

INSIDE: SWP AND MARXIST THEORY

Bulletin

OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Vol. 1, No. 6

Nov. 23, 1964

10 Cents



A Freedom School in Rulesville, Miss. What will Johnson do for the Negroes now that he is elected?

Did Barry Goldwater Really Lose?

To many who have considered the U.S. two-party political system as the best of all possible systems, the candidacy of Senator Goldwater created some nagging doubts. The mass media are now trying to erase these doubts with some extremely misleading election post-mortems.

Goldwater ran on an openly reactionary program, catering more openly to racism than capitalist candidates have in the past. The candidate representing the vast majority sentiment of the capitalist ruling class, Lyndon Johnson, won handily. Johnson ran on the usual "liberal" program, paying lip service to peace while continuing the war in South Vietnam; paying lip service to prosperity and job security while doing nothing to help the millions unemployed or threatened with unemployment; paying lip service to equal rights while doing nothing for the Southern

INSIDE: SWP AND MARXIST THEORY

Bulletin

OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Vol. 1, No. 6

Nov. 23, 1964

10 Cents



A Freedom School in Rulesville, Miss. What will Johnson do for the Negroes now that he is elected?

Did Barry Goldwater Really Lose?

To many who have considered the U.S. two-party political system as the best of all possible systems, the candidacy of Senator Goldwater created some nagging doubts. The mass media are now trying to erase these doubts with some extremely misleading election post-mortems.

Goldwater ran on an openly reactionary program, catering more openly to racism than capitalist candidates have in the past. The candidate representing the vast majority sentiment of the capitalist ruling class, Lyndon Johnson, won handily. Johnson ran on the usual "liberal" program, paying lip service to peace while continuing the war in South Vietnam; paying lip service to prosperity and job security while doing nothing to help the millions unemployed or threatened with unemployment; paying lip service to equal rights while doing nothing for the Southern



A Freedom School in Rulesville, Miss. What will Johnson do for the Negroes now that he is elected?

Negro and even less than nothing for the Northern Negro. Despite the sham nature of Johnson's civil rights and anti-poverty legislation, he was able to gather around him the established leaderships of the Negro movement and the bureaucratic leaderships of the labor movement almost to a man, and thus secured the biggest multi-class bloc of support since Roosevelt's heyday in the 1930s. It was this combination of capitalists voting for the man who best represented their long range interests, and workers voting for the "lesser evil" who doesn't represent their interests in any short or long term sense, which administered the defeat to Goldwater.

An unmitigated disaster for the Republican Party, the liberal commentators tell us. These pompous preachers, in the press and on radio and television, tell us that the Goldwater candidacy defied the natural laws of American politics, and those Republicans (as well as any one else who may be thinking along lines of introducing ideological difference into American politics) had better learn their lesson. U.S. politics, it seems, has always been and always will be a choice between candidates debating methods and not general goals. Not only is capitalism here to stay and the contest to be limited to capitalist parties every four years, but these parties had also better see to it that they do not get involved in ideological battle. We need a choice, but not too much of a choice, even between different capitalist candidates.

This kind of reasoning has been, perhaps, expressed clearest by the Editorial Board of the New York Times. The Times said, the day after the election, in their editorial entitled, "Choice, Not Revolution":

Although Senator Goldwater in his concession statement yesterday refused to recognize that the voters had clearly rejected his version of conservatism, the election results demonstrate once again that no healthy, stable society wants to confront a sharp political choice between severely defined extremes. Only when a country is in serious trouble as the United States was during the depression of 1932 does it want to make a radical break with its immediate past. In ordering their domestic affairs at home and in operating as a nation in the dangerous, unsettled world, the American people have too many enduring interests to permit sudden shifts in government policy.

When a political party defies this truism, it meets the fate the Republicans encountered this week. As soon as the Republican party reconstitutes itself once again as a reasonable, responsible, modern-minded party, it will be in a position to offer the voters a reasonable choice.

The main blind spot in the Times' analysis is

their refusal to recognize that the U.S. is in "serious trouble," as they grant it was in 1932. But that is the whole meaning of the 1964 election, which the Times prefers, of course, not to see.

Thus the liberals insist on the eternal nature of the non-ideological confrontation of two capitalist parties. But this system has long ago outlived any progressive role, and has been prolonged only with the aid of bureaucratic leaderships in the labor and Negro movement. Now, in 1964, we see real signs of decay in the bourgeois political structure. Beneath the surface calm and stability of Johnson's victory, lie the crisis and contradictions which led to the rise of Goldwaterism in the first place. The liberals stumble blindly on, not answering Goldwater in any fundamental sense, and voting their confidence in the very status quo that produced Goldwaterism and that will produce much worse in the future.

