



Nixon-Brezhnev-Mao Push "Peaceful Coexistence" Fraud

As Russian party head Leonid Brezhnev does his best to convince Nixon to trade American technology for Siberian natural gas, and Nixon in turn attempts to divert public attention as far away from Watergate as possible, the workers movement must evaluate the real significance of the current U.S./USSR talks. Some 42 out of the total of 101 agreements between the U.S. and the Soviet Union since 1933 have been negotiated by the Nixon administration. Does this perhaps signal the cementing of a "superpower" bloc? With all the talk of massive foreign investment in the Soviet economy, are the achievements of the October revolution endangered? What is the meaning of the SALT and European Security Conference bargaining?

The Brezhnev visit is unlikely to produce anything of great importance, just as Nixon's visit to Moscow last May resulted only in a meaningless statement of "Basic Principles of Relations" filled with platitudes about peaceful coexistence. But both the Russian bureaucracy and the American ruling class face powerful pressures forcing a sharp change from their

international policies of recent years. While the Communist Party declares that "humanity can achieve a lasting peace" and Brezhnev speaks with honeyed words of a new period of "relations of peace, mutual respect and cooperation between the states of the East and West" (*Daily World*, 16 June 1973), Marxists must recognize that the present unstable situation of great-power politics leads in quite the opposite direction, toward a new imperialist world war.

While Brezhnev and Mao, by their policies of seeking to form diplomatic blocs with the various imperialist powers, only promote this trend, there does exist the objective basis for a real alternative, one which offers a possibility of survival for the human race—the revolutionary unity of the international working class, directed against all the predatory bourgeoisies. Achievement of revolutionary class unity internationally will necessarily entail as well political revolutions in the degenerated and deformed workers states (USSR, China, Eastern Europe, North Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba) as

an integral part of the international socialist revolution.

Decaying Capitalism and Moribund Bureaucracy

On the American side, Nixon is faced with the precipitous decline of the dollar in recent months, a reflection of that loss of U.S. economic hegemony in the capitalist world which was made official by the 15 August 1971 devaluation/wage-freeze measures. At the same time, the balance of payments situation remains precarious, a sharp recession threatens to materialize in the near future and inflation is raging at near-record levels. More generally, the capitalists of all the major Western powers face intensified international competition and the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. The immediate consequences are rapidly sharpening trade war as well as efforts to increase the rate of exploitation at home, through driving down the real wages of the working class, speed-up, etc. The bourgeoisie is certainly interested in exploiting Siberian oil and gas deposits, but its ability to do so at this time is

limited. And in any case, the purpose of this "benevolent" attention is not the development of natural resources production in the Soviet Union, but ultimately the appetite for the reconquest of the deformed workers states and the reopening of their markets to exploitation by Western capital, a goal which can be accomplished only by violent counterrevolution entailing incredible suffering for the working class.

The bureaucracies administering the deformed workers states are, on the other hand, faced with a tremendous need for the capital goods and advanced technology available only from the capitalists. The necessary trade, credits, concessions, etc., pose an eventual danger to the workers' conquests, given the failure to extend the revolution to the advanced capitalist countries. But with the accumulated rigidities of 45 years of bureaucratically planned economic growth, the Soviet Union is in desperate need of new stimulus. For this parasitic caste, the rapid development which would be achieved by freeing the productive forces from their bureaucratic fetters and

continued on page 3



Miliken/Howard Patrick

Chavez' Class-Collaboration Prepares the Way Teamsters, Growers Conspire to Smash Farm Workers' Union

The United Farm Workers union faces death in California after eight years of organizing drives based on social-pacifism, religion and direct appeals to the capitalist class. The UFW aimed to give farm workers union protection after decades of the most brutal exploitation, but the Chavez leadership's conscious suppression of working-class methods of struggle threatens to reverse all gains made by the farm workers.

The Teamster bureaucracy under Fitzsimmons, Nixon's best friend in labor, is the chosen instrument of California agribusiness to give the knife to the "radical" UFW. At the Los Angeles convention of the American Farm Bureau Association last December, Fitzsimmons clearly stated that

he favored a Teamster-grower alliance. In 1970 special sweetheart contracts were signed with Salinas Valley lettuce growers to prevent the impending victory of the UFW throughout California agriculture. Now, as each of the hard-won contracts of the five-year grape strike expires, the Teamster bureaucracy signs a sweetheart contract with the grower. In the Coachella Valley, the Teamsters signed contracts with 15 growers on 15 April, the day after UFW contracts expired, without consulting a single farm worker. Preparations for similar treachery are under way in the San Joaquin Valley, the heart of grape production. To the UFW, which is still based primarily on grape workers, this constitutes a clear death threat.

Chavez' response to the Teamsters' attack is not addressed to the labor movement and rank-and-file Teamsters, but to church leaders, liberal Democrats and the capitalist business partners of the growers themselves. UFW strikes against Teamster-raided growers have been 90 percent effective, but Chavez is relying on his characteristic tactics of passive protest and consumer boycott, together with handouts from the AFL-CIO.

The futile policies of Chavez are revealed in all their class-collaborationist wretchedness in a three-page letter, mimeographed for distribution to trade-union bureaucrats and liberals. over his signature. The letter is addressed to Quentin Reynolds, chairman of the board of Safeway

Stores, the California-based supermarket chain and major agribusiness marketer which is currently under UFW boycott for handling scab lettuce:

"Mr. Reynolds, you must be blind to what is at stake here or you would surely be using your influence with the growers and Teamsters to resolve this conflict in the lettuce and grapes...."

"The Teamsters say they represent the workers. How is that possible? The grape workers have been members of our union for years. Mr. Reynolds, do you and other Safeway officials really believe that farmworkers want the Teamsters union? Why don't we find out once and for all! Why don't you join me in a public appeal for elections...."

continued on page 8

Defend Chilean Miners' Strike

As the Unidad Popular (UP) government of Chile is increasingly isolated by the rise of labor militancy on the one hand, and the mounting forces of counterrevolution on the other, President Salvador Allende has decided to take a class stand with the bourgeoisie. In response to a two-month-old strike at the El Teniente copper mines, Allende used the national police force (Carabineros) against the strikers, asked the heads of the armed forces to re-enter the cabinet of the popular-front government and moved to "restore order" in two mining provinces by placing them under military control.

The strike began on 10 April with the 13,000 miners of the nationalized El Teniente mine, the largest underground mine in the world, in Rancagua.

It spread in early June to Chuquibambilla, the world's largest open pit mine, where workers held a 48-hour support strike which may expand into a strike of indefinite duration and nationwide scope.

The strikes have already forced the Chilean government to suspend shipments of copper, its major export,

to Europe, causing losses of \$50 million per day in foreign exchange, in a situation where Chile is heavily in debt and forced to import food. The government claims that the "national interest" is higher than that of the "privileged" miners.

The miners, on the other hand, are striking to defend the sliding scale of

wages (automatic cost-of-living adjustment) won years ago from the former American owners of the mines through hard-fought struggles. They are demanding a 41 percent pay raise to keep up with the soaring cost of living (up 240 percent in the last year alone). Food is already rationed and the black market is booming. The government claims that the existing cost-of-living adjustment must be dropped and replaced with a "re-adjustment law" which would raise wages only of workers in the lowest categories. If successful, this would break the back of working-class resistance to the wave of inflation and lower real wages, exactly as happened during the previous popular-front governments after World War II.

On 14 June, riot police attacked a demonstration of 4,000 miners, who had marched on Santiago from the northern mining districts, using water guns, armored personnel carriers and tear-gas grenades. At the mine itself more than 500 Carabineros have laid siege, firing machine guns into the air to gain access to the installations. Strikers erected barricades at the entrances to the mines and hurled dynamite at the police. More than 30 miners have already been injured in the conflict.

The Communist Party and the UP are trying to smash the strike, arguing



El Teniente

MARCELO MONTEALEGRE

End the Witchhunt in Peru!

The Peruvian military dictatorship of Lieutenant-General Juan Velasco has in recent months resorted to brutal repressive tactics against that country's ostensible Trotskyists. Hugo Blanco, deported in September 1971, is but one of many political exiles and victims of the "revolutionary" policies of the generals who took power in a bloodless coup in 1968.

Recently arrested and facing an uncertain future are Ricardo Napuri, leader of the Partido Obrero Marxista Revolucionario (POMR—affiliated with the French OCI), and Sergio Barrios and José Carlos Ballón of the Liga Comunista (affiliated with the British SLL). The Liga Comunista has been outlawed, its publication *Comunismo* suppressed, and its printing press seized. The military is pursuing other leaders of the organization. According to first-hand reports the political prisoners are being tortured to force them to reveal names and addresses, to identify other prisoners and to sign false confessions.

The Stalinists of the Peruvian Communist Party, major force in the General Confederation of Peruvian Workers (CGTP), support the Velasco dictatorship as a "progressive government." According to a veteran miner and union local delegate quoted in the 27 March 1970 *Daily World*: "This is not exactly the moment for arguing about whether or not the government is revolutionary. The important thing is that it has been

Peruvian Embassy
Washington, D.C.

We demand immediate release of political prisoners held in Peru's jails, victims of your government's savage rightist repression. These include workers, peasants and students arrested in the course of recent strikes and demonstrations in Arequipa, Puno, Moquegua, Cuzco, Tacna and Piura. The brutality, provocation, systematic jailing of socialists, strikers and other militants expose the "progressive" pretensions of the Velasco government as blatant hypocrisy—a cover for direct attacks on the working class and its organizations. This is an offense against working people internationally. Free Ricardo Napuri, Sergio Barrios, José Carlos Ballón and other supporters of the Liga Comunista and the Partido Obrero Marxista Revolucionario! Repatriate Hugo Blanco! Stop the persecution!

Spartacist League
USA

furthering revolutionary acts and that is what's basic. We have to support and radicalize it."

Though the CP cadres have themselves been the object of brutal repression at the hands of the Velasco government, the Stalinists capitulate to the bourgeoisie and military at every opportunity. The very existence of the CP-led unions is threatened as the government attempts to incorporate the trade unions into the state through SINAMOS (Sistema Nacional de Apoyo a la Movilización Social) and a government trade-union federation, the CTRP.

The Stalinists are sowing the seeds of their own destruction as they play the treasonous role of police informers and guardians of internal labor discipline for the military dictatorship. They have cooperated directly and indirectly with the government in the arrest of Trotskyists and other militants. As the bourgeoisie's attacks escalate, the very survival of the Peruvian workers movement is at stake; class collaboration becomes literally suicide. The release of political prisoners and the repatriation of the exiles must be secured by a united-front defense by all workers' and peasants' organizations. End the persecution! Free the Peruvian political prisoners!

Protests should be addressed to:

Peruvian Embassy
1320 16 Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Telegram

Statement of Resignation from the Class Struggle League

Comrades:

Fusion with Vanguard Newsletter means that once again you must bury the Communist program. But you comrades claim (or hope) that the CSL-VNL position on democratic centralism will allow you to maintain "it" surreptitiously. In this fusion you will not be building an organization in your own image. After two years of struggle (the formation of the Leninist Faction, breaking out of the SWP and independent existence) the Class Struggle League has been captured by the centrists of the VNL. What will emerge from this VNL-dominated fusion will be far from the political perspectives outlined at the first convention of the LF/CSL. At that time despite the dispute with the D.C. and Oakland comrades, no one had given serious programmatic consideration to any organization but the Spartacist League. Fusion with the SL seemed a logical outcome of our struggle in the SWP.

When VNL was considered it was stated we would have to choose sides on the split from which VNL evolved i.e. the Ellens-Turner fight in the SL. Yet, many comrades have maintained a "know nothing" silence. But, comrades, if we are serious in agreeing with Trotsky that the crisis the proletariat faces is one of leadership, then it is criminal to engage in un-principled factionalism. And, comrades, can you honestly solidarize yourselves with Turner's role in that fight? I, for one, condemn Turner's role of lightning rod for an underground faction. You cannot have a principled fusion with an un-principled factionalist!!!

In "Against Fusion with VNL" I have outlined my differences with VNL's CRFC [Committee for Rank-and-File Caucuses] strategy and counterposed SL's work. The CRFC is exactly what the CSL leadership mistakenly accuse SL of desiring, i.e. a catch-basin for burnt-out ORO's. It's simply another version of the SWP's two-stage theory of politics. First the mass agitational slogans devoid of politics are put out, then the real stuff. As far as industrial concentration, the VNL is no more interested in your plans for colonization than the ex-POT.

Comrades, although originally you maintained you had programmatic agreement with the SL, your motion towards fusion with VNL proves that not to be the case. The LF/CSL was not a homogeneous grouping. To a large fraction of the members it was part of a motion towards an organization that has maintained the communist continuity of Trotskyism, the Spartacist League. Apparently to the leaders of the LF/CSL, the fused group was to be "their" organization. (Unfortunately for them even this dream has fallen and instead the organization is now Turner's.) Along with this movement away from the SL the CSL hardened on a Menshevik conception of the vanguard party that is characterized by the formula that "the disputes of the party are the disputes of the class." This is a pre-Communist International conception that leads to the type of heterogeneity that characterized the parties of the 2nd International. As the Bolsheviks and Trotsky washed their hands of that swamp, so must we.

For the reasons outlined in "Against Fusion with VNL" I reject fusion with VNL, solidarize myself with the Spartacist League and resign from the CSL. I urge other comrades to re-study and re-examine the only organization that has maintained the Trotskyist program in the U.S., the Spartacist League.

Enrique Ayala
19 April 1973

-Advertisement-

Still Available:

many back issues of

Studies on the Left

academic socialist journal,
predecessor to *Socialist Revolution*

Only 50¢ each (scarcer issues
\$1.00 a copy)

For free circular listing available
issues and description of contents,
write:

Globe Distributors c/o Spartacist
Box 1377, GPO
New York, New York 10001

that labor unrest is threatening to bring the country to the brink of civil war and making it impossible for Allende to govern. This, they say, opens the door to the right wing. But it is clear that the program Allende is unable to enforce is precisely the program of the bourgeoisie—make the workers pay for inflation.

