NY LOCAL IN SIXTH MONTH OF STRIKE

Phone Workers Continue

Defiance of Sellout

After six months of stubborn determination by telephone workers, the New York phone strike suddenly seemed to come to life, seemingly with the blessings of all the leaders. Mass picketing of Bell installations, "education" of scabs, and militant marches through the streets of Manhattan and Brooklyn by masses of phone workers expressed new spirit. The New York strike is yet another example of the great capacity of the American workers for sacrifice on behalf of their class, and the role of the bureaucracy as an essentially fragile lid atop potentially enormous force. The furious determination of the leading strikers reveals again the hollowness of the old rationale for the left's opportunism toward the union bureaucracy: that the workers are not prepared to take the extreme steps necessary to confound the bureaucracy and overthrow the condition for its existence—capitalism.

The CWA international leadership under Joseph A. Beirne, which has attempted to sabotage the strike in the interests of maintaining the nationwide settlement, was able to hold out against Beirne and his leadership-capitalism. Carnivale, who was recently elected as a militant leader, is presently popular. He will probably try to maintain a militant image kept within the bounds of Beirne's "rules." His militant posturing will not bring results, and he will take the rank and file down to defeat with him. Without a rank-and-file struggle against the entire bureaucracy, from Carnivale to Beirne, and a serious attempt to shut down the Phone Co., completely, the most militant street demonstrations will not prevent defeat.

What Is Needed to Win

The real issues of the strike call for economic and political solutions beyond the imagination of Carnivale and Beirne, and show where they have failed. To begin with, the limits imposed by the national sell-out must be broken. The official settlement of a 12.4% wage increase retroactive to May 1, 1971 and a pathetic 5% each of the two succeeding years does not even catch up on the wages lost through inflation and taxes since the 1968 settlement! The so-called cost-of-living increase in the last two years of the contract is insignificant. Many CWA operators (at the bottom of the scale) are getting less than 10% the first year. In light of recent wage settlements by coal operators (at the bottom of the scale) are getting less than 10% the first year. In light of recent wage settlements by coal...
Phone Workers...

ers from one area against another, and to keep all wages low. There should be a union shop and one nationwide contract and pay scale with equal wages for equal work, including an unlimited cost-of-living escalator. The New York workers must mobilize CWA ranks across the country behind this.

Organize Operators!

Local issues center on grievance procedure, upgrading (the question of seniority vs. hiring off the street), absence control, etc. Important as these are, Beirne will grab at the smallest "local issue" bone tossed out by the company that he thinks he can get by with, to avoid confronting the decisive issue of breaking through the limits of the national settlement. After a strike as long as this one has been already, such an end would be a grotesque insult.

More vital is a "local issue" of a different kind—the question of the operators, whose company union is not honoring the strike. Furthermore, some of the women CWA members in clerical and other fields have scabbed, feeling they have been left at the bottom too long by the CWA leadership. This disheartens Beirne to keep going no matter how militant the strikers are on the streets. Organizing travelling pickets against the out-of-state scabbing is acceptable to Beirne and Carnivale to a certain extent; but organizing the operators would require organizing on the basis of a struggle against the CWA bureaucracy. It was Beirne's betrayal last July that turned the tide among the operators against the CWA and subsequent rep resentation election. But the "militant" Carnivale refused to tackle precisely this task of organizing the operators, despite pressure from them, talk of "determined" Beirne's retaliation for breaking the "rules."

The United Action caucus in Local 1101, heavily publicized by Workers' Power of the International Socialists (IS) has failed utterly to fill the need for hard, alternative leadership based on a working-class political program. Carnivale is apparently too popular right now for United Action to dare more than a one-sentence swipe at him for "caverism" in its 3 January issue. The most political article of the issue, entitled "Beirne Must Go!" practically invites Carnivale to join "If the CWA is to be effective, rank and file groups must organize in each local to make our leadership fight the company and the international." (emphasis ours)

While these phones refuse to challenge "their" "good guys," they also refuse to really fight "bad guy" Beirne when they get a chance, as revealed in "What Beirne Really Said,..." in the same is-

On a larger scale, the effect of policies like those of United Action would be disastrous for the political consciousness of the workers. Many of the most militant would come to see the "left" caucuses in their unions as a brake upon achieving what they want, as a parasitical left思维er for the bureaucrat. The result would be increasing spontaneity among the workers, leading to heroic acts of organiza tionized defeat. In the present case, IS chooses a line when the workers have demonstrated willingness to go to extreme lengths, for their talk of "forcing the bureaucracy to do certain things!" When the opportunity presents itself, the workers exhausted, they may revert to a more far-reaching perspective, since then they will have no worry about being taken to court. This is possibly being faced with the responsibilities of providing revolutionary leadership accusing from smashing the bureaucracy.

