The widening gap between the affluence of the black middle class, the doctors, lawyers, clergy, executives, politicians, etc., etc., who are living in luxury, and the poverty of the black workers condemned to live in the ghetto, is becoming more obvious with each passing day. This contrast between black wealth and black poverty has become so clear that many leaders of the Civil Rights Movement are pointing to the disparity that it represents a danger that is, for the middle class and for American imperialism.

Last year the New York Times printed a series of lengthy articles on this subject which included interviews with middle class black leaders throughout the United States. Among them was James W. Compton, Executive Director of the Chicago Urban League. The Times reported Mr. Compton’s remarks as follows:

"...as the gulf between the have and the have not widens, as the comfort of the well off stands out in sharp contrast to the discomfort of the poor, the threat of social disorder and disruption grows."...

"Mr. Compton warned that if the ‘black underclass’ revolt again, their uprising will be against class..." (New York Times, February 28, 1978)

Mr. Compton’s fears of the black workers is only equalled by his hatred for them, and by his ignorance. He cannot even begin to understand what Karl Marx explained 100 years ago—that the wealth of the proletariat classes is based on the exploitation of the working class. The “have nots” or “underclass” Mr. Compton speaks about produces the “better life” that he and the rest of the middle class enjoy.

Another black reformist, Dr. Alvin Poussaint, Dean of Students at Harvard Medical School, also pointed to the “dangerous social antagonism” that is developing between the black workers and the middle class.

"It is certainly a dilemma," said Mr. Poussaint, "and a lot of blacks do not want to even acknowledge that there are class differences. But they exist, and they are getting worse. By prepondering that there are no class differences, strategy to deal with the problem can’t evolve. . . the strains of the conflict are beginning to show..." (Ibid.)

Dr. Poussaint’s “strategy to deal with the problem” is quite simple—he wants the leaders of the Civil Rights movement to evoke the most obvious evidence of their collaboration with the American ruling class, and to conceal the pay-off they are receiving for misleading the masses of black workers.

In May of last year Dr. Poussaint expressed his view quite bluntly in an article he wrote for the New York Times:

"...In January [1978] the N.A.A.C.P. released a statement that was widely interpreted to support decontrol of natural gas and oil prices, a position generally favored by the oil industry. . . . The more sensitive issue is a possible conflict of interest reflected in the N.A.A.C.P. energy policy... it is public knowledge that Margaret Bush Wilson, Chairman of the N.A.A.C.P. Board of Directors, also sits on the Board of Directors of the Monsanto Company, which has substantial oil-related interests. As she receives the usual lucrative fee for corporation duties—$20,000 for serving in the Board and $500 per Board meeting, Monsanto said—some people are wondering if she may have divided loyalties..."

Dear Doctor—is who pays the fiddler also calls the tune. It is precisely because the interests of the Civil Rights movement coincide with those of the ruling class that Margaret Bush Wilson sits on the Board of Monsanto. And, she is not alone, as your article reveals:

"Vernon Jordan, Jr., President of the National Urban League, sits on the Board of the Xerox Corporation. . . . He, too, receives substantial remuneration for his services: $14,000 per year plus $3,500 for serving on the executive’s compensation and benefits committee..."

The Rev. Leon Sullivan, head of the Opportunities Industrialization Center, one of the country’s largest minority training programs . . . serves as a paid member of the Board of General Motors. . . . General Motors says it pays him $15,000 a year plus $250 per Board meeting, plus $7,000 for sitting on the audit committee, plus $8,000 for sitting on the public policy committee..."

"Although it is important to have minority input on our nation’s corporate Board, one wonders about the propriety of our civil rights leaders serving in such position... because some people believe that these public figures may be in conflict of interest binds, they risk the appearance of being ‘bought’ or ‘compromised’...

Continued on page 2

25 YEARS OF STRUGGLE—OUR HISTORY

Twenty-five years have passed since our movement began as a rank and file workers’ opposition to the leadership of the Communist Party U.S.A. When we began our struggle in the 1930s we were simply opposed to the most obviously opportunistic policies and extreme revisionism that then prevailed within the American Communist Party. As our movement developed and continued outside the old Party organization, we gradually learned that revisionism was not limited to the American CP, nor was the victory of opportunism a recent event. It was only after 15 years of development, however, that we arrived at our present understanding of the historical collapse of the world communist movement:

- The victory of opportunism in the international communist movement corresponds to the period of Lenin’s illness and death (January 1924). Once Lenin was out of the way the bourgeois trends led by Stalin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, etc., gained control of the Soviet Party and state, and soon became the dominant force in the Communist International. The line and actions of the Soviet Party after Lenin’s death represented a total reversal of the revolutionary Marxist principles he had fought for his all life.

- 1924 marked the end of the workers’ state in the USSR and the re-establishment of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Since then, the capitalist system of production has reigned supreme in every corner of the earth—socialism does not exist anywhere in the economic system of the USSR, China, Albania, and all of the so-called socialist blocs, is state capitalism concealed behind a pseudo-socialist facade.

- Today, the entire international communist movement, including the “pro-Russian,” “pro-Chinese,” “pro-Albanian” and Trotskyist trends, represents the left arm of the world bourgeoisie political apparatus. This is true regardless of whether a particular trend is represented by a ruling party (as in the USSR), forms part of a coalition government (as in Italy), function as an opposition party in parliament (as in France), is one of a wide assortment of tiny groups (as in the USA), or functions as an illegal “opposition group” (as in many neo-colonial nations). At all times, and under all circumstances, the capitalists need bourgeois communist organizations to help control the working class politically, to direct its energy towards reformism, and to hinder the formation of revolutionary proletarian organizations.

In the present period, revolutionary workers throughout the world are faced with the all important task of understanding the capitalist character of the communist movement, and on the basis of this critical understanding, building a new international proletarian movement.

The Marxist Workers Committee is the present organizational form of a trend that began in the 1930s inside the revisionist Communist Party.