Meanwhile, on 13 June Allende asked the army, navy and air force to enter the cabinet in order to stem the unrest. In a similar move last November, the head of the armed forces became Minister of the Interior while the UP government dropped plans for nationalizing part of the transport system in an attempt to appease the opposition Christian Democrats. While Christian Democratic business associations were leading a nationwide lockout, the Communist Party was calling for the widening of the UP coalition to include these counterrevolutionary plotters!

Now the Stalinists claim that the strike is being fomented by a bloc between anti-communist trade unions and the fascist Patria y Libertad group. The Christian Democrats won control of the copper unions in elections last February after the government had forced the miners into a similar strike and Cuban leader Fidel Castro unsuccessfully appealed to the workers to "sacrifice more" for the fatherland.

(In the 13 June *Guardian*, "independent radical" apologist for Stalinist reformism, the strikers are referred to as a "privileged" sector, and the strike is written off as a "testimony...to the survival of capitalist mentality at all levels in the mines." A "survival of capitalist mentality" is hardly surprising in a capitalist state which, moreover, is just now machinegunning striking workers! What would the *Guardian* recommend instead, penance for the sin of trying to feed their children?)

It is not the responsibility of the workers that right-wing forces are using the issue of the strike against the government. A revolutionary leadership of the unions would rapidly extend the strike and demand the formation of a government of the workers parties alone, which would expropriate the key sectors of the economy. This would immediately eliminate any demagogic attempts by the right to capitalize on the strike, as well as unify the class for the inevitable clash with the bourgeoisie. The ability of the Christian Democrats to win control of the miners' unions is due solely to the complete failure of the left parties to put forward such a program in the labor movement.

As the hysterical attacks by the social democrats and Stalinists against the copper strike mount, revolutionaries must call for: Unconditional Defense of the Chilean Miners' Strike! For the Formation of Workers' Militia! Smash the Pop Front! For a Workers Government! ■

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Bi-weekly
of the Spartacist League

Editorial Board:

Liz Gordon (chairman)
Jan Norden (managing editor)
Chris Knox (labor editor)
Karen Allen (production manager)

Circulation Manager: Anne Kelley

West Coast Editor: Mark Small
New England Editor: George Foster
Midwest Editor: Joseph Seymour
Southern Editor: Jose Vetter

Published by the Spartacist
Publishing Company, Box 1377,
G. P. O., New York, N. Y. 10001.
Telephone: 925-8234.

Opinions expressed in signed
articles or letters do not neces-
sarily express the editorial
viewpoint.

Continued from page 1 ...Coexistence

relying on the initiative and capabilities of the working class is not an alternative. Thus the bureaucracy must, in order to preserve the basis of its existence (the nationalized means of production, state control of foreign trade), seek to attract massive infusions of Western capital while at the same time placing severe restrictions on the conditions of its introduction (e.g., no direct foreign investment). These divergent interests of the capitalists and the bureaucrats of the Soviet bloc make substantial, long-term economic agreements highly problematical and fundamentally unstable.

The other major discussions of the last two years have focused on the German question and arms limitation. Though obviously overlapping, these questions are distinct and separate. The Spartacist League is absolutely in favor of the normalization of diplomatic relations between East Germany and other nations. This is a concrete act which can lead to increased trade for East Germany as well as placing a temporary tactical obstacle to attack from the West. Disarmament, however, is a petty-bourgeois illusion. Wars can be eliminated only by destroying the imperialist (capitalist) system which generates them. No matter how many treaties prohibit bombs, bombs will be produced if the bourgeoisie requires them. Unlike the Stalinists, who piously promote utopian pacifist illusions, we as Trotskyists unconditionally support the military defense of the deformed workers states against imperialism (while calling for political revolution to replace the bureaucracy which is hindering that defense); we therefore oppose mutual disarmament schemes, call for unilateral disarmament of the capitalist states and support the "workers' bomb." Down with the SALT negotiations!

"Peaceful Coexistence"

Since Stalin, rejecting fundamental tenets of Marxism-Leninism, first conceived of his "theory" of "socialism in one country," Russian foreign policy has been based on "peaceful coexistence" with one or another sector of the bourgeoisie. (Right now, Brezhnev's line seems to be to convince the whole of the capitalist class of the merits of peaceful coexistence.) Coupled with this was Stalin's cowardly and philistine statement that "the idea of exporting a revolution is nonsense." But it was precisely in order to "export revolution" that Lenin and Trotsky founded the Communist International in 1919. Trotsky raised only tactical objections to the Red Army invasion of Poland in 1920; indeed, Trotsky supported even the bureaucratic and half-hearted revolutionary measures undertaken by Stalin's invasion of eastern Poland in 1939.

The underlying presupposition for a policy of "peaceful coexistence" is that workers states and capitalist states can exist together peacefully over a long period, a proposition contrary to Marxism and never supported by Lenin. To buttress their position the Stalinists quote Lenin on such issues as the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty, trade relations with and recognition of capitalist states, etc. But these issues constitute another question, namely whether it is permissible for a workers state to enter into practical, limited agreements with capitalist states. Just as we may be compelled to sign a temporary truce in the economic class struggle, in the form of a labor contract, so we may likewise be forced to sign similar truces at a political level. Thus the SL has criticized the Vietnamese Stalinists not for negotiating with the American imperialists but rather for the terms of the settlement (e.g., ignoring the political prisoners) and for their goal of a coalition government, which is based on the presumption that the bourgeois and Stalinist armed forces can "peacefully coexist" in the same state!

Until recently, the slogan of peaceful coexistence with the U.S. had been the exclusive property of the pro-Moscow CPs. But with the Nixon-Mao détente of 1972 we see vivid confirmation of the Spartacist League's characterization of Maoism as "reformism under the gun." Mao, it turns out, had never rejected "peaceful coexistence" but only the "misapplication" of this policy by Khrushchev:

"As for the imperialist countries, we should unite with their peoples and strive to coexist peacefully with those countries, do business with them and prevent any possible war, but under no circumstances should we harbor any unrealistic notions about them."

—Mao Tse-tung, "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People"

Consequently, as the Communist League, a U.S. Maoist group, wrote, China must "force a policy of peaceful coexistence on the U.S. imperialists at this time" (*People's Tribune*, April 1972).

Ye Shall Know Them By Their Acts

While Trotskyism is not opposed to military agreements with capitalist states (after all, Germany trained the Red Army during the early 1920's!), the particular agreements entered into by the Stalinists reflect their policies of capitulation before the bourgeoisie (theoretically justified by the slogans of "socialism in one country" and "peaceful coexistence"), and thus inevitably undermine the defense of the workers states.

One of the prime examples of peaceful coexistence cited by the *People's Tribune* article mentioned above was the "non-aggression pact" between Stalin and Hitler, signed on 23 August 1939. It is a fact written indelibly in the pages of history that one week later Hitler invaded Poland, in preparation for his later assault on Russia itself! More recently, last year, less than two weeks before Nixon was to go to Moscow to meet with Brezhnev, the U.S. began mining Haiphong harbor and bombing North Vietnam. Aside from a mild pro-forma protest, the Soviet leaders did nothing, so eager were they to go forward with Nixon's visit, during which they signed with this butcher a joint declaration that they would "proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alterna-

tive to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence." As for the "militant" Mao, today the Chinese diplomats are campaigning to encourage the maintenance of NATO in Europe and the remilitarization of Japan in Asia—peaceful coexistence with the capitalists and war with the USSR!

These policies are explicitly directed against proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries. This, of course, is no accident. Several years ago, during a bitter Spanish miners' strike, the Franco government was able to replenish its dwindling coal stocks by an agreement with Poland to cover the deficit caused by the strike. The bureaucrats are literally "strikebreakers of the revolution." And right now, as the American CP is trying to put on an appearance of militancy by calling for the impeachment of Nixon, Brezhnev is doing everything possible to shore up the Nixon government during the Watergate crisis, and the Russian press is treating the liberal outcry over Watergate as the product of anti-Soviet reactionaries.

The policy of peaceful coexistence cripples the defense of the deformed workers states themselves. Concretely, this defense today urgently requires the elimination of the bureaucratic-nationalist Sino-Soviet conflict which already ties up more than half the armed forces of the two principal deformed workers states (in addition to hindering the transport of supplies to Vietnam). Throughout the Vietnam war the Spartacist League has called on Moscow and Peking to supply the Vietnamese with sufficient quantities of the most modern weapons—something they have never done, preferring instead to seek to advance their own narrow interests by secret negotiations with Nixon. Although the policies of "peaceful coexistence" ultimately endanger the very existence of the deformed workers states, the bureaucrats cannot mount a revolutionary defense, for to do so would require mobilizing the working class, which would pose a direct threat to their own parasitic rule.

For the immediate release of political prisoners in the deformed workers states, victims of anti-socialist repression! Down with Brezhnev-Mao! For Sino-Soviet Unity Against Imperialism! For the Rebirth of the Fourth International! ■

Letter

Dear Editor,

The series "Stalinism and Trotskyism in Vietnam," while an important contribution to the history of this little-known chapter of world Trotskyism, nonetheless contains certain significant omissions. Part I of the series in *WV*, 27 April 1973, leaves open to question whether the 1933 electoral bloc between the Indochinese Stalinists and the Trotskyist group led by Ta Thu Thau (the "Struggle" group) "was simply a no-contest pact or involved joint propaganda around a lowest common denominator program." I. Milton Sacks, in his article "Marxism in Vietnam" (in F. Trager, ed., *Marxism in Southeast Asia*, Stanford, 1959) states that the Ta Thu Thau group and Indochinese Communist Party ran on a common electoral program which "stressed mainly a series of democratic demands (right to strike, right to form unions, voting rights, etc.) and a number of welfare measures designed to alleviate the condition of the Vietnamese workers (lighter taxes, housing, recreational facilities, etc.)."

Part 2 of your series (*WV*, 11 May 1973) states that "Seeking to avoid any appearance of revolution, the Viet Minh asked for and received the abdication of Bao Dai..." The Viet Minh were so anxious to avoid "any appearance of revolution" that they actually did not ask for the abdication of Bao Dai and were anticipating working within the framework of the monarchy. The Stalinist "two-stage revolution" which divides the democratic and national tasks

in the colonial countries from the socialist revolution, and proscribes a prior "democratic-national revolution" which is supposed to be carried out in alliance with the colonial bourgeoisie, is converted in practice into a "three-stage revolution" with a prior "progressive aristocratic-comprador bourgeois" stage! The Stalinists in inverted fashion are aware of the dynamic of the permanent revolution outlined by Trotsky, i.e., that to carry through the tasks of the democratic and national revolution the tasks of the socialist revolution are necessarily placed on the agenda. Thus, the Stalinists, in order to delay the socialist revolution, must also prevent the tasks of the national and democratic revolution from being carried through. So it was in Spain where the Stalinists prevented the expropriation and redistribution of land; so it was in Vietnam; and so it is today in Chile. Ho Chi Minh's futile attempt to recrown the "progressive monarch" Bao Dai, puppet of French and Japanese imperialism, anticipated Mao Tse-tung's courtship of that cast-off puppet-Prince of U.S. and French imperialism, Sihanouk, by 25 years. Bao Dai's actual abdication was the result of a telegram sent on 21 August 1945 by a mass meeting of the Hanoi General Association of Students, in response to a motion raised by Ho Huu Tuong, leader of the Trotskyist Indochinese Communist League.

Comradely,
Reuben Samuels
18 May 1973

AS CLASS STRUGGLE RAGES IN ARGENTINA

Guevarism vs. Social Democracy in the USec

Next to Chile, Argentina is today the politically most volatile nation in Latin America. Strategic and even tactical questions are posed with razor sharpness. Guerilla warfare, terrorism, electoral and trade-union policies—a correct revolutionary approach to these issues is crucial even to provide any leadership in day-to-day struggles of the masses. The urgency and instability of the Argentine situation sharply highlight the crisis of revolutionary leadership and expose the political bankruptcy of both wings of the fake-Trotskyist "United Secretariat of the Fourth International."

The key question is how to break the working class from Peronism, and from the syndicalism which arises as a spontaneous response to the sellouts by the Peronist labor bureaucracy. For three decades Peronism—a nationalist bourgeois populist movement—has been the dominant force in Argentina's political life. Although it represents an important sector of the capitalist class, Peronism is based primarily upon support from the working class (Argentina is over 80 percent urban and has a large industrial proletariat). Since the military *gorilas* (reactionary officers) overthrew Perón in September 1955, they have never been able to achieve a stable government (either by themselves or in combinations with the bourgeois liberal and conservative parties) against the opposition of the pro-Peronist masses. In response to the waves of working-class unrest throughout the country since the 1969 uprising in Córdoba, the generals finally decided to negotiate with Perón in hopes of achieving a military-Peronist co-government. With Perón worried about losing support to the left, an agreement was reached between these former bitter enemies in order to preserve the bourgeois order at all costs. In the recent March elections Hector Cámpora, presidential candidate of the Peronist FREJULI (Justicialista Liberation Front), gained an overwhelming victory and the generals finally stepped down. Shortly afterward, Cámpora announced that he would crush the guerilla movement (*New York Times*, 5 May 1973). Eager to show his reasonableness, the "jefe máximo" of Latin American guerillism, Fidel Castro, sent his greetings to the new government.

There is, however, growing opposition to Peronism within the workers movement. The reformist Communist Party has rapidly increased its membership from 10,000 in 1966 to more than 100,000 today, making it the second largest CP on the continent. In addition, there are at least three parties which claim to support Trotskyism. Yet in different ways each of these "Trotskyist" parties capitulates before the pressure of the bourgeoisie, failing to provide a clear proletarian alternative to the bourgeois populism of Peronism and the popular-front reformism of the CP.

