

Bulletin

OF THE **WORKERS PARTY**

CONTENTS

THE PARTY SHOULD WORK IN AMERICAN MASS ORGANIZATIONS - By William Barton	1
PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION By J. Sifakis	4
AMENDMENTS TO RESOLUTION ON INTERNATIONAL SITUATION - By L. Shields	6
ORGANIZING THE UNEMPLOYED - By Robert Frost	8
THE IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE FOR WORLD DOMINION - By E. R. McKinney	9

15 CENTS

VOLUME IV, NUMBER 2
CONVENTION BULLETIN NO. 8

JANUARY 31, 1949

2206

THE PARTY SHOULD WORK IN AMERICAN MASS ORGANIZATIONS

By William Barton (New York)

- - -

This latest addition to the collection of "what-is-to-be-done's" of the Workers Party is in complete agreement with the proposal to drop the "party" title and encourage a more realistic expectation of the new organization's role. It finds essential agreement with most of the thus-far-seen discussion material on organization, with the clear exception of the article by Irving Swanson which sought a reinvigoration of the campaign party idea, although there were some valuable specific suggestions here too. The starting point for any organizational proposals must be that the body now known as the Workers Party is not and will not in the near future be a party; it is, and will remain for the immediate period, a center for politically advanced individuals painstakingly striving to garner support from interested elements of the population for a revolutionary democratic socialist answer.

The crux of all hopes is the belief in that answer by the organization's cadre. That is the paramount need whatever the organization form or type of activity. Without it there can be no membership morale and the ability to convince and influence others. That is the broad basic political question, to which the writer hopes to devote a subsequent discussion.

What follows is an attempted guide to the methods for making that accepted program more meaningful to members and sympathizers and more capable of any immediate realization in the actual existent political world. Its adoption might act as an additional spur to the increased confidence in the political line adopted mostly through historical examination and the oretical analysis. It is hardly a cure-all for present ills, but is a conceivable suppressive therapy to make those ills less virulent today and provide for a more rapid and complete recovery tomorrow.

The last Active Workers Conference attempted the first official break with the standard organizational operating procedure of the Workers Party, and the Trotskyist movement in America generally, by calling for an all-out drive to get into mass organizations. Since then little of that stated approach has been realized, with the exception of work in the American Veterans Committee, begun well before the Conference. Necessarily, directives were not too detailed, and the difficulty of breaking from old attitudes and old habits prevented anything but mild isolated successes in the mass organization orientation.

The American Trotskyist movement worked for ten years to build up a political cadre from advanced socialist politicoes. When that was judged achieved with the organization of the SWP, the next planned step was out into the mass arena with the perspective of becoming a significant party of the American working class in a reasonably foreseeable time. The transitional program was to be the programmatic bridge, the trade unions the organizational vehicle of operation. In the split that created the Workers Party,

the new organization was even more determined, and hopeful, of establishing itself as a noticeable force. The slogan of the "campaign party" visualized a group whose open and declared activity would provide a direct attraction for leftward moving masses.

Actually, the war intervened before this idea could be seriously put into practice. Instead, the party members not in service became rooted in trade unions. The existence of this home for agitation on very immediate political questions gave the entire party an elan and purposefulness in a period when many others had succumbed to political discouragement (most noticeable in the pre-Pearl Harbor days and the first year after the U. S. entrance into the war). There may have been external reasons for this psychology among comrades in industry, i.e., the prevalence of working class militancy even in war time, but much of it was due to the additional spark, transmitted to people outside industry, that came from the concrete connection with an organizational excuse for existence.

Since the war, for whatever reasons, fewer people are in shops. Those working in industry have best maintained their morale, whatever the specific conditions of their unions. Most of the rest are generally rootless. Attempts have been made, particularly in New York, to have the party itself assume a campaign role - to carry on the type of work which only mass organizations are capable of achieving. Such ventures can be successful only in special circumstances, or can achieve the desired end when publicity is the only objective (demonstrations before consulates and Irgun meetings).

The work in AVC has been the only extensive extra-union mass work, and here a smaller group has been involved than is available. Yet, despite the failure of the party to utilize AVC as a medium for recruitment, despite the recent unfortunate history of AVC, those actively engaged in veterans work have a far greater sense of purposefulness than most of those who are nowhere.

The contending psychology that has made mass organization orientation difficult to achieve has been a direct result of the party's history and its motivating perspective. The party was usually the exclusive vehicle of political education. Influence was to come from the spread of the party press, speaking to individuals (wherever found), or the party's own campaigns. Only the trade unions were deserving of immersion of party members as organization builders. The symbol of the program was the party; the job was to recruit individuals. Whatever formal notions to alter that ideology may have been adopted, the widespread psychology has not changed, except for the idea of becoming an organizational force in the hoped-for labor party.

Something has been ignored relevant to the American social structure, with its network of clubs, leagues, societies. While the percentage of the population in such bodies can be exaggerated, they form the necessary nucleus for any widespread activity in any sphere, particularly in politics. The Active Workers Conference scuttled the European-bred tradition by advocating their utilization on as wide a scale as possible. It wisely left the specific selection up to branches. But the significance, or possible significance, of that change in orientation did not penetrate. The few

successful applications are glaring and edifying exceptions.

The experience of one branch, that attempted to investigate places for mass work but still thought along traditional lines, is very illustrative. A research committee was set-up. A couple of inter-racial organizations were selected as immediate possibilities. But these were soon rejected when the branch learned that the units of these organizations did not meet very frequently and that the membership did not look like prospective "contacts." The guiding notion was still the old line idea of seeking out individuals to whom one could talk "politics" - a hoped-for result of mass organization work, but not an immediate necessity.

Another failing of the common mass organization approach is the acceptance of the inevitable schema according to which one first becomes a real activist (or stays out), and then has enough prestige to present his political line, which he must do at the slightest opening. First of all, though an active member is better than an inactive one, the latter is better than none. It is incorrect to believe that he who does not devote much time to the organization automatically becomes a pariah and must not open his mouth. Secondly, the presentation of a political line need not be planned with the progression of a military campaign. The line will show itself as issues arise over a period of time, perhaps long. It need not be forced for fear one is not distinguishing oneself from political rivals.

Every member should get into one or more mass organizations - that is a truism worth repeating. The only possible excuse, hardly ever given, is financial. Time is no drawback. Members of AVC need not go to more than one meeting in two months and still exercise some influence and meet some people other than his usual acquaintances. He might not be able to convince them of the theory of permanent revolution, but he might get them to support a labor party, or participate in a housing conference with a particular program to present, or help organize an anti-Fascist demonstration. The political lessons will flow from the life of the organization. Confident and understanding revolutionary socialists need not worry about their ability to further that education. But, the mirage of results in two days must be out of everyone's consciousness.

The problem of arranging time schedules is a matter of detail. However, one suggested substitution is the use of nights usually devoted to routine activities like regular Labor Action sales in front of trade union meetings for mass organization participation whenever possible. Such routine work is fruitful to neither the party nor the individual; it is a carry-over from the idea of the party as the mass organization.

The American "joining" habit is waiting to be tapped. Naturally, the Workers Party cannot expect to utilize mass organizations in anything resembling the frequent scale of the Communist Party. But it can contribute to the overcoming of the rootlessness of so many members and sympathizers. At present, specific assignments, except for veterans, have to be worked out on the spot. In any case, little of any meaningful activity is likely to suffer as a result.

PRE-CONVENTION DISCUSSION

By J. Sifakis (Pittsburgh)

- - -

I congratulate the Political Committee of the Workers Party for its correct analysis and theoretical Marxist understanding of the international situation in these critical hours through which the socialist movement is passing. The resolution on the international situation will remain one of the best documents the socialist movement has produced since the degeneration of the Second International in 1914 when Lenin made it his prime task to re-assemble the scattered forces of revolutionary Marxism.

Credit also goes to the Political Committee for its position advising a protest vote for any of the three socialist candidates for president. This gives us a clear idea of the socialist and class-conscious votes cast in the last election. The official tabulation shows over 173,000 votes. Without fear of mistake, we can say, through experience with those who count the ballots, that this figure was probably higher.

A correct analysis of the results of the election will show that all the votes were not only against American capitalism but also opposed to Russian collectivism. This represents the Third Camp -- enough forces to build a revolutionary socialist party. Half of the votes for Thomas and Teichert belong to our party. Ninety percent of Dobbs' voters, when they discover that the SWP supports Russian imperialism and is in reality the left-wing of Stalinism, would also turn to us.

To wait for them to come to us, however, would be criminal. We must go to them. But how? By changing the name of our party? While there may be some advantages in a change in name, the mere changing of our shirt will not bring us any nearer to our objectives. By building a labor party? We would be swallowed up in it. Upon our political and organizational independence in America depends the reconstruction of the revolutionary socialist movement throughout the world as the resolution on the world situation shows.

The Workers Party is the beacon light of the international labor movement. Let's keep it lit. Our party, an insignificant sect, has the best theoretically trained cadres that I have come in contact with in thirty years of revolutionary activity in various parties and groups. Our theories can be applied in the everyday struggle of the working class as demonstrated in different parts of the country. To make our theories workable, every member of our party must become an activist.

There are numerous activities that the party might now enter or, where it already is, engage in more vigorously. Some suggestions:

1. The Political Committee should contact all the various groupings and small parties (such as the Proletarian Party) existing in the country in order to establish comradely discussions for

the purpose of building a party based on Marxist principles.

2. Every member in a position to join a trade union must participate actively in all union affairs.

3. Join all social and cooperative societies.

4. Join and build educational clubs in colleges.

5. Build neighborhood clubs to fight high prices, etc. Later these clubs can form centers to which to rally the workers during the depression.

6. Above all, make LABOR ACTION a workers' paper, not, as it is today, a paper for the workers.

Every branch should elect one member to submit copy to LABOR ACTION at least once every two weeks. The activities of each branch should be published from time to time in LABOR ACTION. The articles in the paper must be shortened and their literary standards reduced. A worker after a hard day in the shop has neither the desire nor the ability to read long involved articles. He will glance at the headlines and lay the paper aside.

Above all, the language of the paper must be reduced to the level of the understanding of workers. Surveys show the average American completes 8.4 school years. For workers alone the figure would be lower. The Reader's Digest and similar magazines slant their material towards that standard. If anything, LABOR ACTION's standards should be a great deal lower.

#

AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION ON INTERNATIONAL
SITUATION

By L. Shields (Chicago)

- - -

For paragraphs 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, substitute the following:

What is noteworthy, from the point of view of the Marxist prognosis is that this change has been accomplished without a socialist revolution and not under the leadership of the working class in these colonies. This is a repetition of the experience of the nationalist movements after the first world war, and confirms as sharply as possible Lenin's theoretical view that working-class leadership is not a necessity for the accomplishment of the liberation of oppressed nations. The chief factors in the new wave of successful struggles for independence are fundamentally the same as those after World War I: the rise of national consciousness on the part of peoples previously dormant, and a decline in the fortunes of individual imperialist nations. These two factors have been present in various combinations in the liberated countries: in India and Burma both elements played an equally important role; in Israel, the high pitch of national consciousness proved sufficient; in Syria and Lebanon, the victory of British over French imperialism resulted in independence for these two countries. If Indonesia and Indo-China should prove victorious, still another factor, Stalinism, may prove itself capable of leading the masses in a successful struggle against their old foreign masters.

The primary object of the struggle for independence is today, as before, the achievement of political liberty. This is not to be confused with economic independence, which is both reactionary and impossible. The people fight to remove themselves from the category of instruments of the purposes of others to human beings with wills of their own. This means, above all, a defence of their own language and culture, and of their social status in relation to the other peoples of the world. It is for this reason that they are willing, if necessary, to undergo a reduced material standard of living, to gain their own statehood.

Even from an economic point of view, political independence is now more important than ever for the colonial peoples. For this grants them the opportunity of developing their resources for their own advantage, rather than to satisfy the rapacity of a declining imperialism. This economic development in turn gives them a greater political status among the other nations. It also gives the people the possibility, through class struggle, of benefiting from the economic situation of the country to a far greater extent than would have been possible under foreign domination.

Although Russia and the United States are the two most powerful imperialisms in the post-war world, it is easy, especially in the case of the United States, to exaggerate this domination. Only within the past month the following events have shown how far U.S.

economic superiority is from translation into political domination: 1) the victory of France on the question of the Ruhr; 2) the invasion of Indonesia by the Dutch; and 3) Britain's threat to invade Israel. Altogether the view that there are only two independent countries in the world is so gross an exaggeration as to amount to a falsehood.