Continued on page 4
Bruce Wright

‘Controversial’ Black Judge—Servant Of White Ruling Class

In 1970 a black lawyer, named Bruce Wright, was appointed judge of the Criminal Court by Mayor John V. Lindsay. For the last nine years Judge Wright has defended the laws and interests of American capitalism—just as faithfully and skillfully as the other judges, black and white, of New York. In return for his services he has received a salary of $44,451 each year. He has, in fact, done his job so well that the respectable New York City Bar Association recently praised him as a “decidedly better than average” judge, and in 1976 he received the Ethical Humanist Award from the New York Society for Ethical Culture.

All this praise, however, was not earned only in the courtroom—for Judge Wright has been an outspoken, prominent promoter of black nationalism.

In both a recent speech at Princeton University and a sermon at a church in Brooklyn, Judge Wright made several statements that have been widely publicized by the New York press and TV. At Princeton he declared: “Police have a right to hunt down blacks and kill them with impunity.” This is a nationalist lie—the police do not hunt down and kill black doctors, lawyers, businessmen or $42,000-a-year judges. The police do beat up, arrest on false charges, and kill black workers.

Like all nationalists, Judge Wright tries to lump together people of different classes and pretend they have the same interests. In this case he refers to the “common interests of the black people” whose enemy, he claims, is “the white man.” The falseness of this view becomes obvious if you remember that a large number of the New York cops who beat up and shoot black workers are black policemen. In fact, the Police Department prefers to use black cops in the black ghetto and Latin cops in the Latin ghetto, etc., because they are more effective tools. In the same way the ruling class appoints black and Latin judges to carry out its laws along with the white judges. In real life “black people,” just as “white people” are divided into different classes with completely different interests and different enemies.

The workers do not live alone in their neighborhood. Side by side with the proletariat lives the criminal element, the lumpenproletariat. They are the muggers, burglars, junkies, rapists, hustlers, pimps, etc., who rob off the workers and their families, who rob, beat and kill them. This is true in every working class neighborhood—despite the illusion created by the “mainline”—the white workers are victimized more often by the white criminals, the black workers are attacked more often by the black criminals, and the Latin workers are usually ripped off by the Latin thugs.

Black middle class, and black criminals. He makes no distinction between a black man or woman who swears 8 hours a day in a millionaire’s factory to earn enough to feed his family, and the black mugger who kills him and steals his pay. The criminal element, the lumpenproletariat of every color is the deadly enemy of the working class. They like Bruce Wright, try to hide behind nationalist slogans. “Black is beautiful!” shouts the black lumpen—before he robs a black worker.

Every class conscious worker must expose and fight the criminal element of all colors. But class conscious workers must also expose the middle class servants of capitalism. The Judge Wrights, who fill the state with white and Latin varieties (like NY Mayor Ed Koch and Deputy Mayor Herman Badillo) breed distrust and hatred between the different colors and nationalities that make up the American working class.

While Judge Wright is trying to mislead the black workers with nationalism, the white politicians, newspapers, and white union leaders in New York tell the white workers that “all blacks are criminals,” that “whites should unite against blacks,” etc. Those racist lies which have been repeated to generations of workers have created the fear and distrust which divide the white workers from their class brothers. Genuine representatives of the working class strive to unite their class by exposing both nationalism and white chauvinism (racism).

CLASS OPPOSITION

“White blacks,” declared Judge Wright in his Easter sermon, “have had 350 years of holocaust in this country.”

No Judge, you are lying.

The violence of the ruling class, the holocaust you speak about, has always been aimed at the producing classes. The violence of the Southern landowners was not aimed at the black slaves before the Civil War, and it was aimed at the sharecroppers after the war. Today the violence of the ruling class is aimed at the working class in general, and especially at the black and Latin workers—not at the lawyers, doctors, businessmen, judges—and of any color. You are a nationalist, Judge Wright, because black nationalism serves the interests of both the black middle class, and the class that pays you $42,000—the white American ruling class.
Colombian Worker Beaten In Jail
By NYC Cops

At 11:00 p.m. on a New York City Saturday night in April, a young Colombian worker (whose name we will omit for his own protection) was arrested for drunk driving after a car accident. Although he was unhurt at the time of arrest, by 8:00 p.m. the following night he was in the intensive care unit of Kings County Hospital. The cops had beaten him so brutally that he required a week in intensive care (followed by a further three weeks more in the regular ward) before he was able to leave the hospital.

The police tried to conceal their criminal work by adding a charge of assaulting an officer to the original one: drunk driving—they claimed that their prisoner’s injuries were caused by the car accident, although it was 21 hours after his arrest before he was brought to the hospital.

There is no excuse for driving under the influence of alcohol—it is irrespons- ible regardless of who does it. But that does not excuse the performance of the agents of imperialism—law enforcement.

The experience of this young worker is certainly not unusual or new—in fact thousands of cases just like this occur each year. When a worker is arrested, his fate depends much more on the whim of the police than on any ‘constitutional right’ or ‘Supreme Court decision.’

The entire system of American justice is organized on class lines, from the police station to the highest courts. The beatings in jail are reserved for the working class—when a white middle-class man, doctor, or other middle-class individual is arrested, he is given all the rights and privileges that belong to a class that can afford the best lawyers and pay for endless appeals.

The black and Latin workers, who generally belong to the most exploited section of the American working class, are particularly victim to all these tactics—but this is a question of class—not nationality.

When Colombian industrialists and bankers, or even doctors and lawyers, travel to New York they are accorded the most polite and respectful treatment. They are never referred to as ‘spics’ and they come and go as they please, unmolested. But when Colombian workers migrate northwards to find jobs in the U.S. they are hounded by the police and subjected to the lowest paying work. And then they find the oppressive side of American ‘justice.’

Conditions are hard for these workers if they immigrate legally, but even more so for those who come without papers. They are made to work under the conditions imposed by a system that is designed to control them. The Colombian workers are subjected to all the same exploitation as any other worker, but also they are subjected to the additional burden of being foreigners in a foreign country.

‘Professor Wilson wrote: “It is clearly evident in this connection that many talented and educated blacks are now in accepting positions of prestige and influence at a rate comparable to or in some situations, exceeding that of whites with equivalent qualifications. It is equally clear that the black under class is in a hopeless state of economic stagnation, failure and further behind the rest of society.”’ (ibid.)

