fortunes merely by extending funds to the most desperate customers. But alas! The time-honored empirical solutions are running their full course. That their "elder statesmen" recognize this is all too clear from their daily foreboding pronouncements.

American finance capital never fully recovered from the paralytic stroke it received in the economic avalanche which began in October, 1929. The years of cataclysmic decline that followed in its wake were proof irrefutable that private ownership of the means of production was strangling the social organism. That whole complicated network of capitalist property relations which is forever masking itself under the pseudonym of "free enterprise" and the "democratic way of life" was suddenly stripped of its sodden garments and began to appear with each passing day of chronic crisis, as just a brutal mass of reactionary and hypocritical obstructions standing in the way of the American people. Signs, too, were to be observed everywhere that this revolutionary idea might even take hold of the broad masses. The bourgeoisie reacted with frenzied, hysterical opposition, even to the most insignificant social demands. It was not that the bourgeoisie could not "afford" them, but it was indicative of the fact that the idea of revolution, which was slowly making its way into the nerves of the masses, had simultaneously raised itself as a spectre in the minds of the bourgeoisie.

But the continent of Europe was again pregnant with another imperialist holocaust, and America was destined to become the arsenal from which Europe would draw an apparently unlimited stream of weapons for its own self-destruction. This is what was at the bottom of the recovery that followed. This is what interrupted the further development of America's first series of truly great class struggles and cooled the molten lava of the embryo revolution that was the CIO in its Heroic Age, the phase of its "sitdowns."

20. "Violent outbursts take place sooner in the extremities of the bourgeois organism than in the heart, because here regulation is more possible."³ Thus did Marx many decades ago, without even alluding to America, depict its role while at the same time foreshadowing the first series of successful revolutionary conflagrations at the extremities of the imperialist system, and not at its heart. But the heart is so fashioned that it can properly nourish only the natural parts of its own body. While it is incontestably true that America is today the center of the world-wide imperialist system it must not be forgotten that it was constructed to fit the narrower framework of the American continent. The laws of physiology have yet to exhibit how the heart of an organism, itself in old age, can be made to function while assuming the added responsibility of pumping its blood into an ever-increasing number of dead and decaying parts artificially engrafted to it. This is an abomination in nature as well as in society! The heavy preponderance of the dead weights of European and Asiatic reaction will inevitably ruin its aging heart.

The burden of the preceding paragraphs is calculated to show that the tendency in world politics and economics whereby the revolutionary center of gravity moved steadily in one direction and the economic center of gravity in another direction, will sooner than most philistines realize, convert itself into its opposite and result in a union of the two.

This is the real meaning of America as the "foundry where the fate of man will be forged." The coalescing of the revolutionary center of gravity with that of the economic center will be the great turning point in man's history.

The first truly revolutionary outburst on the social soil of the American continent will light the flames of a new revolutionary conflagration which is sure to envelop the entire globe. It will graphically demonstrate how "East meets West" not by the construction of new and more tortuous artificial boundaries, but by the revolutionary destruction of all of them. It will be the supreme and ultimate alliance of the great truly progressive classes of the East and West in a final effort to accomplish their own dissolution. This in turn will terminate the first great cycle of man's development from sub-man--to man--to Communist Man, and set him on the path to new and higher syntheses.

21. It is only in the light of the general perspective outlined above that we can arrive at a fuller and more many-sided estimate of the period which began with the first worldwide imperialist explosion of August 1914.

At the end of two world wars and the beginning of the third one, the relative position of the two basic classes in the struggle for world hegemony is as follows: The world bourgeoisie lost its material bases in Russia, China and Eastern Europe. It all but lost the shattered remnants of its base in Western Europe. But it strengthened itself materially and socially in America. The world proletariat in a social and historical sense, holds power in Russia, China and Eastern Europe, but at the cost of its complete political expropriation. It lost its revolutionary vanguard and succumbed to ideological strangulation. This resulted in the complete atrophy of the revolutionary Marxist spirit, its traditions, its heritage, not to speak of its revolutionary methods of struggle and its liberating principles. From this followed a long period of demoralization of the world proletariat and its consequent inability to reorganize itself under a new revolutionary vanguard.

That is the balance sheet of the world-wide class struggle--with the losses as well as gains on both sides of the class barricades. And viewed in retrospect, could it really have been otherwise? Such a long and protracted struggle, extending for decades and spanning the continents as well as the oceans, could not but result in catastrophic losses as well as prodigious gains.

In a continuous, raging, ever-deepening and widening war between the classes, no greater error can be made than to confuse a momentous gain with a loss, or for that matter vice versa. Our primary purpose in making an appraisal of the class character of any given social formation is to formulate guides for action. The proletarian army cannot for long be under a cloud as to whether certain of its contingents belong to the enemy or are part of its own class camp. A gain must be defended and a loss must be erased! Such are the ruthless and imperious demands of a war that must be fought to the death.

But can Eastern Europe and China be regarded as a gain for the proletariat? As a success? Perhaps the best way to answer this question is expressed in the words of Walt Whitman: "It is provided in the essence of things that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary."

Thus the real merit, the lasting significance of the overturns in Eastern Europe and China are that they shall bring forth, as expressed in the words of Whitman, "SOMETHING THAT MAKE A GREATER STRUGGLE NECESSARY." China and Eastern Europe are stepping stones which bring "the greater struggle"--the inevitable social Armageddon between capital and labor--even closer.

The emergence of China and Eastern Europe as workers' states has not closed the epoch of their revolutions but merely opened them--and projected them on the broad highway of the world struggle of the classes where their fate and the fate of the world proletariat will be decided. The crushing of the old state apparatus and the erection of a new one based on workers and peasants merely lays the foundation for the development of the revolution from lower to higher stages--a development that can find its fruition only on the international arena. If we adopt the global class war as the scale of our measurements then we can see that the overturn in Eastern Europe and in China have materially changed the relationship of forces between the world bourgeoisie and the world proletariat, and have been a heavy blow to imperialism by circumscribing the orbit of its deadly operations, i.e., the extraction of surplus value, the super-exploitation of the people abroad in order to better enslave the people at home. This in itself is a progressive development.

Neither Russia nor China nor Eastern Europe nor Yugoslavia can build "socialism in one country" or even together "in one zone." If in the period which opened in 1924, when a relatively more stable equilibrium prevailed, the building of socialism in one country was a reactionary, nationalistic Utopia, then today it is completely fantastic, and a cruel deception of the masses. While significant gains can be made here and there by the nationalization of the means of production and the collectivization of agriculture, the distortion of the economy of these countries as a result of the imperative needs of the military situation makes peaceful planning, even on a modest scale, far more difficult. The world is living in a perpetual state of war, literally on the edge of a precipice. The dark shadow of American imperialist might, and the terror of its military prowess are a preponderant element in the calculations of the large as well as the small states. As long as the incubus of American finance capital clings to the body of world economy no real long-term socialist planning can be done anywhere on the globe. A world that is living in the shadow of the atomic bomb cannot but economically gear itself more and more towards war: that is, the forcible solution of irreconcilable contradictions which cannot be resolved in any other manner. That is the indelible outline of the stark reality. Whoever preaches "the neutralization of the two camps" for a long period, is handing the masses a soporific pill while the bourgeoisie is sharpening its dagger.

22. The metamorphosis of the USSR--the most striking social phenomenon in man's entire evolution--presents a living social panorama that is truly staggering. This is scarcely to be wondered at. It contains within its broad bosom such an abundance of contradictions, contrasts, and nuances--is so rich and variegated in content--

combining horse-drawn vehicles with jet-propelled planes--harnessing the energy of the peasant who still draws his water direct from the well, while exploring the possibilities of the mountain-moving atom--a whole country moving at break-neck speed, and yet at a snail's pace--holding out the greatest hopes for the masses, and yet dashing them to the ground every day, every hour--connected and interconnected with a thousand threads to the most distant and most barbarous past, and yet serving as a beacon light for man's future--a vast labyrinthine social complex whose every sinew and muscle is twined and intertwined with the most suffocating and stifling overgrowth of parasitic fat. Such are some of the more obvious aspects of a once isolated and struggling infant state that has now arisen to the stature of a veritable giant.

A real analysis of the Soviet state can only be made with the aid of what Lenin called "the last word in scientific evolutionary methods"--dialectics. "The essence of it," he took great pains to show, "is the division of the one and the cognition of its contradictory parts."

Where is the summer soldier in labor's minor wars who has not championed the Soviet Union when that social phenomenon appeared in its "one-ness," i.e., its unity, and as it is seen in relatively stable equilibrium--"at peace with the world", and in harmonious collaboration with labor's deadly enemies?

And who has not seen the erstwhile sycophant and purveyor of the most infamous Stalinist dogmas who has suddenly awakened in the midst of the cold war and now sees only "its contradictory parts"--the conglomerate mass of Stalinist distortions of the Soviet state? It remained for Trotsky to show that the real essence of the objective dialectics of the Soviet state lies not in its "one-ness" (the unity of opposites in the body social, which is conditional, temporary, and relative) nor in its multitudinous contradictory parts (which are merely objective manifestations of the hidden process), but in the "division of the one," (the struggle of opposites, which is absolute) and must inevitably result in the separation of the revolutionary social structure from the reactionary super-structure. Therein lies the essence not only of the Soviet Union but of dialectics itself! This is the imperishable rock of Trotskyism, the only valid and consistently revolutionary Marxism of today.

23. In between capitalism and socialism lies ahead a rather lengthy period of transition. Since the advent of the October Revolution, it has generally been recognized to be more protracted in character than was originally conceived in the pre-monopoly days of capitalism. It must now also be fully recognized that to the transition between capitalism and socialism there also corresponds another lengthy parallel transition, a transition in the development of the proletariat from the stage of non-consciousness to consciousness.

Like all other elements in the material evolution of man, consciousness is subject to the same laws of movement--of slow quantitative growth, of leaps forward and breaks, of the transformation of quantity into quality, etc.--as all other phenomena. The successive breakdowns of the First, Second and Third Internationals can be conceived as breaks in the evolution of the consciousness of the proletariat. These breaks correspond to, or rather follow on the heels of, giant rifts in the material struggle of the classes, arising from their incompatible roles in the process of production. The reflection of this in the consciousness of the working class, particularly in its vanguard, are true-to-law developments, conforming inexorably to objective law. Rather than evincing the reign of the arbitrary, they demonstrate that consciousness, like all other elements in social development, is the product of a deep inner lawfulness.

The victory of the Thermidorean over the revolutionary tendency in the struggle of social forces following the October Revolution was the greatest break in the development of the consciousness of the working class. The revolutionary tendency

fell in combat as a result of the concentration of all the material and social forces of the bourgeoisie against an isolated and besieged fortress of the world revolution. The centralism of the imperialist bourgeoisie triumphed over the revolutionary centralism of the proletariat, and produced a monstrous reaction in the bureaucratic absolutism of Stalinism.

24. Our movement will triumph over all its ideological enemies, and lead the world proletariat to ultimate victory by remorselessly and relentlessly exposing before all the world the inherent contradiction and ultimate separation of the virus that is Stalinism from the bacillus that is the revolution, inherent in the structure of a whole group of workers' states comprising almost half the population of the world. The latter demands of us that we passionately, loyally and devotedly defend them against all their enemies from within and from without. Failure to do it boldly and courageously will result in a breach of revolutionary duty not only to the workers and peasants in those states, but to the world proletariat as well. Equally imperative is the consistent, energetic and absolutely uncompromising exposure of the perfidious role of Stalinism all over the world. In the daily prosecution of these tasks as part and parcel of the general world-wide prosecution of the class struggle we will grow strong and soon count our followers by the millions.

25. This is not the summer of Stalinism, but its Indian Summer. This is not the Winter of labor's historical role, but that of capital's, and its golden bloody dusk now settling all over the globe heralds not the long night of reaction but the relative (even though it may be total) darkness of the equinox before the storming of the heavens by the proletariat.

October 29, 1950

1. New International, April 1936.
2. The Founding Conference of the Fourth International, (Program and Resolutions) Socialist Workers Party, New York, 1939. p. 80.
3. Trotsky: History of the Russian Revolution, Vol. 3, appendix 2, p. 349, London, V. Gollancz Ltd., 1933.

by Sam Marcy

Is There an Independent Destiny for the American Working Class?

I propose to discuss in this article what I believe to be the basic and underlying issues in the current discussion. The first one is: Is there an independent destiny for the American proletariat? The second one is: What is the historical fate of Stalinism in the new epoch of global class war, and how does this affect the task of the American vanguard, the SWP?

Let us consider the first issue. Is it possible for the American proletariat to carve out for itself an independent destiny, an independent road toward socialism separate and apart from Europe and Asia? Is it possible to strike out on an entirely new path, which will lead to the broad highway of the American Revolution? After all, is it not true that the American working class is still virgin soil, and really has no allegiance to any political party in the sense that the Europeans, or the Asians, or the Latin Americans have? Is it not possible to start from a new beginning, brush aside the Stalinists as well as the debris of the various socialist sects and begin anew, dig deeper and deeper into the trade unions, and conduct the struggles there in the spirit of the independent class politics of Lenin? If we divorce ourselves from the fate of Europe and Asia, will we not get the ear of the workers more readily? If the workers hate Stalinism and Russia, be it for good or for bad reasons, of what concern is it to us if they will follow us on our path to socialism?