- - -

Paragraph 17: in the last sentence, replace the comma with a period and omit the last clause beginning with "but."

#

2213

ORGANIZING THE UNEMPLOYED

By Robert Frost (San Francisco)

- - -

Today there exists an ever-growing sector of the American working class that is most amenable to the program of the Workers Party - the unemployed. Propagation of socialist ideas could find no more fertile field, providing proper channels (semantics, etc.) are dug, with which our ideas and immediate demands can be funneled with the least possible resistance. A visit to any State Employment Office reveals workers who have been deprived of their jobs are disgruntled, are sharply aware of the shortcomings of the economic system and their trade unions, and are looking for answers. We must be prepared to give the answers.

Incessantly we are informed by the press pimps that a recession is on the economic horizon. Industrial production of consumer goods has caught up with effective demand; army enlistments are so high that the draft is temporarily unnecessary. National economy threatened by frequent recurrence of "soft spots" that forbode an imminent collapse of the entire economy structure. As socialists we must prepare today to take fullest advantage of such a crisis. Immediately we must formulate a plan for drawing the discontented unemployed to our party.

Comrades who have worked in this field in the '30s should write-up their experiences in the unemployed movement and play a dominant role in formulating plans and directing practical work in this field.

A considerable segment of the unemployed consists of young veterans, a most desirable type for the movement. With little skill or seniority they are promptly hit by a decline in business activity. The consciousness of this group must be focused on the most "militant face" of the Workers Party. Our boldness and determination of purpose will attract them to us enabling us to siphon off the best elements for the Workers Party. Recent strikes in California oil fields revealed that young vets were the most militant fighters against scabs and cops.

A need exists for immediate action in organizing the unemployed. We have the resources to get the ball rolling. The Stalinists and the bureaucrats of the trade unions should not have the allegiance of the unemployed by forfeit. Entrance into our ranks of fresh victims of the capitalistic class would silence the wails of the "hard-wringers" and instill a real militancy into our party. The dawn of a capitalistic crisis in the United States must find the Workers Party with solidified positions ready to take immediate advantage of an enemy torn by internal convulsions.

#

2214

THE IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE FOR WORLD DOMINION

By E.R. McKinney

For the third time in less than four decades the imperialist nations prepare for world imperialist war. Based on the present conflicts and antagonisms it is highly probable that a single generation of mankind will witness three world imperialist wars in its own life time. All the nations prepare for the Third Imperialist World War. Each in its own way and with its own imperialist aims in view. They prepare for another world war, these exploiters and oppressors of the people, with the same self-righteousness with the identical pious protestations of innocence and guiltlessness with which they dragged the peoples into the first and second world slaughters. Each side proclaimed that it had been attacked, that it was only defending itself from annihilation. Each side was always saving civilization from barbarism and from "the aggressor." In the name of "good will toward men," and "peace on earth," the priests of each side called on his nation's god to bless the national armies and to smite the armies of the other side. Each side posed as the savior of civilization, of the home; as the defender of Christian ideals and the champion of democracy and of freedom.

Twice during this century the people of the world have been beguiled into lending an ear to this propaganda and to giving their support to their imperialist betrayers and treachers. It is the great bourgeois-democratic nations of the West which have been the loudest, up to now, in proclaiming their democratic virginity and their readiness always to come to the defense of small nations and to become the heralds of a better day; after the war is won. This has been the case in two world wars where the national line-up each time was about the same. England after centuries of piracy, brigandage and oppression became the defender of the weak against the strong. France with her strangle-hold on millions of exploited victims in Africa and the Near East. Little Belgium with her black Congo and countless stumps where hands used to be. The hands were gone because they had not gathered enough rubber for the Belgium robbers. Also the United States, hallowed of all the nations. This country can always proclaim its untarnished purity. We want no territory; we thank our God that we are not like other men. We merely ship our billions to other lands and let the exploiters there take our interest out of the hides and carcasses of their victims.

Germany was the culprit in the first two Imperialist World Wars. But Germany will not play her former role in the coming conflict. Germany has been made "safe for democracy." The German people are impoverished, naked and hungry. Their country has been dismembered, denuded and occupied. Germany has joined the Society of the Democratic Nations of the West. The culprit now is Russia. It is Stalinist Russia which will be the "aggressor" in the coming imperialist blood-letting. It is the former ally of the US which is now "threatening the peace of the world."

The combatants change but the pattern of imperialism remains the same. Russia and the United States stand face-to-face in full armour these two former allies in the last ordeal to save the world for democracy.

The present epoch; the epoch of the final desperate struggle of the imperialist nations for world dominion has its roots in the 19th century, the century of imperialist brigandage and expansion. First the grabbing of territory, the carving out of the vast imperialist empires, then the plundering of the stolen countries; the robbing, exploiting and butchering of the inhabitants. All of this in the name of carrying "the white man's burden", of civilization, of the brotherhood of man.

At the turn of the century the United States became an actor in the imperialist tragedy. Now begins the day of "dollar diplomacy" and a determined effort to achieve our "Manifest Destiny". This "Manifest Destiny" has always been a desire, plan, scheme to achieve a "place in the sun," to extend the influence of the US beyond the national boundaries; out into the Pacific, throughout South America. There was a chafing at the bit because of British dominance; financial and maritime. Due to its immense size, population, natural resources, accumulated wealth and productive capacity the United States did not follow the European pattern of the seizure of territories, thereby giving rise to the fiction that "America is not an imperialist nation." Furthermore the US had its Monroe Doctrine which gave this country full hegemony in the western hemisphere. Lastly there were the millions of the native population to be exploited by the capitalist ruling class. Therefore the US did not become involved in the imperialist chicaneries peculiar to the European nations. This country was satisfied to enter the world market with its cotton, wheat, lumber, meat and manufactured articles. The great boast was our annual favorable balance of trade. The whole world bought from us and we always sold more than we bought. And above all it was the boast of our statesmen that we followed the advice of the founders of our Republic, we had not suffered ourselves to be drawn into any "entangling alliances" with foreign nations. The US existed in "splendid isolation," there were thousands of miles of ocean between us and the trouble spots of the world. All that was needful for the US according to candidates for office, college presidents and "public spirited businessmen" was to continue to go on "in the way we have been going," that is sell more to the rest of the world than we bought from them, accumulate the world's supply of gold, open up every country in the world to American commerce and for the export of American capital. This was not imperialism according to the proponents of the "American way of life." England, France, Belgium, Germany and Holland were imperialist nations because they owned and controlled vast colonial empires. It was our business to continue this course and let Europe fight its wars. They were none of our business.

Europe did go on with its wars and conflicts; its upheavals, revolutions and counter-revolutions; with its perennial balance of power coalitions, with its partitioning of old nations and the creation of new nations. The division of and redivision of the world between England, France, Germany, Belgium and Holland never ceased. This was the real "concert" of Western Europe. This peaceful and profitable banditry by western Europe was only upset by the rise of capitalist Japan and its bid for Asiatic hegemony, and by the emerging rivalry between Germany and England.

All of this imperialist conquest and grabbing resulted in the robbing, enslaving, exploiting and killing of hundreds of millions of human beings. England, France, Germany, Belgium and Holland with cross and sword carried "civilization" to Asia and Africa. In all

these imperialist forays, in all their colonial wars, in all their "police actions" against helpless and defenseless human beings, the imperialist nations were laying the foundations of the present. It is not far from the rape of Africa and the plundering of Asia to the shambles and devastation of the Europe of today. First the imperialist overlords devour the weak. Then when there are no more weak, or when each of them has gorged himself with the weak; they then begin to feed on each other. First conquer and subdue. Then divide and redivide. Then the strong line up against the strong.

The United States was drawn into this imperialist net. How could the money lender remain isolated? How could the righteous financier and the pious storekeeper of the world keep aloof? Where the investments and the markets are there is the fatherland. If there was any doubt about this in the mind of anyone in the US the doubt was cleared up at least in part by the participation of the US in the First World Imperialist War and the world leadership role assumed by this country following that war. The "American Dream" was shattered. Bourgeois economics, which is taken seriously by the capitalist ruling class, triumphed over bourgeois ethics and Memorial Day orations. These are for the masses. Eventually every nation, great and small was drawn into the dirt, grime and blood of capitalist development and imperialist intrigue; the US no less than Britain, Germany or Japan. World capitalism recognized no national boundaries, no "superior races," no "law of nations," and no "rights of man."

The process of divide and redivide could not go on forever. The earth is only so big. Human endurance has physical limitations. There are only so many colonial slaves to be exploited and robbed. The notion of one dominant imperialist power had to emerge. With the birth of this idea the scramble would begin all over again; "on a higher plane." Science and technology could be called on to aid each rival imperialism in its bid for world dominion. It is no longer the priest and the preacher who are the most effective adjuncts to imperialist banditry but the scientist and the engineer.

The first effective application of the concept of world dominion by a single nation, that is by a single national bourgeoisie, was the case of German fascism and Adolph Hitler. The "Sawdust Caesar" in Rome dreamed of a revived "grandeur that was Rome," but he was never taken seriously outside of his own household. With Germany it was different. Germany, the loser in the First World Imperialist War, stripped of her colonies, buried in worthless marks, her commerce driven from the seas, mortgaged to Wall Street; hemmed in by the nations on the West and Stalinist Russia on the East. The way out according to the Nazi politicians was not the Weimer way or the Moscow way. Both of these: "Democracy" and "Bolchevism" had failed.

It was out of the fermentation of the imperialist notion of world dominion that the Second World Imperialist War arose. The capitalist collapse of 1929 the decade-long stagnation of production the restlessness of the toilers of the world, including the colonial peoples, the steady trek of the American dollar into every nook and cranny of the world, the contraction of the world market; did not offer a way out for all the imperialist powers. Some one national bourgeoisie had to assume the responsibility for establishing "order. Not only "order" among the toilers, among the people, but in the ranks of the bourgeois themselves. To bring "order" in the world meant to make the world safe for a sick and ailing capitalism and for it

least one dominant imperialism. If not one dominant capitalist nation, then at least one dominant in the West and one in the East; or some other "equitable" and "reasonable" arrangement which would prolong the life of world capitalism.

Those who do not understand this and who continue to talk innocently or glibly about "aggressors," "democracy versus totalitarianism" and "Christianity versus atheism," will be totally defenseless before the propagandist and protagonists of the 3rd Imperialist World War.

We say that Hitler applied the notion first. The Nazis did it in their own way: cruel, savage, ruthless and inhuman. What has to be remembered however is that what was essentially the evil of the Nazi crusade was not its barbarity but its political and economic concept of assuming the role of arbiter of the destinies of the peoples of the world. How any imperialist nation carries out its plans will not be determined to any appreciable degree on the basis of nationality, race, religion or the traditions of the country; but by what they find at hand useful, what is felt necessary to win. The end desired by an embattled capitalism will determine what means are used to achieve that end. If the desired end can be achieved by bribery, bribery it will be; in any one of its manifold appearances. If the concentration camp is necessary, the concentration camp it will be; even if not called by that name but blessed with the label of "democracy."* Franklin Roosevelt, good American bourgeois that he was, certainly developed the notion of the supremacy of the US bourgeoisie over every other national bourgeoisie. Roosevelt of course thought of himself as sitting on top of the heap as the world's imperialist chieftain. Churchill understood this very well. He knew at least that the sun was beginning to set on the British Empire. American world hegemony of course would be achieved in the "democratic" way not with Hitler thoroughness. "Manifest Destiny" for the US during this period assumed new and more concrete meaning. This was the national theme of the Second Imperialist World War. The struggle for its consummation goes on unabated.

The world is now three years removed from the close of the Second Imperialist Struggle. And yet millions of men are still under arms. The armies of the US, England, Russia, Holland, Belgium and France stand guard over the peoples of the world just as though they were so many millions of chain gang desperados. The imperialist conquerors make the whole earth their private parade ground and shooting range. They have conspired against the national independence of conquered nations. In the name of democracy the conquered peoples are governed by military dictators. This is particularly true in Germany, and in all zones. The victorious imperialists continue the orgy of killing with their trials of the "guilty." The people of the invaded areas are being taught the principles of "democracy" by American lieutenants from Mississippi, British sergeants who practiced democracy on the Indians and by the Russian GPU.

Not only are the armies maintained by all the imperialist nations but they make bigger and ever bigger appropriations for enlarging their "defense establishment." We live in a period of victory without peace.

* Hitler was not the only statesman who nourished the idea of world dominion.

