

The Irish Upsurge

NOT GREEN AGAINST ORANGE, but

CLASS AGAINST CLASS!



Grief, Rubble, Religion: Flags and crosses mark the place where three boys died on Bloody Sunday.



Left:
George Meany
of AFL-CIO;

Right:
George Boldt,
Chairman
of Pay Board.

Meany Maneuvers Against Nixon

EMBARRASSES "PROGRESSIVES"

George Meany and his bureaucratic cohorts—with one notable exception—have at long last resigned from Nixon's Pay Board, stripping the Administration's anti-labor drive of a great deal of its facade of consensus and partnership in protecting American capitalism. In itself this is an excellent thing.

Meany's action reveals his dual role as a workers' leader and simultaneously an agent of Nixon's class within the workers' movement. When the working class understands this contradictory nature of the trade union bureaucracy, it will be armed with a vital weapon in the struggle to sweep it aside and install a revolutionary leadership.

Meany's resignation is a tactical ploy to strengthen the bureaucracy's hand in the Democratic Party by appearing to lead an anti-Nixon offensive, make the Democratic "friends of labor" look better than the Republicans and help them get elected in November. Then Meany and his friends, who have always favored wage-price controls and the economic and social relations of capitalism, will impose Nixon's policies themselves.

Nixon knows this, and has opted for all-out war with the AFL-CIO, hoping that the records of the Democrats and labor bureaucrats will play into his hands. His statements match in arrogance Meany's hypocrisy; Nixon wishes to see the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie expressed

continued on page 2

On March 24 Prime Minister Heath announced the imposition of direct British rule over the Province of Northern Ireland, ending 51 years of local rule. Heath's move, which received immediate Labour endorsement, reflects the growing exasperation in London with the sectarian strife which stalls British plans for a facelifted, pacified Ireland integrated into a modernized neo-colonial status with the Common Market. Despite the fears of Faulkner's Protestant Neanderthals, the minimal concessions Heath has promised to the Catholics will not alleviate the oppression of the Catholic masses any more than did the occupation by British troops. The British move leaves the Protestants enraged and the Catholics quite properly unsatisfied, setting the stage for full-scale sectarian civil war in the near future. The tasks of Marxists to show the way to turn the conflict into a war against the capitalist order have never been more urgent.

Since 1969, Ireland has stood on the brink of a revolutionary crisis. Yet in proportion as revolutionary possibilities have unfolded in Ireland, the divisions among the Irish working masses have grown to cripple the proletariat and prolong Ireland's semi-colonial status within British and European capitalism.

One lesson of the needless shedding of working-class blood must be driven home; that the armed forces of the imperialist state—in this case the British—do not provide the slightest measure of protection to the oppressed, whose plight stems fundamentally from the same bourgeois order which the troops serve. In 1969 the Catholic minority welcomed in British troops, believing that they would protect the Catholics against a sectarian pogrom. With few exceptions, the foresight of the left was no keener. Bernadette Devlin spoke for most of the left when she was reported as saying:

"The saving of lives, the necessary saving of lives in that circumstance, was brought about by the whole system and therefore you cannot simply say take the troops out of Ulster. Because the people will say you cannot take the troops out because if you do the people will die."

—Workers Press, 18 June 1970

The troops stayed, and the people died. Long before Bloody Sunday the actions of the British troops had taught the Catholics that although "simply" demanding the troops' departure was insufficient, nevertheless their removal was an absolute precondition for ending police-state terror against the northern Catholic minority.

Today the IRA, with substantial mass support, bombs and shoots British troops, and others besides. They have succeeded in making life in Ulster extremely uncomfortable for British soldiers and much of the populace as well, but they have not dislodged the troops. The focus for organized resistance is restricted largely to the secret armies of the IRA, which among its other decisive weaknesses is pursuing a policy of virtually indiscriminate mass terrorism. The struggle has not spread to the South, nor has the capitalist government of Eire done anything to help, save provide limited, temporary semi-sanctuary. The bourgeois state power of both Ulster and Eire recognizes the mortal danger to it implicit (but not now actual) in the struggles of the working-class Catholic minority in the North.

continued on page 9

**On Marxist
Method and
Class Betrayal:**

WAR AND THE WORKERS LEAGUE / Pg. 5

AT SMC CONFERENCE: Workers League, Labor Committee Guard SWP-Liberal Left Flank

At a time of heightened class struggle and the breaking up of the delusion of the "American Century," as the dangers of world imperialist war loom more clearly before a restive world working class, the American anti-war movement under the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party/Young Socialist Alliance deepens its class collaboration, justifies, and defends it more openly. A greater gift to the reformist bureaucrats and reactionary demagogues in maintaining the allegiance of the workers cannot be imagined. But the appetite of the SWP to preserve its bloc with the liberal bourgeoisie at any cost is well known. Surely, then, the other currents active in the anti-war movement, whatever the differences among themselves, have exposed the betrayal of the

renegade "Trotskyists" of the SWP/YSA on fundamental class issues to all seriously anti-imperialist elements?

The truth is that the ostensibly "left" opposition to the SWP/YSA anti-war leadership—the Workers League/Young Socialists and the National Caucus of Labor Committees—is nothing but a more sophisticated version of SWP class-collaboration, "rendering it more profound" to fool the socialists; they have rendered the SWP invaluable assistance in maintaining the vehicle for their treachery, the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) and the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC).

Given the parochial and sectarian character of most groups calling themselves "Marxist," and

their practice of "defending" their politics by avoiding debate, the greatest importance of gatherings like the SMC Conference held in New York on February 26-27 is that they provide rare opportunities to kick over the rocks and expose the tendencies which crawl beneath them to the light of political clarification.

While the SWP/YSA capitulation to social-chauvinism and social-patriotism was consummated seven years ago, each year brings a new variation on the class-collaborationist theme. This year the ex-Trotskyist SWP's program on imperialist war was presented by the youth contingent of the liberal (McGovern) and even the "center" (Muskie) imperialist bourgeoisie.

The "workshop question" opened the conference as the conference sponsors proposed an agenda which placed lengthy workshops before plenary discussion or presentation of resolutions. YSAers speaking in favor of the proposal rose and announced with great pomp and pride that "since we can read we do not need to have the proposals read to us." As if plenary sessions were supposed to consist of the reading aloud of proposals and not the dialectic of verbal debate—why go to the trouble and expense of holding conferences if a literary exchange and mail referendum will do? Is it not because a mail referendum is profoundly less democratic, as every trade unionist knows and as every self-proclaimed "Marxist" ought to know? Workshops seem very cozy and democratic since every person gets a chance to speak. But at a conference where many hostile political tendencies are represented the only democratic means of presentation is plenary sessions where each tendency is allotted equal time for political presentations. Allotting time by individual as in workshops simply allows the largest tendency to hog the discussion.

The proposed agenda was opposed primarily by the Spartacist League/Revolutionary Communist Youth (SL/RCY), the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC), and the Workers League/Young Socialists (WL/YSA). Agenda opposition was the sole principled gesture the WL could muster during the entire conference, and it even succeeded in compromising itself on that. While the WL pointed out that the proposal for early workshops was meant to suppress political discussion, when the motion passed the WL hurried off to its own workshop—from which they excluded other tendencies!

The SWP/YSA had yet another gimmick for suppressing debate. Early in the conference a straw vote eliminated resolutions which did not have large support at that point. (What would the SWP think of an election law which dropped Presidential candidates from the ballot on the basis of a straw vote taken in April?) The WL voted for the straw vote procedure. Combined with its scandalous behavior concerning its own publicly advertised workshop, this demonstrated that the WL was as fearful as the SWP of political discussion and that the objection to the "workshops first" agenda was entirely phony.

Although the SWP considers it quite proper that blacks discuss only with blacks, women with women, gay with gay, etc., in exclusionist workshops, it is vehemently non-exclusionist where bourgeois politicians are concerned; it invited the class enemy to the labor workshop and defended the right of the "Youth Coordinators" for the Muskies and McGovern tickets to address the workshop on how to "reach out" to labor. When an SL/RCY motion for the exclusion of these Youth for Imperialism passed with the support of the NCLC, the SWP claimed that the "principle of non-exclusionism" (which apparently applied to no other workshop than the labor workshop) was violated and walked out.

The walkout contrasted sharply with the behavior of the SWP delegation at the recent Versailles Peace Conference, dominated by the French

continued on next page

Meany Maneuvers Against Nixon

Continued from Page 1

solely through himself: "The President cannot and will not allow any leader of labor or any leader of management, no matter how powerful, to put himself above the best interests of the American people" (press briefing by Ziegler, NY Times, 23 March).

Meany has exposed the fallacy which underlies the historic dual errors of revisionism in the workers' movement—tailing a section of the bureaucracy or seeking to by-pass it—and vindicated the Marxist analysis. Those leftists who originally placed confidence in the "Alliance for Labor Action" saw the union bureaucrats only in their aspect as workers' leaders, some leading more and better than others. In accepting the bureaucratic framework and opting for one wing, the left restricts itself to the same limitations accepted by the bureaucrats of various stripes—tactical flexibility within the limits imposed by the preservation of capitalism. Thus the Communist Party hailed the bureaucratic founding of the ALA as "historic" and "planned to be the greatest crusade in labor's history" (Daily World, 29 May 1969). Today the UAW's Woodcock tails after the arch-reactionary Meany, while Fitzsimmons, the other "progressive" founder of the ALA, stays on the reconstituted Pay Board, holding the bag for Nixon.

From the first the Spartacist League denounced the ALA as a ploy by long-time allies of Meany to create the appearance of distance between themselves and the increasingly unpopular symbols of the trade union status quo. Our leaflet to the members of District 65 in New York, part of the ALA lash-up, issued 28 May 1969 concludes: "So if the AFL-CIO is a conservative, bureaucratic organization, the Alliance for Labor Action (ALA) is a fake. It would be a crime if the Reuther-Livingston-Teamster alliance got away with their public relations ploy. A policy of struggle for militant gains within the trade union movement is necessary, but it's not going to be made by the smash and grab ALA tactics run by a bunch of cynical labor fakers!" ("Where Is 65 Being Taken?") More recently, *Workers Vanguard* in March denounced as fraudulent the announced merger of the ILWU and Teamsters. Meany is now successfully posturing to the left, proclaiming defense of longshoremen's interests while Bridges and Fitzsimmons openly sell them out. So much for the fake "unity" maneuvers touted by the bureaucrats, the CP, Workers League, et al.!

Progressive Labor has zig-zagged between errors, unable to fight the bureaucrats because incapable of understanding them. When Hoffa was jailed, PL described the Teamsters as "tough" with a leadership somehow better than the run of bureaucracies in general: "Hoffa would not be behind bars today if he had kept to the tactics of struggle which had always worked for him and the Teamsters." (Challenge, April 1967, emphasis ours).

With the founding of the ALA, however, PL denounced precisely the outlook it had professed, swinging over to the polar opposite of its earlier error to an identification of labor bureaucrats with "bosses," and tending to abandon union struggle altogether. PL's abstentionist line on work within the organizations of the working class, an outlook expressed more consistently by the Labor Committee, ignores the fact that the bureaucrats, though traitors, necessarily base themselves on the workers' organizations and must actually lead them—within the framework of capitalism—in order to survive. To avoid the task of fighting against them for leadership in the unions is a betrayal because it allows the bureaucrats, as Meany is now doing, to pose as the real workers' leaders and get away with it!

John L. Lewis of the UMW and CIO, masqueraded as a brash independent workers' leader by defying Roosevelt during World War II—only to sell out to Wendell Wilkie. Labor bureaucrats walked off the "tripartite" Korean War pay board only to crawl back later. Meany's tactics differ now and then from those of his "brothers"—now to the left of them, now to their right—but his role is the same. Fitzsimmons and Meany, their tactical roles now reversed since the founding of the ALA, remain identical!

The SL seeks to build a revolutionary leadership in the trade unions for the overthrow of the bureaucracy, a precondition for the class struggle against capitalism. Marxists raise demands on the bureaucrats only to expose their insufficiency as workers' leaders—not to call upon them to alter their fundamentally traitorous character voluntarily, as in the Workers League's demands on bureaucrats totally committed to the Democratic party to form a labor party. Instead, we call upon the ranks of labor to adopt a class struggle program which requires for its accomplishment a revolutionary change of leadership in the trade unions.

LABOR OFF THE PAY BOARD—FOR GOOD! No concessions to government control of any kind!
CONTROL PRICES NOT WAGES! No government wage-price controls under any administration!
BUILD A LABOR PARTY—through uncompromising struggle in the unions against the trade union bureaucrats of all stripes who tie the labor movement to the parties of the employers!

TWO VIEWS ON IMPERIALIST WAR:

From Leon Trotsky

Coyoacan, D. F.
November 17, 1937

To the Editors of *The Challenge*
Dear Friends:

You are asking me to participate in your campaign against war. Permit me to limit my answer to a few words.