The lesson of this strike must be the realization that a fight for a contract that satisfies the needs of the CWA membership actually means a struggle to oust the rotten leadership locally and nationally. The bureaucrats maintain their position by limiting the struggle to the narrowest range of economic and trade union issues and by keeping the workers confined and divided into separate, competing unions and locals. But the workers are confronted every day with an entire range of social and political issues that directly affect their lives and future: unemployment, wage controls, inflation, war, racism, sexual discrimination. The interests of the working class as a whole, internationally, in these and other questions stand diametrically opposed to the interests of the corporations and bosses ruling most of the world. Therefore, any organized opposition in CWA or any union for that matter falls far short of the reformist demand if it is not to be still another device for some ruler's career. The program must include ending unemployment through a full-range of social demands, union democracy, an end to discrimination against racial minorities and women, labor off the pay board, strike action against war and a working-class political party to smash the influence of the bosses' political lackeys and lead the labor movement out of the hands of their reformist bureaucratic friends.
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New York Daily News

A r e p o r t of an "impromptu" meeting with Beirne in Washington, D. C. The article—the entire issue, in fact—contains no mention of the slightest political challenge to Beirne by United Action on any aspect of the need for a rank-and-file caucus, a fight to overthrow the bureaucracy, or transitional demands—despite Beirne's report statement that he "is seeking intervention by various political figures to mediate the issue." Beirne's subservience to the political handmaids of the giant corporations stands in marked contrast to the attitude of the ranks of 1101 at a recent street demonstration, in which a Brooklyn Assistant to the Borough President was booted and shouted down amid general condemnation of "politicians." The indivisible marriage of the trade union bureaucracy to the bourgeois politicians, particularly the Democratic Party, is central to their role as the bosses' policemen within the labor movement. United Action's silence in the face of the open betrayal of inviting these enemies to interfere in labor affairs is typical of IS's craven cowardice and opportunism.

The 31 January Workers' Power can do no better than to note byproduct of rank-and-file determination to act (in this case, sending "flying squads" of pickets to installations in surrounding regions and Detroit) in spite of bureaucratic sabotage. Determined rank and file militants can force the labor bureaucracy to do certain things, including get out of the way... With a strategy and an understanding of what the real power relationships are, mass rank and file action can change things," it has noticed that the labor bureaucracy will go further under pressure than it will go without pressure. A profound insight! But the bureaucracy can bend to "determined rank and file initiative when it is exhausted in the absence of a programmatically distinct caucus fighting for leadership, Concessions from bureaucrats can be won by the real threat of an opposing caucus with a revolutionary transitional program, in the same way as greater reforms are won from the bourgeoisie by a revolutionary threat than by reformist pressure.
Defend the Gains, Defeat the Usurpers

The differences expressed below between the "Anti-Stalinist Study Group" (ASG) and ourselves have a significance beyond the issues discussed (which are of sufficient importance in their own right). By itself, the ASG is but a small group in northern California which publishes the newsletter Takahij, and with whom we have had comradely relations. But the ASG is a direct expression of a major and characteristic section of the very important Japanese revolutionary left, in particular the Kakumaru faction of the Japan Revolutionary Communist League led by comrade Kuroda. Given the profound contradictions of Japan and in the context of the mounting world crisis, the capacity theoretically, politically and organizationally of the Japanese revolutionary left to face these contradictions in victory or defeat of the Japanese proletarian revolution, itself an issue of overwhelming importance in East Asia and of first magnitude in global impact.

But the Japanese movement is disoriented, as illustrated by the Kakumaru faction's "world revolutionary strategy of 'anti-imperialism, anti-Stalinism'", explicitly parallels the vastly different phenomena of capitalist imperialism and the essentially derivative Stalinist bureaucracies. It leads logically and historically to incapacity in the struggle against Stalinism within the workers' movement. Without smashing Stalinism in Japan, the revolution will surely miscarry.

The Japanese revolutionary left arose out of the Stalinist party after the Hungarian revolution of 1956 and attempts to make sense of its own recent experiences alone. The official "Fourth International," deep in its own revisionist decomposition, only damaged and further disoriented the Japanese comrades. The essential task facing the Japanese comrades is to take as the central axis of their movement the organically assimilated experiences of the international communist movement: the Leninist experience of the Hungarian workers in 1956 and transcending the existing peace movement—this is the central task of anti-war struggles at the present stage. Consequently, this slogan of opposition to both US and USSR nuclear testing contains within it an impetus urging the masses to understand not only the essence of imperialism, but also the anti-proletarian nature of contemporary Stalinism. (On this point see Kuroda Kan‘ichi, "What is Revolutionary Marxism?" pp. 77-78.)

Letter to the Editor:

The symposium on "August 6 and International Anti-War Struggles" sponsored by our group had as its main purpose the promotion of revolutionary anti-war struggles from the standpoint of proletarian anti-imperialism and anti-Stalinism. We contend that the experiences of the Japanese revolutionary left is extremely relevant, we present an outline of the development of the Japanese anti-war movement, with specific emphasis on the Japanese anti-Stalinist movement and the struggle of the Japanese revolutionary left in the forefront of these struggles.

In organizing the symposium, we were guided by two principles. First, it is our opinion that only those organizations in the U.S. which base themselves consciously on an anti-Stalinist orientation will be capable of leading the American anti-war struggles in a revolutionary direction. Second, while there is a necessity for these revolutionary groups to engage in common struggle, it certainly should not be done to the exclusion of ideological confrontation between themselves so as to sharpen the basis for promoting a revolutionary movement here in the U.S.

Despite the elemental militancy which is frequently displayed by groups which have embraced Stalinist politics, we do not believe that such groups can possibly function as even a potential vanguard of the American revolution nor hardly of the world revolution which must sweep aside both imperialism and Stalinism. For our August 6th symposium, we called upon speakers from their position as anti-Stalinists to present their perspectives and arguments concerning Stalinism. (Since the S.L. was well aware before August 6th of the specific groups from which we were requesting speakers, we think that if the S.L. was sincerely interested in inviting P.L., they might have brought up this issue with our group before August 6th. Yet, the first we heard about this was in the pages of Workers' Action in late September.)