This is capitalism today and this is capitalist society. This is the order of things which promises the people peace but follows each promise with a war more devastating than the last. This is the "system of free enterprise" which solves a ten year period of world-wide unemployment and economic misery with a new world slaughter crowned by Hiroshima and its 70,000 victims. But millions of dead and wounded of the Second World Imperialist War were not enough. Today's maimed, homeless and starving are not enough. The thousands upon thousands of slave workers in Russia are not enough. We need another war so that there can be more Hiroshimas, more homeless, more starving and more slave labor.

Who are these rulers who step forth again as organizers of the next imperialist conflict? What is "our democratic way of life" which after 300 years can only offer mankind the same cycle of woe: birth, exploitation, disease, ignorance, hunger, war and death. What have the Truman's, Attlees, and Stalins to offer except exactly what Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Wilson had to offer; what Churchill and Roosevelt and Stalin had to offer: depression and war. This is the face of the 20th century and the promise of the future in the capitalist world.

The rulers of the great nations prepare for war; but only a war of defense. Not one of the big imperialists ever starts a war. They do not keep armed to the teeth for the purpose of any type of aggression. Their huge navies, air forces and armies are always for "defense." Peacetime compulsory military training and conscription are merely "defense" precautions. They arm and await the arrival of the "aggressor."

The devastation of the Second Imperialist World War was so great and the demands of the military machine for goods was so great that a post war "boom" was created in the effort to satisfy the everyday needs of the people and of industry, commerce and transportation. The present "boom" in capitalist production is the result of wartime destruction of material, supplies, goods, equipment and buildings. The "boom" is also based on the need to produce ordinary consumer supplies which were not produced during the war because plant and material were used for the production of these same supplies for the military forces. The present "boom" therefore demonstrates nothing more in connection with the business cycle than a temporary need for extraordinarily high production to make up for what was lost during the war. Capitalism today has not demonstrated its ability to solve its most harassing problems anymore than in 1929 and thereafter up to the opening of the war.

The production of consumer goods has reached an all time high in the United States, the chief of the capitalist nations. Production in Europe has shown a phenomenal rise in the past year. However this will not go on indefinitely. Production in the US is maintained at the present high level by the needs we enumerated in the paragraph above and by the European Recovery Program. There are indications however that leveling off process may soon set in. The capitalist market will reach capitalist satiety.

Another factor however enters the production picture in all the imperialist nations; that is the creation of stock piles for the next war and the production of equipment for the huge military establishments already in existence and authorized to be formed.

Furthermore there are the battleships, the airplanes, the transports the big guns and the atom bombs which must be manufactured now or in the near future. Should the capitalist peacetime market collapse through "overproduction" high prices and low wages or any of the numerous causes of capitalist crisis; production can be maintained through the production of military equipment and supplies in preparation for the Third Imperialist World War.

This would be not only the case in the United States but with all the nations of the world, great and small. It is not likely that any nation will have opportunity to escape some form of participation in the next war. Furthermore all countries are being impelled by Russia and the United States into two blocks. This means that the economies of all countries will be forced into the dual role of "peacetime" and war production.

This turning to war production is of course not a new departure in capitalist economy. Today however the vastness of imperialist operations, the intricacies and technological complexities of modern warfare and the tremendous demands of the war machine make it imperative that the whole of the economy be kept alerted for war production. For many years before the Second Imperialist World War Europe had become an "armed camp". The productive apparatus of the several countries was already producing for war all out of proportion to the wealth of these states. This was particularly true of Germany after the rise of the Nazi party.

What is relevant and significant fight now in this connection is the fact of the gigantic size of the war budgets; 15 billion in the US for one fiscal year. This means that a large part of the resources of the country: plant and equipment, raw materials, financial resources, technical and intellectual ability will be integrated around the problems of war and production for war. Contemporary capitalism therefore becomes a race between wartime and peace time production with production for war becoming more and more a normal aspect of capitalist production. Peace time production gets squeezed in between imperialist wars or between cessation of shooting and the beginning of preparations for the next war. During peace time the economy is expanded to take care of increased peace time civilian demand. Later when the preparations for war begin a part is shunted off to military production. When the war begins or immediately before the whole economy is integrated into the "war effort."

Despite the fact that war production is a progressively larger part of the total of capitalist production this does not now constitute any change in the nature of capitalism, or any new sector in capitalist development. There can be no splitting up of capitalism into peacetime capitalism and wartime capitalism. No fundamental distinction of the slightest degree can be drawn between capitalist production of the "means of production," production of the "means of consumption," and that "newly significant sector of the economy" which "is the destruction--production of goods which do not re-enter either into the process of production or into (what is at bottom part of the same process) the production of labor power". This quotation is from the resolution of the Political Committee. One can only guess at what the PC means. No evidence is presented to substantiate the existence of this "newly significant sector of the economy..." We'll try to understand the PC.

As we understand the resolution the contention is being made that today the capitalist economy produces, means of production (a rolling mill for the steel industry), means of consumption (a pair of shoes) and a Garand rifle (means of destruction) Or let us say a gear cutting machine, a civilian airplane and an army bomber. The first is "means of production", the second "means of consumption, and the third "means of destruction." Now what we have a right to have explained to is is the distinction between that sector of the capitalist economy which produces the Garand rifle and that sector which produces the shoes? Which sector produces the rifle which is used in hunting rabbits? (Remington Arms Co produces both) Do the shoes which a soldier wears come from the "means of destruction" sector or the "means of consumption" sector? The same rolling mill (means of production) is used to roll armor for battleships, sheet metal for civilian commercial trucks. In that case the rolling mill is both "means of production" and "means of destruction."

This does not make much sense. Perhaps we don't understand the position of the Political Committee. We can only try to interpret what is written. We can only look at this contribution of the PC as an attempt to be profound where there is no need for profundity. There is no need to attempt to concoct new theories to account for the present state of capitalism and of bourgeois society. This is particularly true if all one can produce is a theory as thin and as ill-grounded as the one we have before us. We leave out at this point, any consideration as to whether or not tanks, military planes, bombs and battleships (means of destruction) "re-enter...into...the production of labor power." In capitalist production it is very difficult to understand the difference between replacing a battleship or replacing a farm tractor which has worn out or become obsolete. It is incumbent on the PC to present some proof for this contention. That is the PC has the responsibility to elucidate this brand new theory.

This attempt to draw some basic distinction between the capitalist production of the materials of war and the materials of peacetime production and consumption has no justification either in theory or in any sound and responsible empirical procedure. No separation can be made between capitalist production of the means of production and consumption and production of materials for war, except agitational distinction. This would only be valid when agitation is in order. No theoretical or analytical lines can be drawn between the three by which the production of battleships and military poison gas is made a separate category. It is one of the tragedies of the whole course of capitalist production that the capitalist has not let his conscience bother him over what was going on in his plant so long as a profit was coming from the operations. The PC is bothered and depressed at the size and regularity of war preparations and production for war. It has been known by Marxists for some time that the vicissitudes and contradictions of capitalist society and the rivalries of the great capitalist nations lead to imperialist war. It is also true that wars today will be global affairs with millions of men and women participating. If there is an army of 10 millions more production is needed than for an army of one million. If war is to be carried on by sea, land and air, then equipment suitable for each area of combat is necessary. There was no question of production of the means of destruction when warfare was carried on with fist and stone club. Each man used his own fist and made his own club. Things became more complex when the bow and arrow arrived but this was still relatively simple. There was not

even production of the means of destruction during the First World Imperialist War. This idea was born after the Second World Imperialist War: after the coming of the atom bomb.

The capitalism which produced 90,000 planes in the US and thousands of tanks, shells and guns is the same capitalism which produces millions of pounds of beef, millions of gallons of gasoline, rows of houses and millions of pairs of shoes. There is no new "sector" to the capitalist economy.

Even in Nazi Germany where for several years the economy could correctly have been called a war economy in that the whole country was organized in preparation for war, we did not discover a new sector. We believe the "means of destruction" which the PC has discovered is the atom bomb. It is the atom bomb which is the "new sector." Whatever was new in Nazi economy appeared concomitant with or after the establishment of the Nazi political system; that is after a political counter-revolution. No political counter-revolution has taken place in the US. Bourgeois democracy is intact. At present there is no concrete evidence that bourgeois democracy is in danger in the US. These are the facts. These are the facts which mature Marxists will be guided by,

What lies ahead in the matter of qualitative changes in the capitalist economy can not be foretold. It is enough for today to understand what is actually transpiring. To look at capitalism today in the manner of the PC resolution as production of the means of destruction, is somewhat of a reformist and pacifist approach to the question of the coming war and the war uses to which the economy is put. We have heard about production for "profit" and not for "use." Now we are to be agitated over the new capitalism: Production for Profit and Destruction; production of the means of destruction.

According to the resolution of the PC "The link between the economic and political changes thus produced is the fact that the market for this third department of capitalist production is the state. The rise to dominance in the economy of this type of production effects therefore, the partial negation of the blindly operating market as the regulator of capitalist economy and its replacement by the partial planning of the state bureaucracy." Since the consolidation of the national states hasn't the state always been the "market" for war materials and equipment? In the modern state who or what would be the market for war commodities except the state? Isn't the war-making power assumed by the central political authority in every modern state? Isn't it precisely this which makes the state the market for war commodities? Is the capitalist state which buys 15 billions worth of war supplies different from the capitalist state which buys only \$5 billions worth?

What does the PC mean by the "partial planning of the state bureaucracy?" Does the resolution mean that already in the US the government is beginning to assume a managerial role now held by the owners of industry and their managers? What is meant by "planning" as used in the resolution.

It is well-known that in the period of capitalist decline, the state must intercede in the interests of a weakened private capitalism. The state enters with its economic program tucked away under a political slogan such as "The New Deal", or the "New Deal State" (Now

called "The Fair Deal State" by Truman.) There are public works of all sorts, subsidies to industry, etc. The state becomes the market. A large part of the national income is supplied by state spending. The "blindly-operating market...is replaced by the "partial planning of the state bureaucracy."

Not only is the state drawn in because of the generally unfavorable economic situation with capitalism but also because of the constant threat of war arising out of the imperialists conflicts attendant on capitalist decline. As we have already indicated, big wars demand big expenditures. The state becomes a big market because of the increasing number of wars "cold" or hot. There is no need to invent any new theories or any new "sectors" of the economy to account for this phenomenon.

The resolution also presents another new theory: "the bureaucratization of capitalism." Here again we are not told just what the new phenomenon is. Again the new theory is not elucidated adequately. We are told that "...the life of every important country in the world, including the US, is being organized more and more on the basis of a permanent war economy and a permanent militarization of society...In this stage of the dominance of war economy and the bureaucratization of capitalism, the role played by state intervention ("statification of the economy") changes accordingly...The all-pervading degeneration of capitalism marked by the new phenomena outlined above is superimposed upon its decade long decline, just as the new stage of the bureaucratic militarization of capitalism does not begate but is superimposed upon its stages of imperialism...Capitalism itself is doomed...In the long war between Western imperialism and Stalinist imperialism, the victory of the former can be achieved by it only by intensifying precisely those tendencies which push it in the direction of its enemy. War economy--bureaucratization--bureaucratic planning--controls--regimentation--declining standard of living in the midst of 'full employment' for war production--these are the social prerequisites for gearing capitalism toward the victory in the threatened war."

Here again the PC attempts to be profound but succeeds only in being verbose, stilted and unconvincing. The resolution contends that the US can win against Russia only by becoming more and more like Stalinist Russia, that is by becoming more and more totalitarian. Why is this? We are not told. There must be a reason for things. We are not a fundamentalist Baptist church or a band of Catholic children receiving instruction from the Sister. We don't say that the PC position is not correct. We only want to know how they found out. That is we want some evidence. All the concrete evidence is against their conclusion. The US went through the war with fascist Germany without the slightest concrete movement in the direction of fascism. We say "concrete" because we know as well as the next that in a period of capitalist decline, the bourgeoisie in any country will resort to fascism to preserve its property and its rule. But a generalization is not always applicable every day in the week; or in every political resolution.

We ask some questions. Are the roots of fascism and of Stalinism the same? Will more "regimentation" be needed against Stalinist totalitarianism than was necessary against fascist totalitarianism? Why? Is there no difference between what is called "the war economy" in the US and the Russian war economy? What is the similarity between "bureaucratization in the US and in Russia?"