This evolution of the middle class reveals the real meaning of the Civil Rights Movement—it was not the ‘brain child’ of any of its leaders, but rather the fulfillment of the romantic ideas of those who thought that the Civil Rights Movement would be a rapid and painless path to equality and freedom for all Americans.
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EXPANDING SOVIET IMPERIALISM

Territory seized in WWII and annexed by the Soviet Union.

Soviet neo-colonies—members of Comintern and the Warsaw Pact.

COLLAPSE...

Continued from page 12

two groups of "great powers" for the re-division of the world. In Europe the German and Italian imperialists of the "Axis" sought the British, French, American and Russian imperialists of the "UN Alliance" to determine who would dominate Europe and would get the lions share of the colonial world. In Asia, it was primarily a conflict to decide whether Japanese or American imperialism would have a free hand tooly the colonial world of the Pacific Basin.

The seeds of WWII were sown in the Versailles Treaty that ended the First Imperialist War. Realizing the impossibility of preventing inter-imperialist conflicts to prevent a new attack on the workers state, the Soviet Party had, as early as 1920, a definite line on the prospect of new imperialist wars, and the role of the Soviet state.

In a speech to a meeting of Party activists on December 6, 1920 Lenin explained how the Soviet Union intended to utilize the inter-imperialist conflicts:

"A vast literature exists on the future Japanese-American war. It is beyond doubt that war is brewing, that it is inevitable... But that being the case, we, as Communists, remain indifferent and merely say: "We shall carry on propaganda for communism in these countries." That is correct, but it is not everything. The practical task of communist policy is to take advantage of this hostility and to play one side off against the other. Here a new situation arises, like the two imperialist countries, Japan and America. They want to fight and will fight for world supremacy, for the right to loot. Japan will fight so as to continue to plunder Korea, which she is doing with unprecedented brutality, combining all the latest technical inventions with purely Asiatic tactics. Here we find all the methods of recapturing and all the latest technical perfections combined with a purely Asiatic system of warfare and unparalleled brutality. But the Americans would like to grab this Korean tidbit. Of course, defence of countries in such a war would be a heinous crime, a betrayal of a socialist state. We cannot help one of these countries against the other; we shall carry on propaganda and is obliged to take advantage of every hour granted it by circumstances in order to gain strength as rapidly as possible.

Go ahead then [Japan] and defeat America; we have no objections." Lenin states further: "A war between the imperialist powers would have saved us even more. If we are obliged to put up with such capitalist robbers, each of whom is ready to knife us, it is our prime duty to make them turn their knives against each other. Whenever thieves fall out honest men come into their own..."

We have shown you one of the imperialist antagonisms we must take advantage of—that which exists between Japan and America. There is another—the antagonism between America and the rest of the capitalist world..."The third antagonism is between the Entente and Germany... Everything that increases the antagonism between America and the rest of the Entente or between the entire Entente and Germany should be used by us... We shall likewise set America against Japan, the entire Entente against America and all Germany against the Entente." (Collected Works, v. 3, 443-450).

FASCISM AND REVISIONISM

The theory of Fascism, created by the modern revisionists for the 7th World Congress of the Communist International (1935) was designed to serve two functions: to conceal the Soviet Party's total betrayal of Marxist principle and simultaneously provided a rationale for the USSR's alliance with one group of imperialists in the forthcoming world war. In order to justify "counter-revolutionary" as irrelevant to everything that Lenin had written on imperialist war and proletarian internationalism, the revisionist theoreticians needed to create the illusion that there was something fundamentally different about this imperialist conflict. Because the USSR was allied with the British, American, French 'democratic' imperialist group against the Axis imperialists, Fascism was singled out as the "unique element" that transformed this imperialist conflict into a "genuine war for peace and democracy..." In 1935 Fascism was not a new phenomena. Benito Mussolini had organized his first fascist squads in 1919. Street fighting between the Communist workers and fascists in Italy was going on more or less continuously from February of 1921 until Mussolini's "March on Rome" and assumption of power in October of 1922. In A Letter to the German Communists in August of 1921 Lenin quoted a resolution of the Communist International calling on the Italian Party to fight the "opportunism of Socialism and the same time... maintain close contact with the proletarian masses... during clashes with the counter-revolutionary fascist organizations." (Collected Works, V. 3, 52, p.312).

In his speech to the fourth Congress of the Internationale in November of 1922 (i.e., after Mussolini came to power) Lenin noted: "The fascists in Italy may, for example, render as a great service by showing the Italians that they are not yet sufficiently enlightened and that their country is not yet insured against the Black Hundreds." (Selected Works, V. 3, p.728).

From the viewpoint of Marxism, the fascists were a
Stalin-Trotsky: Two Faces of Modern Revolutionism

Joseph Stalin was General Secretary of the CPSU during its transformation from the revolutionary Marxist party Lenin had fought for into an international center of revisionism and opportunism. Lenin-Trotsky’s “opposition” to the CP’s leadership in 1923 was “defending the USSR from the threat of revisionist capitulation after Lenin’s death. Trotsky’s opportunism after 1924 was fully consistent with the lack of principle shown in his earlier career.”

MAO TSE-TUNG’S NARODNIK-REVISIIONISM

Mao Tse-tung was one of the opportunity leaders of the CCP who had held posts both in the Kuomintang Party apparatus and in the Nationalist government. Although he was a minor political figure in the 1920’s, it was Mao who would complete the process of merging revisionism “Marxism” with Sun Yat-sen’s narodnik theories.

Bourgeois Revolution in China

The Peoples Republic of China has been, since its creation in 1949, a state of the Chinese bourgeoisie in which state capitalism is the main economic form. The Chinese Communist Party is an instrument of Chinese capitalists—state capitalism is the guiding principle. This is clearly shown by the Chinese Communist Party, under the leadership of Sun Yat-sen in 1911. Today China is one of the largest and most important states in the world, second only to the USA and USSR.

An understanding of the Chinese Revolution must begin with a reflection of the Chinese Communist Party, a party that is in reality the Chinese Communist Party, a party that is no longer in China, a party that is now in the hands of those who have seized power in China. The People’s Republic of China, which has been described as “a grand experiment in human freedom” and “the most successful revolution in the world,” is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state.

The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state.

The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state.

The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state.

The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state.

