

Revolutionary Communist Youth NEWSLETTER

10¢

Number 14

October-November 1972



McGovern with supporters in Boston.

N.Y. Daily News

McGovern and the New Left

The New Left entered its death agony when SDS fell apart. George McGovern is now attempting to bury the corpse.

The New Left was rooted in the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, particularly the campus milieu. Born as the advance youth guard of liberal, Social Democratic and bourgeois idealism, it was tied to the Kennedy wing of the ruling class. While the early alliance broke down, symbolized by the sellout of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party at the 1964 Convention, it produced no qualitative break. SDS was still willing to go "part of the way with LBJ." But the inability of the capitalists to realize even its minimal promises of peace and civil rights eventually drove the New Left further and further away from conscious, active support. But most of the New Left activists did not move in the direction of the working class. The New Left, having broken pragmatically with the ruling class, saw little hope in the American proletariat still immersed in the reaction and passivity of Cold War red purges. Instead, it oriented in an empirical manner to what was currently in motion—the "Third World," oppressed minorities, and even the students themselves.

But it is now 1972. The "Third World" is not toppling U.S. imperialism. Rather, Mao is inviting Nixon to China. The black nationalist movement is in ruins, with its most militant and best known expression, the Black Panther Party, morally disgraced, split and physically defeated by the repressive apparatus of the state. And the Vietnam war continues, despite the election of three so-called "peace" candidates.

The repeated failures of the New Left have clearly demonstrated the bankruptcy of its theoretical conceptions. Some of its components

have drawn the correct conclusion that only the working class has the power to destroy imperialism. Most of them have returned to the waiting arms of the liberal bourgeoisie.

Bloc of 5! Classes

Important in this process is the role played by the Stalinist DRV-NLF itself. The NLF's struggle against U.S. imperialism and bourgeois liberalism's embracing of the American war effort in Vietnam helped create the New Left. Yet this moral and political authority which the NLF possessed has now facilitated the capitulation of the New Left. The 7-point Peace Plan sellout and the all but open support for McGovern in the pages of *Nhan Dan* by the Hanoi bureaucracy all served to further disorient those rooted in impressionism.

According to the June 1972 *Liberated Guardian*:

"... Nixon could encourage a coup in Saigon led by someone with the stature of Big Minh. Such a coup would at some point in the future lead to the tripartite coalition the NLF has been seeking...."

"If Nixon can work out such a deal the left must educate the American people about the war sufficiently so that people will see the defeat for just that. Nixon will be seen as a loser rather than a peace-maker."

Thus, according to the *Liberated Guardian*, if the NLF forms a coalition government with Nixon's consent with a treacherous compradore like Minh, this is not a sellout but a victory! The extent to which political degeneration has taken place can be seen in the fact that not even the Chinese Communist Party, when they were chasing Chiang Kai-shek as an ally, ever stooped to declaring that the compradore bourgeoisie was somehow a friend of the "people."

But what is the nature of the "tripartite coalition"? If there is any way of preventing the gains that the construction of even a deformed (Stalinist) workers state would produce, short of a U.S. battlefield victory, the NLF's "coalition" is it. It is proposed precisely in order to avoid the dangerous necessity of taking power through a social revolution carried to *completion* by the working class and poor peasants. Once set in motion the revolution might well transcend the confines the Stalinist bureaucracy seeks to keep it in.

Thus, during the Tet offensive, when the NLF was at the height of its influence among the urban masses, it refused to establish Soviets. When Quang Tri was taken during the spring offensive, private property was declared sacrosanct, and a new government established composed predominantly of Saigon's ex-officials!

"Small and Vacillating" Rifts

The Spring Offensive which could have sent Thieu packing allowed McGovern, as the repre-

continued on page 3

Young Socialist Alliance:

Reformism on the Rocks

[The following was written by Ron P. and Paul A. Ron was a member of the YSA and Paul of the YSA and the SWP. For further information on the recent splits in the YSA SWP, see *Spartacist* No. 21, Fall, 1972.]

It has been traditional on the left to date the qualitative degeneration of an organization as having taken place just prior to one's leaving it. In the case of ourselves and the Young Socialist Alliance Socialist Workers Party, such "tradition" is invalid.

The irreversible turn of the YSA SWP away from revolutionary Marxism occurred in the early 1960's and has been well documented in the literature of the Spartacist League and Revolutionary Communist Youth.

