

# VANGUARD newsletter

Published monthly by independent revolutionary socialists  
Editors — Harry Turner, Hugh Fredericks, Robert Davis  
P. O. Box 67, Peck Slip Station, New York, N. Y. 10038



Vol. 3, No. 11 Price 10¢ (\$1.00 per year) Labor donated December 1971

Contents: To Stop the Attack on the Workers! .....	p. 149
Fundamentals of Capitalist Crises -Part I --The Relevance of Marxist Economics Today ..	153
Bangla Desh and the Indo-Pakistani War .....	155
Nationalism and the SWP .....	159
Our Next Issue .....	162

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER Table of Contents for 1971

## TO STOP THE ATTACKS ON THE WORKERS!

✓SOCIALIST FORUM and VANGUARD NEWS-LETTER have cooperatively formulated the following joint leaflet which calls for the creation of an alternative leadership within the labor movement based on an "industrial, regional and national network" of rank-and-file committees on our common transitional program.

✓This program, based upon the Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International, the "Transitional Program", largely written by Trotsky in 1938, seeks to unite the unorganized and unemployed to the organized workers through the rank-and-file committees.

✓It also poses the need to unite the racially divided Black and other oppressed minorities with the white workers by a struggle against all forms of special oppression and its manifestation as super-exploitation in the work-place. This unity, as our leaflet makes clear, is fundamental to any real counterattack--the only meaningful defense--by the working class against present and future attacks by the ruling class.

✓As our leaflet also makes clear, the sharpening attacks by the "capitalists of all countries" on their

workers is an aspect of the new period of general decline for world capitalism. The post-World War II period of economic growth has ended. The enlarged productive capacities of the advanced countries now exceed the limits of the world market.

✓American capitalism with an older productive plant has found increasing difficulty in meeting the competition of European and Japanese rivals. It has also found its role as the chief military and financial bulwark for world imperialism an increasingly heavy burden. Utilizing the threat of a continuing 10% surcharge on American imports, it has now forced Europe and Japan to assume more of its military burden and to increase the value of their currencies and thereby the price of their exports. But increasing its sales abroad and at home at higher prices to American workers, American capitalism hopes now to improve its balance of trade and payments. Clearly, however, the new agreement extracted under duress cannot be of long duration. As the economic decline becomes more pronounced, inter-capitalist rivalries and with it the class struggle in all coun-

tries will become increasingly acute. /The "Transitional Program" of Trotsky which was considered so "outmoded" by so-called "Trotskyists" and "near Trotskyists" in the post-war period of capitalist growth is once more proving not only its vitality but also its indispensability in our epoch, the "epoch of imperialist decay". Related to developments since the second World War, this program again demonstrates how "in the movement of the present" the "communists" can "also represent and take care of the future of the movement", in the words of the Communist Manifesto.

/Our cover letter to "Workers' Organizations" which precedes the leaflet calls for a united front on a non-exclusionary basis against the attack of the ruling class and for joint work in the construction of a network of rank-and-file committees.

\* \* \* \* \*

To: Workers Organizations and Working Class Militants  
Dear Comrades,

As our enclosed leaflet indicates, we believe that a broad united front of all workers' organizations on a non-exclusionary basis is required today to halt the attack on the workers by the Nixon Administration.

All sections, liberal, moderate and conservative, of the Democratic and Republican parties of big-business have, in one or another degree, endorsed this anti-labor drive.

We have arranged a meeting at Academy Hall, 853 Broadway, New York, N.Y., on Tuesday, January 25, 1972, at 8 P.M. to discuss joint activities in organizing a campaign to stop the anti-labor drive. We believe that the construction of "rank-and-file committees in the unions united into an industrial, regional and national network," as our leaflet states, is central to this campaign.

Although the leaflet advances our general "program of struggle" as socialists, we do not pose it as a condition for united activities, but only the demands for "the independence of the unions from the state" and "an independent workers' party." We hope to convince the workers of our full program in and through our

We believe that a principled unity of workers' organizations on the broadest possible basis will be able to organize an offensive against the continuing betrayals of the Meanys, Woodcocks, Fitzsimmons and other labor misleaders.

/As we have often stated, we see the proposed network of rank-and-file committees as not only an alternative leadership for the organized workers, not only as uniting them to the unorganized and unemployed, but also as that organization which can become the factory committees, the workers' councils, "Soviets" or "Socialist Industrial Unions" in the concept of Daniel De Leon, i.e., as forms of "dual power" at a revolutionary moment. We, in other words, understand the rank-and-file organization as the connecting link between the "movement of the present" and "the future of that movement." /

united struggles.

We believe that the unity in action of oppositional currents in the trade unions on the more limited program which we have posed can be the beginning of a serious American working class movement.

Fraternally, SOCIALIST FORUM  
VANGUARD NEWSLETTER

CORRECTION

The article, "Women's Liberation and Trotskyism", in our last issue, carried the statement in the preface on page 144 that "married women constitute 40% of the labor force."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the US Department of Labor indicated in March 1970 that women workers constituted 38% of the labor force and that 41% of all married women were in the labor force.