This leads to the consideration of another "theory" put forward by the PC's resolution: "The basis for the disorientation of the proletarian forces consists in this: that these rival exploiting systems are not clearly recognized as enemies on an equal footing..." What does this mean? The rival systems are capitalism and what the WP has called bureaucratic collectivism. Bureaucratic collectivism is not capitalism. The political superstructure in the US is bourgeois democracy; that in Russia is bureaucratic collectivist totalitarianism. Are the two political systems on an equal footing? Was bourgeois democracy on an equal footing with German fascism in the last war? In what way. The only significant and correct meaning which can be given the statement "on an equal footing" is to take it to mean: Both Russia and the United States are imperialist nations. The war between them therefore must be and can only be imperialist on both sides. Consequently the working classes of all countries should oppose their own ruling classes and carry on the class struggle irrespective of the fortunes of their ruling classes in the war. Furthermore Marxists must not compromise or water down this principle. Marxists will not have any "wait and see policy." This is a sound prediction which any Marxist can make now. Any Marxist can take a categorical position now on his attitude toward the coming struggle between the US and Russia.

If the phrase means anything more or less than this; if it means anything in addition to this then it is incorrect. For example if the statement means that the political superstructures economic substructures of the two countries are "on an equal footing", then the statement is incorrect. In relation to totalitarian bureaucratic collectivism, bourgeois-democracy is and remains progressive and is therefore to be preferred to bureaucratic collectivism. It is true that the very notion of collectivism has been horribly mangled by reactionary Stalinism. We however remain collectivist, Marxian collectivist. We do not wilt under the anti-collectivist blows of the bourgeois. It is also true that bourgeois-democracy is under continued assault by the bourgeoisie itself but this does not determine our attitude toward bourgeois political democracy. In relation to Stalinist totalitarianism (as with Hitler totalitarianism) we maintain the position that bourgeois democracy is progressive. They are not "equally reactionary."

We read in the PC's resolution: "In proportion as production for war purposes becomes the accepted and determining end of economic activity, the role of the bureaucracy cease to be limited to that of a political superstructure and tends to become an integral part of the economy itself... This bureaucratization of economy... leads to the growth of the state bureaucracy in size, in the importance of its role for the regulation of the economy, and in its relative independence from the direct control of the capitalist class." We have to ask whether or not this is a political resolution for the guidance of the Party TODAY or is it an educational essay explaining what fascism is and how it develops? If this section of the resolution is an educational piece on fascism in general, then the PC should say so and issue it as such. In that case it will not be necessary to hedge the new theories about with such dodges as "relative independence from the direct control of the capitalist class." (My emphasis. McK) The next paragraph speaks of the "new dominance of war economy and the new role of the state bureaucracy, tending to substitute state-organized planning for the blind operation of the market..."

Unless the whole section "B" of the resolution is to be taken as a theoretical and educational essay on the meaning and development of fascism in general, then it is saying that there is a pre-fascist situation in the US today; or more accurately there is a pre-fascist situation in every capitalist country. We used to be told periodically that we were in a "pre-revolution situation." Now it has become pre-fascist, pre-police state.

If this is the situation and this is what the PC really means, then the Party is faced with the necessity of proclaiming this from the housetops in stentorian tones. If it was necessary to spread alarm in LABOR ACTION about the coming of the next war, it is doubly necessary to warn the people of the "police state."

"Statification," "the new dominance of war economy," "the new role of the state bureaucracy, tending to substitute state organized planning for the blind operation of the market" has not advanced equally in all capitalist countries or all spheres of capitalist production, being especially marked in those capitalisms devastated or bled white in the war. (like England and France) and less marked in proportion to the wealth of the country (as in the United States.) This may be read on page 3 of Bulletin No 7, Convention Bulletin No. 4.

We had assumed that this "statification," "bureaucratization," "state organized planning" were all "trends" in the direction of the "police state," that is reactionary trends. But we are told that it is more advanced in England than in the US. However "this development" in England is under the direction of the Labor Party. We assumed that the WP supported "this development" in England. Is the LPGGB today a vehicle for the development toward the "police state" Is what the Labor Party is doing, no different from the acts of Congress in the US? The resolution of the PC reads: "While a nominally socialist government staffed by the Labor Party is the vehicle through which these changes are taking place, the bourgeoisie has so far put up a comparatively weak resistance..."

Where does this leave us? What kind of nationalization can we be for? What kind of "state-organized planning" can we be for? The only inference that we can draw from the PC resolution is that we can only be for genuine, honest to goodness socialist planning and nationalization. Is that what the PC means?

Section "B" of the resolution ends with an adjuration and warning: "...the refusal of the Marxists to make the slightest compromise with the social democratic notions of supporting the capitalist side of the war in order to gain a 'breathing spell' from the threat of Stalinist totalitarianism." We take it that all the preceding new theory was for the purpose of stealing people against social-patriotism. We take it that the solemn promise quoted above is intended to scare the waverers and transform them into intrepid Marxists. Wee be unto him who ignores these warnings! It is high time that that type of polemic ceased in our Party. There is far too much of it in the convention resolutions. No potential social-patriot will be deterred by these juvenile blasts. Above all the pedagogical value of such declamations is exactly zero. Even should some one be scared to raising his or her hand for the resolution; that's all it will be, one more hand raised, one more vote. There can be no assurance that the hand-raiser will remain in the Party.

No new invention of theory or methodology are necessary in order to understand contemporary world capitalism and the capitalist society today. For over a decade now the decline of capitalism has been treated not only by Marxists but by many liberals as well. We have explained that not only are the recurring crises a part of capitalist decline but also the ever recurring capitalist world wars. Any concrete examination of capitalism and of bourgeois society will provide adequate foundations for the Marxist thesis that the 20th century is the period of capitalist decline. As capitalism spread over the whole world in the 19th century it carried along exploitation, robbery and oppression. Allied with this orgy of capitalist aggrandizement carried on by nations in concert, are the contradictions of capitalist production and the rivalries engendered among the imperialists themselves as they go about their self-appointed rounds of plunder and pillage. Out of this comes imperialist war, and the struggle of each imperialist power to dominate all the rest; that is to dominate the world. The political domination of the world follows fast upon the gaining of economic monopoly and the maturing of monopoly finance capitalism. The monopolists of every country seek to dominate the world market, to corner the world supply of raw materials and to become the world's banker and creditor. As every capitalist seeks to devour every other capitalist so every imperialist class seeks to devour its rivals.

Each national capitalist class calls upon its own government to assemble the resources of the nation for perpetuating "national prosperity" and eventually to defend the "nation's honor." The capitalists themselves are not as a rule of one mind as to how this should be done. It is out of this intra-class conflict that the government bureaucracy begins to increase its weight as an independent force. It seeks to impose its own solution not only of capitalist crises but to adjudicate the disputes within the ranks of the capitalist; and between the capitalists and the working class. The bulk of the government bureaucracy in capitalist society comes from the middle class, the class which has no significant place in production. Because this class has no significant place in production it can not exercise any appreciable influence in society. It can not come into its own, it can not have its day. A means of escape from petty-bourgeois thralldom is by way of the government bureaucracy. Here it sinks its roots and seeks to perpetuate itself. The bureaucracy itself however is also not of one mind. It too has its "right", "left" and "center," adhering to and defending similar divisions in the bourgeoisie.

This bureaucracy increase in importance because the industrialists and financiers have not been able to maintain capitalist equilibrium and progress. The state must step in. Also "the government" steps in because all government is jealous of its prerogatives, its prestige and its existence. It must also be emphasized that no government, not even the Hitler fascist government was a completely free bureaucracy. It had to make certain compromises with "free enterprise."

Suppose we should take the position that lacking the intervention of the working class, the "police state" is inevitable. What do we do after we have made this pronouncement? If the PC should attempt to answer this question the weakness of the resolution will be revealed. We hold that whether or not a police state will come, or if there is a "trend" or "tendency" to a "police state", is not the important question for a political resolution. It may be made

to assume importance for an educational class or a debate. It is not a subject which can have much present political meaning for a mature Marxist politician, as politician.

What is important is, how much time do we have? What is the tempo of the "tendency" and how far has it gone. These are the relevant and important political questions which must be elucidated concretely and not in the manner of the PC resolution.

For example; if the "tendency" is only the beginning, that is one thing and we act in a certain way. If we can estimate that the achievement of this end is some years away we will certainly not act as though it were right upon us. If we are being hard pressed we have the fight and the duty to scream at the top of our voices; "Wolf! Wolf!" If this is not the case then we can proceed in a more leisurely and educational manner. If a building is discovered to be burning, I doubt that its inhabitants would continue any discussion on the dangers and imminence of fire. If the flames however are miles away the discussion might continue.

Neither the qualitative nor the quantitative aspects of the question are the same in the alternative situations we have denoted. From this follows that the political formulation of the question must be precise, careful and reserved. If this is not done the posing of the question can only provoke outbursts of pompous loquacity, demagoguery and bombast. Furthermore it can not be validly argued against our point of view that this is a question which is difficult of quantitative formulation. This is true but after one says that quantitative formulation is difficult, it is impermissible to proceed as though it were easy. It is not possible with this question, to give a precise quantitative answer, but it is possible to make an objective (non-polemical, non-factional) estimate which is properly motivated politically and organizationally. That is; one can make an intelligent working approximation. Because they are not prophets real Marxists are forced to proceed in this manner again and again. We must approach this question as all other political questions with a high degree of concreteness and objectivity. We must do this or the Party political discussion will be nothing more than a cave of winds.

World leadership today lies with the US. Up to now a high degree of bourgeois democracy persists. This itself is in part responsible for the inner conflicts among the bourgeoisie and the state bureaucracy. Furthermore we are not only witnessing what may be called bourgeois-democratic inertia (resistance to change) but a conscious demand by a part of the bourgeoisie that it continue. More potent than this is the activity of the masses (in their own somewhat primitive manner) in behalf of bourgeois-democracy. This was illustrated in the surprise election of Truman. This "tendency" is no less a fact than the "tendency" toward the "police state." We say that right now the tendency toward the preservation of bourgeois-democracy is the dominant tendency. This is disconcerting of course to some of the Party SLFers, for instance those comrades who preferred, desired the defeat of Truman (not of course the election of Dewey. The contradiction is their's) in order that "democratic illusions" might not be "spread among the masses."

What the real trend is in connection with bourgeois-democracy is of the highest importance. It is important to fight for the preservation and widening of bourgeois democracy today. The PC resolution obscures this and merely succeeds in spreading muddlement, by posing the question as if the fight to preserve bourgeois-democracy is equivalent to defense of U. S. imperialism. It might be and undoubtedly is, among those who render principled support to bourgeois-democracy. However it may be precisely the struggle to maintain bourgeois-democracy which may prove to be the most effective weapon, in practice, against the operations of imperialism and as the pathway to mass action against "police state" tendencies.

The masses certainly have "democratic illusions." It is the business of the Marxists to aid in dispelling these illusions. They can only accomplish this, however, by concrete and practical intervention. It will not be accomplished by the spinning of new theories, by beating the drums, or by crying "wolf." It is exactly now while there is a "breathing spell" that the Marxists should be striving with might and main, in the "tented field" to dispell the democratic illusions of the masses and to organize them for the assault on world capitalism and imperialism. According to the PC resolution, however, the only excuse to talk about a "breathing spell" is as a cover for one's intention to support "the capitalist side of the war."

There are illusions and illusions. The masses can be fed various illusions and become victimized by them. To become the victim of the notion that we are in the period of pre-fascism or pre-police statism is no less dangerous than to become the victim of the notion that bourgeois-democracy and capitalism can be made to serve the permanent interests of the masses. Should the masses succumb to either illusion they will go down in defeat. And in each case they will not know until it is too late just what was the nature of the illusion.

Capitalism is in decline on a world scale. Capitalist crises are global and include all of production: agricultural and industrial. The capitalist capture of agriculture puts it in the same class as industry with all the problems of industrial production: overproduction, unemployment and crisis. Despite the fact that two-thirds of the world's population are engaged in agriculture, millions upon millions remain unfed or undernourished just as they are unclothed and unhoused. This condition accompanies the capitalist "victory of production."

In 1944, 81% of the world's population had an average real income of less than the equivalent of \$10 per week per breadwinner. It was only in Australia, Great Britain, New Zealand, Canada, Switzerland, the Argentine and the U.S., with 10% of the world's people that the real wage was as much as \$20 per week per breadwinner. This is the boasted capitalist "high wages," the "good wages" of "free enterprise."