In order to fight against war, it is necessary to understand clearly the reasons which cause war. It is necessary to know the laws of the development of the present, i.e., imperialist society. The Marxist appraisal of war and the methods of fighting it have been expressed in the programmatic brochure of our International Secretariat, *War and the Fourth International*. It is necessary to make this pamphlet the subject of attentive and serious study in youth circles.

The fight against war is inseparable from the class struggle of the proletariat. Irreconcilable class consciousness is the first condition for a successful fight against war.

To fight against war means, first of all, to build a new International, to strengthen its ranks, to temper its cadres.

I warmly wish you success in this work!

From YSA Organizer

In addition the conference witnessed the intervention of a number of sectarian political organizations such as the Spartacist League, the National Caucus of Labor Committees, and the Workers League. The proposals of these various organizations were decisively voted down as the SMC once again reaffirmed its character as an antiwar action organization.

Of particular importance was a motion proposed by the Spartacist League to exclude "bourgeois politicians and their representatives" from the conference. This proposal, which attempted to change the character of the antiwar movement as a movement organized around agreement to act against the war and open to everyone who opposes the war, was also overwhelmingly rejected. The reaffirmation of the nonexclusionary character of the antiwar movement, especially in an election period, was particularly important.

—17 March 1972

SMC Continued...

Communist Party, from which the Ligue Communiste (the SWP's fraternal associates in France) was excluded. The SWP did not walk out of Versailles—thereby demonstrating that the "principle of non-exclusionism" applies not even to their own fraternal groups but only to the class enemy, whose right to participate the SWP defended to the point of brutal violence at the July NPAC conference. Class-collaboration has its own set of "principles."

Years of rule have taught the bourgeoisie a trick or two. They do not just happen to dispatch Nixon off to China quoting the Thought of Chairman Mao, nor do their young hacks accidentally stumble into SMC conferences. The sandbox politicians for Muskies and McGovern are only too happy to co-sign with the SWP/YSA resolutions which state: "Our peace plan has one point and it's no secret: Immediate, total, unconditional withdrawal of U.S. troops, planes, bombs and matériel from Indochina: Out now." They are delighted to use the SWP to foster the liberal illusion that imperialist war can be ended by "peaceful and legal" parades and in such a way that the American class struggle is not exacerbated, just as they are only too happy to use China to obtain an Imperialist peace in Vietnam, a peace that will mean the defeat of the Vietnamese revolution.

Leninists also have a "peace plan" and it too "is no secret":

"The slogans of Social Democracy must be: First an all embracing propaganda of the socialist revolution, to be extended to the army and military activities; emphasis to be placed on the necessity of turning the weapons, not against the brother wage-slaves of other countries but against the reaction of the bourgeois governments and parties in each country."

—Lenin, *Theses on War*, Sept. 1914

"The slogan of 'peace' is incorrect as the slogan must be: changing the national war into civil war. This change may take a long time, it may and will demand preliminary conditions, but the work must all be conducted along the line of such a change. In this spirit, in this direction, [Lenin goes on to state, with WW I version of the SWP in mind] We can neither 'promise' civil war nor 'decree it' but it is our duty to work in this direction, if need be for a very long time."

—Lenin, letter to Shlyapnikov, Oct. 1914

Needless to say Lenin could find no liberal bourgeoisie willing to present his "peace plan"! We purposely have selected Lenin's earliest statements on imperialist war, made when chauvinism ran rampant, when the Second International was in shambles and the idea of a new International was music of the future, when the Bolsheviks were at the nadir of their influence, to demonstrate that Lenin did not save his revolutionary politics for revolutionary situations. One does not make a revolution by waiting for it to happen and then taking a communist position. And one certainly does not make revolution by proposing endless liberal-directed, Imperialist-infested parades as the strategy for fighting against imperialist war! Only the revolutionary mobilization of the working class against the Muskies, McGoverns and Hartkes as well as against the Nixons, only the systematic work of winning the class to the program of proletarian revolution can end the Vietnam war on our terms, not those of the oppressor. The "best" result which could happen (and hasn't yet) through collaboration with the bourgeoisie on the "single issue" of the war is

that the troops will be brought home—in order to be sent to war elsewhere, built up for future imperialist wars, or sent against dock workers as Hartke has proposed. The "peace plan" of Muskies, McGovern and the SWP is the plan for an Imperialist peace which will strengthen U.S. capitalism for new imperialist wars in new places. Only the "peace plan" of Lenin, i.e. "turning the guns the other way," leads to genuine peace.

NCLC Discovers "Class-for-Itself": SMC

When Senator Hartke consummated the pop front passions of the SWP and joined the NPAC steering committee, the International Socialists (IS) and the NCLC both decided to "relate constructively" (in the IS' phrase) and rushed in to sit on the same steering committee with red-baiter, strike-breaker Hartke. The SWP/YSA had expected that by enticing Hartke onto the NPAC steering committee the hordes of innocent Democratic youth would follow. Instead, traipsing after Hartke came the IS and NCLC.

A popular front is a coalition of nominal socialists with the bourgeoisie; its program must be limited to the bourgeoisie's program as long as the "socialists" desire the bourgeoisie's participation. To endorse a popular front or a conference whose purpose is to consummate a popular front is to endorse bourgeois politics. Even the IS, which enters everything mushy and class-collaborationist (from Peace and Freedom to the present New American Movement), lacked the stomach to endorse this SMC conference. The NCLC was the only nominally socialist group (aside from the SWP/YSA, the architects of the pop front) to join hands with Youth for McGovern and Youth for Muskies in endorsing this conference. Then, as the conference opened, the NCLC feigned naivete, hypocritically discovered the taint of class collaboration and withdrew their endorsement.

The NCLC's maneuvering within NPAC/SMC flows directly from its counterrevolutionary conception of what NPAC and SMC are: On one hand NCLC correctly characterizes them as class-collaborationist popular fronts; and on the other hand it offers the following characterization of SMC/NPAC in its resolution to the SMC conference titled "Working Class Alternatives in the Election Year":

"The practical question is therefore where and how to begin to create such alliances of initiating forces. For this purpose, the SMC and its sister, NPAC, organizations have certain special qualifications and, consequently, certain inescapable moral responsibilities. These two organizations chiefly typify the only existing institutions in the U.S. which bring together virtually all of the much smaller groups and individuals professing a commitment to the unified organization of working people against the present wage-gouging and other oppressive measures."

The only "class-for-itself" formation which represents the revolutionary interests of the working class and all the oppressed is the revolutionary vanguard party. Even soviets are simply organs of dual power and whether they serve the revolutionary interests of the working class is decided by the struggle of parties within the soviets. The Menshevik-dominated soviets in the Russian Revolution supported the imperialist war and broke strikes as ruthlessly as any bourgeois government. But the NCLC, which identifies popular fronts with soviets, would have entered the Kerevsky government and in the 1930's in the U.S. we would find them in the American League for Peace and Democracy, not in the CIO.

The NCLC's misconception of the class nature

of pop front formations extends to their equivocal position on the exclusion of the bourgeoisie. While they supported SL/RCY motions for the unconditional exclusion of the political representatives of the bourgeoisie, they did so only after constantly trying to dilute the class basis of these motions. Thus the NCLC report of the conference in their *New Solidarity* issue of 6-10 March:

"While the Spartacist League habitually introduces a blanket motion for unconditional exclusion of all capitalist candidates, the NCLC specified as the reason for exclusion McGovern's participation in the present capitalist assault on workers' living standards as indicated in the SWP factsheet on McGovern's anti-labor record and by his vote in the Senate three weeks previous to break the West Coast dock strike with a compulsory arbitration bill."

Were the Labor Committee in Britain they would have to support the exclusion of Harold Wilson from anti-war conferences on the basis that he has an equally bad labor record. Many American labor fakers, like the ones who sat on the Pay Board, support compulsory arbitration and other anti-labor offensives but there is no class basis for their exclusion (as opposed to denunciation) from the anti-war movement. They,



—New Solidarity

SL supporter demands expulsion of McGovern agent in SMC labor workshop.

and many ostensible socialists as well, are traitors within the working-class movement who must be exposed. The bourgeoisie must be excluded as the class enemy if the working class is to be independently mobilized against imperialist war. The purging of the class enemy is an absolute precondition for the exposure of the labor fakers and other class traitors.

The NCLC further compromised itself by passing out an open letter to the Detroit branch of the SWP which reaffirmed support for the SWP/YSA's physical beating and exclusion of the Spartacist and Progressive Labor/SDS supporters from the July NPAC conference. The letter stated:

"the NCLC... supported the exclusion of the disruptors and in fact considers the disruption to be a sabotage of an effective political challenge to the presence of bourgeois politicians."

In fact, the SL forces had called for a political debate on whether Hartke should be permitted to speak. The chairman, Jerry Gordon, shouted down our motion and it was never voted on. To have sat on one's hands while Hartke spoke and waited until the next day following his speech is an ineffective academic non-challenge to the presence of bourgeois politicians.

While condemning the SWP's Jenness-Pulley campaign as a "clown-show" the NCLC proposes as the "working-class electoral alternative" an electoral campaign which would "welcome active support for our campaign from the whole popula-

continued on page 8

SL-RCY (and others) Pop the Red Balloon

The history of the New Left was largely the history of the rise and fall of SDS. Cut off by a generation of war and cold war from the tradition of the "Old Left," (a loose term covering both the reformist FDR-supporting Communist Party and the revolutionary Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party, and other groups besides) the New Left of the 1960's tried unsuccessfully to produce its own ideology of social change, independent of both mainstream liberalism and Marxism. As SDS swung leftward, dropping its communist exclusion clause in 1965, every traditional tendency from official Stalinism (CP) to revolutionary communism (Spartacist League) plus hangovers predating Marxism (anarchism, terrorism) and the newer variants of Stalinism (PL "Maoism" and "Third Worldist" tendencies)—all began to gain followers in SDS. In the ensuing intense ideological struggle when spokesmen for the various tendencies had complete freedom to compete for hegemony, a major theoretical lesson was hammered out for many: that the working class is the modern agency of social revolution. Through their experience in SDS some petty-bourgeois radicals were able to overcome the oppressive weight of bourgeois ideology and re-learn the lesson set forth in the Communist Manifesto.

This lesson, if assimilated and put into practice, could have transformed the New Left into a socialist youth movement allied with, and facilitating the development of, an emerging left-wing opposition to the labor bureaucracy in the unions. Instead, the lesson was squandered and deformed. Following the politically clarifying split of SDS into two factions—a Third World vanguardist tendency (RYMs I and II and the Maoist RU) and a proletarian-vanguardist tendency (Worker-Student Alliance, led by PL and critically supported by the Spartacist League) both wings degenerated, the Third Worldists fairly rapidly, and PL/SDS over a longer period of time. Unable to break with Stalinism and link up in a principled way with left-opposition struggles in the unions based on the transitional program, PL/SDS retreated into campus parochialism and, somewhat later, more ordinary reformism. Thus the New Left as a whole disintegrated into scattered grouplets and individuals, leaving behind it recruits for the various organized tendencies and a considerable number of disillusioned cynics.

Raising the Dead

The New Left is now a corpse, but the leftover New Leftists try to revive it. Unfortunately for them, attempts to turn the clock back usually result in unforeseen and comical situations. The most ridiculous recent case validating this historic law was the ill-fated "Red Balloon Conference" which met at Stony Brook, New York on March 3-5. The conference was convened by the "Red Balloon Collective" of Stony Brook, a group professing basically Weatherman politics but

lacking Weatherman's dedication.

Leaders of the Red Balloon Collective apparently decided they wanted the New Left again—but this time without the ideological struggle which characterized the original New Left and was its healthiest component. In their convention call paper, *The Red Balloon*, the RB Collective laid out an amorphous but nonetheless real political line—a blend of Third World Stalinism (political support to the PRG and its peace proposals), black nationalism (asserting that the primary oppression of blacks is of a colonial nature, and glorifying black lumpenization), opposition to Newton on behalf of the Cleaver wing of Pantherism, and hippy lifestyleism (calling for "revolutionary" communes, food co-ops, etc. and for a "worker-freak alliance"). Smart enough to lack confidence in their own program (which was a compromise hammered out in the inner chambers of the Red Balloon) the RB Collective determined not to lay it open to critical scrutiny: the new New Left must be free of political discussion so that the politics of the Red Balloon could win out by default.

Thus, the RB prepared in advance an elaborate agenda designed to avert any possibility of political discussion. The pre-conference packet blatantly stated that "Floor debates have proven to

as irrelevant to the topic of the workshop, or, if presented, voted down due to lack of opportunity for full political discussion. Generally speaking, the RB's agenda was an ingenious bureaucratic device, which Stalin would have admired.