Two of these groups—the PST (Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores—Socialist Workers Party) and the PRT (Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores—Revolutionary Workers Party)—both support the same self-styled "international," the so-called "United Secretariat." But (as recent internal USec documents clearly reveal) there is very little "unity" these days in the USec—and in fact the two Argentine "sections" pursue diametrically counterposed policies!—exposing the USec as an opportunist federated rotten bloc. The two Argentine groups supporting the schizophrenic USec epitomize the two political lines in a conflict which

is threatening to blow the USec apart: the PST is a consummate expression in practice of the social-democratic appetites of the U.S. Socialist Workers Party, while the PRT has put into practice the guerillaist line of the USec European majority of Mandel-Maitan-Frank, drawing the logical political conclusions of support for Castrolism and Maoism.

(The third major ostensibly Trotskyist group, Política Obrera [Workers Politics], is allied with the French OCI and defends the popular-front policy of an "anti-imperialist" front with bourgeois nationalists, as do Política Obrera's co-thinkers of the Bolivian POR.)

Guerillaism vs. Marxism

In the past three years there have been more than 250 kidnappings by guerilla groups in Argentina, many of them occurring in the last three months since the presidential elections. The first group to be formed was the FAR (Revolutionary Armed Forces), organized in 1966 to link up with Guevara's Bolivian guerilla group and subsequently contained by the military. Two Peronist groups, the FAP (Peronist Armed Forces) and the Montoneros, are much more mixed politically, including ex-right-wingers and directing their actions exclusively at the military rather than capitalism. The FAR, FAP and the Montoneros have been considering fusion for some time.

The more spectacular actions have been largely the work of the Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo (ERP—the Revolutionary People's Army) which is the armed wing of the PRT, the official Argentine section of the "United Secretariat." Among other things the ERP has been responsible for the recent kidnapping of the high Navy offi-



Joseph Hansen

cials responsible for the massacre of guerillas last summer at Trelew. The character of ERP actions varies from simple expropriations (such as the \$1 million confiscated from the National Development Bank) to the disarming of the guards at the Fiat Concord plant and direct participation in the March 1971 uprising in Córdoba. In May 1971 ERP members kidnapped an executive of the Swift Packing Company, demanding as ransom the reinstatement of suspended workers, better wages and working conditions and the distribution of food to slum areas. Last year they assassinated a hated official of the Fiat plant.

Many ERP operations have won wide sympathy from the working masses. However, sympathy and active sup-

port are two very different propositions. Most ERP actions are simply classical individual terrorism, acts directed against particularly hated symbols of capitalist despotism and exploitation. They are qualitatively the same as the tactics of the Russian Narodniks who sought to destroy czarist rule by assassinating czarist officials. The Russian Marxists first formed as a group in *rejecting* such impotent tactics as a strategy for revolution, counterposing instead the insurrectionary mobilization of the entire working class:

"In principle we have not rejected, and cannot reject, terror. Terror is one of the forms of military action that may be perfectly suitable or even essential at a definite juncture in the battle.... Far be it from us to deny the significance of heroic individual blows, but it is our duty to sound a rigorous warning against becoming infatuated with terror, against taking it to be the chief and basic means of struggle.... Terror can never be a regular military operation...."

—V.I. Lenin, "Where to Begin," 1901

Concerning guerilla warfare, Lenin took the same position:

"...a Marxist cannot regard civil war, or guerilla warfare, which is one of its forms, as abnormal and demoralising in general.... [but] the party of the proletariat can never regard guerilla warfare as the only, or even as the chief, method of struggle.... this method must be subordinated to other methods.... it must be commensurate with the chief methods of warfare, and must be ennobled by the enlightening and organising influence of socialism."

—V.I. Lenin, "Guerilla Warfare," 1906

As a strategy guerilla warfare ultimately amounts to *peasant* war. Trotsky pointed out in his theory of permanent revolution that in the backward countries even the "democratic" tasks of the revolution can only be successfully fulfilled under the dictatorship of the *proletariat*, leaning on the peasantry. Peasant-based guerilla warfare runs against this strategic perspective. Writing on Mao Tse-tung's peasant armies, Trotsky commented:

"The peasant movement is a mighty revolutionary factor, insofar as it is directed against the large landowners, militarists, feudalists and usurers. But in the peasant movement itself are very powerful proprietary and reactionary tendencies.... He who forgets about the dual nature of the peasantry is not a Marxist...."

"The Russian Narodniki ('Populists') used to accuse the Russian Marxists of 'ignoring' the peasantry, of not carrying on work in the villages, etc. To this the Marxists replied: 'We will arouse and organize the advanced workers and through the workers we shall arouse

the peasants.' Such in general is the only conceivable road for the proletarian party."

—L.D. Trotsky, "Peasant War in China," 1932

The "Trotskyists" I: The PRT and Guerillaism Run Amok

The official Argentine section of the "Trotskyist" USec, however, has a quite different point of view. According to documents of the PRT:

"For all these reasons, for a period of several years our strategy [is] for creating a revolutionary army in the countryside and to form hundreds of armed detachments of the workers and people to operate in the cities...."

—Carlos Ramirez, et al., "The Only Road to Workers' Power and Socialism," 1968

It is only natural that in embracing this guerillaist strategy the PRT has found it necessary to break with orthodox Trotskyism:

"It was not only Trotsky and Trotskyism which preserved and elaborated revolutionary Marxism in the face of Stalinist degeneration, as has been traditionally affirmed in our party and in our international. A similar role was played by Mao Tse-tung and Maoism...."

"Mao and Maoism creatively applied and developed Marxism-Leninism in the revolutionary people's war theory...."

"Today the principal theoretical task of revolutionary Marxists is to fuse the main contributions of Trotskyism and Maoism into a higher unity which would prove to be a real return to Leninism...."

"We believe that our party should clearly pronounce itself in favor of the world strategy formulated by Castroism...."

—Carlos Ramirez, et al., "The Only Road to Workers' Power and Socialism," 1968

Even more clarity is provided by an interview of Roberto Santucho (a PRT leader) published in the Chilean Castroist magazine *Punto Final* of 29 August 1972:

"...the Revolutionary Workers Party [PRT] defines itself ideologically as Marxist-Leninist and welcomes the contributions of various revolutionists from other nations, including those of our main Comandante, Che Guevara. It also welcomes the contributions that Trotsky, Kim Il Sung, Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi Minh and General Giap have made for the revolution. We believe that it is inadequate and inappropriate to ideologically define the given organization as Trotskyist."

—quoted in *Intercontinental Press*, 27 November 1972

As for the Fourth International, according to a "Memorandum on the International" of the PRT, it "has great limitations and a scarcely redeemable tradition": Thus the PRT calls for "the formation of a new international revolu-



Ernest Mandel

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS



Left: Chs Gusvora with Cuban guerilla fighters in 1958. Uppsr right: Juan Carlos Corol, presidential candidate of the social-democratic PST in recent Argentine elections. Lower right: Nahuel Moreno, PST theoretician.

tionary party based on the Chinese, Cuban, Korean, Vietnamese and Albanian parties" (*Resolutions of the Fifth Congress of the PRT, 1970*).

Maolism and Castrolism (or Albanian Hoxhalsm for that matter) are fundamentally no more than national variants of Stalinism, with its "theories" of "socialism in one country" and the "bloc of four classes." Thus all of these leaders concur in proclaiming that the revolution in the backward countries must be *national* rather than socialist, led by the peasantry and perhaps sections of the bourgeoisie (the "good" bourgeoisie, of course) rather than the proletariat. This is simply the old Menshevik theory of revolution in stages, first the "democratic" stage, and later (never) for socialism. It is the explicit denial of the Marxist theory of permanent revolution and a repudiation of Lenin's April Theses. This two-stage theory is taken up by the ERP in its strategy of "anti-imperialist guerilla war." In an interview in 1971, a leader of the PRT responded to the question, "What are the politics of the PRT-ERP?" by saying:

"The ERP is a national liberation organization that struggles for the people. The PRT is based on the working class and fights for socialism. There is a difference in emphasis."

—James Petras, "Building a Popular Army in Argentina," *New Left Review* No. 71, January-February 1972

The program of the ERP makes this "difference in emphasis" more explicit by not mentioning the word socialism (much less Marxism or Trotskyism), and calling for a "system of social democracy, a revolutionary people's government led by the working class," a classic exposition of the Maoist slogan of "new democracy." The classless call for a "people's government" is the repudiation of the slogan of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky—"Workers of the World Unite!"—and the result is unadulterated bourgeois patriotism:

"Argentines: The Revolutionary People's Army calls on all patriots to fulfill their responsibilities, to take their posts in our revolutionary war of the People, in this second War of Independence. General San Martín and Comandante Guevara are our finest examples. The task of the hour is to follow and emulate their thought and action and that of our past and present heroes and martyrs. WIN OR DIE FOR ARGENTINA!" [emphasis in original]

—"Program of the Revolutionary Army of the People," *Resolutions of the Fifth Congress of the PRT, 1970*

Like Mao and Castro, the PRT/ERP does not draw a sharp line against coalitions with sectors of the bourgeoisie. In general, it calls for alliances with "sectors of the petty bourgeoisie and progressive bourgeois sectors" which "can have an interest in

the revolution, but not with sufficient consistency to be able to lead it forward" (*Intercontinental Press*, 31 July 1972). In particular, the PRT/ERP has supported the line of the MIR in Chile, which gives "critical support" to the popular-front government of Allende, and the line of the Tupamaros in Uruguay, who supported the bourgeois candidate of the "Broad Front" in last year's elections. In Argentina, a section of the ERP broke away at the time of the March elections to form the ERP/22 August which called for votes for the Peronist FREJULI candidates. While the PRT correctly refers to the Peronist movement as bourgeois and refused to give it open support in the elections, it has nevertheless made a sharp (and false) distinction between the Cámpora government and the armed forces. According to a recent interview with a leader of the ERP, since the

"Cámpora government represents the popular will... our organization will not attack the new government as long as it does not attack the people or the guerilla movement. Our organization will continue to struggle militarily against the large, exploitative companies, imperialist ones for the most part, and the counterrevolutionary armed forces.... As for the police... the ERP will suspend its attacks against it as long as it does not cooperate with the army in hunting down the guerilla movement and in repressing popular demonstrations."

—*Intercontinental Press*, 28 May 1973

And this alter Cámpora has already declared in advance that he will "crush" the guerillas mercilessly!

Thus the PRT/ERP politically capitulates to the Stalinist policy of two-stage revolution and support for the "progressive bourgeois sectors." Guerillism itself fundamentally disorients the advanced workers by point-

ing toward isolated heroic acts instead of the revolutionary mobilization of the proletariat. According to the PRT, the "classical" or "Russian" "model" of armed insurrection of the working class is syndicalist, and instead the "only road" is preparation for a "prolonged guerilla war." While turning from peasant guerilla war to urban guerillaism, the PRT/ERP substitutes a utopian military tactic for the need to construct a revolutionary leadership through intervention in the struggles of the working class:

"In addition, the entire party recognizes the clear distinction made between urban guerillas and self-defense of the masses, aware that the guerilla units in the cities were following a tactic relatively independent of the daily shifts in the class struggle. That is, they work out tactical plans independent of the immediate struggle of the masses."

—"The Class Struggle Inside the Party," *Resolutions of the Fifth Congress of the PRT, 1970*

A "revolutionary" strategy "independent of the daily shifts of the class struggle" means military adventurism by petty-bourgeois forces relying upon individual heroics rather than upon the organization and consciousness of the proletariat. Even if the guerillaist organization and its cadres are not simply physically liquidated, they can in no case establish a healthy workers state governed by the working class. In those rare cases when such formations have succeeded in seizing state power, they have established only bonapartist forms of rule, either bourgeois nationalism or—in the best case—deformed workers states which must undergo proletarian political revolution to oust the bureaucratic strata which block the road to socialism and the extension of the revolution internationally.

The "Trotskyists" II: The PST and the Social-Democratic Swamp

Thus the "Trotskyist-Castroite" theories of the PRT/ERP guerillaists have nothing in common with authentic Trotskyism. In the Usec faction fight, the opposition to the PRT radical terrorists and their European Usec supporters is led by the reformist U.S. SWP, which is backing the Argentine PST of Nahuel Moreno, pseudo-Trotskyist café revolutionary *sui generis*, and until 1969 the leading spokesman of the Usec in Latin America. Although the SWP-Moreno wing now seeks to pose as principled defenders of orthodox Trotskyism against Castroite guerillaism, the basis of their opposition to the Mandel-Frank-Maitan tendency epitomized by the PRT/ERP is from the right, proceeding from an appetite for direct reformist collaboration with their own bourgeoisies.

This can be illustrated by examining Moreno's own history and his current positions on Argentina. In 1961 Moreno wrote:

"Of course, life has brought out the gaps, omissions and errors of the program of Permanent Revolution... The dogma that only the working class can accomplish the democratic tasks is false. Sectors of the urban middle class and the peasantry are, on occasion, the

revolutionary leadership... History... has rejected the theory that the proletariat, in the backward countries, is the revolutionary leadership... Mao Tse-tungism, or the theory of guerilla war, is the particular reflection in the field of theory of the actual stage of world revolution... [It is necessary to] synthesize the correct general theory and program (Trotskyist) with the correct particular theory and program (Mao Tse-tungist or Castroist)... [The state] conserves relative autonomy and can maneuver between distinct social classes... There are revolutionary democratic dictatorships (based on the peasantry, the people and the proletariat)."