Goldwaterism Still Remains

The frustrations of a section of the bourgeoisie and of middle class layers of the population is not ended by Johnson's victory, massive as it is in comparison with past campaigns. If the moderates take complete control of the Republican Party (which is by no means guaranteed), this polarization on the right will simply find expression outside the two party framework, as it already is in such organizations as the Conservative Party in New York State, the John Birch Society, and many other more extreme groups. On the other side, the growing frustration of the Negro masses and sections of the white workers who are being hit by automation will not cease with Johnson's victory either. Socialists must recognize the growing crisis and prepare by fighting for independent working class political action in the Negro movement, in the union movement, and among the unemployed and unorganized.

It is important to note that the percentage of eligible voters who voted was well below the high of 63% in the 1960 presidential election. The masses of people are by no means solidly behind Johnson. About 40% of the population, consisting primarily of people too busy keeping their families fed, clothed, and housed at the minimum standards to bother with such things as elections, did not vote. Thus, of the total eligible voters, Johnson got only about 37% and Goldwater 23%.

SWP Campaign Is a Failure

The independent and socialist protest campaigns, including the Socialist Workers Party presidential campaign for which the Bulletin advocated support, nowhere made a really significant impact. The SWP made no serious attempt to relate their election campaign to the real struggles of the masses--struggles which the SWP has failed over the

past few years to involve itself in. Its essential appeal was to the tired old radicals who used to vote for the American Labor Party and, to some extent, the students. But these middle class forces were overwhelmingly behind Johnson and so we can expect that the SWP vote will be the smallest it has been for many, many, years.

We are very pleased, however, with the proposal of the Progressive Labor Movement for a united independent workingclass campaign in New York next year. As Progressive Labor has involved itself more than any other radical group in the actual struggles of the masses there is a hope that whatever electoral efforts they initiate will also be oriented towards the masses themselves rather than the middle class radicals. All electoral activity on the part of socialists must be taken in conjunction with steady and consistent work in the working class, and never as a substitute for that work.

REUTHER STILL FAILS TO BRING 'LABOR PEACE'

Strikes Hit Ford Plants, Mack, Allis Chalmers, Tool Shops

From the very beginning of its existence in September of this year, this Bulletin has devoted as much attention as space permitted to the development of the class struggle in the U.S. automobile industry. What Walter P. Reuther (who denies the existence of this class struggle) hoped and fervently worked for was that the contract negotiations between the UAW and the auto companies would be something like a picnic in the country---a picnic where "labor" would sit down with management, and after a few rounds of playful backslapping, the bureaucrats and the plutocrats would emerge to announce that a settlement had been made and that there would be no strike. Reuther would then be free to devote full time to his main preoccupation, the campaign to re-elect Johnson.

Yes, Mr. Reuther had a hope back in August, but it was an empty dream, a big bubble that was burst by the reality of the class struggle. As of this writing, almost three months after the contract negotiations began in earnest, the industry is still troubled with the "restlessness" of disgruntled workers: strikes by some 23,000 workers have shut down all operations of the Mack Truck and Allis Chalmers Companies as well as all the parts shops represented by the Detroit Tooling Association and, in addition, at nine of the Ford Company's key plants, over 25,000 production workers are out on strike over "local" issues even though a national contract was signed on Sept. 18th.

As we have indicated in previous articles, the contracts negotiated with the auto producers are miserable palliatives which don't begin to solve the fundamental problems for the workers of job security and decent on-the-

job conditions. The result, in an industry where the employers are constantly seeking means to cut back on labor costs and squeeze more production out of each workers has been an increase in the widespread anger and frustration among the ranks of the UAW. At GM where conditions are the worst and the company to this day runs things with an iron hand, the local strikes showed that many auto worker are more than willing to fight. If their fight brings little or no solution to the basic problems, it is first of all because of the two-faced Reutherite International leadership which prefers "peaceful co-existence" rather than a struggle to challenge GM's proclaimed prerogative to "operate an efficient business." While the local bureaucrats are more susceptible to rank and file pressure, these leaders generally have no program or desire to challenge the Reuther leadership.