Socialism in One Country

Although we do not deny the superficial militancy of the P.L. and its pro-working class orientation, we know that P.L. has never broken with Stalinism and is merely another of the all-too-familiar left-wing Stalinist sects. We have seen many of them in Japan and are not at all impressed by them. We further cannot agree with you in defining the essence of Stalinism as being "class collaboration." Our understanding is that the ideology of Stalinism is essentially characterized as being the theory of "socialism in one country"—the idea that it is possible and necessary to construct "socialism" in a single country. Thus, Stalinism amounts to an abandonment of the theory and practice of world revolution and of the Marxist concept of world socialism. Stalinists may or may not engage in class collaboration; they may advocate peaceful coexistence or armed struggle; they may simultaneously arm themselves with nuclear weapons while seeking out negotiations with the imperialists.

We do not use the word "Stalinism" as a mere cureword; our definition is quite precise. Although we are willing to work together with P.L. in the attainment of certain immediate goals where there is an elementary agreement, we do not delude ourselves into believing that they have broken away from Stalinism.

"Anti-Imperialism, Anti-Stalinism"

In your article, you referred to the Kakumaru's "general slogan of "anti-imp redalism, anti-Stalinism" and an "earlier slogan" of "Down with US-USSR Nuclear Testing!" This is an error. The slogan of the Kakumaru faction is a concrete formulation of the world revolutionary strategy of the Kakumaru faction. The slogan of the student and USSR nuclear testing was a concrete application of this world revolutionary strategy, as it is applied to the conditions of today's world, characterized by the vicious cycle of nuclear tests between the Eastern and Western blocs. In raising this slogan, the Kakumaru faction was exposing the corruption of all the existing left, which was symbolized by their willingness to oppose nuclear testing by American imperialists but their inability to resolutely oppose the testing by the USSR, just as they had been unable to denounce the USSR's suppression of the Hungarian revolution of 1956. The position of the Kakumaru faction is that the essential aims of anti-war struggles at the present stage are to expose the corrupt realities of the contemporary world itself, which consists of reciprocal regulation and reciprocal dependence between the imperialist bloc and the Stalinist USSR bloc, and to create an organizational power aiming at the fundamental overthrow of these contradictions and the realization of true peace. In other words, to create a revolutionary current containing within itself a breach with Stalinism in the form of transcending the existing peace movement—this is the central task of anti-war struggles at the present stage. Consequently, this slogan of opposition to both US and USSR nuclear testing contains within it an impetus urging the masses to understand not only the essence of imperialism, but also the anti-proletarian nature of contemporary Stalinism. (On this point see Kuroda Kan'ichi, "What is Revolutionary Marxism?" pp. 77-78.)

Arm ed Force

Even if one were to view the Stalinist rulers as a "counter-revolutionary bureaucratic caste" sitting on top of revolutionary gains, this would not prevent one from protesting resolutely against the counter-revolutionary policies of the Stalinist bureaucracies. One of these policies is the mass creation of armed forces (nuclear weapons, the arms race) coupled with summit talks and negotiations. This two-faced strategy of the Stalinist bureaucrats, who are unable and unwilling to lead the world proletariat towards the proletariat confrontation, but that it is essential for the revolutionary left consistently confront, and resolutely and courageously expose this anti-proletarian policy by the entire world Stalinist movement.

In today's world, weapons are consistently used by the Stalinists in a manner inimical to the revolutionary struggles of the masses. The uprising of the Hungarian workers was crushed by Soviet tanks. The rebellion of the population of East Pakistan, the armed struggles of the youth students of Ceylon, have been crushed with Chinese arms. Someday, even the nuclear weapons of these countries may be put into use to suppress the revolutionary struggles of the working people. Are we to defend each and every counter-revolutionary policy of the Kremlin and Peking bureaucrat because of some imputed "revolutionary gains" said to be inherent in the nationalized means of production? Are we to refrain from exposing the counter-revolutionary policies of the USSR-Chinese bloc because this would be to deny these Stalinist countries their weapons and to invite imperialist attack? We may say No! The Stalinist bureaucracies, the Stalinist parties, and the Stalinist communism must be thoroughly exposed and smashed everywhere in the world. It would be criminal to foster any illusions about the "pro-gressive" or "revolutionary" nature of any Stalinist group or party, and to refrain from struggle to overthrow Stalinism on the strength of illusions.
As the election year opens, and John Lindsay begins to stretch and leap from his bed to keep from being swallowed up in his own club—fisted incursions. The crisis he is trying to leave behind in New York City has developed into a catastrophe for labor. As the city's pay-rolsamean wage controls nationally has combined with the inflation, the lifting of rent controls, cutbacks in city services, deliberate city hall employment, another transit fare hike and sky-rocketing tolls and taxes to force the problems of the capitalist system into a ferocious attack on labor. The "leaders" of labor, meanwhile, have cooperated as usual.

Compulsory Arbitration Imposed

Lindsay has finally capped the onslaught with a crown of real labor defeat. As in New York—a compulsory arbitration bill for city employees which, combined with the state's anti-labor Taylor law, effectively bars the most important city unions and sets a dangerous precedent for labor in every city. Until now only Vallejo, California and Eugene, Oregon had similar laws. It fits in with the need of the ruling class nationally, in its present crisis, to break the strength of the labor movement, and is an important feather in Lindsay's cap in his bid to be the Washington representative-in-chief of the bourgeoise.