In Europe and Asia there is a complex--or contradictory combination--of revolution and reaction. Such is the situation in Russia, Eastern Europe and China. Is it not far better to disregard the whole complexity? Why take the onus of Europe's curses on our back? Why carry a burden which is not necessary, and certainly not acceptable, to the American workers today and perhaps not even adaptable to the American scene? Will we gain more by linking up our fate with the revolutions of the East and of Europe, or by withdrawing from them? Does what is described as the revolutionary complex in Europe and Asia hinder or help us? Is the revolutionary reality of Europe and Asia a magnet through which we can draw the most advanced elements into our party, or is this revolutionary reality not overshadowed and outweighed by the dark spectre of Stalinism? Will we gain more by drawing upon the revolutionary reality in Europe and Asia, or will we lose more as a result of the terrific obstacles which Stalinism puts in our way as a bar to the American worker?

I have raised this series of questions in a particularly sharp manner because I think it has a close relevance to the present discussion. I have raised these questions because I have felt for a long time that sooner or later the process of uneven development in the revolutionization of the world proletariat would place these questions on the agenda in the American party. This would happen because of the tardiness in the radicalization of the American working class and the fact that the revolutionary center of gravity is still in the East. The revolutionary center of gravity has been moving with giant strides, but thus far, further and further East, so that by now it has fully in its grip not only the continent of Asia, but Africa and the Middle East. The tidal wave of world revolution abroad is in sharp contrast to the reactionary trend that has dominated this country for several years now. That is why the above series of questions must be put on the agenda and fully examined.

Let us begin with the most elementary question. Is the American proletariat an independent social entity? Obviously the answer is no. But let us pursue it a little further with the aid of a quotation from Lenin.

The Link in the Chain

Lenin wrote:

"The whole of political life is an endless chain composed of an infinite number of links. The whole art of the politician consists in finding and taking firm hold of the link that is most difficult to take from you, the most important at the given moment and the one which best guarantees to you the possession of the whole chain."

Lenin's reference to the link and the chain offers an almost perfect analogy of the relationship between the American proletariat and the world-wide proletariat. The American proletariat is the link, the world proletariat is the chain. The American proletariat is historically the most important and decisive link for the fate of the whole chain. But--and this is of the greatest importance--the link is indissolubly connected and intertwined with the whole chain. Separate the link from the chain and neither the link nor the chain exists. If the American proletariat were a social entity not connected with the chain, then we could consider the question of an independent destiny. But the American proletariat is an inseparable and completely inter-dependent link, not merely of the world proletariat, but of an entire global class camp. Unless we view the American working class in this light, we cannot see it in proper historical perspective, nor can we analyze the course of its ultimate destiny. In order to fully answer the questions posed, it is absolutely necessary to consider the new world setting.

I have introduced in the above paragraph the conception of the global class camp, the camp of which the American working class is an indispensable and key part whose fate, let me repeat, is completely tied up with it. The conception of our class camp is different today from any other period in the history of the working class. There was a period in the history of the working class when its camp was confined almost exclusively to the exploited proletariat. That was the period prior to the October Revolution when it had relatively few allies among the oppressed masses in the colonies and dependent countries when the latter slept the sleep of the centuries. Of course they were always allies in a social sense but not politically articulate. In the epoch that saw the rise of the victorious revolution in the USSR headed by Lenin and Trotsky, the Soviet Union was at the head of the camp of the exploited which already included millions of awakened colonial masses. In the epoch of Stalinist degeneration and the consequent isolation of the Soviet Union, the isolated workers state introduced a monstrous distortion, mutilation and atomization within the camp of the world proletariat. In the present epoch our class camp is not only constituted differently because it is a new historical period, but because it has a number of characteristics which distinguish it from the previous epoch.

In What Manner is Our Class Camp Different than in the Previous Epoch?

In the first place, the camp of the proletariat today, unlike the previous epoch, has the bulk of the oppressed peoples in the colonies and dependent countries within its camp as allies. The mass of peasants, semi- and non-proletarian elements of the backward countries, which in previous epochs were the reserve of imperialist reaction, can now be regarded not merely in a social but in the political sense as well, as having been attracted to and daily becoming more and more part and parcel of the camp of the proletariat. The revolutionary ferment all over the colonial world is testimony to this fact. Our class camp is numerically much larger, much more politically conscious than in all previous epochs. The second characteristic of our class camp is that it has state allies, states where the working class, if not in a political sense, then certainly in a social and historic sense, holds the ruling power. The third characteristic of our camp, as differentiated from the Stalinist epoch proper, is that the deformity and mutilation introduced by the Stalinist leadership at the head of this

camp is now on the threshold of its exit from the historical scene; whether this be a matter of months, or a few years is not of great moment. What is of great moment is that the conditions for its existence are slipping from under its feet. The fourth characteristic of our class camp is that the new state allies, China and Eastern Europe, by their very existence, have so thoroughly undermined the foundations of the imperialist structure that it can virtually be said that the world relationship of forces has been definitely and irretrievably turned in favor of our camp. However, this turn in the relationship of forces does not automatically decide the fate of our camp, but merely sets the stage for the inevitable struggle.

Our camp, the camp of the exploited, is still characterized by the same deficiencies which have characterized the exploited, oppressed and subjugated classes in all previous historical epochs. It lacks, first and foremost, at its head, a leadership willing, capable and ready to insure victory in the unfolding conflict with imperialism. As in all previous historical epochs, the exploited classes are still blinded by the class enemy's poisonous ideology of sectionalism and narrowmindedness, the purveyors of which are the labor lieutenants of capitalism and the Stalinist bureaucracy. Our camp needs unity but in large part is characterized instead by totalitarianism. It needs revolutionary internationalism but instead is consistently being injected with the chauvinism of imperialism or the no less virulent chauvinism of the Moscow oligarchy. This entire class camp with all its shortcomings, with all its dire failings, with all the terrible handicaps of treacherous leadership, is nevertheless moving onward, not consistently, not uniformly, not everywhere with the same tempestuous revolutionary sweep, but it is moving steadily and invading the fortresses of imperialism. Our class camp, it becomes plainer every day, constitutes an invincible and wholly viable social formation. The struggle that it is conducting is many-sided. It fights its battles not only economically and politically but, as is now evident, with military means.

The Global Class War

Actually, there has been a global war on ever since Korea. The bourgeoisie has long been aware of this, and its most authoritative representatives are applying the conception of the global war with every new turn of the situation. Let us examine this war before we resume our main point, the relationship of the American proletariat to the entire class camp.

On May 4, 1953, the New York Times, in an editorial on the crisis in Indo-China, wrote:

"Thus what might seem at first glance to be a small jungle war in the hinterland of a little and obscure state in the interior of Southeast Asia comes into perspective as part of a great global conflict that is both physical and ideological. It cannot be divorced from other developments in that conflict. It must be seen, therefore, in (this) light..."

Thus we see from this authoritative organ of the big bourgeoisie that they regard the war from an exclusively global viewpoint, and the bourgeoisie has so regarded it for quite a long time. Of course, the bourgeoisie does not in so many words characterize the global struggle as a global class war. Why should it? The bourgeoisie must always mask the class character of its predatory wars in the interests of duping the masses.

I believe I was the first one to show that the global war was in reality a global class war. I did this in a memorandum submitted as material for a pre-convention discussion entitled Memorandum on the Unfolding War on October 29, 1950. (Internal Bulletin Vol. XII, No. 4) In this memorandum I stated:

"The fact that the opening phase of the war may manifest itself (or rather conceal itself), even if only initially and temporarily, as a war between nations, should not in the slightest degree obscure its clearcut class character. It is not a war between the nations but a war between the classes... in this war the geographical boundaries are social boundaries, the battle formations are class formations, and the world line of demarcation is the line rigidly drawn by the socialist interests of the world proletariat. Every worker must know his place as well as his duty."

We must now come back to the elementary generalization made earlier to the effect that the American proletariat is not an independent social entity but, on the contrary, an unbreakable link in the class chain. It must share its fate and its destiny, and since its role is enormous and decisive within the camp, all the heavier are its responsibilities to the camp.

Revolutionary Internationalism vs. "Socialist" Isolationism

If the global class war has done one thing on the American scene, it has definitely and forever ended that variety of bourgeois isolationism of which the old Senator Borah was a typical representative. The present day bourgeois "isolationists" are thoroughly internationalist and profoundly class-conscious of the vital interests of the entire bourgeois camp. They defend the world bourgeois camp regardless of the political clique which may head this or that capitalist government, whether it be in Formosa or Belgium. Their isolationism is merely a mask, a trick and device to put across a thoroughly internationalist and imperialist approach. Their viewpoint is global in character. They seek to fight the socialist revolution on a world scale. The difference of opinion among them does not really rotate around the issue of nationalism vs. internationalism, but on which section of our class camp they should open their next military operation. The most sober and the most irreconcilable statesmen of the camp of Wall Street show the most profound class consciousness when they defend every landlord, every bourgeois, every kindred social group on the globe against the invasions of the revolutionary movement.

But how does this concern the American working class? Can we not prosecute the class struggle at home in a way that would not involve the issues raised above?

Let us take a typical union on the vast industrial Niagara frontier, where a membership meeting is in progress. The union is the IUE-CIO representing the Westinghouse local, a local by no means distinguished for its lack of militancy. One of the issues on the agenda is the McCarran Act, which is a good issue for the militants to fight on. But the resolutions all emanate from the CIO National Office. What is the line of the resolutions? They call for amendment of the Act, but not of those provisions which victimize radical workers and call for the deportation of others. They call for amending the Act so that certain categories of displaced persons like ex-landlords, ex-generals, ex-businessmen, ex-bankers and "people with skills and abilities" from the "Iron Curtain" countries can have easier access to the USA. The resolutions aim to strengthen "democracy" at home by fighting the "Reds" abroad. This is "internationalism," the internationalism of the Wall Street banker as transmitted by his labor lieutenants in the ranks of the workers.

This variety of internationalism has been raging to a lesser or greater degree for several years now, and as long as the global class war continues, such a variety of internationalism is bound to continue. We cannot circumvent it, we cannot get around it, and we cannot chart out a course which would avoid it. (We are not here concerned with what our sparsely placed fractions can do under present conditions; we are talking about our approach to this question from a longer term perspective.) To the line of imperialist internationalism brought in by the labor fakery, we must

have a proletarian, internationalist line which combats it effectively. This calls for an intransigent global class line, which meets the issues raised by the labor fakers in a class manner. If we do not do this, then we are leaving the arena to the Stalinists.

To project a line whereby we avoid taking such a position is charting a course for "socialist" isolationism, a pale reflection of the hoary bourgeois isolationism that has long vanished from the American scene. It is no effective answer to the imperialist-minded labor bureaucracy, who are lining up the workers to fight the "Reds" on a global scale to safeguard the "free world." Their politics are geared to save the "free world" from "world communism." There can hardly be any national issue in the labor movement of any scope which is not directly affected by the labor bureaucracy's line on "communism." Even the simplest and most elementary issue on Jim Crow or housing, or even any municipal issue which takes on some sharpness and momentum, like the issue of loyalty oaths for tenants in federally subsidized housing projects, immediately takes on the aspect of a fight against communism, i.e. the global class struggle. This is how internationalism is an issue to the American workers every day in the year.

To fight this issue effectively does not mean waiting for the powder kegs, which American imperialism is preparing all over the world, to explode on the home front. It does not mean waiting for the development of purely national issues to arise on the domestic scene, which can be separate and apart from the world struggle. All national issues of any real momentum will be increasingly connected with the international struggle. Our program, tactics, and strategy must be geared to this.

As Trotsky said in The Third International after Lenin, "In our epoch, not a single communist party can establish its program by proceeding solely or mainly from conditions and tendencies of developments in its own country...The revolutionary party of the proletariat can base itself only upon an international program corresponding to the character of the present epoch, the epoch of the highest development and collapse of capitalism. An international communist program is in no case the sum total of national programs or an amalgam of their common features...In the present epoch, to a much larger extent than in the past, the national orientation of the proletariat must and can flow only from a world orientation and not vice versa. Herein lies the basic and primary difference between communist internationalism and all varieties of national socialism."

"The Road to Peace"

Now let us see how far the line of our party has been in accord with the conception of the emergence of two irreconcilable class camps in global conflict for hegemony over society. Let us examine Comrade Cannon's pamphlet, "The Road to Peace According to Lenin and According to Stalin." Comrade Cannon's pamphlet was not written in some by-gone era of peaceful development. It was published in 1951 in the midst of the era of the global class war. The author's point of departure is not the existing world of social relationships. True enough, there is a passage where Comrade Cannon makes allusion to "the class struggle of the workers merging with the colonial revolutions in common struggle against imperialism," but he does not indicate that this concrete world we are living in is torn by two irreconcilable class camps whose struggle has already broken out in military warfare, where the casualties are already counted in the millions, where the fighting is on opposite sides of the class barricades.