# TO STOP THE ATTACK ON THE WORKERS!

The Nixon Administration proposes to solve the growing problems of American capitalism on the backs of American and foreign workers. This is what the "new economic policy" is all about.

During the years of "boom" the bosses enjoyed super-profits. The workers might have received crumbs in terms of real wage increases, but only at the price of speed-up in the shop, longer working hours and/or workers' wives having to find employment. For most workers, a forty hour week no longer exists. If a certain amount of overtime is not required, it is needed by most workers in order to make ends meet. Today in many working class households, both the husband and wife are forced to bring home pay checks. In other words, the working class has had to pay for its "higher" standard of living with longer working hours and harder work.

The long period of economic "boom" without a major world crisis is now over. The capitalist system is now being exposed again for what it is--a system of inherent crisis. But "new" measures are now proposed by the bosses and their political representatives to protect their profits, measures which, in the name of combating inflation, are aimed right at the workers' pocketbooks and working conditions.

Nixon's first set of economic cure-all policies sent the unemployment level to over 6%. His second--the wage-"price" freeze, Phases I and II--is concerned with holding down wages of those who still have jobs. All this while the big-business bosses are subsidized--"stimulated"--with tax credits and accelerated tax write-offs. The workers' taxes meanwhile on the local, state and federal level continue to take a bigger bite out of their pay envelopes. Price control is little more than a joke.

The capitalists in all countries are preparing to squeeze their workers harder to meet the sharpening competition for the world market. They are jockeying with each other to export their economic problems onto the backs of the workers in the other countries. Along this road humanity will find not only a new world-wide depression but also a new world war many times more destructive than the last.

We socialists call for a program of struggle in the interests of the working class directed toward a working class solution for the poverty, unemployment and wars which capitalism produces along with great wealth for a small minority. This program raises the need for:

- A shorter work-week at no reduction in pay to end unemployment.
- The organization of the unorganized and unemployed.
- A minimum wage at union scale and at a decent standard of life.
- The unconditional and immediate withdrawal of all US forces from Indochina and the dismantling of the US military machine abroad.
- The major industries to be placed under workers' control with production for the needs of workers and the general population, not for military-imperialist designs. Schools, hospitals, housing, not bombs, bullets and tanks.
- A workers' government and production planned in the interests of all mankind, not for the profit of a handful of exploiters.

Basic to any working class program must be the unification of the class itself regardless of race, nationality, creed or sex. The capitalists have long used the tactic of "divide and rule." In the US, the Black and women workers make up a pool of cheap labor for the bosses. The super-

exploitation of these workers holds down the wages of all workers. The Blacks who have been excluded from the higher paying jobs are now being brought in by the liberal bosses only at the expense of the white workers' jobs to further the interests of the bosses in keeping worker pitted against worker. Only by struggling against the super-exploitation of Blacks, women and other sections of the working class, can the class be united to struggle for its own interests against the bosses. The unity of workers does not stop at frontiers. The working class and exploited masses around the world must also unite to stop the export of unemployment. Close links must be established with foreign trade-union movements for coordinated struggles.

In fighting for this program, labor must also organize independently of both the Democratic and Republican big-business parties. The liberal Democratic "friends of labor" were the first--with George Meany right behind them--to call for an "incomes policy." Their differences with Nixon are only tactical over the smoothest way to accustom the American work-horse to the new harness.

But a break with the political parties of the bosses requires a struggle to drive all those misleaders who support and collaborate with the bosses out of the labor movement. The labor bureaucrats may have been able to bring back table scraps in "good times", but today they increasingly expose their unfitness for leadership and their readiness to betray the interests of the working class. They accepted seats on the bosses' Pay Board while snivelling about "fairness" to labor, as if the existence of the Pay Board itself did not constitute an attack against the workers' wages. They put on a show of militancy, e.g., Meany's flip lip to Nixon at the AFL-CIO convention, to hide their real knee-bending to the ruling class. They prepare to back a "liberal" presidential candidate of the other party of big-business, the Democratic Party, in 1972.

To combat the attack on the working class, we call for the formation of rank-and-file committees in the unions united into an industrial, regional and national network committed to:

- \* The independence of the unions from the state. Drive the misleaders collaborating with the bosses on the Pay Board and elsewhere out of the trade unions.
- \* For an independent workers' party based on the rank-and-file against the political parties of big-business.

We ask all those interested in forming such committees to join us in organizing a meeting to forward these ends.

SOCIALIST FORUM  
GPO 1948  
New York, N.Y. 10001

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER  
PO Box 67, Peck Slip Station  
New York, N.Y. 10038

I want to hear more about the rank-and-file committees.

Send a free trial subscription to the undersigned.

NAME .....

STREET .....

CITY ..... STATE ..... ZIP CODE .....