The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state. The Chinese Communist Party is no longer in China. It is no longer in China because it has been transformed into a workers state.
25 YEARS: OUR HISTORY
Continued from page 1
U.S.A. In 1956, when the Party was torn by factional conflicts, the left faction took the organizational form of the Marxian-Leninist Caucus and presented its program to the entire Party membership. Sections of the Caucus were organized within the Party in Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Williamsport, Pa. and New York. It was composed almost entirely of rank and file workers. After two years of futile attempts to get rid of the revisionist leadership of the Party, the Caucus left the CPUSA and formed, in August 1958, the Provisional Organizing Committee to reconstitute a Marxian-Leninist Communist Party (known as POC).

OUR HISTORY
In order to bring our readers the political content of those early struggles for a revolutionary workers movement we will quote briefly from the Main Report of the POC founding conference:

"Here and now, we declare our stand in relation to the dominant clique in the old Communist Party..."

"We refuse to consent in attempts to make the Communist Party into a tool of one or a few individuals who must be regarded as being unanswerable to the dictates of the propertarian membership of the Party and of the international movement..."

"We mean now to dissociate ourselves once and for all from the opportunistic sectarian policies which isolate us from the rank and file workers in order to combat "isolation" from the labor lieutenants of capital.

"We will no longer submit to their perversion of democratic centralism to impose on the Party its opportunistic line under the pseudonym of "the Negro question", a policy which has already seriously weakened...working class solidarity..."

"We denounce their attempts to manipulate the Communist Party in the South in 1955..."

"The old CP leadership has a historically confirmed habit of harrying Marxian-Leninist political and organizational principles...for mass and party "advantages" in the trade union field, in the electoral field, in the courts, etc..."

"Our membership is composed mainly of proletarians, Negro, white, and Puerto Rican, from a number of industrial centers of the Eastern and Middle Western sections of the United States. We directly represent the former caucus movement. We represent indirectly the far wider group of Communists with or without temporarily without organizational connections, who share our views of the present political situation, who are confident that we represent in an organized form the revolutionary, internationalist Marxian-Leninist traditions of those American workers who established the CPUSA 39 years ago..." (Report to the P.O.C. Founding Conference, pp. 24-26)

As POC we began publishing our newspaper, the Marxian-Leninist Vanguard (1958 to 1977). Vanguard was the immediate predecessor of the Marxist Worker.

The main strength of the newly born POC was our proletarian composition and our burning desire to create a revolutionary workers party. Our weaknesses were innumerable. Most important was our almost total ignorance of genuine Marxist theory — what we had been taught in the CPUSA was a monstrous caricature of proletarian science. Our desire, however, to fight our class enemies forced us to seek out the answers to our problems in the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. In this way, we gradually acquired a limited grasp of Marxism during the POC period. But it was still mixed with the residue of our revisionist training and our illusions about the international communist movement.

The POC had been created in 1958. After 10 years of existence, we decided that we had developed the necessary prerequisites for building a new Marxist worker’s party in the United States. In retrospect, it is clear that our decision was premature.

At a Congress convened in New York City in July 1968, the POC became the American Workers Communist Party (AWCP). The AWCP continued to publish the Marxian-Leninist Vanguard (altering its name in 1972 to the Marxist Vanguard). During our first years as the American Workers Communist Party we reached a number of very important theoretical conclusions about the history of the international communist movement. However, the AWCP never grew into the worker’s party we had hoped to create — instead it was diverted onto an extra revolutionary course which led to a policy of self-isolation from the working class. This policy of isolation caused the Party to disintegrate until finally in 1977, the tiny, isolated sect that remained liquidated the AWCP and ceased publication of Vanguard.

In January, 1978 the Marxist Workers Committee was formed by workers who had been members of the Marxian-Leninist Caucus, the POC and the AWCP.

We had learned from our own painful experience that the AWCP’s sectarian policy of isolation from the working class resulted in the destruction of everything positive that our movement had achieved. We, however, will not give up the struggle of our class simply because we were misdirected for some time. We have come together again as the Marxist Workers Committee to continue the fight for a revolutionary worker’s movement that we began 21 years ago.

When assessing the POC period of our movement (1958-1968) we must make a distinction between our struggle against the various bourgeois movements and trends within the USA, and our abysmal ignorance of the international movement. Despite many shortcomings, the positive aspects of the POC represented a real orientation of the American workers’ movement, and set POC apart from the myriad of petty-bourgeois groups that comprise the middleclass "left" in the USA. Among the contributions of POC we must include the following:

U.S. TRADE UNIONS

From our first days as the Marxist-Leninist caucus we had criticized the CPUSA’s policy of uniting with the "labor lieutenants of capital" against the rank and file of the trade unions. In POC we made a thorough examination of the American labor movement and came to the conclusion that the entire trade union apparatus is a part of the superstructure of the American bourgeoisie. The AFL-CIO and all the "independent" unions are the U.S. capital as a means of controlling the American working class economically and politically, and as an arm of American finance capital throughout the world, especially in the neo-colonial countries. They function internationally through such imperialist organizations as the Africa-American Labor Center, the American Institute for Free Labor Development and the International Labor Organization (ILO).

We also showed that the major strikes in the USA are called by the union leadership for the economic benefit of the capitalists — usually in order to liquidate overproduction. Genuine expressions of rank and file militancy within the American labor movement, when they have occurred, necessarily take the form of wildcat strikes or the rank and file rebellions against the trade union apparatus.

IMPERIALIST BRIBERY OF THE U.S. WORKING CLASS

One of the essential tenets of the Marxist theory of imperialism, which was buried by revisionism and denounced by POC, is the theory of imperialist bribery of the proletariat. Writing in 1916, Lenin described how the imperialist bourgeoisie uses a portion of its colonial super-profits for bribery: "The capitalists can devote a part (not a small one at that) of these super-profits to bribe their own workers, to create something like an alliance (recall the celebrated 'alliances' described by the Webbs, of English trade unions and employers) between the workers of the given nation and their capitalists against the other countries." (Collected Works, v. 23, p. 114).