But Comrade Cannon's pamphlet, as the subtitle indicates, is "according to Lenin and according to Stalin." It is the road to peace according to Lenin that we are interested in. The road to peace, as Lenin taught us, is through ruthless and implacable class war. The war in Korea is a class war. It has to be waged in that manner. Nowhere in his pamphlet does Comrade Cannon ever characterize the war as a class war. One has to infer it or guess it. Nor does he view it as part of a general class war. Comrade Cannon points out that according to Lenin, war in the epoch of imperialism is inevitable. That is true. And it is also good criticism of the perfidious Stalinist theory of co-existence. But it is not sufficient criticism of Stalin's road to peace to say that co-existence is a delusion, and that war is inevitable. It must also be shown that we, the Leninists, are for the road to peace in this concrete global class war through the vigorous, unrelenting and energetic prosecution of the war. Our road to peace is fighting the war to a finish through the combined efforts of the exploited and oppressed in our camp. This also is not shown in Comrade Cannon's pamphlet. The American proletariat is not depicted as an inseparable detachment of one army in one class camp whose aim is overall victory over the class enemy. Furthermore, Comrade Cannon does not deal with Korea as a phase of the class war. He does not see the battlefield in Korea as a picket line or one of a series of world picket lines demarcating the socialist interests of the global class struggle. In effect, he does not deal with the war from a thoroughly revolutionary internationalist point of view.

Comrade Cannon's pamphlet is largely devoted toward exposing the treacherous co-existence theory of the Stalinists. That, of course, is excellent criticism. But merely demolishing this theory opens up no perspective. Stating that the war is inevitable is correct, but it does not by itself indicate a solution. General references to "the struggle for socialism" are also inadequate. To give "the struggle for socialism and against the war" a concrete meaning, one must clearly and unambiguously show the road of thorough-going revolutionary defeatism in the camp of imperialism, and the road of revolutionary defensism in relation to the USSR, Eastern Europe, China and the rest of the colonial world. One must make absolutely clear that these two complementary tactics of the world proletariat flow from one strategical line of defending the socialist interests of the entire class camp from imperialist attack. This too is not shown in Comrade Cannon's pamphlet. He therefore shows no effective revolutionary alternative as against the Stalinist tactic of the treacherous, vacillating, collaborationist line known as "co-existence."

It may be claimed that Comrade Cannon's pamphlet was directed to the broad masses of workers. Hence the sharp revolutionary formulations outlined above would be unsuitable. But Comrade Cannon's pamphlet aims to demolish the theory of co-existence. There are only two groups in the USA at the present time who are against the theory of co-existence, the extreme right and the extreme left. By the nature of the pamphlet, it could only be directed toward those radical workers who are against the capitalist status quo, against co-existence from the left. And to these workers it is insufficient to merely give as the alternative to co-existence the theory of the inevitability of war, without posing in the sharpest form the complementary tactics of revolutionary defeatism and revolutionary defensism. Otherwise, the theory of the inevitability of war assumes a fatalistic and utterly passive character.

The Defense of the USSR

It has been traditional in our movement to include a section on the unconditional defense of the USSR in any document or popular pamphlet which deals with war. Comrade Cannon's pamphlet, dealing precisely with this question, the question of war, in order to continue this tradition, should contain such a section. But all that we can find in Comrade Cannon's pamphlet is a bare reference to the "heritage of October." No one except a party member could possibly infer from this isolated phrase that our movement is for the unconditional defense of the USSR.

Such a section--on the defense of the USSR--is all the more necessary, particularly because Comrade Cannon goes into such detail in his descriptions of the monstrous crimes of Stalinism. Where one deals in such meticulous detail with the degeneration of the Soviet state and Stalinism, it is all the more important to make crystal clear our defensist position on the USSR. I am not for splashing all over the pages of the Militant blazing headlines of unconditional defense of the USSR. But every worker who is thinking at all about politics sooner or later approaches us with this question: "Where do you stand on Russia?"

The Soviet Union is a contradictory phenomenon. It is a revolutionary social system with a counter-revolutionary leadership. Comrade Cannon expounds on the concentration camps, frame-ups, etc. What he says is true. But this truth alone is insufficient.

There was a time when we were practically the only group in the labor movement consistently explaining this truth from the revolutionary point of view. But today the bourgeoisie has seized upon this aspect of the Soviet state and broadcast it to the four corners of the earth. Today this is practically all the American worker hears. It is drummed into his ears day in and day out by the tremendous capitalist apparatus of radio, television, the press and the pulpit. He identifies the reactionary aspect of the Soviet Union with the entire social system, just as the capitalist class wants him to do. Hence, it is all the more obligatory to emphasize the other side of the Soviet Union, its class character, its new social system. It is necessary to explain that it is a living, viable workers' state, an historic gain of the working class, a conquest to be defended.

Unfortunately this is not at all indicated in Comrade Cannon's pamphlet. Nor is it indicated in his Los Angeles speeches, which are replete with references to the planned economy of what is characterized as the "nationalized sector" without mentioning that we defend the boundaries of this "sector." We are taking too much for granted if we assume that the American workers will gather that we defend the Soviet Union, by merely rendering acknowledgement of a superior type of economy.

It is not so much that we have to emphasize the defense of the USSR from the point of view of military defense, although that too will be of importance at a later date. Most important in the emphasis of the defense of the USSR is its pointed method of showing to which class camp we belong. By continually emphasizing defense of the USSR as well as China and Eastern Europe, we make crystal clear that we are an inseparable part of the entire world camp. It is in this connection that the posing of the defense of the USSR is more important and more urgent in our propaganda and agitation than ever before.

By consistently and persistently elaborating our defensist position on the USSR, Eastern Europe and China, we are affirmatively showing our class solidarity with our class camp. Now since the issues of conciliationism toward Stalinism and Stalino-phobia are being raised, is not this the best way to demarcate and differentiate ourselves from Stalinism--to crushingly answer these mutually opposing accusations, to show that we not only fight Stalin but are the most vigorous, most loyal and most determined defenders of the USSR?

Comrade Hansen's Article

In this connection, a lead article by Comrade Hansen on the death of Stalin contains the same flaw as Comrade Cannon's pamphlet. As a matter of fact, an examination of our weekly paper for the past several years indicates a steady and undiminished tendency to play down the revolutionary defense at a time when it is most necessary and essential. Rare is the occasion when any mention ever appears in our press of

the defense of the USSR. It might almost be said that it only lives in the memory of those who knew our position of old. At a time when the USSR is playing such a tremendous role on the international arena, and at a time when it is most necessary to expose the real character of the Stalinists, we ought to make clear that we are not only for the defense of the USSR, but that we are its most determined, most devoted and most loyal defenders. We ought to make clear that our defense of the Soviet Union is not only revolutionary, but effective; and the bureaucracy is vacillating, one-sided, nationalistic, and in the long run disastrous. This is our point of departure as against the Stalinists.

Comrade Hansen's article on Stalin describes his historical role as the agent of counter-revolution and goes through the familiar crimes of Stalin, covering his long and infamous career as the leader of the Soviet bureaucratic caste. I, of course, have no quarrel with his depicting the crimes of the bureaucracy. But nowhere in this article does Comrade Hansen really indicate defense of the USSR. It is wrong and impermissible that his vague reference to the defense of the USSR is written in such a way that only a Trotskyist with years of party membership could possibly guess that we are for this defense. We are, of course, for the defense, not only in the sense that the workers of the world in capitalist countries should defend it against imperialism, but that in the USSR we are the best soldiers in any such struggle, and the most ardent defenders of the social base of the USSR. From Comrade Hansen's article, no one would conclude that we defend the USSR as we defend a labor union against the bureaucrats, that is, by defending it heart and soul against its class enemy and its own misleaders.

Such a bold position, it will be objected, will put us way out on a limb, particularly in a country where the reaction is so severe. This objection may be valid to some extent. Still, tactics could be adjusted. The main strategical conceptions, however, must be made clear as daylight, even if it means our temporary isolation.

This general point is a hundred times more valid in relation to China and Korea. Aside from the initial error that was made in our approach to Korea, the clearcut character of the struggle on the Asian continent as a class struggle, as a struggle between imperialism and the world-wide working class and its allies among the oppressed colonial peoples is still not being made clear enough or sharp enough to demarcate us from all varieties of pacifists, liberals, or Stalinist supporters. We must make plain that in the struggle in Korea, or any other place on earth, between the two class camps, we pursue a line of revolutionary defeatism. Moreover--and this is very important from the point of view of our differentiation from the Stalinists and all sorts of pacifists--we wish to facilitate the victory of our side, our class side, regardless of its temporary leadership. At the same time, we mercilessly expose all the reactionary, wrong, inadequate policies pursued by the Kremlin and foisted upon the leaderships of the colonial masses in Asia, and counter-pose the revolutionary, Leninist-Trotskyist line to victory. It is to be noted that the Minority's attack on Comrade Cannon's pamphlet does not refer to this vital question.

The need for strengthening our position on the defense of the Soviet Union has been apparent for several years. As long ago as December 7, 1948, Comrade Cannon addressed a letter to me on some official business, in the course of which he asked me for my opinion of his "Proposals for a Propaganda Campaign," I replied to Comrade Cannon on December 14, 1948 as follows:

"Your project should include a more consistent, more clearcut exposition and rearmament of our own evaluation of the USSR and Stalinism in general. This means to reinterpret the expansion of Stalinism on the European continent and in Asia strictly in the terms and analysis made by Trotsky in "In Defense of Marxism." In my view everything that has happened in Europe and Asia can still be accurately gauged with the yardstick employed by

Trotsky in his analysis of the 1939 events in Finland and in Poland. It appears to me that there has been some backsliding on this question as evidenced by our co-thinkers' theses (1947) which we amended at the last plenum (1948). But the very necessity for the amendments shows that we were approaching a danger signal." (The reader will note by the dates that I was referring to our co-thinkers' theses of 1947, and not the 1951 thesis which is the one involved in the current discussion.)

"We stand for the position of unconditional defense of the Soviet Union, my letter continued, "and all territories of the so-called satellites where the means of production have been nationalized and planned economy introduced. Nothing that has happened on the international arena has in the slightest degree invalidated our position..."

In this letter I also suggested that our magazine "should regularly carry polemical material against the Shachtmanites, notwithstanding their numerical insignificance in the labor movement." One of the main thoughts motivating this whole letter was a fear of adaptation to the dominant trend of reaction in American society.

The defense of the Soviet Union must be implemented in our activity as well as in our propaganda. It is difficult, of course to find a way to the masses with this important principle. But the way must be found.

The Rosenberg Case

The Rosenberg Case offers in every respect an accurate gauge of my position toward Stalinism and the Soviet Union in relation to the American scene. Let us first discuss the position from the point of view of principle.

Suppose we assume that the Rosenbergs are "guilty" of stealing important documents, etc., of engaging in so-called espionage. We all know that espionage is an element inseparable from the conduct of the foreign affairs of state, be it a workers' state or an imperialist one. It would be the sheerest nonsense to assert that any state does not spend enormous amounts of money for such purposes. Even a state with a revolutionary leadership would of necessity have its intelligence department. Why do governments exchange naval, military, and air attaches if not for such purposes? The U.S. government publicly boasts that it spends hundreds of millions of dollars for espionage in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It is no accident that Walter Bedell Smith, now one of the under-secretaries of State, is the former head of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and was formerly ambassador to Moscow.

Now we are living in the epoch of a global class war, a war which can only end in the demolition of one of the contenders. It is a ruthless and implacable war to the death. Espionage is an inescapable concomitant in the preparation and prosecution of such a war.

If the Rosenbergs, let us assume, had admitted that they did steal these documents--which is not so in this case--from a class point of view they would have committed no crime. We do not advocate these tactics. They are not necessary for the class struggle in the USA, and needless to say, we do not collaborate in any of these activities. But in the global class war which spans the continents and the oceans these cases are bound to be legion. Accordingly, from the class point of view and to the extent that circumstances permit, we must defend them.

If we are to do this, we cannot merely be "me too" supporters. A party which takes its position on this question clearly, boldly and courageously from the point

of view of principle must not merely give support: it must attempt to seize the initiative in the matter, whenever that is available. It is claimed that the Daily Worker also kept silent for a time about the case. But it seems to me that is all the more reason why we should have taken the lead. That would have been an excellent medium for exposing the Stalinists.

Now the question that immediately arises on the basis of the Rosenberg line I have presented above is: would it not put us completely out on a limb? That indeed is a crucial question. Still, if we regard ourselves as having the revolutionary alternative to Stalinist methods; if we regard ourselves as being the genuine expression of the independent class politics of the proletariat on a world scale; if our party is the historical instrument for giving expression to the needs of the working class, as against the perfidious methods of the Stalinists: then in taking this bold position on the Rosenberg Case, first of all from the point of view of the class principle and secondly from the point of view of the defense of civil rights in general, we would be presenting a clear and independent class alternative as distinguished from the Stalinists.

Another question that would be raised as an objection to this line is that it would tend to isolate us even more than we are now. But even if that were the case, it would in the long run pay off. Had we boldly taken the initiative in the Rosenberg Case, it is clear on the basis of what subsequently happened, our standing with the radical elements might have been appreciably better than it is today. I do not think it would necessarily have accomplished a great deal as concerns party growth, but it might have added to our periphery, and it certainly would have served as an excellent example.

The Rosenberg Case is an outstanding example of our problems in relation to Stalinism on the American scene. The Stalinists appear in the eyes of most radical workers as the extreme Left. Unfortunately, our party is almost unknown to broad sections of the radical workers of America. A problem for the party is to be able to distinguish itself from the CP, not as another variety of radicalism but as the revolutionary expression of Marxism and as the real Communists in contrast to the Stalinists, who are the real "pinks." To be able to do this in a period of reaction is a truly gargantuan task. But unless we make ourselves clear on just such questions, we shall run the risk of not winning the vanguard to our side. I repeat: we cannot be mere supporters of the Rosenberg Case. We are either the best, the most devoted, the most conscious, the most conscientious fighters in just such cases, or we are in danger of appearing as simply another variety of radicals while the Stalinists will appear as the "real McCoy."