JOB ..... UNION ..... labor donated

FUNDAMENTALS OF CAPITALIST CRISES - Part I

The Relevance of Marxist Economics Today

For many a month and especially since August 15, 1971, when President Nixon initiated his "new economic policy" with a wage-"price" freeze, the mass communications media have been filled with economic jargon usually reserved for the financial sections of the more staid newspapers.

American workers are receiving a short "course" in capitalist economics. They are kept informed about the latest developments in the international monetary crisis which still plagues world capitalism. They have even been made aware that this crisis is an expression of more fundamental contradictions which are now coming to the fore. They have been introduced into the intricacies of balance of payments and trade, of currency devaluations and revaluations, of foreign trade surcharges and "Buy American" tax credits for capital machinery and equipment.

As part of their "lesson" in bourgeois economics, American workers have been "drafted" by the Nixon Administration with the blessings of all sectors of the ruling class and its political servitors in the Democratic and Republican parties for a commercial war against the foreign competitors of American capitalism. The workers are directed to do their patriotic duty by sacrificing contracted wage gains and living standards. By refraining from making up their losses in real wages, let alone trying to raise their standards, inflation, they are told, will be "controlled", American products will become more competitive and American unemployment will be reduced.

All sectors of the ruling class, liberal, moderate and conservative, have conspired to hide a fact they well know that inflation is the result of the excess money and credit placed in circulation by the deficit financing of the federal government over many years. The expansion of the US economy additionally stimulated by military expenditures was "fueled" in this manner, as was also US capitalism's role as gendarme for world capitalism.

The ruling class now hopes to

teach the workers the "lesson" that the blame as well as the cure for its inflation additionally exacerbated by the war in Indochina must be born by them.

Marxism, however, teaches the lesson that the ruling class' "solutions" in this period can only result in greater impoverishment, fascist enslavement, new wars and nuclear wars which destroy mankind.

We hope to present the fundamentals of Marxist economics to our readers in this series of articles, to disclose the essence of capitalist exploitation and oppression and the underlying contradictions which make crises under capitalism inevitable.

With any prolonged improvement in the economy, Marxism has been consigned to oblivion by the overt capitalist apologists and "revised" --emasculated to suit the empirically observed and understood facts --and thereby made more acceptable to the bourgeoisie.

Thus, in the period before the first World War, when world capitalism was still enjoying a relatively peaceful expansion, Edward Bernstein emerged as the prophet of gradual and painless transformation of capitalism into socialism.

Just before the crisis of 1929 and a world-wide depression, Warner Sombart, the German bourgeois economist who, according to Trotsky, was "virtually a Marxist" at the beginning of his career, proclaimed that monopoly capitalism had succeeded in eliminating cyclical economic crises.

So also in the post-World War II period of world capitalist economic growth, Ernest Mandel, the Belgian theoretician of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International (USFI), arrived at his theory of "Neocapitalism." The opportunist

turn from the working class to petty-bourgeois radical currents by all sections of the USFI found its "economic" justification in Mandel's borrowed conception of "proletarianization of intellectual labour," in the "alienation" and "revolutionary consciousness" of the "new middle class" in the Mandelian post-imperialist stage of capitalism.

In common with International Socialism (IS) of Great Britain, Mandel also found a "permanent arms economy" providing capitalism with the means for successfully dealing with economic crises. Until the signs of the present crisis had become so unmistakable that even bourgeois economists had begun to express their alarm, the theoreticians of both the USFI and IS, the latter explicitly, had written off the possibility of a catastrophic economic downturn for world capitalism. Until quite recently, IS was still expressing confidence that the "permanent arms economy" would provide world capitalism with an economic expansion for at least the next decade, even if "intermittant" and at a slower pace.

Although some "revisors" of Marxism loudly assert their fidelity to its dialectical materialist method, all, in practice, violate the fundamental provision, that the essence of any phenomenon can only be grasped when apprehended as a totality. The empiricist-minded tend to see the immediate aspect of reality apart from the past. They concentrate their attention on a short segment of the capitalist economic curve, understand it as a straight line and expect it to continue in the same direction. They are, therefore, unprepared for the reassertion of the "old formulas" of Marx. A catastrophic economic crisis is no longer a phenomenon of the past, but--whatever temporary makeshifts are still possible--of the immediate future.

In viewing the overall capitalist economic developments, it is necessary to distinguish the primary economic curve from secondary fluctuations. Until World War I, in spite of intermittent crises, the

productive forces of world capitalism expanded. From the first until the second World War, despite temporary stabilizations and even periods of "prosperity", particularly in the US, they stagnated and declined. After World War II, capitalism, given a new lease on life, achieved a temporary expansion of the productive forces, an expansion which has now reached its zenith, and is in process of being transformed into its opposite.

The "formulas"--the scientific expression of the fundamental laws of development of capitalism which Marx had uncovered--had not to be discarded but to be understood in their changed content as a result of further development and increased complexity.

It was because Marx understood social phenomena in their historical development and capitalism as a stage in the development of society and not as a system given for all eternity, that he was able to analyze and disclose its laws of motion.