In the late 1950's the forced isolation of the SWP from the working-class movement through the Cold War witchhunt took its toll in the SWP in lowered recruitment and a turn away from the proletariat both physically and theoretically. The increasing impressionism of the YSA SWP achieved its qualitative culmination in 1963 in the adoption of the position that Cuba had become a healthy workers state without the intervention of a revolutionary Trotskyist party leading a proletarian revolution. This position laid the groundwork for the regroupment between supporters of the SWP with the Pabloist International Secretariat, forming the United Secretariat. This fusion did not stop the rightward motion of the SWP toward reformism, past the U.Sec.'s centrist revisionism—a process essentially completed in 1965 when the SWP justified a class-collaborationist policy in the anti-war movement.

"Mass Actions"

For years now, the YSA and its unofficial parent body, the SWP, have been telling their

14 August 1972

Political Committee,
Socialist Workers Party

National Executive Committee,
Young Socialist Alliance

We, the undersigned, hereby resign from the SWP and the YSA. We take this step as the culmination of our previously declared support within the SWP to the Declaration of the Leninist Faction of 15 May 1972 or, in the case of the YSA member, of our present solidarity with the politics of that Declaration.

In accordance with the programmatic parallelism of our political position with that of the Spartacist League of the U.S., and as principled and serious revolutionists, we intend to seek fusion with the SL. We call upon all others in basic agreement with our views to adopt the same perspective.

Fraternally,

Paul A., SWP (Washington, D.C.)
Jeff B., SWP (Oakland-Berkeley)
Dave P., SWP (Washington, D.C.)
Martha P., SWP (Washington, D.C.)
Ron P., YSA (New York City)

members and the radical public how the YSA/SWP leads "mass actions in the streets, independent of the capitalist parties." These "mass actions" were defined, especially by the Hansen wing of the YSA/SWP, as "objectively anti-capitalist"; thus those who argued for explicitly anti-imperialist slogans were guilty of "phrase-mongering." The reasoning is: after all, if Senator Hartke and the pacifists wish to indulge in revolutionary actions, who are we to care what they really think? And so it has gone: not "Immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Southeast Asia" but "When women say this war should end, this war will end!" Despite the impressionism and the sophistry which convert Senator Hartke into an

continued on page 2

Continued from Page 1

Young Socialist Alliance...

"objective anti-capitalist" when he steps onto an NPAC podium, the YSA/SWP recruited hundreds of youth enthusiastically repeating the litany that these "mass movements" were "independent of the capitalist parties." For pragmatists, nothing succeeds like success, and even if the war had not ended, at least the size of the "objectively anti-capitalist" demonstrations increased from march to march.

But suddenly it is 1972. It has become apparent to virtually all YSAers that "mass" opposition seems to spring forth only where YSA locals exist and that the turn-out at the semi-annual peace crawls has been withering away. Even the most starry-eyed *Militant* salesman must be aware that something is amiss.

The YSA/SWP membership is told, "Yes, the actions have been smaller than we predicted, but it's an election year. More people would have turned out had they known about the marches, but the bourgeois press didn't build the action."

Suddenly, after having been told for years how the "masses (everything is a "mass action" for the YSA) have turned out for "independent" actions that were "objectively revolutionary," we are told that they don't turn out because it's an election year! Suddenly, the basis for the masses' "independence" of the capitalist parties becomes clear—those were non-election years. The real nature of the YSA's great successes then becomes its ability to keep people from voting capitalist during periods when there were no elections! So much for independence. And if such actions were "objectively anti-capitalist," why is the YSA surprised that they should now lack support from the capitalists' press? If only the capitalists would build the YSA's "mass actions".... Is it not a shame that the only thing preventing ever bigger and better successes for the YSA is the existence of the capitalists?

Leninist Youth-Party Relations

On paper the YSA is a democratic-centralist organization. Positions are presented, a discussion takes place, and the position adopted becomes the official line which all members must defend publicly. On paper, the YSA's ties with the SWP are extremely loose. Bound formally by "fraternal relations," the YSA is therefore politically and organizationally independent in a formal sense. Such formal independence is as real as the U.S. government's "democracy."

