

# International Internal Discussion Bulletin

volume X number 10

July 1973

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>COMRADE GERMAIN'S ERRORS ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION</b> by Gus Horowitz	5
<b>APPENDIX A: The Permanent Revolution in the United States</b>	20
<b>APPENDIX B: Black Nationalism, Class Struggle and Party History</b>	21
<b>APPENDIX C: The Forging of Oppressed Nationalities in the United States</b>	24
<b>APPENDIX D: The Multi-National Character of the Leninist Party</b>	26

price

The International Internal Discussion Bulletin is the English-language edition of the internal discussion bulletin of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

It is published by the Socialist Workers Party as a fraternal courtesy to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

Bulletin Department, 14 Charles Lane, New York, N. Y. 10014

# **I.I.D. Bulletin**

**volume** x

**number** 10

July 1973

**price**

40 cents

Page 4

was blank in the  
original bulletin

- Marty

Feb 2014

# Comrade Germain's Errors on the National Question

By Gus Horowitz

This article will discuss some of the errors on the national question that are contained in the document by Ernest Germain, "In Defence of Leninism: In Defence of the Fourth International" (IIDB, Vol. X, No. 4, April 1973). This document forms a key part of the platform of the tendency initiated by a majority of members of the IEC. Most of the discussion of the national question occurs in sections 16-18 of the Germain document attacking the policy of the Canadian LSA/LSO and in section 22 dealing with the SWP position on Black and Chicano nationalism.

The official position of the LSA/LSO on these questions is contained in the resolutions "Canada and the Crisis of World Imperialism" and "The Mounting Class Struggle in Quebec," adopted at the April 1973 LSA/LSO convention. These documents are available in the July-August 1973 issue of the *International Socialist Review*. The resolutions themselves serve as an effective refutation of Comrade Germain's attack on the LSA/LSO and expose his charges as groundless. In addition, I hope that the Canadian comrades will contribute to the International Internal Discussion Bulletin a specific answer to Comrade Germain. This article will be limited to a discussion of some of the broader questions posed in Comrade Germain's document, as well as a brief discussion of the SWP position on Black and Chicano nationalism.

This is a very important subject, not only because serious differences have emerged within the leadership of the Fourth International on the theoretical level, but because it has very important implications for the practical work of the Trotskyist movement throughout the world. Over the past period the national question has assumed an increasingly important role in the world revolution—not only in the colonial and semicolonial countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, but also in the advanced capitalist countries and in the workers states.

The struggles of the Irish people, the Québécois people, the Black and Chicano peoples, the growth of oppositionist currents among the Ukrainians and other oppressed nationalities in the Soviet Union, and the role of the national question in Czechoslovakia in 1968 all testify to this fact. Unless the world Trotskyist movement has a clear understanding of the interrelationship between the national question and the socialist revolution, it will not be able to advance these struggles or build the mass revolutionary Marxist parties necessary to lead to the socialist victory.

Unfortunately, Comrade Germain's discussion of the national question is not internally self-consistent. This makes it difficult to achieve clarity about all the differences.

His document includes many passages which are in complete accord with the long-established Marxist position on the national question and which are in harmony with the present positions commonly held throughout the International. At the same time, and sometimes in the very same passages, he includes statements which tend to contradict this position. Some of his incorrect positions are not overtly stated but only implied, either through his emphasis or through the logical extension of faulty premises. To clarify the differences it will be necessary in this article to highlight the inconsistencies in his position and draw out the logical conclusions of his argument. At the same time, I will try to point out the main areas of agreement.

## I. TWO MAJOR ERRORS

I think there are two main errors in the Germain document in terms of implications for practical work:

1) It downgrades the importance of the national question in the world socialist revolution, precisely during this era in world history where it has been shown to have increasing importance. Its treatment of this question tends to call into question part of the foundation of the theory of permanent revolution.

2) It tends to put primary emphasis in the national struggle on the danger that nationalist demands will play into the hands of the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation, rather than on the proven potential that nationalist demands have shown for advancing the class struggle. This has the practical consequence of encouraging revolutionary Marxists to ignore a powerful weapon of the Leninist party—nationalist demands—and, in effect, to hand them over to the bourgeois and petty bourgeois elements of the nationalist movements.

Some of Comrade Germain's arguments are completely spurious on the surface—like the idea that national oppression can be ended in the era of imperialism, and has been in most cases, without breaking from capitalism. On one level this is just a semantic trick. By Comrade Germain's definition, a nation is nationally oppressed if and only if it is a formal colony; therefore, if it is no longer a formal colony it is no longer nationally oppressed. It follows, according to Comrade Germain, that it is "obviously misleading" to call semicolonies like India, Indonesia, or Nigeria nationally oppressed. (page 30) But what is far more misleading is a definition of national oppression which miseducates revolutionists about the importance of the fight against the national oppression that these nations still do suffer. Comrade Germain's state-

ment is as astounding as it is wrong, and makes a caricature of the scientific exactitude of Marxist terminology.

In addition to India, Indonesia, and Nigeria, which have attained formal political independence only recently, Comrade Germain includes in his list semicolonies like Argentina and Brazil, which have had formal independence for over 150 years. Yet the Trotskyist movement, to the best of my knowledge, has never maintained that Argentina or Brazil have overthrown foreign national oppression, even though these are relatively advanced semicolonies. What about Mexico, formally independent since 1821; how is it that in 1938 Trotsky could write in connection with the oil expropriations, "Semi-colonial Mexico is fighting for her national independence, political and economic. This is the basic meaning of the Mexican revolution at *this* stage." (See his article "Mexico and British Imperialism" in *Writings of Leon Trotsky*, 1938-39. Emphasis in original. The same theme is expressed in Trotsky's other articles on Mexico reprinted in the same volume.)

In contrast to Comrade Germain's innovation, the Trotskyist movement has always emphasized the fact that foreign national oppression still exists in the semicolonies of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. We should continue to do so, not out of unthinking attachment to tradition, but because we refuse to belittle the importance of the fight against national oppression in these countries.

## National Liberation and Permanent Revolution

On a deeper level, Comrade Germain is in error in attempting to draw a sharp dividing line between foreign national oppression and foreign economic exploitation. He says, "it is not necessary to 'break all ties with imperialism' in order to eliminate foreign national oppression. . . . Where foreign *national oppression* is eliminated, foreign *economic exploitation* remains and increases." (page 30, his emphasis) But this overlooks the fact that the two are intertwined. Economic control by imperialism is the basis for maintaining national oppression, and where the former still exists, national oppression continues.

When oppressed colonial nations win their formal political independence today, this represents a step forward, even though they remain under bourgeois rule. But it does not solve the task of national liberation any more than it solves the other uncompleted tasks of the classical bourgeois revolutions. When formal political independence is achieved, an alteration occurs in the *form* through which foreign national oppression is maintained; it becomes more *indirect*. Imperialism's political domination becomes more indirect and covered up, while its economic domination generally remains as overt as ever. Comrade Germain seems to miss this very simple point, which should be ABC to a Marxist. *He fails to make the distinction between formal political independence and genuine national liberation.*

In the semicolonies, although the indigenous bourgeoisie is in nominal control of its state, its overall economic subordination to imperialism is combined with and tied into its qualitative political and military weakness relative to imperialism. This means that it is unable to defend the interests of the nation against foreign imperialism. Behind the outer mask of independence lies foreign political

and social, as well as economic, domination. Whenever they feel the occasion warrants, the imperialists will attempt to intervene directly, as the U. S. has done countless times in the semicolonies of Latin America. Not only do the more powerful imperialist states continue to intervene in the political affairs of the weaker, dependent semicolonies, but the very economic framework of domination/dependence itself serves to reinforce all forms of political, social, and cultural backwardness in the semicolonies. These are some of the key reasons why the nominally independent nations of Latin America have always been regarded by the Trotskyist movement as not only subjected to economic exploitation by imperialism but also to national oppression.

Comrade Germain asks, "Is it true that, because the national bourgeoisie is dependent upon imperialism, it is unable to *break all ties with imperialism and therefore* cannot lead a victorious struggle against foreign *oppression*?" (page 30, his emphasis) Yes, that has been the traditional answer of the Trotskyist movement. Not only is the national bourgeoisie economically and politically weak and dependent relative to foreign imperialism, but because of its own weaknesses within its own nation it fears to call upon the only force capable of breaking the bonds of dependence—the urban working masses and the rural poor.

Comrade Germain, however, apparently rejects this answer and in so doing deepens his error even further. "This is completely wrong. The struggle against national oppression is not an anti-capitalist struggle. It is a struggle for a bourgeois-democratic demand. The existence of the world capitalist system is not an absolute obstacle to the overthrow of national oppression, under conditions of imperialism." (page 30)

If Comrade Germain were right about ending foreign national oppression without overthrowing capitalism, what would this do to the theory of permanent revolution? Would it not lend credence to the Stalinist argument for a two-stage theory of revolution? Comrade Germain recognizes this dilemma and correctly points out that "It has become the Stalinist line towards the colonial revolution that there has been after 1945 a 'stage of national liberation struggles,' which is supposed to solve the problems of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. . . ." (page 31) But how does he propose to answer the Stalinists?

He answers by saying that while national oppression can be ended without overturning bourgeois rule, the tasks of the agrarian revolution cannot be solved, and this is the main thing. "It is because the agrarian question is not solved today in any of the semi-colonial countries which conquered national independence after World War II that in spite of the minority situation of the proletariat, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat allied to the poor peasantry remains a realistic perspective." (page 31)

What about all the agrarian reform programs that have been implemented in the semicolonies? Some of them, as in Egypt, were not entirely inconsequential. Don't they represent a solution to the agrarian question, just as formal political independence represents to the national question? These agrarian reform programs, I am sure Comrade Germain will agree in answering, are limited and partial, and are far from being the thoroughgoing land

reform that is necessary and that can be won only through a socialist revolution. But, Comrade Germain, isn't the same true for the national question? Isn't formal political independence only a limited and partial answer to the national question, far from being the genuine national independence that we envisage as necessary? Isn't it true that genuine national liberation can only be won through a socialist revolution?

The truth of the matter is that the Marxist movement has always regarded the national question and the agrarian question in backward countries as closely intertwined. One of the chief reasons why formal political independence only hides a reality of dependence is the fact that the agrarian question is not solved, the economy cannot become advanced, and national dependence in all areas remains in force.

Comrade Germain goes on in the very same passage to argue (against whom?) that it is wrong to reduce the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution to a national liberation struggle, and he points out that "the struggle for national liberation, for agrarian revolution, for full democratic freedoms for the masses, and for defense of the class interests of the working class are *inextricably combined and intertwined*. . . ." (page 31, his emphasis) This is correct. One need only add that it speaks eloquently against Comrade Germain's own attempt to separate out the agrarian question from this "inextricably combined and intertwined" process of permanent revolution in the semicolonies.

But it is not "reduction," nor is it "confusing, to say the least," as Comrade Germain thinks, "to present any revolution in a backward country—be it the Algerian revolution, the Cuban revolution, the Vietnamese revolution, the Palestinian or the Arab revolution—as a 'national liberation struggle.'" (page 31) To *limit* one's perspective to the national question is of course wrong; but it is just as wrong to fail to see the national struggle as a complex and often "confusing" *form* of the class struggle. As Trotsky pointed out in his discussions about an independent Soviet Ukraine, ". . . the national struggle [is] one of the most labyrinthine and complex but at the same time extremely important forms of the class struggle. . . ." ("Independence of the Ukraine and Sectarian Muddleheads," *Writings of Leon Trotsky*, 1939-40) Comrade Germain, however, only emphasizes certain forms of the class struggle and downplays the national aspect.

## The National Question in the Advanced Capitalist Countries

Comrade Germain's error of belittling the national question in the semicolonies is extended to the oppressed nationalities in the advanced capitalist countries, such as the Québécois people, the Basque people, and the Irish people. (I leave aside for consideration later the Black and Chicano people in the United States. Comrade Germain incorrectly treats their situation as qualitatively different.) Comrade Germain believes that "the whole notion of applying the formula of permanent revolution to imperialist countries is extremely dubious in the best of cases. It can only be done with the utmost circumspection, and in the form of an analogy." (page 34) Circumspection is always

desirable, of course, but Comrade Germain is simply wrong. The permanent revolution can indeed be applied in the advanced capitalist countries, and the Trotskyist movement has been doing so for a long time (particularly in regard to the national question). And a revolutionist in Canada, in Spain, or in Ireland who does not know how to apply it will be in deep trouble.

The author of the theory of permanent revolution had something to say on this matter, and it was in relation to the most advanced imperialist country of all. In his discussions with American Trotskyist leaders on the problems of the Black struggle in the United States, Leon Trotsky pointed out that "Weisbord is correct in a certain sense that the 'self-determination' of the Negroes belongs to the question of the permanent revolution in America." (*Leon Trotsky on Black Nationalism and Self-Determination*, p. 14) He said it was imperative for the SWP to find the road to the Black people and that if this was not done, "the permanent revolution and all the rest would be only a lie." (*ibid.*, page 43)

Trotsky developed the theory of permanent revolution, an extension of the Marxist understanding of the law of uneven and combined development, in relation to the problems of the Russian revolution. The specific features of that situation were quite different than, say, the problems of the revolution in Black Africa today. But using the method of the permanent revolution, we can apply it there. The problems of the revolution in advanced capitalist countries are much more different, but it remains essential for Marxists to tackle the problems there that stem from uneven and combined development—for example, the still existing uncompleted national tasks in the framework of an advanced capitalist economy. That is why the revolution in Canada, for example, will most likely be a combined revolution—combining the Québécois national independence struggle with the proletarian socialist revolution in Quebec and in all of Canada.

Does Comrade Germain reject this perspective? If not, why does he feel compelled to emphasize that given a powerful upsurge of the workers struggle, "there is no fundamental class interest which would prevent imperialism from transforming any such nationality into independent puppet states." (page 35) That is theoretically true, but unlikely. It is certainly not the perspective that we should emphasize regarding the national question in these countries.

Comrade Germain correctly points out—quoting from the Transitional Program—that in backward countries democratic demands have a very great specific weight in the socialist revolution, and that the relative weight of democratic and transitional demands there is determined by the peculiarities, specific conditions, and degree of backwardness. But for the national question in the advanced countries, the point he stresses is not the correct one. Marxists should stress that, because of the size and weight of the proletariat, the transitional class demands of the workers are more quickly and intimately tied to democratic demands, and consequently the leading role of the proletariat in the national struggle is enhanced. Instead, Comrade Germain draws a conclusion that tends to belittle the importance of the national question in the advanced countries.

His concern is to alert comrades as to "how inadmissible

it is to ascribe to the national self-determination struggle of the Québécois or of the Basque nationality a similar weight in the Canadian revolution or in the revolution on the Iberian peninsula as, say, the national self-determination struggle of the black people in a revolution in Southern Africa." (page 34) Aside from other considerations, Comrade Germain fails to note that Blacks in South Africa are 68 percent of the population and all non-whites total 81 percent, while the Québécois are only 30 percent of the population in Canada, and the population in the three Basque provinces of Spain forms only 5 percent of the total population of that country. Nevertheless, the national question is extremely important in these latter countries.