But the Red Balloon made one error which Stalin never made. Stalin's bureaucratized Comintern invited hard Stalinized cadres to its congresses; the Red Balloon sent its conference call far and wide. Imagine Stalin's dismay at three hundred anarcho-freaks turning up for a Comintern congress! This is exactly what happened to the Red Balloon as, from all corners of the country, from every underground-lumpen freak-yippy commune, all the victims and rejects of capitalist society, as well as a few subjectively revolutionary types, descended like a swarm of locusts on the "peaceful" college town of Stony Brook.

The SL/RCY also sent a small contingent with boxes of literature and a supply of leaflets titled "Pop the Red Balloon" which denounced the political line of the Red Balloon paper while calling for a defense of the group against police harassment. (Several days previously, while fighting the campus administration's ban on the conference, nineteen Red Balloonists had been arrested for "kidnapping" an administrator.) Red Balloonist

On Georg Lukacs' Dropping Dead

"Hegel wrote, in 1796, in the diary of his sojourn through the Bernese Alps, that '...the Christian imagination has produced nothing but an insipid legend.' It is not accidental that the images associated with Christianity—servility, sickness, corruption, weakness, degradation, masochism, cowardice, prostration—are the very images that define the life and work of Georg Lukacs, who recently did us the long-overdue courtesy of dropping dead. Uniting the mystic's propensity for sudden conversion and the most obsequious realism since Aquinas, Lukacs, for more than fifty years, specialized in adapting himself to, and justifying, the given reality in which he found himself. Thus his philosophical erudition and 'classicism' were put in the service of the reality of forced labor camps, the Moscow trials, 'socialist' realism, Stalin's destruction of the Bolshevik party and the degeneration of the Communist International."

Workers Vanguard is pleased to recommend to its readers the pamphlet beginning with the above quote, "In Memory of Georg Lukacs," published by the Surrealist Group, is available through Franklin Rosemont, 3714 North Racine Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60613. The pamphlet is a satisfying demystification of the leprous academic who for decades popularized all the works of Stalinism to gullible intellectuals.

be very costly to the unity of new organizations. That is why they have been eliminated here." The conference was to consist mainly of workshops organized around such topics as "racism," "sexism," etc. The brief plenary was to consist of motions raised and voted up by 2/3 majority in the workshops; the packet then stated "There will be NO proposals accepted from the floor of the plenary." The workshops themselves were all to be run by women (to combat self-confessed rampant male chauvinism) who were hardened Red Balloonists who would see that only the most banal discussions took place. Thus major political statements attacking the entire world-view of the Red Balloon and counterposing a revolutionary working-class orientation would have little chance of ever reaching the floor for general discussion as they would probably be declared out of order

response to the leaflet and the SL/RCY presence was, naturally, immediate hostility. The SL/RCYers had to insist upon their right to set up a literature table on an equal basis with other tendencies—the Red Balloon claimed exclusive right to allocate table space, using the argument that they had checked out the tables from the student union.

Agenda Collapses

When the conference began, the contradictions implicit in the whole situation became immediately apparent. It required one agenda motion from the SL/RCY (for a more extensive plenary in which motions could be raised) to break the elaborate structure set up by the Red Balloon. A straw vote revealed that half the conference rejected the RB's bureaucratic setup and desired general discussion—the SL/RCY because of political points it wished to make, the anarcho-freaks because of libertarianist objections to the bureaucratic agenda.

Thus the balloon burst before it got off the ground. The next two days were taken up with agenda squabbles and workshops. The SL/RCY called for a political plenary discussion, while the anarcho-freaks spent hours discussing their own sexism and setting up endless workshops with themes like "racism in our lives," "revolutionary food," "Jewish nationalism," "media," etc. After these developments the conference reached its low point.

The RB Collective and its co-conspirators began to ooze into two wings in the course of the conference. One wing leaned toward the creation of a "red party now," while the other wanted to retain the "mass radical youth organization" conception, modifying it into a sort of super coordinating committee clearing house for "the movement."

continued on page 8

Subscribe!

\$1.00 YEARLY

INCLUDES SPARTACIST

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

WORKERS VANGUARD

BOX 1377 / G.P.O. / NEW YORK / N.Y. 10001

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Monthly
Published by the Spartacist League

Editorial Board: Liz Gordon, Marv Treiger,
Nick Benjamin (managing editor).

Production manager: Karen Allen,
Circulation manager: Janet Rogers.

West Coast editor: Mark Small,
New England editor: George Foster.

Subscription: \$1 yearly (11 issues). Bundle rates for 10 or more copies. Address: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001. Telephone: WA 5-8234. Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint.

THE "TROTSKYISM" OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL



WAR AND THE WORKERS LEAGUE

In the current period of heightened inter-imperialist rivalry, the pressures of war will be reflected in increasing measure in the opportunism of sections of the workers movement which abandon their proclaimed struggle for international revolutionary solidarity of the workers in favor of support to one section or another of the imperialists struggling for a greater share of plunder. Our task becomes more urgent, therefore, to conduct a relentless exposure of workers' and radical organizations which now support, openly or backhandedly, bourgeois forces in war.

We analyze here one recent case of egregious betrayal of the working class by an ostensibly revolutionary, even "Trotskyist" organization. That the Workers League, the American section of the "International Committee for the Fourth International" of Tim Wohlforth and Gerry Healy, took its public stand in favor of the military moves of the Indian bourgeois government in the India-Pakistan war, responding to pressure no greater than the current relative popularity of the Indian action, indicates the certainty and depth of their future betrayals in wars of wider proportions and greater consequent pressure to betray to a section of the bourgeoisie. If the unbridled opportunism characteristic of the Workers League/Socialist Labour League combination is not politically expunged from the workers movement in time, revolutionists will write of them in future major wars as Lenin in 1915 characterized the policy of the social chauvinists of the Second International:

"Forty-four years after the Paris Commune, after half a century of the mustering and preparing of mass forces, the revolutionary class of Europe must, at the present moment, when Europe is passing through a catastrophic period, think of how to quickly become the lackey of its national bourgeoisie, how to help it plunder, violate, ruin and conquer other peoples, and how to refrain from launching, on a mass scale, direct revolutionary propaganda and preparation for revolutionary action."

—Lenin, "Imperialism and Socialism in Italy," Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 366.

Such was Lenin's paraphrasing of the Second International's position. We shall see why his fight for an independent working-class revolutionary policy in bourgeois wars retains burning importance today.

In the article "War, Revolution and Self-Determination" in the January 1972 number of *Workers Vanguard*, the Spartacist League analyzed the India-Pakistan war and the duty of revolutionists to seek the defeat of both governments and their armies in that war. The SL position flew in the face, as usual, of most of what was being said on the left; its opponents either directly supported the Indian army (Workers League/Socialist Labour League) or claimed that behind that army, despite it, with its help or because of it, somehow, was a national liberation struggle instead of its opposite; somehow the invading Indian army with its tanks and planes was being "used" by the Bengali workers and peasants. What remains of the "International Committee" of Tim Wohlforth and Gerry Healy explicitly stated: "We critically support the decision of the Indian bourgeois government to give military and economic aid to Bangla Desh" (*Bulletin*, 20 December 1971). We distinguished between aid from a bourgeois government and control by that government and noted that the Indian bourgeoisie had obviously taken control of the just Bengali self-determination struggle, and that a "self-determination struggle" under the total military and political control of another nation's bourgeoisie is something other than it claims to be.

Wohlforth "replied" to our characterization of the IC as "waterboy for the Indian army" in an

article "Spartacist Rediscovered Shachtman" in the 17 January 1972 issue of his *Bulletin*. The title refers to WV's view that in 1942 the stance of the Workers Party of Max Shachtman on the question of the Chinese "self-determination struggle" was more Leninist than that taken by the Socialist Workers Party led by James P. Cannon.

Spartacist's "Shachtmanism"

The central thrust of the WL's "reply" is to smear the SL as "Shachtmanites," i.e., as anti-Marxist renegades, and thereby cancel out the impact of our arguments (on Bangladesh, the WL position on the working-class character of the police, their role in the National Peace Action Coalition [NPAC] as left face of SWP class-collaboration documented in *Workers Action* #10, etc.) are having on Wohlforth's own ranks. He shelves any defense of his indefensible support to the Indian bourgeoisie in favor of slander and label-pasting, hoping thereby to escape the impossible task of answering what we said about his stand. After all, we may be right, but he has the method; and even when correct we are still abstentionist petty-bourgeois empiricist swine.

Wohlforth accuses the SL, together with the SWP, Red Mole, the OCI, etc., of sharing "...the same methodological and class position as the Shachtman group in 1940" [emphasis added]. The SWP majority in 1940 characterized the Shachtman-Burnham-Abern grouping as a petty-bourgeois current in flight from the working class and the imperative defense of the Soviet Union, and presumably that is now what the Wohlforthites tell each other the lot of us are.

According to Wohlforth "the direct connection between the present day abstentionists and their Shachtmanite ancestors is Spartacist." Whatever this may mean metaphysically to Wohlforth, it is the direct reverse of the facts, as anybody outside the Workers League should have the political knowledge to recognize. None of the groups attacked for "abstentionism" (SWP, Red Mole, the OCI, and the SL) trace their political or organizational ancestry to Shachtman's Workers Party/independent Socialist League/Young Socialist League; all of them to this day stand formally on the position of the Trotsky-Cannon Majority in the 1939-1940 SWP faction fight; they all maintain formal continuity on the question of the class nature of the Soviet Union and the necessity to defend it against imperialism; all regard the Shachtman-Burnham-Abern break a consequence of petty-bourgeois capitulation to anti-Soviet "democratic" imperialism. All of them! How the Pabloists (SWP, Red Mole) and the inverted Pabloists of Healy-Wohlforth's IC became revisionists had nothing to do with the issues of the 1939-1940 SWP fight, except in the elementary sense of the kinship of all varieties of revisionism and centrism. There is an organization which traces its ancestry to Shachtman—the International Socialists—and they are not mentioned in Wohlforth's essay on Shachtmanism! (The IS' "two wars" position on Bangladesh was criticized in the WV article.)

Wohlforth quotes a section from our above-mentioned article in the January WV (leaving the source unidentified so as to make it tougher to look up) which raised the similarity between the slogan of self-determination for China in the circumstances of World War II and support for Bengali "self-determination" under conditions of total Indian control of that movement. We referred to Shachtman's conclusion "that such support was merely backhanded assistance to U.S. imperialism which not only merely assisted, but controlled the Chinese forces."

Wohlforth's "answer" avoids the China-India analogy, the question of the U.S. in China in World War II, and the question of Bangladesh independence—which is what our article was about. The section of the article he does quote was aimed not at Wohlforth, but at the more circumspect SWP, whose objective support to India was backhanded. In the section dealing with Wohlforth, titled "Healyite 'Principles' Oil the Tanks," we wrote:

"The SWP 'merely' justifies the capitulation of the Bangla Desh leaders to the Indian army; the Healyites openly support the Indian bourgeoisie's army."

This characterization was not surmise on our part. We quoted the *Bulletin* text:

"We [the 'International Committee'] critically support the decision of the Indian bourgeois government to give military and economic aid to Bangla Desh."

Since the WV's view that the IC "has proclaimed itself waterboy for the Indian bourgeoisie's army," was based on a literal reading of the very words they wrote in their press, no one should be surprised that Wohlforth does not deal with them. No chance. Why attempt to defend a grotesque betrayal? Wohlforth quotes our reference to Shachtman's position on China in World War II, and lets fly. WV had said:

"In a polemic with the SWP in 1942 it fell to Max Shachtman's lot to place the general principle of support to self-determination struggles within a context of Leninist regard for concrete reality. The issue was China. Should socialists support China's war against Japanese imperialism on the grounds of self-determination for China, or had such support become merely, as Shachtman charged, backhanded assistance to U.S. imperialism which not merely assisted, but controlled the Chinese forces?"

He replies:

"Every word [of the SL passage] is like a textbook example of the reactionary empirical method of the petty bourgeoisie. First Max Shachtman is abstracted from... Max Shachtman, [Bulletin's dots] It just happened to 'fall' to Shachtman, who had just committed a criminal split with Trotsky deserting the defense of the Soviet Union under the class pressure of imperialism, to defend Leninist principle! Shachtman himself is broken up into a series of episodes and positions some of which are correct and some incorrect. This in itself represents a complete abandonment of theoretical thought."

The generous, openminded reader, might be inclined to think that while the argument is admittedly murky and inept, where the *Bulletin* creates so much smoke there must be fire. The smoke turns out to be but dust as Wohlforth thrashes his straw man.

What Is Shachtmanism?