In reality, two separate relations exist between the YSA and SWP. For the friendly person (i.e., majority supporter), the YSA is the youth group of the SWP—something well known throughout the U.S. radical movement. But for the "hostile" SWP member (i.e., dissident), the YSA is an alien organization where party members must be bound by SWP discipline to defend the SWP majority line. Such an organizational set-up is of course quite handy for the YSA/SWP majorities in curtailing the rights of oppositionists, but it reduces the YSA to a sterile front-group existence, denying the youth the experience of participating in the disputes of their common movement. This organizational structure was established only after the purge by the SWP leadership of the original founders of the YSA: Wohlforth, Robertson and Mage.

Leninist practice in youth-party relations, developed by the first four Congresses of the Communist International, provides for organizational independence and political subordination for the youth organization. In practice, this means that the youth group has a separate structure approximately parallel to the party's and provides a training ground for professional revolutionaries. There is a common discipline in both youth and party so that a faction developing in the party has the right to fight for its positions in the youth group, and vice versa. If a majority of the youth group takes a position counterposed to the party majority line, then the youth is obliged to publicly defend the party majority position, as the party embodies the revolutionary experience of successive generations and is thus the highest body of the common movement. In

the U.S., the SL/RCY uniquely embodies the Leninist practice in youth-party relations.

Workers' Democracy

Workers' democracy means the right of all tendencies in the working-class movement to freely present and argue for their positions. Revolutionaries have the obligation to defend all such tendencies, regardless of disagreement with their politics, against bureaucratic abuses or physical attacks as well as against repression by the capitalist state. The principle of workers' democracy is one of the defining traits of Trotskyism which developed in struggle against the degeneration of the revolution in the Soviet Union, the purge trials and the Stalinists' and capitalists' alliances against left oppositionists.

For the YSA/SWP, the principle of workers' democracy has been reduced to a tactic. Upholding workers' democracy is fine, as long as it is against other groups' violations. But when certain mileage can be gained by shunting it aside, the YSA/SWP has shown they are quite willing to do so.

Thus, in the "mass movement" conventions, the YSA/SWP has adopted the tactic of refusing to recognize speakers from other left groups, later denouncing the groups for "disruption" if they attempt to get the floor outside of the parliamentary channels which the YSA/SWP abuses to its own advantage. Yet when YSA/SWP members are denied the floor in similar circumstances, the *Militant* is quick to protest and explain the need for workers' democracy.

A member of the Workers League, Juan Farinas, was called for induction into the U.S. Army. At the induction center Farinas distributed leaflets condemning the Vietnam war, and was arrested and charged with "disruption." When a committee to defend Farinas was formed by the Workers League, YSA members were specifically instructed not to give written endorsement to the defense case, on the grounds it would be presented publicly as political agreement with Farinas. Had this really been the grounds for the YSA's policy on the defense campaign, their responsibility was clear: to themselves initiate united front defense efforts on Farinas' behalf. Instead, YSA members are told to abstain from Farinas' defense while the *Militant* hypocritically publishes sympathetic accounts of his case.

At the 4 July 1971 NPAC conference in New York, the YSA/SWP made its position on workers' democracy crystal clear. After refusing to defend militants like Farinas against the attacks of the bourgeoisie, the YSA/SWP was more than willing to physically defend the bourgeoisie against verbal attacks by the left! When members of the Spartacist League and Progressive Labor attempted to shout down bourgeois political representative Senator Hartke, an attack was launched, led by SWP National Committee member Fred Halstead, against PL. Just as we had consistently condemned and physically opposed PL's past gangsterism against left groups (including the YSA/SWP), the SL supporters came to the defense of PL against this eviction, which Halstead admitted he had launched. Hartke promptly took the opportunity to use his "right" to speak to red-bait the so-called "disrupters," including explaining at an NPAC press conference that such people were just as bad as Nixon!

The YSA/SWP's self-serving conception of workers' democracy is, then, the same as that of the Workers League, PL and all of the other groups that YSA members are taught to denounce. The YSA is particularly distinguished in having beaten up communists specifically in order to guarantee "freedom of speech" to a bourgeois politician at an NPAC meeting (which is presumably "objectively anti-imperialist"!). In this decisive test, the Workers League joined in the SWP goon squad while the International Socialists and Labor Committee equivocated. YSA members are schooled in denunciations of "Stalinism," but the YSA/SWP has adopted that essence which Stalinism has in common with Social-Democracy—class collaboration—and has demonstrated a clear and conscious willingness to fight on the ruling class' side of the barricades.