What is the purpose of Comrade Germain's useless analogy? Does he believe that the national question is only of secondary importance in Canada or Spain, or that the national question will recede into the background among the Québécois and Basque peoples as the presumably purer class questions come to the fore? Either idea is completely incorrect and would lead our comrades in Canada and Spain to miss the importance of the national question for the socialist revolution in those countries.

### **Is the Nationalism of the Oppressed a Danger?**

Comrade Germain's second major error flows logically from his first. If under conditions of imperialism the national question can be resolved under the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, and tends to be in most cases, then nationalist demands are liable to be more dangerous than beneficial to the proletarian revolution.

Thus, according to Comrade Germain, in oppressed nations where there already exists a developed bourgeoisie, "to defend the notion of 'unconditional support' for Québécois nationalism, Arab nationalism, Indian nationalism, or Ceylon nationalism, is to disarm the workers and poor peasants of these countries in their class struggle against their own bourgeoisie, is to make the conquest of power by the proletariat in the course of the anti-imperialist struggle—i.e. the whole process of permanent revolution—more difficult if not impossible, and puts a big obstacle on the road of building Leninist parties among these nationalities." (page 34) Or again, in relation to Quebec or Ireland, right after he gets finished explaining that there is no fundamental class interest to prevent imperialism from turning these into independent puppet states, he says, "for these reasons the danger of a mass struggle in an imperialist country based solely on demands for national self-determination [no Trotskyist says 'solely'—that's just a debater's trick by Comrade Germain] being absorbed by the bourgeoisie is very real." (page 35) That is the big danger in these situations, he says. Exactly wrong.

Now, Comrade Germain does not deny that demands "expressing the right of national self-determination" can help advance the class struggle (although, for what I presume are polemical reasons he does not call them by their right name—"nationalist demands"). And he correctly points to the need for revolutionary Marxists to combine their propaganda and agitation around "demands expressing the right of national self-determination" with demands of a proletarian and socialist character. (page

35). But the reason he gives is "in order to make this absorption [by the bourgeoisie] much more difficult." Comrade Germain's error is to view the nationalist demands of the oppressed nationalities primarily as a danger likely to inhibit the advance of the proletarian revolution.

In contrast to Comrade Germain, we should emphasize the tendency for the nationalism of the oppressed to advance the class struggle. We have learned this from experience, particularly since the end of World War II. In the Cuban revolution, for example, nationalist slogans played an important part in advancing the struggle. "Cuba Si! Yankee No!" and "Patria o Muerte" (Country or Death) were among the central slogans used in defending the socialist revolution. A Cuban who waved the Cuban flag was expressing nationalist sentiments. But a revolutionist who could not distinguish between a Cuban waving the Cuban flag in Havana and a Cuban waving the Cuban flag in Miami would have been sadly out of touch. Be concrete: that is rule number one in dealing with the national question.

There is a sectarian logic to Comrade Germain's position. If we must oppose all nationalism, as he contends, what should we say to the Chilean masses who demonstrate in the streets and express their sentiment against U.S. imperialism by carrying Chilean flags? Should we tell the Chilean masses that carrying the Chilean flag is always reactionary? That it gets in the way of the struggle to nationalize U.S. imperialist corporations? What do we say to the Basque people who attempt to fly the Basque flag, even though it is illegal, and wear clothing with the Basque colors? Should we discourage them? Do these activities get in the way of presenting our Marxist program? Or should we solidarize with their sentiments and in that process present our Marxist program as the way to achieve their just nationalist-democratic goals?

It is obviously true that not all nationalist slogans raised within an oppressed nationality are progressive under all circumstances. Arab nationalism, when directed against the Kurds, who are oppressed by the Arabs, is reactionary and deserves no support whatsoever—it must be fought. It expresses the interests of the Arab ruling classes rather than the interests of the Arab masses. In the interests of clarity and precision, such nationalism is better termed "chauvinism." When, however, Arab nationalism is directed against Israel and imperialism, it expresses the interests of the Arab masses above all, and Marxists support it. This does not mean that Marxists can support every nationalist slogan raised in the struggle against foreign oppression. Some specific nationalist slogan tied to religion, for example, cannot be supported; but at the same time it should be emphasized that the nationalist struggle of the oppressed, even when waged against their oppressors under incorrect slogans, is objectively progressive. That is why we support this nationalist struggle unconditionally, i.e., without placing prior conditions on the nature of the leadership or even the formulation of specific slogans.

Comrade Germain makes the point that it is mistaken to think that "'consistent nationalism' would automatically lead to a struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . ." (page 34) This is correct. The nationalism of oppressed nations does not automatically lead the masses



to socialist consciousness and to a socialist revolution. But who says it does? We say that the fight for the nationalist demands of the oppressed, to be carried through consistently to the end, must become part of the socialist revolution. But we do not say that it *automatically* leads in that direction. That is where the revolutionary Marxist party comes in. That is our role. It is the role of the party to participate in the nationalist movement with its revolutionary Marxist program and pose an alternative leadership to the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois currents in the nationalist movement. The question is: *how* to do it?

Comrade Germain correctly points out that in the national liberation struggles revolutionary Marxists must put forward the key transitional demands expressing the independent class interests of the proletariat and demands for agrarian reform related to the class interests of the poor peasants. But he fails to see that another one of the main ways that revolutionary Marxists in the nationalist movement differentiate themselves from the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois currents is by being the most consistent and intransigent champions of the nationalist demands and other democratic demands of the masses.

Let us not forget that the burden of national oppression weighs heaviest on the proletariat and poor peasant masses. Discrimination in language, housing, jobs, education, and many other manifestations of national oppression make the national question a burning one for the proletariat and its closest allies.

The permanent revolution teaches us that the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie *betray* the struggle for nationalist and other democratic demands, that they are incapable of waging the consistent and intransigent struggle necessary to carry the struggle for these demands through to the end. As opposed to the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois currents, who hesitate, vacillate, and ultimately betray the nationalist aspirations of the masses, the revolutionary Marxist party shows the way to carry the struggle for these demands through to the end. And we do so not by turning our backs on nationalist demands as if they were somehow second-rate, but by championing them just as we champion demands in the specific interests of the proletariat and peasantry. We don't *limit* ourselves to nationalist demands, of course, but neither do we put them in a subordinate position, as Comrade Germain's line would lead us to. If anything, the history of the class struggle has taught us the immense power that nationalist demands can have in advancing the class struggle.

Two experiences are worth noting in this regard: the liberation struggles in Palestine and in Bangladesh. In both of these struggles similar democratic nationalist demands were put forward and won wide mass support: "for a democratic, secular Palestine" and "for a democratic, secular Bangladesh." Proponents of these demands include bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalists. The leadership of Fateh, for example, a petty-bourgeois nationalist organization, was the main popularizer of the demand for a democratic, secular Palestine. Naturally the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalist leaders did not have any intentions of advancing the socialist revolution. They interpreted these slogans in their own way, linking them to their own class programs which are opposed to the program of Marxism. Does this mean that revolutionary Marxists are duty bound to *oppose* these democratic de-

mands and *counterpose* to them on all occasions specifically socialist slogans?

No, not at all. These democratic demands corresponded to the interests of the proletariat and peasant masses: for political democracy; for separation of religion and the state; for a specific expression of national self-determination (a unitary Palestine, an independent Bangladesh). Revolutionary Marxists have the duty to advance demands like these, at the same time to show how the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois nationalists betray the struggle for these demands, and point to the socialist revolution as the only way to achieve them. For example, in raising the demand for political democracy, revolutionary Marxists differentiate themselves from the Menshevik-Stalinist concept of forming a classless democratic state, a formula which generally conceals the goal of forming a bourgeois state.

These demands, linked with other democratic, immediate, and transitional demands indicated in our transitional program, have the potential for mobilizing the oppressed proletariat and peasant masses in struggle against their oppressors and exploiters. To turn our backs on nationalist demands, simply because bourgeois or petty-bourgeois nationalists also raise them with their own alien class interests in mind, is to hand over to them a proven powerful political weapon that should be in the Marxist arsenal.

## Comrade Germain's Lapse into Subjectivism

The theory of permanent revolution asserts that the socialist revolution is on the agenda in the backward countries, despite the fact that the tasks of the bourgeois revolution are yet to be completed. This assertion is grounded in an analysis of the *objective* world economic, social and political conditions and the role of the various social classes within that framework. Comrade Germain, as I have noted earlier, maintains one-sidedly that the main reason for rejecting the stages theory is that the agrarian question cannot be resolved in the semicolonies today. In that same section he makes another error which should be noted. He lapses into a subjectivist explanation for the theory of permanent revolution.

"Revolutionary Marxists," he says, "do not reject this Menshevik theory of stages only or mainly because they stress the inability of the national bourgeoisie to actually conquer national independence from imperialism, regardless of concrete circumstances. They reject it *because they refuse to postpone to a later stage* the peasant and workers uprisings for their own class interests, which will inevitably rise spontaneously alongside the national struggle as it unfolds, and very quickly combine themselves into a common inseparable programme in the consciousness of the masses." (page 31, my emphasis)

No, Comrade Germain. It is not because we "refuse to postpone" these struggles (a *subjectivist* explanation), but because the struggles for the pressing bourgeois-democratic demands including national liberation (but of course not limited to this task) are inextricably and objectively intertwined under present conditions with the socialist revolution.

Implicit in Comrade Germain's document is another lapse into subjectivism, which we should call attention to.

It is Comrade Germain's view that nationalism as a rule is reactionary because it is bourgeois ideology. But, "there can be some exceptions to the rule," he says, "based upon exceptional 'historic and economic circumstances,' i.e., those of oppressed nationalities which do not yet possess their own ruling class, or which have only such a miserable embryo of a bourgeois that, in the given and foreseeable situation, it is excluded that this embryo could actually become a ruling class without a complete disintegration of the imperialist structure. The best example of such exceptions are of the Black and Chicano nationalities inside the United States." (page 34)

I will deal with Comrade Germain's errors on Black and Chicano nationalism later on, but there is a question that should be posed to Comrade Germain right now.

If nationalism remains only a bourgeois ideology because that is the way it originated historically, from what material basis does it arise when there is no significant historical possibility for the development of a strong bourgeoisie and where there doesn't even exist a significant petty bourgeoisie, as is the case with the Black and Chicano people? What are the material class origins of this nationalism?

The same type of question could be posed in relation to the national question in the European workers' states. There is no significant bourgeoisie there either. But there is nationalism, corresponding primarily (not entirely, of course) to the consciousness of the masses of the reality of their national oppression. The goal of independence is not without significant support in the Ukraine. It is true that many of those interested in a capitalist restoration would certainly attempt to promote the aspiration for Ukrainian independence. But whose class interest does this nationalist sentiment serve primarily? Trotsky maintained that it was primarily the working class and peasantry. When he raised the slogan "for An Independent Soviet Ukraine," he pointed out the following:

"The barb of the slogan of an independent Ukraine is aimed directly against the Moscow bureaucracy and enables the proletarian vanguard to rally the peasant masses. On the other hand, the same slogan opens up for the proletarian party the opportunity of playing a leading role in the national Ukrainian movement in Poland, Rumania and Hungary. Both of these political processes will drive the revolutionary movement forward and increase the specific weight of the proletarian vanguard." ("Independence of the Ukraine and Sectarian Muddleheads," *Writings of Leon Trotsky*, (1939-40), Pathfinder Press)

I think it is permissible to generalize from Trotsky's remarks. Far from decreasing the leading role of the proletariat or inhibiting the development of the influence of the Leninist party, the more thoroughgoing is the struggle for the just nationalist demands of the oppressed masses, the more able is the proletarian party to assert leadership. The fact that bourgeois and petty-bourgeois class forces assert themselves in the nationalist movement should not blind us to this deeper understanding.

Comrade Germain, as I have already noted, quotes for us in his document a passage from the Transitional Program, interpreting it wrongly to bolster his view belittling the national question in the advanced capitalist countries. But immediately preceding that very passage

in the Transitional Program is an explicit statement, which precisely indicates how democratic demands are weapons of the working class against the national bourgeoisie:

"The central task of the colonial and semicolonial countries is the *agrarian revolution*, i.e., liquidation of feudal heritages, and *national independence*, i.e., the overthrow of the imperialist yoke. Both tasks are closely linked with each other. [Emphasis in original. Note again how Trotsky considered national independence an important task yet to be achieved in *semicolonial* countries.]

"It is impossible merely to reject the democratic program; it is imperative that in the struggle the masses outgrow it. The slogan for a National (or Constituent) Assembly preserves its full force for such countries as China or India. This slogan must be indissolubly tied up with the problem of national liberation and agrarian reform. As a primary step, *the workers must be armed with this democratic program*. Only they will be able to summon and unite the farmers. *On the basis of the revolutionary democratic program, it is necessary to oppose the workers to the 'national' bourgeoisie*. Then, at a certain stage in the mobilization of the masses under the slogans of revolutionary democracy, soviets can and should arise." (Emphasis added. *The Transitional Program for Socialist Revolution*, page 97, Pathfinder Press, 1973, section on "Backward Countries and the Program of Transitional Demands.")

Ernest Germain fails to see precisely this point: that on the basis of revolutionary demands (and this includes nationalist demands) the proletariat exposes and opposes the bourgeoisie. Instead, he sees the exact opposite—that nationalist demands will play right into the hands of the bourgeoisie. Wrong.

Doubly wrong, because the practical effect of Comrade Germain's position would be to teach revolutionary Marxists to turn their backs on these powerful nationalist demands and hand this important weapon over to the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois betrayers of the national liberation struggles.

## II. COMRADE GERMAIN TAKES A GIANT STEP BACKWARDS

Until now, the Fourth International had generally agreed on the importance in the epoch of imperialism of drawing the distinction between the nationalism of imperialist oppressor nations and the nationalism of oppressed nationalities. We have recognized that whereas the former is reactionary to the core, the latter plays a progressive role in advancing the struggle against oppression. For that reason, our movement has opposed the nationalism of oppressor nations but has supported the nationalism of the oppressed nations insofar as it was directed against their oppressors. Our support to Black nationalism in the USA is probably the best-known example. At the same time, of course, as Marxist internationalists, our viewpoint transcends nationalism. Recognition of the distinction between the nationalism of the oppressed and the nationalism of the oppressors has been at the heart of our understanding of the national question. We have considered our views on this subject to represent a step forward in enriching Marxist theory.