The character of Shachtmanism and the experience of the Workers Party is indeed fit material for discussion among Marxists. Wohlforth raises it to pose as "defender of Trotsky." For Wohlforth—in order to lend horror to his label—must assert that the break with the SWP in 1940 over the question of Soviet defensism was an immediate repudiation of all Marxist principles—hereafter the SWP majority would be right on all disputed questions, and the "Shachtmanites" wrong on all of them. To assert anything else would be breaking Shachtman up "into a series of episodes and positions some of which are correct and some incorrect" and a "complete abandonment of theoretical thought." That this nonsense can be passed off in public without flinching as the embodiment of "Marxist method" is an indictment not of Shachtmanism but the abysmal political miseducation carried on inside the WL. It runs counter to the experience and practice of Marx, Lenin, and Trotsky; it is a cultist argument at-

continued on next page

Continued from Page 5

tractive to a Stalin-Wohlforth-Catholic mentality but death to Marxists. It effectively denies the Leninist conception of both democratic centralism and the united front; it turns regroupment like that between the Bolsheviks and Trotsky's *Mezhrayontsi* in 1917 into capitulation not fusion. It flies in the face of reality in that during the war years there was substantial agreement between the SWP and the WP on the issues they faced, much to the confusion of militant workers and the radical public generally. This led to the two organizations holding unity negotiations in 1946 to consider whether sufficient agreement existed between them to establish a fused party. Further, during the years 1940-46 the Workers Party considered itself, and was considered by European Fourth International sections, as co-thinkers of the Fourth International.

Wohlforthian Method: Cultist Cretinism

Wohlforth's reasoning on what he fancies is "petty bourgeois empiricism" is childish, stupid, and anti-Marxist to the core. On one level, of course we must break Shachtmanism up "into a series of episodes some of which are correct and some incorrect." Wohlforth claims to be both a Leninist and a Trotskyist. To do so he must either employ the method he labels "empiricism" or simply ignore the intense polemics Lenin and Trotsky waged against each other for years. Obviously in those episodes one or the other, but not both and maybe neither, was correct. Trotsky was won over to Lenin's conception of the organizational question and Lenin came to accept Trotsky's stand on the Permanent Revolution and the tasks of the proletariat in the democratic revolution. No intelligent study of the years before the October Revolution can fail to show that Lenin was wrong as against Trotsky on an aspect of their task, and vice versa. We do not claim that either Max Shachtman or J. P. Cannon were ever Marxists of the stature of Lenin or Trotsky. But only a political imbecile, a cultist pseudo-Marxist can ignore the fact that generally healthy Marxist organizations and leaders have been wrong, or took inadequate positions on particular issues for periods of time; and that even groups standing generally to their right occasionally took superior positions on particular issues at a given time. Wohlforth's denunciations of the SL for noting that Shachtman espoused what we consider a correct position on the Chinese issue shortly after his "criminal split with Trotsky" only shows his dread of critical analysis. What Wohlforth calls "the reactionary empirical method of the petty bourgeoisie"—i.e., careful investigation into all the issues in a political dispute such as that between the SWP and WP—Lenin considered essential in politics, and remarked that anyone who did not study the issues for himself "can be dismissed with a simple gesture of the hand."

Was it not Stalin who argued that to separate Trotsky's critique of bureaucratic degeneration in a workers state after the revolution from Trotsky's centrist-Menshevik position on organizational questions before the revolution constituted an abandonment of Marxism—that Trotsky, wrong earlier on the one question, had to be wrong on the other? Or conversely, was it not Stalin again who argued that to separate Lenin of the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" from Lenin the builder of the democratic centralist Bolshevik party constituted the grossest heresy?

In point of fact, it "just happened to fall" to Lenin to first abstract Lenin from... Lenin, to refute his "old self" in the April Theses. He had been an "Old Guard" within the Party and the main proponent of a now outmoded theory. Lenin's new position approximated Trotsky's correct theory that the dictatorship of the proletariat (in alliance with the peasantry) could be established in Russia without a prior European socialist revolution or a period of workers and peasants democratic dictatorship.

Has Wohlforth utterly forgotten that Trotskyism itself became a system only as a theoretical response to Stalin's progressive abandonment of the hard conclusions of the October Revolution, on the one hand, and Trotsky's shedding of his earlier, "episodic" position on the party on the other?

Stalin, like Wohlforth, began with the proposition: The masters of Marxism are infallible and the renegades are wholly bankrupt. The cult Stalin built around Lenin was only preparatory to the one he built around himself. Stalin accomplished

this not solely through the building of statues and the recitation of incantations, but through a theory of the direct coincidence of truth with a single individual's thought until that individual and not his positions become the ultimate authority. The application of Trotsky's theory of uneven and combined development to the realm of cognition provides a useful antidote to this Stalinist-Wohlforthite theory.

There is another aspect of Wohlforthian methodology we need to take up for a moment. Wohlforth's celestial dialectic refuses to descend to the worldly plane. When we acknowledged Shachtman's role on the Chinese question of 1942, we did so on the basis of his placing "the general principle of support to self-determination struggles within a context of Leninist regard for concrete reality" against Wright of the SWP. It is not because we consider China of 1942 exactly analogous to Bangladesh in 1972 but rather because Shachtman's methodology was consistently Leninist in those articles.

When we consider the concrete, if you please, criteria of support to Chiang over which Wright and Shachtman argued, it resolves to whether military aid and strategic military subordination through imperialist control of the general staff (General Stillwell's command) was a sufficient basis to decisively transform Chiang's anti-Japanese struggle into an appendage of U.S. imperialism. Shachtman thought so; Wright did not.

What Wohlforth has overlooked is that both Shachtman and Wright, the WP and the SWP, agreed that a U.S. army invasion would make the question moot and of course subordination to imperialist arms would be unmistakable.

The physical presence of the Indian army backing up the military command of General Aurora places Wohlforth against Shachtman, Lenin, and the SWP! If there were a Dantean Inferno to which Wohlforth were consigned, it would consist of him endlessly fleeing all the figures, revolutionary and centrist alike, who were after this political bandit's hide.

Shortly after the WP's repudiation of Soviet defensism and its split from the SWP, James Burnham split with the WP majority to find his place in ultra-right politics thereby lessening the internal pressure for a consistent anti-Marxist generalization. Shachtman and Abern continued to consider themselves Trotskyists until after the end of World War II, and in a few cases—and the question of support to Chiang Kai-Shek's China during the Pacific War was one of them—the Workers Party was correct as against the SWP. Anyone who reads it will discover that Shachtman's argument was essentially an "orthodox" gloss on Lenin's position on Serbia and Poland during World War I, applying the criteria Lenin developed to the new imperialist war.

That the SWP could be wrong on an issue should hardly surprise Wohlforth. In his own pamphlet "The Struggle for Marxism in the United States," Wohlforth characterizes the period of World War II as one in which "American Radicalism Reasserts Itself," arguing that the SWP was then slipping into narrow "orthodoxy," able to "reassert" past positions but not creatively apply Marxist principles to new situations—a polite way of saying that their positions were wrong or inadequate on a number of things. Is it then Wohlforth's position that no one could be right on those questions?

In the long run, under the enormous pressure of U.S. imperialism, the Shachtmanites, left to their own devices, had to find themselves in the camp of that same imperialism. That happened, but not according to the Workers League's latest timetable—it took seventeen years from the split in 1940 before the reconciliation of the WP with American social democracy took place. It is not inconceivable that the whole process of the WP's disintegration could have been reversed had reunification with the SWP taken place before the full pressure of the cold war atmosphere bore down on both organizations. Certainly between the years 1940-46 the WP was no literary exponent of world imperialism, as one would infer from the Bulletin, but rather a left centrist party whose members seriously desired a communist revolution. The disintegration and decay of the WP must be analyzed in the same way as the demise of the revolutionary SWP, as a process by which the SWP moved to a severe deformation as a revolutionary party by 1953, when the principle of internationalism was undercut, to rightward moving centrism as the SWP totally embraced Fidel Castro in 1961, to 1965, when they joined hands as reformists with the liberal imperialists in the anti-war popular front.

To leave the question here would merely invite

more WL sneers about "evolutionary method." The "Shachtmanite" slander is too valuable for Wohlforth to give up voluntarily; it is a time-worn anathema which has allowed him and the SWP to evade answering our charges of betrayal to their ranks. But it is easily exploded.

Wohlforth vs. Wohlforth—Again

In 1962 the forerunners of the Spartacist League and the present Wohlforth grouping were members of an oppositional minority tendency in the SWP. At the behest of Gerry Healy of the English SLL Wohlforth sought control of the tendency, and failing to win a majority, consummated an unprincipled split within its ranks. We have



WAR AND THE WORKERS

published the documents of this rupture in Marxist Bulletin #3: *The Split in the Revolutionary Tendency*. The first document in the collection is a letter from James Robertson to Geoffrey White, written a month before the break was carried out, detailing the machinations of Wohlforth in preparing the split. It reads:

"Tim Wohlforth gives every evidence of ardently desiring the Robertson-Ireland wing of the tendency out of the Minority and out of the party, and the sooner the better—as witness his concluding remarks at the last NYC tendency meeting: 'Robertson's covertly for a split within a few months. If Jim goes, good riddance!' And of course there is the 'break all ties, deepen the breach' tone and language of his document. Cannon wrote more mildly of Shachtman in 1940, though Tim obviously believes he and I are the exact reincarnations of those two. So driven is he to create a panic mood of hate to consummate a split of the tendency that to add to the compound picture of a petty bourgeois grouping of the upper West Side's middle-class 103 St. fleeing the proletarian factory quarters at 101 St. that poor old Tim snarls and foams at any decent comrade daring to call the Shachtmanites of 1941-46 a left-centrist grouping. To cite Tim Wohlforth against Tim Wohlforth, however:

"We can now get an accurate picture of the political development of the Shachtman tendency. It was born in 1940 as a petty bourgeois opposition within the Trotskyist movement. It went through a 'second split' with the mass exodus of those who rode the opposition bloc out of the movement altogether. It then launched a party and attempted to compete with the SWP to be the Trotskyist party in this country. It contained at this time divergent tendencies which pushed it in different directions. It had within it tendencies which wished a reconciliation with the SWP by building a united Trotskyist party. It had other tendencies which forced it to the right—to a definitive break with Trotskyism in 1946. We can characterize the WP of this period as a left centrist grouping of unstable composition which couldn't quite decide exactly where it was going. Then following the 1946 WP-SWP unity affair and with the opening of the cold-war witch hunt, it began to move to the right at an accelerated pace, transforming itself from a competing ten-

dency within the Trotskyist movement into a centrist "third camp" tendency which felt itself antagonistic to Trotskyism as well as to reformism. It stayed only for a relatively short time in this centrist limbo as it soon struck out in an open reformist direction, seeking today to become the loyal left wing of the social democracy." (page 22, *What Makes Shachtman Run?*, Tim Wohlforth, August, 1957.)

The characterizing of the WP is a small matter as it relates to our needs, but it is very big for one thing which is easily obscured by charges and accusations—who is serious toward our history and theory and who has bent and twisted them for petty factional gain and to try to make a wrong line look good?" [our emphasis]

—The Split in the Revolutionary Tendency, pp. 2-3.



Behind the Facade: At left, Workers League demonstration; below, the Indian tanks WL supported move into Bangladesh.



S LEAGUE

In 1964 Wohlforth stated the following on the SWP which he now holds up against Shachtman as absolutely right on the China issue:

"... The theoretical sterility of the SWP goes much farther back than that [1940] having its roots in Cannon's empirical bloc with Trotsky covering the whole period from 1928 to 1940. Cannon and the SWP's leading cadres never attempted to master the Marxist method. It was Trotsky's job to develop theory and Cannon's job to build an organization around his theories. This division of labor broke down with the Shachtman fight in 1940 when a good half of the party was lost to petty bourgeois revisionism and the rest saved largely by Trotsky supplanting the SWP leadership in the struggle."

—Tim Wohlforth, letter to Robertson, 12 August 1964 in ACFI "Information Bulletin No. 1" (undated) referring to the SL-ACFI unity negotiations. [our emphasis]

Thus Wohlforth in 1964 considered the American Trotskyists from the time of their founding to be totally lacking in revolutionary capacity and nothing more than organizational hacks in a bloc with Trotsky. The implicit conclusion, of course, is that Wohlforth is this country's first Marxist! But more important than Wohlforth's pathetic self-glorification is the logic of his argument, for given his characterization of the SWP surely it is axiomatic that without Trotsky the SWP, if it took any correct positions at all, must have arrived at them by dumb luck or sterile reflexive orthodoxy!