We should have made our class position clear in the Rosenberg Case. We should boldly have taken the initiative in this matter ahead of the Stalinists and carried on the fight in such a manner as to show to all the world the difference in approach between genuine Communism and its Stalinist counterfeit.

As the Rosenberg Case demonstrates, the party has a tremendous problem in relation to Stalinism. It is not so much that they steal our thunder. It is that we are not utilizing the vast reserves of our revolutionary Marxist position and are drifting along rather than driving a conscious line.

To pursue the case a little further: I understand from the New York Times that there was a Rosenberg rally at the Triborough Bridge Auditorium in New York which was attended by 10,000 people--a tremendous audience considering the period we are living in. Now my approach to this question is as follows: did we do our utmost to reach these people with our message and literature in the traditional manner? Did we do all in our power to penetrate the mass of this audience with our ideas? If we did not then it was a gross error.

Did either the Majority or Minority leaders propose any concrete course of action in relation to this rally? I don't know. But I do know that if in Buffalo there were a meeting of this character, were it to consist of only thirty people, our party would be there "the fastest with the mostest." This goes not merely for Stalinist peripheral organizations but for any organization where advanced or liberal elements are gathered. And this goes hand in hand with our trade union line and in no way contradicts it.

The Rosenberg Case is a world case by now. In treating the Rosenberg Case, what is important for us as the class vanguard is to present the proletarian world point of view. This is our most valuable asset, our method of presenting it from the class point of view, particularly as against Stalinism, which presents it from the point of view of formal bourgeois democracy only.

Of course, we also defend the Rosenbergs from the point of view of elementary bourgeois democratic rights, and we participate in any organization which defends bourgeois democratic rights from reactionary incursions. But we cannot regard any such case exclusively from the viewpoint of bourgeois democracy, since in that case we lose our specific class approach.

The Rosenberg Case--and I am merely using it as a vehicle to express my position and not so much because of its importance--should also be regarded in another light: from the point of view of the current discussion on propaganda. The case offered an opportunity for action, for live action. I understand that there were about a thousand people in a picket line in front of the White House, demanding clemency from Eisenhower. In such an action we should participate, because it gives us an opportunity to test ourselves in combat, an opportunity to fight. For without live action, without testing, without experience through combat, without matching in action our class line against our opponents, we have no opportunity of learning and gauging our results.

I view such an action as the "hard" line against Stalinism. I view it as a field for combat. There is nothing worse, on the other hand, than merely to watch the developments of the Rosenberg Case or any other similar case without intervening; for it is inactivity, passivity, watching the world go by without taking any action even on the smallest, the tiniest and most modest scale--idleness, which becomes the transmission belt for all sorts of moods leading to demoralization.

In 1947 the Stalinists projected the idea of a "vetocade" to Washington to protest against the imminent passage of the Taft-Hartley Bill. At that time the CP in the Buffalo area had a considerable influence in the labor movement. We immediately sought to seize the initiative in this vetocade, and while we didn't obtain the entire initiative, our comrades did a magnificent job, tested themselves in ideological hand-to-hand combat with the Stalinists; and to this day this "vetocade" remains not only one of our most valuable experiences but also a testimonial to our approach, an approach motivated by a desire to enter into combat, to engage in class struggle activities of any type, and to make crystal clear our independent class and political approach.

The Willie McGee Case, which was also under the sponsorship of the Stalinists, is another example. Here too we seized the initiative in our area. We gathered thousands of signatures, distributed 6,000 Militants, and carried out a motorcade in the heart of the Negro area.

If there really were any illusions in regard to Stalinism or any type of conciliationism, as Comrade Cannon claims, then it would be all the more obligatory to participate in such actions. For it is only through experience that illusions are demolished.

Let me cite here something which I consider another tactical slip-up on the part of our party. On January 29, 1949 I wrote to Comrade Stein proposing that the Political Committee offer Comrade Cannon as a defense witness, an expert on revolutionary Marxism, as a method of intervening in the CP trials. Our purpose, I stated then, would be, along with taking the initiative in this intervention, to show the revolutionary Marxist line in contradistinction to the Stalinists.

And in a post script written one day later I point out that this would "show our solidarity with the Stalinists as against the capitalist frame-up." "Of course," the letter continued, "the Stalinists will never accept us as defense witnesses. Their refusal then could be publicly utilized not only to expose them but also to offer to the labor movement generally an example of our united front tactics in relation to defending all working class victims of capitalist persecution." I further suggested that the party submit what is known as an amicus curiae brief. The Stalinists themselves would have had no say in either accepting or rejecting this brief. But even without acceptance of the brief, the mere fact of its presentation, which would necessarily have been reported in the capitalist press of the nation, would have shown to the workers of America where we stood. In spite of the Stalinist leadership, indeed, right over the heads of the Stalinist leadership, it would have been a clear appeal to the better elements of the Stalinist rank and file and one that could hardly be distorted.

While I did not anticipate earth-shaking results from this proposed tactic, still it would have been a method directed toward strengthening and refurbishing our revolutionary position before the world. Comrade Stein and the Secretariat, however, did not accept the proposal; and I feel that this is a regrettable further addition to what has already been said concerning the Rosenberg Case.

To sum up the Rosenberg Case, the fact that it became such a tremendous issue on the American scene specifically, as well as on the world scene, indicates how utopian and visionary it is to seek out an independent course for the American workers, separate and apart from engaging in such struggles as this. This case demonstrates how inextricably interwoven are the politics of the American scene with those of the world struggle. In particular it demonstrates how interlinked are the politics of our party with our entire class camp, of which American labor is one of the links. And, as we said at the very beginning of our article, an indispensable link, and historically the most decisive.

- - - - -

Before going further with the question of the independent destiny of the American working class, let us consider for a moment the question of the American Stalinists, and our tactics toward them. This flows from the first question. But it interacts with it also. And its consideration will help us to view the matter from another side.

The Trotsky Conversations

The Trotsky conversations as reported in the stenogram (Internal Bulletin, Vol 15, No. 10) throw a fresh light on Stalinism and our attitude toward it. The 1940 discussions with Trotsky are in every way illuminating and rich in content. It is in these conversations that we see the problem of problems: our relation and attitude toward the Stalinists when they are in their "left" turn. More than thirteen years

have elapsed since then, years which have been characterized not only by war but by revolution as well. It is in the light of the new world reality that we must view these conversations and not merely in the light of the conditions as they existed in 1940.

In a note to the discussion by Comrade George Clarke, he states that what is significant in the attitude of Trotsky's opponents toward giving Browder critical support is that it "duplicates almost word for word today the furious opposition to proposals of a far more restricted nature than critical support of a CP presidential candidate. The contrast is further highlighted," says Clarke, "by the fact that the Stalinist movement has been in a pseudo-left turn for more than five years, and the ferment in their ranks is obviously more deepgoing than in the brief period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact."

That there is and has been ferment in the Stalinist movement today as it was during the time of the Trotsky conversations is only too clear to require further proof. What we must do before considering the validity of any tactical orientation toward the Stalinists is to determine the social character of the "ferment" within the CP. Is the ferment or the dissatisfaction in the Stalinist ranks due to the CP's pacifist line, its policy of "co-existence," its lack of a revolutionary proletarian line against war? In other words, is the ferment in the Stalinist movement due to the urgings of the rank and file for a more revolutionary line, or is it due to the fact that under the furious blows of reaction the CP cannot hold its followers even with a mildly pseudo-leftist anti-war line? (To make it clearer, is the ferment in the CP due to the fact that the rank and file are seeking a more revolutionary line, and are dissatisfied with the pacifist, co-existence line of the CP?) If we examine the ferment in the CP in this light we can only come to the conclusion that the ferment is primarily due to the blows of the reaction and the severity of the witch-hunt. In my opinion, the dissatisfied and disoriented elements in the Stalinist movement are in the main leaving the Stalinist ranks not because they want a more revolutionary line but because they can't stand up under the pressure of the reaction and the witch-hunt. Of course, into the ranks of the CP peripheral organizations have come new layers, who have just been awakened to political life, and it is from these that we can make our greatest gains. But we must not confuse this question with the questions of the general social character of the ferment in the various CP organizations. Thus the social character of the ferment as a whole in the CP ranks is not at all like the ferment in the ranks of the SP in the early Thirties when the ranks were seeking a revolutionary progressive line under the impetus of a wave of radicalism throughout the country. Nor is it the type of ferment which was present in the CP ranks in the late Thirties when the CP was pursuing a rabidly Rightist course toward fighting fascism in words while doing nothing about it in deeds.

Our party organized a giant demonstration in the heart of New York City to fight the fascists. The CP was for fighting them only in words, but the mood of the rank and file was for action, and at least on that occasion we carried the day. The workers responded by the thousands, and to this moment we consider that a glorious chapter in our party's history.

So the real question before us is: can we gain substantially from the ranks of the Stalinist movement in a period of reaction when the ranks are disintegrating, not because of a revolutionary or progressive ferment, but primarily due to inability to stand up under the blows of reaction? This aspect of the question of our approach to the Stalinists is not adequately examined in the Minority document. Now I am all for having a tactical approach toward the Stalinists, and for working in any of their peripheral organizations, particularly in such key cities as New York, Los Angeles and Chicago--where they are probably five or ten times the size of our own organization.

My motivation for this approach is not based on any revolutionary ferment that exists in these organizations. Nor is it based on the fact that the labor movement

is at the present time in a state of quiescence. I would be for it even if it were in a state of resurgence. My motivation is based on our strategical orientation as the world revolutionary vanguard whereby we seek out an opponent political class current in any area where we can find it for the purposes of irreconcilable combat. We regard ourselves as the world vanguard of the proletariat, as the leader of our entire class camp on a global scale, and we must engage our antagonist who also leads a global class current and constitutes our most formidable political rival in the same class camp. We must combat them in the spirit of revolutionary competition for the hegemony of this camp. Even more important than that, is that by seeking out our political rival, we are practicing and perfecting our revolutionary program.

In order to further elaborate this point let us examine the Trotsky conversations in some detail. Comrade Cannon opens the conversation: "The Stalinists are the problem." Why? "Because," says Cannon, "the workers are unable to distinguish the real difference between us." The Stalin-Hitler Pact seemed to disintegrate them, "but it (the CP) was losing just the democrats." But how about the militants? "They," says Comrade Cannon, "are more devoted than ever (to the CP). They believe that the party now has 'the revolutionary line.'" And that exactly was the situation in 1940. There was ferment in the CP ranks, but they were losing only the pink democratic elements. The militants became more loyal than ever. And that is essentially the situation today, only magnified a hundred-fold by the fury of the reaction.

Elsewhere in the conversation Comrade Cannon says, "The problem is to get the CP out of the road." But how? Trotsky proposes critical support for Browder. Cannon says this will compromise us in the eyes of the non-Stalinist workers. Trotsky proposes that we "turn our political face to the Stalinists." Cannon says, "It has many complications." What were the complications? Among them it "would disrupt our work among the progressive trade union elements." Trotsky answers, "You are afraid to become compromised in the eyes of the Rooseveltian trade unionists." Further, Trotsky shows firm conviction that if we turn our political face to the Stalinists we will make headway with them. Trotsky says, "I ask for two or three hundred Stalinist workers. That is the minimum requirement." The discussion is finally terminated by Comrade Hansen leading off with a question: "I am wondering if Comrade Trotsky considers that our party is displaying a conservative tendency in the sense that we are adapting ourselves politically to the trade union bureaucracy." And Trotsky replies, "To a certain degree I believe it is so."

Analyzing the conversations in the light of the present international situation, several facts emerge from the conversations which have a direct bearing on the controversy today.

In 1940, as we see by the conversations, the CP was in ferment. But like today it was not in revolutionary ferment. As Cannon puts it, they were "losing just the democrats." And that's what they are losing now. These are the elements that are in ferment, moving away from the CP. And these elements, with the exception of layers of newly awakened political elements, are not likely to be moving in our direction. Was Comrade Trotsky right then in proposing that we turn our political face to the Stalinists? Yes, because otherwise we would face a greater danger of adapting ourselves at that time toward the conservative trade union leaders and today to the general dominant trend toward reaction. Was Comrade Trotsky over-optimistic in his perspective of getting "a minimum of at least two or three hundred Stalinist workers?" Yes, he was. It could not have been done for the reason that the genuine revolutionary elements in the CP "were more devoted than ever" to it--on the basis of the new pseudo-leftist line. And this is substantially the situation today.

Should we nevertheless "turn our political face to the Stalinists?" Yes. Not because we will necessarily gain a lot, but because there is a field of combat for us, where we test our general revolutionary program.

What new problem arises out of an examination of the Trotsky conversations in the light of the present Stalinist run to the left on a world scale? It is this: when the Stalinists make a "left turn," particularly in a period of reaction accompanied by severe repressions, our task in relation to the Stalinists becomes not easier but tremendously more difficult, for their "leftist" line gives the false impression that their line is the same as our own. Hence differentiation from the Stalinists becomes an utmost necessity. It being a period of reaction, however, the differentiation in a revolutionary direction tends more to isolate us among the broad masses while not bringing appreciable gains from the CP. Thus, even under the best of circumstances, and even if we had Lenin and Trotsky themselves as the leadership in the party we would still face a tremendous problem. The problem of differentiation from the Stalinists is a double-edged sword. If we use Trotsky's approach to the question, that is, of turning our political face to the Stalinists, it means of course a strengthening of our revolutionary line and a sharpening of our class approach. The gains, of course, from the Stalinists would be modest indeed. But if we do not carry out this approach, we run the risk of veering a course toward adaptation.