Impressionism and "Consistency"

In a society rampant with bourgeois ideologies, which in the absence of a strong proletarian pole permeate the left, the YSA/SWP has adapted to pacifism, nationalism, feminism, betraying Lenin's and Trotsky's intransigent struggles against all forms of bourgeois ideology.

The theoretical justification—the cover to hide the YSA's break from Marxism—has been "consistency," a cover based on impressionism. It is

RCY Newsletter

EDITORIAL BOARD: Libby Schaefer (Managing Editor), Paul Friar (Assistant Editor), Reuben Samuels, Stephanie Kamkov, Richard Cramer
PRODUCTION: Pat Michaels

The *RCY Newsletter* is published by the Revolutionary Communist Youth, youth section of the Spartacist League. We seek to build a revolutionary socialist youth organization which can intervene in all social struggles armed with a working-class program, based on the politics of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky.

Subscriptions, \$.50 for 6 issues. Write RCY, Box 454, Cooper Sta., New York, N.Y. 10003.

claimed that a "consistent" fight against capitalist oppression leads "logically" to socialism. The reasoning is that oppression is rooted in class society, and consequently, those who resist their oppression will see the need to end class society. Thus, YSAers are told that "consistent nationalism," or "consistent feminism," leads to socialism.

But what is the essential class nature of such ideologies as nationalism and feminism? There is indeed a consistency to these ideologies. But it is a consistency that remains bourgeois. It is a consistency that aims, not to end oppression inherent in class society, but rather to equalize oppression or, in the limit, to extend to the particular group the privileges that flow to the exploiters. In the policies of the most extreme nationalist groups (which are, incidentally, the most consistent) is found not socialism but, in Karenga's US group, armed attacks on other black groups such as the Black Panthers; in Leroi Jones' group is found not the unity of the working class, but union-busting activities in alliance with the Ford Foundation. The "consistency" theory is merely the YSA/SWP's cover for capitulation to bourgeois ideology.

Nowhere is the YSA's capitulation seen more clearly than in the naked class-collaborationism which day by day becomes more the hallmark of the YSA/SWP within the American left. Through classless slogans which are termed "democratic and transitional demands," the YSA/SWP actively seeks to draw bourgeois representatives into all of their various "mass movements." The "consistency" theory has not been explicitly advanced here, but it cannot be far behind. After all, if one considers "consistent nationalism" to lead to socialism, then it is but a short step to consider "consistent democracy" of the McGovern or Chisholm variety to lead to socialism. Perhaps in part due to the SWP's fetishistic pride in its own electoral campaigns, the YSA/SWP has not yet openly extended its support to the bourgeoisie to the electoral front, but the YSA/SWP's reformist impulse generates powerful pressures in sections of the YSA/SWP leadership to throw off the last trappings of "Trotskyism" and "independence" which stand in the way of their appetite to become the new mass party of American reformism.

Mired in revisionist theory which justifies class-collaborationist practice, the YSA actively seeks to mis-educate an entire generation, disparaging genuine revolutionary consciousness as sectarian or ultra-leftist. As a substitute, it must play up the old liberal-Stalinist notion of "honest" people (the bourgeois democrats, the nationalists, etc.) waging a "consistent" struggle against oppression. And when the class interests of recent allies become so apparent that they can no longer be ignored, the YSA along with the liberals can

continued on next page

EASTERN REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LE

FRIDAY

■ "The Struggle for a Workers Party" by Joseph Seymour, Spartacist League Central Committee (College of Liberal Arts, Rm. 522, 8 p.m.)

NOVEMBER 3-4

Friday: \$1.00 — Saturday: \$1.50
BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Sponsored by Spartacist League/Revolutionary

Continued from Page 1

McGovern and the New Left

representative of outright bourgeois defeatism, to gain leadership of the Democratic Party. The misleadership and defeats of the New Left aided him in gaining almost unchallenged hegemony over the campus population. As spring student strikes took intermissions during the Democratic Party primaries, students, mostly in the newly enfranchised 18-21 year-old group, provided the door-bell ringing, caucus-packing machinery that enabled McGovern to take advantage of the rise of bourgeois defeatism. The pact was sealed at the Democratic Convention with the dumping of Daley and the New Leftish quotas of Blacks, women and youth.

The tide of pro-McGovern sentiment that has swept the campus milieu has dragged with it almost the entire New Left to one degree or another. The opportunist rationales used to justify capitulation have been endless.

Remarkable in its own way for cynicism and sophism is the *Guardian*.



Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman and Rennie Davis hold press conference while awaiting jury verdict from Chicago Seven trial.

Daily World

Continued ...

only bemoan the fact that these people were not honest or consistent enough.

Is There a Way Forward for the YSA?

The Workers League Young Socialists, urged on by their British mentor, Gerry Healy, adopted the perspective that "the road to the American working class is through the YSA." In this transparent rationale for the WL's opportunist gyrations there is however a grain of truth: the road to the American working class is through the YSA in the same sense as it is through the Communist Party, YWLL, PL, SDS and even the WL/YS for that matter—through them with "hip boots and a shovel" as SWP founder James Cannon would once have said.

The YSA's betrayal of the principle of workers' democracy; its violation of Bolshevik norms of democratic centralism; its apologies for bourgeois ideology; its class collaboration; its blocs with the bourgeoisie against the left—all of these have been documented. Like addicts who require more and more of what first got them going, the YSA responds to the current rightward movement of the campuses by chasing after it, abandoning one opportunist policy for an even more opportunist one as time progresses.

Is there a way forward for the YSA? Of course there are always ways forward. But for the YSA as an organization, none of the ways are revolutionary. It is for this reason that the authors of this article first approached the SL RCY, an organization which defends and struggles for those revolutionary policies which the YSA has decisively abandoned. And it is for this reason that we call upon those members of the YSA who desire to take part in the construction of a proletarian vanguard party, and to struggle for the rebirth of the Fourth International, to break with the YSA SWP and join the RCY SL. ■

In the lead article of 23 August 1972, it explained in detail that McGovern is an imperialist politician, essentially no different than the others, but then went on to speak "... of the necessity to take advantage of every rift and antagonism, *however small and vacillating* [our emphasis], that exists among the ranks of the bourgeoisie... We do not oppose the growing trend of those among the masses who intend to vote for McGovern...."

But the bourgeoisie is not a monolithic entity. There are *always* "small and vacillating" rifts within it. There were "small and vacillating" rifts between Hitler and Goebbels. Not only is the *Guardian* advocating a bloc with one section of the bourgeoisie, but it is using a rationale that could equally justify such a bloc at *any* time or place. This is the logic of naked capitulationism.

Left Moves Right

Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin, after years of attempting wrecking jobs on the Left for being "too political" have shown up with shorn locks deep in the McGovern camp. But what is more natural, since the two of them have continuously stated in the past that there was no difference between the "exploiters" on the Left and the bourgeoisie? The remnants of Weatherman are hoping that McGovern will lessen the repression, enabling them to walk unimpeded to the land of milk, honey and "power to the people." Rennie Davis, Dave Dellinger and other "movement" individuals popularized by the bourgeois press have adopted the slogan "Evict Nixon."

The SWP has continued to recruit from its series of Pop Fronts by preaching their "independence" from all political parties. When attacked from either the right or the left, the SWP could simply chant "We're for non-exclusion. Everybody should vote for who they want." Of course this "line" succeeded beyond their wildest dreams (or nightmares)—NPAC and SMC supporters are voting for who they choose... McGovern! And the SWP's response? "After McGovern—Us" as they tell their members, planning on a tremendous influx of new, but non-socialist, recruits through the Jenness-Pulley campaign as disillusioned McGovern supporters swarm to the SWP YSA after the elections.

The orthodox Maoists of the Revolutionary Union (RU) claim that they are to the left of the SWP in wishing to build a "mass independent anti-imperialist movement." Through the Attica Brigade, an "anti-imperialist" marching society that they are currently involved in, they have issued a leaflet urging McGovern supporters to build the mass anti-imperialist movement, since it was, after all, this "movement" which built McGovern.

Likewise, the Maoist groups participating in the People's Solidarity Committee (Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization—formerly Young Lords, Venceremos, I Wor Kuen, Black Workers Congress, and others, including the RU) push the slogan "Defeat Nixon" without mentioning McGovern, thus giving the latter backhanded support.

No Steps Forward, Another Back

The role of PL/SDS is particularly unfortunate. The WSA was the pro-working-class wing of the old SDS. Its victory through political struggle over RYM offered the possibility of winning a large part of the New Left to the side of the working class. But PL was incapable of taking advantage of that opportunity. Having no conception of the role that a communist youth organization could play,

it formalized its incapacity into the "theory" that "students cannot tell workers what to do." Even at its most post-split left point, PL specifically, emphatically and repeatedly rejected the idea that SDS should be a socialist youth group. PL could think of nothing better for SDS than wretched gimmicks like the Campus Worker-Student Alliance strategy or endless PL unemployment marches. Having no strategy for pro-working-class students, it was inevitable that SDS should sink back into the swamp of New Leftism, carried away by the McGovern tide.