As Marx points out in his Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, the "guiding thread" which both Marx and Engels discovered independently and which led to their development of "scientific socialism" was the recognition that different stages of society correspond to a definite level of the productive forces of mankind.

Societies are organizations for the production and distribution of goods and services needed for human existence. When labor technology is at the level of the stone age, only a primitive communal society is possible. The growth of the productive forces, and with it the division of labor between handicraft and agriculture produces either slave society or the Asiatic "mode of production." When technology stands at the level of the windmill, feudal society prevails; with the development of machinery, capitalism.

At a certain point, the productive forces developing "in the womb" of the society come into conflict with the "relations of production" or property relations.

Slave society is an advance over

the previous primitive communism because this class divided society made possible the development of science and technique. But, as also in the feudal and capitalist modes of production, development reaches a point at which property relations become "fetters" on the productive forces. "Then comes the period of social revolution." The feudal fetters were struck by the English in the seventeenth and the French in the eighteenth centuries. The first breach in world capitalism-- "the last antagonistic form of the social process of production"--

occurred in Russia on October 25, 1917 (November 7, 1917, modern calendar).

Our series will take up the Marxian laws of motion of the capitalist economic base, on which the "social, political and spiritual" superstructure is erected, in relation to their current concrete manifestations. We will also discuss the economics of the societies which are transitional between capitalism and socialism, the bureaucratically degenerated and deformed workers' states.

(to be continued)

### BANGLA DESH AND THE INDO-PAKISTANI WAR

Every organizing designating itself as "revolutionary Marxist" was put to the test by the struggle in Bangla Desh and the Indo-Pakistani War.

A correct, i.e., a Marxist understanding of the national question has again proven to be essential armament for revolutionists. Without it, opportunist adaption to bourgeois nationalism, and in turn, the betrayal of the revolution, particularly in the under-developed countries becomes inevitable.

The Indian armed forces with auxiliary support from the Mukti Bahini, the Liberation Army, has "freed" Bangla Desh. India, thus far the only government to do so, has "recognized" the new Republic of Bangla Desh, and promises to withdraw its troops when the "stability" of the new regime has been secured. The defeated Pakistani Army--which was for a time permitted to keep its arms for protection against the vengeful Bangali masses--is now in process of being shipped into internment in India for its own safety. The Indian Army is now busy maintaining "public order". It is attempting to disarm the Mukti Bahini on the grounds that otherwise 2 million "Bihari" or non-Bengali Moslems would be slaughtered. The latter had provided the "razakars", the armed civilian collaborators with the Pakistani Army, who, together with right-wing Bangali religious fanatics, had participated in the bestial treatment--mass rape, torture and murder--of the Bangali

population and which had resulted in driving almost 10 million, primarily Hindu, refugees into India.

The Pakistani ruling class had unleashed a genocidal terror against the Bangali people in the east in order to be able to continue to exploit the labor and resources of a people dissimilar in everything save religion. Now that the Pakistani workers and peasants, who had succumbed to the anti-Hindu chauvinist wave during the war, may again raise class demands with the defeat, the bourgeois "socialist" Bonapartist, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto has been chosen to replace the previous Bonapartist General Yaya Khan. The wealthy head of the Pakistani People's Party is considered best-fitted for the task of defending capitalist relations in the diminished Pakistani state.

The Indian ruling class, which oppresses its own minorities, the Kashmiris in the north and the Tamils in the south, which represses the West Bengalis, which ousted its legally elected representatives and murders members of the Naxalite organization, has used the Pakistani terror against the East Bengalis to further its own predatory interests against Pakistan.

The Indo-Pakistani War is thus a struggle between rival bourgeois ruling classes who use nationalist

and religious ideology to confuse the masses and in this way increase their ability to maintain and expand their "rights" of oppression and exploitation, with the masses of Bangla Desh as pawns. The revolutionary Marxists were, therefore, required to call for a policy of revolutionary defeatism on both sides. Bangla Desh will only win its freedom with the overthrow of capitalist relations in the whole sub-continent by a socialist revolution.

As in the Balkan wars before the outbreak of the first World War, India and Pakistan are inextricably enmeshed in the struggles of the "great" powers. Then, two rival blocs of imperialist countries competed for world capitalist hegemony; now, a three-cornered struggle of the Soviet degenerated workers' state, the Chinese deformed workers' state and imperialism's strongest state, the US. The Soviet and Chinese bureaucratic castes are concerned only with preserving their power and privilege in a manner which can only serve to erode the collective property foundations on which they rest. The US is concerned with shoring up the present world imperialist status-quo, while preparing for a future "showdown" to return the non-capitalist states to direct imperialist exploitation. All are concerned with maneuvering with the bourgeois regimes in all parts of the world against the world proletariat and the socialist revolution.