Response to this imposition of "public" (read capitalist) dictatorship over the workers (by City Council vote of 34 to 3) from the barricades in the battle lines of 1968 to New York, he gave it back-handed support by their silence or refusal to fight it, while Victor Gotbaum—head of DC37 of AFSCME, the largest union of city employees, and one of the most ambitious fakers in the anti-labor New York Times about the "leaders" of the city's sanitationmen's strike, when other city employees were outlawed strikes by public employees. In 1968 when the state legislature broke precedent by refusing to approve pension gains negotiated with the city by his union. He called it a "tragic two-day action in which bridge workers" (read brokers) were used to block the bridges into Manhattan, but he then gave up on every single issue involved, referring to the promise of a new legal approach by private agencies, in transportation, which is standard—as a "victory"! He thereby drew the steam off the general strike—this time he avoided the precedent that they can annul collective bargaining agreements at will (see Workers' Action #9, July-Auguest for further details on this process—keeping the full application of this principle. A slick maneuverer, Gotbaum has always used "inside" con-nections while opposing open struggle, enhancing his personal power while the workers face abject defeat. In the key test of Lindsay's campaign to save city credit and bondholders' profits by laying off city workers, Gotbaum refused to fight the first such firings since 1935, thereby paving Lindsay's way.

DeLury, though he speaks gruffly at times and plays his cards more closely to his chest, plays the same game. He was one up on Gotbaum in 1971; not only did he let the precedent of legis-lation be set, he actively sided by, but he acti-ively aided the state by ordering sanitation trucks to cross the pension strike picket lines! This tough-talker had only three days earlier threat-ened a general strike if any city workers were laid off as a result of budget cuts. In due course the identical problem was taken from DeLury's sanitation contract, signed later the same year, the precedent of Gotbaum's "victory," DeLury's mostly verbal role-playing as the "tough labor" leader has about as much meaning in its outcome as the workers as Gotbaum's labor move-ment in private industry have contracted due to the inevitable power they need in the form of people who are minimally fed, rested, cured, educated, and at the place of work on time. Yet the costs for this are shifted onto the backs of the working people in order to help the capitalists beat the crisis of their ever-narrowing profit margins. In 1915 Roosevelt New Deal, the Cities have been forced to assume more and more services, many once These services are vital to the capitalists for re-creating the labor power they need in the form of people who is 24%! Meanwhile city employment has increased, as important sections of employ-ment, an
capitalist) dictatorship over the workers (by City

Lindsay—Club-Fisted Strikebreaker

The record leaves no doubt as to why Lindsay took this step or why the labor bureaucracy has sunk to such an abysmal depth of treachery as to welcome what is intended as labor's death sentence. From its inception, the Lindsay administration has been nakedly anti-labor and brutally provocative in its strikebreaking. Lindsay's very first act in office was to provide the first transit strike in the history of the TWU, by not giving his flunkies to refuse to negotiate, then jailing TWU President Quill for violating the Taylor law (which outlaw strikes by public employees). In the 1968 sanitation strike, when other city employees refused to follow orders to scab on the garbage collectors, Lindsay tried to call in the National Guard, and was only stopped when Rockefeller intervened; he then provoked a "strikers' strike in which he used the Ford Foundation and black 'community' demagogy to try to break the union. Lindsay's top officials, like Quill and DeLury, went out of their way to stir up the anti-labor New York Times about the "insuffi-cency" of the laws against public-employee strikebreaking. Lindsay worked to poison compulsory arbitration to fill this "gap" and make up for his own club-fisted incompetence in dealing with the workers. The New Year deadline, as early as 1966 a bill to strengthen the Office of Collective Bargaining (OCB), which now administers the compulsory arbitration, has been nakedly anti-labor and clumsily managed by its bankers-capitalist employers, and the reformist labor leaders!

Transportation Bond Scandals

Rockefeller, who was acclaimed a "humanitar-iun" shortly after committing mass murder at Attica, jousted with Lindsay over the electoral spoils in a sickening public display of ruling class hypocrisy. Their essential unity on all issues in the class struggle—which are the real political questions—is typically displayed in the shell game of transportation bond issue, subway fare hike, and tax package. Each choice contains the same reactionary imposition of service costs on the workers, who can decide democratically how they are to be billed.

Lindsay and Rockefeller, capitalists and "la-bor" (read bureaucrats) lined up behind the bank- ers' swindle of the bond issue to "save the fare" by re-financing the subways and lining the bank- ers' pockets with workers' tax money later. De- spite the "unanimity," the voters overwhelmingly rejected the bond issue in last November's elec-tions because—as everyone noted—they wanted no more taxes, "Democracy," chirp Lindsay—Rockefeller. Their order was "more services for electoral appeal. Meanwhile, one city union head, John DeLury, said that Lindsay had "convinced him" to favor more services for electoral appeal.