—N. Moreno, *La revolución latinoamericana*, 1961

This is simply an earlier incarnation of the ideology of the PRT/ERP: the revolutionary role of the peasantry, the bankruptcy of the program of permanent revolution, the theory of new democracy—it is all there, perhaps even a bit more crudely worded. It was on the basis of these theories that the Moreno group, which until then had been deeply buried in the Peronist movement—issuing its magazine *Palabra Obrera* "under the discipline of General Perón and of the Peronist Supreme Command"—fused with a petty-bourgeois Castroite group (the FRIP), which had been active among Tucumán sugar workers, in 1964 to form the PRT, official section of the "United Secretariat of the Fourth International."

During the period 1964-68 the PRT continued to follow these guerillaist policies, and without a single word of protest from Usec leaders. It would doubtless still be doing so today if some of the well-meaning but naive militants of the PRT had not decided to put Moreno's words into practice, calling for the transition to armed struggle in the north. For a time Moreno went along with the drift, going so far as to announce that "today OLAS [Castro's guerilla "International"], with its national combat organizations for armed struggle, is the only organizational vehicle for power" (N. Moreno, "La revolución latinoamericana, Argentina y nuestras tareas," *Estrategia* No. 7, September 1968).

But "armed struggle" has a way of becoming dangerous, so when it was clear that a sizeable portion of the PRT was actually headed toward the formation of a "guerilla army," Moreno split the party (1968). Until late 1971 the Moreno group retained the name of the PRT and of its newspaper (*La Verdad*), while the guerillaists led by Carlos Ramirez became known by the title of their organ (*Combatiente*). However, having already exhausted the policies of deep immersion in Peronism and Castroism, Moreno, sensing a possibility of participating in the elections as a respectable left party (all communist parties are banned in Argentina, and have been both under Perón and the military), began sniffing around for a new swamp in which to bury the PRT (*Verdad*). This was promptly found in the shape of a wing of the old Partido Socialista Argentino (PSA—Argentine Socialist Party, affiliated with the Second International) led by Juan Carlos Corol. The formalities of a common program were tidily dealt with in the form of "Basis of Unification" which has been described by Joseph Hansen and his co-thinkers as "consisting essentially of a summary of Trotskyist positions based on the theory of permanent revolution" (*Argentina and Bolivia—The Balance Sheet*, 1973).

Let us see what the permanent revolution sounds like in the mouths of these social democrats. In the first place, it seems that the party must "tirelessly struggle to bring about a workers and people's government that will assure national liberation and the revolutionary construction of socialism." This is simple enough: if Trotskyism calls for a workers government to achieve socialism, and Stalinism calls for a people's government to achieve national liberation—then just combine the two for the best of all possible worlds! Sixty years of struggle between Stalinism and Trotskyism,

continued on page 10



ERP guerillas at Trelew after attempted escape from prison in 1972. One week later guards shot them in cold blood, killing all but three.

The Stalin School of Falsification Revisited

1/ THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

In their tireless efforts to betray the struggles of the workers and peasants, the Stalinists must continue to maintain a pretense of revolutionism. Yet their doctrines stand counterposed to the line of Marxism. This presents them with a dilemma, which they can only resolve by resorting to systematic lies about the Trotskyists. This goes from distortions of the political positions of Trotsky (as well as Marx and Lenin), to denying Trotsky's leading role as the military organizer of the October Revolution and accusing him of carrying out espionage for the Mikado! While many of the specific charges leveled against Zinoviev, Bukharin and other leading Bolsheviks accused of Trotskyism during the Moscow Trials were admitted by Khrushchev in 1956 to be total fabrications, the method remains. Today we are witnessing a widespread revival of the "Stalin School of Falsification" especially on the part of the various Maoist groups. Just as Stalin in his day needed a cover to justify his crimes against the working class, so today must the Maoists resort to vicious slander in order to cover for their counterrevolutionary policies in Bangladesh, Indonesia and elsewhere. This series is intended as a reply to these lies and an introduction to some of the basic concepts of Trotskyism, as they have developed in the struggle against Stalinist reformism during the past fifty years.

The struggle between the reformist line of Stalinism and the revolutionary policies of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky is no academic matter of interest only to historians. The counterrevolutionary policies of the "Great Organizer of Defeats" (Stalin) led not only to the assassination of Trotsky by an agent of Stalin's GPU and the murder of tens of thousands of Russian Left Oppositionists in the Siberian concentration camps, but also to the strangulation of the Chinese (1927), German (1933), French (1936), Spanish (1937), Indonesian (1965) and French (1968) revolutions as well as the sellout "peace agreements" of the Vietnamese Stalinists in 1946 and 1954. The struggle between Stalinism and Trotskyism is literally a matter of life and death for the revolutionary movement and must be given the closest attention by militants who are seeking the road to Marxism.

What is the Permanent Revolution?

At the heart of this conflict is the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution. This theory, first advanced at the time of the 1905 Russian revolution, was summarized by Trotsky in his article "Three Concepts of the Russian Revolution," written in 1939:

"...the complete victory of the democratic revolution in Russia is conceivable only in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, leaning on the peasantry. The dictatorship of the proletariat, which would inevitably place on the order of the day not only the democratic but socialistic tasks as well, would at the same time give a powerful impetus to the international socialist revolution. Only the victory of the proletariat in the West could protect Russia from bourgeois restoration and

assure it the possibility of rounding out the establishment of socialism."

It is this theory which Davidson and the Stalinists reject when they say that "Trotsky's views on the course of the Russian revolution, like those of the Mensheviks, were refuted by history" (*Guardian*, 4 April 1973). In fact, only because the uprising never reached the seizure of power was Trotsky's theory not confirmed in practice in 1905. The course of the Russian revolution of 1917 fully verified this theory. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat, embodied in soviet power, could solve the questions of land and peace, as well as liberating oppressed nations from czarist rule. Moreover, a careful analysis of Lenin's views in 1905 and 1917 shows that he came over to agreement with all the essential aspects of Trotsky's formulation, and abandoned his own earlier slogan of a "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry."

The Stalinist claim that Lenin still stood for a "democratic" revolution in 1917 and called for "socialism in one country" is pure fabrication. Likewise, their accusation that Trotsky's slogan was "Down with the Czar, For a Workers Government," supposedly ignoring the peasantry, was repeatedly denied by Trotsky. The slogan of permanent revolution was, rather, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, supported by the peasantry.

In Trotsky's view, because of the uneven and combined development of the world economy, the bourgeoisie of the backward countries is tightly bound to the feudal and imperialist interests, thereby preventing it from carrying out the fundamental tasks of the bourgeois revolution—democracy, agrarian revolution and national emancipation. In the presence of an aroused peasantry and a combative working class, each of these goals would directly threaten the political and economic dominance of the capitalist class. The tasks of the bourgeois revolution can be solved only by the alliance of the peasantry and the proletariat.

Marxism holds that there can only be one dominant class in the state. Since, as the *Communist Manifesto* states, the proletariat is the only consistently revolutionary class, this alliance must take the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, supported by the peasantry. In carrying out the democratic tasks of the revolution, the proletarian state must inevitably make "despotic inroads into the rights of bourgeois property" (e.g., expropriation of landlords), and thus the revolution directly passes over to socialist tasks, without pausing at any arbitrary "stages" or, as Lenin put it, without a "Chinese wall" being erected between the bourgeois and proletarian phases. Thus the revolution becomes permanent, eventually leading to the complete abolition of classes (socialism).

But socialism is the product of the liberation of the productive forces at the highest level of capitalist development: classes can be abolished only by eliminating want, that is, scarcity. Thus, while the dictatorship of the proletariat may be established in an isolated and backward country, socialism must be the joint achievement of at least



Leon Trotsky arriving in Petrograd, May 1917.

several advanced countries. For these complementary reasons the revolution must extend and deepen itself—or else perish. Thus the opposition between Trotsky's "permanent revolution" and Stalin's "socialism in one country" is in reality the opposition between socialism on a world scale and the most brutal regime of bourgeois-feudal reaction (barbarism); there is no middle road.

While the theory of permanent revolution was the achievement of Leon Trotsky, the concept was first introduced by Karl Marx in 1850. Davidson, in his effort to cloak Stalin's theory of "socialism in one country" with the mantle of Marxism, maintains that Marx's use of the phrase "permanent revolution" was simply a general observation about class struggle continuing until socialism:

"Thus the revolution is 'permanent' in two ways. First in looking toward the future, its course is one of uninterrupted class struggle until classes themselves are abolished. Second, looking back historically once classes are abolished, the revolution is permanent in the sense that there is no longer class struggle and the seizure of power and domination of one class by another."

—*Guardian*, 4 April 1973

At this level of abstraction, it is no wonder that Davidson concludes that differences arise only "in the particularity of the question." But let us take

a look first at what Marx actually said:

"While the democratic petty-bourgeois wish to bring the revolution to a conclusion as quickly as possible, and with the achievement, at most, of the above demands, it is our interest and our task to make the revolution permanent until all more or less possessing classes have been forced out of their position of dominance, until the proletariat has conquered state power, and the association of proletarians, not only in one country but in all the dominant countries of the world, has advanced so far that competition among the proletarians of these countries has ceased and that at least the decisive productive forces are concentrated in the hands of the proletarians. For us the issue cannot be the alteration of private property but only its annihilation; not the smoothing over of class antagonisms but the abolition of classes, not the improvement of existing society but the foundation of a new one."

—Karl Marx, "Address to the Central Committee of the Communist League," 1850

This is in fact a powerful polemic, 75 years in advance, against Stalin's sophistry about "socialism in one country." Trotsky's theory is a further development of these fundamental propositions in the epoch of imperialism, when capitalism has penetrated throughout the backward regions and the objective prerequisites for socialism on a world scale already exist (thereby endangering even the young

bourgeoisies of the ex-colonial countries).

Revolution by Stages: Germany 1848

According to the Stalinists the chief error of Trotskyism is the failure to recognize the necessity of "stages" of the revolution, in particular the democratic stage as opposed to the socialist stage. One of Davidson's more illustrious predecessors wrote (a few years before Stalin murdered him as a "Trotskyite"):

"Comrade Trotsky put the dictatorship of the working class at the beginning of the process, but did not see the steps and transitions that led to this dictatorship; he ignored the concrete relation of forces... he did not see the stages of the revolution...."

—N. Bukharin, "On the Theory of Permanent Revolution," 1925

Let us consider this "theory" of two-stage revolution, the "particularity" of the permanent revolution. Did Marx, perhaps, have such a theory? Marx, of course, rigorously distinguished the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions as to their social content, since they represent different epochs of historical development. But even in the mid-19th century it was becoming clear that the bourgeoisie was too weak and the proletariat too powerful for there to exist a "Chinese wall" between the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions. Distinct in social content, they would be closely linked historically. The German revolution of 1848 made this link particularly clear. In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels wrote:

"Communists pay special attention to Germany. There are two reasons for this. First of all, Germany is upon the eve of a bourgeois revolution. Secondly, this revolution will take place under comparatively advanced conditions as far as the general civilisation of Europe is concerned, and when the German proletariat is much more highly developed than was the English proletariat in the seventeenth century or the French proletariat in the eighteenth. Consequently, in nineteenth-century Germany, the bourgeois revolution can only be the immediate precursor of a proletarian revolution."

Marx did not believe that the working class could directly achieve victory in 1848, but that it would be forced to support the liberal bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie insofar as they fought against feudal-absolutist reaction. But even in this pre-imperialist period, when the proletariat was quite weak and politically dominated by the artisan and democratic petty-bourgeois interests, he counseled the workers to "simultaneously erect their own revolutionary workers' government hard by the new official government" in order to oppose their previous ally, as well as bring about "the arming of the whole proletariat."

Marx's prediction that proletarian revolution would closely follow the bourgeois revolutions of 1848 was not borne out. But neither were there successful bourgeois revolutions, precisely because the fear that proletarian revolution would break out if the least step were taken to rouse the masses drove the liberals into the arms of Prussian and Austrian reaction. Tied to the feudalists by a common dread of social revolution, the liberals strove not to overthrow the monarchy (as did the French bourgeoisie in 1789), but to share power with the feudalists. The German bourgeoisie could not rise above the level of a "shopocracy," as Engels put it.

Revolution by Stages: Russia 1905

The Russian revolution of 1905 again raised the question of permanent revolution, but in much sharper form. The Russian bourgeoisie was far weaker even than the German. For centuries the main characteristic of Russian development was its primitiveness and slowness, resulting from Russia's unfavorable geographical location and sparse population. Capitalist development in the northern empire was pri-

marily imported from the West by the autocratic state, simply grafted on to the existing feudal economy. Thus while a modern industrial proletariat was forming in the main cities, concentrated in large factories which utilized the most advanced techniques, the town handicrafts and early forms of manufacture which had formed the economic base for the bourgeoisie in the West, never had time to develop. With large industry primarily in the hands of European capital and state banks, the Russian capitalist class remained small in number, isolated, half-foreign and without historical traditions. Moreover, it remained tied by a thousand strands to the feudal-absolutist state and the landed aristocracy. A bourgeois-led revolution which could solve the tasks of democracy, agrarian revolution and national emancipation, was utterly out of the question. And yet the tasks of the bourgeois revolution remained.