One of the best illustrations of this dialectical approach toward nationalism occurs in Canada, where it is vital

for Marxists to recognize the distinction between Québécois nationalism and English Canadian nationalism. In Quebec, where the Québécois people suffer a real national oppression, the struggle against that national oppression is progressive. Québécois nationalism—that is, the idea that the French-speaking Québécois people share common problems and have a common national interest in opposition to their English Canadian oppressors, and against the centralized state, for example in regard to language rights—promotes consciousness of the reality of that oppression and the need to struggle against it. It thereby helps advance the class struggle and the class consciousness of the proletariat, which is internationalist. For this reason, the LSA/LSO supports Québécois nationalism.

But in English Canada, where the basic national tasks have been resolved under the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, nationalism promotes false consciousness (ideology in the strict sense of the word). It does not help advance the struggle against oppression, but on the contrary meshes completely with bourgeois ideology, including national exclusiveness and chauvinism, promotes subordination of the workers to the bourgeoisie, and is completely reactionary. The comrades of the LSA/LSO understood very well this reactionary role of nationalist ideology in imperialist oppressor nations when they overwhelmingly rejected the proposal raised in their organization to support Canadian nationalism.

(Comrade Germain in his document polemicizes against those comrades in the LSA/LSO who proposed viewing Canadian nationalism as progressive. Since he chose to do so, it is unfortunate that he did not call the attention of the world movement to the fact that the richest and clearest discussion of this issue was available in the internal bulletin of the LSA/LSO. The most important contribution to the discussion, the draft resolution entitled "Canada and the Crisis of World Imperialism," was available for more than two months prior to the time Comrade Germain wrote his document. This draft resolution was adopted and is published in an expanded edited form in the July-August 1973 issue of the *International Socialist Review*.)

Comrade Germain's document represents a big retreat from this dialectical approach to the national question. Comrade Germain belittles the crucial difference between the nationalism of the oppressed and the nationalism of the oppressors under the blanket pronouncement that "with the epoch of imperialism, nationalism *as a rule* becomes reactionary; whether it is 'purely' bourgeois or petty-bourgeois in character." (page 32, his emphasis)

To bolster his view, Comrade Germain cites several quotations from Lenin to prove that Lenin said that Marxists oppose nationalism. It is possible to find many quotations from Lenin opposing nationalism, and from Marx and Engels, and from Trotsky (though fewer can be found from Trotsky). We can also find quotations from Lenin, and Marx and Engels, and Trotsky (more from Trotsky) that seem to contradict these other quotes—such as Lenin's statement that "the bourgeois nationalism of *any* oppressed nation has a general democratic content that is directed *against* oppression, and it is this content that we *unconditionally* support." ("The Right of Nations to Self-Determination," *Collected Works*, Vol. 20,

p. 412. Lenin's emphasis.) On balance, I concede that Comrade Germain could find the greater number of quotations from the classics that speak against nationalism. It is important, of course, to ground our present positions in the traditions of Marxism. But if we are not to be scholastics, we cannot be content to rest an argument on quotations, and certainly not on the basis of comparing the total number of quotations on each side of the argument. If we probe the question a little deeper, we will see that it is our position, and not Comrade Germain's, that more accurately corresponds to the spirit and method of the great Marxists.

The Marxist movement's attitude toward nationalism, and even the definition of the word "nationalism," has undergone an evolution, corresponding to the changing historical context in which nationalism arises. Let us examine this evolution briefly.

## The Evolution of Nationalism

Nationalism arose in connection with the bourgeois revolutions of the previous historical era, which led to the formation of the modern nation-states. The rising bourgeoisie, out of its own class interests, which at that earlier time corresponded to historical progress, had to establish a unified national market and break down all the economic, political, and cultural barriers to the development of the capitalist system. It promoted the idea of the nation (a new historical idea) and the identification with the integrity, independence, values, culture, and language of the nation. It also promoted the idea of democracy to help break down the feudal and pre-feudal political and ideological barriers to progress and to mobilize mass support against the entrenched ruling classes. These relatively simple ideas were historically fused with the broader universal outlook of the bourgeoisie which required that these goals be subordinate to the social hegemony of the bourgeoisie. In this way, the term "nationalism" (and also "bourgeois democracy") came to stand for the ideology (false consciousness) of the bourgeoisie. The Marxist movement, while recognizing the progressive historical role of the rising bourgeoisie, never supported this bourgeois ideology. That is why so many quotations can be found from the great Marxists attacking nationalism (and also bourgeois democracy).

But as capitalism became triumphant in many countries, a change occurred in the historical significance of nationalist ideology. Comrade Germain describes this well:

"Nationalism is an ideology, the ideology of national solidarity irrespective of regional, ethnic or social differences. This ideology played a progressive role essentially in the 16th, 17th and 18th century, i.e., in the classical period of bourgeois-democratic revolution of the pre-industrial era, when the bourgeoisie was historically a revolutionary class. It was a powerful ideological and political weapon against two reactionary social forces: particularistic feudal or semi-feudal regional forces, which resisted their integration into modern nations; native or foreign absolute monarchs and their aids and props, which resisted that emergence even more desperately. With the development of capitalist industry in the 19th century, nationalism gradually loses its progressive character. The triumphant bourgeoisie uses that ideology now less against

— rapidly disappearing— precapitalist reactionary social forces, and more and more against its foreign capitalist competitors (or worse: other nations whose territory it wants oppressively to include in its own 'home market') and against the working class. 'National solidarity' is called upon to stifle the rise of the proletarian class struggle." (page 32)

The error in Comrade Germain's argument comes when he fails to grasp the significance of the different functions of nationalism in the imperialist oppressor nations and in the oppressed nations. He is correct in pointing to the thoroughly reactionary character of nationalism in the imperialist oppressor nations, but he is wrong in *counterposing* proletarian internationalist consciousness to nationalism in the oppressed nations. Internationalism, he says, is universally "opposed to the idea of national solidarity or national community of interests. In the best of cases— when advanced among oppressed nations— it is a narrow, parochial substitute and cover for the programme of the permanent revolution, i.e., national and social emancipation. In most cases— when advocated by the capitalist class or its ideological representatives— it is a thoroughly deceptive and mystifying ideology to prevent or retard independent class organization and class struggle by the workers and poor peasants." (pages 32-33)

It is true, of course, that the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation tries to use nationalism for its own class interests— up to a certain extent and then only as a thoroughly deceptive and mystifying ideology. But what Comrade Germain fails to see is that in the era of permanent revolution, the nationalism of the masses of the oppressed nationalities tends to mesh with socialist consciousness not bourgeois ideology, because the real momentum of the struggle for nationalist goals tends to mesh with the socialist revolution not the bourgeois revolution.

Rather than "substituting" or "covering" for internationalism, the nationalism of the oppressed directed against their oppressors will tend to impel oppressed nations in the direction of internationalism— provided, of course, that a revolutionary Marxist leadership is present to help advance the political consciousness of the masses. It is in that sense that we support the nationalism of oppressed nations. The proletarian internationalism of the masses of the oppressed nations will transcend, but at the same time encompass, their revolutionary nationalist aspirations, rather than being counterposed to them.

The comrades of the LSA/LSO expressed themselves well on this point in their resolution "Canada and the Crisis of World Imperialism." They said the following:

"In general terms, nationalism is an identification with the integrity, independence, values, culture, or language of the nation; the belief that the nation as a whole has common problems, goals, or tasks; and the concept that a struggle or common endeavor in pursuit of these goals is called for.

"In a national struggle or movement, different social classes tend to stress different aspects of nationalism, to connect the struggle with their own specific objectives, But this does not mean that several distinct 'nationalisms' coexist, one for each major social class. The pursuit of national goals by elements of every social class will have a common point of reference: the situation of

the nation as a whole and the tasks that flow from this.

"Nationalism has a progressive character only where it promotes the struggle against real aspects of national oppression suffered by a people— that is, where it corresponds to real national tasks (winning of national independence, establishment of national language, etc.) left unachieved by the bourgeois revolution, and which can now be achieved in their totality only through socialist revolution. In such struggles of oppressed nationalities, the working class does not develop a 'different' nationalism from the bourgeoisie. Rather it is the most thorough-going and revolutionary advocate of the full achievement of the tasks of national emancipation, and has the most consistent interest in carrying through such tasks. In contrast, in imperialist nations where such tasks are already realized, nationalism serves only the bourgeoisie." (*International Socialist Review*, July-August 1973, page 25)

It is the dual function of nationalism that explains the seeming contradictions or discrepancies in the Marxist classics— opposing nationalism as bourgeois ideology, but also pointing to the progressive, democratic content of the nationalism of the oppressed.

In recent years, the Trotskyist movement has introduced a change in terminology, using the word "nationalism" not so much to describe its specific origins in connection with bourgeois ideology, but in a more limited sense to describe the simple concept of identification with the nation. This change began with the development of the SWP position on Black nationalism and it has until now been widely accepted in the world Trotskyist movement. The reason for this change was to make our terminology correspond more precisely— i.e., more scientifically— to the political reality of today, so that we can better understand that reality. In the case of oppressed nations, including but not limited to the Black people in the United States, when the masses hold the idea that they have common interests as a nation, this does not necessarily correspond with the false consciousness that is bourgeois ideology, but can correspond to a true though limited consciousness of reality.

This approach corresponds to the fundamental thrust of Marxist thought on the national question. Our theory was never a rigid dogma, but evolved historically as the dual character of nationalism in the present era became more and more clear. A brief historical summary will illustrate some of the evolution of Marxist thinking on the national question.

## The Evolution of the Marxist View

The views of Marx and Engels, for example, underwent a shift in relation to Ireland and Poland, two European nations in which the national question had not been resolved. The new compilation of their writings that has recently been published, *Marx and Engels on Ireland* (Progress Publishers, Moscow), is useful to study in this regard. There, we learn how Marx and Engels changed their views on the importance of the national question in relation to the socialist revolution. One of the most well known statements to that effect is in a letter that Marx wrote to Engels on December 10, 1869. He said: "For a long time I believed that it would be possible to overthrow the Irish regime by English working-class as-

cedancy. I always expressed this point of view in the *New York Tribune*. Deeper study has now convinced me of the opposite. The English working class will *never accomplish anything* before it has got rid of Ireland. The lever must be applied in Ireland. That is why the Irish question is so important for the social movement in general." (page 284, his emphasis.) Several times Marx and Engels repeat their view that the national question in Ireland would be the lever for the socialist revolution in Britain, just as they viewed the British revolution as the lever for the revolution in Europe.

If we read further we find Engels writing the following to Kautsky on February 7, 1882: "I therefore hold the view that *two* nations in Europe have not only the right but even the duty to be nationalistic before they can become internationalistic: the Irish and the Poles. They are most internationalistic when they are genuinely nationalistic." (page 332.)

How else to explain this seemingly anachronistic though very "modern" statement except in the light of the approach that the Trotskyist movement had adopted today?

Lenin, following the same method and spirit as his two great predecessors, made extensive contributions to the theory of the national question. One of his clearest and most mature statements on this question occurred at the time of the second congress of the Communist International in 1920. Lenin wrote draft theses for the congress's commission on national and colonial questions. (Comrade Germain quotes from these theses in his document, though a thorough study of Lenin's theses will show that they do not bolster Comrade Germain's argument.) This question provoked a lively debate at the congress. Lenin's theses were amended slightly and adopted. In addition to the theses, Lenin's report on the deliberations of the commission is very instructive. Not only does it contain a very clear and succinct summary of the theory of permanent revolution (without naming it as such, however), but it also deals with the debate over terminology that occurred. This debate can shed some light on how we can deal with the term "nationalism." Here is what Lenin reported:

"As a result of our discussion, we have arrived at the unanimous decision to speak of the national-revolutionary movement rather than of the 'bourgeois-democratic' movement. It is beyond doubt that any national movement can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement, since the overwhelming mass of the population in the backward countries consist of peasants who represent bourgeois-capitalist relationships. It would be utopian to believe that proletarian parties in these backward countries, if indeed they can emerge in them, can pursue communist tactics and a communist policy, without establishing definite relations with the peasant movement and without giving it effective support. However, the objections have been raised that, if we speak of the bourgeois-democratic movement, we shall be obliterating all distinctions between the reformist and the revolutionary movements. Yet that distinction has been very clearly revealed of late in the backward and colonial countries, since the imperialist bourgeoisie is doing everything in its power to implant a reformist movement among the oppressed nations too. There has been a certain *rapprochement* between the bourgeoisie of the exploiting countries and that

of the colonies, so that very often—perhaps even in most cases—the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries, while it does support the national movement, is in full accord with the imperialist bourgeoisie, i.e., joins forces with it against all revolutionary movements, and revolutionary classes. This was irrefutably proved in the commission, and we decided that the only correct attitude was to take this distinction into account and, in nearly all cases, substitute the term 'national-revolutionary' for the term 'bourgeois-democratic.' (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 241-42)

We cannot know if Lenin considered applying the same terminological change in relation to bourgeois or petty-bourgeois nationalism. There is nothing in his writing to indicate as such, but it certainly seems permissible for us to have done so, in the light of Lenin's approach at the second congress.

What about Trotsky's writing on the national question? Trotsky not only had the benefit of standing on the shoulders of Marx, Engels and Lenin, but he lived in an era closer to ours and, in addition, had the deepest understanding of the process of permanent revolution. He was able to assimilate the knowledge, experience, spirit, and method of his predecessors, and enrich the Marxist understanding of the national question as a result. Trotsky, we should note, moved closest toward using the terminology that we have been using today. For example, in his writings on Spain, Trotsky pointed out the necessity for communists to politically combat petty-bourgeois nationalism in Catalonia, and not to give it a communist coloring; but at the same time he emphasized that in the given circumstances, "Catalan nationalism is a progressive revolutionary factor; Spanish nationalism is a reactionary imperialist factor." (*The Spanish Revolution (1931-39)*; see pages 109-10, 155-56)

As far as I know, Trotsky's clearest and most explicit statement in support of the nationalism of the oppressed occurs in a brief document he wrote on September 18, 1930, entitled "On the Declaration by the Indochinese Oppositionists." Unfortunately it has not yet been published, but a translation into English is scheduled for publication in the September 1973 *International Socialist Review*. The relevant passage by Trotsky reads as follows:

"On page four there is the statement that nationalism 'which at all times has been a reactionary ideology, can only forge new chains for the working class.' Here nationalism is taken abstractly as a transcendent 'super-social' idea which always remains reactionary. This is neither a historical nor a dialectical way of posing the question, and it opens the door for incorrect conclusions. Nationalism has not always been a reactionary ideology, not by far, and it is not always one today either. Can one say, for example, that the nationalism of the Great French Revolution was a reactionary force in the struggle against feudal Europe? By no means. Even the nationalism of the late-arriving and cowardly German bourgeoisie in the period from 1848 to 1870 (the struggle for national unification) represented a progressive force against Bonapartism.

"At the present time the nationalism of the most backward Indochinese peasant, directed against French imperialism, is a revolutionary element as opposed to the

abstract and false cosmopolitanism of the Free Masons and other democratic bourgeois types, or the 'internationalism' of the Social Democrats, who rob or help to rob the Indochinese peasant.