Understanding this aspect of imperialism is absolutely essential to an objective assessment of the American working class, especially in the post WWII period. The revisionist leadership of the CPUSA insisted that this Marxist theory did not apply to the United States. In POC, however, we demonstrated that imperialism, both inside and outside the United States, underlies the political demoralization and passivity that has characterized the American proletariat since World War II.

The demoralization of the U.S. working class of this period closely resembles a similar period in the history of the British working class. The British workers were also temporarily demoralized by a..."
The U.S. Working Class—Grave Diggers of American Capitalism

The U.S. Working Class—Grave Diggers of American Capitalism

"O, all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletarian alone is a really revolutionar-

... What the bourgeoisie overthrew was its own supremacy; in its own place of the proletariat. Its fall and the victory of the proletarian are equally inevitable." (Karl Marx, Communist Manifesto)

continued on next page
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The signification of a political movement that arises from any particular strata of class society is determined by the relation of that strata to the means of production. This Marxist truism definitely applies to the intelligentsia, including both its active members, engaged in their professions, and their sons and daughters training in the universities and colleges. In imperialist society the intelligentsia are tied to finance capital, to the Rockefellers and the Fords, by their own economic interests. Imperialism. Lenin explained in 1913, "means the subjugation of all strata of the propertied classes to finance capital." Expressing this general truth in concrete terms, he wrote, "The facts show that all the propertied classes down to the petty bourgeoisie and the 'intelligentsia' have joined the imperialists en masse." (Selected Works, v.1, p.227-8)

Lenin had, in 1907, pointed out that a proletarian party must expose the counter-revolutionary role of the intelligentsia and combat their influence amongst the workers: "... the influence of the intelligentsia, who do not take a direct part in exploitation, who are trained to play with general phrases and concepts, who go in for 'very good' ideas and sometimes from sincere stupidity elevate their middle-class position to a principle of non-class and non-class politics - the influence of this bourgeois intelligentsia over the people is dangerous. Here and here alone do we find an infection of the masses which is capable of doing real harm and which demands the ejection of all the forces of socialism in an endeavor to counteract this poison." (Selected Works, old edition, v.11, p.694)

Nothing has more thoroughly substantiated the truth of Lenin's assessment of the intelligentsia than the history of the U.S. "student rebellion" and new left.

The "student rebellion" arose after the American and Soviet Imperialists had liquidated their cold war, and the U.S. state had removed the accompanying anti-communist legal restriction inside the U.S.A. The rebellion of the neo-ideological intellectuals of imperialism began with the famous Free Speech Movement at the University of California (Berkeley) and gradually perverted as it went down in the war in Vietnam was concluded. This "rebellion" was fostered in the students' enthusiastic support for, and participation in, every form of bourgeois reform that existed in the U.S.A., from the prison rights movement, to the pacifist disarmament movements, the "anti-Vietnam war" movement, and the emerging feminist movement.

The new left political trends arose out of the "student rebellion" period. Their organizational and ideological roots, however, can be found in the opportunistic "old left" parties - the CPUSA, the League for Industrial Democracy and the Trotskyist organizations. The new left (SDS, etc) promoted themselves as an "independent" movement and proved their independence by attacking Marxism more openly and directly than the older (and wiser) revisionist parties. In POCS, we have observed the reactionary content of the "student rebellion" as well as the new left, and pointed out that the class interests of the proletariat and its movement are irreconcilable. We also exposed the actual unity between the established opportunistic parties and their new left offspring.

In general, during the POC period of our movement (1958-60) we gradually accepted an understanding of the bourgeois political trends within the USA, but we were thoroughly confused about international opportunism. Or, to better put it, we understood that the communist movement had collapsed in America, but did not yet comprehend that it had collapsed worldwide, and knew very little about the history of the collapse.

In 1958, when POC was born, we thought that international opportunism had dominated the Chinese and Yugoslav Communist Parties. When the Chinese-Soviet split became public in 1961 we immediately noticed the Chinese side, naively believing that their disagreement with the Soviet Union was based on principle. As recently as 1967 we regarded China as a socialist country and supported the Chinese CP and the Vietnamese communist movement as the vanguard of the world proletarian movement.

US-ChINESE PARTNERSHIP

Our illusions were shattered in 1968, the same year we created the American Workers Communist Party (AWCP). In the spring of 1968 the United States and New Vietnam announced their agreement to begin negotiations for a peaceful conclusion of the war in Vietnam. (Those negotiations were later held in Paris, but that is another story.) We were constantly hinting that 'socialist' China and imperialist USA were preparing for a public rapprochement. Vice-President Hubert Humphrey called upon America to begin "building bridges to China." At that time, we concluded that the "bridges" had already been "built" and that only the public-ceremonial aspect of US-Chinese collusion remained for the future. After evaluating the meaning of both these events, for what we had thought was the "center of world revolution," we came to the following conclusions:

a) The North Vietnamese state and the NLF of South Vietnam were in the control of the Vietnamese bourgeoisie.

b) The Vietnamese workers and peasants were sacrificing their lives in a war that could best be described as a neo-colonial regime in Vietnam with a "socialist" facade, such as the one in Cuba.

The subsequent events in Southeast Asia have proved that our assessment was fundamentally correct.

By the end of 1968 we concluded that the events in Vietnam and China were symptoms of something much deeper and more fundamental than a "temporary setback" in a healthy proletarian movement. We were finally awakened to the realization that the pro-Soviet and pro-Chinese parties and groups within the world communist movement are united in their opposition to Marxism and the revolutionary interests of the international working class.

Our initial re-assessment of the forces within the communist movement was presented in a report to the Central Committee of the AWCP on December 7, 1968. This report was entitled "Let the Socialists or Bearish Comrades learn or bear any childish regrets for what is a living reality on the world problem, the revolution in the world scale has suffered a serious defeat. The main factor in that defeat has been the total collapse of the Old Chinese and Cuban revolutions, and the world scale has suffered a serious defeat. The main factor in that defeat has been the total collapse of the Old Chinese and Cuban revolutions, and the world scale has suffered a serious defeat. The main factor in that defeat has been the total collapse of the Old Chinese and Cuban revolutions, and the world scale has suffered a serious defeat." (The socio-political scope of the treachery of the modern revisionists can be fully gauged when it is realized that this was written by the Social Democrats during the First World War...)