Wohlforth's twisting of history for petty factional gain is the same now as in 1962. The purpose, like the method, is analogous. A number of leaders of the SWP oppositional grouping which became the Revolutionary Tendency (RT) in 1961 had come over to Trotskyism from Shachtman's dissolving ISL/YSL, among them Mage, Robertson and Wohlforth. The SWP leadership carried out a slander barrage against all these leaders, who had broken from Shachtmanism, as "unreconstructed Shachtmanites." The individuals who were to go on to found the SL insisted on a serious evaluation of the degeneration and decay of the Shachtmanite organizations, as they were to do with the partly

parallel breakdown of the SWP. Wohlforth was then looking for an opening to make common cause with the Dobbs leadership to smash the Robertson-Mage-White grouping. The fraudulent issue of "Shachtmanism" arose, and Wohlforth jumped at the chance to use it, despite the fact that he was one of the central targets of the SWP's slander! As then, so now: to get the SL, he establishes another bloc with the SWP, reaching across ten years in time, to underwrite his contention that the SWP was right to expel these people, since all the time they were only concealed Shachtmanites! Now as then he continues to offer aid and credence to the SWP Pabloists as their loyal opposition, asking only one thing—get the Spartacist League!

Parenthetically, one can trace a political origin to many of the present and past SL cadres and leaders that is different from that typical of the WL-SWP: namely origins in the CPUSA! Thus Geoff White was a state chairman of the CP and Smith Act indictee; Ed L., a long-time CP trade union cadre; Jim Robertson, a CP youth activist; and then Harry Turner, buried for years in a CP underground cell. These were later joined by Dave Cunningham of the Iowa CP and Marv Treiger from the Los Angeles CP. All these comrades were led to Trotskyism out of the clash between their subjective revolutionary impulses and the realities of Stalinism, i.e. a recapitulation of the road of the original Left Opposition itself.

In 1957 when Wohlforth was struggling to be a Marxist and not a political bandit he characterized rather well the pressures and dynamics which made the WP "a left centrist grouping of unstable composition which couldn't quite decide where it was going" in the period before its definitive break with Trotskyism in 1946. According to Wohlforth today, his own analysis in 1957 can only be breaking Shachtman up "into a series of episodes, some of which are correct and some incorrect," which is "a textbook example of the reactionary empirical method of the petty bourgeoisie." Wohlforth says that in such an approach "Max Shachtman is abstracted from... Max Shachtman"; we can only observe that the above counterpositioning indicates that, by Wohlforth methodology, Wohlforth is dissolved into... Wohlforth. Hegel observed about the reflective nature of philosophy that "the owl of Minerva flies only at dusk"; Wohlforth's owl flies deaf, drunk and night-blind.

Now, nearly ten years after the split in the RT, Wohlforth brings up the same charges, in the same manner, for an even baser purpose. This time Wohlforth uses the "Shachtmanism" slander to cover his bloc with a section of the Indian bourgeoisie and the Indian army, a bloc which the logic of Marxism and class struggle dictates can only be ultimately directed against the workers and peasants of India and Bangladesh and the revolutionary movement.

Those Little Dots

Wohlforth begins his piece with a quote from Trotsky:

"Throughout all the vacillations and convulsions of the opposition, contradictory though they may be, two general features run like a guiding thread from the pinnacles of theory down to the most trifling political episodes. The first general feature is the absence of a unified conception... History becomes transformed into a series of improvisations. We have here in the full sense of the term the disintegration of Marxism, the disintegration of theoretical thought, the disintegration of politics into its constituent elements. Empiricism and its foster brother, impressionism, dominate from top to bottom... Throughout the vacillations and convulsions of the opposition, there is a second general feature intimately bound up with the first, namely, a tendency to refrain from active participation, a tendency to self-elimination, to abstentionism, naturally under cover of ultra-radical phrases.... Hot on the trail of 'concrete' political tasks in words, the opposition actually places itself outside the historical process."

One wouldn't know it from the Bulletin text, but the quote from Trotsky which Wohlforth has adduced against the SL is taken from Trotsky's "An Open Letter to Comrade Burnham" included in *In Defense of Marxism*. More than the source is omitted. By omitting Trotsky's reference to what positions he was criticizing, Wohlforth's quote amounts to no better than a forgery of Trotsky's words. What politics of Burnham's is Trotsky characterizing? Omitted from Wohlforth's selection are Trotsky's references to "Hitler and Stalin in Poland; Stalin and Mannerheim in Finland." Trotsky is referring to Burnham's refusal to defend the Soviet state and his hostile attitude toward the dialectic and to the question of the class difference between that state and its bourgeois-imperialist enemies. That is the first point: it was not for refusing military support to a bourgeois

state (in any kind of war) that Trotsky and the SWP majority denounced the Burnham-Shachtman-Abern minority. It was for their responsiveness to bourgeois public opinion running against such support to the Soviet Union. See any difference there, Cde. Wohlforth? Or is that hair-splitting over "concrete reality" again?

Wohlforth: Revolutionary Defeatism Equals Abstentionism

Next point: Wohlforth hopes that a smokescreen of quotations from Trotsky written against positions entirely different from the SL's will convince the reader that a position, clearly stated, against both of two warring bourgeois armies is—abstentionism! A really abstentionist organization would have evaded an analysis of the war, or claimed simply that wars are tragic events for the workers. The SL took the position of revolutionary defeatism against both Indian and Pakistani bourgeois governments and their armies. That Wohlforth calls abstentionism. He gets involved, he takes sides—no abstentionist he, no indeed!—he pitched right into the fray on the side of one of the bourgeois robbers! The policy of revolutionary defeatism in a bourgeois war meant something rather different, for Trotsky, than standing "outside the historical process." Wohlforth doesn't say so of course, but he has condemned Lenin's entire policy during World War I as "abstentionist," and "empiricist" besides, since Lenin was manifestly concerned with "concrete conditions." Wohlforth's "anti-abstentionism" is that of the betraying Second International which also took sides—lots of them—bourgeois sides.

Wohlforth: Britain Equals Pakistan

Third point: in case any one of his readers is quick to notice the class distinction between the Soviet state—which was what the 1939-40 debate was about—and the bourgeois Indian state, Wohlforth immediately dishes up another non-sequitur to cloud the issue doubly. At least in this instance his quote does refer to India. Thus the following from Trotsky, again offered without source:

"India is participating in the imperialist war on the side of Great Britain. Does this mean that our attitude toward India—not the Indian Bolsheviks but INDIA—is the same as toward Great Britain? If there exists in this world, in addition to Shachtman and Burnham, only two imperialist camps, then where, permit me to ask, shall we put India? A Marxist will say that despite India's being an integral part of the British Empire and India's participating in the imperialist war, despite the perfidious policy of Gandhi and other nationalist leaders, our attitude toward India is altogether different from our attitude toward England. We defend India against England."



Tim Wohlforth

That is a good statement of the SL position: it too defends India against England, against the U.S., and the rest. Now where, Cde. Wohlforth, did Trotsky defend an Indian war against Pakistan, or before that state's existence, against Afghanistan, Burma, Iran or China? You raise the question of wars and the colonial world. Name one instance in which Lenin or Trotsky urged or supported a war by any colony, client state, or imperialist-dominated backward nation against another. By Bolivia against Peru? By Iran against Turkey? Does Wohlforth presume to bend reality (or his despised "concrete conditions") to fit Trotsky's position on a fundamentally different issue so far as to assert that Pakistan is imperialist like the U.S. or Britain while India is Pakistan's colony in rebellion? A war between Britain and India is of course a different matter for Marxists than a war between Britain and Germany. But a war between one tinpot semi-colonial bourgeoisie and another such bourgeoisie is not different in this respect from a war between two great imperialist powers. Neither India nor Pakistan is a colony of the other. To the assertion that East Bengal had a semi-colonial relationship to West Pakistan, against which the Indian army made war, a Marxist would have to reply that Tanganyika was a colony of Hohenzollern Germany; Britain warred against Germany in World War I—did Lenin support Britain against Germany? Or advise the Tanganyikans to invite British control to aid the war against Germany? He supported the right of the Irish to accept

continued on next page

Continued from Page 7

WAR AND THE WORKERS LEAGUE

German arms—that did not amount to German control of the republican movement. (Because of "concrete reality," again, Wohlforth.) But Lenin certainly did not urge the Kaiser to send armies to Ireland, which would have meant trading the British yoke for the German, and one cannot conceive of a statement from him, "We Bolsheviks critically support the decision of the Hohenzollern government to send arms to the Irish rebels." He did not support no matter how critically the unsupportable motives of the German government; he supported the independent and entirely different motives of the Irish rebels, who were so situated that the German "help" was not occupation or control—their struggle remained independent.

In fact Trotsky's quote above comes down on the opposite side of Wohlforth's position. Does Trotsky favor the assistance from the subject Indian nation to Britain in its war? He condemns the Indian nationalist leaders for that policy—and he would have condemned the Bengali nationalists' support to the adventure of conquest by the Indian bourgeoisie.

Fourth point: in the "Conclusions" section of Trotsky's "An Open Letter to Comrade Burnham" from which Wohlforth tore a quote, stands a paragraph his supporters would do well to ponder. Wohlforth lumps the SL with Shachtman in alleged disregard for principle, for theory, for veering about according to petty-bourgeois impressionism, Trotsky said:

"The politics of a party has a class character. Without a class analysis of the state, the parties and ideological tendencies, it is impossible to arrive at a correct political orientation. The party must condemn as vulgar opportunism the attempt to determine policies in relation to the USSR from incident to incident and independently of the class nature of the Soviet state."

The WL owes an explanation of why it is necessary to proceed from the class nature of the Soviet

What Lenin Thought of the "Abstention" Charge

In 1915 Lenin wrote a polemic against the Italian social chauvinists who urged Italian entry into World War I on the side of Britain and France. Our quotation begins with Lenin's paraphrase of the reformist position of a certain Barboni:

"Neutrality is a narrow-minded egoism, a non-understanding of the international situation; it is baseness towards Belgium, and 'absenteeism', and 'the absent are always wrong' says Barboni, entirely in the spirit of Plekhanov and Axelrod. But since there are two legal parties in Italy, one reformist and the other a Social-Democratic labour party, and since in that country it is impossible to fool the public by covering up the nudity of the Potresovs, Cherevanins, Levitskys and Co. with the fig-leaf of Chkheidze's Duma group or of the Organising Committee, Barboni frankly admits the following:

"From this point of view I see more revolutionism in the activities of the reformist socialists, who have been quick to realise the enormous importance that such a change in the political situation [in consequence of a victory over

German militarism] will have for the future anti-capitalist struggle, and who, with perfect consistency, have espoused the cause of the Triple Entente, than there is in the tactics of the official revolutionary socialists who, like a tortoise, have hidden under a shell of absolute neutrality'....

"In conclusion, we would like to note that, confronted by a workers' party, Barboni attempts to use sophistry so as to play up to the workers' revolutionary instincts. The internationalist socialists of Italy, who are opposed to a war which in fact is being waged for the imperialist interests of the Italian bourgeoisie, are depicted by him as adherents of a cowardly abstinence, a selfish desire to hide from the horrors of war...."

—Lenin, "Imperialism and Socialism in Italy," *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 364-365.

state in determining our attitude toward its military moves, yet we stand condemned as reactionary empiricists when we proceed from the class nature of the Indian state!

Wohlforth as Merlin

The obscurantist, now-you-see-it-now-you-don't character of the "dialectic" developed by Stalin and Mao and adopted by Healy and Wohlforth could not possibly be illustrated more clearly than by the following syllogism, all parts of which are taken directly from his "Spartacist Rediscovers Shachtman." 1) The IC openly offered "critical support" to the military move of the Indian bourgeois government. 2) The SL urged revolutionary



Max Shachtman

defeatism on both sides. 3) The SL policy is abstentionism, i.e., the SL did not take a stand. 4) "Not taking a stand" means standing with the bourgeoisie. 5) Therefore the SL stood with the bourgeoisie.

And so support of the bourgeoisie becomes support of the working class; the call to workers to practice revolutionary defeatism becomes support of the bourgeoisie. Even Kautsky,

who had to mislead a more sophisticated audience, never sank to an argument so stupid and patently illogical.

All the lies, all the twisted logic and the distortion of Trotskyist history, theory and tradition, all the slanders about "Shachtmanism" peddled to his supporters, will not be enough to wash the bloody disgrace from Wohlforth's and Healy's hands. They deliberately turned a section of the workers movement, raw uneducated would-be communists, into recruiting agents for a bourgeois army. The degenerated Second and Third Internationals sold out for far higher stakes; Healy-Wohlforth's betrayal will not win them janitors' jobs, much less cabinet posts. ■



Creature at left of Bulletin cartoon received Bulletin's "critical support."

Continued from Page 4

There were charges of bureaucratic manipulation, sexism, etc. within the ranks of the RBers since many prominent among the "red party now" tendency had originally been callers of the conference. The inner politics of the Red Balloon bore a curious similarity to the old inner circles of RYM/SDS. The mass organization presumably operated on the basis of "participatory democracy" which in practice meant anarchy up front and manipulation behind the scenes by the real decision-makers who met in continuous secret sessions. In SDS it took the form of the National Office Collective (Klonsky-Coleman-Dohrn) until Weatherman formed their own leadership group in the Weatherbureau and successfully contested the NO for power.