"The Declaration states quite correctly that the nationalism of the bourgeoisie is a means for subordinating and deceiving the masses. But the nationalism of the mass of the people is the elementary form taken by their just and progressive hatred for the most skillful, adroit, and ruthless of their oppressors, that is, the foreign imperialists. The proletariat does not have the right to turn its back on *this kind of nationalism*. On the contrary, it must demonstrate in practice that it is the most consistent and devoted fighter for the national liberation of Indochina." (Translated from the Russian. Trotsky's emphasis.)

Comrade Germain can be excused, of course, for not knowing of this statement by Trotsky, hitherto available only in Russian. But he cannot escape the fact that Trotsky's statement is entirely consistent with the general thrust of his other published writings and those of the other great Marxists on the national question. It is Comrade Germain's contrary position on nationalism that is at odds with the Trotskyist view.

This historical survey is very skimpy, to be sure. But I think it illustrates some of the historical precedents for the present position of the Trotskyist movement, which calls attention to the importance and progressive character of the nationalism of oppressed nations.

As Marxists, we are not narrow nationalists. We fight any attempt to *limit* the struggles of the oppressed masses to simple nationalist demands; we always put forward the Marxist program of proletarian internationalism; but we incorporate within that program the just nationalist demands of the oppressed nations, and show how the socialist revolution is the only way to achieve them.

## Two Forgotten Examples

This view had been held today, not only by the LSA/LSO in Canada and the SWP in the United States (whose views on the national question Comrade Germain attacks), but by Trotskyists throughout the world. Ironically, this view used to be expressed by some of those who are now supporters of Comrade Germain's document — Comrade Mandel, for example.

Just a couple of years ago, in March 1971, Ernest Mandel did a good job in debating Maxime Rodinson in Brussels on the topic of "Nationalism and Class Struggle." The text of Comrade Mandel's remarks can be found in the March 1972 issue of *International Socialist Review* or in the May-August 1971 issue of the French magazine *Partisans* (no. 59-60).

Comrade Mandel, after explaining that Marxists consider the nationalism of the imperialist bourgeoisie to be strictly reactionary, says the following:

"Does this mean that Marxists, and particularly Marxists of the Leninist school, to which I adhere, identify every national idea and all nationalism in the twentieth century with imperialist nationalism? They do not. An idea already present in the writings of the older Marx, or Marx in the last ten years of his life, was expanded upon in Marxist thought in the imperialist epoch and assumed an

absolutely decisive place for assessing national struggles in our century. It's the simple and perhaps simplistic notion—but I believe that at times simplicity permits clarity—that *it is necessary to make a distinction between the nationalism of oppressors and exploiters and the nationalism of the oppressed and exploited. I say that this notion has a Marxist origin.* It was Marx who was first to develop this notion in response to two concrete questions which he accorded a colossal importance in his entire strategy for the international class struggle: the Polish and Irish situations. . . .

"It's a singular feature of the imperialist epoch that making this distinction between the nationalism of the exploiters and the nationalism of the exploited *does not divert the proletariat from the struggle for state power and socialism but, on the contrary, leads them toward it.* This is because of the fact that in the imperialist epoch the tasks of national liberation and unification of oppressed nations can only be accomplished through an alliance of the proletariat and the poor peasantry, under the leadership of the proletariat, and through the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat." (my emphasis)

So, even one of Comrade Germain's staunchest supporters disagrees with him on this very important question! How can we explain this? Comrade Germain, I fear, has let his polemical zeal get the better of him. To remedy this most unfortunate situation, perhaps it is in order to suggest to him a more thorough study of some of the earlier writings of Comrade Mandel.

The above-mentioned article is worthy of study by all Trotskyists. In addition, students of the Trotskyist position on the national question can benefit from reading the very excellent booklet published a few years ago by the Fourth International entitled *Marxism vs. Ultraleftism: Key Issues in Healy's Challenge to the Fourth International*. Several places in that booklet sharply contradict the new Germain document. For example, it explains that the national question as well as the agrarian question is central to the colonial revolution, even in formally independent semicolonies, such as Cuba had been prior to the Cuban revolution: "As for the national problem, this was solved in just as radical and complete manner. . . . Cuba, which was to all intents and purposes a colony of U. S. capital for more than half a century, after having been a colony of the Spanish crown, has become a truly independent country, the only country really independent from the U.S. in all of Latin America. So the record shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that the basic social tasks historically connected with the bourgeois-democratic revolution—the agrarian question, national unity, national independence—have been carried out in Cuba by the revolution led by Fidel Castro." (page 31)

The booklet goes on to argue in chapter eight against the SLL's abstentionist line toward the national liberation movements and its political myopia which says that there is no colonial revolution but only a proletarian revolution. Some of the same arguments can be directed against Comrade Germain's latest document, which says that it is confusing to speak of a national liberation struggle rather than a process leading to a socialist revolution.

The booklet has a very fine chapter defending the SWP's position of support to Black nationalism. The first sentence of this chapter points out the crucial importance of distinguishing between the nationalism of the oppressors and the nationalism of the oppressed.

All in all, this booklet published by the Fourth International is a well-rounded expose of Healyite revisionism on many of the key political questions facing the workers movement today. It explains the source of Healyite revisionism in the following words: "By degrading theory into a mere vehicle of faction fighting against 'revisionism,' they are compelled step by step to revise essential parts of revolutionary Marxist theory and tradition. Their revision of Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution is but one instance of their departure from Marxism." (page 50)

The author of this excellent booklet was . . . Ernest Germain! But, then, that was back in 1967, when Comrade Germain was marshalling his polemical skills in defense of a correct political line. Today, his search for debaters points to justify a bankrupt line has led him to take a giant step backwards—away from the Trotskyist position on the national question and the application of the theory of permanent revolution to this crucial question.

In his latest document, Comrade Germain exhibits a penchant for scrutinizing the past positions of Comrade Moreno. Since Comrade Germain is so inclined, it is a pity that he did not apply this same method to his own case. There is one important difference to note, however. Comrade Moreno made errors on guerrilla warfare in the past, but has now corrected these errors. Comrade Germain's political trajectory is in the opposite direction.

### III. WHAT IS THE SWP POSITION ON BLACK NATIONALISM?

Given the above differences on the national question, one of the most peculiar parts of Comrade Germain's document is that section which treats Black and Chicano nationalism in the United States. Comrade Germain is glowing in his tribute to the SWP position: "One of the greatest political achievements of the SWP in the last fifteen years has been the correct understanding of the peculiar way in which the national question—the question of the oppression of the Black and Chicano people—poses itself in the United States." He singles out George Breitman, who did pioneering work in this regard, saying that his contributions "were among the most important creative contributions to Marxist thought realized by the world Trotskyist movement since the murder of Leon Trotsky." (page 43)

We in the SWP are not overly modest, and appreciate praise if it is deserved. However, it would have been preferable if Comrade Germain had been less effusive in his praise and more accurate in stating what our position is. In fact, he gives the wrong explanation for our position that Black and Chicano nationalism are progressive. He says that the main reason why Black and Chicano nationalism are progressive is that "both these nationalities-in-information do not have 'their own' ruling class in the real sense of the word, and cannot acquire such a ruling class—not to speak of their own bourgeois state—without a complete disintegration of U.S. imperialist economy and society. . ." (page 43)

This explanation fits in very neatly with Comrade Germain's current argument that nationalism in the semi-colonies, or in places like Quebec or Ireland, cannot be progressive because there exists an indigenous bourgeoisie. Unfortunately, the nonexistence of a Black or Chicano bourgeoisie was not at all the reason why we developed the position that Black and Chicano nationalism are progressive. Furthermore, to speak of nonexistence of a Black or Chicano bourgeoisie is an exaggeration. Such a bourgeoisie does exist; it is small and weak, but probably not very much smaller and weaker, even speaking relatively, than in several countries in the colonial world. What is qualitatively different is the small proportion of the Black and Chicano petty bourgeoisie—i.e., the relatively small proportion of farmers (peasants)—as compared to the backward countries, and the correspondingly high proportion of proletarians. But since this is similarly the case in Quebec and Ireland, it is not entirely surprising that Comrade Germain failed to notice it.

To set the record straight, it will be necessary to quote at some length from the basic document in which the SWP position was first adopted, the *Freedom Now* resolution adopted at the 1963 convention of the Socialist Workers Party. (This is available as a pamphlet by the same title from Pathfinder Press.) Our position on Chicano nationalism developed later, in the process of analyzing the specific features of the Chicano struggle, but the methodology was the same. Therefore, in the interests of brevity in an already lengthy article, I will confine this discussion to the SWP position on Black Nationalism.

### What the Freedom Now Resolution Says

The *Freedom Now* resolution is in nine parts. It begins, in the first two parts, by analyzing the evolution of the Black struggle and the tendencies in the Black movement up to that time. Worth noting is the fact that Black nationalism was represented at that time primarily by the Black Muslims, a religious sect led by Elijah Muhammad, which became the main channel in the post-World-War-II period through which Black nationalist sentiment developed organizationally. Many militant Blacks joined the Muslims—Malcolm X was one. As opposed to all other groups on the left at that time, the SWP did not identify Black nationalism with Muslim ideology. Perhaps this was one of the factors that enabled us to see things far more clearly than any other group on the American left. (The Communist Party, for example, likened the Black Muslims to Black fascists.)

The third part of the document, entitled "Negro Nationalism Today," is the most important for the present discussion.

It begins by taking up the question of terminology: "General definitions of nationalism are inadequate for understanding and explaining Negro nationalism in the United States today. While it has resemblances to the insurgent nationalism in African countries, and to the nationalism of oppressed minorities in the old Russian Czarist empire, American Negro nationalism also differs from them in certain important respects. . . ."

"The American Negro people are in a situation with some unique aspects. They are an oppressed minority without a clearly defined geographical, language, or cultural basis for differentiation from their oppressors. Ne-

gro nationalism is at this point a broad medium for 'self identification,' a method of differentiating a racially oppressed minority from its oppressors and of uniting it ideologically and organizationally to free itself from oppression. Negro nationalism plays a function for the Negro people here in many ways like that which class consciousness plays for the working class.

"James Baldwin's attempt at a definition of nationalism is a useful one to build on. This author said it means 'that a certain group of people, living in a certain place, has decided to take its political destinies into its own hands.' Applied to the United States, as it was meant to be, this means that large numbers of Negroes have decided, and more are in the process of deciding, that they cannot leave their future in the hands of the white oppressors but must unite with other Negroes and decide for themselves what they want in and from the United States. This consciousness is the basic feature of Negro nationalism today."

As we see, one of the creative aspects of the SWP position was in the area of terminology. The most common use of the term "nationalism"—denoting a reactionary ideology serving the class interests of a bourgeoisie—proved inadequate.

This section of the resolution also discusses the progressive function of Black nationalism.

"The intensification of separatist moods among Negroes in the Northern cities expresses a rejection of American class society from top to bottom and a strong desire to break free from the evils of that society. It is their verdict that the present 'American Way of Life' has nothing worthwhile to offer Negroes. In the absence of a revolutionary labor movement or powerful socialist vanguard, the radicalism of the Northern ghetto masses flows through channels of race-consciousness, repudiating U. S. society as the white man's world. The urge to tear loose and separate from the social fabric of U. S. capitalism is not far removed from the urge, under different forms, to abolish that system in revolutionary struggle. . . .

"The first big task of the Negro struggle is the mobilization and unification of the Negro masses in an independent movement to fight for their equality—and indispensable condition for an eventual revolutionary alliance of the working class and the Negro people. Negro nationalism is progressive because it contributes to the creation of such an independent Negro movement. It will remain progressive so long as it fulfills that function, whether the struggle be fought along integrationist or separatist lines."

Note that the "nonexistence" of a Black bourgeoisie is not even mentioned as a factor bearing on the analysis that Black nationalism is progressive.

The resolution goes on to make the attitude of the SWP more precise: "Revolutionary socialists welcome the growth of such Negro nationalism and give its participants whole-hearted collaboration in the fight against our common enemies. For us, Negro nationalism and revolutionary socialism are not only compatible but complementary forces, that should be welded closer together in thought and action."

Note that the resolution did not regard Black nationalism as a "substitute" or "cover" for class consciousness. The resolution goes on, "The nationalist tendencies still lack a comprehensive and realistic program to solve the

problems of the Negro people, and many nationalists have confused conceptions. Revolutionary socialists must be simultaneously firm and patient in demonstrating that Marxism, properly understood and applied, is valid and relevant for the Negro struggle—firm because of our confidence in the correctness of the socialist program, patient because we know that the logic of the Negro struggle inevitably leads it into socialist channels.

"Nationalism itself is an empty vessel which can be filled with vastly different contents. The nationalism of Chiang Kai-shek is the opposite of that of a Chinese Communist revolutionist or a Fidel Castro. Militant Negro nationalists can have wrong ideas and petty-bourgeois illusions. Negro Marxists have to imbue the nationalist sentiments and struggles of their people with a revolutionary, scientific, anticapitalist content and direction."

This section of the resolution also notes that "Negro nationalism, as it now exists, should not be equated with Negro separatism, the tendency that advocates creation of a separate Negro nation. The two are not the same thing. All separatists are nationalists but not all nationalists are separatists." This point is taken up further in the fourth section of the resolution. It is worth quoting, too, because of Comrade Germain's error on this question in relation to Quebec. Comrade Germain accuses the LSA/LSO of tail-endism because it waited for an indication of mass trends among the Québécois people before moving from support to self-determination to advocacy of separation. (page 32)

The *Freedom Now* resolution, by contrast, indicates the correct method that should be utilized.

"In 1939, we foresaw the possibility that the Negro people, as part of their struggle to end centuries of oppression and exploitation, might some day decide that they want a separate nation, controlled and administered by themselves. We said that if this happened, it would settle the long theoretical dispute about whether or not Negroes are a national minority as well as a racial minority, and that we, as supporters of the right of self-determination, would support the Negro demand for a separate nation and do everything in our power to help them obtain it.

"In taking this position we did not become advocates of a separate nation, as the Communist Party used to be, nor do we advocate it now. What we advocate is the right of the Negro people to decide this question themselves. All we commit ourselves to do is support their fight to achieve whatever *they* decide they want, whether it be equality through integration or equality through separation, or both. . . .

"In general, Negro thought and discussion about separatism and related questions is much more intense than 15 or 24 years ago. But the mass of the Negro people have not yet taken any settled stand on these questions, and we must still await their definitive decision.

"Until the Negro masses decide, the SWP neither advocates nor opposes a separate nation. . . .

"If the Negro people should decide they want to separate, we would openly come out in favor of granting them separation. At the same time we would continue to fight before, during and after any separation which might take place, to abolish all racial inequalities and the cause of such inequalities in the United States. In that sense, we



are and will remain integrationists, whatever else happens. We are convinced that the revolutionary struggle for socialism and the establishment of a socialist government will eliminate the basic causes of racial antagonism and create the conditions for equality and integration of all in a new type of living together."