Faced with this reality the two wings of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party took sharply opposed positions. The Mensheviks with scholastic formalism and utter spinelessness deduced from the democratic character of the initial tasks of the revolution the "strategy" of an alliance with the liberal bourgeoisie. In a speech at the "Unification Congress" of the RSDLP (1906), Axelrod, a leading Menshevik, remarked:

"The social relations of Russia have ripened only for a bourgeois revolution. ... While this general political lawlessness persists, we must not even so much as mention the direct fight of the proletariat against other classes for political power. ... It is fighting for the conditions of bourgeois development. Objective historical conditions doom our pro-

the agrarian revolution. This was codified in his formula of a "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry":

"We must be perfectly certain in our minds as to what real social forces are opposed to 'tsarism.' ... The big bourgeoisie, the landlords, the factory owners, and 'society,' which follows the *Osvobozhdeniye* [the liberals] lead, cannot be such a force. ... We know that owing to their class position they are incapable of waging a decisive struggle against tsarism; they are too heavily fettered by private property, by capital and land to enter into a decisive struggle. They stand in too great need of tsarism, with its bureaucratic, police, and military forces for use against the proletariat and the peasantry, to want it to be destroyed. No, the only force capable of gaining 'a decisive victory over tsarism' means the establishment of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry." [emphasis in original]

—V.I. Lenin, "Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution," 1905

This policy was irreconcilably opposed to the insipid liberalism of the Mensheviks, instead fanning the flames of peasant revolt and leading the proletariat in a "tactless" assault on the czarist autocracy. But at the same time he insisted on the characterization of the revolution as bourgeois, with power to be placed in the hands of the peasantry and the future opened to a flowering of capitalist development:

"Marxists are absolutely convinced of the bourgeois character of the Russian revolution. What does that mean? It means that the democratic reforms in the political system, and the social and economic reforms that have become a necessity for Russia, do not in themselves imply the undermining of bour-

geois rule; on the contrary, they will, for the first time, really clear the ground for a wide and rapid, European and not Asiatic, development of capitalism; they will, for the first time, make it possible for the bourgeoisie to rule as a class."

—Ibid.

Trotsky's view, quoted at the beginning of this article, was distinct from those of the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks, though immeasurably closer to the latter. As he later wrote: "The theory of the permanent revolution, which originated in 1905... pointed out that the democratic tasks of the backward bourgeois nations lead directly, in our epoch, to the dictatorship of the proletariat and that the dictatorship of the proletariat puts socialist tasks on the order of the day."

—"Permanent Revolution," 1929

According to Davidson, Lenin "insisted that the revolution would develop in stages" while Trotsky supposedly completely ignored the bourgeois-

democratic stage. This is simply a smokescreen. Trotsky never denied the bourgeois character of the initial phases of the revolution in the sense of its immediate historical tasks, but only in the sense of its driving forces and perspectives:

"Already in 1905, the Petersburg workers called their soviet a proletarian government. This designation passed into the everyday language of that time and was completely embodied in the program of the struggle of the working class for power. At the same time, we set up against Tsarism an elaborated program of political democracy (universal suffrage, republic, militia, etc.). We could act in no other way. Political democracy is a necessary stage in the development of the working masses—with the highly important reservation that in one case this stage lasts for decades, while in another, the revolutionary situation permits the masses to emancipate themselves from the prejudices of political democracy even before its institutions have been converted into reality." [emphasis in original]

—L.D. Trotsky, "Introduction" to *The Year 1905*, 1922

Davidson again tries to cloud the issues by claiming that Trotsky was "hostile to the peasantry" while "Lenin's view is directly opposite." This is pure fabrication. It is true that Trotsky dismissed out of hand the idea that the peasantry as a whole could be a "socialist ally" of the working class:

"From the very first moment after its taking power, the proletariat will have to find support in the antagonisms between the village poor and the village rich, between the agricultural proletariat and the agricultural bourgeoisie."

—L.D. Trotsky, "Results and Prospects," 1905

But in this respect, Lenin's view was identical:

"The struggle against the bureaucrat and the landlord can and must be waged together with all the peasants, even the well-to-do and the middle peasants. On the other hand, it is only together with the rural proletariat that the struggle against the bourgeoisie, and therefore against the well-to-do peasants too, can be properly waged."

—V.I. Lenin, "Petty-Bourgeois and Proletarian Socialism," 1905

The dispute between Lenin and Trotsky was not over whether or not the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution could be skipped or whether an alliance between the workers and peasants was necessary, but concerned the political mechanics of the collaboration of the proletariat and peasantry, the degree of independence of the latter. Trotsky pointed out (as had been shown by all past revolutionary experience, as well as the writings of Marx and Engels) that because of its intermediate position and heterogeneity of its social composition, the peasantry as a class was incapable of taking an independent role or forming its own independent party. It was compelled to follow the lead of either the bourgeoisie or the proletariat.

Revolution in Stages: 1917

It is no accident that Davidson's articles hardly mention the 1917 October Revolution, going instead from the disputes in 1905 over the role of the peasantry straight to the question of "socialism in one country." Indeed, had Davidson reproduced Lenin's writings from this period he would have had to print statements radically different from Lenin's views of the 1905-1907 period. Before Lenin's arrival from Europe on 4 April the majority of the Bolshevik party called for "critical support" to the bourgeois Provisional Government of Prince Lvov, which had taken power after the February revolution overthrew the czar. Stalin was the chief spokesman for this viewpoint at the March 1917 Bolshevik Party Conference. In his report on the attitude to the Provisional Government, he said:

"...the Provisional Government has in fact taken the role of fortifier of the conquests of the revolutionary people. ... It is not to our advantage at present to force events, hastening the process of repelling the bourgeois layers, who

continued on page 10

Illustration of Stalinist doctoring of history:

Top photo shows
Lenin speaking
while Trotsky and
Kamenev wait.
Lower picture,
taken a few
seconds later,
has been
retouched to
eliminate Trotsky
and Kamenev.

letariat to an inevitable collaboration with the bourgeoisie against our common enemy."

This conclusion was derived by simply mechanically pasting the classical scheme of European (and more particularly French) development onto Russian conditions, with the implications that proletarian revolution could only come after many decades of capitalist development. The kernel of the Menshevik position was captured by Plekhanov's remark that "we must prize the support of the non-proletarian parties and not drive them away from us by tactless behavior." To this Lenin responded: "...the liberals among the landed gentry will forgive you millions of 'tactless' acts, but they will never forgive incitements to take away their land."

As against Plekhanov's coalition with the bourgeoisie, Lenin called for a bloc with the peasantry to carry out



...Farm Workers

After cataloging the crimes of the Teamsters in the fields and pointing out that "Safeway promotes Teamster lettuce as 'union' lettuce," Chavez goes on:

"Doesn't your conscience require you to support the desire of farmworkers to build an honest and democratic union that they can believe in? Mr. Reynolds, we ask you in this time of crisis to stand for justice by selling only those grapes and only that lettuce that bears the UFW label." [emphasis in original]

Instead of denouncing the Teamster leadership directly to rank-and-file teamsters, Chavez seeks to prod the capitalist anti-labor witchhunters into a new attempt to destroy the truck drivers' union: His letter to Reynolds denounces Teamster "corruption" and cites possible pretexts for state investigation. Chavez appeared at a press conference in Washington, D.C. with Democrat Edward Roybal of Los Angeles to call for a congressional probe of Teamster-grower collusion. In January, Chavez sued the Teamsters in San Francisco federal court, citing violations of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act and conspiracy, and charging over \$200 million in damages.

Like the "progressive" bureaucrats Arnold Miller of the UMW, James Morrissey of the NMU, etc., Chavez invites the bourgeois state to protect the workers and settle disputes within the labor movement. Such an expression of confidence in the "fairness" of the state not only creates the illusion of the state as a "neutral arbiter," somehow standing above classes, but lays the basis for further governmental interference and ultimately control of the trade unions. While Teamster operations in California fields are simply company unionism (often without any members at all), the rest of the Teamsters' union is real. "Calling the cops" on the Teamsters through court suits and state investigations is potentially as serious as the Teamster-grower assault on farm workers.

Teamsters Out of the Fields!

The conflict in the fields in California is not a "jurisdictional dispute," but a conscious attempt by the Teamster bureaucracy to provide the growers with a company union to smash the UFW. This treachery is laced with the most blatant racism. In an interview Einar Mohn, West Coast Teamster official, made his feelings clear on farm-worker participation in the Teamsters union:

"I'm not sure how effective a union can be when it is composed of Mexican-Americans and Mexican nationals with temporary visas. Maybe as agriculture becomes more sophisticated, more mechanized, with fewer transients, fewer green carders [aliens], and as jobs become more attractive to whites, then we can build a union that can have structures... and have membership participation."

—Los Angeles Times, 28 April 1973

This was not an idle insult, since the growers hope to use the protection afforded them by the Teamster alliance to increase mechanization and force farm workers out of their jobs over the next few years.

Teamster bureaucrats are using hired professional thugs largely recruited from motorcycle gangs, paid \$67 a day and armed with clubs and chains to beat pickets and force workers to stay in the fields. They have accepted thousands of dollars in illegal cash payments from lettuce growers to do their dirty work, and no doubt unknown thousands more from other growers. Teamster contracts restore the hated labor contractor system in place of the union hiring hall system of the UFW. In an industry which has been notorious for dividing the workers by playing off ethnic and national groups

against one another, union control of hiring is a key demand.

The meager but legitimate contracts won by the UFW for grape and lettuce workers do represent a step forward for one of the most oppressed sectors of the American proletariat. Despite the Chavez misleadership, these gains must be defended against the joint attack of the Teamster bureaucracy and the growers. The first demand of all militants can only be "Defend the UFW! Teamsters out of the fields!"



Sheriff's deputies arrest UFW strikers near Bakersfield, Calif., in May.

This demand must be accompanied by demands for a vigorous organizing drive; mass picketing; well-prepared, armed self-defense of picket lines; and a drive throughout labor to prevent the handling, moving and processing of struck products. The Teamsters are key to this strategy, with their control of canneries, shed workers and truck drivers. Rank-and-file teamsters in California have denounced the betrayals of Fitzsimmons, and some notable successes have been achieved in the past in getting teamsters and longshoremen to "hot cargo" scab products. Yet at every turn, Chavez has moved to substitute boycotts for hot cargoing and spreading the strikes, and impotent pacifism in place of militant mass picketing. This has opened the door to the Teamster union-busting which now threatens to throw farm workers back to abysmal, pre-union conditions.

The Question of Immigration

Successive waves of immigrants were used for intensive labor in the fields after Chinese immigration was ended in 1882—Japanese, Filipinos, "Okies," etc. When the creation of World War II-related jobs robbed the fields of labor, the "bracero" program was instituted to import Mexicans as contract labor, subject to terms of employment set unilaterally by growers and enforced by the threat of deportation. The growers were thus supplied with a docile work force, desperate and totally at the mercy of the employer.

At the end of World War II, the growers claimed a continued "labor shortage," and obtained extension of the "bracero" program. In the first major farm strike in the post-war period, against DiGiorgio in 1947, braceros were used as strikebreakers against the National Farm Labor Union (NFLU-AFL). The braceros working for DiGiorgio at first left the fields in support of the union, but returned to work when threatened with deportation. The NFLU, an outgrowth of the Socialist Party-backed Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, showed that it had no intention of fighting for the rights of braceros. Instead of denouncing deportation and seeking to organize the braceros, the NFLU leadership appealed to Congress to stop the use of

braceros as strikebreakers, which was formally illegal under the master bracero contract. By the time the NFLU's liberal friends could provide assistance and transfer the strikebreakers to another grower, the braceros had already harvested and irrigated during the crucial period, undercutting the impact of the strike. After two and a half years of unsuccessful picketing, the strike was ended and the AFL dropped the NFLU by shutting off financial support.

The labor aristocracy in the U.S. has consistently called for and defended immigration restrictions, exclusion and deportation in a distorted attempt to defend the jobs of American workers. The bureaucrats "guard" the wages and conditions of American workers by lining up with the capitalists and their imperialist government against foreign workers. Unless the labor movement combats imperialist protectionism, including discriminatory immigration quotas and the "illegal" status of foreign workers, with an internationalist commitment to the organized struggle of all workers, it will continue to fall victim to capitalist maneuvers based on super-exploited layers.

When the bracero program was ended under the pressure of the AFL-CIO in 1963, the flow of Mexicans desperate for jobs continued on the basis of illegal maneuvers by the Naturalization and Immigration Service. The workers, illegally residing in the U.S., were deprived of all rights and subject to deportation. As a result of liberal exposure of the Immigration Service, massive roundups and instant deportations of "illegal" aliens are now being conducted.

Until March 1973, the UFW supported the Rodino-Kennedy Bill which would provide fines for employers who knowingly hire aliens, on the grounds that aliens drive down wages and provide recruiting grounds for scab-holders! By this incredible support for discriminatory nationalist legislation, directed primarily at the same Mexican workers who make up the backbone of the UFW as well as providing a justification for building the union on Mexican nationalism, Chavez reveals his appetite for joining the labor aristocracy by creating a miniature ver-

sion of the Meany and Fitzsimmons machines which for years have tried to sabotage the farm workers' struggles. Chavez' change of heart came only because the death threat to the union happens to coincide with the deportation of thousands of Mexicans in the Los Angeles area. Public support for the union would have dwindled rapidly had it maintained its earlier position.

Origins of the UFW

Chavez began organizing farm workers as a member of the Community Service Organization, a middle-class community protest group for Spanish-speaking workers set up by Saul Alinsky. Chavez broke with the group when it balked at serious trade-union organizing, but he carried its conceptions of middle-class protest with him. During the 1965 Delano grape strike, which was begun not by Chavez but by the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee (AWOC, AFL-CIO), Chavez sought to impose "non-violence" on the strike through his National Farm Workers' Association (NFWA), substituting appeals to priests for the organization of picket defense. This resulted in physical attacks and arrests as harassment of the strike mounted.

Schenley industries was shut down by mass picketing during the 1965 strike, and traveling pickets managed to prevent the loading of scab grapes on a ship bound for Hong Kong from San Francisco. These actions etopped the importation of scabs at Schenley and inspired enthusiastic support from longshoremen and teamsters to stop the flow of scab grapes. Chavez, however, worked to curtail such militant, class-struggle methods, replacing them with a grape boycott based on appeals to liberals and eham labor solidarity. Action by other workers was limited to supporting the boycott.