The Militant Is Surprised

In the Nov. 2nd Militant, a socialist weekly which represents the ideas of the Socialist Workers Party, an article by William Bundy quite correctly observes: "The real story of this GM strike is that it has been an attempt by Reuther to allow the rank and file to 'blow off steam' in a well controlled national strike and then in the local strikes without ever coming to grips with the problems that caused the steam to build up in the first place." Bundy then concludes, "The most remarkable thing about the strike is that it revealed the existence of more steam than almost anyone expected." We assume that the "almost anyone" that Bundy refers to is himself and his associates on the Militant staff along with the middle class radical friends of the Socialist Workers Party who are even less concerned with the trade union struggle. The fact is that almost no one who is really concerned about and familiar with conditions in the GM plants and the mood of the GM workers could be surprised at the quantity of steam.

In contrast with the Militant's overly abstract and episodic coverage of the developments in auto, are the excellent articles by Walter Linder in Challenge, a socialist weekly published in New York by the Progressive Labor Movement. The Oct. 3rd and Oct. 20th articles report on interviews with production workers at the Linden, N.J. and North Tarrytown, N.Y. GM plants. Any of our readers who accepts the mythology that in today's America there is no exploitation of labor, no class struggle, or thinks that American industrial workers are hopelessly complacent and apathetic should read these articles.

"For the work you do, they treat you like a slave. It's run just like a military outfit," said one worker at the Tarrytown plant whose sentiment was "echoed by every picket interviewed at the plant gates." A 14 year Fisher Body worker said, "From 6 A.M. until the end of the day you don't have time to put a cigarette down and pick it

up at the same time between moves of the line." As for "relief," he had this to say: "When you got to go to the bathroom, you have to wait for a relief man to cover your job on the line. If he's relieving someone else, you have to wait until the other guy gets back. Many's the time when I was a relief man, when I couldn't get to a guy soon enough and he had to throw out his clothes 'cause he never made it to the toilet." But woe to the man who leaves the line without relief--he gets "suspended for a week or so."

If a man is fortunate enough to keep his job in the face of automation and rationalization, he still has to withstand the "speedup." One old timer at the Linden plant said: "If you slow up they don't want you...I couldn't keep up with the line so I had to take a janitor's job and a pay cut or get out. They stand over you on the line, watching every motion, to figure out how to add motions to each guy and then lay off others." And if you can survive the speedup, you might get replaced by a machine. Employment at the Linden plant is down from 5000 to 2500 in the memory of one of the workers who said that while "we're out picketing they're installing stuff inside that will lay off 300 more by the time the strike's over."

As for Reuther's famous contract with GM, a fairly typical reaction given by one of the Linden workers was: "Reuther's the best Vice President GM ever had." The feeling about the local leadership both at Linden and Tarrytown was generally that they had been "bought off" by either the Company or by Reuther, or at best played an equivocating fence-sitting role. Clearly, a new leadership must be built in the UAW to challenge and defeat the Reuther machine, starting at the local level. Such a leadership drawn directly from the militant rank and file will have to be able to withstand all sorts of red-baiting, race-baiting and general persecution organized by both the auto corporations and the International leadership. Revolutionary socialists should encourage and involve themselves in any way possible in the creation of rank and file caucuses which can provide a class struggle program and leadership aimed at taking the UAW away from Reuther and giving it back to the workers.

THE SWP AND MARXIST THEORY

SWP and Its International Allies Betray Their Bankruptcy

Through Their Inability to Understand the Crisis of Stalinism

The present world is in constant flux, constant change. Instability is the key everywhere. Never before has it been more important than today to understand the basic contradictions within reality by means of the Marxist method. Without such an understanding the working class is

blind and cannot achieve world supremacy.

Long ago those sections of the Fourth International which were under the leadership of Michel Pablo abandoned any serious attempt to master the Marxist method and have impressionistically drifted from event to event ever since. More recently the Socialist Workers Party has seen fit to join the Pabloites in their international meanderings. They now call themselves the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

The complete theoretical bankruptcy of this formation can be seen from a study of their declaration on the Khrushchev ouster issued Oct. 19th and printed in the November 2nd issue of the Militant. This declaration addresses itself to the important question of why the USSR bureaucracy dumped Khrushchev. It is precisely this question that these people cannot begin to answer.