The fifth section of the resolution explains that capitalism cannot solve the national question in the United States. "Studying the present trends in the light of the past, revolutionary socialists conclude that racial oppression can be abolished in the United States only if the present capitalist profit system is eliminated and replaced by a system based on production for use."

The sixth section deals with the interrelation between the Black struggle and the radicalization of the labor movement as a whole. "The coming radicalization of the labor movement will be accompanied by and accomplished through the creation of a left wing in the unions. This cannot be some vaguely 'progressive' formation interested mainly in winning union offices, but a group that will be distinguished by class struggle policies, an independent labor party orientation, and active support for the Negro struggle inside and outside the unions. Militant Negroes will contribute to this big change both by forming their own groups in the unions and helping to build and be part of a left wing, or closely connected with it."

The seventh section of the resolution outlines the SWP position favoring the creation of an independent Black political party. This was developed as an extension of our long-established policy of supporting independent Black candidates and independent struggle action by Black people.

"The creation of a Negro party running its own candidates would rock the whole political structure to its foundations. It would throw the Democratic Party into a crisis. Without the majority of Negro votes which it now gets, it could never again hope to hold national power. The only place it could go would be down. Organized labor would be faced with an excruciating dilemma too. Its coalition with the Democrats is justified on the ground that the Democrats can 'win.' But when it becomes plain that they cannot win, the unions would be forced to reconsider their whole political policy. Advocates of a labor break with the old parties would get a bigger and better hearing from the ranks. Thus the creation of a Negro party would benefit not only the Negro but his present and potential allies. . . .

"Our support of such a party in no way conflicts with our own independent socialist political campaigning or with our continued advocacy of a labor party. On the contrary, we believe that a Negro party, a socialist party and a labor party would find much in common from the very beginning, would work together for common ends, and would tend in the course of common activity to establish close organizational ties or even merge into a single or federated party."

Then, in the eighth section of the resolution, the SWP deals with the significance of the fact that Black people are overwhelmingly proletarian in composition.

"In previous convention resolutions, the SWP predicted that the Negro movement would precede and outpace the labor and anti-capitalist movements. This prediction was based on the fact that while the Negro community

is predominantly proletarian, the Negro people are more than just another more heavily exploited section of the working class, and the Negro movement is more than just a party of the general working-class movement.

"As an oppressed minority, the history of the Negroes is different, their position in society is special, their consciousness is influenced by racial, national and international as well as class factors, and they have developed their own standards, their own methods of action and their own forms of struggle. Although they are a minority numerically, they are a compact minority, knitted together by capitalist segregation in the ghetto and by a common sense of resentment against injustice, and they often play a role disproportionate to their numbers, a vanguard role. This prediction has been strikingly confirmed by recent events, which sees the Negroes in motion and out front while the labor movement is standing still and lagging behind.

"Previous SWP resolutions have also analyzed the special factors tending to radicalize the Negro movement. The Negro struggle is the struggle of an oppressed minority for democratic rights, for equality. But because the American capitalist class will not grant equality, it tends to merge with the wider struggle for the abolition of capitalism, for socialism. Under the banner of democratic rights, the Negroes learn to reject the myths about American democratic capitalism, and through their own experiences in fighting for democracy they reach deeply radical conclusions, frequently ahead of other sections of the potentially anti-capitalist forces. This analysis has also been verified and validated by recent developments which find the Negro movement becoming radicalized, rejecting gradualism and passing beyond liberalism, which is still the dominant ideology of the labor movement. . . .

"In previous SWP resolutions, we explained that because the Negroes are doubly exploited, their struggles have exceptional effects on the social and political life of this country. Their fight for simple democratic rights tends to upset the status quo. Their special demands introduce unsettling elements into the consciousness of the working class as a whole, disturbing the relations between the classes and inside the classes. Their independent action serves to spur, stimulate, awaken, excite, inspire, divide, unite and set into motion other, bigger forces."

The final, ninth section of the resolution, takes up the role and tasks of the revolutionary Marxist party.

"The role of the Socialist Workers Party is to assemble and programmatically equip the forces that will lead the coming American revolution to abolish capitalism and racism. This function is indispensable because American capitalism is so powerful and racism is so deeply rooted in it. . . .

"The SWP seeks to equip both revolutionary whites and Negroes with the best set of scientific tools yet devised to change society—Marxism. Drawn from and fusing the lessons of American and world experiences, Marxism is constantly enriched, refined and rendered more effective by the experience of new struggles. It illuminates the causes of racism and points to the method for eradicating them. The SWP has long sought to 'Americanize' Marxism (that is, to apply it to American conditions and use American conditions to modernize and expand Marxism itself). In order to accomplish this, it must now also work to 'Afro-

Americanize' Marxism (that is, apply it to the specific conditions of the Negro people and use the experience of their struggle to further concretize and enrich Marxism.)

"The SWP believes and acts on the belief that the working class cannot achieve its aims without the Negro people achieving theirs. The American revolution for a socialist democracy cannot succeed unless it is based on an equal and mutually acceptable partnership between the working class and the Negro people. It is this belief, deeply ingrained and expressed in the SWP's program and practice, rather than any written or verbal assurances or pledges which affords an objective basis for regarding the SWP as different from other organizations most of whose members are white. . . ."

"The SWP does not belittle, stand aside from and turn its back on the immediate and partial struggles of the Negroes, but views them as a necessary and hopeful link to future, more fundamental struggles and participates in them actively and wholeheartedly. White or black, those who understand the need for a revolutionary-socialist party will find the genuine article in the SWP."

That, in summary, is the SWP position that was put forward in 1963. The resolution is not without flaws, but it did adequately establish our position on Black nationalism, and the basic methodological approach we took. And it is on the basis of what that document says that the world Trotskyist movement has generally credited the SWP with making a creative contribution to Marxist theory. The ideas initially put forward in that document were the basis for further development of the SWP position on the Black struggle. Two of the key later documents are *The Case for an Independent Black Party*, adopted at the 1967 SWP convention, and *A Transitional Program for Black Liberation*, adopted at the 1969 SWP convention. (Both are available as pamphlets from Pathfinder Press.)

## The Demand for a Black Party

The SWP position advocating an independent Black political party is, as I have already indicated, an extension of our position advocating support to independent Black candidates and independent extra-parliamentary struggles by Black people. This has been the long-established policy of the SWP, and was specifically encouraged by Trotsky (see *Leon Trotsky on Black Nationalism and Self-Determination*, pages 47-48). It should be noted, of course, that we do not conceive of a Black political party solely as an electoral party, but as a mass organization that would attempt to advance the Black liberation struggle on all fronts.

Comrade Germain cautions against applying the SWP's call for a mass independent Black party to other parts of the world. He maintains that it would be wrong to call for an independent Québécois mass party or an independent Palestinian mass party or an independent mass party of the Bengalis or of the Sinhala-speaking people of Sri Lanka. That is correct. Of course, there is no one in the leadership of the SWP or the Fourth International who has proposed making such an unwarranted extrapolation.

Like the SWP's call for a labor party, the appropriate-

ness of its call for a mass independent Black party flows from specific American conditions. We note, first of all, that one of the main problems of the class struggle in the United States is that there are no mass workers parties of any kind. The bourgeois parties have a stranglehold over the masses, including Black people. One of our central tasks is to promote a mass break from the bourgeois parties along working class lines. This is necessary to advance the independent organization of the working class as a whole. Our call for a labor party fits into this framework. So does our call for a Black party. And in *this* regard, the fact that Black people are overwhelmingly proletarian in composition, that there is only an inconsequential Black bourgeoisie, and a relatively weak Black petty bourgeoisie is an important factor. Under these specific conditions, all indications are that an independent Black party would be a proletarian party, albeit in nationalist guise.

We reject the idea of supporting Black candidates in any bourgeois parties that exist or may arise. And we insist that to be independent, a Black party must be a genuine and complete break from the capitalist parties. For example, during elections we would oppose the idea of a Black party running its own candidates for local or minor offices, while supporting capitalist candidates on the national level or for higher offices.

We would fight for a Black party to adopt proletarian methods of struggle, and we put forward the revolutionary Marxist program as the only one capable of offering effective solutions to the needs of Black people and the working class as a whole.

We do not conceive of a Black party—or a labor party—as a substitute for the mass revolutionary Marxist party that must be constructed; rather, we think that either would facilitate the construction of a mass revolutionary Marxist party. Although we think it is unlikely, we do not preclude the possibility that under certain circumstances the revolutionary Marxist party could develop into a mass party prior to the construction of a mass labor or Black party. Under such circumstances, the revolutionary Marxist party itself would be the instrument that the Black masses and the working class as a whole would look to for leadership, thus obviating the demands for a labor party or a Black party.

Furthermore, we do not support the idea of forming a separate Black revolutionary Marxist party. Our concept is the Leninist one—that the revolutionary Marxist party is multinational.

Comrade Germain, in his document, indicates his agreement with the SWP position in support of an independent Black political party.

## The Transitional Program for Black Liberation

In regard to the Transitional Program for Black Liberation, however, his only comment is the following oblique remark: "The whole idea of 'transitional programmes' for sectors of the masses must at least be submitted to a critical discussion, as the very nature of the Transitional Programme lies in its function to bring the masses through their own experience to a *single* conclusion: the need to struggle for power, to make a socialist revolution."

(page 46, his emphasis)

It is rather curious to hear such a statement from Comrade Germain, since he is undoubtedly familiar with the *Transitional Program for Black Liberation*—the editors of *Quatrième Internationale* evidently finding worthy of translation into French and publication in the November 1969 issue. Anyone reading this document knows that it is permeated from start to finish with the call for a socialist revolution. It sets as a central task the necessity "to link struggles for the pressing immediate needs of the Black people with the revolutionary goal of overturning the whole racist capitalist system." It also emphasizes that "without the white workers, the movement for Black liberation cannot realistically pose an immediate struggle for government power." Within that framework it proposes a series of demands designed to advance the Black struggle and the class struggle as a whole in the context of the present situation in the United States. (See in particular pages 10-11 of the pamphlet version of the *Transitional Program for Black Liberation* or pages 166-167 in *The Transitional Program for Socialist Revolution*.)

The adoption of this document is entirely in keeping with the traditional Trotskyist conception of applying the Transitional Program. We have only one unitary, international program for the socialist revolution, one program which is held in common by all sections of our world movement; but we attempt to enrich that program, utilizing the same method, by adapting it to the specific conditions in each country and to the special needs of various sectors of the mass movement.

From his statement, one can only infer that Comrade Germain thinks that this idea must be submitted to critical discussion. He should know that it has already been submitted to critical discussion, and that a policy has been established. Two examples: 1) The Transitional Pro-

gram itself points out that "the sections of the Fourth International should work out with all possible concreteness a program of transitional demands concerning the peasants (farmers) and urban petty bourgeoisie and conformable to the conditions of each country." (*Transitional Program For Socialist Revolution*, page 86) Surely this approach is permissible for predominantly proletarian sectors of the masses as well. 2) In specific relation to the Black struggle in the United States, Trotsky urged the formation of a Black struggle organization and said, "We should take the initiative. I believe it is necessary. This supposes the adaptation of our Transitional Program to the Negro problems in the United States—a very carefully elaborated program with genuine civil rights, political rights, cultural interests, economic interests, and so on. It should be done." (*Leon Trotsky on Black Nationalism and Self-Determination*, page 37)

It would have been helpful if Comrade Germain had indicated exactly why he thinks this traditional approach must be submitted to critical reexamination. Perhaps he can enlighten us in a future document.

The SWP analysis of the place of the Black liberation struggle in the coming American revolution was also treated in the political resolution adopted by the 1969 SWP convention. This resolution drew a balance sheet of our previous analysis of the current radicalization and projected our long-range views of the dynamics of the American revolution. The analysis of the Black struggle contained in that document has therefore a precise, thesis-type value. I therefore include that section of the 1969 political resolution as Appendix A to this article to make it easily available to those who are interested in referring to it. Also included as appendices are three other items which help explain the SWP position on Black and Chicano nationalism.

## Appendix A. The Permanent Revolution in the United States

[The following is an excerpt from "The Course of U. S. Imperialism and the Revolutionary Struggle for a Socialist America," the political resolution adopted by the 1969 convention of the Socialist Workers Party.]

\* \* \*

The current stage of the struggle of the Afro-American people for self-determination that began in the middle fifties expanded with the meteoric rise of Malcolm X in the sixties and the mass combativity manifested in the ghetto explosions. One measure of the immense rise in nationalist consciousness has been the recent *Newsweek* survey showing that one-fifth of the Afro-Americans now believe that the only way they can achieve real progress is through the establishment of a separate Black nation. This mass separatist sentiment is the clearest single sign of wholesale rejection of illusions about the future of capitalist America.

The Socialist Workers Party was prepared theoretically for these developments, having discussed their possibility in the thirties with Leon Trotsky, who brought the Leninist teachings on the national question and the vast experience of the Russian Revolution to bear on this very problem in the United States.

The liberals, and likewise many revolutionists, viewed the struggle of the Black masses as aiming at integration within the white capitalist structure and as simply a component of labor struggles. Trotsky foresaw more complex—and more revolutionary—possibilities. In his opinion, the Black masses would come to reject this type of "integration" in view of the centuries of bitter experience with racial oppression they had suffered. In the course of their struggle for emancipation, a consciousness that its goal could be realized only through winning unconditional self-determination, and not through integration or equality within racist American capitalism, would more and more clearly manifest itself. Marxist revolutionists had the duty of unconditionally supporting the independent organization and struggle of the Black masses. Only the firm maintenance of such support could prepare the conditions for a powerful political alliance between independently organized, nationalist-minded Afro-Americans and socialist-oriented workers, Black and white, in opposition to the entire capitalist system.

It would take the establishment of a workers' government to open the possibility of establishing, if desired by Afro-Americans, a Black nation either as part of a federated socialist republic or in complete independence, if Afro-Americans so wished. Moreover, after trying either alternative, they would be free to switch. Independent Black mass organizations would be the ultimate guarantee of safeguarding this right. And no organization that did not clearly state this would be considered a rev-

olutionary or trustworthy ally by the Afro-Americans.

The movement for Black liberation is a complex and contradictory fusion of two explosive trends. One is an irrepressible and powerful democratic thrust for self-determination as a distinctive national minority. This is combined with a proletarian struggle against the capitalist rulers. All those who fail to understand the dual character of the Afro-American movement and combined characteristics of the coming American revolution are bound to go astray in comprehending its development and orienting correctly toward it.

The problem of winning full democratic rights and national emancipation for Black Americans is a task that was unsolved by the American bourgeois revolutionists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and has been handed down for solution to the socialist revolution of the twentieth century. The revolutionary potential of this nationalist movement has already been evidenced in the fact that it initiated and continues to deepen the mood of radicalism in this country and that the Black masses and the Black workers are the spearhead of opposition to the status quo. This vanguard role of Black nationalism is bound to intensify rather than diminish in the further unfolding of the third American revolution.