This course toward adaption would also be a "differentiation" from the Stalinists, but it is the kind of differentiation which would make us appear the more "moderate" organization or an organization that "just preaches socialism in general." Hence the correctness of Trotsky's line. It teaches us that in a period of reaction the revolutionary vanguard may become more isolated, lose a lot more influence in the ranks of the broad masses; but its supreme merit is that it retains and strengthens the revolutionary capital of the party, its revolutionary theory and its revolutionary practice. In this way the vanguard builds for the future.

What Comrade Trotsky said in his Stalinism and Bolshevism(p. 9) is exactly in point:

"If an unfavorable relation of forces prevents it (the vanguard) from holding the positions that it has won, it must at least retain its ideological positions, because in them is expressed the dearly-paid experience of the past."

The Wallace Question

If one were to chart an independent destiny for the American working class, if one were looking for a road separate and apart from the Stalinists and away from Europe's and Asia's road then it would first appear that the Wallace movement could have served as a pathway for it. There is no question that the Wallace movement had elements of the classical American populism. But how did it really develop? It was merged with a current that was global in character. What gave it such a character? It was the Stalinists. The Wallace movement reproduced the "genuine" type of popular American radicalism, but under the given social setting it inevitably took on political coloration from the world scene.

In the "Roots of the Party Crisis" the Minority fails to mention the Wallace question. They begin with the "auto crisis" at the August 1947 Plenum and then jump to the 1949-50 discussion on Eastern Europe. The first was a trade union turn with which the present Majority finally went along. The second was a very good theoretical discussion on the events in Eastern Europe.

But the first concrete step in the party's course toward adaptation to the dominant trend of reaction was the unfortunate February 1948 Plenum known as the "Wallace Plenum." The Minority's bulletin fails to mention the "Wallace Plenum." I do not believe this failure is merely due to the present Minority's taking a wrong position (along with the Majority) at that time. It is not necessary for anyone to beat his breast and enumerate every mistake. Nor is it the intention of this document especially to expose mistakes. Since the question of the "roots" of the crisis has been raised, however, we must not hesitate to go to the real root of the problem. The Minority document fails to do this.

This failure is because the Minority misunderstood, and still misunderstands, the real nature of the Wallace-type groupings, and their full significance in the present global class struggle. Everything the Minority says about the Huberman tendency and the Compass Clubs was a hundred times more true of the Wallace movement. The Wallace question was a big issue in every CIO union. Support of Wallace in the UAW or steel locals did not mean orienting toward the imperialist-minded bureaucracy but directly counter to them, and being branded as "communist," as pro-Soviet and being red-baited. It did not mean giving up the independence of the party, but asserting the party's independence of the trade union bureaucracy in a most uncompromising manner.

The party took the line of least resistance on the Wallace question, certainly at least as far as the trade union and mass work was concerned. Since the question of mass work as opposed to "propaganda" work has been posed so sharply, it is all the more important in the interests of a fruitful analysis to search out the meaning of the position taken at the "Wallace Plenum."

Wallace himself, of course, may be dismissed as an inconsequential individual like Norman Thomas, whom Trotsky called a "political misunderstanding." Comrade Cannon's characterization of Wallace and his Idaho singing partner as capitalist politicians was correct, but beside the point. The real question was: what was the class character of the Wallace movement?

There were two principal answers to this question at the Plenum. The Majority held it was a third capitalist party. A minority composed of Swabeck, Mills and Bartell at first viewed it as an emerging labor party. Both were wrong.

The Wallace movement at that time literally encompassed millions of workers and middle class individuals throughout the country. It was no secret to anybody who was at all acquainted with political trends in the country that the Stalinists were its core, were practically directing the movement, and constituted the bulk of its activists. The movement had a tremendous appeal to whatever was progressive in the liberal or radical movement. But as soon as the party constituted itself and selected its candidates, a barrage of red-baiting and hysteria descended upon it such as this country has rarely seen. It was no exaggeration to say the Wallace party was literally red-baited to death.

The Wallace party was not really a political party at all. It was a Stalinist-directed, working-class and middle-class movement with an essentially working-class character. At the same time it had a much looser and broader character than their other "fronts," with greater opportunities for us to work in. It was not at all a "Popular Front" of the Blum type.

The Wallace movement was a progressive-radical movement in spite of Wallace. The international situation, and the intimate involvement of the U.S. in that situation, foreshadowed that the movement would be red-baited to death. This red-baiting did not occur merely because of the presence of the Stalinists in the move-

ment, but more especially because of the influence of their line upon the movement. Anything remotely pro-Soviet was, and still is, bound to be red-baited. But could a large radicalized grouping of some millions in America today avoid the Soviet question and concentrate only on the question of wages, housing, etc., alone? Of course not. The Americans for Democratic Action who are much more middle class in character with much less of a mass base and who repeat many of the purely liberal aspects of Wallace-ism, have not avoided the Soviet question. They take a clearly anti-Soviet position.

Once again--the international problems are intertwined with the national in the most concrete and intimate way. It is not only that the general world economic and political problems of American imperialism will break its hold at home and create the opening for the American workers. (This is the general schema in Comrade Cannon's internationalism). It is also the specific and immediate effect of the struggle abroad on the struggle at home. For instance, in the fight against the boss, and in the fight within the union about how to fight the boss, the "red" issue has never been absent. And today the "red" issue is interlinked with the Soviet issue. If the rank and file did not so link it, the right wing leaders would do it for them. The global class struggle flares up within the national borders again and again--not, so far, with the fury or clear class polarity that it does abroad, it is true. Nor did the Wallace movement (certainly not as much as the Rosenberg Case) confront us with letters a foot high saying: "I am the Russian question in a new disguise."

Wallace's Russian program was the mildest form of conciliation toward the Soviet Union. Regardless of his charlatanry and unworkable program he gathered around him many supporters who were genuinely sympathetic to the Soviet Union. And is it so remarkable that this was combined with all the "American" aims--the economic struggle--Taft-Hartley--the Negro question, etc.? This is not an accidental vagary, or twist, of Stalinism: it is a verification of the interdependent destinies of the American and world-wide working classes.

Comrade Cannon's position was that it would be "crossing class lines" to give critical support to Wallace. He advocated the "unconditionnal independence" of the party as the key to winning the masses for revolution. (But without a clear understanding of the above interdependence, the independence of the party could not be clearly understood either). It would not have been "crossing class lines" to give critical support to Wallace. It would only have been supporting Wallace as Lenin said "a rope supports a hanged man." It would have been reaching out our hand toward elements of our own class we could not reach in any other way except through critical support of Wallace. (This, as everybody on the NC knows, was my position, and it flowed from the international orientation I also elaborated at that Plenum).

The Wallace Plenum misjudged an important juncture of recent history. More than that, it laid the basis for the party's adaptation toward the reaction in the following period. Were some of the majority comrades sectarian in their outlook? Possibly they were. But basically, the line was an adaptation to the red-baiting opposition to the Wallace movement. Were Comrades Clarke and Cochran, who voted with the Majority six months after the "Auto Plenum," sectarian in their outlook? This is a point they should ponder over themselves.

The minority at the "Wallace Plenum"--at that time the Chicago NC members--saw a radical and militant movement in which our party could do useful and fruitful work. Their political tactic of critical support was correct. Unfortunately, the Chicago comrades did not foresee the direction this new movement was fated to take. By projecting a "labor party" orientation they had in reality projected a period of upsurge. They had not perceived that, in one sense, the Wallace movement was a last flickering of radicalism under the spreading blanket of reaction. Most of all,

they did not see the Wallace movement in the light of the new global setting that ultimately was to decide its fate.

The Minority line today, in this important respect, closely approximates the Chicago minority's line of February 1948. True, the present Minority would not be so rash as to predict great gains from the Stalinist milieu. But they see it outside of its global framework, aside from its interdependency, and hence, one-sidedly. It is not only that there are less numbers in this milieu today than in the Wallace movement; it is also that the people themselves are much less receptive (to us), even if they are more political than the much larger group in the Wallace movement was.

The Majority today seems to continue the same line of adaptation that they presented at the "Wallace Plenum," thus making the party more dependent on the present anti-Soviet prejudices of the working class. The present discussion is proceeding too much like the too-much-forgotten Wallace discussion. It is proceeding in a masked or half-blinded manner, in which the participants have thought out neither their full motivations, nor the full consequences of their positions. The Majority's adaptation to the rightward trend is obviously not conscious or deliberate, but its objective effect is the same.

The Minority, however, while correct in their tactical approach, are wrong from the point of view of political analysis. The very fact that they characterize the trouble as sectarian Stalinophobia would indicate that they see more in the Stalinist milieu than is really there.

The fact that the Minority persist in characterizing the Majority as "Sectarian" surely cannot be ascribed to excessive diplomacy, softness, politeness, etc. on their part. It would appear, rather, that they see the field for activity, the movement of the workers, etc. in a different quarter than the Majority, and that they feel the Majority are "missing the bus" in a practical sense.

To repeat: it is not a sectarian, pathological fear or hatred of Stalinism which motivates the Majority. It is fear of the reaction, and fear of the generally reactionary mood which pervades most strata of the labor movement. It is not an abnormal psychological phenomenon, but a perfectly understandable, if somewhat obscured, political phenomenon.

It is not because the Majority are separate and apart from the labor movement; it is precisely because the Majority are oriented toward the American labor movement. The motive and purpose of this orientation is of course laudable enough taken by itself. But as we all know, the American workers are temporarily permeated with the mood of reaction. Unfortunately, the Majority is showing a tendency to cater to this mood.

The Minority, on the other hand, are repeating the error of the Chicago minority on the Wallace question. In spite of their correct tactical approach they have not, apparently, absorbed the full meaning of the Wallace discussion, nor of the conversation with Trotsky which they themselves have published.

The question of the independence of the party (which arose in the Wallace discussion), its real independence, its Bolshevik independence, faced a really fundamental test at the time of the "Yugoslav Affair."

The Yugoslav Question and the Independence of the Party

Some time after the break of Tito from Stalin, our movement had projected the idea that the international climate was becoming more favorable for the construction

of genuine revolutionary parties and that "the parallel crisis of Stalinism and imperialism" created the favorable objective conditions for the development of independent revolutionary movements away from Stalinism. The Tito affair, according to our co-thinker's document pointed in that direction and probably was the precursor for other such movements. Between this period and the period of the Third World Congress, our movement's orientation was one for independent revolutionary developments separate from and against the Stalinists.

Tito's break with Stalin was in itself, as an initial step, progressive and revolutionary. But for us to project the further perspective of possibly converting the Titoist Communist Party into a genuine revolutionary party was simply a lapse into utopianism. However, certain external and purely superficial events and pronouncements of the Tito regime impelled our co-thinkers to believe that nothing less than a conversion of the Tito party into an adherent of our movement was in sight. In a lead article in the Militant, the May Day Manifesto of the Yugoslav CP was hailed as "the second greatest event in the history of the working-class movement." Actually this Manifesto had nothing in it whatever that would warrant such a conclusion except a phrase about "a return to the road of Lenin" in it without indicating what the road was.

Aside from the fact that at the time of this article in the Militant there was already on the mainland of China a new workers' state, which in reality had been the greatest event in working-class history since the October Revolution, the article had a completely erroneous perspective in relation to Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav CP. If ever I felt our movement could be completely disoriented I felt that this was the occasion. I made my position clear at the Midwest Party Conference held in Cleveland in May of that year. Later I wrote a letter to Comrade Warde of the Secretariat. This letter offers a clue to my position in the present internal discussion. I quote from the letter of June 12, 1950:

"Regarding the Yugoslav question, I have not seen a scintilla of objective evidence from the Yugoslav or world press, which would in any way indicate a real turn in the political policy of the Yugoslav leadership. Our uncritical attitude towards the Titoists is wrong, dangerous and without any justification from the point of view of the objective realities of the Yugoslav CP. It is a dangerous illusion to believe that the leadership is moving in our direction, or making any visible turn in their political policy.

"I have read Gabe's and Germain's resolutions, and while I believe that Babe's resolution is far more acceptable than Germain's, I do not think that it is at all adequate, since he leaves out entirely the question of our attitude towards the Tito leadership. The PC should draw up a resolution which should encompass the following points: 1) That Yugoslavia is a workers' state, and that an actual social revolution has taken place there, because the bourgeoisie has been crushed, expropriated, and their political power smashed. The old capitalist state apparatus was shattered in the period from 1944-46, and a new one erected based upon the support of the workers and peasants (the mutation of state form took place in the period 1944-46). 2) The world proletariat must defend the Yugoslav state against the encroachments of the Soviet bureaucracy and against world imperialism. 3) The Yugoslav leadership pursues a national socialist, not a Trotskyist, course in their foreign and domestic policies. They base themselves fundamentally on the immediate exigencies of Yugoslavia and not on the world revolution as the fundamental lever. They indicate no recognition of the dependence of the Yugoslav state on the world revolution. Their foreign policy is adherence to the United Nations, not

adherence to the Fourth International. 4) Our attitude towards the Yugoslav leadership should not be qualitatively different than towards any other labor bureaucracy. We support the progressive aspects of their struggle against imperialism and the Stalinist bureaucracy. But we must at the same time consistently and mercilessly expose their reactionary policies, such as a) support of the United Nations, b) "reliance on ourselves and only on ourselves," as Tito says, c) the failure to boldly repudiate Stalinist dogmas of socialism in one country, class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, d) bourgeois pacificism instead of revolutionary struggle against imperialist war.