The declaration documents well enough what everyone already knows--that there is a deep internal crisis within the USSR. Agriculture is in a mess; economic growth as a whole is lagging; relations within the Soviet Bloc are in shambles; the international position of the USSR is deeply compromised. That Khrushchev has been dumped as a scapegoat for all these failures and that the new Kremlin leaders have no real alternative to Khrushchev's policies is also well understood by all. The real question to which Marxists must address themselves lies deeper than this: what are the fundamental contradictions within the Stalinist system which have produced this crisis and what is the solution to these contradictions? It is here that the Pabloites show their total bankruptcy.

For instance the declaration states:

It was impossible at one and the same time to maintain a rapid improvement in the standard of living for the masses, to keep up with the imperialist powers in the armaments race, grant increasing aid to the colonial bourgeoisie, undertake feverish construction of homes, and increase the volume of investment on the colossal scale needed to maintain a constant high rate of industrial expansion.

Of course it has been impossible for Khrushchev to do all these things. But these are things which must be done if the USSR is both to survive in an imperialist dominated world and allow for at least a moderate bettering of the conditions of its people. The real question is why this has been impossible and what would make it possible to achieve such necessary goals.

Here the only suggestion the declaration makes--and it is not at all clear on this point--can be found in

the following sentence: "Khrushchev was not ready to take the 'big leap forward' that would have been possible with the introduction of democratic planning and workers' self management." It is undoubtedly true that bureaucratic mismanagement has aggravated the economic problems of the USSR and that the direct participation of the working class in the direction of the economy would help the economic development of the country immensely. But it would not remove the weight of armaments production imposed upon the USSR by the imperialists. It would not provide the resources for the development of a chemical industry so essential to further development of agriculture. It would not by itself allow the central planning commission to allocate more of the economy to consumers goods production while at the same time pacing heavy industrial production at a level necessary for overall economic growth. The workers would be in a position to make decisions but they could only make decisions within the framework of the world situation the USSR finds itself in.

They Fail to Understand Trotsky's Analysis

The Pabloites are unable to probe deeper than this superficial analysis because they no longer uphold Trotsky's theoretical understanding of the workers states. Trotsky saw the Soviet state as a workers state which had degenerated in the direction of capitalism. The fundamental cause of this degeneration was the isolation of the USSR in a backward country in a world dominated by capitalism. Within this framework a bureaucracy grew up which continually undermines the working class foundations in the country though so far it has been unable to totally destroy them. The solution of this fundamental contradiction of the USSR as a workers state in a world dominated by capitalism is of course the spread of the revolution to the advanced capitalist countries. Unless this was accomplished, Trotsky felt, the USSR could not survive indefinitely.

The Pabloites as early as 1949 and 1950 fundamentally revised this theoretical outlook by removing from it its heart. No longer was the USSR isolated in a predominantly capitalist world, they stated. No longer was it conceivable for the USSR to be overthrown internally through capitalist restoration. The USSR could only develop upward and onward towards the future communist society in the spirit of Doctor Pangloss.

The basic document of the Fourth World Congress of the Pabloites, held in 1954, was "The Rise and Decline of Stalinism." This document claimed that:

...the coming decisive battle will not be waged between the restorationist forces launching an offensive to restore private property, and the forces defending the conquests of October. It will be, on the contrary, waged between the forces

defending the privileges and administration of the bureaucracy against the assault of the revolutionary forces of the working class embarking on the struggle for the restoration of soviet democracy upon a higher level.

Thus the Pabloites in 1954 saw Stalinism so strengthened that there was no longer any real threat of capitalist restorationism through the mechanism of the bureaucracy and its policies. At the time that this document was written the SWP characterized it as "revisionist" in part precisely because of this kind of formulation.

Today the SWP claims that the Fifth World Congress of the Pabloites, which was held in 1957 after the Hungarian and Polish uprisings, marked a turning point for the Pabloites at which they corrected their past errors. In actual fact this Congress reaffirmed the essential outlook on Stalinism taken at the Fourth World Congress. Ernest Germain, today the fairhaired boy of the SWP, specifically motivated this revisionist theory in his report of the Congress on the question of Stalinism:

...towards the end of the Second World War, with the victory of the Yugoslav revolution, the victory of the Chinese revolution, and the spread of the colonial revolution, with the enormous progress of the Soviet economy, it became clear that the relationship of forces was turning in favor of Revolution on the world scale.