The Afro-American struggle for liberation is the most formidable expression of the logic of permanent revolution in American life today. It has begun on the basis of a fight for national emancipation. But this democratic objective cannot be obtained except through all-out combat against the entire capitalist system, which holds down the Black masses for its own profiteering reasons. Thus, regardless of the prevailing ideas of its participants, the thrust toward national liberation inexorably tends to merge with the broader class struggle against capitalist domination.

The oppression and exploitation inflicted upon Afro-Americans cannot be removed by capitalism for four main reasons: (1) Black capitalism is much too weak, timid and dependent on white business circles to carve a place for an independent Black nation. (2) The white capitalist structure requires keeping the Blacks at the very bottom of the social scale in order to maintain a reserve army of cheap labor that puts a check on the wage demands of other sectors and serves as a ready supply of workers in areas of sudden economic expansion. (3) Even if the ruling class could be persuaded that Afro-Americans deserve special economic treatment and social upgrading, they would reject emancipating them, because this would call certain inviolable private property rights into question. It would also immediately raise the related struggles of the most poverty-stricken whites and other oppressed national minorities to explosive proportions. (4) The capitalists maintain their rule through the ancient device of keeping the working masses from uniting in a common struggle to displace them. They do this by implanting

and fostering the worst prejudices. Holding a sector like the Blacks in the position of pariahs, economically depressed and educationally disadvantaged, is too potent a means of blocking solidarity among the masses for America's ruling class to give up.

The special social composition of the Afro-American population is no less decisive a factor than the material interests of the plutocracy in sharpening the revolutionary edge of its struggle. The Afro-Americans are not peasants dispersed in backward rural areas; they are predominantly proletarians concentrated in the biggest cities and the key industries and services.

They are subjected to double exploitation as Blacks and as workers. Compelled to exist by selling their labor power, their wages as Blacks tend to be the lowest, their rate of unemployment the highest, their opportunities for advancement and skills the slightest. Their demands as the most exploited section of the working class dovetail with the demands of the poorest of the poor for better conditions of life.

The class composition and status of the Black workers can be expected to objectively propel them into leading positions in the Black community, in the building and direction of a Black party and the inclusion of working-class demands in its program, and in the antibureaucratic struggles in the unions. Their experiences in these struggles will make it easier to win the most farsighted among them to socialist ideas and to membership in a multinational Leninist combat party.

The combined character of the mass Afro-American movement to gain power to have control over their own future precludes any separation of stages in the struggle for its nationalist demands and socialist objectives. There cannot first be a successfully concluded struggle for national independence and democratic rights and afterwards a struggle for social liberation. The two must be indissolubly combined and will, in fact, reciprocally reinforce each other. The nationalist demands must be tied in with working-class demands in order to obtain either.

But there is more to the matter than this. The struggle

for Black liberation is bound to be an exceedingly powerful stimulant to developing the anticapitalist movement of the whole American working class. The formation of a Black party would transform American politics by upsetting its long-established organizational structure and alignments, leading to the disintegration of the Democratic Party coalition and setting an example of independent political action for organized labor. Through their Black caucuses in the unions, the Black workers have already taken the initiative in contending against the racist and reactionary policies of the ossified bureaucrats, thus helping to begin the work of breaking their stranglehold upon the labor movement.

The failure to appreciate the revolutionary dynamism inherent in the Afro-American drive for self-determination causes many white radicals to misunderstand or depreciate the revolutionary thrust and potential of Black nationalism. On the other hand, the current crisis of leadership in the Black community is traceable to a failure to understand how the democratic demands pointing to self-determination, such as Black control of the Black community, can be tied in with transitional demands that promote the fundamental objectives of the working-class movement in the struggle for socialism.

The continual ferment, periodic mass militancy and spontaneous uprisings in the ghettos show what combativity exists. Yet up to now the Black community lacks not only an independent mass party but even an organized vanguard clearly dedicated to the task of building such a party.

The first step toward resolving this glaring contradiction is to work out a program that sharply delineates the nature and goals of the Black liberation struggle and projects a course of action that can lead toward the construction of an influential Black mass party and the education of its cadres. Suggestions along this line are included in the SWP resolution: *A Transitional Program for Black Liberation*.

## Appendix B. Black Nationalism, Class Struggle and Party History

[The following are excerpts from a contribution by George Breitman to the pre-convention discussion of the SWP in 1969, in response to questions discussed by Morris Chertov. It is reprinted from the *SWP Discussion Bulletin*, vol. 27, no. 12, August 1969.]

\* \* \*

Now the years during which black nationalism, however defined, has been growing at a very rapid tempo and has become a *mass* phenomenon among black people are precisely those years in which black radicalization has reached the highest point in the history of this country.

This leads us to ask ourselves certain questions: Is it an accident that the growth of black nationalism and the

growth of black radicalization occur simultaneously, or almost simultaneously? Or a coincidence?

I am not sure what Comrade Chertov would answer, but I am sure that the great majority of our party, and almost the complete cadre of the party that has joined since 1963 (many of them partly in response to this phenomenon), would answer, "No, it is not an accident or a coincidence; it is a causal relationship." And most of those who have read our press and literature since 1963 (which is where we develop our positions and analyses too; that's not done only in formal convention resolutions) would probably add, "Black nationalism is a specific form of black radicalization; it is also the dominant form in which radicalization has occurred among black people in the United States in the 1960s; and there is little sign that it will

be different in the 1970s."

Comrade Chertov might agree with parts of this statement. But I gather, from the final part of his article, that he would not accept the final part of the statement, concerning the future. I gather this because there he attributes black nationalism (what he calls "the very question of nationhood" arising today) to "the quiescence of the class struggle" and apparently counterposes the resurgence of the class struggle to the continuation of black nationalism and separatism.

This view, which some younger members of the party find hard to understand or take seriously, is not just a dogmatic aberration; it has a history, a certain kind of logic, a certain amount of validity. There is no doubt that the rapid rise of black nationalism in the last decade, and the specific forms it took, are in part the result of the previous and continuing ebbing of the class struggle. That is the logical and valid part of the view expressed by Comrade Chertov. If the class struggle had continued to rise after World War II, if the working class had been able to continue the radicalization started in the 1930s, had created its own party and started out on the road to power, it is possible that the *way* in which the black people radicalized would have been different.

But the radicalization of the working class was thwarted and declined, and the black people did not continue to wait for the working class—they began to radicalize in their own way. (A damned good way, too; and a damned good thing for all of us that they did.) *This created a new situation.* This new situation is going to affect the future, including the forms in which the working class will radicalize; already has affected it—beneficially. To expect that when the working class begins to radicalize, everything and every relationship will revert to what it used to be 10 or 30 years ago, is worse than undialectical; it is unintelligent. Black nationalism is here to stay—from now until well after the socialist revolution. And that's a good thing too because it is one of the assurances that the revolution will be successful. (Whether black nationalism will take on a predominantly separatist character is a different question; and a subsidiary one.)

In the 1930s Trotsky tried to teach the party, and especially its Chertov-Breitman generation (which, according to this year's membership survey, represents less than 6 percent of the party), that the most profound expression of black nationalism might well occur at the time of the revolution, that is, *at the time of the most acute class struggle.* (He was talking about separatism.) For historical reasons it was difficult for some members of that generation to grasp Trotsky's position; and some never grasped it even six years ago, when black nationalism as a mass sentiment was no longer just a theoretical possibility, but becoming a fact; and some who grasped it then did it only partially or tentatively or empirically: Yes, they thought, black nationalism is an undeniable progressive factor today, but perhaps when the class struggle revives. . . .

We have learned a lot since 1963, or we should have. One of the things we should have learned (and which most of the new members have learned—not because they are smarter than the old, but because they came on the scene at a different time) is that there is no necessary contradiction between class struggle and black nation-

alism, or between class struggle and whatever you call it: the national struggle, the racial struggle or the national-racial struggle of the black people to liberate themselves. Trotsky did not see any contradiction when he examined the situation in the United States in his discussions with our representatives in 1933 and 1939. And he even wrote, three months after those discussions in 1939, (see page 76 of the completely unreviewed and widely unread *Writings of Leon Trotsky, 1939-40*), that the national struggle is "one of the most labyrinthine and complex but at the same time extremely important forms of the class struggle."

Although he was not referring to the black struggle in this country, it would be useful for us to pursue and think through that concept, and then apply it to the black struggle. A lot more useful, a lot more revolutionary, a lot more conducive to the advancement of the class struggle than a sterile, historically outdated counterposing of class struggle and black nationalism.

## II

Other of Comrade Chertov's points revolve around terminology and the history of certain concepts used in the party. Specifically, he objects to the use of the terms "black nationality," "national minority" and "national oppression" when referring to Afro-Americans because of implications he sees in these terms:

"'Nationality' is a term that can only be drawn from a concept that the black people are *now a nation.* 'Nationality' cannot derive from a nation *coming into being*, or a view that a process now developing will *someday* produce a nation. It has to refer to an *existing* nation."

The reason he is concerned about this is that he thinks that designating Afro-Americans as a nationality or national minority (which he equates with designating them a nation) represents a departure from or reversal of that part of our 1939 resolution on self-determination which was summarized as follows in our 1963 resolution: If the black people decide they want a separate nation, "it would settle the long theoretical dispute about whether or not Negroes are a national minority as well as a racial minority. . . ."

It is impossible in the space and time now available to discuss fully all the ramifications of the development of our views over more than three decades during which both objective and subjective conditions have changed drastically; it has indeed been a long dispute, and it would take too long to do it justice here. But certain aspects raised by Comrade Chertov can perhaps be clarified briefly.

I don't at all see why "nationality" or "national minority" has to refer to an existing nation; in fact, a distinction is usually made between a nation and a nationality both inside and outside the Marxist movement. (On the other hand, "nationality" and "national minority" are often used interchangeably, except when the group involved is a majority rather than a minority; for example, it would be absurd to call the blacks of South Africa a national "minority.")

Four years ago, when we lived in different cities, George Novack wrote me a letter about an article in the Summer

1965 *Science and Society*, "Worker and Fatherland," a study by Roman Rodolsky (who has since died) citing passages from Marx and Engels in which they clearly distinguish between nationality and nation. In the following four paragraphs of his letter, the first two represent a summary of the views of Marx and Engels and the last two are Novack's application (at that time) of of these views to the question of black nationalism:

"The concept of nationality refers to a community of people with joint traditions of various sorts (descent, language, condition of servitude, territory, culture, etc.). The nation is the population of a sovereign state.

"Nationality, the essential mark of a national minority and its movement, is the product of common historical conditions which bind together a specific set of people. It need not culminate in the constitution of a nation. That depends upon the life history of the given nationality.

"Thus the Afro-Americans have distinctive and separate features which make them into a nationality within the framework of the present capitalist white-supremacist United States. But whether or not they ever arrive at the point of becoming a nation-state depends upon future developments of a still indeterminate nature.

"What is important to ascertain is the main direction of the process of growth of nationality at each specific stage (is it waxing or waning?) and ultimately, if the movement is extended and intensified enough, when the ascending nationality is ready to go over to the national state form. That would mark the crucial point of qualitative change in the nationalist movement."

It seems clear that black Americans can be called a nationality or a national minority on the basis of the Marx-Engels approach summarized above. Comrade Chertov cannot find any support in that approach for a definition that excludes a group from being called a national minority or nationality before it has become a full-blown, existing nation.

How about the Lenin-Trotsky approach? Here I will quote myself from the party discussion bulletin of September, 1954:

"Can we call an oppressed minority a 'national minority' if it does not demand a separate state? If we accepted that as the decisive criterion, we would have to devise a new term to describe many of the groups and movements that we have characterized as 'national' up to now. In fact, as Trotsky says in his discussion of the problem of nationalities in *The History of the Russian Revolution*, it took the February 1917 revolution and the great social upheaval that followed it before several of the most oppressed minorities became aroused enough to formulate self-determination aspirations, and some of them didn't do even that until after the October Revolution. The Marxist practice up to now has been to refer to these as national minorities just the same. Are we now to revise that characterization for them? We would have to if the criterion of a demand for a separate state is made paramount [in deciding whether or not a group is a national minority]."

Many other passages could be cited, but they are not really needed. Comrade Chertov's premise—that if we call Afro-Americans a national minority, it means we are calling them a nation—is manifestly wrong. And all conclusions flowing from this premise are wrong too.

But if black Americans are a national minority, why haven't we used that term before in our resolutions? And don't we have the duty to show, in Comrade Chertov's phrase, "*how and why* the change from a *racial* minority to a *racial* and *national* minority took place"?

Why hasn't the term been used before? There are various possibilities: Perhaps we thought it was a wrong term to describe the reality in the past; perhaps it was the right term in the past but we didn't realize it; perhaps we weren't sure and therefore postponed a decision until we were sure; perhaps some of us thought it was the right term and some of us thought it was wrong and others weren't sure, and the decision represented a temporary compromise — not to use the term for the time being — until further developments clarified the question. Perhaps we didn't adopt the term "national minority" in a resolution until now for the same reason that we didn't adopt our position on self-determination until 1939—that is, because we know more now than we did in the past, because our thinking and our insight have been sharpened both by the unfolding of events and a firmer grasp on theory.

In a certain sense the 1939 convention formulation did represent a compromise—between Trotsky and his supporters, on one side, who had no doubt whatever about the nationalist direction of the struggle, and on the other side J.R. Johnson (the author of the resolution) and those who shared his doubts about the future. The compromise was acceptable to Johnson because it left certain questions open, and it was acceptable to Trotsky because it took a firm and correct stand on the essentials. (After their discussions in April 1939, which are transcribed in *Leon Trotsky on Black Nationalism and Self-Determination*, Trotsky said to Johnson: "I suspect that you are just a *little* opportunistic on the Negro question, but I am not quite sure." *Fourth International*, January 1941)

But it was a legitimate and fruitful compromise, which enabled the party to take several long steps forward in theory and practice; and it laid the groundwork for our ability without too much trouble to grasp the new stage in 1963—the nationalist stage.

Because the question of whether the blacks are a national minority was left open in 1939 (it did not say they were not a national minority) it has come up several times in our history. In our second major resolution on the black struggle, the one adopted at our 1948 convention, of which Johnson was a co-author, we spoke about the "racial and national" aspects of the movement and about the "maturing Negro racial and national consciousness" and the growing up of an "embryo 'nation within the nation'." (*FI*, May-June 1950) Fraser objected, but most of the party thought such statements warranted because we were trying to follow developments closely and see what changes were being germinated even at a time when black nationalism was apparently almost extinct. In answer to Fraser in 1954, I suggested that perhaps the best term to express the uniqueness of the situation was "racial-national" minority. (Years later I noticed that Trotsky, writing about South Africa in 1935, had referred to "the solution of the national [racial] problem") Perhaps by 1963 we should have drawn new conclusions about the national minority question, instead of recalling what we had said in 1939, but the new stage of nation-

alism was just opening and many of us were still not sure.