It is false completely to judge the economic situation by what one sees in the U. S. where piles of accumulated wealth can be drawn on. The U. S. was not harmed by the war. On the contrary, this country improved its economic position in the course of the Second World Imperialist War. That is, in the midst of the world decline of capitalism, the American bourgeoisie improved its economic position.

The question of the relation of political democracy to the stage of the economy is important. Bourgeois-democracy increases in a general way only when the economy is expanding. If the economy is contracting, of course the danger of a reactionary assault on bourgeois-democracy is real. World capitalism today is genuinely concerned with this problem: that is, how to expand production, hold wages down and at the same time maintain "the price structure." The senile capitalist ruling classes of Europe, dependent as they are for their sustenance and defense, on the U.S., hold as fast as they can to their old privileges. They hope to rebuild their national capitalisms and retain or reestablish their colonial empires. To be successful today, however, in its own name, a national imperialism must have its base in a very wealthy and unscathed country such as the U. S. There must be an abundance of human material and technical and scientific resources. Even in Russia these are lacking in sufficient quantities. At the other end are the little imperialisms, such as Italy, Yugoslavia and the like. This means that neither totalitarianism nor bourgeois-democracy can triumph today with only a political point of view and an army. The political program must be concretized in supplies and equipment. The army at the front must be supported by the army in the field and the factory.

The accumulated wealth and the extraordinary economic position of the U. S. are primarily what give this country its dominant position in the world of imperialist nations. It would be a mistake, however, to say that the U. S. and Russia are the only imperialist nations of real importance. Even a cursory examination of the facts will reveal the falsity of this conclusion. England remains a dominant imperialist nation. It is true that she is subordinate to the U.S. It is also true that in all probability her resources are not equal to those of Russia. However, England's African empire, on which increased attention is being directed today, is a vast and rich territory which any imperialist nation would be proud to possess or exploit. Despite her poverty, France remains one of the going imperialist nations. The world has recently witnessed the imperialist antics of the Dutch. They retain all their power and venom. "Little Belgium" is still in possession of her African acres.

It is a mistake and misleading to base the status, longevity or potency of any of the imperialisms by the degree to which they might be capable of standing up to Russia or the U. S. Such an approach to Britain as an imperialist nation is wholly unsatisfactory and worthy only of some ranting American chauvinist. England or France do not have to fight Russia alone. The western block of imperialists will fight together. True they will fight under the suzerainty of the U.S. but that will not sit too heavily upon their

ruling classes. It is highly improbable that England will lose her African empire, her Far East interests or the Suez through any activity of the U.S. This will hold true for the other members of the Western Block.

In the light of this consideration it is necessary to examine more closely what is meant by the struggle for world dominion as it relates to the U.S. It certainly does not mean the same thing as it would mean if we were discussing the subject now in relation to Russia. The victory of the Western imperialists has not produced the same results as would have a victory of fascist Germany and Japan. It is necessary to keep this distinction before us and to have it clear. World dominion for the U. S. means above all the U.S. as the banker and creditor of the other nations. To a certain degree and perhaps only temporarily it means interference in the internal affairs of the European nations. This type of interference is not unusual with big bankers. It is also true that the American bourgeoisie will not look kindly on "social experimentation" by the European countries. This bourgeoisie of course will be an irreconcilable enemy of socialism and any movement of the European masses toward liberation from capitalist and imperialist exploitation. But this will be true also of their own ruling classes.

There will be no such thing as imposing a semi-colonial status on Europe. This for several reasons: the strong nationalist spirit, the mass resistance of the people, bourgeois-democratic inertia, the resistance of the masses in the U.S. Furthermore, such type of domination would be useless and constitute a first rate blunder for the American bourgeoisie. Also, the line-up as it is today need not necessarily be of long duration. There can be other alignments. Imperialists do not maintain their friendships as a matter of principle. Should there be too much meddling by the U.S., some of the European countries might decide to go over to Russia. Or remain neutral. They might not relish the idea of becoming the battlefields of the next war.

For all these reasons the U.S. will proceed with a fair degree of circumspection and democratic fanfare. Bourgeois-democracy will prevail and remain the political superstructure of the Western Block. There is no sound reasons now for making any other predictions. The U.S. and the ERP countries together will seek to rebuild a capitalist economy in these countries. These countries will attempt to go on as before with their empires and the exploitation of the peoples of these colonial areas. A large part of the funds for this exploitation and development will come from the U.S. These European countries and their colonial empires will become not only areas for the placement of American capital but also markets for American exports.

It is idle to devote space in a political resolution to any discussion of whether or not it is desirable for the capitalist economies of Europe to be rebuilt. It is no less idle and nonsensical to discuss whether or not it is the business of Marxists to call for the rebuilding of capitalist economy. No matter what our desires may be as Marxists or what we conceive to be "our business" in this connection, it is a fact that the capitalist ruling class will always attempt to rebuild its capitalist economy. This is what they are attempting to do and will do in Europe. It is also a fact that the

masses in Europe and U.S. today must labor either in a capitalist field, factory, mine, mill; or in a socialist factory, field, mine or mill. Unfortunately, if the masses of Europe exist today it will be on the basis of their getting the opportunity to provide surplus value for a capitalist class. Any other attitude, any other talk is mere gibberish.

Such a brutally objective attitude toward this question has no necessary political connection with faith in capitalism, in the efficacy of bourgeois-democracy or in American imperialism. The only "faith" involved here is the faith that one need not necessarily be contaminated by contact with fact.

What is the direction in which world capitalism is moving? We submit that no definitive answer can be given to this question. The P.C. resolution says that "it must be emphasized that while, both in economic structure and in political consequence, a new stage is marked, it is yet a new stage of capitalism, indeed of capitalist imperialism." That is, it is still capitalism and still imperialism. This is not very helpful. What will we do with this whole theory in practice? We contend that it is not necessary to give an answer to the "police state" query. Here are the reasons.

We know enough about capitalism as it actually is to be able to say what course the working class should pursue in practice. We know that capitalism is in decline, that the capitalist economy is not today an expanding economy. We know that bourgeois political democracy can only be maintained in a constantly expanding economy. We know that as the economy contracts there is a tendency toward the contraction of democracy. But we also know that not only is this development a grave threat to the working class but to the ruling class also. Because the working class and its allies, the masses, will resist the reduction of its liberties and its standard of living. In a non-expanding economy class lines stratify in a hard way and the gap between the classes widens. This leads to an assault on property and the institutions of property.

It is our business to organize this assault on the basis of real and actual data in hand. We know that there is time before the descent of the "police state" if this is to be the fate of mankind. We do now live in a "democratic interlude." Marxists have but one responsibility in the situation; that is to use this "democratic interlude" for the purpose of organizing the masses to struggle so that the interlude will end in socialism and not in a "police state." Should a "police state" really appear in the West, the Marxists will not, and should not be allowed to console themselves with a "We told you so." The masses of the world are in their present plight at least in part because many of those who call themselves Marxists have been content merely to pour forth new batches of theories and predictions every so often, but nothing more. There is one new stage that we must not become the proponents of: the arm-chair stage-of class struggle.

The great task ahead in Europe, that is continental Europe, is still national liberation: the right of all the historic nations to determine their own destinies and go their several ways in peace. To be free from molestation, invasion and imperialist oppression. The big nations are not alone in these offenses; the little imperialists such as Italy, Bulgaria, et al, are not guiltless. The monstrous and brutal foray of The Netherlands into Indonesia in the interest of its psalm-singing pietistic marauding bourgeoisie. The bullying and perfidious action of England in assembling its armed forces for "defense" against Israel. The smashing of one small nation after the other by the giant bully on the East; Russia. The demand of former fascist Italy that she be given back "her" colonies in Africa. Little Belgium waxing fat again on the blood, sweat and tears of the Belgian Congo. England withdrawing from India with traditional British hypocrisy. Just as though the world did not know that she could not hold on any longer and that furthermore India is too close to Russia. It is better to bear "the white man's burden" in black Africa. To squeeze out the last ounce of imperialist profit before Africa too looks "into the book" and reads about freedom and liberty.

Japan is ruled by an American general. East Germany by the Stalinist GPU. West Germany by British, American and French generals. There are those who say that the armies of the Western Bloc should remain in Germany so long as the Russian Army is there. People who have this point of view apparently forget that the U.S. army is not in Germany at the invitation of the German people. It is our bounden duty, not only as Marxists but also as decent human beings, to demand the return of every foreign soldier to his own national soil; to take the conquering armies off the backs of the German and Japanese people. To say that we want our army to stay there to keep the Russian army out is merely to say that we prefer our imperialists to the Russian imperialists. This is really a "new stage" of Marxism.

We remain the champions of freedom, liberty and national independence. We apply this to all the colonial peoples and the nations of Europe and Asia. To the extent that our voice can carry we call upon the toilers of all the imperialist countries to stand up and refuse to be beguiled into improving their economic position at the expense of the oppressed and enslaved peoples in the colonies. This applies particularly to the workers in the U. S. who are in duty bound to resist the invitation of American imperialism that we eat, clothe and house ourselves at the expense of the European masses of the colonial masses.

There is ferment among the colonial slaves all over the world. This ferment was stimulated during the war not only by the democratic utterances of the Great Powers but also by the development of industrial production in the colonies for war purposes. The simple fact of the increase in income and standard of living has had the effect of impelling natives to increase their demands for independence or for greater participation in the government of the colony.

This upsurge of nationalism must be supported and encouraged.

The "unrest" in the Far East, Middle East, the Near East, Africa and the West Indies, especially in the present unsteady world situation is no good omen for the big or little imperialists. It is not possible for the "mother country" any longer to use the colonies merely as suppliers of raw materials, as markets for "home" manufacturers (including junk and shoddy) and man-power for the armies of the oppressor. The colonial people will demand a higher and higher price for their participation in the ventures of the "mother country."

It is one of the atrocities of imperialist war that it is mainly during such orgies that the imperialists pay attention to the material development of the colonies and to the material and intellectual needs of the people. Such solicitude, of course, is predicated upon grim necessity and is limited to the minimum which will produce maximum results. This procedure has continued after the war. Today "development" companies of American, British and Portuguese imperialists are concentrating on Africa. It is clear from the trend of these post-war activities that the Western imperialists, particularly England and the U.S., intend to concentrate on Africa as the last field of operations. This fabulously rich continent cannot only supply billions in wealth and men for years to come but it is a safe refuge from attack by Russia. This is not true of the East. They plan also for Africa to become a safe jumping off point, for the real combat areas of Europe and the East.

As the colonial peoples are drawn more and more into this net of world imperialism in which they are expected to play a role prescribed by their imperialist masters, they will begin to understand that they can have no genuine interest in the schemes of the capitalist oppressors. Their eyes will be opened to the meaning of national freedom and independence. They will begin to understand that the land and everything in it is, and by right should be, theirs. It is this consummation, of course, which the usurping imperialists will seek to avoid just as they at the same time will be seeking to avoid a like development among the masses at home, and any rapprochement between their own proletariat and the oppressed of the colonial areas.

It is necessary to emphasize that the clash of imperialist interests is not confined to the main struggle which goes on today between the Western Bloc and the Russian Bloc. There is a marked lack of harmony among the countries of the United Nations group. This results not only from old historic antagonisms such as between France and Germany but also from the changed configuration of world capitalism. England which was once the big creditor nation is today liquidating its investments in the U.S. for use in rebuilding its domestic economy. The U. S. which as late as the beginning of the First World War found it necessary to have its commerce carried in British bottoms and to play second fiddle to British finance capitalism, is now not only the world's bread basket and manufacturer but

also the biggest of all the world's pawnbrokers and loan sharks.

The U.S. has its ERP and its proposal for an Atlantic Defense Pact which is the usual imperialist euphemism for getting ready to engage in another imperialist slaughter. We oppose U. S. imperialism in all its aspects and phases. We struggle against the "old" imperialism and the "new" imperialism. We do not however equate the ERP with the Atlantic Pact. To do so is merely to say that "imperialism is imperialism" and let the matter end there. We begin by saying that the ERP is part and parcel of the plans of U. S. imperialism for domination of the world. The formulation in the resolution of the National Committee that "it is not correct to view the Marshall Plan as being primarily or essentially a plan for economic aid to Europe," is an ambiguous and meaningless formulation. It is not a "by-product" nor is it "incidental" as the NC resolution asserts. Unless one is engaged in a discussion of the psychology of the bourgeoisie, or its motives, then it is necessary to say that the Marshall Plan is "primarily" and "essentially" a plan for economic aid to Europe. We are not concerned and hold that the European workers should not be concerned with the motives of the American imperialists. We know what they are and every worker in Europe should have known before he read the mechanistic and barren resolution of the NC.