As has been widely noted in the radical and also the bourgeois press, China, which in the company of the US gave military and political support to Pakistan, forfeited all credibility as a champion of the right of oppressed nations to self-determination. Its role in the United Nations (UN) Security Council as virtually a partner of the US on this issue speedily confirmed the judgement of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER in November that the Chinese practitioners of "socialism in one country" would strengthen the "world counterrevolution" on entering the UN through its attempts to further its national security by "diplomatic wheeling and dealing."

Pakistan's defeat was also a defeat for this bureaucratically conceived and self-defeating outlook.

The Soviet Union, where Stalin's doctrine of "socialism in one country" originated, having "backed the right horse", seems to have emerged with an improved "geopolitical" position. No longer the "honest broker" between Pakistan and India, its recently increased military aid and full backing to the Indian bourgeoisie in the UN is now expected to "pay off" in Indian bases for its navy and military access to south-east Asia. It has thereby countered the recent US-Chinese rapprochement by successfully turning China's southern flank politically and militarily, while also strengthening its military posture against the US.

Although the US has suffered a political defeat, its rulers have been able to maintain their equanimity, precisely because the defeat administered by India to Pakistan did not alter social relationships, and does not, therefore, fundamentally threaten US imperialism's power and profits.

The demand for self-determination for Bangla Desh has been utilized by the Indian and East Bengali bourgeoisie to advance their interests and to eliminate the danger of a revolutionary solution. Indian overlords will now control an "independent" Bangla Desh through the bourgeois Awami League which its arms will have securely placed in power. Bangla Desh will now function as a client state of the Indian bourgeoisie.

Opportunist organizations such as the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and the Workers League (WL) and their respective "Fourth Internationals" the United Secretariat of (USFI) and the International Committee of (IC) are busy assuring their supporters that the socialist revolution has nevertheless been advanced in the Indian sub-continent.

They, and along with them the International Socialists (IS), were unabashed advocates of "everyone into the pool", of all "revolutionary socialists" joining the Mukti Bahina peasant-guerrilla movement

controlled by the Awami League, staffed by the commanders of former East Bengal regiments and police, and, in turn, trained, equipped and led by the Indian army, i.e., under the complete domination of the Indian bourgeoisie!

But, this "inconvenience" did not bother the open SWP and more circum-spect WL drum-beaters for "revolutionary nationalism." Because-- don't you see--once "national liberation" has been won, the "objective" situation would "inevitably" move the "masses" onward to the socialist revolution! The same rationale had previously been used by both organizations in hailing the "Arab Revolution" and in covering-up the NLF sell-out program in Indochina. So much for the WL's and SLL's anti-Pabloist campaign!

And now, these advocates of the revolution-in-stages masked as Trotskyists have even given critical support to the Indian bourgeoisie in the war, the WL and its British co-thinkers of the Socialist Labour League (SLL) openly and the SWP more discretely.

Thus, on the grounds that US imperialism wishes to produce "a more docile regime" and "weaken the Indian economy" to enable "US finance capital" more ready penetration, the IC's statement in the December 20, 1971 issue of the "Bulletin" gives:

"critical support to the decision of the Indian bourgeois government to give military and economic aid to Bangla Desh."

The SWP makes its adaptation to bourgeois nationalism less crudely. In the December 24, 1971 issue of the "Militant", Tony Thomas uses the language of Marxism, a preface that both the Indian and Pakistani ruling classes are "fighting for their predatory interests" to declare that the war:

"nevertheless provided an opening for the national liberation struggle to receive important assistance in ridding Bangla Desh from Pakistani domination."

The WL and SLL not very long ago attacked the Guillermo Lora Partido Obrero Revolucionario (POR) and its French partners in the IC, the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI) which supported it, for betraying the revolution in Bolivia. Lora was guilty of subordinating the struggle for the proletarian revolution to the liberal Bonapartist regime of Torres, and of then forming a "Popular Front" on a program tailored to its bourgeois components to fight "fascism" by restoring bourgeois democracy.

But, Lora's and their own orientation do not differ qualitatively! All betray the revolution through neo-Menshevik policies of "democracy" or "national liberation" first, and then the socialist revolution! The line of the WL and SLL subordinates the revolutionary would-be Marxists and thereby the working class to the bourgeoisie in Bangla Desh, the Middle East and also in Indochina through the NLF, while professing to keep the proletarian revolution always in their hearts, just as Lora does in Bolivia.

"Forward to the revolutionary and socialist unification"--of India, and especially, it would seem, of East and West Bengal, declares the IC! And of socialism for the Pakistani masses, not one word!

Tariq Ali, who cannot as easily ignore the people from whom he derives, and perhaps also speaking for the USFI, differs with the SWP position. Although still clinging to the comforting conception of a "united Red Bengal" abstracted from a socialist overturn in the entire sub-continent, and from the revolutionary leadership which is required for the task, he also calls for what appears to be a policy of "revolutionary defeatism" on both sides. He is opposed to the "supporters of the 'Provisional Government'" fighting "on the side of the Indian bourgeoisie against the Pakistani army!" Instead, declares Tariq Ali:

"all revolutionaries must struggle to turn the inter-bourgeois war into a war against the bourgeoisie."