Stalinist-Third Worldist politics are doomed from their own internal contradictions to endless vacillation from sectarian partyism to opportunist movementism and back again. Weatherman at a certain point proclaimed itself the embryo of a "fighting red army" and then after a few quick defeats hid underground. Unable to link the party to the class through a transitional program and transitional organizations in a principled way, the RBers, as all Stalinists, rely on maneuvers.

Under the pall cast over the Conference by our initial agenda fight, the RBers met in a selective and exclusive caucus (the SL/RCY was voted out

...Red Balloon

of the meeting) to map out a new Grand Strategy. The shift to the "red party" conception under the circumstances amounted objectively to and reflected psychologically a cowardly desertion of the troops they had amassed from around the country. The conference never really ended. It simply dissipated, suggesting that the secret weapon in the hands of the local authorities was simply to let things go on as planned. In the minds of the incurably self-deceiving RBers, after appropriate "self-criticisms" the conference may appear to have "transcended" itself into a super pan-Red Balloon caucus of the really real revolutionists.

Revolutionary Committee Chases Balloon

Into this swamp charged the knights of the "Revolutionary Committee" (recent splitoff from Youth Against War and Fascism), who had busily been rousing the hopes of radically inclined prison inmates and others in the great prospects for the conference. The Revolutionary Committee attempted to save the day by rallying the demoralized into the special caucus. This grouplet, which formed the left appendage and loyal opposition of the Red Balloon, has a penchant for taking up the cudgels of the lost causes of assertedly left Stalinist bureaucrats after they have lost. They style themselves Marcyites without Marcy (YAWF head)

who, according to them represents the real continuity with Trotskyism (even though shorn of Trotsky); they simultaneously take up the banner of Lin Piao (real Maoism without Mao) only to find themselves vending deflated Red Balloons for the real balloon vendors who had themselves collapsed.

The spectacle of the Red Balloon Conference differed from its RYM-SDS predecessor in another telling respect. Throughout the Conference one noticed a distinctly listless atmosphere. Despite all the prattle about "new" or "liberated" life styles, despite all the bizarre trappings of anarcho-freakism, the Red Balloon Conference showed itself unable to generate any real enthusiasm for a return to the bankrupt New Left, whose best elements long ago transcended radical petty-bourgeois populism in favor of a proletarian struggle perspective.

Despite its built-in self-destruct mechanisms, the Red Balloon or something like it may someday get off the ground and hover for a time. Workers Vanguard encourages its readers to guard against such a potential nuisance by adopting a simultaneous policy of consistently laughing them to scorn while providing principled defense for them against state repression. Insights useful for both tactics are offered in the free leaflet, "Pop the Red Balloon," available from Workers Vanguard. ■

Continued from Page 1

CLASS AGAINST CLASS!

Rule of Proletariat or Iron Fist of Reaction

Today's struggles in Ireland pose two alternatives: either the revolutionary ripping away of the oppressive old state, not only the Orange but also the Green, and the wielding of secular state power by the united Irish working class; or else a counterrevolutionary blood bath as sectarian fascism seizes upon the chaos of militant struggles which disrupt bourgeois "order" but cannot bring down the bourgeois state. The former course would lead almost immediately to a revolutionary upsurge throughout the area and the possibility of creating a socialist federation of the British Isles, a spectre to terrify all of bourgeois Europe. The latter situation of prolonged social instability and violence is the present course of the Irish upsurge, fitting closely what Trotsky described as the conditions for a fascist overthrow of bourgeois democracy, with its iron fist shattering all working-class organs of struggle.

If the struggle in the North reaches the point of social overturn, with the working class directly threatening the rule of the imperialist-petty-bourgeois bloc, the old order will find its surest and most energetic allies in the Green Tories of Southern reaction.

Nationalism: From Bomb to Portfolio

Ireland has not suffered from a lack of militant struggle. As in so many other instances, however, even the subjectively best of the Irish militants have soon stumbled over that most disorienting of all questions facing the workers movement: the national question. The splinter republican movement which led the 1916 struggles became, in the space of a few years, a complacent and reactionary national ruling class. What arose in 1916 was both a foretaste and a warning, though insufficient and distorted, for the social struggles in Ireland now.

Orange Needs Green

The northern counties under the Faulkner government at Stormont are integrated both militarily (direct army occupation since 1969 and direct political control from last March 24) and structurally into the English state and economy (with its "welfare state" appendage). The Faulkner government enjoys a wide base of support among the northern Protestant majority, petty-bourgeois and working-class alike. If it is true that the regime's support derives in large part from the fanning of age-old obscurantist anti-Catholic prejudices, it is nevertheless also true that the clerical-reactionary "Green Tory" Catholic state in the South appears to northern working-class Protestants not as a liberator but as an oppressive menace, worse than Faulkner and the British. So long as the South remains what it is, the observer must not allow either distaste of Stormont and London nor sympathy for the centuries of wrong done the Irish Catholics to obscure the fact that Protestants in the North as a bloc stand unalterably opposed to unification with the present Eire. No revolutionary strategy which does not take account of this elemental fact can be anything but dangerous phrasemaking. How strong and uniform this Protestant sentiment is can be gauged by the fact that the present government came to power one year ago as opponents of the former Premier, Chichester-Clark, on a "get-tough" program aimed at the IRA and Catholic agitation for civil rights. This reactionary mass sectarian attitude is the result of previous British machinations—"playing the Orange card," in Churchill's phrase—but it is no longer British policy. The sectarian mentality of the Protestant masses is today fed primarily by the immense gift to sectarian demagoguery offered by the reactionary and miserably poor state in the South. The present intransigence of the northern Protestants in fact stands as an obstacle to the present preferred British imperialist policy toward Ireland—the dismantling of direct rule in favor of a federal, neo-colonial solution for all Ireland as the countries go into the European Economic Community.



Peter L. Gould

The national question is the stumbling block of the Irish revolution, and Irish nationalism divides the working class and is hence reactionary, i.e. nationalism must be smashed by working-class unity—this much is true, but a partial and one-sided truth. Nationalism will remain and grow if the leaders of the working class do not eliminate its appeal through a recognition of the reality of national oppression and a working-class program to combat that oppression and the national backwardness and chauvinism it engenders to the great profit of the bourgeoisie.

To demand recognition of the right to self-determination, i.e. the right to secession and a separate state, does not imply that Marxists necessarily advocate that the workers actually take such a step.

For Ireland, Marxists must put forward a series of linked demands against the existing oppression; some will be expressions of the ultimate goal of communist unity across present state boundaries, while others represent an interim need to undercut nationalism through offering hard guarantees to the sectors of the working class presently pitted against each other.

FOR THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR AN INDEPENDENT, DEMOCRATIC ULSTER—FOR THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND IN A COMPLETELY SECULAR, DEMOCRATIC IRISH STATE; THEREFORE NEITHER ORANGE NOR GREEN BUT A WORKERS REPUBLIC! Through posing the first demand, we seek to cut across the legitimate aspects of the Protestant workers' fears of domination by the present, clerical reactionary state in the South. We do not recognize a "right" of the Protestants to opt for unity with Britain—the policy just imposed by Heath—as such a connection by definition guarantees continued oppression of the Catholics; hence the "independent" qualifier in the slogan. The demand is an assertion of independence from all traces of the Green Tory nationalism which illegitimately claims solidarity with the plight of the oppressed Catholics. The first demand facilitates the realization of the second, in fact, is indispensable to it; far from being counterposed, one is essential to the other.

FOR THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE CELTIC FRINGE; FOR A SOCIALIST

FEDERATION OF THE BRITISH ISLES. We stand for the right of all the nationally oppressed Celtic minorities—including the Bretons in France—to secede and form their own states. The twentieth century, the time of the utter exhaustion of the old progressive role of the bourgeois states, is not the time to complain of the "divisive" and partly utopian character of such moves toward independence; at the same time we urge these minorities to resist a separatist course, but acknowledge and defend their right to do so.

The socialist federation of the British Isles is the only long-term solution, inasmuch as a workers' uprising in any part of the area must lead immediately to civil war throughout the region. The chances of victory for the proletariat in such a struggle will be immensely enhanced if the advanced workers are known by all sections of the masses to have disassociated themselves entirely from all "great"-nation chauvinism through their emphatic recognition of the right to self-determination.

The response of the British working class to the plight of the Irish, expressed through the above linked demands, is more immediate an issue due to the interpenetration of the Irish workers among the British and the relationship of the Irish economy as a whole to Britain. Ireland remains today one of the poorest countries of Europe. To escape Irish squalor many Irish workers emigrate, and a large number seek work in Britain. Not only Ireland's products, but also Ireland's sons and daughters go to Britain. Despite the heavy emigration, however (Ireland is the only European country to have experienced a net loss in population in the last century) unemployment remains heavy in both Ulster and the South. During the "boom" years of World War II, for example, Ulster unemployment dropped to "only" five per cent. The figures for 1966 place Ulster unemployment among insured persons at 6.1 per cent, far above the 1.5 per cent rate in the rest of the U.K. The rate for Ulster Catholics, however, has been about twice as high. The extension of the British "welfare state" to Ulster has tended to depress the desire of both Protestant and Catholic to emigrate; in the South, however, due in part to the less extensive social welfare schemes, emigration, though lower in the late 1960's, had reached a figure of around 60,000 annually in the 1950's.

The Irish workers, concentrated mainly in the less secure and lower-skilled jobs, may well prove to be the most militant section of their class throughout the British Isles. Less stultified than some of their English counterparts who have lived through a century of the dead-handed labor bureaucracy, the Irish workers in England and in Ireland may, like the new industrial proletariat of late Tsarist Russia, prove more bold in action.

An additional reason for coupling the demand of self-determination rights for an independent, democratic Ulster with the demand for a unified Ireland under workers' control and the perspective of a socialist federation of the British Isles is to limit the reactionary-chauvinist potential in the genuine fear among the relatively skilled, relatively well-off (by low Irish standards) Protestant workers of the loss of their shabby but real benefits from the British welfare state. The attitude of Ulster Protestants to their limited but real economic advantages—even in that backwater of a backward British economy—is somewhat analogous to the fears of white American workers that any advance in the condition of the black workers under capitalism will come at the expense of the middle and upper layers of the working class. What makes this mentality in Ulster especially hard to crack is the existence of a state boundary marking off Ulster from the other section of British-European capitalism's backyard in Eire, and hence the absolute necessity to deal with the national question.

FOR ARMED WORKING-CLASS DEFENSE AGAINST MASS TERRORISM, NOT ONLY THE ORANGE BUT ALSO THE GREEN! The terrorist units of the IRA, together with the Protestant vigilante organizations must be met by the un-

continued on next page

Continued ...

CLASS AGAINST CLASS!

compromising resistance of the working class. The popularity of the IRA and the whitewashing of its policies on this question by the left has contributed substantially to the false mass appeal of the two wings, especially the Provisionals. The issue of mass terror is not simply a dispute over "tactics"—it is fundamental to the evaluation by revolutionists of a group's class composition and program. The IRA is no more deserving of the support of professed revolutionists than a group of black nationalists in the U.S. conspiring, for example, to pour gasoline into the crowded New York subway system—however much the left does, and must, solidarize with their rage.

Pabloist Confusion

Although it has supported the Provisionals since, the Red Mole organization (section of the "United Secretariat of the Fourth International," nominal friends of the American SWP) originally supported both contending wings of the IRA, giving the left an object lesson in the patent absurdities to which uncritical enthusiasm for currently popular petty-bourgeois formations leads. In the April 1971 Red Mole Bob Purdie, a leader of the British Pabloists, wrote regarding the split in the IRA and the various tactics used:

"We support both against British imperialism, and defend their right to take action against the British occupation forces. We have political differences with both, but we support their struggle unconditionally, as is the duty of every British Revolutionary. We recognize both as the vanguard of the oppressed minority. We support them, and we support that minority when they attack British troops. We support them when they throw stones, when they throw petrol bombs, and when they shoot at British troops. Unconditionally."

Behind the verbal militancy of Purdie's passage stands the utter bankruptcy of Pabloism as a Marxist strategy and the lack of any program whatsoever for the consummation of the Irish revolution.

It is the duty of every socialist to support every struggle of oppressed peoples against imperialism, just as we support every struggle of the working class against the employers; that goes without saying. This is true, furthermore, regardless of whatever criticisms one may have of the course followed at any given moment. If Purdie had intended to say this, and nothing more, we would have no quarrel with him. But then he goes on to say that "we recognize both [IRA wings] as the vanguard of the oppressed minority," that "we support that minority... unconditionally."