Miami, McGovern and Mindless Activism

At the Democratic Convention, when McGovern stated at a Prisoners of War wives' meeting that he would keep troops in Thailand until the prisoners were returned, SDS gathered up a flock of indignant liberals to "confront" him at his headquarters. McGovern, joined by national TV, met them personally, and informed them that the statement meant nothing, since he had previously promised to withdraw all troops from Indochina regardless of other NLF activity.

An SDSer then handed McGovern their "anti-racism" bill, requesting his signature. He pointed out that the bill which forbade police to "assault a minority person except in provable self-defense" (and when don't the police claim self-defense?) said nothing about assaults on whites. The SDSer then stated that the Senator had the old bill, and immediately set off for a copy of the new bill for his signature. Rarely has SDS disgraced itself so utterly and publicly!

"Political Working Class" for McGovern

The resolution of the National Caucus of Labor Committees at the Trade Unionists for Action and Democracy conference stated that "TUAD will refuse all support to candidates for public office *who advocate wage controls in any form*" (our emphasis). Given the proper situation, not only might a bourgeois candidate denounce wage controls (and in fact McGovern has said that Nixon's wage controls are "unfair") but he could conceivably mouth every one of the points in the NCLC program, only to drop them after the election, as the bourgeois state remains intact. The NCLC's failure to declare their opposition to *all bourgeois candidates*, regardless of *what* they say, exposes their incapacity to take a clear working-class line.

In the last analysis, despite their bitter denunciations of him, the NCLC serves as a left cover for McGovern's economic schemes, just as the SWP serves as a left cover for his peace promises.

It is not simply that McGovern is a capitalist candidate—indeed the NCLC has shown a willingness in the past to bloc with the CIA-compromised Socialist Party against the rest of the left, when they attacked the then pro-working-class Worker-Student Alliance wing of SDS in the SP's *New America*.

McGovern represents an attempt by one bourgeois wing to draw all wings of the radical petty-bourgeois intelligentsia under its banner. Therefore, McGovern came up with his "plan," which, though considerably more modest than the NCLC's schemes, is fundamentally of the same species. Such reform platforms of the *early* McGovern-NCLC have traditionally served as the programs of Popular Fronts. How radical and deep-going they are is determined by the depth of the working-class radicalization and militancy that they are designed to dissipate. And when the crisis is over the program is burned. Whether the promises of the Popular Front are minimal or far-reaching is irrelevant, as they are worth no more than the paper they are printed on, as McGovern's abandonment of his pre-nomination platform shows.

No Middle Road

If leaflets, bull sessions or simple activism were enough to end the war, the war would have been ended long ago. If ringing door-bells and lesser evilism in elections were enough, the war would never have gotten started. From Eisenhower with his promise to "go personally to Korea and bring the boys home," through Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, with his "secret peace plan," all American presidents have been "peace candidates" of one form or another. But unable to fight its way out of the pragmatism which gave it birth, the New Left has continued like a punch-drunk fighter to reel from one post-election knock-out to another. The New Left has spent virtually its entire existence trying to find a middle road between reformism and revolution, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. It has not yet understood that no such middle road exists. ■

THE STRUGGLE FOR REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT

SATURDAY

"Trotskyism and the American Labor Movement" by Chris Knox, Editor, *Workers Vanguard* (College of Liberal Arts, Rm. 12, 11 a.m.)

Workshops (Place to be announced, 1 p.m.)

Plenary Discussion (College of Liberal Arts, Rm. 12, 4 p.m.)

Party (Place to be announced, 8 p.m.)

For information on transportation, housing, etc., call:
New York: Libby (212) 781-6565 or Reuben (212) 348-5159
Boston: Barry (617) 776-4367 or Steve (617) 661-8284

Communist Youth

Trouble for the Bureaucracy:

Student Opposition in Yugoslavia

The recent trial of left-wing Yugoslav students demonstrates again the need to construct mass Trotskyist parties (sections of a reconstructed Fourth International), to lead working-class political revolutions in the deformed workers states.