Under these conditions, to hang on to an alternative prospect, at least for short or medium term forecasts, meant to substitute vulgar eclectics for Marxist dialectics. To repeat in 1953 what had been true in 1933, i.e. that the USSR could experience either the reestablishment of capitalism or political revolution was to change Trotskyist theory from an instrument of analysis of reality into a collection of ritual formulae. It meant refusing to settle a question which had already been settled for a whole historical period at Stalingrad, Belgrad, Peking, Dien-Bien-Phu, and on the Yalu, where capitalism has been dealt such powerful blows that its reestablishment in a short time in the USSR was no longer a possibility. (emphasis ours)

In 1961 the Socialist Workers Party incorporated this essential theoretical outlook in its international resolution "The Struggle Between the Socialist and Capitalist Camps." This resolution declared that "The victory of the Chinese Revolution in 1949, coupled with the setback of American imperialism in Korea in 1952, definitively altered the world relation of forces in favor of socialism." It also stated categorically: "The Soviet Union is no longer isolated internationally."

It Is Capitalist Dominance that Causes Crisis

However the current crisis of Stalinism has been brought about precisely because the world relation of forces continues to be in the favor of the capitalists, and the USSR and the other workers states continue to remain encircled by the imperialist powers. It is the combined weight of military power of the imperialists and the economic dominance of the world capitalist market which has brought about the deep internal economic crisis of Stalinism. All the diplomatic maneuverings of Khrushchev as well as the divergent policies of the various workers states are vain attempts to break out of this position of subordination to the capitalist world. The expansion of Stalinism into Eastern Europe and China--predominantly backward economic areas--in reality has only expanded the problems of Stalinism rather than solving them.

How dangerous can be a failure to understand this fundamental contradiction of Stalinism is illustrated on other pages of the November 2nd Militant. A front page article by one Dick Roberts happily reports on the independence evinced by the various workers states and Communist Parties in their reaction to the Khrushchev ouster. But independence from the Kremlin is not at all an automatically progressive development. This is especially true when it is abundantly clear that the East European bureaucracies seek independence only to become even more deeply enmeshed in the world capitalist market and develop closer ties with the imperialists than would be possible if they remained absolutely subservient to the USSR. Certainly the Italian and French Communist parties seek an independent stance to further their course of greater and greater adaptation to their own bourgeoisies.

The deepening crisis in the workers states has reached a point where the great conquests of the October Revolution are now being threatened by capitalist penetration. There is no way out of the present crisis except through a working class revolutionary approach which seeks to overthrow the capitalists in the advanced countries. We favor the working class assuming direct control over the workers states not only to end bureaucratic mismanagement but even more important to once and for all break these countries from peaceful coexistence class collaborationism so that the workers states can be the kind of center for world revolutionary struggle that Russia was in the days of Lenin and Trotsky.

At every important stage in the development of the struggle against capitalism revisionists like the Pabloites do great harm by disarming the working class theoretically and thus facilitating the continued world dominance of capitalism--a dominance the USSR cannot afford to forget for a moment even though our Pabloites do not recognize its existence. The United Secretariat and its American supporters, the Socialist Workers Party leadership, have completely broken with Trotskyism.

CHINA, STALIN AND THE WORLD REVOLUTION

Mao Can Neither Completely Break with the Khrushchevists
Nor Establish Permanent Peace With Them*

Never has it been more important than today to understand the real nature of the Chinese leadership and what makes it play the role that it does play in the world. The recent ouster of Khrushchev is opening up the possibility of a certain retreat by both the USSR and Chinese leaderships from the kind of struggle against each other they have been waging the past few years. Such a development can cause tremendous confusion among sincere revolutionists who have supported the Chinese in their struggle against the revisionism of the Soviet Union unless these revolutionaries achieve a deeper understanding of China itself.

The Chinese Communist Party has a long, long history of the closest collaboration with Stalin and the Comintern. The present leadership of the CCP was molded precisely during this extended period of collaboration with the Kremlin. At every major turn of the international situation the CCP faithfully carried out the line of Stalin. When Stalin in the 1930s sought to come to terms with the so-called "democratic" imperialists as a way to counter Hitler without independently mobilizing the working class, the CCP for its part sought to come to terms with Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang. It continued this policy right through the war and into the postwar period. Only the decision of Chiang to seek to crush the CCP militarily in a last desperate attempt to salvage his corrupt rule in China forced the CCP into an all out struggle for power.

While at the beginning Stalin resisted this turn of the CCP in the end he went along with it for he hoped to secure his Eastern flank from a direct imperialist threat through the triumph of Mao's armies throughout China.