"Our perspective with respect to the Yugoslav CP should be one of building a left wing from the ranks of that party, and not in fond hopes of regenerating the old leadership. This does not mean that we should neglect to collaborate with them any more than we do with the other labor bureaucracies. To this, however, must be added the inescapable corollary of unconditional independence of our party and freedom to criticize in the course of the collaboration.

"I have noted that there is a little more moderation in the last 2 issues of the Militant on the Yugoslav question. I would advise still further moderation. At any rate this is far safer and will not put us out on a limb should there be a sudden turn in the Tito leadership which would be exceedingly embarrassing to us and disorient our membership."

On June 22, Comrade Warde replied:

"By this time you will have received another informative report on internal developments in Yugoslavia. I believe that your attitude towards the leadership there is entirely too rigid. Moreover, it flies in the face of established facts. The fact is that we are already in a bloc with them and our collaboration on many important issues is daily becoming closer and closer. Our attitude has never been an uncritical one and we have conceded not an iota in principle in effecting this collaboration. Where we believe they are incorrect, we have pointed that out in a friendly tone and a comradely fashion.

"Your appraisal of the evidence about their development differs from mine and that of most comrades who have followed it closely. It appears to us undeniable that a genuine turn toward the left, that is, toward the Leninist standpoint has been taken by them. How far they will go and at what pace we do not know, but we would be very poor politicians if we did not do all in our power to facilitate their progress toward our positions and to try and have them come over all the way. Both our actions and criticisms have been an influential factor in that respect in the past period and will have an even greater influence in the period ahead. The important thing for us is to take full advantage of the opportunities opening up along the line of my report. This is the biggest political opportunity we have ever had."

I have quoted this correspondence in full because it has a direct connection with the current controversy. Then, as now, the reaction was raging, not to the same degree, but none the less surely, and the mass movement in this country, while it was not as quiescent as it is now, was by no means in a militant mood. Nationally, and particularly insofar as it concerned Local New York, the policy had been to seek out all Yugoslav organizations and organize brigades to Yugoslavia, since Yugoslavia was our "biggest political opportunity." This was as

good a time as any to counterpose to the Yugoslav orientation mass work in the trade union movement, as our main task. But the proper approach was to take the issue of Titoism on its merits. I was then, as I am now, for the perspective of sinking our roots deeper, deeper, and deeper into the mass of trade union workers; no matter how difficult the situation may be. I did not counterpose the main arena of our work, the trade unions, as against our "biggest political opportunity." That, however, is only one lesson of the Yugoslav experience. One other lesson was that our movement was searching and probing everywhere (and correctly so) for opportunities, but the objective situation on a world scale had not opened up such possibilities as yet.

The biggest lesson, however, was with respect to the unconditional independence of our party. The Tito episode was really a case in point. No one raised it except myself in the above letter. If the Majority comrades feel that the unconditional independence of the party is so important in the current controversy, I should think that was the time to have raised it--at a time when we ran the danger of becoming the tail to Tito's kite. The Titoist movement had no real appeal to the working masses anywhere in the world, precisely because the Titoists had no internationalist perspective and offered nothing to the communist workers abroad which was even a shade different from what the Stalinists and reformists offered. The other important factor in the Tito experience is that it offered the happy alternative of circumventing the struggle against Stalinist movements everywhere by a "new independent road." Would that that were so! Unfortunately, that was not the case. It indeed would be a happy alternative if it had objectively existed, but it did not.

In our struggle to vanquish Stalinism, we cannot chart out an illusory independent road whereby we would avoid them. Our path towards the masses on a world scale, and to a narrower extent in the USA, is blocked by the Stalinists; and it is in mortal combat (and not aversion) that we will come out victorious. That of course does not depend on our efforts alone but on the turn in the objective conditions, which are ripening all over the world. An attempt to chart out on the American arena an independent road is just as illusory as on the world arena. As Comrade Cannon said in 1940 to Comrade Trotsky, "The Stalinists are our problem. We've got to get them out of the road." We cannot do this by circumventing them, by secluding ourselves, by seeking an illusory independent road toward the American workers. We must meet them in combat, in irreconcilable struggle, with the recognition that they are a global class current, and that their defeat will be the product of the joint efforts of all the workers and oppressed peoples in our entire class camp. This will be done and it can be done.

To repeat:

The Tito experience showed that it was wrong to project false hopes based on non-existent conditions.

It is just as false that we chart out an independent course towards the American workers without reckoning with the global class current of Stalinism. We must invade their arena, always conscious that we are fighting a global social phenomenon. We must orient toward the American working class as a sector in a global camp which is indissolubly bound to that camp and dependent on it in no less degree than the entire camp is dependent on it.

On the other hand we must not conceive the Stalinist milieu in this country as merely "an area for fruitful work," "an area where there are advanced people" or proceed on the basis "that the labor movement is dormant." Whether the labor move-

ment is dormant or insurgent, our work, our struggle against Stalinism must go on, not merely because we think it is a good source for recruiting, but because we are in revolutionary competition with them as one global class current against another for hegemony of the world camp of all the proletarians and oppressed peoples.

We cannot proceed to vanquish Stalinism on the American arena merely on the basis of its American peculiarities.

Perspective on the American Revolution

"In the present epoch," said Trotsky in The Third International after Lenin, "to a much larger extent than in the past, the national orientation of the proletariat must and can flow only from a world orientation and not vice versa. Herein lies the basic and primary difference between communist internationalism and all varieties of national socialism."

The above words of Trotsky in no way contradict his statement that "America is the foundry where the fate of man will be forged." I quoted this last statement and elaborated on it in the memorandum which I presented to the 1950 Convention. To some comrades, the remarks seemed to be out of place because the discussion was on Eastern Europe and Yugoslavia. But I felt they had a relevance to the discussion, as I feel they have a relevance to the present one. However, they cannot be lifelessly applied to the American scene. Only the comprehension of the dialectical inter-unity of both these Trotsky concepts and their concrete application on the field of the American class struggle, will serve to accomplish our historic tasks.

May 20, 1953

LETTER TO SWP NATIONAL COMMITTEE RE: WEISS ARTICLE ON CLARK

from Sam Marcy
September 25, 1957

Dear Comrades:

I note with satisfaction the proposal of the Secretariat to initiate a discussion in the PC on the regroupment developments, and to follow it up with a Plenum.

This letter is intended to be a preliminary contribution to the PC discussion.

I want to protest most vigorously against the political line of the article by Comrade Murry Weiss in the September 16th issue of the *Militant* regarding the resignation of Joseph Clark from the CP and as foreign editor of the *Daily Worker*. Comrade Weiss makes the following important points regarding Clark's letter of resignation.

Clark has attacked the Stalinist version of proletarian internationalism as expressed by the Duclos letter to the recent CP convention, and expressed solidarity with the Hungarian insurrection.

Clark made an "open break with Stalinism" even though it "lacks consistency and thought-out conclusions."

Clark bases "his break with Stalinism on a socialist opposition to American capitalism at home and abroad."

Clark "gives promise of playing a vital and constructive role in the current regroupment movement of revolutionary socialist forces in the United States."

On the contrary, the reality of the situation is that Clark is a Stalinist renegade who has cast aside his organizational ties with the Moscow bureaucracy only to reinforce his class subservience to imperialism.

What Do They Mean By "Stalinism"

No term has acquired such a multitude of different meanings to different people as the term "Stalinism." This is not to be wondered at. For terminology, like all other weapons in the class struggle, serves class ends. The bourgeoisie and the Soviet bureaucracy, for diametrically opposite aims, have both with relentless vigor, systematically palmed off perfidious Stalinism as genuine Communism. In like fashion, but even more pernicious to the enlightenment of class conscious workers who are trying to free themselves from the ideological shackles of Stalinism, is the deliberate palming off of vulgar, bourgeois anti-Stalinism as good coin for revolutionary socialist opposition to Stalinism.

Thus, when Joe Clark says that he is breaking with Stalinism, the inference gathered by many and implied in the article by Comrade Weiss is that he is breaking with Stalinism in order to move towards revolutionary socialism, or gives the promise to do so.

But let's see how Clark himself differentiates between Communism and Stalinism in this very same letter of resignation to which Comrade Weiss obviously closes his eyes. "Within our country," said Clark, "communism has made an important contribution to the welfare of the people." Indeed, one can say that Communism has made an important contribution depending on whether you mean genuine Communism or its counterfeit, Stalinism.

There was a period when Communism made an important contribution in this country, dating probably from 1917 until 1924; the days when Lenin and Trotsky headed the Soviet State and the Communist International. Then followed the Stalinist perversion from 1924 until the capitulation of the German CP in 1933. This in turn was

followed by a period of the crassest opportunism and outright class betrayals of the most monstrous character, the so-called decade of "people's frontism" and support of the imperialist war, the decade roughly between 1935 and 1945.

Now, which of these three different periods does Clark refer to as having been "Communist," as having made a contribution? The period of 1919 to 1924? Oh, no. It is, he says, "the decade of 1935 to 1945." That's when he says "communism" had reached a "high point." The crassest sort of class collaboration and the worst betrayals of Stalinism are passed off by Clark as the heroic age of communism, the glorious days of Popular Frontism and the imperialist war.

Is this an "open break with Stalinism"?--with the class essence of Stalinism?

How could Comrade Weiss have missed this point as being the real tipoff on the direction Clark is traveling? A Stalinist worker could genuinely mistake the role of the Stalinists, but a flunkey like Clark who has decades in the CP leadership behind him, could this be explained as a mere "inconsistency," as mere lack of "thought-out conclusions," as Comrade Weiss puts it?

Clark and Deutscher

But Clark, Comrade Weiss says, is seeking a "serious explanation" for the debacle of Stalinism. Proof: "In one of his last columns in the Daily Worker," writes Comrade Weiss, "Clark tried to find the social basis for this rise of an autocratic bureaucracy in the Soviet Union by citing Isaac Deutscher's analysis of the historical circumstances which gave rise to Stalinism. It is well known that Deutscher, for all his profound differences with Trotskyism, had based his entire analysis of the Soviet bureaucracy on the theoretical work of Leon Trotsky."

Let us for the moment disregard the fact that Deutscher does *not* base himself on Trotsky's theory, but on a falsification and disembowelment of the revolutionary essence of Trotskyism. To follow Comrade Weiss's reasoning, we thus get this: Deutscher bases himself on Trotsky--Clark bases himself on Deutscher; ipso facto, Clark is moving in the direction of Trotsky.

What other conclusion can one draw from this astonishing paragraph? To be sure, there is a common denominator between Clark and Deutscher. But this is exactly what Comrade Weiss fails to disclose. Deutscher, like Clark, is for the complete renunciation of the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat, and its substitution by class collaboration. Deutscher, like Clark, is for capitalist coexistence. Deutscher, like Clark, is for imperialist democracy as the road for socialism in the West (of course, they're both for genuine proletarian democracy in the East!). Deutscher's and Clark's attitude toward the Soviet bureaucracy, like Cochran's and Shachtman's (whether it be in the one case of sympathy, and in the other of antipathy) has its origin in their attitude toward their own imperialist bourgeoisies, and not in their attitude toward the world proletariat. Deutscher's conciliationist approach to the bureaucracy is but part of his conciliatory attitude toward British "democratic" imperialism, and Clark's antipathy for the bureaucracy is based on the current fierce hostility of American imperialism, and is in no way related to the imperious demands of the workers for a revolutionary class-conscious struggle against the bureaucracy.

Trotsky's struggle against the Soviet bureaucracy, on the other hand, is an inseparable part of his revolutionary struggle against the entire imperialist bourgeoisie and all who conciliate with it.

But let us assume Clark knows the social basis of the rise of the Soviet bureaucracy. Does that, in and of itself, indicate that he is moving in the direction of revolutionary socialism? Is there a Cochranite, a Shachtmanite, or a Stalinist leader who will not admit, at least in private the social basis for the rise of the American labor bureaucracy--who will not tell you that they are labor lieutenants of American Capitalism, who will not grant you the venal role of this bureaucracy? But to proceed from these correct generalizations to carry on a ruthless, merciless fight against the bureaucracy, ah--that is something else again.

It is precisely in this respect that Clark and Deutscher are lacking. Their "socialism" is in fact a gutless and spineless "socialism,"--harmless to the bourgeoisie. The essence of revolutionary socialism lies precisely in its indomitable will to struggle. Marx was above all a fighter.

Democracy vs. Autocracy

"My view, is that socialism can be served only by a complete break with Stalinism. The latter perverted socialism by substituting autocracy for democracy. But Marxists have always advocated socialist democracy, which they uphold as more libertarian than any yet attained." Comrade Weiss quotes this approvingly as part of Clark's search for a "serious explanation" for the debacle of Stalinism.