"Urban Crisis"

Lindsay's portrayal of the political issue as his struggle on behalf of the afflicted cities for more help from the tight-fisted states and feder- al government is so much snake oil. Since the Roosevelt New Deal, the cities have been forced to assume more and more services, many once vital to the capitalists for re-creating the labor power they need in the form of people who are minimally fed, rested, cured, educated, and at the place of work on time. Yet the costs for this are shifted onto the backs of the working people in order to help the capitalists beat the crisis of their ever-narrowing profit margins. In 1915 Roosevelt New Deal, the Cities have been forced to assume more and more services, many once These services are vital to the capitalists for re-creating the labor power they need in the form of people who is 24%! Meanwhile city employment has increased, as important sections of employ-ment, an

Transport Strike Duds

A unique opportunity to blow apart this ruling class labor bureaucracy hypocrisy was missed by the "humanitarian" Governor Rockefeller, who was acclaimed a "humanitarian" shortly after committing mass murder at Attica, jousted with Lindsay over the electoral spoils in a sickening public display of ruling class hypocrisy. Their essential unity on all issues in the class struggle—which are the real political questions—is typically displayed in the shell game of transportation bond issue, subway fare hike, and tax package. Each choice contains the same reactionary imposition of service costs on the workers, who can decide democratically how they are to be billed.

Lindsay and Rockefeller, capitalists and "la-bor" (read bureaucrats) lined up behind the bank- ers' swindle of the bond issue to "save the fare" by re-financing the subways and lining the bank- ers' pockets with workers' tax money later. De- spite the "unanimity," the voters overwhelmingly rejected the bond issue in last November's elec-tions because—as everyone noted—they wanted no more taxes, "Democracy," chirp Lindsay—Rockefeller. Their order was "more services for electoral appeal. Meanwhile, one city union head, John DeLury, said that Lindsay had "convinced him" to favor more services for electoral appeal.

"Urban Crisis"

Lindsay's portrayal of the political issue as his struggle on behalf of the afflicted cities for more help from the tight-fisted states and feder- al government is so much snake oil. Since the Roosevelt New Deal, the cities have been forced to assume more and more services, many once vital to the capitalists for re-creating the labor power they need in the form of people who is 24%! Meanwhile city employment has increased, as important sections of employ-ment, an

Transport Strike Duds

A unique opportunity to blow apart this ruling class labor bureaucracy hypocrisy was missed by the "humanitarian" Governor Rockefeller, who was acclaimed a "humanitarian" shortly after committing mass murder at Attica, jousted with Lindsay over the electoral spoils in a sickening public display of ruling class hypocrisy. Their essential unity on all issues in the class struggle—which are the real political questions—is typically displayed in the shell game of transportation bond issue, subway fare hike, and tax package. Each choice contains the same reactionary imposition of service costs on the workers, who can decide democratically how they are to be billed.

Lindsay and Rockefeller, capitalists and "la-bor" (read bureaucrats) lined up behind the bank- ers' swindle of the bond issue to "save the fare" by re-financing the subways and lining the bank- ers' pockets with workers' tax money later.
these countries into the train of Ben Bella, Nasser, etc., and to in turn use these regimess to lay the basis for reorganization for healthy interests. Agricultural $10 billion in 1966 is an turn in the imperialist exploitation of these countries.

Continued from Page 8

in 1967 we are told: “In order to open up the Southern Hemisphere for direct internal market investment, a new ‘Marshall Plan’ would have to be launched.” —Marcus, The Third Stage of Imperialism

Once again Marcus’ theories collide head-on with the facts. Recent events have underdeveloped countries, although they didn’t say so in State of the Union rhetoric, control foreign aid, as revealed in their run-down of Lindsay’s benefits: breaking the policy “strike” and “docking” cops’ pay. Like the Commu- nist Party’s “Labor-Defense” (L-D) Committee, the Socialist Workers Party leaped at Lindsay’s bait in 1968 and helped pit black workers against white workers. The SL delegation defeated the proposal to end the strike, on bureaucratic grounds, when one might have been possible despite Guinan-Gilmartin, the manipulation of the teachers’ union. (This was on its days-off-for-a-week strike.)

The Leninist position on self-determination is quite clear in the case of the Awami League.

Spartacist Forum

Speaker: Mary Treiger

formerly of the Communist Workers Party

Los Angeles

The Leninist position on self-determination is quite clear in the case of the Awami League.

The Awami League is the main political force for self-determination among the Bangladeshi people. It has been fighting for the right to govern itself and to have control over its own affairs. The Awami League is a socialist party that seeks to replace the capitalist system with a socialist one. The Awami League has been involved in numerous armed conflicts with the Bangladesh government, which has sought to crush the movement and prevent it from achieving its goals.

The Awami League has won significant victories over the years, but it has also faced many challenges. It has had to navigate the complex political landscape of Bangladesh, where many different political forces are vying for power. The Awami League has also had to contend with the government’s efforts to suppress the movement, including a ban on the party and the arrest of its leaders.

Despite these challenges, the Awami League continues to fight for self-determination and has maintained its influence in Bangladeshi politics. The party has a strong base of support among the Bangladeshi people and has been able to organize mass movements to support its cause. The Awami League has also been able to win support from international organizations and governments, which have recognized the party’s commitment to democracy and self-determination.

The Awami League’s commitment to self-determination is based on the idea that people should have the right to govern themselves. This right is essential for the development of a just and equitable society. The Awami League believes that self-determination is not only a right but also a necessity for the development of a socialist society in Bangladesh. The party has been working towards this goal by organizing mass movements and by working with other political forces to create a democratic and socialist state.