We support the just struggles of the Irish against imperialism, just as we support the victory of the Vietnamese revolution against imperialism and its Asian allies—unconditionally, in the military sense. We support neither in any "unconditional" sense for their policies, because their existing programs are blueprints for proletarian defeat. Nowhere does Red Mole offer an analysis of the IRA program, the necessary starting point for any political (programmatic) conditional or unconditional support. The Pabloist policy is blind, rhetorical enthusiasm over current struggles and nothing more.

It is the further duty of every Marxist to advise against outbreaks or incidents which run counter to the interests of the class and the socialist revolution. Enthusiasm over mistakes, on the ground that any rebellious motion on the part of the oppressed is *de facto* "objectively anti-imperialist" is a betrayal of leadership. The history of class struggle is filled with examples of the revolutionary party advising against actions which it considered foredoomed to defeat, while nevertheless participating in those which unavoidably broke over its head. It does so in order to prevent the movement from being led up a blind alley, and to use its influence to advocate switching pressure to another flank, forming defensive actions, etc. Marx's attitude toward the Paris Commune is a model. He warned the French proletariat against the premature uprising, yet enthusiastically threw himself and the First International behind it, offering advice, criticisms, defense when it nevertheless took place. The SL commented concretely on this problem in March 1971. In "The Irish Uprising and the Cliff Group" we wrote:

"But a vicarious emotional identification with the oppressed Irish fighting back against their tor-

mentors is not enough. Nor is barricade rhetoric or mere activist militancy adequate. To be sure, no one fit to bear the title revolutionary can possibly oppose the reflexive reaction of the oppressed—the street fighting tactics, the shooting of occupying soldiers, the periodic upsurge of rebellious violence, and the rest. But no matter how justified, such episodes must not become a substitute for revolutionary political struggle. Without the knowledge of what to do next—that is, without a program, a conscious plan of action—the struggle will simply waste itself in secondary considerations."

This point is crucially important where a developed revolutionary vanguard exists embryonically or not at all. Marxists are neither Blanquists nor spontaneists; revolution, in the epoch of proletarian revolution, is a science, and the role of the Marxist party is to direct and lead it in a scientific, considered fashion. Perhaps even more relevant in this regard than the Commune is the lesson of Bolshevik experience during the "July Days" in 1917, four months before the October Revolution when revolutionary Marxists possessed infinitely more influence than they do today in Ireland. At that time the Leninists opposed an armed working-class demonstration in Petrograd and, where prohibition failed, took the lead themselves to channel the action into relatively peaceful directions. They sought to restrain an incident which could have led to premature insurrection and the resultant beheading



Youths flee yet another bombing in bleak Belfast.

of the workers movement by triumphant counter-revolution.

The Bolshevik decision was a conscious one, determined by concrete analysis of the situation and assessment of the strength of the various class alignments, the influence and preparedness of the party, etc. We would ask Purdie and the Pabloists: Was Lenin wrong? If he was right, how by your policy of enthusiastic support of every flareup, no matter how motivated or calculated, that occurs in North Ireland, could you implement your "political criticisms," i.e., how could your organization, with its policies, intervene to prevent actions it considered to lead to disaster? Or isn't the end result of your Pabloist methodological premise the assumption that the victory of the Irish Revolution is inevitable and onrushing, and the counterrevolution so weak that no mistaken tactics could play into its hands?

We submit that the above conclusion is the only possible one to be drawn from the Red Mole's analysis: the Pabloist thesis that the revolution is so strong it is inevitable in the present period. The "inevitable" conclusion, then, would have to be: under these circumstances, there is no need for a Leninist-Trotskyist vanguard party to lead the revolutionary struggle in Ireland. Those who support the victory of the Russian Revolution can only be grateful Lenin and Trotsky had a totally different conception of how to make a revolution and that the Red Mole was not around to join the reformist chorus on the irrelevance of the Bolshevik party.

Spartacist Local Directory

BERKELEY-OAKLAND. Box 852, Main P.O., Berkeley, Calif. 94701, phone: 848-3029.
BOSTON. Box 188, M.I.T. Sta., Cambridge, Mass. 02139, phone: 321-3826.
CHICAGO. Box 6471, Main P.O., Chicago, Ill. 60680, phone: 643-4394.
DENVER. (contact New York)
EUREKA. Box 3061, Eureka, Calif. 95501.
HOUSTON. (contact New York)
LOS ANGELES. Box 38053, Wilcox Sta., Los Angeles, Calif. 90038, phone: 467-6855.
NEW ORLEANS. (contact New York)
NEW YORK. Box 1377, G. P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001, phone: WA 5-2426.
SAN DIEGO. Box 22052, Univ. City Sta., San Diego, Calif. 92122, phone: 453-1436.
SAN FRANCISCO. Box 40574, San Francisco, Calif. 94140, phone: 826-8259.
STONY BROOK, L.I. Box 854, Port Jefferson, N.Y. 11777, phone: 246-8848.
WASHINGTON, D.C.-BALTIMORE, phone: 223-1455.
(PARIS, France, phone 887.87.13.)

Our conclusion is drawn not only from Red Mole's strategic outlook, but is buttressed by the observation in Purdie's sentence, "we support both [IRA wings] as the vanguard of the oppressed minorities." Both!! Two vanguards, and... neither of them a Marxist party! If Lenin were not already dead he would hang himself!

The IRA Split

We will do as Purdie did not and look to the programs of the contending IRA wings to see what each wants. Is there a class difference between

them? In the last analysis, rhetoric aside, there is—the Provisionals find their base in and rest upon petty-bourgeois Irish nationalism, objectively operate as a militant extension of the clerical Free State in the South and find their main enemy in the English presence in Ireland. The Officials are more formally Marxist, stressing the leading role of the working class, calling for a socialist republic, and naming the enemy as capitalist imperialism. (It is probably not accidental that the front page headline of the August 1971 Red Mole reads: "For the IRA Against British Imperialism," limiting the enemy to Britain in the fashion of the Pro-

visionals.) If it is in this sense Purdie supports both, he is saying the petty-bourgeoisie as a class plays a role equal to the working class in socialist revolution—an idea which went out the window when Marx sat down to write. If he does not mean this, then he cannot consider class analysis important in looking to program. Two classes, two vanguards?

The IRA wings themselves do not and cannot support even each other. Despite the particular issue the IRA split over—the traditional abstention from sitting in bourgeois parliaments, a position both wings now repudiate—the differences were real and fundamental, and this is recognized by all involved. Their relations are acrimonious and have led to violence between them; the Officials, further, have accused the Provisionals of among other things functioning like provocateurs. When Purdie supports both, does he support their mutual charges against each other? Would he support "both" of the venomously hostile Black Panther wings?

Even in the best case, Red Mole is guilty of polyvanguardism, the assumption that there can be more than one vanguard of the class in the struggle toward revolution. If we can again use the Russian Revolution as a touchstone, Purdie's position is similar to saying he supports "both wings" of Russian Social Democracy in 1917—Bolshevik and Menshevik, the wing which guided the working class to power and the wing which fought against it. To say under similar circum-

continued on next page

stances—the fact of the matter is that neither IRA wing has anything approaching a revolutionary program—that one supports "both" is to say one hopes for the revolution by... supporting counter-revolution! That such a position is the apotheosis of silliness is true; it is also true that such is the only possible conclusion one can draw from Red Mole's strategy for the Irish Revolution.

Nonetheless, factually we owe Red Mole an apology, and offer it here. In the Spartacist League's leaflet, "The Irish Upsurge and the Cliff Group," issued one year ago, we stated that the Healyites alone among the major British left groups had opposed the sending of troops to Ulster. Our information was incorrect; Red Mole has convincingly demonstrated that the Healyite claim to the unique correct position on this issue was, once again, a lie. A group which must constantly misrepresent the positions of its opponents may be assumed to have nothing of value to say; and the Healyite Socialist Labour League has veered in a short time from an ultra-"working-class" concentration on the Irish class issues alone, to tailing the "Irish freedom fighters"—moving from the meaningless abstract to the false concrete.

Capitulating to Chauvinism

The position of uncritical enthusiasm for the IRA exemplified by Red Mole is the common thrust of most organized left tendencies. It has at least the merit of solidarizing subjectively with an organization whose struggles are identified with the side of the oppressed. A less prevalent but equally skewed approach to the Irish national question is held by the "Workers' Committee" which enjoys the support of Progressive Labor in the U.S. Their sympathy to the Protestants' legitimate fears of incorporation into a clerical state has led them into a qualitative capitulation to the oppressive mood prevailing among the Protestants, in a recent leaflet titled "The Working Class Solution to the National Conflict in Ireland," the Workers' Committee states:

"As far as the national conflict is [sic] Ireland is concerned, the main enemy of the Protestant working class is the Catholic capitalist class. It is not the Catholic population at large. It is not the Catholic working class. When Gerry Flitt refers to Ulster Protestants as "a million monsters" that is simply an expression of the racialism which is always associated, to a greater or lesser degree, with nationalism. And when John McKeague refers to the Catholic community as "animals," that is also an expression of nationalism. Nationalism derives from capitalism. The working class stands opposed to capitalism and to its ideology." [our emphasis]

In the leaflet's list of demands we find the following:

"The committee demands that the Southern government abandon immediately its claim to rule over the Ulster Protestants. It demands the cessation of all propaganda directed against the Ulster Protestant nation.

"It is only when this demand is met that conditions will exist for the full implementation of democratic rights for the Catholic minority in the North. The events since 1968 have made it quite clear that the Protestant masses will not abandon their defences against the policies of the Catholic nationalists until the latter abandon their attempts to bring the Ulster Protestants under their domination. It would be futile to expect otherwise. The succession of Unionist governments since 1968 have found that out to their cost." [our emphasis]

Of course there is Protestant reaction and nationalism and Catholic reaction and nationalism. We have attempted here to sketch the symbiotic relationship of the two. But our opposition to nationalism, and to all bourgeois ideology, must never blind us to the distinction between the chauvinism of the oppressor and the chauvinism of the oppressed. The working class is indeed obliged to eliminate those features of the Eire state and society which feed fear, obscurantism and reaction among the Protestant working masses.

On Home Rule and Rome Rule

Prevailing illusions about the benign, if bourgeois character of the state of Eire justify some examination of some of that state's particular features—well known, we may be certain, to the frightened and confused Protestants of Ulster.

Eire is more than a nation which happens to have an overwhelming Catholic majority. It may be worth the space to quote article 44.1.2 of the Eire constitution on the relationship of the state to the Church of Rome:

"The State recognises the special position of the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church as the guardian of the Faith professed by the great majority of the citizens."

On the family:

"41.2.2—The State shall, therefore, endeavor to ensure that mothers shall not be obliged by economic necessity to engage in labour to the neglect of their duties in the home.

"41.3.2—No law shall be enacted providing for the grant of a dissolution of marriage."

Eire has the dubious distinction, therefore, to be one of the few places in the world prohibiting divorce, going even so far as to prohibit marriage between partners one of whom was legally divorced in another country (like Britain and Ulster)!

An event described by Liam de Paor in his excellent book Divided Ulster serves to illustrate the sort of thing in Eire which powerfully aids the Orange movement in whipping up anti-Catholic hysteria among Protestant workers. In 1950-51 occurred a scandal, widely publicized in the North but also in the South, in which the Minister of Health, a Dr. Browne, was forced to resign under strong pressure from the bishops and subsequently published the correspondence relating to his "Mother and Child Health Service" scheme which had aroused the intense opposition of both the hierarchy and his own party. The published correspondence revealed not only the predictable views of the hierarchy on sex education, the



family, and public health care in general, but also the view of the then Prime Minister, Mr. Costello, who stated in a letter to Dr. Browne:

"...I understand that you have not replied to His Grace's letter. I am afraid you do not appear to realise the serious implications of the views expressed in that letter, since you have, by advertisement and otherwise, continued to publicise the scheme to which objections have been taken. Such action might well seem to be defiance of the Hierarchy....

"I have no doubt that all my colleagues and, in particular, yourself would not be party to any proposals affecting moral questions which would or might come into conflict with the definite teaching of the Catholic Church."

This particular affair served not only to provide much grist for the propaganda mills of the Orange sectaries on the religious question, but also gave the working-class Protestants a glimpse of the sort of public health service—if any at all—they would enjoy under Green rule.

Eire's book censorship is fairly well known; the list of banned books includes the works of Ireland's best-known twentieth century author, James Joyce. Contraception, of course, is officially nonexistent.