It would seem that Ali is one of the "supporters of the 'Provisional Government'", i.e., the government of the Bangla Desh bourgeoisie and only opposes the bourgeoisie of India and Pakistan. In any case, the pedantic paraphrase of Lenin's slogan, "Turn the imperialist war into a civil war", even if seriously intended by Ali, the advocate of "revolutionary nationalism"--would be of little avail as a pious wish.

As we pointed out in our July-August issue, Ali's "revolutionary nationalist" slogan of a "united socialist Bengal":

"would unite the masses in Pakistan behind...the Pakistani ruling class and divide the masses in India in the name of 'socialism'."

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER has been the only organization, to our knowledge which has had the honor of upholding a consistently revolutionary Marxist position in preparation for the "inter-bourgeois" Indo-Pakistani war.

While we have unconditionally supported the right of Bangla Desh to independence, we have been alone in publically opposing the separation of the Bangla Desh revolutionists from the proletariat and their submergence in the peasant-guerrilla movement. In our July-August issue, we called upon these revolutionists:

"...not [to] discard their class banner and program...not [to] yield to the tide of bourgeois nationalism...[to] maintain...ties...[with] the organized and unorganized workers...and reestablish them wherever they have been severed..."

We instead called upon them to work to win the national liberation movement to their banner.

We called for "revolutionary fraternization" and for the use of "the artillery of the land question" against the Pakistani "'peasants in uniform'."

We raised the Leninist position on the national question, the unity of the masses of the oppressor and oppressed nations. We called upon

the revolutionary Marxists in Pakistan to fight for the right of Bangla Desh to independence and to unite it to their own "class struggle and to the land question in overthrowing the military dictatorship in a socialist revolution." We called upon the revolutionists in Bangla Desh to raise the need for a "socialist federation of the entire sub-continent united by the international socialist revolution to the advanced countries." We called for an international working class campaign against the maneuvers of both the imperialists and the counterrevolutionary Stalinists.

We called, in other words, for "the Permanent Revolution, a socialist revolution under the leadership of the working class at the head of the peasant masses...linked to the international socialist revolution."

It is the program of the Permanent Revolution and not "revolutionary nationalism" for which the revolutionary Marxists in the Indian sub-continent must fight.

The Indo-Pakistani war cannot soften any of the explosive contradictions of under-developed countries in this epoch. Only socialism can set free the productive forces and overcome the increasing poverty and misery of the masses in this area. The emerging world crisis of capitalism must intolerably sharpen all class antagonisms.

In Pakistan, the defeat may spur a resurgence of the mass struggles which led to Ayub Khan's downfall in 1969. Ali Bhutto's demagogy will not be able to disorientate the masses for long, given a Marxist leadership which knows how to win the peasants behind the working class.

No amount of Soviet economic and military aid to the Indian bourgeoisie can prevent the growing poverty of the workers and peasants. The ashes of victory are certain to replace the present pleasant glow which has temporarily increased the authority of the Indira Gandhi regime in India.

The Bangla Desh masses with a per capita income of \$30 a year will not long remain tied to the Awami League.

The Indo-Pakistani war and the Bangla Desh struggle prove once more that without an international working class Leninist and Trotskyist vanguard party, the international socialist revolution cannot achieve a break-through. War, Trotsky once said, speeds up all social processes.

### NATIONALISM AND THE SWP

✓ We reprint below another section of the major resolution of the Communist Tendency (CT) which was recently expelled from the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), "Historical Roots of the Degeneration of the Fourth International and of the Centrism of the SWP--For a Return to the Proletarian Road of Trotskyism."

✓ As our readers will note, this section, "Nationalism", adheres to the Leninist and our own position on the national question: the revo-

The Indo-Pakistani war and Bangla Desh has served to illuminate the bankruptcy of all those "revolutionary socialists" who, expressly or by a "tactical" silence helped to divert the revolutionists in the Indian sub-continent from a proletarian orientation

lutionary Marxists unite the workers of oppressor and oppressed nations and national minorities by fighting for the right of self-determination of the oppressed nation and for an end to all forms of special oppression. By thus proving their internationalism in deed, the workers of the oppressed nation or minority gain confidence in the workers of the oppressor, and become immunized to the siren song of their bourgeois nationalists.✓

\* \* \* \* \*

Nationalism has always posed serious questions for the Marxist movement, questions around which have revolved some of the most urgent problems facing revolutionaries.

From the revolutions of 1848 through Marx's writings on Ireland to Lenin's polemics against Rosa Luxemburg and Trotsky's theory of Permanent Revolution, runs the thread of the national question. Nor is the situation any different now. The inadequate way in which the party has understood the writings of Lenin and Trotsky has found expression, as have so many other failures, in a tail-ending of, and an adaptation to, petty-bourgeois currents, in this case of the bourgeois Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican "Nationalists."