I mention some of these episodes of the last 30 years to indicate that the compromise was never intended to last indefinitely, nor until the day when somebody could prove that 51 percent of the black people wanted a separate nation; we continued to watch and try to learn. Our 1939 resolution said the question would be solved in practice. Well, some of the older party cadres now think that has happened—that nationalism has become a distinct mass tendency, that even separatism has the support of perhaps a quarter of the black population, and that whether or not Afro-American choose and achieve a separate nation, the term "national minority" fits them today in every reasonable sense. Most of the younger cadres, who matured politically after the rise of nationalism, never doubted it.

How and why did the change from a racial minority to a racial and national minority take place? (Usually "when" is included in such questions.)

Before undertaking to say how and why such a change occurred, it would first have to be demonstrated that such a change *did* occur. But did it? The possibility exists

that Afro-Americans have been a national minority all along, but that its nationalist characteristics were hard to discern, and that for various reasons, good and/or bad, we were unable to discern them with certainty until the present decade. If this is so, and I for one tend to think it is, then we cannot answer the questions Comrade Chertov poses.

I do not mean there have not been changes—we have been publicly tracing the changes in the consciousness of the black people for the last six years, and we think those changes have definitively clarified the question left open 30 years ago about the nationalism of the oppressed black minority; at least by any reasonable standards accepted by our party and the Marxist movement as a whole.

So I think it suffices for us to state that we view Afro-Americans as a national minority entitled to the right of self-determination, and to leave it to the historians or posterity to decide whether we were right or wrong in not having reached that conclusion before this.

New York  
August 16, 1969

## Appendix C. The Forging of Oppressed Nationalities in the United States

[The following are excerpts from the summary by Jack Barnes to the political report presented at the February 1970 plenum of the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party.]

\* \* \*

Before discussing our position on an independent Chicano political party, we should begin by clarifying how our view of an independent Black political party developed. We faced a situation that was unique. Lenin did not precisely foresee this demand in his writing on the national question.

Lenin was clear on the responsibility of the revolutionary party in stressing socialist demands and democratic demands; it depended on whether the revolutionary socialist party was in the oppressor nation or in the oppressed nation. The proletarian party of the oppressor nation gave unconditional support to the democratic demands of those nationalities that were oppressed by its own ruling class, and the party stressed this in its propaganda to the usually chauvinist-minded or racist-minded workers. The proletarian party in the oppressed nation, which supported and fought as part of the nationalist struggle for self-determination, stressed the internationalist and proletarian demands in order to win over the workers of its nation to the banner of proletarian internationalism. These were two of the key points that Lenin emphasized. In addition, he was crystal clear on questions like that of the Ukraine. He supported the unconditional right of the Ukrainian people not just to organize and fight for their independence

but to separate from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, if they chose. Taking this approach was the only basis on which to establish a strong Soviet Union and prepare for world socialism.

But we are faced here with some special circumstances. What Trotsky began grappling with, what he saw—and then what we saw later—in the Black struggles in the United States was a national struggle with characteristics that Lenin had not dealt with. The Afro-Americans are a nationality that did not originate like most others that the Leninist movement discussed. Black people were dragged to North America as slaves. They came here speaking different languages. They came here from totally different levels of historical and cultural development. They came here from totally different nations, from totally different tribes, from totally different sections of Africa. Certainly none of these characteristics was a common denominator.

Their common denominator became their servitude, the *destruction* of their native languages, the destruction of their native cultures, the destruction of their native religions by the slave masters. What happened was that on American soil, under unique conditions, these Black slaves became a new nationality not directly linked to their original nations or tribes, which spoke different languages, had no common bonds whatsoever and often didn't know each other. That is the origin of what we today call the Afro-American nationality or the Black nationality.

Their common denominator became their skin color. Racism was reinforced with the defeat of Reconstruction and the rise of American imperialism, and an oppressed



Black nationality was welded more strongly together by the oppressor. This was not a development like that of the usual oppressed nationality with a clear geographical boundary and a relatively long, homogeneous cultural-historical identity. It was a unique phenomenon. And that is why Trotsky—in his discussions with his American comrades, who didn't see this because they concentrated on what was *different* about Afro-Americans compared to classical oppressed nationalities—stressed the lessons learned from the Bolsheviks on the national question, but also added some things that were new. He thought the American socialists were blind in not seeing the development of this new nationality that had been created due to the unevenness of the development of American capitalism.

This is a country that is creating new nationalities. Think for a minute about the Indians. The word "Indian" comes from the fact that the white man was so dumb that he thought he was in India. It had nothing to do with describing a single nation. The Native Americans had different levels of cultural development, came from different tribes, spoke different languages; some had no communications with others; there were no nation-states. They were one of the real genocidal victims of American capitalism. What happened was that their culture and their separate identities were to a large degree stripped away from them, and they developed a common bond, too, the common bond of being called goddamned Indians. And that was about all. They were herded together on reservations; they were further discriminated against—victims of the deepening racism and the rise of imperial arrogance; and it was in this process that a new national minority was created, the Indian or Native American nationality. It did not exist before, although this does not erase various differences among Native Americans from different tribal heritages.

In certain ways, this is true of the Chicanos. In this sense, the Chicano people are also a *new* nationality created by American conditions. Chicano nationalism does not reflect the desire to return to Mexico in a geographical sense, but the determination to stand up united and win the right of self-determination right where they are—in Aztlan.

The real *common* language of the Afro-Americans and of the Native Americans is English. The oppressor's language is their common language. Trotsky raised the possibility of Afro-Americans developing a separate language. But this would have had to be a new language. It could not have come from their former languages, which have been wiped away.

What did Trotsky say? In the discussions reprinted in *Leon Trotsky on Black Nationalism and Self-Determination* and in the articles on the national question reprinted as part of *The Writings of Leon Trotsky* [1939-40], he said that imperialism itself, under special conditions and out of racial material, can create new nationalities. That's exactly what happened here in the United States, and the specific process is outlined in the political report adopted by the last convention:

"In the [political] resolution, a thumbnail sketch is given of the rise of American imperialism. It says that 'after spreading across the North American continent, slaughtering and dispossessing the Indians and overpowering the slave system in the South in the process, it became a

world imperialist power at the turn of the century. In the Spanish-American War, U. S. imperialism seized sectors of the decayed Spanish empire outright, dislodged Spain from Cuba and proceeded to establish its own empire in Latin America and the Pacific.' In that thumbnail sketch are described all the components that American capital incorporated in its nation: Afro-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans." It is not the working class but the oppressor class, in its drive to incorporate labor and territory under its national control, that created the oppressed nationalities.

In his contribution to the discussion for the convention, George Breitman raised the question for discussion: when exactly did the Afro-Americans become a nationality? I think they became a nationality with the defeat of Reconstruction, which showed the incapacity of American capitalism to integrate the former slaves, and with the rise of American imperialism. That is just my opinion, and someone else may choose another time. But certainly that period—with the growth of racism and the rise of Jim Crow, which were necessary to justify American imperial expansion against the colored peoples of the world and to help create pariah pools of unemployed low-wage labor and divide the working class—was a key point in the creation of this oppressed nationality.

Trotsky was conscious of lurking prejudice among workers of the oppressor and privileged nation, even among advanced workers. He said that it is not very, very difficult for the revolutionary party to teach an English worker to have solidarity with the rest of his class. It is a lot harder to teach him to have solidarity with a yellow coolie or a brown laborer. And it is harder still to teach him to have solidarity with the struggles of women. Something that we can learn from Lenin, Trotsky and our own party's experience and tradition, something we affirmed explicitly in the resolution we passed at the last convention, is that we, as the revolutionary proletarian party in the oppressor nation, the United States of America, have the responsibility to lead the fight for the unconditional right of these oppressed nationalities to organize independently and to determine their own destiny. This is a revolutionary democratic task that the American bourgeoisie has long been unable to carry out. Only the proletarian revolution can carry out this task, we say. And the SWP socialist fighters will prove it by being at the head of those who unconditionally fight at the side of the national minorities at each stage of their struggle.

Unlike every bourgeois politician or petty-bourgeois bureaucrat, we are not afraid of these struggles, because every independent democratic struggle is a fight against imperialism and a fight for the working masses. It is a fight against the enemy of the working class, and we will prove our worth in practice—whether it is a fight for preferential hiring, for open admissions or for the establishment of a separate state.

At the last convention we discussed the fact that, although for many years we didn't recognize the degree to which the national question applied to the oppressed nationalities in the United States, we supported independent candidates of these minorities. Unlike all other radical tendencies, we applied our class-struggle principles and supported every fight for democratic rights, up to and including independent political action. Before we

adopted our 1963 position (really readopted our 1939 position in light of the unfolding rise of Black nationalism), we had a long history of supporting genuinely independent candidates of the national minorities. We understood this responsibility very clearly and acted on it.

At our last convention, we pointed out how the coming American revolution will be a combined revolution. Like the Russian Revolution, it will be a revolution of the oppressed national minorities for self-determination—complete independence and the right to determine their own future—and a revolution of the working class to overturn capitalism and establish a workers' state. A very important fact, which makes our perspective of a combined revolution even more clear, is the overwhelmingly working-

class composition of the oppressed national minorities in the United States. In fact, the odds are that it will be the oppressed national minorities in the United States who will adopt proletarian demands most rapidly and most thoroughly. We have seen nothing in the last thirty years to make us doubt Trotsky's prediction on this.

If the national struggle is another, very complex form of the class struggle, as Trotsky insisted, then the nationalist consciousness of a heavily proletarian national minority is an important form of class consciousness. I think that the general nationalist feeling among the mass of working Afro-Americans is the most advanced form of class consciousness of any broad layer of the proletariat in this country today.

## Appendix D. The Multi-National Character of the Leninist Party

[The following remarks were made by Gus Horowitz during a discussion in the Chicago branch of the SWP on December 3, 1968. The discussion took place when Wilbert A., a member of the Chicago branch, resigned from the SWP to join the Black Panther Party. A large part of the discussion was published in the *SWP Discussion Bulletin*, vol. 27, no. 3, June 1969. The remarks below were transcribed from the tape recorder and were not edited.]

\* \* \*

We have three interrelated discussions, as was mentioned before. One is on the character of the BPP—whether it's a vanguard formation, whether it will develop into a mass black political party, whether it will develop in a Marxist direction in the broad sense of the term. Another question is the tactical orientation of our party to the BPP—whether or not black members of the SWP should enter into the BPP and work within it, or whether our work should be outside of it. And the third, the most important point and the one which has been the axis of this discussion, is the character of the revolutionary Marxist party itself, which is one of the fundamental questions in our program.

Wilbert mentioned that one of his aims in joining the Panthers is to try to develop Marxist cadre within the Panthers. And Speaker C developed this general conception a little bit further, that is that what we mean by the crisis of revolutionary leadership is the lack of Marxist cadres; we need to develop a sufficient number of Marxist revolutionary socialists. Well, that's not what we mean by the crisis of revolutionary leadership. We say that the objective situation of the world socialist revolution has existed for many, many years. There have been revolutionary situations that have taken place in numerous countries and yet many of these situations have not resulted in successful socialist revolutions because of the crisis of revolutionary leadership. What we meant by this is not that there weren't a sufficient number of Marxists, people who thought they were Marxists, or individual cadres who thought they were revolutionaries, or people

who thought they were revolutionary socialists, or people who thought they were Leninists but that the crisis of leadership was that there was not a revolutionary socialist party, an organization with a program adequate to the task of achieving that socialist revolution.

There's a difference between so many individuals who consider themselves to be Marxists, with varying degrees of really being Marxists, and those same number of individuals actually working together in a democratically centralized manner within a revolutionary socialist party. We together as individuals can only do so much, but together in an organization, we're able to accomplish a lot more. The crisis of revolutionary leadership and the central task for the world socialist revolution is the development of a revolutionary socialist Marxist Trotskyist Leninist vanguard party, which will lead the revolution. That's the task which we have in the United States and throughout the world as a fraternal part of the world revolutionary socialist party. And so it's not a question of where you can develop Marxists, or where you can develop Marxist cadre. The question is how to build a revolutionary Marxist organization, a party. That's where a fundamental line of difference exists.

Now the character of the party as an international, multi-national vanguard organization is not one which someone has thought up simply as a good idea and so on. To the contrary, as has been mentioned by a number of speakers, the character of the party is one which is imposed upon it, imposed on the working class by the nature of the capitalist system and the tasks of building a new system, a socialist society. Capitalist rule throughout the world has specific national characteristics that may differ from country to country. In the colonial world and in the United States the axes of emphasis of the single revolutionary program may vary, but the general nature of capitalism has also imposed general international tasks upon the working class, a single program before it for the overthrow of capitalism. The reason why you have a single organization is because you have a single program. We don't have a program that's different from the program of the revolutionary Marxists in Africa

or in Asia or in Latin America, or in the Soviet Union, or in Czechoslovakia, or in France—that program is the same. We all have the same program—the Transitional Program. The program takes on different specifics in different sections of the world. The struggle for national independence, democracy and land reform aren't crucial revolutionary demands within the United States as they are in the colonial world, but these are all part of the international socialist program. There is a single organization because there is a single program. A world party is not a federation of different sections. It's a centralized organization, a democratic centralized organization and not a federation where each national grouping has autonomy in its national area. There is one program which every member of the world party of the socialist revolution carries out, although there are different concrete national strategies, emphases of application in different countries in the world and in different sections of the same country. In other words, the tasks of the world working class are both separate and interconnected at the same time. Separate and interconnected. And while, because of the Voorhis Act, the SWP cannot affiliate to a world party, we are in full ideological and fraternal solidarity with the Fourth International.

We're aiming for an international society, with no nation-state boundaries as exist under capitalism. At the same time, the struggle takes place within different national states and in a single national state there are different sides and aspects to the struggle. So there is one party of the revolutionary vanguard with a program applying to the separate and interconnected aspects of the class struggle, both internationally and within a single nation. That is why for instance the seemingly contradictory demand of nationalism has a revolutionary content. The nationalism of oppressed nations has a revolutionary content which will lead toward the elimination of oppressive nationalism and nation-states themselves.

So our task, as we've already said, is to develop within one organization internationally, and in its national sections or fraternal organizations, revolutionary Marxists of all sections of the society, of the oppressed nations and revolutionary Marxists of the oppressor nations as well, in one party, to coordinate the single program of struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution. That is, it's not sufficient merely to develop individual Marxist cadres, but you must develop Marxists who are all members of the same revolutionary organization. The organization which has the program for the American socialist revolution. So in this sense, Wilbert's decision to resign from the party is a step away from a fundamental concept which we have always had.

The question then is, will we be able to develop and to recruit black revolutionaries as members of the revolutionary socialist party, the Socialist Workers Party? There is an uneven development of the building of the revolutionary party, and recruitment to the party takes place in different ways in different times. We are going through a period right now where we're recruiting one by one. But in the accumulation of individuals joining the party there will be times when we recruit through fusions and joining together with other groupings, including groupings of black revolutionary-minded militants who are looking toward the building of a revolutionary party.