But saying this is not to deny that the primary oppression in Ulster is that visited by the Protestants (including many Protestant workers) upon the Catholics; that this chauvinism was skillfully nurtured for centuries from London for its imperialist ends; and that the oppression of the Catholics in the North feeds Green Toryism among the Catholic masses even more than Green Toryism inflames the Protestants. Marxists in Ulster dare not evade their primary responsibility at home to solidarize in all ways including militarily with the struggles of the Catholics for equal rights. To justify a betrayal of this elementary duty by oblique references to the "defences" of the Protestant masses without pointing out that such "defences" have verged on pogrom—which is why the Catholics originally welcomed British troops—represents an extreme case of accommodation to the backwardness of one's own working class.

Black nationalism in the United States, even of the relatively honest and independent Black Panthers, has undoubtedly strengthened Wallaceism among the white workers and petty bourgeoisie. But we do not equate the chauvinism, the obscurantist delusions of the black nationalist movement with white racism—although we fight against both. It may even be true that most white workers will not be won to a program of common class struggle until the oppressed blacks prove to them that such is their perspective; the Ulster Protestants may not slough off their chauvinism until the Catholic

workers in Ulster and Eire abandon all their bourgeois-clerical illusions—but it is not the job of Marxists to prolong the grip of sectarian chauvinism on the consciousness of relatively privileged workers by rationalizing their chauvinism!

The "main enemy" of the Protestant workers is not the Catholic capitalist class. It is their "own," Protestant and British, capitalist class and its petty-bourgeois defenders! All the capitalists are enemies of all workers everywhere, but the main battle of workers in one nation must always be against their own bourgeoisie—only thus do they offer to their class brothers abroad a serious promise of their internationalism, that they do not stand with their own capitalists, masking their stand with class-struggle phrases, against the workers of other countries.

A revolutionary policy in Ireland as everywhere must begin "at home." For southern Ireland, a struggle must be fought first and foremost against the bourgeoisie and its religious-national trappings there. Only a Leninist-Trotskyist party in the South which has proven its complete independence of clerical reaction and the nationalist fantasies in which Ireland abounds can win the support of the Protestant workers and the British working class as a whole. The Protestant workers must, as a minimal gesture of good faith to the Ulster Catholics and all Irish workers, give unstinting military support to the demands of the Catholics for equal rights, while maintaining the sharpest criticism of that movement's narrow limitations.

Ireland will remain tottering for the foreseeable but not indefinite future, as it has since 1969, on the brink of a revolutionary crisis, lacking only the subjective factor, the Leninist vanguard party. The Irish struggle could be the spark of proletarian revolution in the British Isles and Europe—it nearly was before—or the Irish resistance may once again, through its own nationally circumscribed conceptions, fall to misguided heroism, and another dramatic failure of primitive zeal in capitalism's last years.

American leftists infatuated with "struggle" devoid of program would do well to look at Ireland today. Ireland has not lacked for heroic struggle—but the end result is the present one—a sectarian client state of British imperialism in the North and a scarcely less naked client state in the South, mired in the "ould sod" of ignorance and clerical reaction.

Neither essential policy can be carried on without the creation of an Irish movement dedicated to rebuilding the Fourth International—the struggle to assimilate and propagate the bitter revolutionary lessons of the past half century. Such a section will face the duty to combat both the revisionism of the unstable, contending sections of the United Secretariat and the Healyite English SLI, whose limitless opportunism tempered by thuggery has earned them a reputation merited previously only by Stalinists. On the level of mass work, the principal task of Marxists in Ireland in the near future will have to be politically destroying the IRA in both its wings, while—and by means of—giving them full support against the armies, courts and internment camps of Britain, Ulster and Eire.

The fighters in the Irish resistance, first and foremost the men and women of the IRA, can find their place on the proletariat's side in the Irish and British revolutions only if they are won to Leninism by a section of the reconstructed Fourth International in Britain and Ireland. The alternative is intensified sectarian conflict and the assured victory for British and all European capitalism in a barely refurbished, perhaps newly dismembered, Irish client state.

Marxists must restrict their support, even critical support, to groups in the Irish struggle which support the main thrust of each of the linked demands:

FOR A SOCIALIST FEDERATION OF THE BRITISH ISLES, FOR THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE CELTIC FRINGE.

DOWN WITH MASS TERRORISM, NOT ONLY THE ORANGE BUT ALSO THE GREEN!

FOR THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION FOR AN INDEPENDENT, DEMOCRATIC ULSTER, THE ENGLISH OUT! FOR THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND IN A COMPLETELY SECULAR, DEMOCRATIC IRISH STATE; THEREFORE NEITHER ORANGE NOR GREEN BUT A WORKERS REPUBLIC! ■

SDS in Rightward Plunge

The rightward motion of Progressive Labor and SDS continues to deepen. Backing off from its earlier impulse toward a hard if elemental class-conscious stand, PL/SDS has turned toward accommodation to the "peace" popular front, to the SWP-dominated right wing of the women's liberation movement, and to lowest-level liberal moralizing exemplified in SDS's current anti-racist textbook campaign. The latter single-issue orientation is the prime focus of the SDS National Convention Against Racism held on March 30 through April 2 at Harvard University.

Even in its pro-working-class days, the PL-dominated Worker-Student Alliance SDS was distinguished by low-level demands (non-slip mats for cafeteria workers, etc.) and by a studied refusal to acknowledge its socialist politics even when asked. Now SDS abandons even its subjective, moralizing and parochial concern for a section of the working class (campus workers) in favor of subjective, moralizing and parochial appeal to the academic allies of the liberal bourgeoisie. The anti-racist textbook campaign focuses on racism as "the main way people are oppressed today" [New Left Notes flyer, 6 November 1971]. The main oppression in capitalist society, and the root of all special oppression, is wage slavery, but the current campaign steers clear of this issue out of fear of being denounced as socialist.

Moreover, as the name indicates, the anti-racist textbook campaign does not even focus on the most significant and pervasive expressions of racism in American society, but rather on the threat posed by conservative academic ideologues like Shockley and Herrnstein to the liberal "anti-

racist" academics who oppose the new theories of inherent black inferiority but who support the same system as do the neo-racists. SDS' campaign could at best attract the sympathy of academic liberals, but it cannot alleviate in the least the miserable conditions imposed upon blacks in the United States.

PL's idealism and academic fixation lead it to maintain that white racism flows from the belief that blacks are genetically inferior. In reality, white racism and its accompanying belief in black inferiority are the reflection and attempted justification in white consciousness of the actual material oppression which blacks are forced to endure. Better-off social groups always tend in bourgeois society to regard with fear and contempt those less well-off, especially when they see a struggle on the part of the latter for an equality which seems to threaten their own share of the limited capitalist "pie." Only a higher sense of class interest and loyalty in the working class—the understanding that even the limited gains of sections of the class are endangered by the special oppression of other groups, the large "reserve army of labor," etc.—can counter racism on a mass scale.

Perhaps the most ominous feature of PL/SDS's idealist single-issuism is the solution proposed to end racism in the academic world: pressure on university administrations, with their direct ties to the ruling class, to fire racist professors. Reactionary and racist ideologues must be combated, but by the students, faculty, and workers demanding student-teacher-campus worker con-

trol of the schools. To demand that the administration take up the task is to invite the liberal and even the conservative bourgeoisie to cut the budgets, tear up union contracts and restrict enrollment on the convenient excuse of a campaign against racism, as in the New York Teachers' Strike of 1968. Needless to say such measures only confirm the fears of whites and drive them to support of racist demagogues who warned them all along that the blacks and liberals would destroy their jobs and futures.

The Spartacist League and Revolutionary Communist Youth place the following demands on the SDS Convention:

I. This conference condemn and reverse SDS' concentration on the anti-racist textbook campaign as a conscious adaptation to academic liberalism, and reaffirm an anti-imperialist, pro-working-class orientation by openly declaring itself socialist.

II. This conference condemn and reverse SDS' support for NPAC and SMC and its demonstrations as representing an alliance with the liberal wing of the ruling class.

III. The main form the oppression of blacks takes is their concentration at the bottom of American society. The struggle against racism must concentrate on fighting concrete acts and practices of racial oppression, rather than simply opposing racism as a pervasive social attitude. This struggle must necessarily be linked to that of the working class as a whole and to the fight for socialism. ■

RCY Class Series On the Russian Question

The class series will deal with the degeneration of the Bolshevik Revolution and the class nature of the Soviet Union, as well as the struggle to rebuild the party of the proletarian revolution in the U.S.S.R. on the program of political revolution which will restore workers' democracy and proletarian internationalism.

Classes will be held at Columbia University at 7:30 p. m. on alternate Tuesdays, beginning on March 28th. For more information, and to get a reading list for the class, write: RCY, Box 454, Cooper Station, New York, N. Y. 10003, or call: (212) 831-3004 or (212) 925-2426.

Continued from Page 3

Workers League, Labor Committee Guard SWP-Liberal Left Flank

tion..." and which proposes schemes for "reconverting" war industry into "productive" endeavor—which in the absence of the struggle for proletarian revolution is as utopian as the Biblical exhortation to beat swords into plowshares. Their elaborate taxation proposal, with its infatuation with state debts places them clearly as disciples of Proudhon, not of Marx. As Engels said of the Proudhonist fetish with debts and taxes:

"State debts!" The working class knows that it did not make them and when it comes to power it will leave the payment of them to those who contracted them... "Taxes!" A matter that interests the bourgeoisie very much but the worker only very little. What the worker pays in taxes goes in the long run into the cost of production of labour power and must therefore be compensated for by the capitalist. All these things which are held up to us here as highly important questions for the working class are in reality of essential interest only to the bourgeois, and still more so to the petty bourgeois; and, despite Proudhon, we maintain that the working class is not called upon to safeguard the interests of these classes."

—Engels, *The Housing Question*, Part One: How Proudhon Solves the Housing Question

Further, the NCLC has nothing more to say about the Vietnam war than that the U.S. should get out "immediately and completely," a program they share with McGovern-Muskie and the SWP. Instead of exposing the futility of parades and proposing a means for the working class to fight imperialist war (for example by strike action) the NCLC indulges in ethical exhortation for NPAC and SMC to assume their "inescapable moral responsibilities" to become "embryonic soviets." The NCLC rhetoric reeks of moralism and a

middle-class, reformist, bloodless conception of class struggle.

The Workers League's Bulletin report on the SMC conference asserts that a WL spokesman said: "Never before has there been an anti-war conference that was in such open collaboration with the Stalinists and liberals." But the WL/YS (which always "takes sides" on matters like the New York police "strike" of last year and the military moves of the Indian bourgeoisie—i.e. supporting both) refused to "take sides" and abstained on the SL/RCY motion to exclude the political representatives of the capitalists from the conference and the anti-war movement. When the WL/YS submitted a motion condemning the Versailles Congress as Stalinist and a betrayal of the Vietnamese revolution, the SL/RCY submitted an amendment extending the condemnation to the bourgeois pop front SMC conference. The WL opposed the amendment, thus itself "taking sides" with both Stalinism and the liberal bourgeoisie—in the SMC. This stand exposed their motion on the Versailles Conference as cheap phrasemongering. By refusing to condemn a bourgeois-dominated popular front—and then calling on it to condemn a Stalinist-dominated conference—the WL motion amounted to red-baiting and Shachtmanite Stalinophobic posturing. Likewise the WL calls on the SMC to condemn the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies. "Trotskyists" could offer no greater assistance to the Stalinists in retaining the loyalty of subjectively revolutionary workers than by seeking a bloc with the class enemy to denounce Stalinism! The bourgeoisie must be thrown out of the anti-war movement precisely so that the working class vanguard can struggle

against the Stalinist class traitors, untainted by the hypocritical "anti-Stalinism" (anti-communism) of the bourgeoisie!

The main thrust of the WL/YS resolution was its call to "support the SWP election campaign." Uncritical, unconditional, the WL swallows whole a campaign whose central thrust is social patriotic pacifism, union-busting, "community control," "independent" nationalist Chicano and black parties which would constitute obstacles to building a labor party, petty-bourgeois feminism, student vanguardism, etc. The campaign is devoid of working-class content and is indistinguishable from the campaign of a bourgeois politician like Shirley Chisholm, who is also for community control, feminism, pacifism, etc. If the SWP is chasing after the various Youth for Imperialism the WL/YS runs right behind them.

The Bulletin report quotes a YS member as stating: "We are mobilizing the youth separate from the Stalinists and the capitalists to take power." This is sheer youth-vanguardist nonsense that would make even Ernest Mandel cringe. Classes take power, not generations. Youth for McGovern, Youth for Lindsay, Youth for Muskie are youth, too, and highly conscious of it besides. The "method" of the WL/YS is eclectic, opportunist, idealist pragmatism.

We say: Smash the class-collaborationist SMC and NPAC—destroy the campaign hall for the politicians of imperialism! The NCLC and WL/YS—which denounce the SWP YSA while endorsing or equivocating on the class purposes of its creation, NPAC, SMC—must be defeated as left supporters of the structure the SWP has built for the bourgeoisie. ■