The fundamental expression of the Marxist policy of nationalism has been that of supporting "the right of self-determination." This has been interpreted by the party leadership to mean that the nationalism of the oppressed is progressive and even "revolutionary" and thus merits support. This is exactly backwards. "Nationalism," so defined is reactionary and can serve only the interests of the bourgeoisie of both

nations. The actual purpose of this slogan was to prove to the workers of the oppressed nation (Georgians, Irish, etc.) that the working class of the oppressor nation was fully on their side in their struggle for liberation, even to the point of supporting their right to secede from the oppressor nation and found their own state. This slogan was clearly intended to unite the workers of different nationalities against their common enemy by showing the oppressed nation that the proletariat of the oppressor was its real ally and that the proletariat would fight for every gain of the oppressed nation, no matter how costly it might be to "their own" state. The position was not that the nationalism of the oppressed was progressive, however understandable it might be, but that the nationalism of the oppressor was reactionary. This was by no means then a concession to nationalism, but on the contrary, a struggle against it, designed to

make class-conscious internationalists out of workers of both nationalities.

The SWP, having turned its back on the working class and having lost the class line, is compelled to find substitutes for the proletariat. This process results in a policy of polyvanguardism, of "independent mass movements"--of "2,3,many grave-diggers." One of the first of these excursions from Trotskyism was the adaptation to "nationalism." This policy has world-wide applications, but has primarily been confined to the US and Black, Chicano and Puerto Rican nationalism.

Puerto Rican nationalism finds its major thrust in the slogan on the Young Lords buttons--"Tengo Puerto Rico en mi corazon"--"I have Puerto Rico in my heart." Its remaining features are in common with the two major currents--Black and Chicano nationalism. These two areas are very much interlocked: the one foreshadowing and the other filling in our petty-bourgeois adaptationism, the theory of the Black movement outlining the practice of the Chicano movement.

The adaptation took place first in the case of the Blacks. The position of the party, and of Trotsky, was that the Blacks were not a national minority, but a racial minority with a possibility of national development, the arrival of which would be heralded by the demand for separation. This was the party's position as late as 1963 in the "Freedom Now!" resolution. But that was quickly abandoned, and by 1969 the Blacks were to discover that they had "always" constituted a nation, per order George Breitman (self-determination!). When Trotsky posed the possibility of a national reality for the Black people, he did so in the context of the late nineteen-thirties, when the "Black Belt" still existed, before the great migration north during the war and post-war years. This Diaspora, urbanizing and proletarianizing the former sharecroppers and tenant farmers, the closest thing the US ever had to peasants, effectively eliminated the possibility of a national

development. The Blacks, who were destined to be "the very vanguard" of the American Revolution in the words of the 1940 resolution, now occupied the position of the critical factor in the American proletariat, making up a disproportionate share of the most exploited and oppressed sectors of the class, including the industrial proletariat. The Black workers constitute a super-exploited layer and thus have the greatest potential for revolutionary action. But it was no accident that the party only verbally acknowledged the proletarianization of the Blacks and went wild over their non-existent nationality. The party did not even feel obliged to discuss the problems of territory, language and culture. It did not want to consider such things, because it was in the process of tail-ending the Black petty-bourgeoisie who sought a separate development for the Blacks in order that they might become a leading group in the Black "community" without the competition of the white capitalists. The party leadership ignored the lesson of the Communist Manifesto that the proletariat is the "only really revolutionary class," and that the other classes that fought to maintain themselves in the face of capitalist concentration were "...therefore not revolutionary..." Instead of the petty-bourgeoisie leading the proletariat, the party should have struggled to win the Black workers and to lead them at the head of the Black and white masses to the revolution. Instead, the party merely tail-ended, flattered, praised and generally toadied to these representatives of a reactionary and outmoded social layer. The names are too many to mention, but the line has been the same--"the lack of leadership in the Black community," which expressed only an idle wish for the nationalists to do something they could not do--an abstentionist and spontaneist policy for the party. The party has covered itself by quoting Trotsky, without any understanding, and by actually counterposing Trotsky to Lenin, who said all those harsh

things about nationalism, in a manner identical to that in which the Workers League counterposes Lenin to the "incorrect" Trotsky. We feel no need to oppose them to each other; we feel that their contributions complement each other, just as they did in 1917.

The party's adaptationism has now carried it so far that it combines the struggle of the Black petty-bourgeoisie with that of other "vanguards," like Black students, or Black women or Black gays. Sad to say, for the pragmatists this adaptationism has not paid off. There are no figures on Black party membership, but the figures at the last YSA convention tell the sad story. Out of approximately 1,330 members the YSA had "approximately" 45 Blacks, and the figures for the party are probably no better. The percentage of Blacks in this country is about 12%, while in the revolutionary youth organization Blacks constitute about 3½%! Although these figures seem surprising at first, they are really extremely logical. Why should some Black youth who agrees with the YSA's program join it when he can get that program in any Black nationalist organization? Sometimes the party's feverish attempts to see Black nationalism everywhere make an almost humorous picture. For instance, in the postal strike the party claimed to see "Black nationalism" in the fact that the Black workers played a vanguard role, ignoring the point that they are naturally the "very vanguard" of the class. One wonders what made the white workers follow the Blacks' lead--semi-Black nationalism? Or maybe they were tail-ending Black nationalism? This view of the party only proves the old adage that, "there are none so blind as those who will not see."