Schenley became the first major grower to sign a contract with Chavez, in April 1966. Though Schenley had been shut down since October 1965 through mass picketing, Chavez laid responsibility for the victory on the boycott. He then proceeded to organize a struggle against DiGiorgio based on similar boycott tactics and a mass march to

Spartacist League Public Offices

REVOLUTIONARY LITERATURE

BAY AREA

Wednesday } 3:00-8:00 p.m.
Friday
Saturday 12:00-6:00 p.m.

330-40th Street
(near Broadway)
Oakland, California
Phone 653-4668

BOSTON

Tuesday } 1:00-5:00 p.m.
Wednesday } 7:00-9:00 p.m.
Friday
Saturday 11:00 a.m.-3:00 p.m.

639 Massachusetts Ave.
Room 335
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Phone 492-3428

Spartacist Local Directory

ATLANTA Box 7686, Atlanta, GA 30309	DETROIT..... (313) 862-4920 Box 663A, General P.O. Detroit, MI 48232
BERKELEY- OAKLAND..... (415) 653-4668 Box 852, Main P.O. Berkeley, CA 94701	LOS ANGELES..... (213) 467-6855 Box 38053, Wilcox Sta. Los Angeles, CA 90038
BOSTON..... (617) 876-6382 Box 188, M.I.T. Sta. Cambridge, MA 02139	MILWAUKEE Box 5144, Harbor Sta. Milwaukee, WI 53204
BUFFALO..... (716) 881-3064 Box 412, Station C Buffalo, NY 14209	NEW ORLEANS..... (504) 866-8384 Box 51634, Main P.O. New Orleans, LA 70151
CHICAGO..... (312) 548-2934 Box 6471, Main P.O. Chicago, IL 60680	NEW YORK..... (212) 925-2426 Box 1377, G.P.O. New York, NY 10001
CLEVELAND..... (216) 696-4943 Cleveland W/V Committee Box 2492 Cleveland, OH 44112	SAN DIEGO..... (714) 272-2286 Box 22052, Univ. City Sta. San Diego, CA 92122
	SAN FRANCISCO..... (415) 863-1459 Box 40574 San Francisco, CA 94140

appeal to liberal Democrats. Culminating in a rally of 10,000 in Sacramento, the march showed the readiness of farm workers to organize. The repeatedly asserted purpose of the march, however, was not even a protest but a "penance for the sins of the strikers". The response of Democratic Governor Brown to this impotent display was, "Growers have problems too."

But Brown was running for re-election and needed votes. He arranged for union elections to be held at DiGiorgio ranches. This did not stop the growers from attempting to defeat the union through bringing in the Teamsters as a company union. Though the Teamsters had a strong base in the canneries, and rank-and-file teamsters had been eager to refuse to handle struck products, the Teamster bureaucracy's response from the beginning was to keep the canneries working and sabotage all efforts at solidarity. DiGiorgio's campaign to force the workers to vote Teamster was defeated, a major victory for the NFWA. However, Chavez's policies of reliance on liberals, state aid and trade-union bureaucrats were solidified. It was on

the growers. Only mass picketing and refusal to handle scab grapes could have achieved a quick settlement. Nevertheless, notable gains were made by the consumer boycott in many cities, and table-grape growers were forced to sign with Chavez in 1970.

This victory posed the threat of union organization of all California agriculture. Once again, the growers turned to the Teamsters, who provided sweetheart contracts for Salinas Valley lettuce growers. As farm workers struck against the rotten contracts, the Teamster bureaucrats admitted the hollowness of their position by signing a jurisdictional agreement which surrendered the fields to the UFW. The contracts, however, were still in force as long as the growers stuck to them, so the strike was on. The growers brought in court injunctions against picketing backed up by mass arrests to defend their Teamster contracts. Chavez called off the strike and fell back on another boycott.

The failure of the lettuce boycott to stop the grower-Teamster alliance is responsible for the present attack on the UFW's base. Chavez is uncriti-

that improved the conditions of hundreds of thousands of farmworkers.

"It was the willingness of the UFW to abandon the tired methods of the labor bureaucrats for new methods of organizing that has enabled it to do this."

—Workers' Power, June 1973

While it criticizes the UFW for supporting Democrats, the IS simply suggests a switch in support to La Raza Unida Party, without even mentioning the need for a workers party based on the trade unions, which the IS claims to support. La Raza Unida Party represents precisely the same kind of community protest, multi-class reformist

unions, these incidents would have been inconceivable. Such a policy would have pointed the way to militant unionism in the interests of the rank and file by mobilizing the ranks into struggle and weakening the bureaucracy. Instead, UFW policies have only served to keep farm workers isolated and strengthen bureaucracy, including that of the Teamsters!

The impotent do-goodism of Chavez is simply another version of the class collaborationism of Fitzsimmons: the reliance on favors from sections of the capitalist class at the expense of other



Helen Chavez, Senator Robert Kennedy and Cesar Chavez praying in Delano after Chavez' 1968 fast to rededicate himself to principle of nonviolence. Chavez' rejection of working-class methods of struggle in favor of pacifism, religion, and middle-class protest in alliance with liberal capitalist politicians, has aided the forces seeking to destroy the Farm Workers union.

this basis that the NFWA and AWO were merged into the United Farm Workers' Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO.

Successful labor boycotts are quite rare, since they rely on hitting the boss where labor is weakest, at the widely dispersed market places, rather than in production, where labor power is strongest. The boycott of table grapes which followed the victories over wine growers lasted for five years, partly because of the ease with which the Pentagon was able to buy up vast quantities of scab grapes to prop up

cal of the AFL-CIO because of Meany's financial grant to the UFW, yet it was the AFL-CIO which sabotaged the lettuce boycott through failure to provide any real support, just as during the grape boycott. The UFW leadership continues its pacifist policies, allowing pickets to be arrested, kneeling in protest, etc., instead of attempting to mobilize the ranks of labor behind the strike through direct, working-class action. "We are willing to pay any price to have a union," lectures Chavez.

In order to establish its base in an uphill fight, the Chavez leadership is forced to appear very militant, close to the ranks, and to lead strikes. All the elements are present, however, for the establishment of a conservative union bureaucracy if the base is secured.

In a special *Workers' Power* supplement, the International Socialists hail the United Farm Workers as objectively progressive: "Despite many shortcomings and weaknesses, the UFW in practice points in the direction of fighting militant unionism in the interests of the rank and file." If by this is meant that the victory of the UFW over the Teamster-grower alliance is essential to the interests of all workers, there can be no quarrel. But the IS retrospectively endorses the past policies of the UFW leadership which led to the present situation:

"The boycott is the strategy that won for the farm workers in the past. Strikes, while hurting production, have been difficult to sustain....

"The boycott is no longer sufficient, and the time for the non-violent tactics of the civil rights' movement is past if the union is to stay alive....

"It has been the United Farm Workers Union that has led great strikes and marches, that rallied millions in support of La Causa and La Huelga, and



International Brotherhood of Teamsters President Frank Fitzsimmons speaking to the American Farm Bureau Federation this year. Recent newspaper accounts accuse the IBT of receiving money from growers to hire thugs to attack UFW supporters. A California paper reported Nazi party spokesmen saying the Nazis were paid by the Teamsters to send troopers to Coachella Valley to attack the Farm Workers union.

approach to politics that Chavez represents in trade unionism. The ultimate purpose of the IS' opportunist grovelings is to promote the careers of a new layer of "militant" trade-union bureaucrats based on social-democratic demagoguery.

The policies of Chavez and Co. are a betrayal of farm workers which must be exposed as part of a general campaign to replace the reformist trade-union bureaucracy, left, right and center, with revolutionary leadership of the working class. As it stands now, the UFW does not in practice point to "fighting militant unionism in the interests of the rank and file." Its policies have allowed what began as a potentially militant, working-class alliance with longshoremen, for instance, to completely degenerate. The Bridges leadership of the ILWU was able to dump a proposed invitation to Chavez to address the union's recent convention, and to completely eliminate all direct criticism of the Teamsters from the convention resolutions, in order to avoid alienating the Teamsters (see *WP* No. 22, 8 June 1973). Similarly, the AFL-CIO leaders of the "United Labor Action" rally in San Francisco against Phase 3 were able to eliminate all mention of the UFW from the program, despite Meany's protestations of "support." If the United Farm Workers had consistently fought for and organized the spreading of its strikes and "hot carguing" of struck products by other

workers, instead of a fight for labor solidarity to wrest real gains at the capitalists' expense. While Fitzsimmons was forging his alliance with the growers at the expense of the farm workers, Chavez made his alliance with the Kennedy wing of the Democratic Party, backers of the Rodino Bill, at the expense of Mexican workers in the U.S. Chavez seeks to use the power of whatever section of the capitalist class and state he can to crush the Teamsters, including its ranks. His leadership must be replaced by a caucus organized on the basis of an internationalist, class-struggle program, including destruction of all discrimination against immigrants, mass picketing, spreading the strikes, self-defense against attack, international organizing, a sliding scale of wages and hours to eliminate competition over jobs, smashing the two capitalist parties and building a workers party based on the trade unions to fight for a workers government, expropriation of industry, etc. Instead of limiting the struggle to the framework of the capitalist system, within which any gains achieved can at best be only transitory and minimal, it is necessary to raise demands which link current struggles to the need for socialist revolution. The key to achieving revolution is to build a new, proletarian revolutionary leadership to replace the present reactionary leadership of the labor movement. ■

sub-

scribe

includes

SPARTACIST

\$

3

24 ISSUES

Name

Address

City

State Zip

Make checks payable/mail to:

SPARTACIST PUBLISHING CO.

Box 1377, GPO, New York, NY 10001

WORKERS VANGUARD

LESSONS OF THE 1973 FRENCH STUDENT STRIKES

--Down with the Bourgeois Army!
--For Worker-Student Unity through a Leninist Party!

Speaker: LIBBY SCHAEFER
RCY National Secretary,
SL Central Committee

NEW YORK

SATURDAY, 7 JULY at 7:30 p.m.
St. Gregory's Church, 144 West 90th Street
(Subway: B'way-7th Avenue 1RT to 96th Street)

For information:
Phone 925-2426/RCY, Box 454, Cooper Station, New York 10003

Contribution

Continued from page 7

PERMANENT REVOLUTION

will in the future inevitably withdraw from us. It is necessary for us to gain time by putting a brake on the splitting away of the middle-bourgeois layers. ...Insofar as the Provisional Government fortifies the steps of the revolution, to that extent we must support it; but insofar as it is counter-revolutionary, support to the Provisional Government is not permissible."

—"Draft Protocol of the March 1917 All-Russian Conference of Party Workers"

While the bulk of the party leadership called for "completing the bourgeois-democratic revolution," Lenin insisted that the only revolutionary policy was calling for the dictatorship of the proletariat. In taking this position he came over to Trotsky's program of permanent revolution, and was accused of Trotskyism by the right wing. This required an ideological rearming of the party and at one point Lenin threatened to resign from the Central Committee in order to take the struggle to the ranks when his "April Theses" were initially voted down by the leadership. The key passage in these theses stated:

"The specific feature of the present situation in Russia is that the country is passing from the first stage of the revolution—which, owing to the insufficient class-consciousness and organization of the proletariat, placed power in the hands of the bourgeoisie—to its second stage, which must place power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants."

—V.I. Lenin, "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution," 1917

In direct opposition to Stalin's position of less than a week earlier, Lenin demanded "No Support for the Provisional Government; the utter falsity of all its promises should be made clear..." (*ibid.*). The opposition to Lenin was led by Y. Kamenev who claimed that "the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not completed. ... As for Comrade Lenin's general scheme, it appears to us unacceptable, inasmuch as it proceeds from the assumption that the bourgeois-democratic revolution is completed, and builds on the immediate transformation of this revolution into a socialist revolution." In his "Letters on Tactics" Lenin replied to this charge:

"After the revolution [of February-March 1917], the power is in the hands of a different class, a new class, namely, the bourgeoisie...."

"To this extent, the bourgeois, or the bourgeois-democratic revolution is completed."

"But at this point we hear a clamor of protest from people who readily call themselves 'old Bolsheviks.' Didn't we always maintain, they say, that the bourgeois-democratic revolution is completed only by the 'revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry'?... My answer is: The Bolshevik slogans and ideas on the whole have been confirmed by history; but concretely things have worked out differently...."

"The Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!—there you have the 'revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry' already accomplished in reality."

"This formula is already antiquated...."

"A new and different task now faces us: to effect a split within this dictatorship between the proletarian elements (the anti-defensist, inter-nationalist, 'Communist' elements, who stand for a transition to the commune) and the small-proprietor or petty-bourgeois elements...."

"The person who now speaks only of a 'revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry' is behind the times, consequently, he has in effect gone over to the petty bourgeoisie against the proletarian class struggle; that person should be consigned to the archive of 'Bolshevik' pre-revolutionary antiques...."

"Comrade Kamenev... has repeated the bourgeois prejudice about the Paris Commune having wanted to introduce socialism 'immediately.' This is not so. The Commune, unfortunately, was too slow in introducing socialism. The real

essence of the Commune is... in the creation of a state of a special type. Such a state has already arisen in Russia, it is the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!"

—V.I. Lenin, "Letters on Tactics," April 1917

And the Paris Commune, Brother Davidson, was the dictatorship of the proletariat. In an article for *Pravda* at about this time, Lenin formulated the question in a manner identical to that of Trotsky:

"We are for a strong revolutionary government.... The question is—what class is making this revolution? A revolution against whom?"

"Against tsarism? In that sense most of Russia's landowners and capitalists today are revolutionaries...."

"Against the landowners? In this sense most of the peasants, even most of the well-to-do peasants, that is, probably nine-tenths of the population in Russia, are revolutionaries. Very likely, some of the capitalists, too, are prepared to become revolutionaries on the grounds that the landowners cannot be saved anyway...."