The modern revisionists have sold out all the workers and communist movements in the capitalist countries, but even more than this - they have bartered away the greatest historic achievement of the working class, they betrayed the dignity and honor of the proletariat. Logically, together with the dictatorship of the proletariat, the socialist system of production has temporarily disappeared from this earth, and in its place the capitalist system of production reigns.
The American capitalists have been throwing crumbs from their imperialist banquet to the American working class in the form of higher wages, social services, etc., in order to buy social peace at home.

The preceding words sounded the death knell of the AWCP. The most precious possession of the party, its proletarian composition, was cast aside in order to make room for the new "revolutionary social segment"—women. In reality, of course, it never bothered the party to have no more than a handful or a few on their rolls.

The cadre who replaced them in leadership were much younger and politically inexperienced. They were women. They were trained by the AWCP,able to work within the framework of centralism and the national leadership. They were trained in the so-called "revolutio

As the older workers were replaced by the new leadership the General Secretary's theory of the "New Social Segment" was accepted by the party, and the AWCP was transformed into a women's party. This was done in order to accommodate the new leadership's view that the problems of the American working class were not of a sufficient magnitude to warrant the attention of the AWCP. The new leadership, instead, focused on the problems of the "modern" American woman. This led to the disbanding of the AWCP, with the exception of the women's branch, which continued to operate as the "Revolutionary Women's League." The AWCP, however, continued to exist as a men's organization.

The disintegration of the AWCP was a significant event in the history of the American working class. It marked the end of the revolutionary socialist tradition in the United States and the beginning of a new era of political fragmentation and disunity. The AWCP's legacy of militant class struggle and solidarity with the struggles of other oppressed peoples continues to inspire activists and fighters today.
The Father of Chinese Narodniki-Revisionism

Mao Tse-tung, 1947. In Northern Shensi. Peasant troops like these brought the Chinese bourgeois revolution to victory in 1949-53. By destroying the remains of feudalism and unifying the country, they laid the foundations for modern industrial China. In 1947 the working class was far away from Mao—saying and working in the cities of China (which he called the "enemy's main bases"). In the next revolution, the rapidly growing Chinese proletariat will overthrow Chinese state capitalism.

COLLAPSE...

Continued from page 3 that the Chinese working class existed only in those cities which he called "the enemy's main bases."

A few pages further on, Mao revealed the real leadership of the Chinese peasants: "most intellectuals ... have a keen political sense and often play a vanguard role or serve as a link with the masses in the present stage of revolution." (Ibid., p. 322)

In this respect, the alignment of classes in the Chinese revolution in 1939 was essentially the same as in 1911—it was not the workers who were leading the revolutionary process—it was the intellectuals.

The Chinese Revolution developed militarily along the lines Mao Tse-tung had projected in 1939. The armies of revolutionary peasants, led by the CCP, "surrounded the cities," which were not taken until the very end (1948-9). They were captured, not by proletarian insurrections, but by the armed peasants. (See "Red Army in China," July 31, 1949.)

If there was any doubt as to who Mao meant by the term "national bourgeoisie," it was dispelled by his resolution for the CCP's Politburo in 1951, which clearly stated: "It is necessary to unite intellectuals, industrialists, and businessmen ... on the basis of the struggle against imperialism and feudalism." (Selected Works, v. 3, p. 48)

Here the contradiction between the bourgeois reality of the Chinese Revolution and the pseudo-Marxist view behind which it was concealed by the CCP, becomes glaring. A joint dictatorship of the Chinese working class and the Chinese capitalists, of the exploited and the exploiters, is simply a social and historical impossibility. Mao Tse-tung, however, was not the first opportunist to propose just that impossibility. In 1919 the German Kautsky said the same suggestion, to which Lenin replied:

"To reconcile, unite the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat! How simple! What a brilliantly phallicist idea!... The only pity is that it was tried in Russia under Kerensky, by uniting Mensheviks and SR-Revolutionaries, those petty-bourgeois democrats who imagined themselves socialists."

"... the alternative is either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat..." (V. I. Lenin, On the International Working Class and Communist Movement, Moscow, p. 290)

The Chinese communists, like the Russian Social-Revolutionaries, were only petty-bourgeois democrats who "imagined themselves socialists," and the pseudo-academic of China, like bourgeois states everywhere, claimed to represent "the whole people." Before the victory in 1949, Mao had admitted: "Some immature Communists think that the present revolution is the Agrarian Revolution is actually a socialist revolution. It must be emphatically pointed out that these views are wrong." He also acknowledged that: "It is not at all surprising but entirely to be expected that a capitalist economy will develop to a certain extent within Chinese society with the sweeping away of the obstacles to the development of capitalism after the victory of the revolution." (Selected Works, V. 2, p. 329-330).

However, intertwined with these truthful statements were the requisite fairy tales about socialism: ... "[It] is highly probable that China's bourgeois democratic revolution will ultimately avoid a capitalist future and enjoy a socialist future." (Ibid.)

In 1955 Mao Tse-tung stated that the "new democratic" state would in a period of 15 years, "build a socialist society in China." (See Selected Works, v. 5, p. 154) Simultaneously, the Chinese state of "the people" would transform itself into the dictatorship of the proletariat.

What really occurred, however, was that Mao and the Chinese bourgeoisie carried out Sun Yat-Sen's program for developing Chinese industry through a combination of private and state capital. Dr. Sun had outlined his plan of "regulated capital" in the Manifesto of the First National Congress of the Kuomintang in these words:

"Enterprises, such as banks, railways, and airlines, whether Chinese owned or foreign-owned, which are either monopolistic in character or too big for private management, shall be operated and administered by the state... this is the main principle of the regulation of capital." (Quoted by Mao Tse-tung, Selected Works, V. 2, p. 328)

Utilizing both state and private capital, but relying most heavily on state capitalism, the Chinese bourgeoisie has followed the historical footsteps of the European and American bourgeoisies. After contributing its economic and political power within the borders of China it has developed into a world imperialist power.

Recent events in Asia have awakened many workers to the realization that China is not the "land of socialism." It claims to be. What is not yet understood is that the current events are the natural outcome of the whole development of the Chinese bourgeoisie revolution.