The two major departures of a programmatic nature that the party has made have been "Community Control" and the "Independent Black Party." What was intangible and abstract about these ideas become concrete in the case of the Chicano variants. There is nothing new about community control. It is simply the old

"national-cultural autonomy" which Lenin fought against so fiercely in Russia. The party, however, "since the city is the Black man's land," abandons the Leninist position of the "right of self-determination" for the nationalist position of its desirability of separation, community control is transitional to statehood. What it represents in the US is simply the utopia of the Black and Chicano petty-bourgeoisie seeking to maintain capitalist property relations "on their own," without the interference of white monopoly capital. And like all such utopias it is simply reactionary insofar as it can be realized. Crystal City, Texas, is the living proof of this. A small group of petty-bourgeois Chicanos now control the town on behalf of the residents who are left out of the decision-making process entirely. This grouping, with the blessing of the SWP, has embarked on a "red trade-union" policy, breaking old bureaucratic unions and replacing them with ostensibly independent Chicano unions. Contrast this behavior with the party's abstentionist policy in the case of the Farm Workers. What few reforms are possible are emblazoned all over the "Militant" and recounted in glowing terms at great length. Sewer socialism, Texas-style, has made Crystal City into a "brown Milwaukee."

The problem of nationalism was confronted by Malcolm X, by far the best of the Black nationalists and an actual voice of the Black masses, shortly before his death. In the "Young Socialist" interview he said, "I used to define Black nationalism as the idea that the Black man should control the economy of his community, the politics of his community, and so forth." In essence, community control was Black nationalism's content. Malcolm then went on to describe his experience with the Algerian ambassador to Ghana, who had posed difficult questions to him about the limits of his revolutionary policy. Malcolm then said, "So, I had to do a lot of thinking and reappraising of my definition of Black nationalism. Can we sum up the solution to the prob-

lems confronting our people as Black nationalism? And if you notice, I haven't been using the expression for several months. But I still would be hard pressed to give a specific definition of the overall philosophy which I think is necessary for the liberation of the Black people in this country." Comrade Breitman has tried to explain away these remarks many times, but it cannot be done, especially in the context of this interview, which shows Malcolm's increasing turn toward socialism and internationalism. Is it not strange that Malcolm the non-Marxist, should have known in 1965 what the Trotskyist SWP does not know yet: that community control, Black nationalism, is not the way out for the Black workers and the Black masses?

The independent party slogan, on the other hand, is a unique contribution to Marxism. It is unfortunate Lenin never thought of an independent Ukrainian or Georgian party; he could probably have accomplished a lot more. In the case of the Blacks, despite our best efforts, the idea has simply not caught on. A serious leadership would question the correctness of such a policy, just as the labor party slogan would have to be re-examined if the workers as a whole were as radical as the Blacks and the labor party had gone over like the proverbial lead balloon.

The Chicano experience illuminates the reality of such a proposal. Such

### OUR NEXT ISSUE

As our readers are aware, our newsletter has been published toward the end of the month.

We are now preparing a January-February double issue. Beginning in March, we hope to have our newsletter in the hands of our readers at the beginning of the month.

Our January-February issue will contain the speeches made by the national delegate and leading spokesman for the Communist Tendency to the SWP convention, David Fender.

Comrade Fender has now joined our ranks and has accepted the post of

a party would simply be a bourgeois party, a pressure group for the nationalist petty-bourgeoisie to extract concessions from the ruling class, primarily through the Democratic Party. La Raza Unida Party is merely the American equivalent of the Parti Quebecois.

What then should be the policy to win the national and racial minorities? A class-struggle policy is the only answer. The party must be torn from such reformist concepts as "people" and "community," which are easily used to divert the oppressed minorities into supporting bourgeois politics be they black, brown, yellow or white. The road to the "community", the ghettos and barrios, begins at the point of production. We must present to the super-exploited workers of the minorities a class program. These workers are potentially the "very vanguard" of their class and every effort must be expended to win them. Left-wing caucuses must be built which will support, to the very end, the right of self-determination and wage a determined fight against the special oppression of these workers. White workers, in their class interest, will be attracted to these caucuses. By fighting for a sliding scale of wages and hours and a doubling of the minimum wage, union democracy, organization of the unorganized, and a labor party, these caucuses will be the base of a mass revolutionary movement.

organizational secretary.

We have been informed by Robert Sherwood that the Labor Action Committee of Canada is in basic agreement with the position of the Lora POR and OCI on Bolivia, and that we will receive a letter defending its present position. We intend to publish it in our January-February issue together with our answer.