"Against the capitalists? Now that is the real issue. That is the crux of the matter, because without a revolution against the capitalists, all that prattle about 'peace without annexations' and the speedy termination of the war by such a peace is either naïveté and ignorance, or stupidity and deception...."

"The leaders of the petty bourgeoisie—the intellectuals, the prosperous peasants, the present partiers of the Narodniks... and the Mensheviks—are not at present in favor of a revolution against the capitalists...."

"The conclusion is obvious: only assumption of power by the proletariat, backed by the semi-proletarians, can give the country a really strong and really revolutionary government."

—V.I. Lenin, "A Strong Revolutionary Government," May 1917

It is true that Lenin both at this time and later occasionally referred to the soviets in the period February-October 1917 as an expression of the "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry," but those soviets did not hold state power. The struggle for "All Power to the Soviets" was, as Lenin put it, the struggle against the petty bourgeoisie, which did not wish to struggle against capitalism. And the state which resulted from the October revolution was the dictatorship of the working class, supported by the peasantry. From 1917 on Lenin never implied that there could be such a creature as a state of two classes, such as envisioned by Stalin and Mao. As he put it in his polemic against Kautsky, "The Soviets are the Russian form of the proletarian dictatorship" ("The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky," 1918).

Slogans and programs of revolutionary parties have a real meaning in the class struggle; they call for certain courses of action and oppose others. Kamenev who in April led the fight to retain the slogan of the "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" in October opposed the revolutionary insurrection, and after the successful uprising actually resigned from the Central Committee and the Council of People's Commissars in protest. In this behavior there was at least a semblance of consistency.

But Davidson and Stalinists everywhere would have us believe that the "Old Bolshevik" program was confirmed by the October Revolution! Behind this deception lies a purpose, namely to justify the anti-revolutionary policies of Stalinism. It is always "too soon" for socialist demands, we must always go through a "democratic stage" before the peasants can seize the land and the proletariat can expropriate the expropriators. As a true proletarian revolutionary, Lenin learned from the experience of the 1917 revolution, advancing a new program when the inadequacy of the old one had been clearly revealed. But what can one say of people who not only refuse to assimilate these lessons but insist on proclaiming that black is white? In the mouth of Stalin in 1927 the slogan of a "democratic dictatorship" was a justification for ordering the Chinese Communist Party to give up its arms just as

Continued from page 5

...Usec

the murder of tens of thousands of Left Oppositionists, the strangling of the Chinese, German, French, Spanish and Vietnamese revolutions—these are but mere trifles when respectability can be achieved through painless fusion with social democracy!

And what about internationalism? What of the Fourth International, in particular? It seems that "while recognizing the need for an International," the PSA will not "yield [its] inalienable right to determine strategy and tactics to any leadership or tendency that is not rooted in the proletariat and the Argentine people." And what about the program? As good reformists, the PSA has two: the minimum and maximum programs, which appear in one set of "demands for immediate struggle" and another set for "struggle on a permanent basis" (i.e., socialism). One of the more interesting immediate demands is "for an end to the repressive role of the armed forces and their use in the service of capital.... For the constitutional right of soldiers and officers to take part in politics" [our emphasis]. The PSA envisions reforming the very essence of the capitalist state, thereby avoiding mentioning touchy subjects like armed struggle, workers militias, etc.

Moreno elsewhere referred to this opportunist swamps "95 percent Trotskyist." Perhaps he can help us to find the five percent. Is it in the "workers and people's government"? In the refusal to recognize the authority of any International which is "not rooted in... the Argentine people"? Or perhaps it is the maximum-minimum program, a hallmark of reformism? Is it the "end to the repressive role of the armed forces" under capitalism? Or the refusal to say one word about armed struggle in a country which has been in a pre-revolutionary situation for four years?

Having achieved the necessary respectable cover, the "revitalized" "95 percent Trotskyist" PSA (now renamed the PST) proceeded to throw its total energies into the election campaign. At a time when even the PST characterized the situation as "pre-revolutionary," this exclusively electoral approach can only be called classical parliamentary cretinism. Moreover, instead of running on its own program the PST devised a new tactic, the "workers pole." "Take advantage of our legal status," it declared, offering to put any bona fide worker on its slate. Are you left-Peronist, pro-CP, syndicalist? Never mind, we can all get together in a single slate and, who knows, perhaps one day we can all be part of one great party of the whole class, the kind Kautsky built, the social democracy.

Unfortunately, this is still very "small potatoes" and it still leaves the mass of the working class under the control of Peronism. Instead of calling on the workers to break from Peronism (how crude and sectarian!), the PSA offered to vote for the Justicialista candidates if the FREJULI ticket was

made up of at least 80 percent workers, instead of just 25 percent (*Avanzada Socialista*, 22 November 1972). In response to Perón's return last November, the PST newspaper's front page banner headline read: "Why is Perón Coming? Hopefully it will be to impose fighting workers candidates and not to make deals with the oligarchy" (*Avanzada Socialista*, 8 November 1972)!

To believe the words of Moreno and his group, one could only conclude that Trotskyism and the whole science of Marxism simply amount to the method of finding the highest bidder to sell out to. In a country where Peronism, a bourgeois movement, is dominant in the working class, it is necessary to pose a sharp class alternative to populism, not offer to vote for it if 80 percent of its candidates are labor bureaucrats! To break the workers from Perón, revolutionary communists can propose a class united front, even to the traitorous leadership of the CGT; we can demand the formation of a labor party with a class-struggle program; we can demand general strikes to impose the urgent demands of the workers. But a working-class united front against the bourgeoisie can never be achieved by making a bloc (open or secret, it makes no difference) with the leading bourgeois politician, General Perón!

The Struggle in the Usec: Both Wings vs. Trotskyism

In preparation for the Fourth Congress of the "United Secretariat" the reformist SWP and the centrist European majority are finding themselves sharply counterposed in one country after another. Splits have already taken place in Argentina, Australia, Spain and French Canada, while pro-European tendencies exist in the U.S. and English Canada. Both sides have written thick documents which show in great detail how the other side rejects Leninism and embraces reformist policies. Meanwhile, the SWP bombastically proclaims itself the "Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency" while the main document of the European majority is Mandel's "In Defense of Leninism"! As far as we can tell, most of the accusations on both sides are quite correct. The cover of orthodoxy and/or militancy, however, is completely bogus. We warn honest militants in the Usec who are seeking a road to Trotskyism: you will not find it on either side in this dispute between tweedledum and tweedledee.

To comrades who may be taken in by Hansen's pretense of opposing "the turn at the Ninth Congress (1969) toward guerillaism" we offer the key section of the founding document of the Usec, written by the SWP itself in 1963:

"Along the road of a revolution beginning with simple democratic demands and ending in the rupture of capitalist property relations, guerilla warfare conducted by landless peasant and semi-proletarian forces, under a leadership that becomes committed to carrying the revolution through to a conclusion, can play a decisive role in undermining and precipitating the downfall of a colonial and semi-colonial power. This is one of the main lessons to be drawn from experience since the Second World War. It must be consciously incorporated into the strategy of building revolutionary Marxist parties in colonial countries."

—"For Early Reunification of the World Trotskyist Movement," March 1963

The "turn" was made a decade ago when the SWP rejoined the European revisionists on the basis of the acceptance of the fundamental Pabloist proposition that non-proletarian, non-Trotskyist leaderships could carry out the socialist revolution.

In contrast to this is the statement issued by the Spartacist tendency at that time:

"Experience since the Second World War has demonstrated that peasant-based guerilla warfare under petty-bourgeois leadership can in itself lead to nothing more than an anti-working-class bureaucratic regime. The creation of such regimes has come about under the conditions of decay of imperialism, the demoralization and disorientation caused by Stalinist betrayals, and the absence of revolutionary

Coming Next Issue: THE STRUGGLE AGAINST PERONISM

Chiang Kai-shek prepared to massacre thousands of Communists and militant workers. Today, when the same slogan is used to justify support for "anti-imperialists" such as Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia, it will have the same result—annihilation of the revolutionaries and strangulation of the revolution. The choice is posed world-wide: Either socialism or barbarism, there is no middle ground! ■

Marxist leadership of the working class. Colonial revolution can have an unequivocally progressive revolutionary significance only under such leadership of the revolutionary proletariat. For Trotskyists to incorporate into their strategy revisionism on the proletarian leadership in the revolution is a profound negation of Marxism-Leninism...."

—Toward Rebirth of the Fourth International, June 1963

The SWP wing's new-found "orthodoxy" is thoroughly fraudulent; in renouncing the guerillalist line in which it formerly wallowed, the SWP has not rediscovered authentic Trotskyism; it has merely passed beyond centrism to consistent reformism, using "orthodox" arguments to protect its cherished respectability against the adventurism of its USec allies.

But the left rhetoric of the Mandel-Frank-Maltan wing is equally qualitatively separated from Trotskyism. In the heat of the USec faction fight, the European majority is now attempting to separate itself from the more grossly capitulationist consequences of the PRT/ERP policy. Accordingly, we find them innocently asking:

"Why, despite the favorable objective conditions and the prestige won by the actions of the ERP, have the ties between the party and the masses remained extremely weak? Why, especially after the Sylvester action, has the urban guerrilla war been marked by a setback in political content, inasmuch as the actions have generally been dictated much more by the needs of defending and freeing militants than by logistic requirements or by a more political overall plan?"

For this there is a simple answer: because this is the inevitable result of the strategy of guerilla warfare (called for by the Latin American resolution at the 1969 USec congress) which is necessarily "independent of the daily shifts of the class struggle." It is only in late 1972 that the USec majority suddenly begins to insist that:

"The PRT must confirm—etimating any possibility for misunderstanding—its appreciation of the anticapitalist socialist dynamic of the revolution in Argentina, ruling out any notion of revolution in stages.... It must define more precisely its conception of the alliances the working class must enter into.... All these precedents [from 1957 and 1961] must be recalled inasmuch as they indicate the origin of a whole series of positions expressed by the PRT, even after the 1968 split (the evaluation of Maoism, and especially Mao's conception of people's war; the estimate of Castroism; the conception of building the international; the conception of the struggle against the bureaucracy in the degenerated workers states). These positions mean that the Argentine comrades have very clear and serious differences with the conceptions of the International. It is an urgent task for the section to develop an in-depth discussion with the International on these questions."

—"The Political Crisis and Perspectives for Revolutionary Struggle in Argentina," December 1972

Comrades, if this discussion is so urgent today, why was it not relevant at any other time in the last ten years? These positions were developed (most of them) by Moreno in 1961-62, not yesterday; yet until December 1972 the USec said nothing! As recently as mid-1971 Livio Maitan, a top leader of the European majority, wrote uncritically:

"The strategic perspective the Argentine comrades are following is the one laid down by the Ninth World Congress of the Fourth International [1969]—elaborated and made more precise by the last two national congresses of the PRT..."

—Intercontinental Press, 26 April 1971

It still is—for the Latin American line of the USec today is unadulterated Castroism. The USec majority says this slyly, in "Trotskyist" terminology; the PRT/ERP says the same thing out loud, so the disgusting betrayal of the principles of Marxism can be savored in all its glory. Meanwhile the SWP/PST issues one press release after another making clear that its smug social-democratic reformism has nothing to do with this guerilla adventurism. Nor with Trotskyism, we might add. ■

Continued from page 12 NMU...

to other liberal trade-union bureaucrats, such as Woodcock and the recently-elected Arnold Miller of the Mineworkers, though not so competent. Like them he relies on government support, but as an out-bureaucrat he must do so in slightly more militant tones. (His answer to the job problems was to promise to "jump up and down on the White House lawn!") By his constant use of the capitalist courts, he actually represents a threat to the interests of the membership, since his victory would provide the bosses' government with additional opportunities to intervene in and control the unions, such as has occurred as the result of the Talt-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts and Bobby Kennedy's attempt to break the Teamsters union.

Those that voted for Morrissey (approximately 5,300 compared to 14,400 for Wall) did so largely because he appeared to be the one oppositionist with a chance of winning. This was not due to any base in the union (he has no caucus and issues his newspaper only very rarely) but due to the well-orchestrated publicity build-up in the liberal press. These efforts were coordinated in Morrissey's current campaign by Joseph Rauh, a liberal lawyer (former chairman of Americans for Democratic Action) with connections to big money, and his publicity outlet James Wechsler of the *New York Post*. Through this network he has received the support of establishment social democrats, the same forces which have supported Walter Reuther in the UAW, César Chavez in the Farm Workers and U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. At election time, Morrissey slaps together a temporary "slate" of running mates who have nothing in common save an unquenchable thirst for the assets, preferably liquid, of power. (One of Morrissey's "friends" during this last campaign, Peter Charles, had only a few short months earlier been placed on a committee assigned to physically throw Morrissey out of the NMU convention by Curran!)

Another "oppositionist" (the quotation marks definitely indicate uncertainty) was Andy Dinko, who received about 572 votes. While it would be extremely difficult to prove or disprove the widespread speculation that he was put up by the current administration to draw off votes from Morrissey as a spoiler, it is certain that the bureaucracy avidly pushed his literature in ports where there was noticeable opposition sentiment. Dinko was sup-

posedly shot in the hand under extremely dubious circumstances during the campaign (he happened to be right outside his doctor's office at the time), and focused his campaign around publicity stunts such as mariachi bands and free whiskey from his trailer which was conveniently parked outside the New York port hall for much of the campaign period.

Birds of a Feather: Left Social Democrats Flock to Morrissey

In an amazingly blatant article in the equally disgusting June issue of the *International Socialists' Workers' Power*, the IS left social democrats amplified on their supposedly "critical" support to Morrissey. It says the Militant-Solidarity Caucus should dissolve into the Morrissey campaign without (somehow!) dropping its program. While criticizing Morrissey (the fig leaf), they fail to explain how his campaign was supportable in any way, instead claiming that he "represents" the desire of the ranks for democracy, and is "waging a fight" (where? how?) around job issues, although his job program "while better than Curran's open

James Morrissey (right) and lawyer-friend Joseph Rauh in press conference. Morrissey relies on bourgeois press and bosses' courts instead of mobilizing ranks on a class-struggle program.



reactionary protectionism, is no more viable in reality."