As the Awami League continues to fight for self-determination, it remains a powerful force in Bangladeshi politics. The party’s commitment to self-determination is an inspiration to people around the world who are fighting for their right to govern themselves. The Awami League’s struggle is a testament to the power of people to change their own destiny.
about any "revolutionary" gains said to be embodied within the politico-economic structure of the Stalinist bureaucratic system. Those who are unable to discern the counter-revolutionary, anti-proletarian essence of Stalinism (its ideology, its politico-economic system, its diplomatic policies) are certainly unable to lead the American working class forward towards the contemporary world revolution. To avoid the tragedies of the Russian Left, we would call upon them to unite in joint actions on the basis of struggle together with all groups of the American revolutionaries to assimilate the revolutionary theory of Trotsky and Trotskyism, to overcome its defects, and to move forward towards the creation of revolutionary theories based on Marxism-Leninism for the accomplishment of the contemporary world revolution, overthrowing both imperialism and Stalinism.

We reaffirm our resolution to continue to struggle together with all groups of the American anti-Stalinist revolutionary Left and will continue to call upon them to unite in joint actions on the basis of opposition to both imperialism and Stalinism.

Stalinist-Study Group
October, 1971

WV REPLIES:

To the extent that you have addressed your arguments on Stalinism to the Marxist League, you imply that the SL maintains a more favorable evaluation of Stalinism as opposed to revolutionary leadership than you do. Our differences with you on Stalinism are of another kind entirely.

To begin with: we have always held, with Trotsky, that the Stalinist regimes and parties are centrally responsible for the decades-long delay of world proletarian revolution, a delay which increasingly poses for mankind the barbarian alternative to socialism. In their powerful reinforcement by their betrayal of the ability of the bourgeoisie to control the workers, they fully merit Trotsky's characterization as "the apologists of the working class." The question, then, is how Stalinism is to be expunged. For this, an understanding not only of the magnitude of its crimes but its social origins and nature is essential.

Your letter does not make clear what you believe the Stalinist bureaucracies to be. You strongly suggest, however, that you disagree fundamentally with the Trotskyist analysis of the Soviet and Korean bureaucracies as parasitic, politically re-actionary ruling strata which constitute a step toward capitalist restoration but are not in themselves that restoration. You say, "Even if one were to view the Stalinist rulers as a counter-revolutionary bureaucratic caste' sitting on top of revolutionary gains..." You ask: "Are we to defend each and every counter-revolutionary policy of the Kremlin and Peking bureaucracies because of some imputed 'revolutionary gains' said to be in their favor?"

Emphasis added Are you implying that our position means that we are defending these counter-revolutionary policies? You cite the necessity to "assimilate the revolutionary theory of Trotsky and Trotskyism" and "to overcome its defects," in order to avert further tragedies for the workers' movement like that of Trotsky himself.

The reader must be struck by your reluctance to say openly the only thing your statements can mean. We doubt that you are suggesting that Trotsky expected revolutionary good deeds from the bureaucracies but regarded them as "the apologists of the working class." To which you can accuse Trotsky on this score is his understanding of the class nature of the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies. The only "defect" which you can accuse Trotsky on this score is his understanding of the class nature of the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies. The primary enemy of the working classes The objective cause of the Stalinist political ecreation. Trotsky certainly did not regard the revolutionary gains preserved in the nationalized means of production as a matter of opinion, or "imputed gains." He considered the nationalized means of production, the absence of a bourgeoisie, as defining the Soviet Union as a workers state--"a priceless pledge for the future"--despite its degeneration. For this reason, and from any softness toward the political phenomenon of Stalinism, Trotsky never placed imperialism and Stalinism on the same level as implied in the slogan, or "world strategy" of "Anti-imperialism, anti-Stalinism" although his position was both anti-imperialist and anti-Stalinist.

Stalinist Dilemma

To whom is your question, "Are we to defend each and every[sic] counter-revolutionary policy of the Kremlin and Peking bureaucracies..." addressed? Does it apply to us? What counter-revolutionary policies do you feel we support? Your next question reads "Are we to refrain from exposing the counter-revolutionary policies of the USSR-Chinese bloc because this would be to deny the Stalinist bureaucratic class their weapons and to invite imperialist attack? We say No!" And so do we! But in fact you frame the question after the phrase they who insist. It is clear that your question implies, that the interests of the workers' states and the Chinese bureaucracy are identical. Your kind of criticism of the counter-revolutionary policies of the bureaucracy includes in effect denying defense against imperialism to the Soviet Union and similar states. The Stalinists have always slandered the Trotskyists, insisting that the gains of the October Revolution can be defended only by supporting the bureaucracy. Our demand is for an end to the policies which endanger those states, including Stalinist peaceful co-existence illusions. We consider it tragic, and a great service to Stalinism, that you in fact call for a defense of the Soviet Union and China precisely what the Stalinists have always alleged was the core of Trotskyism. Do not swallow the Stalinist lies! As you put it: "Are we to defend each and every counter-revolutionary policy of the Stalinist bureaucracies? The demand for political revolution, however--as distinct from social revolution--would be pure (though perhaps militant) reformism if applied to a capitalist state."