What is at the root of the problem? Democracy vs. Autocracy, as Clark infers? That is the vulgar, bourgeois-radical, non-class approach. Or is it the evolution (degeneration) in *class attitudes* of Stalin and his clique? Stalin abandoned the class struggle (which is what Clark is doing. This is where he has common ground, not only with Stalin, but with Khrushchev and Foster as well). Stalin conciliated with the world bourgeoisie (which is what Clark is doing) and set up a reactionary nationalist utopia of socialism in one country (to which Clark does not object). It is for this that Stalin needed terror in order to convert socialist democracy into bureaucratic autocracy. Abandonment of the *class struggle* was Stalin's crime; autocracy was the necessary and inevitable instrument to effectuate it.

"Socialist Opposition to Capitalism"

Comrade Weiss asserts that Clark is "basing his break with Stalinism on a socialist opposition to American capitalism at home and abroad."

Unless all words have lost their meaning, this is a complete misrepresentation of the position held by Clark. One has only to go to the text of Clark's letter of resignation to fully confirm this.

Moreover, Comrade Weiss admits that Clark still stands on the platform of class collaboration. But Comrade Weiss attributes this to a mere failure to "see the relation of Stalinism to the basic policy of the CP in the U.S."--the class collaborationist concept of a People's Front anti-monopoly coalition "and continued support to 'lesser evil' capitalist politicians."

How can Clark be for "socialist opposition to Capitalism" and still be for class collaboration? Isn't socialist opposition to Capitalism in absolute contradiction to class collaboration? Is this not the most elementary of elementary Marxist principles? Can one be an exponent of class collaboration and at the same time be a candidate "for revolutionary socialist regroupment?"

"Nevertheless, by calling for a break with Stalinism," says Comrade Weiss, "Clark has gone to the root of the problem that faces the disoriented and demoralized ranks of the radical workers who are seeking a revolutionary road out of the crisis of the CP."

But is not the essence of Stalinism, its conciliationist (sell-out) attitude to the bourgeoisie, and to all social forces hostile to the proletariat, exactly what Clark shows a *preference* for? That is what he has *not* broken from. That is what he tenaciously holds on to.

Is a break with capitalist class collaboration *fundamental* to a *progressive* break with Stalinism? Or is it merely incidental, as Comrade Murry implies? When one retains class collaborationist politics, is he breaking in a bourgeois or a socialist direction? *Is the mere break from Stalinism, regardless of the direction in which the break is made, progressive in itself?* How does this approach differ from Cochran's, etc.?

"The only effective posture from which American Marxists can work for American-Soviet friendship--necessary if mankind is to survive in a time of hydrogen-headed ICBM weapons--is that of independence," says Clark. What does he mean by "American-

Soviet friendship"? Does he mean agitation and propaganda for class solidarity between the American worker and the Soviet worker? Does he mean friendship of the American workers to the Soviet Union as a workers' state and irreconcilable class hatred of the bureaucracy? What Clark means is a rapprochement between Wall Street and the Soviet bureaucracy to maintain "peaceful coexistence." Just like in the good old "collective security" days--it was necessary to "put pressure on the diplomats" to sign a collective security agreement, so now we must do the same. Clark is consistent. This is nothing but a 1957 version of Clark's (and Stalin's) as well as Khrushchev's idea of a "collective security pact" between the imperialist powers and the Soviet bureaucracy to maintain "peace"--the peaceful subjugation, exploitation, pillage, plunder of the masses in the interests of predatory imperialism, and the maintenance of the privileges and emoluments of the Soviet bureaucracy.

Can one be for the imperialist status quo by a rapprochement between the Soviet bureaucracy and Wall Street imperialism, and be a candidate for "revolutionary socialist regroupment"?

Proletarian Internationalism

Let us take up another point--proletarian internationalism, which is the acid test for a revolutionary Marxist. To be sure, Clark in his letter of resignation rejects the conception of proletarian internationalism as expressed by the French Stalinist leader, Duclos. One must ask, however, what conception does Clark wish to substitute for that of Duclos? On this score, Clark is quite clear. He gives two concrete examples of what he means by proletarian internationalism.

One example is in 1956. In that year, Clark says "proletarian internationalism required solidarity with the Hungarian workers opposing Soviet intervention." The other example is in the year 1939. "In 1939," says Clark, "internationalism required support for the anti-Hitler war..." What does this mean? Clark is here saying that proletarian internationalism required that the workers of the world support the war of the imperialist "democracies," the war of the "democratic" slave holder against the fascist slave holders for the domination of the wage slaves at home and colonial and semi-colonial slaves abroad.

Since the unspeakable record of the CP's support of the war is only too well known to require documentation, one wonders what Clark's complaint is all about. "In 1939," says Clark (the year of the Stalin-Hitler Pact), "the French and American CP's should not have practiced the 'shameful neutrality' which they did during that period." What should they have done? Practiced revolutionary defeatism? Lenin's profound doctrine of the prosecution of the class struggle by the workers in war time as in peace time? Oh, no! Perish the thought. What Clark means is that there should have been all-out support by the working class for the imperialist Allies during that period just as there was during the war. In place of the CP's hypocritical, shameful "neutrality," Clark would substitute *outright, unashamed* class treachery. Now if a Stalinist worker who had broken with Stalinism said this, one might contain his indignation and patiently explain the A-B-C's of proletarian internationalism, particularly as it pertains to wars of imperialism, whether they be conducted by the fascist or "democratic" varieties.

But it is something else again when this comes out of the mouth of a Stalinist *leader*, a pen prostitute who for upwards of two decades has been in the inner councils of the CP leadership and knows inside and out the arguments of revolutionary Marxists against the permissibility of supporting one's own imperialist government in any war it conducts.

Clark's apparently contradictory and irreconcilable conceptions of proletarian internationalism, that of the Hungarian insurrection of 1956 and of the Stalin-Hitler Pact era of 1939 present Comrade Weiss with a dilemma. He enthusiastically seizes upon one example, the Hungarian one, naturally, and conveniently omits from his article the example of 1939.

That fact that Comrade Weiss eliminated Clark's virulently chauvinist position on a crucial phase of the second imperialist World War, and hails his position on the Hungarian insurrection as proletarian internationalism, shows that Comrade Weiss does not know which is the acid test of proletarian internationalism. Anyone can be for a foreign "revolution," especially if it is hysterically supported by the entire bourgeoisie, as well as the labor bureaucracy from one end of the world to the other. But to be for proletarian class struggle at home, especially during war time, that's another matter.

Worse still, Weiss substitutes for Clark's direct and unequivocal statement, a vague, clumsy and belabored reference to Clark's failure "to connect the policy of Stalinism in the Second World War and the present foreign policy of the Kremlin with the Stalinist perversion of socialism."

Instead of Comrade Weiss trying to think out *what lies behind* Clark's example Number 1 (Hungarian insurrection) and its apparent irreconcilability with example Number 2 (Stalin-Hitler Pact era), Comrade Weiss has succumbed to the easy way out, by eliminating from the article Clark's second example and affirming that Clark's "open break with Stalinism" lacks only "consistency and thought-out conclusions."

Oh, no, Comrade Weiss, It is not Joseph Clark who lacks consistency. On the contrary, he is remarkably consistent. It is you who lack consistency. Clark is only inconsistent in form, but not in class content. In both instances, Hungary and the Stalin-Hitler Pact period, Clark is taking the *same identical class position that his own bourgeoisie is taking*. This is consistency with a vengeance!

Clark and the CP Convention

"I was among those who greeted the progress recorded at the last convention of the Communist Party. It affirmed the American character and its dedication to constitutional democracy," said Clark. Its dedication to imperialist Wall Street democracy! The same democracy that is being dished out by Wall Street to Egypt and Jordan, and only yesterday to Korea and China!

Is the break with imperialist democracy *fundamental* or *incidental* to a revolutionary break with Stalinism? Can one be an exponent of imperialist democracy and at the same time be a guide to the "ranks of the radical workers" who are seeking, according to Comrade Weiss's own words, "a revolutionary road out of the crisis of the CP"?

The servile groveling at the feet of Wall Street democracy is not the only thing Clark applauded with enthusiasm at the CP convention. Even greater was his enthusiasm for the convention's coming out four-square for "independence" and against "dogmatism and sectarianism." What independence? The rank and file undoubtedly want independence from the monolithic stranglehold of the CP. But what does Clark want? To switch his allegiance from Moscow to Wall Street!!!

But what "dogmatism" was condemned? The reactionary dogma of class collaboration? Of peaceful coexistence? Of popular frontism? (Including its latest variety, anti-monopoly coalition) Just to raise the questions is to answer them. And what about sectarianism? Was it condemnation of genuine sectarianism, such as in the Third Period, etc.? Or does it mean condemnation for building the Progressive Party instead of remaining faithful to the capitalist Democratic Party machine?

The long struggle which Trotsky conducted on all these critical issues, is part of the great revolutionary heritage of Marxism, and constitutes the dividing line between Marxism and reformism. Clark is the very incarnation of the latter. Yet Comrade Murry concludes that he "gives promise of playing a vital and constructive role in the current regroupment movement of revolutionary socialist forces in the United States."

This in turn raises the question of the whole meaning of the regroupment process

Regroupment

"Many workers in the party," wrote Comrade Weiss in last winter's issue of the

International Socialist Review, "recoil from the Gates group and tend toward the Fosterites, precisely because of the fear that Gates and his associates want to break with Stalinism only to lead them into the swamp of State Department 'socialism.' On the other hand, these same workers display a keen hostility towards Foster's thinly disguised plans to turn back the clock and reestablish the power of the old bureaucratic machine in the party."

Now if anybody could be called an ideological associate of Gates at the time Comrade Weiss wrote this article, it was Clark. Only Clark was more outspoken than Gates. Now Clark has broken from the CP. Clark was a Gatesite. The rank and file of the CP feared that he was trying to lead them into the "swamp of State Department socialism." Clark's article of resignation confirmed their fears. "The militants are recoiling from the Gatesites and are either tending toward the Fosterites or dropping out of activity altogether," wrote Murry last winter.

What should be our policy? Expose Clark, while relentlessly stepping up the fight against Foster! Gates is a product of Fosterite ideology, which in no way is distinguished from orthodox Stalinism (if such a term can be employed). Fosterism inevitably brings about Gatesism. The liquidation of Stalinism into bourgeois reformism--that is what Trotsky predicted long ago. Our appeal to the militants in the CP must be based not only on a ruthless struggle against Fosterism, but against its end product, Gatesism, the tendency towards capitulation to imperialism. To appeal to the latter against the former will only lead us into a morass.

Unfortunately, that is exactly what Comrade Weiss proceeds to do. He in effect transforms Clark from a Stalinist renegade turned bourgeois-reformist, into a desirable candidate for "revolutionary socialist regroupment." To paint up Clark as a would-be revolutionary socialist when he has obviously embraced imperialism, is not only to do a disservice to the party; it is to close the door of the party to revolutionary militants in the CP who know Clark's role only too well. To do that is to tighten the reins of the Foster group on the remaining rank and file under his influence, and thereby help not only Foster and Khrushchev, but Wall Street as well. Such is the meaning of Comrade Weiss's article on Clark. It takes a concrete case to show up the actual meaning of a political generalization. It points up sharply the meaning of this whole regroupment business.

As long ago as November 5, 1956, at a Political Committee meeting when I presented a resolution together with Comrades Grey and Flint on the Hungarian insurrection, in the course of a speech I stated that it was not possible to have in the next period, a genuine regroupment of revolutionary socialists, because all the other tendencies in the labor movement were moving to the right, and the net effect of the Khrushchev revelations was, under the existing circumstances, to plunge the Stalinist movement further along the path of bourgeois reformism, rather than a break in the direction of revolutionary Marxism. In the absence of a militant resurgence of American labor, based on new catastrophes of either an economic, political or military character, or new developments abroad, no serious regroupment of revolutionary elements could take place on a programmatic basis.

Also, that our orientation should be to redouble our efforts in an assault against the Stalinist leadership, and attempt to win the militant rank and file away from the Fosterites. To do this effectively, we must make it crystal clear that we are in no way holding out a hand to the *Gatesite* leaders--to these capitulators to imperialism who had shown their political physiognomy before the Hungarian insurrection.

In a memorandum submitted to the Convention last spring, I summed up my view of regroupment in point 10:

"*Regroupment*--No regroupment on a revolutionary Marxist basis is possible under present conditions because the general tendency among all the so-called socialist groupings is to the Right. They are not the emerging visage of new resurgent radicalism, but rather the rear of an old one."

I deliberately put this in the form of a prognosis, and voted for the majority resolution, so as to make sure that my position could in no way be interpreted as obstructive of any effort the party may make *concretely* to reach the mass of disillusioned workers in the Stalinist movement.

However, ever since the regroupment process started, it has become more and more clear to me that the objective role of the so-called "regroupers"--this motley crew of ex-Stalinists, ex-Trotskyists, pacifists, social democrats and God-knows-what--is not to resuscitate the class consciousness of the socialist-minded workers, but to entrap them--to push them on some sort of puerile and harmless non-class struggle, non-Marxist and non-Leninist "socialism"--the type of socialism that is perfectly acceptable to the bourgeoisie.

Nevertheless, I am for participation in it for purposes of weaning away the militants from these renegades. But our participation has to be based on a merciless, persistent and consistent struggle to expose them *publicly* for what they are. This does not at all mean non-participation in concrete cases where civil liberties or other forms of working class action are possible, or debates where our attitudes are clear on the fundamental issues.