The U.S. has to and must give economic aid to Europe. This aid must be given to Europe not only as a barrier against Stalinism but also against any threat of the masses to take things into their own hands. Also it may turn out to be the case that the ERP is a good stabilizer for the American economy. The U.S. ruling class with all its ready wealth, even if there were no Stalinist threat, would certainly be stupid to sit quietly and let Europe go completely to rot. What advantage would this be to world capitalism? This is only another way of saying that the Marshall Plan is "primarily" and "essentially" a plan for economic aid to Europe.

It is primarily economic aid because that is what Europe has been getting. They have actually received billions of dollars in food, supplies and equipment. They have eaten the food, burned the fuel, planted the seed and actually constructed and equipped factories. The NC contention would make sense only if the U.S. had promised and had sent nothing. But it is a fact that at the end of the first 4 months, 403 billions had been allocated to Europe. To be more concrete, we name the following: food, 385 million; fuel, 174 million; metals, 80 million; fertilizer, feed and seeds, 80 million. We insist that this is "primarily" economic aid. It is also, from the U.S. side, "...the implementation of the Truman war doctrine..."

This economic aid had produced results. Industrial output has increased in the ERP countries and the standard of living of the people has risen. The important countries have not reached their pre-war levels in production and consumption but there has been a big improvement. We only cite this in demonstration of our contention that the ERP has been "primarily" and "essentially" economic aid.

The defenders of the NC resolution pose what they seem to be-

lieve is the clincher for their position: since when is it the business of Marxists to advocate the rebuilding of capitalism? We do not believe that it is the business of Marxists to advocate the rebuilding of capitalism. We believe that it is the business of Marxists to advocate the destruction of capitalism. We do not believe, however, that the European workers can destroy or even defend themselves from capitalism or imperialism, armed only with empty bellies, emaciated bare fists and sitting amid the ruin and rubble of their bombed cities. We do not believe the workers of Europe can accomplish this even if they are armed with the resolution of the NC and the assurance "that here in America the Marxist movement stands with them in their distrust, suspicion and hatred of the designs of American capitalism on their autonomy." The European workers should distrust the U.S. But what has that to do with their taking the ERP aid and doing everything to get more?

The European economy will be rebuilt to a certain extent. In some countries it will be extended past its pre-war level. The WP will not be asked for an opinion, not even by the workers of Europe. On this question the handful of Marxists in the world will keep their mouths shut if they are serious Marxists. Why? Because capitalism will be rebuilt or Europe will remain a wasteland. That is, unless labor takes power today. Let those who are prepared to tell the European workers to make a bid for power today, step forward. The European economy will be rebuilt or Europe will continue to stand in the breadline, with cup in hand for U.S. charity. We do not believe that such a condition is conducive to resisting U. S. "designs."

One big problem today is to prevent the pauperization of the world; to keep millions from starvation. Those who treat this question lightly from their high "socialist" towers do no service to the advance of socialist ideas. This is a far bigger problem than what kind of agreements the capitalist governments of Europe sign with imperialist United States. The U.S. as set its terms for giving aid to Europe. The terms are those of a fat imperialist money lender who is constrained to observe certain democratic procedures because of the concrete world situation. For instance the U.S. was forced, with Russia standing by, to commit herself not to interfere in the inner life of the ERP countries. They had to do this because this is the very charge which this country makes against Russia. Will the U.S. seek to violate this agreement? Of course: now covertly, later openly.

Our contention is, however, that the U.S. cannot force its will on Europe. The European workers if they organize themselves properly can have a great deal to say and do against U.S. encroachments. They can take the aid and still do this. Nobody can stop them. It is not the ERP which is retarding the development of the European revolution but the lack of a revolutionary-proletarian leadership.

Furthermore, it is the business of American Marxists, if the terms of the ERP are too harsh, to organize and rally the proletariat in the U.S. against the government and against U.S. imperialism. The Marxists in the U.S., however, having virtually no influence with the masses, can do nothing of the sort. We can do nothing tangible to aid the European masses either at home or abroad.

It is therefore incumbent on us to exercise a little modesty in the giving of advice and in the proclaiming of our ERP intransigence.

We believe that the U.S. with nine times the per capita income of the rest of the world should give far more than has been allotted. The American workers should demand that more be given and that there should be no political strings attached. The working class in the U.S. should oppose all imperialist designs of their country, including ERP imperialism. Neither they nor we, the Marxists, should be against the economic aid provisions of the ERP. We should, as best we can, attempt to rally the workers against military aid. We should not be influenced by the childish and pacifist notion that the ERP rebuilt factories will be used to manufacture war material and supplies. Of course they will. Just as in the U.S. But we have not heard any proposals from the anti-ERPers that no more factories be built in the U.S. We are for economic aid and against the military arming of Europe.

The European governments must take the aid from the U.S. The European workers can do nothing about it. Not now. They must take the aid and at the same time be against imperialism. If they are presented with agreements to sign designed against their independence, they will have to sign them. This is the price they and we pay for allowing imperialism to exist in the world. This is the reward of weakness. This is not the first time the weak have had to submit to the strong. This is not the first time that the masses have found themselves powerless in the grip of imperialism.

Whether "European socialists" support their governments or not in signing the EAC is of only scholastic importance. Who are the European socialists? Where are they and what are they doing? Almost all of them are supporting the ERP. And for the wrong reasons. Half of them have sold themselves to Russia and the other half to the U.S. They do not represent the toilers.

We say again that the European masses are caught in the imperialist vise. They must escape but they need time. They need a "breathing spell" and a long one. They need food, clothing and shelter. They need jobs and wages. They need organization: economic and political. They must have time. The Marxists in the U.S. can help them. We can accept our responsibility for organizing the American proletariat to protect the workers of Europe by opposing U. S. imperialism.

In the same Labor Action which carried the resolution of the NC on the Marshall Plan, Comrade Shachtman had an article: "Tug-of-War in Europe..." "In Europe there are no outspoken supporters of American imperialism or the Marshall Plan. There are only apologists for it -- and there is a significant difference between the two. The most that anyone dares say on behalf of American capitalism, or the American government, or the Marshall Plan: After all we are going to get food and economic assistance from the U. S." (Our only comment on Shachtman's statement that there are no outspoken supporters of the Marshall Plan in Europe is that the statement is not true.)

This statement of Shachtman's does not square with the NC resolution. But we let that pass. It is or should be no surprise to

Shachtman that he found no supporters of American imperialism in Europe. Englishmen and Frenchmen have not been traditionally supporters of other imperialisms. I dare say that Shachtman found many Europeans ready to support their own imperialism. What is significant about Shachtman's statement is what he found out about the attitude of the Europeans. They are against American imperialism but willing to take the lures and the fishes: "We are going to get food and economic assistance." That is all we are advocating; that they get the economic assistance represented in the ERP. After that they run their business to suit themselves; no matter what agreements they have signed. The European workers should refuse to be subservient to their own imperialisms, to their own ruling class or to U.S. imperialism. They carry on the class struggle, irrespective of the intentions, the designs or the plans of the U.S. or of the commands of the ERP top officialdom. If they have economic grievances which are not satisfied they strike. When the U.S. seeks to interfere in the internal life of their country they refuse to cooperate. When and if the U.S. begins its program of militarization in Europe the workers fight against and demonstrate against it. They demand that the foreign troops be removed from their country. They do not permit themselves to be bribed by the ERP aid. Their ruling classes will be bribed. They will resent American imperialism because they favor their private imperialism. The workers, however, must carry on the class struggle.

The NC resolution is a dodge; it slides around taking a position on the ERP. It takes a strong position against "American imperialism." It has no program for the European workers. It merely tells them that socialism is the only cure. We who have failed to make any appreciable headway against U. S. imperialism tell the European workers to jump over their own heads: give a "categorical no" to the U. S. imperialists; have principles.

The European workers should not oppose their governments taking the ERP aid. They should call on labor in the U.S. to do its duty by them and hold off the imperialist bloodhounds. The NC resolution is strangely silent on this point. There are two reasons for this. First, the supporters of the resolution are embarrassed by the fact that the Party has no influence in the American working class. Therefore they content themselves with giving meaningless advice to Europe. The other reason is that this resolution is really not a resolution on the ERP. It is primarily a piece dealing with real, alleged or future social-patriotism in the Party on the part of those who believe or who may come to believe that bourgeois-democratic U.S. should be supported against Russia in the war. Specifically the resolution was written at Eber and Garrett.

The NC has only succeeded in mixing a dish of sectarian hash. It will not be a deterrent to social-patriotism nor is it an analysis of the ERP.

The contrasting imperialism to that of capitalism today is Russian imperialism. The Party has already adopted basic positions

on the nature of Stalinism. There is no reason for any revision of the general analysis made in the resolutions adopted by the 1941, 1944 and 1946 conventions of the Party. What we say here proceeds from the basic analysis contained in those resolutions.

The main discussion around Stalinism today flows from the success of Stalinism in Czechoslovakia, and from the threat of Stalinist successes in other countries to the West. Echoes of this discussion appear in the resolution of the PC in its discussion of the bureaucratization of capitalism. The inference that must be drawn from the resolution is the inevitable victory of bureaucratic collectivism because we are told that "In the looming war between Western imperialism and Stalinist imperialism, the victory of the former can be achieved by it only by intensifying precisely those tendencies which push it in the direction of its enemy." If we can understand the English language this can only mean that the U.S., for example, can only win the war with Russia by becoming itself a bureaucratic collectivist state. That is, unless there is proletarian revolution. Since proletarian revolution is not likely unless the war is put off a long time, then the prospect is that at the close of the war the West will be bureaucratic collectivist.

This assumption on the part of the PC is totally unfounded and unnecessary. It is not necessary to explain or predict wartime tightening of government controls. It is not necessary to justify the position of the Party that capitalism is in decline. It is not necessary in order to demonstrate that war has a political content and that it is not merely a contest to determine which side can produce more guns, tanks and planes. It is unfounded because the PC has not and cannot produce any evidence to support its position. Its attempt at justification would pass only among children or scared old ladies. What is the PC's proof again? There is a "war economy," "bureaucratization," "bureaucratic planning," "declining standard of living in the midst of 'full employment' for war production." This is the only proof that the West will go bureaucratic collectivist. It is already on its way to that end. We would also like to know just where is this "declining standard of living in the midst of 'full employment'..." Furthermore, it is necessary it seems to inform the PC that the "full employment" which we know about was caused not by war production but by peacetime production. It is well-known that production since the close of the war has been predominantly civilian production. At the time this is being written wartime production has not gotten under way.

Also we would like to ask, what is the purpose of the quotation marks around the words "full employment" in the PC resolution? Is it the PC's position that there is not full employment?

We will predict that there will be no need for any harsher measures for the prosecution of the war against Russia than for the war against Germany. In all probability there will be less of a tendency away from bourgeois-democracy in the Russian war than in the last. First, the government and the ruling class will probably practice the bourgeois-democratic virtues with meticulous care. Not less, but increased bourgeois-democracy will become an ideological and therefore a military necessity. If there is any "police state" tendency it will come after the war and not before or during the

course of the war. "Bureaucratization" and the rest of the PC's catalogue of woes are "precisely" not "the social prerequisites for gearing capitalism toward victory in the threatened war." The real social prerequisites are more and not less of the practice of bourgeois-democracy. And this is "precisely" what is taking place and not what the PC resolution indicates.

Furthermore, it is improbable that regimentation will be necessary to swing the masses behind their governments in the war against Russia. It is certain that the PC resolution will not help to enlighten and dissuade the masses. The war against Russia is likely to be a more popular war than the war against Germany. Even the PC resolution may aid in this. In no country of the West is there any movement on the part of the labor movement, for instance, to oppose the war preparations. On the contrary, the non-Stalinist organized labor movement in every country is lining up with its government and ruling class in the anti-Russia drive.

The masses of the world need to be educated as to what bureaucratic collectivism is and what Stalinism as a political system is. Despite the 20 year old propaganda of the "Tretskyist" movement, not much has been accomplished. The masses continue to go over to Stalinism, or to oppose Stalinism in a reactionary way. We believe that in part this has been due to the "Tretskyist" opposition to Stalinism appearing to the workers as just a case of the "outs" trying to get "in." This would be the case particularly in the U.S. where the workers are accustomed to campaigns of political bombast carried on between two opposing groups, one out and one in.