The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 provided vindication of the Trotskyist position that the bureaucratic rule in the deformed workers states is, by nature, extremely unstable. Since then, abortive uprisings in Czechoslovakia (1968) and Poland (1970) have again exposed the national Stalinist bureaucracies as uneasy, heterogeneous groupings arising from, but ruling over, the working class. With increasingly vocal opposition in these countries testifying to the deep social ferment, it is probable that Eastern Europe will be the center of the coming political revolutions against these bureaucracies.

In Budapest, Hungary, 15 March 1972 saw the first major anti-government demonstrations since 1956. Radical students shouted down a party speaker at an official rally and led a break-away march which clashed with the police.

The Yugoslav Left and the Fourth International

On 22 November 1971, Ernest Mandel, speaking at the invitation of the Student Cultural Center, addressed a Belgrade crowd of 200 on "The Role of Trotskyism in the Contemporary Worldwide Liberation Movement." Anyone remotely familiar with the climate in the Soviet bloc before Stalin's death must consider such an event extraordinary. But, while extraordinary, there is of course an explanation for it.

Tito was the first of the Eastern European Stalinists to carry "socialism in one country" to its logical conclusion—a split with the Moscow bureaucracy. But he soon discovered that such an attempt at an independent course required support at home. Thus, some concessions had to be made: more political-intellectual freedom; a semblance of "workers' control"; and so on. The byproduct of relaxed controls was the greater receptivity among Yugoslavs to radical ideas and the freedom to express them...until the crackdown began.

In January 1972, three Belgrade students were arrested for "enemy propaganda," for planning to establish an "illegal Trotskyite party" and for contacts with the United Secretariat of Mandel and Frank and the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste of Lambert. One of these students reportedly attended the OCI-initiated "Revolutionary Youth International Conference" at Essen in 1970.

It is unfortunate that many Eastern European militants received their first impression of Trotskyism from the U.Sec. revisionists and from the OCI and its Eastern European supporter, Balazs Nagy. The centrists of the OCI and the Pabloite



Czechs surround Soviet tank, 1968.

World Outlook

U.Sec. must be defeated politically on an international scale as part of the struggle for the rebirth of the Fourth International.

Nationalist Opposition

The trial of the Belgrade students took place simultaneously with the trial of anti-communist Croatian nationalists—an obvious ploy by the Titoists to blur the crucial political difference between the two groups of defendants. This regime, like every other Stalinist bureaucracy, simultaneously resists and re-creates capitalist-restorationist tendencies. Caught between Marshall Plan aid, U.N. neutrality votes and "socialism," Tito has been compelled in elementary bureaucratic self-defense to crack down first on the left students in Belgrade, and then on the pro-capitalist tendencies (which his own policies helped to create) centered in Croatia. Denouncing "rotten liberalism" (of the Yugoslav, not the American variety), Tito led a purge of the League of Communists there, which culminated in the resignations of several pro-nationalist "communist" leaders. Thus he hoped to put an end to the nationalist revival which had won the support of numerous petty-bourgeois elements and the labor aristocracy which was closely linked to the Croatian party bureaucracy. But the purges did not hit the material roots of the nationalism and thus it continued, drawing the recent threat from Tito of... further purges!

Nationalism in Yugoslavia has deep economic roots: slow and uneven industrial development producing pockets of backwardness in the different republics; unemployment with the consequent breakup of families as male workers migrate to Western Europe; and, of course, the pernicious and exploitative role of foreign investment in that country. The inability of the bureaucracy to solve these problems as well as its repression of dissidents breed right-wing nationalist "solutions" of widespread appeal. The Croats feel "exploited" by the Serb-dominated federal government, just as Eastern Europe and the Baltic nations feel "exploited" by Great Russia. Each national bureaucracy's narrow concern for its "own" area's wealth and development is directly related to the nationalism of the bureaucracy's most right-wing sectors. Such forces create the objective conditions for the extension of bourgeois nationalism into active support for the restoration of capitalism. The theory of "socialism in one country" inflames national hatreds and anti-Semitism. It inevitably breeds bourgeois restorationism—first as demands for private property rights in land and small enterprises against the "foreign exploiters," then for group property in industry and finally as full-blown social counter-revolution.

Neither Tito's recent attacks against Croatian nationalism nor his past liberalization indicated any increased "progressiveness" of the regime. The anti-nationalism campaign was reluctantly undertaken, driven forward by left pressure. In 1968, students and workers had protested the development of capitalist tendencies and thus forced the regime to undertake measures restricting the private sector and group property. More recently, Nicolice, one of the students given a two-year sen-

tence for Trotskyism, authored an article for a student journal correctly attacking nationalism as divisive of the working class.