Third-Camp Pacifism

The logical result of your understanding of Stalinism is a species of third-camp pacifism. Your unqualified desire for proletarian revolution is no use to you from the presapling implications of such a policy. Your analysis must lead you to oppose not merely nuclear armament, but all armament, for the Soviet Union and China: "In today's world, weapons are consistently used by the Stalinists in a manner inimical to the revolutionary aims of the working class..." In the problem of a strategy at the present time of the political leadership controlling it? The two do not at all amount to the same thing. Were the Soviet Union a healthy workers state in an Imperialist-dominated world, it would still have to maintain a large military readiness. But in the case of Imperialist powers we oppose armament regardless of their political regime.

We oppose under all conditions the armed forces of the capitalists. But were the trade unions armed, would you demand their disarmament pending the removal of bourgeois agents, reformists, and Stalinists from their leadership? Our analogy may seem to you overdrawn, but you must admit that George Meany is in no way superior to a Stalinist bureaucrat, and he would to whatever extent he could use the working class arms to discipline the workers. Or would you demand the disarming of a Menshevik-led Soviet until a Bolshevik leadership can be installed? Our policy would be to demand that more workers be armed with better weapons--a measure clearly in the class interest--and expose the bureaucrats' resistance to this policy. To oppose the armament of even the most wretchedly bureaucratized and treasonably led working-class formation would be interpreted (correctly) by the workers not as revolutionary principle on our part, but a neutral policy toward working-class defense against the class enemy. Such a policy would only aid the bureaucracies and cannot contribute to the struggle. In fact, our trade union analogy is essential to the understanding of Stalinism. The Soviet bureaucracies resemble very closely what we could expect from a reformist-led trade union raised to state power and administering a publicly-owned economy.

Disarm the Stalinist NLF

What are the implications of your analysis for Vietnam? We support the military victory of the NLF over U.S. imperialist and Vietnamese agents, and we seek simultaneously to expose all the forces standing in the way of such an outcome. First and foremost are the forces in which we express absolute lack of political confidence is the Stalinist leadership of North Vietnam and the NLF. We cannot support their "army" of the NLF, although its leaders can turn page...
its weapons against the working class—an act they have committed before, as in the massacre of the Trotskyists in 1937. If you can show that the prelude to imperialist prevarication is the military victory of the NLF, and on what grounds? That they don’t possess nuclear weapons? That the Soviet bureaucracies are big and powerful Stalinists? But the Soviet bureaucrats are arming North Vietnam and the Vietnamese workers are arming the NLF. Is it really the NLF that is arming the NLF to the hilt, with more modern weapons than their imperialist oppressors? Do you call for the self-determination. The IS invokes such a position to underpin its weapons against the working class—an act they commit against the working class. In addition, it blurs one to the differences between the Stalinist leaders and the ranks, many of whom sincerely desire revolution, but who are led to whether the IS is the road to socialism, or that of capitulation to the imperialists, in the same way that a union bureaucrat “defends” his union, even in a “single country,” it is necessary to would not adhere to its proclaimed policies.

The SWP, which you invited to the symposium, does not even make the appeal to subjectivistic revolutionary desires as PL did at the July Conference (since then, PL has moved right to its old talk of “greater center forces,” etc., which were typical policies left-right oscillation). At that time there was a basis for an appeal to PL for certain common action and discussion in an anti-imperialist framework. But the SWP had invited a representative of the bourgeoisie to the NFPC Conference, they Trotskyist” like the Stalinist Party is “Leninist.” In a sense our greatest difference with you is not over the question of anti-imperialist movement. To the PL militants we would say: “We are with you in your desire to get rid of the bourgeois state. To show you our argument and practice that with

Class Collaboration

Your understanding of Stalinist ideology is myopic, narrow, and confused in defining the essence of Stalinism as being “class collaboration.” Our understanding is that the ideology of Stalinism is essentially characterized as being the theory of “socialism in one country,” “Fine. But explain then what is wrong with the theory of socialism in one country.” Our chief objection to it is that such a “theory” is a failed concept. It is not the theory of a single country, but the failure of a single country, the failure of the IS, Stalinism as a particular variety of revisionism. The failure of the theory of such a justification open to the Soviet bureaucrats. Stalinism as a particular variety of revisionism is the product of that pressure upon the bureaucracy and its proletarian uprisings, and the consciousness of class collaborationists, the only possible justification for such attitudes to circulate in the ranks. Stalinism in trouble when our policy makes them agree with us in our