There is a very present danger today that the anti-Stalinist education of the masses will be derailed by the creation of the notion of Stalinist impregnability or by the notion which has been advanced in the Party that the Stalinists are likely to be successful because they can offer something to the masses and capitalism can not. This position is based, of course, on the position that Stalinism is anti-capitalist. Stalinism is anti-capitalist but it does not follow from this fact that the workers who follow the Stalinists do so for this reason. It is unquestionable that where they are not dragooned into the Stalinist camp they go there because they believe that they will receive some benefits from so doing. This, however, in itself does not mean even that the bulk of these workers is either anti-capitalist or pro-Stalinist.

It is exceedingly risky to say, for instance, what happened in Czechoslovakia and why. We do not have the necessary information. It seems, however, that there is a more marked "tendency" among the masses to support the bourgeois-democratic imperialists than the Stalinist imperialists. It is our opinion that this tendency will increase.

There is a danger too that in the eyes of the Party, Stalinism will become the main danger in the world. There is more than a hint of this in the convention resolutions of the PC. In fact, some of those who are concerned lest there be "compromise with social-democratic notions," or with "reconciliation to American imperialism," themselves become promoters of this notion in their analysis of Stalinism.

Capitalist imperialism and not Stalinist imperialism is the main enemy. It is unlikely that Russia will be the victor in the coming war. It is exactly because Western imperialism is the probable victor; which means world hegemony, for a time, by the U.S. The defeat of Russia would open up more territory and more millions for capitalist exploitation. This can certainly not be conceived as a victory for the masses of the world. World capitalism can defeat Russia for the same reasons that it defeated Germany and Japan: a predominance of the necessities of war and the political superiority of the bourgeois-democratic nations. There will not be the desertions from the ranks of the bourgeois-democrats that we may expect from the Russian forces. Russia is a police state now. It is not in a state of "tendency," or development toward. Is there anyone who will expect the hundreds of thousands in the Russian slave labor camps to go right on slaving during the war without revolt? Will the millions in the "new democracies" continue as today docile or suppressed? Is there anyone so enamored of his eschatological researches as not to see and understand this? For all the West, therefore, it is capitalist imperialism which is the main enemy.

There are those who gripped by fear at the real and alleged strength of Russia, become the proponents of the theory of the support of "democracy" over against totalitarianism. The real error of these people does not lie so much in their support of bourgeois-democracy over against totalitarianism, but is far deeper. Their real error lies in their lack of understanding of, or their rejection of the whole field of theory and practice covered by the expressions "class society" and "class struggle." They poison the workers with their social-chauvinist notions and make it extremely difficult for the Marxists to make headway against the imperialist warmakers. The PC resolution will not help but only give aid and comfort to the defenders of the support of "the fatherland." The social-patriots see the everlasting flowering of bourgeois-democracy while the supporters of the PC resolution tell us that bourgeois-democracy has already completed its course and that the "police state" is upon us.

A central question in the discussion of Stalinism today is whether or not Stalinism can "set the workers in motion." The question asks whether or not it is possible for the Stalinists, for Russia to inspire a socialist struggle in the ranks of the working class and lead the workers into a working class struggle against capitalism. This question has already been answered in the negative by our analysis of Stalinism as contained in the Party resolutions on this subject. The question is really only a topic for educational discussion. Whether or not the Stalinists can set workers in motion in a socialist way, in a revolutionary way, against capitalism is not really the important question today. What is important is how a totalitarian despotism like Stalinism can succeed in gaining control of masses of workers and regimenting them in the interest of the bureaucracy. To say that the Stalinists can accomplish what they did in Czechoslovakia because bureaucratic collectivism is anti-capitalist is to give far too much weight to the ideological element. Also, this theory looks at the mass of workers, including the politically developed European workers, in an idealized way. The workers are not so advanced that they go consciously to Stalinism because they are consciously anti-capitalist. The Stalinists are skillful and cunning bureaucrats. Their conquest of a country begins

many months before the act is revealed to the world. An example is the new Berlin City Council. This Council is really the nucleus of a larger body to be formed later -- if and when the Stalinists should move to take over the whole of Germany. The final act is a coup d'etat with no resistance because there is no force to organize the resistance.

This leads to a consideration of Stalinist nationalization. This needs considerable clarification just as the concept of "workers state" had to be clarified. Stalinist nationalization needs a new term for its adequate and accurate description. While it is true that nationalization has always meant to be taken over by the state or to become the property of the state, the term did not arise in connection with totalitarian states. In bourgeois society where the notion of nationalization arose, it has always been considered an expansion of democracy, a movement away from class or private control of whatever was proposed for nationalization. Whatever was nationalized ceased to be private property and became public property. Nationalization was considered a "progressive" step. But no one considers Stalinist nationalization as progressive. It is considered reactionary by all outside of the Stalinist ranks and the ranks of their apologists. We would not call for "nationalization under workers control" in any Stalinist dominated country. We do in the U. S.

This means that we must cease to speak of "nationalization" when describing the Stalinist process of making private property into state property. We could say "bureaucratic collectivization."

While it is true that Stalinism has a theory, an ideology, this must not be given undue emphasis. Stalinism is anti-capitalist because the Stalinist bureaucrats found an anti-capitalist situation, an anti-capitalist economy already created and at hand to be grabbed and prostituted by them. The anti-capitalist complexion of Stalinism is somewhat fortuitous. The Stalinists are not in principled opposition to capitalism. It is more profitable and more convenient for them to be anti-capitalist. They are anti-capitalist for reasons similar to those which make a bourgeois a defender of capitalism. The bourgeois draws his support and his power from the exploitation of the worker in his system (capitalism). The Stalinist draws his support and power from the exploitation of the worker in his system (bureaucratic collectivism). There is therefore no reason for the Stalinist bureaucracy to go over to capitalism, that is, so long as Russia remains an independent country. There is no reason to believe that the Stalinist bureaucrats would hesitate to embrace capitalism if faced with a choice between capitalism and destruction. If Stalin is faced with defeat in the war he will be amenable to being "bourgeoisified" or bourgeois-democratized.

Because of its anti-capitalist nature, Stalinism is forced to appeal to the proletariat and to the masses. Stalin found himself with a "workers state with bureaucratic distortions." He extended the distortions and turned the workers state into a bureaucratic state based on the collectivized property. Here again the Stalinists have no principles which impel them toward the proletariat. There have been times when the simulated working class orientation of Stalinism has been very embarrassing to the Kremlin. This has

always been the occasion of a "right turn." For instance, during the war this anti-capitalist bureaucracy saw fit to defend capitalism, even against such mild detractors as the liberals and the Socialist Party. Stalinism too has its contradictions.

Stalinism is force; bare brute force, stark and ruthless. It is terroristic and addicted to frame-up techniques and procedures. Its ideology is fabricated on demand to fit the needs of the moment. It falsifies history; It can be extremely nationalistic. It is a dictatorship which elevates a chosen few to economic eminence, but also a dictatorship which increases in numbers until it rests heavily on the whole country. This is the only significant way in which Stalinism and Hitlerism are "symmetrical phenomena."

It is because it is a dictatorship, a bureaucracy and a regime nurtured and sustained by brute force, stealth, dissimulation, craftiness, slavery and murder, that the Stalinists have been able to establish their hegemony in the relatively diminutive East European countries. These qualities are the primary factor in the success of Stalinism. Stalinism today does not appeal to genuinely advanced workers. Advanced workers, as a rule, who adhere to Stalinism are either Stalinist "politicals" or workers who have accepted Stalinist bribes. The masses who march in the Stalinist parades are workers and peasants who are distraught with poverty or ignorance or who feeling that there is no alternative, choose to be part of the Stalinist front. Before any Marxist condemns the East European workers for this it would be the decent thing for such Marxists to place themselves at the disposal of these workers and at their side; or if dealing with the problem from afar, at least provide them with some sort of tangible alternative.

It is necessary in closing our discussion of Stalinism to say something on the Party anti-Stalinist propaganda. The "Trotskyist movement (WP and S/P) have been leading experts on Stalinism for 20 years. We have been the most intransigent, irreconcilable and uncompromising of the world's anti-Stalinists. Perhaps a major portion of our propaganda has been devoted to Stalinism. To date, however, the "Trotskyist" movement has not made a visible dent in Stalinism. Not only this, but we have not been able to profit politically and organizationally by our anti-Stalinist politics. We have not been able to convince workers that we are objective in our anti-Stalinism or that it is not a "family quarrel," or that we would be any better if we were "in power."

One reason for our failure might be that we have become too much the professional anti-Stalinists. Furthermore, we have fought the Stalinists usually only in a literary way in the columns of our press and from the platform in our own meetings. We have not succeeded in coming to grips with the Stalinists in the unions. In fact, from time to time, there has been a tendency to try to get into those plants and locals where "there are no Stalinists." It will be necessary for the Party to give attention to its anti-Stalinist propaganda, particularly now that the workers are beginning definitely to turn away from the Stalinist party. In making a change it might be well to act with greater tolerance toward those seduced by the Stalinists, to allow more time for workers to come to an understanding of Stalinism and not seek to make them into anti-Stalinists

all in one day or one session. Furthermore, we have cast ourselves in the role of anti-Stalinist saviors but we have not been able to impress many with our power to save. We are so jealous of our role as the original anti-Stalinists that we are apt not to welcome into the anti-Stalinist ranks those who have come "late."

In the turmoil and uncertainty of today the workers of the world have no place to go. Today it is possible and necessary to say with complete seriousness that "the present crisis in human culture is the crisis in the proletarian leadership." It is time that every Marxist and every revolutionary faced this fact in all humbleness. It is high time that all of us ceased from our interminable literary advice to the toilers of the world and gave our attention to devising practical ways and means to enter their ranks and to achieve the conscious cooperation and allegiance of just a few workers, if that is all that we can reach. The Marxists must begin to think more and more of practical everyday activity. The masses cannot wait for us to straighten out every facet of doctrine and to get every theory impeccably and impregnably formulated. There is enough theoretical Marxism and enough of current political writing among the Marxists and revolutionaries of the world to build the most substantial organization the working class has ever known. What is lacking is intellectual and moral toughness in the face of the present assault on Marxism; the ability to step resolutely into practical organizational activity and to stay there, and a grasp of effective methods of propaganda. This applies to the WP as to the other "Trotskyist" organizations. We are weak and flabby - intellectually, morally and organizationally. This means that these organizations are weak and flabby politically, if this term is to mean anything more than the ability to write formally correct resolutions.

We assume that the resolution of the PC attempts to deal with this question. But what do we get. A parade of new and half-baked theories combined with warnings about the bogey-man of social-patriotism. The masses of the world "ask for bread" and we "hand them a stone."

The peoples of the world have faced the terrible fact of the degeneration of the October Revolution, the savagery of the Hitler period, the complete distortion of the teachings of Marx and Lenin, the flabby gyrations of Social-Democracy, the ludicrous but tragic flop of the Fourth International and, above all, the spectacle of socialism and communism being carried on the slime-covered banner of Stalin. Faced with the alternatives - the Stalinist ranks or the ranks of the bourgeois-democratic imperialists - millions of us have wandered off in either direction.

For twenty or more years there has been no other organizational alternative. There is none today. Those working class parties in Europe which are not plainly bankrupt are participating integrally in the imperialist revelry. The Social-Democratic parties of continental Europe are in solid collaboration with Washington or have betrayed the people into the hands of Stalin. The British Labor Party for all its "good works" is no less the defender of Britain's

imperialist interests than was the party of the Tory Churchill. Churchill the Tory did not take office to "sit in at the liquidation of His Majesty's empire" and neither did the "socialist" Attlee. The Attlee-Bevin government nationalizes the coal industry and establishes a very progressive medical plan today but on the morrow prepares to "defend" the empire against Israeli "aggression."

The people are caught between the Russian whip, American hypocrisy and the efforts of Britain to remain a going world empire. It is idle to talk about the "hatred" of the people for capitalism or their desire for socialism. What they "hate" and what they "desire" are equally vague. To the extent that their hates and desires are clearly articulated, they do not even have the facility for carrying them out. And today there is no one to help them. If the Marxists do not get this firmly fixed in their heads, we will also contribute to the discomfiture and the eventual rout of the people. Because if we do not assimilate the lessons of the present stagnation of Marxism, we will be either sterile chatterers or adventurist and pompous demagogues.