To critically support a candidate in union elections there must be some element of the socialist program around which there can be unity, however limited. If the candidate sells out once in office, at least he will have helped to build a movement whose thrust is directed against the selout bureaucracy and out of which a new leadership can be forged. But Morrissey doesn't have to sell out his program once in office in order to rule in the same manner as Curran! It would certainly be instructive to NMU seamen (and perhaps to the ranks of the IS as well) if the editors of *Workers' Power* could explain just why they support Morrissey now, but would (presumably)

cease supporting him if he were elected and started implementing his "democratic" program (court suits, government interference, bureaucratic control of the NMU paper).

The May issue of *Class Struggle*, the organ of the associated factions of the recently consummated federation of the former Vanguard Newsletter group with the remnants of the ex-Leninist Faction of the SWP, calls for giving "critical support" to the Herson candidacy, but also makes it clear that it has no fundamental differences with Morrissey's operation, and would support it if Herson hadn't been running. Their criticism centers on the claim that "nowhere in the article [referring to a recent *WP* article about the M-SC] does it describe the attitude M-SC took toward the workers that support Morrissey...." The CS chooses to ignore, in its opportunist haste, the fact that Morrissey has neither a movement nor a caucus behind him. What he does have is a reputation as the oppositionist in the NMU, a reputation he has been assiduously building through court cases, interviews in the liberal press and almost total inactivity in the unions save once every five years at election time.

The Militant-Solidarity Caucus, which, in contrast, is a membership organization with a full political program for the union, joins Morrissey and his supporters in defense of democracy in the union on specific issues, as well as seeking to influence those who say they will vote for Morrissey, according to M-SC spokesmen. The M-SC, however, grew out of an earlier formation which was in the Morrissey "caucus," which at the time called itself the "Committee for NMU Democracy" (since abandoned by Morrissey). This "committee" had no democracy. Herson and others were unilaterally expelled from it by Morrissey personally for arguing that the Committee should adopt political demands vital to seamen, such as opposing de facto racism in the union, calling for working-class action to oppose the Vietnam war, raising the demand for a labor party, etc. Morrissey preferred to limit his campaign exclusively to "democracy" and immediate complaints, such as the lack of jobs.

Morrissey's "democracy" program is simply a statement that he, Morrissey, wants a chance to get into office, and for this he needs a little democracy. Morrissey's real program is that a new generation of bureaucrats should come into power in the unions through an alliance with liberal capitalists, lawyers and politicians, backed up by the bosses' state and their newspapers. This new leadership could then do what the old, discredited leaders are no longer capable of doing—discipline the working class for the current needs of U.S. imperialism in the new period of increasing inter-imperialist rivalries.

The solid support for the Militant-Solidarity Caucus in the ranks of the NMU is still quite limited, but it is a pledge to the future. It must be expanded, consolidated and forged into the core of an alternative leadership committed to the struggle for international workers' democracy. The cynical posturing of IS and the Class Struggle League is simply a competition to determine which of their respective brands of adaptation to the bureaucracy can "produce" quickest—they offer nothing to the membership of the NMU, nor to the rest of the working class. ■

Supporters and friends are invited to an:

Educational-Recreational SL/RCY SUMMER CAMP

from Saturday, 11 August through Sunday, 19 August

located at a northern Illinois lakeside and featuring swimming, boating and other sports. (Easy public transportation from Chicago.)

Discussion topics projected include:

- The post-war economy. (Real class-struggle prospects as opposed to revisionist "neo-capitalism," "permanent war economy," and "final-crisis" mongering.)
- The historical struggle to build the Fourth International and the American Trotskyist movement. (Key issues in Trotsky's time.)
- Decisive issues for revolutionary Marxists in the labor movement.

And more....

RATES: \$6.00 per day for the whole eight days; \$7.00 per day for lesser periods. The classes are scheduled to benefit those who can only attend for either half of the eight days.

For further information and reservations: Contact your SL or RCY Local (see local directory), or write Spartacist: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001.

Curran Flunky Wins NMU Election

M-SC Continues Struggle, Morrissey Appeals to Courts

A continuing loss of jobs to automation and the persistent efforts of the dictatorial Joe Curran regime to run the National Maritime Union onto the rocks by shameless looting, systematic suppression of opposition and patriotic class collaboration with the companies, have led to widespread demoralization of NMU seamen in recent years. This was expressed in the drop in opposition votes during the recent April-May union elections (compared with the previous 1969 vote), permitting Shannon Wall, Curran's handpicked successor, to ride into office with a more than two-to-one victory over his nearest rival.

After presiding over the virtual demise of the union during the past ten years, founding president Curran demonstrated his "confidence" in the future of the NMU by getting out while the getting was good. Claiming \$1 million in severance pay, pension and miscellaneous extras (finally settling on \$250,000 in severance pay and \$53,000 a year for life), he retired before the election so that Secretary-Treasurer Wall could run as the incumbent.

While world shipping flourishes as never before, the union has lost almost three-quarters of its deep-sea jobs since 1963—down from 26,000 to roughly 7,000 at present—through the flight of U.S.-owned bottoms to foreign registration in Liberia, Panama and other countries where they enjoy low taxes and low-paid labor. The decline in the number of NMU seamen has been precipitous, with union membership below

55,000 by 1967. It is primarily among the newer, younger members, who are victimized by the discriminatory "group system," that the loss has been greatest. The end of the Vietnam war shipping boom has taken the greatest recent toll of these predominantly young "Group 2" (second-class hiring status) members. However, older members suffer as well, as they are unable to obtain sufficient sea-time to qualify for the pension.

All factions in the union are, of course, united on the need for jobs: the question is how to get them. There are only two answers, and only one is real.

Class Struggle or Patriotic "Pressure"

The most obvious answer is, unfortunately, the hardest to initiate: the



M-SC picket in 1971, candidate Herson on right.

union must commit itself to organizing all seamen throughout the world, and raise their standards at least to the level of American seamen. This alone would remove the motive for "runaway flag" shipping. It is also an immediate, objective need of all seamen. Most importantly, it could advance the cause of labor throughout the world, building international workers' solidarity against the "multi-national" corporations, combat racism and nationalism, and help prevent imperialist war through working-class action.

This program has been raised in the NMU by the Militant-Solidarity Caucus, which begins with the ultimate need to revolutionize the entire world labor movement as the only answer to the immediate, objective needs of seamen. It explains and elaborates the meaning of its program as an integral part of its intervention into immediate struggles as they arise. Thus when the last U.S.-flag passenger ships were laid up (while foreign-flag cruise shipping continued to boom), and the "respectable" opposition called for nationalization of the ships—simply a bigger subsidy for the companies—the M-SC called for nationalization with no compensation, under workers control, insisting on the full retention of trade-union rights by the seamen. The M-SC also calls for maritime unity, international labor solidarity, an end to all discriminatory divisions and bureaucratic privileges within the union, defense of the left and a workers party based on the trade unions to fight for a workers government.

During the recent elections, the Militant-Solidarity Caucus ran a candidate for NMU president, Gene Herson, who received a total of 358 votes. This was, of course, many times less than the total received by Wall, or even the liberal oppositionist James Morrissey. Nevertheless, this vote represented important development for the caucus. For the first time it has become known nationally (as well as in Panama and Puerto Rico) through tours by caucus members, establishing itself as a legitimate and serious tendency within the union. An indication that votes for the M-SC candidate were a reflection of

but real) for the M-SC. Spokesmen for the Caucus emphasize the need for a realistic propagandistic role of the M-SC at this time, attempting to win adherents to its program. Thus the next task must be the crystallization of a hard core of committed Caucus members, capable of providing a class-conscious alternative to the present bureaucracy and the opportunist fake-militants who promise no more than new faces for the same old shell game with the bosses. This goal will be pursued by a national conference of the M-SC, to be held during the summer or early fall.

The only alternative "answer" to the NMU's dilemma seems much easier but is really no answer at all. This is the policy of calling on the U.S. government to bail out the union with bribes to the shipping companies to induce them to base themselves in U.S. ports (through tax subsidies), by taxing "runaway" lines or other similar snake-oil cures. This perspective depends on a heavy dose of flag-waving and assumes that the fate of American seamen is dependent on the profitability of their exploiters. It ignores the fact, however, that the companies are naturally more successful when exploiting unorganized workers at lower wages. This policy of relying on Uncle Sam has been the cornerstone of the Curran regime, and the results have been catastrophic for seamen (though not for Curran who has, as he put it, "already got his"). Despite Curran's best efforts to make shipping more profitable in the U.S. by allowing companies to slash manning scales, keep down wages and benefits, and commit innumerable other atrocities against the membership, the government has no interest in heeding his pleas. To save jobs, Curran/Wall try to promote profits; but since it is much easier to promote profits by cutting jobs and hiring low-paid unorganized workers, this policy is doomed to defeat. Following its old policies of begging from the government, which Curran learned from his one-time friends in the Communist Party and their popular front policies of enthusing over Roosevelt in the 1930's and World War II, the NMU bureaucracy has no answers

Pre-Strike Purge in Auto

Mahwah Ranks Demand Defense Fight as Bureaucrats Retreat

A pre-strike purge of militants at the Mahwah, N.J. Ford Assembly plant recently escalated into full-scale company provocation when two workers, including UAW Local 906 Vice President Dave Gardner, were fired for participation in walkout over excessive heat in the plant on 11 and 12 June. The heat reached 115 degrees in some areas of the plant on those days. An unofficial rank-and-file meeting on Friday of that week heard of the firing of Gardner and decided to shut down the plant on the second shift, which was done. A second meeting was then held, which resolved to strike to defend the current victims, as well as those of the previous wave of firings a month earlier (see WV No. 21, 25 May 1973). The "militant" Gardner was the hero of the hour.

Though the second meeting on Friday was also unofficial, it was attended by 300 to 400 members with mixed racial composition and representation from both day and night shifts. It had, therefore, an excellent chance to force the local leadership under Joseph Reilly to declare an official strike. This is important, since a wildcat strike led by black workers on the second shift in 1969 was unable, in spite of its militancy, to achieve lasting benefits because it failed to win the active support of the whole union. Wilbur Haddock, recently-fired leader of the United Black Workers, was the last remaining leader of that strike.

A subsequent meeting to plan the strike on the following day, however, ran straight into the roadblock of the union bureaucracy. The UAW leadership would like to siphon off the anger of the ranks by useless minor sabotage or, if this is not sufficient to do the job, by slyly giving backhanded support to an isolated and ill-prepared wildcat which would simply lead to greater de-

moralization. Thus Local President Reilly attended the meeting but did not chair and refused to declare the meeting official. Reilly presented a telegram from the international headquarters in Detroit which commiserated with the local over the firing of one of its officials, claimed the International would bargain for his reinstatement and demanded that the Local take no "unauthorized actions." The telegram completely ignored the other victimized workers, of course.

Reilly then warned that the UAW international leadership would put the Local in receivership if a strike were undertaken and insisted that the workers must do as they are told by the bureaucracy. The "militant" Gardner agreed.

The bureaucracy, although formally "representing" the membership, actually defends the interests of the companies by enforcing labor peace through the medium of the contract which it negotiates in return for a few minor concessions from the management. This same bureaucracy constantly renews itself by sucking in individuals who seek to be militant representatives of the rank and file, but who have no alternative to the current regime. So it is that Gardner, though he would like to appear as a militant alternative to Reilly, must tone down his acts if he wishes to advance his career in the UAW "team."

The membership at Saturday's meeting (16 June) repeatedly demanded that the "leaders" lead instead of kowtowing to the company and the International. But without building a revolutionary leadership based not simply on militancy but on thoroughgoing opposition to capitalist rule, the ranks can only continue to suffer from repeated betrayals by these labor aristocrats. ■



Joe Curran (second from left), hand-picked successor Shannon Wall (third from left) and company executives in 1970.

the past work of the Caucus (though not necessarily indicating full agreement with the program) is the fact that the vast majority were cast in the ports where it has been active (New York, San Francisco, Philadelphia) and where rank-and-file discontent is seething (Panama). Throughout the campaign, the M-SC continued to attempt to raise the level of class struggle, as shown by its efforts to get the NMU to refuse to carry products of the Shell Oil Company, whose U.S. refineries were on strike at the time.

The broader significance of the campaign is that for the first time since the McCarthy period a real class-struggle opposition was able to wage a hard-hitting political campaign and win a sympathetic hearing for its program from broad sectors of the ranks, in a union which conducted one of the most vicious and brutal red purges in the U.S. Given the constant red-baiting by the bureaucracy, the bureaucratic restraints which prevent the Caucus from reaching most of the membership and the big play given by the bourgeois press to the liberal Morrissey opposition, the votes for Herson can be interpreted as a base of support (limited

except more of the same.

The Excluded Middle

Somewhere in between Herson and Curran/Wall stands (or rather, lies) the pathetic James Morrissey, whose politics consist of a futile attempt to locate the non-existent middle ground between class struggle and class collaboration, between internationalism and American chauvinism. Morrissey's vote declined sharply from the 1969 elections where he won the port of New York and 48 percent of the seamen's vote nationally. This time he lost New York decisively and polled less than one-third of the national total. This decline is particularly important since Morrissey does practically nothing between elections except ply his endless series of court cases against the union. His poor showing reflects his lack of a real alternative, in addition to the demoralization in the ranks which makes even throw-away protest votes seem a waste of effort.

In fact, as an ex-member of the Curran machine, who was quite active during the vicious red-baiting campaign of the late 1940's, Morrissey is similar

continued on page 11