You imply that by inviting a group like PL to a united front action we render some kind of assistance to its movement. That is a mystification of class collaboration with a “socialist” theory. With the new “theory” Stalin was able to rationalize a deal, that is, the movement with capitalist powers, turning the communist parties into the deputies of a capitalist system. Stalinist collaboration with capitalist powers, the only justification open to the Soviet bureaucrats. Stalinist collaboration with capitalist powers, the only possible justification for such attitudes to circulate in the ranks. Stalinism is in trouble when our policy makes them agree with us in our desire to get rid of the bourgeois state, to show you our argument and practice that with public and unions, for example, Rockefeller, for example, has no intention of sharing his wealth with them as a reward for their betrayal. While defending nationalized property shelve the struggle here. We seek to win those people to the understanding that they have been betrayed and terribly poisoned, to win them in a word, to Trotskyists as agents of counterrevolution? They agree with us in our desire to rid the anti-war movement of the class enemy—a nomadic position for counterrevolutionary swine—and they are more consistent in this policy than we. How can our leaders turn a deaf ear to such reasonable proposals for debate and common action? Who has the correct revolutionary strategy? We cannot say even this to the SWP, the “Trotskyist” faction aside, when their role was not confused opposition to the bourgeoisie’s position on critical support to the Stalinist bureaucracies, their conscious support. That is, their rhetoric could not be contrasted with class-collaborationist behavior of the “Trotskyists” and the PL, whose public line, too, was class-collaborationist, with PL it was at least possible to contrast the revolutionary rhetoric and their actions at the July NPAC Conference with their Stalinist history and methodology. The pop front with the class enemy is an old Stalinist formula. In this case it was the “Trotskyists” who supported this policy, and the PLers who fought it. Do not let anti-Stalinist labels be your excuse, Scheidemann and Noske were not “Stalinists”; it is in that sense that the difference which must be made is between Dobbs, Barnes, Hansen & Co., as well as that of Healy-Wohlforth Ltd, which supported them. Our difference with PL is that the latter implies that we are not sufficiently anti-Stalinist. Our fear is that your analysis leads you to backhanded support to imperialism (neutralism between imperialism and Stalinism) and fatal illusions over “progressives” who loudly proclaim hatred of the bourgeoisie. The IS’s consciousness does not proceed with the consciousness of anti-Stalinists. The current leadership of the U.S. labor movement came to power on a wave of “anti-Stalinist” rhetoric; only the policies which flowed from Trotsky’s analysis—military defense of the working class against imperialism, the united front toward reformist workers’ organizations including the Stalinist parties—can politically defeat Stalinism in the workers’ movement and open the road to the development of proletarian internationalist revolutionary leadership,
The Labor Committee:

Social-Democratic Reformism

The objective forces for revolution are, as Trotsky noted, overripe, but there can be no revolution until the working class is politically conscious and armed with its revolutionary instrument, the vanguard party, whose program and cadre have been prepared and tested in struggle. This is a gimmick which can substitute for that process.

What Is Utopian Socialism?

Utopian socialism corresponds to the world-view of the petty bourgeoisie. Caught within the industrial working class and big capital, and possessing none of the concepts neither the petty nor the wage labor strikes, in Marx's words, "to be above all class struggles" and "transform into harmony" the irreconcilable antagonisms between capital and wage labor, Apart from communal escapism, the two major currents of nineteenth century Utopian socialism were technocracy and consumerism. Technocracy (Saint-Simon) maintained that the fundamental problems of society can be solved by allowing production to be rationally guided by sciences, engineers, and the like. Consumerism (Proudhon) held that the fundamental issues of social conflict are lowering rents, taxes and In an organization from all forms of adventurism, dil-, amateurishness and hastlerism is that it develops with and through the working class. As Trotsky said: "The revolution pursues its course together with its class. If the proletariat is weak, if it is backward, the revolution confines itself to the modest, patient and persevering work of the creation of propaganda circles, of the preparation of cadre; supporting itself upon its first cadres, it passes over to mass agitation of its youth—all represent typical idealist projection of one's own desires onto reality. On the organizational level, the Labor Committee's "professional insurgents" are not credible to him were he faced with the tactical realities which the incumbent union leadership has to face as long as it accepts existing legal forms of labor struggle and as long as the membership is unwilling to go beyond mere legal forms."

The Labor Committee shares the pervasive New Left desire to dump "dreadful" old-fashioned Marxism-Leninism and seek exciting new political methods. It also seeks to fill the vacuum created by the complete discredit of traditional American socialism. Ten years ago, young political activists who thought in terms of supporting strikes in cooperation with the union bureaucracy, of pressure groups designed to expand medical care for the poor or to maintain rent control, joined the Young People's Socialist League, an early and communist SDS. However, the blatanth triumphant of the trade union bureaucrats revealed their slavish support to the Vietnam war and the die- closure that the liberal anti-communist front groups favored by Norman Thomas and Co. were funded by the CIA completely discredited these forces. This left a clear field for political formulations not tainted by McCarthyism and the stultifying Cold War atmosphere. The Black Vanguards is catering to the same reformist impulse. By terming a student-based propaganda campaign to oppose a transit fare increase a "proto-Soviet," Marcus seeks to give a revolutionary facade to the kind of politics traditionally associated with the Democrats' Party and "socialists" of the Norman Thomas-Bayard Rustin brand.

Mirroring the New Left's contempt for organized labor, the Labor Committee performs an essential task of all social-democratic ideologies—providing an excuse for the conservative politics and sellouts of the union bureaucracy by arguing that they simply reflect the backwardness of the workers and the inherent limitations of unions as social institutions.

"Union leaders of the CIO type do not 'sell out' the membership because they are wretched in general. On the contrary, the union leaders sometimes seem to 'sell out' because they, like the majority of 'rank and file' members, refuse to undertake the sole alternative to accepting a poorer settlement, Union leaders of the CIO type are usually so far as they think the majority of members' union militancy will carry the union in gaining additional benefits, tiny minorities of professional insurgents are often more militant on these questions precisely because they enjoy the speculative luxuries of being out of office. The isolated militant can imagine all sorts of wonderful gains which would absolutely be impossible in the mass movement."

"Since 1959, US has followed policy of managed social revolutions, general policy of imperialism to support nationalist colonial revolutions as long as they remain within control of imperialism. The SWP et al, failed to see this and merely sees US and its allies as using a strategy against the colonial revolution... this is not the case. They are trying instead to close off the possibility of revolution by sucking working class and peasantry of continued on page 5