Likewise after the CCP came to power Stalin fully backed up Mao as Mao slowly transformed the country after the model of the USSR in the same essential way as Stalin had transformed Eastern Europe. All those who see the roots of the present Sino-Soviet dispute as going way back to the origins of Mao's leadership group in the CCP show only their own ignorance of Chinese history. In the main the CCP's relations with Stalin were as close and

*This is the third in a series of articles discussing Progressive Labor's latest international statement "Washington's Grand Design For World Domination." The first article, "What Lies Behind Khrushchevite Revisionism?", appeared in BULLETIN No. 4. The second article, "Behind the Ouster of Nikita Khrushchev," appeared in BULLETIN No. 5. All three articles will be published shortly as a pamphlet.

CHINA, STALIN AND THE WORLD REVOLUTION

Mao Can Neither Completely Break with the Khrushchevists
Nor Establish Permanent Peace With Them*

Never has it been more important than today to understand the real nature of the Chinese leadership and what makes it play the role that it does play in the world. The recent ouster of Khrushchev is opening up the possibility of a certain retreat by both the USSR and Chinese leaderships from the kind of struggle against each other they have been waging the past few years. Such a development can cause tremendous confusion among sincere revolutionaries who have supported the Chinese in their struggle against the revisionism of the Soviet Union unless these revolutionaries achieve a deeper understanding of China itself.

The Chinese Communist Party has a long, long history of the closest collaboration with Stalin and the Comintern. The present leadership of the CCP was molded precisely during this extended period of collaboration with the Kremlin. At every major turn of the international situation the CCP faithfully carried out the line of Stalin. When Stalin in the 1930s sought to come to terms with the so-called "democratic" imperialists as a way to counter Hitler without independently mobilizing the working class, the CCP for its part sought to come to terms with Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang. It continued this policy right through the war and into the postwar period. Only the decision of Chiang to seek to crush the CCP militarily in a last desperate attempt to salvage his corrupt rule in China forced the CCP into an all out struggle for power.

While at the beginning Stalin resisted this turn of the CCP in the end he went along with it for he hoped to secure his Eastern flank from a direct imperialist threat through the triumph of Mao's armies throughout China.

Likewise after the CCP came to power Stalin fully backed up Mao as Mao slowly transformed the country after the model of the USSR in the same essential way as Stalin had transformed Eastern Europe. All those who see the roots of the present Sino-Soviet dispute as going way back to the origins of Mao's leadership group in the CCP show only their own ignorance of Chinese history. In the main the CCP's relations with Stalin were as close and

*This is the third in a series of articles discussing Progressive Labor's latest international statement "Washington's Grand Design For World Domination." The first article, "What Lies Behind Khrushchevite Revisionism?", appeared in BULLETIN No. 4. The second article, "Behind the Ouster of Nikita Khrushchev," appeared in BULLETIN No. 5. All three articles will be published shortly as a pamphlet.

intimate as were those of any other foreign CP from Stalin's rise in 1926 until his death in 1953.

Why the Sino-Soviet Conflict?

If this is the case why has the Sino-Soviet dispute broken out with such ferocity? What explains this undoubtedly deep conflict between the USSR and the Chinese leadership? Is it simply that Khrushchev broke fundamentally from the "correct" policies of Stalin while China continues to adhere to these policies? This is what China at times seems to be claiming. In the first article of this series we examined the nature of Khrushchevite revisionism in detail and it was clear that Khrushchev is carrying on the same essential policies as Stalin but in a different world context. Khrushchevite revisionism cannot be blamed on a single individual. It must be seen as the policy of a whole social stratum--the same stratum which supported Stalin in his day--the bureaucracy of the USSR.

Perhaps then China is in fact rebelling against Stalinism as a whole--the policies of Stalin as well as their later refinement by Khrushchev. But why then do the Chinese insist so strongly on their support to Stalin? How are we to explain this whole long history of collaboration between Stalin and Mao? How are we to explain the very structure of China which to this day is modelled after Stalin's Russia? No, Mao's continued ideological adherence to Stalinism is based on the reality that Mao, too, is carrying forward within the framework of the world situation China faces the same essential Stalinist policy that Khrushchev carried through within the framework of the world situation the USSR faced. It is precisely in the different situations the leaderships of the USSR and China face that we will find the real roots of the Sino-Soviet conflict.

The Chinese Revolution is of a far more recent date than the Russian Revolution. China is going through an extremely agonizing period of industrialization similar to that the USSR went through in the 1930s starting from a far lower economic level than the USSR even at that time. Furthermore, despite the existence of the USSR, it has now become clear that China has been forced to go through this industrialization period with very, very little concrete assistance from the USSR itself. The USSR's failure to offer substantial aid to China has clearly been one of the important roots of the Sino-Soviet dispute.