It is false and not entirely honest for the Marxists to say that the "primary" cause of the present condition of the working class movement is the Stalinists and Stalinism. This is only true on a wide world scale and in connection with the set back of the working class because there were no revolutions after October. This cannot be invoked, however, to explain the tremendous failure of the "Trotskyist" organizations to gain any noticeable influence in any country or the failure of the mass Social-Democratic parties to lead the masses away from social-reformism. The Stalinist corruption of October and their world-wide totalitarian exploits do not explain why the Marxian groups could not make headway with the anti-Stalinist militant workers, of whom there are millions.

We are dealing with the world as it is today. We are attempting to see the total situation: inside and outside the general labor movement. The war drums beat again, the recruiting sergeants are at their posts, the apologists prepare their hymns of hate and the priests are ready to drone out their prayers to their imperialist god, for the victory of their own capitalist employers. We live in a period bearing a resemblance to that of the "Hundred Year's War." We do not speak of the social content but of the outward resemblances: length, periods of "peace" etc. We live in a period of victory without peace.

The working people of the world have a job to do and only the working people can do this job, perform this task. If they do not do the job it will not be done. They can and must have friends and allies but they must accept the responsibility for leading and bearing the brunt of the task. They cannot depend on the "friends of labor" to hold out after the fair weather has gone. This is particularly applicable to the middle class intellectuals and radicals who rush to the fore with banners flying, in the pre-war days. We have seen in two world wars now what they do after the war begins. Also, these intellectuals are amenable to Stalinist pressure, Stalinist flattery and Stalinist bribery.

One of the first tasks of the working people of the world is to

initiate a struggle against those nationalist tendencies which divide the workers of all countries. For the German workers to demand the removal of the armies of occupation from their country does not mean that German workers are justified in entertaining feelings of hatred for the workers of France, England and the U. S. The British and French workers are in duty bound to reject the invitation of their ruling classes to join these ruling classes in chauvinist attacks on the German workers. Labor in the U. S. must never again be beguiled by the sly voice of our capitalists as they seek our support for their high tariff measures, with the cry of competing commodities made by "cheap foreign labor." It is the clear duty of the workers of the world to chrow off the shackles of chauvinism of narrow petty-bourgeois nationalism and to orient toward the world community of labor.

It is necessary to emphasize certain responsibilities of the workers in the "white" nations. First their duty to the workers and masses of non-white Japan, who are at present under the heel of a foreign army of occupation. We must demand that this army be withdrawn and Japanese national independence restored. These same workers and their organizations, if they are true to genuine working class ideals, will interest themselves in a working class way in the plight of the non-white colonial masses all over the world. This will include particularly the millions of China and Africa. These colonial masses are the natural allies of the world proletariat as this proletariat struggles for its own liberation. The colonial slaves, however, can only play their part under the leadership and guidance of the "free" labor movements of the world. The European workers have a responsibility toward the situation in the U.S. as it relates to the Negro. It is their duty to prod the labor movement in the U.S. toward a correct and more militant working class attitude on this question.

The working class of every country must divest itself of its narrowness and its nationalistic and chauvinist prejudices. This means, of course, that the workers of all countries must deliver themselves from the leading strings of their own bourgeoisie. Support for all movements for national independence: European, Asiatic and colonial. Support for the demand that the troops and armies of the invaders and conquerors be removed. These are everywhere objectively anti-imperialist demands. Against the designs of one's own ruling class to violate the national independence of any other country, to continue the subjection of the colonial peoples or to divide the working people of any country from those of any other country.

Effective and practical steps toward these ends must be initiated by the working class in the U.S. and by the American organized labor movement. The reasons for this should be fairly obvious. The U.S. is the wealthiest of all the imperialist countries. It is today the dominant imperialist and will likely remain so for the duration of capitalism. Washington is the world capital of imperialism. The U.S. must become the world center of the drive against capitalism and imperialism. Labor in the U.S. must lead. It must lead, not as now, by merely echoing the State Department and the White House, but in an independent working class way and with an independent working class program. American labor should

take the lead and propose a charter of freedom for the workers and toilers of the world. The first step in this direction, of course, is for the American labor movement to free itself from U. S. imperialism.

The call comes to the working people of the world, to all the toilers everywhere; in the city, the countryside and the colonies to gird themselves for the assumption of leadership. We do not ask the colonial masses to wait but to march together with their kind in the capitalist countries, for the saving of civilization from extinction. By the saving of civilization we mean not only to keep what is worth having of bourgeois civilization but to lay the foundations for the birth of a new civilization. To open the way through which the creative energies of the masses may flow - the masses all over the world, irrespective of race, color or nationality.

To save a civilization in any significant way must mean to break down every barrier which divides one human being, in any social way, from any other human being.

To save civilization must mean that the natural resources of the earth are available to all the peoples and to every nation. That scientific discovery, technological invention and organizational resources shall be placed freely at the disposal of all and not as now become a private monopoly. And not only a private monopoly but also national monopolies. It is indicative of what is taking place when even the exchange of theoretical information and abstract mathematical formulae become "restricted information" and the property of governments.

To save civilization must mean to house, clothe and feed adequately every human being on the earth. To provide for the education and the healing of all. To reduce infant mortality everywhere and to increase the longevity of all people. Yes "a quart of milk for every Hottentot."

To save civilization means to eliminate the monstrous and barbaric situation in which the people of Europe, Asia and Africa find themselves. Hunger, nakedness, starvation - two-thirds of humanity on a sub-standard diet.

To save civilization must not mean merely to preserve the civilization of the West, that is, "white" civilization. It must mean to preserve and liberate the genius of the non-white peoples also. The Indians, Japanese, African, Chinese, etc. These are, in fact, the majority of the world's population. To talk of the destruction of civilization, say by the atom bomb, meaning the destruction of the West, is to say that there can be no civilization save "white" civilization. Where this is naive or unconscious we can say that it is merely a mild form of white chauvinism.

The toilers of the world are faced with the task, not so much of saving civilization, as we know it, but of creating a new civilization. The bricks out of which the future civilization of the people must be built are to be found everywhere, among all the people: the people of the East, the West, the North and the South.

It is true that the backbone, or the central nervous system of this movement must be the world proletariat, every toiler must be assigned a place in the struggle for the great world community of all the people.

These are great tasks for the working men and women of the world. Not much progress can be made toward the achievement of the goals set forth here until a big transformation has taken place among the workers and their organizations. The toilers need the inspiration and guidance of the great social and political thinkers of our class: the great Marxian scholars, leaders and organizers. The capitalist dictators of all countries like to tell the workers that they should beware of socialism as though it were poison. They talk about "regimentation" and the evils of a "planned society." They sing the praises of "free enterprise" and tell us that if we will only produce more, we will have more to eat and wear; also that if the working people want more homes, they should produce more houses.

The way out of war, misery, unemployment, exploitation, race and national hatreds and all manner of insecurity to which the masses are subjected by the capitalist dictatorship is to do away with the exploiting, oppressing, robbing, war-making and life destroying capitalist social order in every country, by the establishment of workers governments in every country.

Working men, women and youth, the world over, must be prepared to follow the teachings of real Marxism and not the perversion of the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Labor must not permit itself to be stampeded into accepting the lies of the capitalists, that what we see in Russia is real socialism and that socialism is really a system of oppression, the destruction of the home and the enslaving of mankind. These are the lies trumpeted through the world by the capitalist brigands and their hired servants. Unfortunately, they are aided in this campaign of lies and slander by leaders in the labor movement. Labor must fight and oppose the terrible and orgiastic degradation of all working class principles, of all genuine freedom, of every shred of intellectual honesty, of every proletarian decency which takes place today in the Russia of Stalin. In its oppression, its exploitation, its barbarism, its lies and slanders, its cruelties, the Russia of Stalin is no part of socialism, no part of what Marx and Engels and Lenin taught. It is capitalism and capitalist imperialism that Stalinism is kin to. This can be understood very clearly if one compares the Stalinist system, which is not capitalism but bureaucratic collectivism, with German fascism, which was capitalism. Both systems - Stalinism and fascism - are harsh, oppressive, exploiting, imperialist. Both enslave the people and rule by police methods and concentration camps. The capitalists of the "democracies," the United Nations capitalist countries, got along very well with fascist Germany until they were attacked by Germany. These same countries got along very well with bureaucratic Russia when they were together fighting against Germany. The capitalist dictators have no difficulty in nesting with other dictators when they find it profitable. What the

working people must remember is that their capitalist masters in every country have always been ready to side with any group which is dedicated to exploiting, plundering and oppressing the masses. That is as true today as it has ever been. The present line-ups on the international scene are not necessarily long-lasting. While it is highly probable that the next war will be between the Russian bloc and the U. S. bloc, this does not mean that the line-up which fights the war will last after the war is over.

While it is correct to charge the toilers of the world as to their duties, obligations and functions, the main responsibility lies with the Marxists, the revolutionists. Genuine Marxism is at low tide. This title today can only be given to several small and ineffective groups, most of whom call themselves "Trotskyist." The intellectual level of the Marxian leadership is low indeed. As a political leadership it is generally incompetent and tends to substitute stale theorizing and sophisticated manifestoes for sound and concrete political analysis. This is a big part of the reasons for the failure of the Marxian movement to grow. To attribute the failure of the "Trotskyist" movement to the power and influence of Stalinism is merely to refuse to face one's own failures and weaknesses, and to ignore the necessity for setting one's own house in order.

This is not to ignore or underrate the real importance for the revolutionary movement of the degeneration of the October Revolution under the blows of the Stalinist bureaucracy. But we can add that the success of bourgeois-democratic propaganda has also played its part: it too is part of the "objective situation." But it is precisely these untoward "objective conditions" which Marxists are called upon not only to analyze correctly but to devise means for overcoming. And Marxists must learn to do this without copious excuse-making. Marxian revolutionaries must not acquire the habit of substituting "good" excuses for non-performance. One can spend a great deal of time and work up a fair-sounding or clever excuse for failure, but forget that the task is still undone. To become expert at explaining why we failed and whose fault it was will never produce or aid in producing real parties.

Workers have the right to expect more from the Marxists than excuse-making. Those of us who go to the workers of the world with advice, particularly with advice about selecting a labor leadership and program, must be able to demonstrate with some concreteness that we know what we are talking about. The fact that we can write resolutions, concoct new theories and give advice is no proof that we know what we are talking about. We must be able to relate a few successes and not just a series of failures for which we have, what in our opinion are, good excuses and explanations. Workers at least know that the trade union bureaucracy will get them some little addition to their wages. What will we, the Marxists, get them? We ourselves are unsure and vague. We are convinced, however, that we might do something if it were not for omnipresent and omnipotent Stalinism. The working class will not accept this. They are correct not to accept it.

The best equipped group to deal with this unfavorable situation is the Workers Party of the United States. In order to begin to play such a role, however, it will be necessary for the WP to free itself from the blemishes outlined above. The WP certainly cannot plead not guilty to the charges cited above. The WP is in a favorable position today. The U. S. is the richest of countries, here is the largest proletariat in the world, the largest organized labor group, the best placed proletariat economically and a working class full of vigor and completely lacking in pessimism. Since the close of the war there has been full employment in the U.S. There has been no serious or obstructing abridgement of bourgeois-democratic privileges. What influence has been wielded by the Stalinists has been steadily on the wane since the war. They have virtually no influence in the labor movement today.

This is an extremely favorable situation for the development and growth of the Marxian party. This is a challenge to the WP in the U.S. In order to meet this challenge, the WP must pull itself up (even if by its bootstraps, even to "jumping over its own head). Not only must the WP make good in the U.S. but at the same time the Party must constitute itself a Marxian center for planned and persistent propaganda to every corner of the earth where we can reach readers and organizers. In the world of today, we of the WP and the whole working class in the U.S. live in relative luxury. We have not bent our backs yet nor have we shouldered our proper load.

These must be developed a hardened, firmly disciplined, thoroughly educated, experienced, mature and militant proletarian cadre in the U.S. capable of giving working class assistance and eventual leadership to toilers all over the world. This party must be able to withstand the assaults of its own bourgeoisie and of world imperialism. This party must be able to stand fast against all the detractors of Marxism: bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, reformist or Stalinist. It will only do this if it is a proletarian cadre trained in the principles and tactics of Marxism. This party will maintain a proper Marxian intransigence. It will not compromise with the vagaries of those who want to explore the possibilities of reforming capitalism; or those who are not sure than the working class can lead; or who are not convinced of the "viability" of socialism. To use a term which timid souls eschew today: it must be a Bolshevik nucleus on the road to becoming a Bolshevik mass party.

#

(To be submitted to the Pre-Convention meeting of the National Committee - February 17, 1949.)