OUR TASKS

We have presented here, in summary form, the most important features in the history of the collapse of the world communist movement. In future issues of the Marxist Worker we will return to each of these periods to show how the victory of opportunism, once it was completed in the Soviet Party and the Third International, took different forms under different historical conditions.

The world communist movements are the left wing of the world bourgeois political apparatus. This is equally true of those movements which find their roots in Peking (or T'ienan) and those who pray to Moscow (or to Leon Trotsky's ghost). We will show how this fact has manifested itself during the post-WWII period, in such diverse phenomena as the creation of the Eastern European "Peoples Democracies" (Soviet neo-colonies), the "Peace and Disarmament" movement of the 1950's, the so-called "National Liberation Fronts" in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and in the "Vietnam-Pacific movement" and "student rebellions" of the 1960's.

Only on the basis of a thorough understanding of how counter-revolution conceals itself behind "socialist" and "revolutionary" slogans and movements, can the regrouping and rebuilding of a truly revolutionary proletarian movement begin.
25 YEARS...

Continued from page 9

movement. Having determined when and how we made the mistakes that led to the destruction of AWCP, we have resolved to pull up the thread of revolutionary development where it was abandoned.

Our experience in the old revisionist CPUSA and in the AWCP has led us to conclude that the founders of scientific socialism were correct when they proposed that a true workers party must develop a cadre of theoretically advanced proletarians, that not only its membership but also its leadership must be drawn primarily from the working class. Building a proletarian movement with working class leaders requires an organization that systematically fights for the theoretical development of its worker cadre. Accordingly, we have adopted as our slogan the battle cry of the First International: "The emancipation of the working class must be achieved by the working class itself." (K. Marx)

PROLETARIAN THEORY

The collapse of the communist movement has meant the wholesale doctrining and distortion of Marxism in the name of Marxism. In this respect, the situation today resembles that which Lenin saw in 1917, when he wrote:

"Today the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the labor movement concur in this doctrine of Marxism. They omit, obscure, or distort the revolutionary side of this theory, its revolutionary soul. They push to the foreground and extol what is or seems acceptable to the bourgeoisie."

"In these circumstances, in view of this unprecedentedly widespread distortion of Marxism, our prime task is to re-establish what Marx really taught." (Selected Works, vol. 2, p. 299)

Today, real Marxists must again "re-establish what Marx (and Lenin) really taught" by exposing the systematic distortion of proletarian theory that has been the work of the Joseph Stalin's, Leon Trotsky's, Nikita Kruschev's, Mao Tse-tung's, Enver Hoxha's, etc., first, and caroused with others.

The movement that the working class requires can only be built on the theory developed by Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The starting point for Marxism, like all science, is objective reality—without an absolutely objective understanding of the current world, and a thorough critique of the communist movement, nothing can be done. Rose-colored glasses and false optimistic assessments are the bread and butter of petty bourgeois communists but they are a deadly trap for the working class.

Before it can construct a new Marxist movement, the working class must see clearly that the old movement has been rotten at its core, a revolutionary movement for the last 50 years. In order to build a new movement, the working class must understand that all the activity, drawing in the Communist movement today, the Soviet, Chinese, Albanian, and Trotskyist, are expressions of opportunism and the adulation of proletarian theory.

The experience of our movement, as well as the history of the world proletariat, reveals that the road to the "final conflict" is always charted by innumerable mis-steps, wrong turns, mistaken paths and temporary defeats. We are completely confident that the lessons which the collapse of the communist movement teaching to the international working class will enable it to erect new revolutionary organizations upon more solid foundations than those of the past, and will help to prepare it for the next storming of the ramparts of the world's defeats. To those faint-hearted souls who point to the defeats of the past only to persuade the proletariat that its final victory is impossible, we will answer as Lenin did after the defeat of the 1905 Revolution:

"The defeat of the revolution resulting from this first campaign revealed, not that the tasks were wrong... but that the forces were insufficiently prepared, that the revolutionary crisis was insuffi-
cien tly wide and deep. The only thing Liberals and wel- rified intellectuals lose heart after the first guaranteed mass battle for freedom, let them repeat it once or twice, and they will be convinced before, don't tread that fatal path again. The class-conscious proletariat will answer them: the great wars of history, the great uprisings of revolutions were solved only by the advanced classes returning to the attack again and again—and they achieved vic-
tory after victory."

(Selected Works, v. 1, p. 584)

STAGNATION AND REVOLUTION IN AMERICA

The American working class is today undoubtedly the most politically backward working class in the world. This is not due to any national idiocy of the American workers, but rather to the unrelenting economic depression, social conditions, and political conditions that have existed in this country during the three decades following WWII. Those 30 years of (relatively) peaceful economic conditions were the result of the victory of American imperialism, which provided a tremendous area of investments and markets for world capitalism, especially in American capitalism. This period of peaceful development, however, will come to an end. The inescapable economic laws of capitalism are about to explode, just as the last epoch of crisis and war gave birth to the post-war peace epoch, so will the peaceful period (once it comes) be marred by the plethora of crises, war, and proletarian revolutions, as the imperialist powers struggle each other for the shrinking areas of new investments.

The American capitalists have been throwing crumbs from their imperialist base to the American working class in the form of higher wages, social services, etc., in order to buy social peace at home. This is how the American capitalists want to achieve internal class conflict within the United States during the post-war period and exploit the political backwardness of the American workers. However, the depression, lower wages, unemployment, and post-war stagnation of the 1920s, in the 1930s, and in the 1940s, up to the 1960s, means that the American workers have not seen the world economic collapse that is an inevitable outcome of the post-war "boom" period—we do not pretend to predict. That it will come, we can state, with absolute certainty, it is known, with equal certainty, that with it will come a new round of imperialist wars and revolutions.

In short, we are on the eve of the death of this development, moved into action, forced to defend its economic interests as its real wages are driven down to lower levels. The imperialist states have lost their ability to buy peace by force. The long period of appeasement, independence from the "two-party system" that has helped it to survive for so long. As the new economic and political winds blow, the American imperialists will have to fall back on the old methods of the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, and over again—there are certain crucial factors that play a role in their case, their situation. As the American proletariat awakens, we of the Marxist Workers Committee have compiled a number of points that are the future of the American working class. We are not casual visitors, the coming to the working class movement. Steadily and patiently, the American proletariat, on which quickens, will not be able to face up to its tasks as a class. It is the objective, and primarily the economic forces, not the subjective will who will bring about this quickness, who will bring about the rebirth of the American proletariat without a single event the proletariat will face this new forces to win against the capitalist system in which we live.