Of course, as the analysis in our article on Khrushchev's ouster clearly illustrates, the USSR itself has been under tremendous economic pressures as it seeks to develop its economy in a world still dominated by capitalism. Its resources available for help to China were therefore strictly limited for neither the USSR nor China, nor both together can really develop into socialist countries without first toppling capitalism in the advanced Western countries

and Japan. But even within this framework it correctly seemed to China that the USSR was more willing to extend aid to various bourgeois so-called "neutralist" countries than it was to a fellow workers state.

The international position of China was likewise different from that of the USSR. The main direct military pressure of the capitalist camp has been bearing down on China rather than the USSR. First came the Korean War. Then there was the constant threat from Formosa bolstered up continually by the US. and now in Southeast Asia the US openly intervenes in what has taken on more and more the character of a small scale war involving US troops. The opposition of the US to admitting China to the UN and its refusal to extend diplomatic recognition to China are but external signs of the different attitude it takes towards China as contrasted to its willingness to deal with the USSR.

The USSR, as we have noted in previous articles, has become more and more enmeshed in economic and diplomatic relations with the capitalists, seeking in this way to lessen the tremendous military burden placed upon it by the imperialist threat and to make up for the inadequacies of its economy through trade. Paralleling this trend has been a worsening of its relations with China which is in no position to so act with the imperialists. In fact it is clear that Khrushchev cynically compromised the international position of China in order to enhance his own international position. Certainly this is the meaning of his aid to India during the Indian conflict with China, his failure to assist China in developing the bomb, and the reports that he even kept the U.S. informed as to nuclear developments within China.

The current Chinese international position is very similar to that Stalin faced in the 1947-1952 period and China's policies to meet this situation also are similar in certain respects. In the 1945 to 1947 period, as we have noted, Stalin's main emphasis was on seeking to come to terms with the imperialists--that is on "peaceful coexistence." By 1947 it was clear that this was no longer possible and thus Stalin, while never totally dropping peaceful coexistence, shifted his emphasis to consolidation of his defense position vis a vis the imperialists. So today China, while not dropping peaceful coexistence, is mainly concerned with her own highly precarious defense position. Thus the emphasis on the bomb, her military support to the fighters in Indochina, and her generally more aggressive international stance.

Just as Stalin's tougher policy slowly became transformed into the Khrushchevism we know today (Stalin already was working along this line at the time of his death in 1953) so China's policy can change if her international position changes. How else can we explain the softening of her hostility towards the French once DeGaulle showed his willingness to wheel and deal with her much as the rest

of the West wheels and deals with the USSR.

China's Real Position on the Colonial Revolution

In line with her position internationally China has, in a more extensive way than the USSR, sought to support forces in rebellion against the imperialists. Her main concern has not been the working class, nor has she emphasized the critical importance of toppling capitalism in the advanced countries. Together with the USSR she shares the view that it is possible to construct socialist societies in single countries without overthrowing imperialism in its world centers. But she has given limited support to what she calls the "national liberation movements".

However, the Chinese approach these movements in a non-working class way. They support supposedly all-class movements which in reality subordinate the working class to the political line of the liberal bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie. These movements seek only to oust the imperialists but do not seek to overturn capitalism itself. However, the Chinese experience itself is testimony to the necessity of overthrowing capitalism if one is really to remove imperialism from the country.

The real line of the Chinese in the colonial revolution was shown clearly enough in the Brazilian coup d'etat last year. At that time the Chinese advocated nothing more than a broad opposition front including the bourgeoisie. At least Castro called for a peasant uprising. Neither Castro nor Mao expressed any interest in proletarian struggle.

In Indonesia the Chinese uncritically support the political line of the Indonesian Communist Party. This party, one of the strongest in Asia and in a position to lead the direct struggle for power, subordinates itself completely to the bourgeois Sukarno government. In Japan the Chinese uncritically support the Japanese Communist Party which holds the theoretically absurd theory that Japan has yet to fully complete its capitalist revolution against feudalism and thus the current struggle must be contained within capitalist limits. Japan, in reality, is one of the most powerful capitalist countries in the world capable of competing successfully against the Western capitalist powers and is overripe for the socialist revolution.