Comrade Weiss's article is evidence of a conciliatory attitude to all those tendencies in the labor movement which it is our duty to mercilessly and publicly expose.

Sam Marcy

Buffalo, 9/25/57

1973 INTRODUCTION TO THE GLOBAL CLASS WAR DOCUMENTS

by Vincent Copeland

This compilation of documents by Sam Marcy may at first sight be a little formidable to new comrades. But it is actually the shortest and simplest summary of the theoretical and ideological positions that led to the formation of Workers World Party and still constitute a large part of our doctrine.

It is even possible to say that the first document in particular was, when it was written in 1950 and still is today, a summary of the world relation of forces between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, as well as a long-term orientation for proletarian revolutionaries.

There are few documents in the communist movement that can be so defined or stand such a test. Where is the analysis of either world or national political conditions written by Browder, Foster, or Stalin that can even stand the light of day today, much less be considered at all applicable to our own time?

Even in the greatly changed world situation of 1973 there is nothing of substance that has to be altered in these essays, nothing that we would wish to erase from the history of our ideological battles. On the contrary, it may be that only through some perusal of these records can one fully appreciate our method and fully understand our application of Marxism-Leninism.

However, some of the emphasis would have to be changed in similar discussions today. And since the events and personalities and even the parties discussed are different, and since altogether new political parties are now on the scene, it is necessary to introduce these pieces with some description of the political situation that prevailed when they were written.

And it is necessary to add that this is why we make this an *internal* document. It is not that any of our history is a *secret* from the movement or from our class. But it is impossible to correctly interpret certain important *nuances* of these particular documents--which are from sixteen to twenty-three years old and were "internal" to begin with--without being fairly well tuned-in to the politics and theory of Workers World Party.

To begin with, they were all directed against the leadership of the old Socialist Workers Party at a time when that leadership still remembered, however dimly, the great Russian Revolution. And although it was already betraying the revolutionary teachings of Leon Trotsky, it still kept the shell of those teachings and it still appeared to be to the left of the U.S. Communist Party. Its anti-Sovietism and anti-communism were not so pronounced as today, and were concealed from its own membership and even to some degree from ourselves. The membership generally still imagined the party was for the revolutionary defense of the Soviet Union.

In this connection one of the most important nuances of the 1950 document on the Global Class War is expressed in the use of the term "Stalinist." This term is used exclusively in the old sense in that document--that is, as a characterization of the conservative, revisionist and occasionally even reactionary wing of the world communist movement.

Stalin was still alive in 1950 and was actively trying to maneuver for "peaceful coexistence" even in the middle of the cold war. He had only gained the image of a left-winger because of the three preceding years of world bourgeois hostility, and then only in some quarters. (It is extremely dubious, for example, whether

Mao Tse-tung at that time regarded Stalin as a very strong champion of the Chinese revolution!)

In the fight between Trotsky and Stalin it was Trotsky who constantly referred to his own faction as the "Bolshevik-Leninist" faction, and it was Stalin who referred to the Left Opposition members as "Trotskyists." Trotsky never really accepted the latter term and he himself always put sarcastic quotation marks around it. Finally, in self-defense, he called the conservative faction "Stalinist"--but mainly in order to emphasize that Stalin personified a basic departure from Leninism.

Given the continued isolation of the revolutionary wing, it was inevitable that we should lose the terminological battle and that the term "Stalinism" would come to mean--in a way--what the CP said it meant or what the bourgeoisie said it meant, since language by its very nature is the instrument of large numbers of people.

Comrade Marcy turned to just this subject in the final document, that of 1957, and gives a political and class analysis of the question. By this time it was crucially important, particularly in the light of Khrushchev's speech against Stalin (which nearly all factions including the Chinese CP, *supported* at the time) to make a clear exposition of the term and show its *relatively* progressive side. Significantly enough, nobody but Marcy made this clarification, so far as I am aware.

But the first document, that of 1950, needs to be viewed with the thorough understanding of the words "Stalinism" and "Stalinist" in their original context as meaning in the document the bureaucratic degeneration of the revolution--*and nothing else.*

The document was written just after the Korean war began, and when it seemed to be already over, after MacArthur had pushed up through North Korea to the Yalu River border of Peoples China. This was before the Chinese came into the war and when Korea appeared to be defeated by the imperialists.

Thus much is said in the past tense about a Korean "defeat." And this was happily corrected by later events not recorded in the document. However the thesis is saturated with optimism about the "coming" victories over imperialism and the Chinese assistance to Korea was in that sense fully predicted.

The SWP had at first taken a "hands off" attitude in the Korean War, supporting neither North nor South and actually talking about "puppets of the West and puppets of the East" or some such formulation. But after a few weeks, partly under pressure from the Marcy tendency, and partly because of the awe-inspiring struggle of the Koreans themselves, the party came out for the proletarian North. But even then, the SWP leadership did not remotely take the position of "two class camps," much less that of two *global* class camps, as advocated in the document.

In fact, this document on global class war led directly to the SWP accusation of "Stalinism" against the Marcy tendency.

Marcy was in reality continuing Trotsky's defense of the Soviet Union in the new post-World War Two epoch, and moreover asserting the *revolutionary* defense as opposed to the conservative, intermittent, undependable, maneuverist, Stalinist defense. But the SWP leaders called this ... Stalinism!

The irony of it all was that they themselves were supposed to be infinitely more for the defense of the revolution than the CP, but they had managed to become in reality *less* for that defense than the CP. If this is not said explicitly in the document, it is only because of the deception and self-deception practiced by

the SWP leadership at the time. Marcy could suspect or deduce such an attitude on the SWP leadership's part, but it would have been impossible to make such a suspicion public, or to define it politically and clearly at the time.

In retrospect, however, it must be said categorically that the SWP leadership, in spite of their traditions, were already by 1950, hiding behind Trotsky's *proletarian revolutionary* anti-Stalinism and using it to rationalize a gradually more conservative position, as they had during the previous two or three years of the cold war.

The first *formal* tipoff as to their changing position was their difficulty at arriving at a theoretical definition of the class nature of the countries of Eastern Europe and above all in defining the class nature of the new Chinese state.

Among the several important contributions of Marcy's 1950 document was Marcy's insistence that Peoples China was in fact the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such a position was absolutely unique in the SWP at that time and was one of the reasons that the SWP leaders labeled us as "Stalinists."

It should be added at once, of course, that this was also a bold proposition in the world movement as a whole. No one else, so far as I know, in Europe or Asia or in the United States, made this point--and certainly not with such categorical clarity.

The U.S. CP called Peoples China a "People's Democracy." (It did draw most of the *conclusions* that would flow from our own more scientific and revolutionary description. And its weaker characterization was partly in imitation of Stalin, partly a special American version of bowing to the cold war in terminology.) And in China itself the party also hedged, although perhaps more for political reasons and pressures (e.g., from the left Kuomintang) than because of theoretical errors.

The second document--that of 1953--concretizes some of the propositions of the first in connection with actual organizational questions. It is complicated, however, by the fact that it refers to a "Majority" and a "Minority" and the Minority was not the Marcy tendency, but another one that had found some vulnerable points in the Majority (Cannon-Dobbs) position, but were themselves on the way out of the movement altogether.

Comrade Marcy's analysis here is also remarkable for its anticipation of this fact and for its careful sorting out of the Majority and Minority attitudes toward the CP. He shows the Minority's accusation against the Majority for "sectarianism" in refusing to deal with the CP was a false issue. The question was one of opportunism and capitulation to imperialism through the medium of SWP adapting to the imperialist-influenced trade union workers at that time. But it was opportunism *on both sides*.

The SWP majority was capitulating to imperialism, as the Minority somewhat understood. And the Minority was capitulating to the old "Stalinism"--or rather to the idea that an *ideological* coalition between revolutionary Trotskyism and the CP would result in great gains. In one sense this might have been very true. But the view lacked seriousness as well as principle and the Minority did not even try to carry out its supposed perspective when it left the SWP.

Marcy shows what the problem really was. His comments on Henry Wallace, on the Rosenbergs and on the Trotsky conversations on critical support of Browder's Presidential campaign, are all meant to emphasize the problem of a correct and *revolutionary* approach to the CPs of the world. And in the course of this he shows that

the U.S. workers do not have a separate destiny (as Cannon and the SWP Majority wanted to believe) independent of the world communist movement, and that a workers' cadre must be created that is international to the core, in spite of American pragmatism and chauvinist anti-foreignism.

There emerges concretely in the third document what is still a little abstract in the second, or at least not so sharp as in the third. This is the attitude toward the crisis within the CP. Which way are the CP dissidents going? To the left or to the right?

Naturally, there have always been some left dissidents (among them, originally, ourselves). But ever since the cold war, the SWP leaders showed a remarkable ability to welcome the *right* dissidents, who were the predominant trend since that time, and an inability to see who were the leftists!

This letter about the evolution of Joseph Clark, a long-time leader of the CP, was just one of a whole series of statements we made after the 20th Congress of the CP of the Soviet Union, the one in which Khrushchev made his famous 1956 speech against Stalin. It was a year after the Hungarian counter-revolution, which figures importantly in the logic of the letter.

This particular letter was written in 1957 just about a year and a half after Khrushchev's speech. And even at that time no one but ourselves had analyzed that speech *from the left*. Even the Chinese revolutionaries were only to criticize it several years later.

After Khrushchev's speech and after the Hungarian counter-revolution in particular, there was a veritable exodus out of the CPs of the world, especially the U.S. CP. And this was the occasion for the biggest illusions on the part of the SWP leadership that they were going to recruit thousands of ex-CP'ers. (In this they took over the vacated position of the "Minority" discussed in the second document.)

It is also worth noting that the SWP leaders were not alone in their giddiness about the "new" CP stance and what they called "regroupment of the left." The general U.S. movement was at its nadir, even though McCarthyism as such had been set back by the liberal bourgeoisie. And many were the elements, including some leaders in the CP today, who thought Khrushchev was leading them toward a great new radicalization and reconciliation of tendencies on a world basis. And from the heights of Mao Tse-tung to the depths of Carl Davidson (or his equivalents at the time) nobody but ourselves challenged this thesis.

Comrade Marcy's letter was then all the more illuminating about the real situation. But by the same token it threw a bucket of cold water on the hot hopes of the "regroupers" in the SWP. So it led to cries of "sectarianism" against us as well as the old familiar accusation of "Stalinism."

Finally, from all this and especially from the documents themselves it ought to be clear why ninety-nine times out of a hundred, we do not rush to defend ourselves nowadays when our critics call us "Stalinist."

This is not because of the nature of Stalinism, but because of the nature of our *critics*. Nearly all of these solidarize in some way with the SWP or with the "democratic opposition" (i.e. the capitalist restorationists) in the Soviet Union. As against *them*, we solidarize with the "Stalinists" even while we oppose the ideology of Stalinism.

As for those other critics among the so-called Maoist-Stalinists of the United States today, those who call us "counter-revolutionary Trotskyists", etc., they may prove to be less of a problem in the long run despite their present ultimattistic and thoughtless invective. But their case requires special treatment which the present documents, although obviously monumental alongside the Lilliputian efforts of the "theoreticians" of the Guardian stripe, do not supply.

This omission it should be remembered, is mostly due to the fact that Mao himself omitted any defense of Stalin at the time. And outside of ourselves no one in the United States had yet noticed that Mao was to the left of Khrushchev (which he undoubtedly was, in spite of his silence on Khrushchev and the 20th Congress!).

This important question is now somewhat more pressing and contemporary than the matters contained in the present work. But without a clear understanding of the old questions it will be difficult for us to gain the kind of clarity that we need in dealing with new ones.

LITERATURE
From Communist Cadre

The Hammer and the Sickle

Vol. 2, No. 3 includes articles on the Vietnam/Cambodia Conflict; Italy in Crisis; and Down with the Dergue--Eritrea Will Win! including Theses on the Struggle in the Horn of Africa and a history of the Ethiopian Dergue.

Vol. 2, No. 2 includes: Carter's Election: Turning Point in US Imperialist Policy; The Proletarian Class Character of the Angolan State; and Trotskyist Economics.

Hungary 1956: A Trotskyist Defense of the Soviet Intervention

Includes "The Class Character of the Hungarian Uprising" by V. Grey (Vincent Copeland, 1957), with an introduction by Communist Cadre.

Documents of the Vern-Ryan Tendency

A little-known faction within the Socialist Workers Party which exposed the revisionist notion of "dual power within the state" put forward by the Fourth International and SWP leadership to explain the post-World War II overturns in Eastern Europe and which, like the Marcy-Copeland faction, grasped the significance of the Chinese Revolution. Published by Communard Publishers.

What the Spartacist League Really Stands For: A Self-Exposure by James Robertson

Reprint of the speech made by leading SL member James Robertson on January 29, 1977 (the speech the SL wouldn't print), with a critical introduction and comments by Communist Cadre.

The price of each pamphlet is \$1.00 (except Documents of the Vern-Ryan Tendency -- \$2.00). Include 25 cents postage with each order.

Order from:

WORKERS AND OPPRESSED UNITE
204 West 20 Street
New York, NY 10011

\$1.50

GLOBAL CLASS WAR

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONALISM VS. "SOCIALIST" ISOLATIONISM:
THE STRUGGLE TO REVIVE U.S. TROTSKYISM

A COMMUNIST CADRE PAMPHLET