The James Composites and Dr. Pousaints are rightly alarmed by the growing hatred between their class and the world. The real work of the proletariat is teaching the black workers to despise the middle class servants of capitalism, regardless of color. Within the American working class, however, the opposite is taking place—unity between the black and white workers is slowly developing, not only out of "integration" by Supreme Court decision, but rather out of dinner table necessity.
COLLAPSE OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The most important, the most pressing task facing Marxism today is to understand the collapse of the world communist movement and the causes of that collapse. As we stated in 1968: "Recognition of the fact that the world working class has suffered a serious defeat on a vast scale represents the indispensable prerequisite from which the revolutionary regrouping within the working class must proceed." (Vanguard, Dec. 1968-January 1969)

Today the brazen opportunism of the modern revisionists of Moscow and Peking is making more and more workers aware that the world communist movement has collapsed, but many are still under the illusion that this was a recent event. Many honest individuals believe that the death of revolutionary communism was marked by Nikita Khruschev's "denunciation of Stalin" or by the fall of Lin Piao or the death of Mao Tse-tung, etc. As long as these illusions persist, until the question of when, and by whom the working class was betrayed is answered, the real causes of the victory of opportunism will remain unfaithful

It is for these reasons that we present here a summary of our views on the collapse of the communist movement and its consequences. In future issues of the Marxist Worker we will examine each of these essential questions in separate articles.

The victory of opportunism within the Soviet Communist Party dates back to the period of Lenin's illness and death in January 1924 (from cerebral sclerosis). It is important to note that Lenin's leadership of the Soviet Party and state ended at the time of his first stroke in May of 1922. In the brief periods in which Lenin was well enough to do any political work, his role was mostly limited to making written comments "from the side lines." He suffered a second stroke in December 1922 and a third in March 1923, which left no hope of recovery.

The political line and policy followed by the Communist Party and Soviet state after his death represented a complete reversal of the Marxist principles Lenin had fought for while alive. After an initial retraction as imperialist war, the internationalism of the working class, the national and colonizaion question, the composition of the Soviet Party and the Soviet state apparatus, etc. This period marked the end of the Soviet workers' state and the re-establishment of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie behind a "socialist" facade.

One of the most important (and most obvious) reversals of Lenin's policy immediately after his death related to the membership of the Soviet Communist Party. In scores of articles and speeches Lenin had reiterated the importance of restricting party membership to only the most class conscious workers, of reducing the number of party members by kicking out Trotskyists and petty bourgeois elements, and preventing similar people from joining by enforcing stringent probationary requirements, etc. (See Lenin's letter to Molotov of March 24 and 26, 1922 in Selected Works (old edition) V. 9, p. 321-323)

All of Lenin's warnings were cynically thrown aside after he was gone. A massive enrollment drive was organized (the "Lenin [I] enrollment") that brought over 400,000 young people into the party within four months of his death. By April 1, 1924 the party membership had almost doubled from the previous year. Just as Lenin had warned, the shadowy influence of careerists and petty bourgeois elements helped destroy the proletarian character of the Party and made possible the rapid transformation of the workers state into a bourgeois state.

Lenin was well aware that such a transformation (to bourgeois state power) was a real possibility, because of the weaknesses of the newly born dictatorship of the proletariat, its international isolation, and especially because most of the Soviet state apparatus was really the old Tsarist-bourgeois apparatus. In December of 1922 he described the Soviet state as: "that same Russian apparatus which, as I pointed out on one of the preceding sections of my diary, we took over from tsarism and slightly moistened with Soviet oil..."

"...the apparatus we call ours is, in fact, still quite alien to us; it is a bourgeois and tsarist bonapartist and there has been no possibility of getting rid of it in the course of the past five years..." (Selected Works, V.3, p.749-50)

In his political report to the eleventh congress of the Soviet Party on March 27, 1922 (the last congress he attended), Lenin discussed the attitude of a group of Russian bourgeois towards the Soviet State:

"This question has been raised by the Smiess Vekh people, who, as you know, are a trend which has arisen among Russian emigres... people who have "Far from being a revolutionary opponent to Soviet revisionism, Trotsky...reached the 'loyal opposition' of Stalin and Co., denying the re-establishment of capitalism in the Soviet Union." come to the conclusion that the Soviet Government is building up the Russian state and therefore should be supported..."

"I get a copy of Smiess Vekh which says quite plainly: 'Things are by no means what you imagine them to be. As a matter of fact, you are slipping into the ordinary bourgeois morass with communist flags inscribed with catchwords stuck all over the place.' I am in favor of supporting the Soviet government," says Utraylov, although he was a Constitutional-Democrat, a bourgeois, and supported intervention. 'I am in favor of supporting Soviet power because it has taken the road that will lead it to the ordinary bourgeois state...""

"We must say frankly that such capitalist enemies are useful. We must say frankly that the things Trotskyism--THE 'LOYAL OPPORTION'
The famous battle between Stalin, Trotsky, Zinovief, Bukharin, etc. for control of the Soviet Communist Party was primarily a dispute as to which opportunistic trend would manage the Soviet state apparatus for the Russian bourgeoisie. Far from being a revolutionary opponent to Soviet revisionism, Trotsky and the Trotskyists (and remained the 'loyal opposition' of Stalin and Co., denying the re-establishment of capitalism in the Soviet Union. To this day, the main Trotskyist parties defend the claim that the Soviet Union is socialist ("with a degenerated workers state").

IMPERIALIST WORLD WAR TWO

The betrayal of the working class by the Soviet leadership and the Communist International came to full fruition during the Second World War period. Every Marxist principle on Imperialist War that Lenin had fought for during WWI was cast aside.

The Second World War was almost an exact historical repeat of WWI. It was nothing but a predatory, imperialist conflict; a struggle between

Continued on page 4