The Chinese carry on an active diplomatic flirtation with national capitalist, militaristic and even monarchic regimes throughout Asia and Africa. A good example is the reactionary Pakistani regime. Of course one must do business with the devil at times but one must tell the world that the devil is a devil. In addition one must continually seek to overthrow the devil even while one is dealing with him. This was always Lenin's way. The

Chinese, however, do things differently. As long as they can deal with a country, such as Pakistan, they are totally uninterested in their Leninist responsibility to support the construction of a revolutionary movement within that country. Only if they cannot deal with the country are they "intransigent" supporters of revolutionary struggle within the country.

Thus revolutionary struggle is subordinated to the diplomatic needs of China in the same essential way that the USSR bureaucracy has always subordinated revolutionary struggles to its diplomatic needs. The only difference is that the diplomatic situation of China is different from that of the USSR and thus the different tactics. On such quicksand stands the revolutionary line of the Chinese.

This approach of Mao's to the colonial countries has nothing in common with Lenin's approach. Of course Lenin favored working relations with the national capitalists and petty bourgeois formations to the extent these formations fought the imperialists. However, he viewed such relations as temporary alliances and he insisted that the working class maintain its independence at all times. He especially was opposed to any amalgamation of the proletariat with these other class forces -- that is he was opposed precisely to the kind of "national liberation movements" China favors. He stated: "The Communist International ... must under all circumstances preserve the independence of the proletarian movement even if in its most rudimentary form." (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. II, Moscow: 1947, p. 658). As to who is to lead the struggle there was never any question in Lenin's mind. Here is a typical statement of his: "Only the urban and industrial proletariat led by the Communist Party, can liberate the rural working masses from the yoke of capital and big landlordism." (ibid. p. 654).

Whom Should We Support in the Sino-Soviet Conflict?

What position should revolutionaries take on the Sino-Soviet dispute? Revolutionaries must realize that the major internal threat to the workers states and to the whole proletarian struggle comes at the present time from the Kremlin and those to the right of the Kremlin in Eastern Europe and in the Western European Communist Parties. It is these parties, largely because of the position they are in, who are opening the "sluice gates" to capitalist penetration.

The situation is not unlike the one we face here in the United States with the trade union movement. Certainly Jimmy Hoffa is as much of a bureaucrat as anyone in the AFL-CIO leadership and his policies are not fundamentally different from those of the AFL-CIO. But today it is Hoffa and the Teamsters Union who feel the main weight from the capitalists and it is the Teamsters who are doing more than the AFL-CIO to organize the unorganized workers. No, Jimmy

Hoffa is not our main enemy at this time. He is Bobby Kennedy's main enemy but not ours. We have no illusions about him but we know whom to fight and when.

Thus we cannot stand aside in this great dispute between the USSR leadership and the CCP and say "a plague on both your houses." The major threat both to the defense of the workers states and to the future development of the whole world revolution comes at the present time from the Khrushchevists like Brezhnev and Co. The Chinese, on the other hand, have been forced to make some searching criticisms of Khrushchevism, criticisms which we know are also of Stalinism itself even though the Chinese cannot face up to this. In addition the Chinese are not in a position to come to terms with the imperialists as is the case with the Kremlin crew.

At the same time we have no illusions about the Chinese. They act as they do not because they are essentially different from the Khrushchevists but because they are in a different situation and in a different stage of development. Their support for "revolution" is limited by their diplomatic position and is more a support for multi-class bourgeois revolution rather than working class socialist revolution. In the long run the Chinese cannot fail to act as the Khrushchevists do today.

Stalinism no longer possesses even temporary stability. Mao Tse-tung is no more capable of steering a straight course and coalescing a reasonably cohesive international formation around a clear political line than is Brezhnev. The future for both will be a confused one of twists and turns as they seek the impossible -- to solve the internal and international problems of their own workers states without tackling the central source of their problems, the continued existence of capitalism in the advanced industrial countries.

Brezhnev and Mao can neither permanently make peace with each other nor permanently break from each other. Neither can stop the continued disintegration of the world Communist movement and the wholesale defection to the bourgeoisie of the mass Communist Parties of Europe. Neither can really resist the penetration of capitalism into the Soviet camp nor can they simply succumb to that penetration.

As long as Progressive Labor, even in part, seeks to rely for support upon a section of this crisis-ridden international formation, it too will be crisis-ridden. There is no stability there. Nor can PL turn its back on this whole painful international process of reconstructing a world working class movement without itself succumbing to pressures within the United States. Its only hope is to face up to this crisis and to seek to understand it by going to the very roots of the crisis in the origins of Stalinism itself. There is no other way.