The political liberalizations provided a useful escape valve for various pressures. But they were undertaken by the bureaucracy in the interest of the bureaucracy—thus the campaign was reversed when it appeared that left-wing dissent was spreading.

Political Revolution

The workers throughout Eastern Europe must utilize the rift between "their" bureaucracies and the Kremlin to win increased political freedom and democratic rights. But these must be part of the struggle, not to support their "own" Stalinists against the Russians, but to overthrow their misleaders at home, replace them with an internationalist leadership elected on the basis of workers' democracy, and thus help spark the political revolution in the Soviet Union itself.

Only a political revolution there can rescue Eastern Europe from the ever-present danger of Soviet tanks and the more serious, long-range danger of capitalist restoration.

In 1956 the ex-Trotskyists of *Workers World* supported the Soviet invasion of Hungary on the grounds that the opposition movements must be counter-revolutionary adventurism since a Trotskyist party did not exist and therefore an uprising could only lead to capitalist restoration. But Marx did not forbid French workers to rise up in 1870 because they lacked a party to lead them: nor did Lenin forbid the Russian workers to form Soviets in 1905 because the Bolsheviks were not ready to take over their leadership. Such mass leadership as is needed today will only be forged and tested through struggle. The experiences of 1956, 1968 and 1970 have helped prepare the workers of Eastern Europe for genuine internationalism. Trotskyism. It is out of the present struggles that a communist cadre must be forged, linked with both the masses and the lessons of the past. And it is only through the leadership of such a party that the destruction of the Stalinist bureaucracies through political revolution can take place. ■

BMC/RCY Fusion Projected

[The following statement was written by the Buffalo Marxist Collective, a group of about 30 members, most of whom are students. The BMC and RCY have recently agreed to enter negotiations leading to fusion.]

The BMC originated in a break of 13 people in and around Progressive Labor, SDS over the anti-Leninist assumptions of *Road to Revolution III* and the ultra-left and sectarian practice of PL during the summer of 1971. The group began its existence as "critical Maoists," with a policy of "deep entry" into unstable New Left formations. The BMC regrouped New Left students around an "independent M-L newspaper," *The Long March*, and maintained leadership in the anti-war movement and the Attica movement in Buffalo as the working-class tendency. The BMC's consistent subjective commitment to the study and practice of Leninism led to a thorough rejection of Maoism and a consolidation around Trotskyism. The geographical isolation from ostensibly revolutionary Trotskyist organizations made the road to SL RCY politics difficult, as when 7 members split from the BMC to join the National Caucus of Labor Committees in the first flush of "Trotskyist" exposure in February. The BMC consciously rejected the NCLC after careful examination and organizational contact, then went on to consciously reject the Workers League and International Socialists as our study of Trotskyism deepened and we continued to expand and established fraternal relations with groups and individuals in other cities. The present period of intense discussion with the RCY is aimed at providing the necessary political clarity for genuine fusion. ■

RCY Regional Addresses

ATLANTA: RCY, c/o Spartacist, P.O. Box 7686, Atlanta, Ga. 30309.

BERKELEY: See San Francisco.

BOSTON: RCY, P.O. Box 137, Somerville, Mass. 02144, or call (617) 547-6670.

BUFFALO: BMC (RCY fraternal group), c/o People's News Service, Box 6, Norton Union, S.U.N.Y. Buffalo, New York 14214.

CHICAGO: RCY, c/o SL, Box 6471, Main P.O. Chicago, Ill. 60680, or call (312) 643-4394.

LOS ANGELES: RCY, c/o SL, Box 38053, Wilcox Sta., Los Angeles, Calif. 90038, or call (213) 467-6855.

NEW YORK: RCY, Box 454, Cooper Sta., New York, N.Y. 10003, or call (212) 925-2426.

SAN DIEGO: RCY, P.O. Box 22052, University City Sta., San Diego, Calif. 92122.

SAN FRANCISCO: RCY, c/o RMC, P.O. Box 40574, San Francisco, Calif. 94140.

WASHINGTON D.C.—BALTIMORE: 1928 Rosemary Hill Drive, Apt. 2, Silver Springs, Md. 20910, or call (301) 585-7430.