Now there's a difference. We sometimes use the terms "Marxist" and "socialist" and "revolutionary" in a very broad sense, which is okay. That is, there are revolutionaries throughout the world fighting, there's people who consider themselves Marxists throughout the world, fighting, and in that broad sense, yes, there is a very large revolutionary movement. But there is a distinction between revolutionaries, and revolutionaries in the revolutionary organization. There's a distinction and an important difference there.

Now we can be sure that there will develop outside of our ranks black militants who consider themselves Marxists, who haven't yet fully accepted the one crucial point of the revolutionary Marxist program, that is, the need for a revolutionary party, an international, revolutionary Marxist party. Our task will be, in some form or another, to fuse with, or to recruit these individuals or groupings of individuals into one organization because it will have one program. When you have the development of black revolutionaries who come to agree with us in our program, then the problem of joining together in a single organization isn't so deep a problem as it may seem right now when that situation doesn't yet exist. And the only way that we will be able to recruit and fuse with such revolutionary-minded black socialist revolutionaries in the broad sense of the word is by being organizationally very flexible and collaborative, working together in the course of the struggle. At the same time, in terms of our ideas, our program must be 100 percent firm politically. We can't give a single inch on this fundamental aspect of our program; otherwise we'll never be able to build the revolutionary party. You can only build it by being 100 percent firm politically and by being organizationally very flexible. The test of our theory, as with all theories, is going to be in practice. It's going to be in what happens. And that's the only real test in the long run of how you will be able to build a revolutionary organization.

Now this discussion is a significant discussion for us, because it reflects two things. This discussion and the one we had at the YSA convention, and which will be continuing, reflect first of all a growing radicalization in the black community. More and more numbers of black militants are coming to consider themselves socialists or Marxists or revolutionaries. That's a very important development, and something which we are for 100 percent. And secondly, that brings with it also the development of formations within this vanguard in the black struggle, like the BPP, and other organizations. This is also a very important and progressive development, which we support 100 percent. The beginnings of the possibility for us to recruit black revolutionaries into the revolutionary party is also a very good development.

We don't see the Panthers as a competitor to the revolutionary Marxist vanguard party; the two are different types of organizations. The BPP is not the revolutionary socialist vanguard party, although they are a vanguard organization in the black liberation struggle. So we support them and work together with them, and we don't see a competition with them. Our task as always will be to try to recruit black militants into our organization. There will be a time when in these vanguard organiza-

tions in the black struggle and in other struggles, the revolutionary party will play a leadership role through its cadres within that organization. That is, I make the distinction between Marxist cadres playing a leading role within such an organization, and the party playing a leading role in such an organization.

Just as we see in the antiwar movement, there's no contradiction between having mass actions, or a vanguard

organization, having a revolutionary Marxist leadership or partially having a revolutionary Marxist leadership which leads in carrying out mass actions of a sort. The antiwar movement has partially a revolutionary Marxist leadership in the person of the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance. There is no contradiction between those mass organizations that carry out mass actions and ourselves.

# INDEX OF INTERNATIONAL INTERNAL DISCUSSION BULLETINS

Below is a list of International Internal Discussion Bulletins, the English-language edition of the internal discussion bulletin of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

It has been published by the Socialist Workers Party as a fraternal courtesy to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International since the reunification of the Fourth International in 1963.

If the price of a bulletin is omitted and replaced by an asterisk (\*), the bulletin is out of print.

The asterisks following the titles of articles indicate that the article is currently available in the following special compilations of reprints from the International Internal

Discussion Bulletin.

\*\*Discussion on Latin America, 1968-1972 (\$1.50)

\*\*\*Discussion on China, 1968-1972 (\$1.50)

\*\*\*\*Discussion on the International Youth Radicalization, 1968-1971 (50 cents)

\*\*\*\*\*Discussion on Europe, 1968-1971 (40 cents)

\*\*\*\*\*The Algerian Revolution from 1962 to 1969, Political Report at the December 1969 IEC, Again and Always, the Question of the International, Letter to 1971 SWP Convention from Pierre Frank (30 cents)

\*\*\*\*\*On the Character of Zionism and the Palestinian Liberation Movement, Nigeria, Nigerian Situation and Our Tasks (20 cents)

## Vol. I, No. 1—April 1963 (\*)—No. 1

Position of the French Section of the International Committee on the Cuban Question

## Vol. I, No. 2—May 1963 (\*)—No. 2

Where Is Healy Taking the Socialist Labour League?—A Dangerous Sectarian Tendency, by S.T. Peng

## Vol. I, No. 3—July 1963 (\*)—No. 3

1. Opportunism and Empiricism, A Reply to Joseph Hansen  
2. Letter from J. Cannon to New York, October 1962

## Vol. I, No. 4—August 1963 (35 cents)—No. 4

International Report at the Twentieth Convention of the Socialist Workers Party, by Joseph Hansen

## Vol. II, No. 1—May 1964 (\*)—No. 5

Documents on the Dispute in the World Movement—Part I  
Introduction

The Sino-Soviet Conflict—It Is Time To See Clearly, by Michel Pablo

A Reply to Comrade Pablo's Article on the Sino-Soviet Conflict, by the United Secretariat

Letter from Comrade Pablo (November 20, 1963)

Letter from Minority (December 14, 1963)

The Issue Is Democratic Centralism, by the United Secretariat

Letter from Comrade Frias (December 30, 1963)

Resolution on Frias' Letter About an Article in "l'Internationale"  
Motion on Ceylon, submitted by Anderson

Statement by United Secretariat on Anderson's Motion Concerning Ceylon

The International Situation (Statement by Majority of the United Secretariat)

Letter from Comrade Pablo (January 22, 1964)

Resolution of the African Commission of the Fourth International

"The Most Friendly Relations"—With Whom? (Statement by the Majority of the United Secretariat)

The Political Orientation of Comrade Pablo (Statement by the Majority of the United Secretariat)

United Secretariat Resolution on "Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme"

Statement by the Minority

Statement by the Majority

## Vol. III, No. 1—February 1965 (\*)—No. 6

Documents on the Dispute in the World Movement—Part II  
Introduction

Letter from Michael Pablo (February 17, 1964)

On Comrade Pablo's "Warning" of February 17 (Statement by Majority of United Secretariat)

The Minority Launches Its Own Internal Bulletin (Statement by Majority of United Secretariat)

Letter From Comrade Pablo to Comrade Nic of the Australian Section (March 1, 1964)

Yes, It Is Time to See Clearly! (Statement by Majority of United Secretariat)

Declaration of the African Commission (Statement by Minority, dated March 15)

In Reply to the Minority's "Fear No Split" Declaration (Statement by Majority of United Secretariat)

International Executive Committee Minutes (First Plenum After the Reunification Congress, May 1964)

Resolution of the African Commission (Statement by Minority Sent to Ceylonese Comrades)

Letter from Comrade Pablo (October 15, 1964)

Statement by Majority Members of the African Commission  
Appeal to the Leaderships and Members of the Sections of the International (Minority Document)

We Will Continue to Protect the Interests of the Movement  
(Statement by United Secretariat of the Fourth International)

A Right-Wing Tendency, by E. Germain

## Vol. III, No. 2—August 1965 (35 cents)—No. 7

The Evolution of Capitalism in Western Europe and the Tasks of the Revolutionary Marxists

Draft Theses on the Progress and Problems of the African Revolution

## Vol. III, No. 3—August 1965 (\*)—No. 8

The Development of the Sino-Soviet Conflict and the Situation in the International Communist Movement

## Vol. III, No. 4—November 1965 (45 cents)—No. 9

Editorial Note

Notification Sent by Minority in Africa to a Member of Majority  
Minority Circular

Minority "Communique"

Pablo Begins His "Discussion" (Statement by the United Secre-

- tariat)  
 A New Stage in the Internal Situation  
 On Pablo's Split  
 Anderson Denies Negotiating with LSSP Renegades  
 Letter to the Leadership and Members of the Sections of the Fourth International (May 20, 1965)  
 Letter to the Leaderships and Members of the Sections of the Fourth International (June 10, 1965)  
 Reply to Two Circular Letters of the Pablo Faction (by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International)
- Vol. III, No. 5**—December 1965(\*)—No. 10  
 Some Criticisms and Comments Concerning the Document on the African Revolution, by Livio Maitan  
 Nasser's Egypt—On the Way to a Workers State? by Joseph Hansen  
 Notes on the Draft Theses on the Progress of the African Revolution (South Africa), by G.V.G.
- Vol. IV, No. 1**—June 1966 (30 cents)—No. 11  
 Organization Report, Presented by Pierre Frank to the Second Congress Since Reunification (Eighth World Congress)
- Vol. IV, No. 2**—June 1966 (\*)—No. 12  
 Canadian Trade Unions Today, by P. Kent
- Vol. IV, No. 3**—June 1966 (\*)—No. 13  
 Resolution on the Relations Between League for Socialist Action (LSA) and Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere (LSO)
- Vol. IV, No. 4**—July 1966 (\*)—No. 14  
 Minutes of the Second Congress Since Reunification (Eighth World Congress, December 1965)
- Vol. IV, No. 5**—August 1966 (\*)—No. 15  
 Documents on Ceylon  
 The Balance Sheet of the Whole Experience of the LSSP (Statement by the Central Committee of the LSSP [R])  
 The Coalition and After, by V. Karalasingham (submitted to the World Congress)  
 The Ceylon Question and the Eighth World Congress, by V. Karalasingham  
 Two Letters from the United Secretariat to the Leadership of the Ceylon Section (Excerpts)
- Vol. V, No. 1**—January 1968 (\*)—No. 16  
 What Our Position Should Be On the Factional Struggle Inside the CCP, by Peng Shu-tse \*\*\*  
 Letter of Comrade Peng Shu-tse to the International Executive Committee \*\*\*  
 The Struggle Within the CCP and China's Situation (Resolution of the Provisional National Committee of the Revolutionary Communist Party of China) \*\*\*
- Vol. V, No. 2**—April 1968 (\*)—No. 17  
 Resolution of the Central Committee of the LSSP(R) on the Middle East Conflict of June 1967  
 A Critique of the United Secretariat Resolution on the Arab-Israeli Conflict by Comrade Edmund  
 First Balance Sheet of the Middle East Conflict, by Comrade Kulatilake  
 The Middle East Conflict (An Appreciation from the United Secretariat)
- Vol. V, No. 3**—October 1968 (55 cents)—No. 18  
 The New Rise of the World Revolution (Draft Resolution for the Third World Congress Since Reunification [Ninth World Congress])
- Vol. VI, No. 1**—January 1969 (30 cents)—No. 19  
 Statutes of the Fourth International (Proposed Draft)  
 Appendix I, Statutes of the Fourth International (Adopted at the Founding Congress in 1938)  
 Appendix II, Statutes of the Fourth International (Adopted at the Second World Congress in 1948)
- Vol. VI, No. 2**—January 1969 (\*)—No. 20  
 Draft Resolution on Latin America \*\*  
 An Insufficient Document, by Livio Maitan \*\*  
 The Relationship and Differences Between Mao Tse-tung and Liu Shao-chi, by Peng Shu-tse \*\*\*
- Vol. VI, No. 3**—February 1969 (\*)—No. 21  
 Assessment of the Draft Resolution on Latin America, by Joseph Hansen
- Vol. VI, No. 4**—March 1969 (20 cents)—No. 22  
 The Worldwide Radicalization of the Youth and the Tasks of the Fourth International [Draft Resolution for the Third World Congress Since Reunification (Ninth World Congress)]  
 \*\*\*\*
- Vol. VI, No. 5**—March 1969 (30 cents)—No. 23  
 Resolution on the "Cultural Revolution" (Document Submitted by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party for the Fraternal Consideration of the World Trotskyist Movement)  
 Draft Resolution on the "Cultural Revolution" (Adopted by Majority of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International for Consideration at the Next World Congress)  
 Return to the Road of Trotskyism, by Peng Shu-tse \*\*
- Vol. VI, No. 6**—April 1969 (20 cents)—No. 24  
 The Algerian Revolution from 1962 to 1969 [Draft Resolution for the Third World Congress Since Reunification (Ninth World Congress)]\*\*\*\*\*  
 Amendment Proposed by Charlier and Germain to the Resolution on Algeria  
 The Position of the Mexican Delegation to the Ninth Congress of the Fourth International on the United Secretariat Resolution on Latin America \*\*
- Vol. VI, No. 7**—May 1969 (20 cents)—No. 25  
 Draft Resolution on Our Tactics in Europe [Prepared by the United Secretariat as Part of the Discussion for the Third World Congress Since Reunification (Ninth World Congress)]\*\*\*\*\*
- Vol. VI, No. 8**—May 1969 (\*)—No. 26  
 An Amendment to the Draft Resolution on the "Cultural Revolution," by Ferdinand Charlier (Submitted for Discussion Prior to the World Congress) \*\*\*  
 An Unacceptable Amendment, by E. Germain (Submitted for Discussion Prior to the World Congress) \*\*\*  
 The New Developments in the Chinese Revolution, by Chen Pi-lan (Submitted for Discussion at the World Congress)\*\*\*  
 Letter from Jose Valdes (Submitted for Discussion at the World Congress) \*\*
- Vol. VI, No. 9**—July 1969 (20 cents)—No. 27  
 Minutes of the Third World Congress Since Reunification (Ninth World Congress)
- Vol. VI, No. 10**—July 1969 (20 cents)—No. 28  
 Report on Tactics in Europe, by Pierre Frank \*\*\*\*\*  
 Minority Report to the World Congress, by Peng Shu-tse \*\*\*  
 A Correction

**Vol. VII, No. 1**—March 1970 (20 cents)—No. 29

A Criticism of the United Secretariat Majority Draft Resolution on the "Cultural Revolution," by Kyoji Nishi \*\*\*

**Vol. VII, No. 2**—April 1970 (40 cents)—No. 30

Letter from Hugo Blanco to Joseph Hansen—January 1970 \*\*  
International Report to the Ninth National Convention of the YSA, by Caroline Lund, December 28, 1969 \*\*\*\*

Balance Sheet on the Student Movement, by Daniel Bensaid and C. Scalabrino \*\*\*\*

A Contribution to the Discussion on the Worldwide Radicalization of the Youth (Resolution Passed by the Political Bureau of the French Communist League) \*\*\*\*

**Vol. VII, No. 3**—May 1970 (20 cents)—No. 31

Resolution of the December 1969 IEC Plenum on the Split in the German Section

Letter from the Central Committee of the GIM to the Leadership of the IKD

Declaration of the Internationalist Communists of Germany (IKD)—Section of the Fourth International—Regarding the Resolution of the December 1969 IEC on the Split in the German Section—January 23, 1970

Letter from the United Secretariat of the Fourth International to all Members of the IKD—February 1, 1970

**Vol. VII, No. 4**—June 1970 (50 cents)—No. 32

Editorial Note

Original Draft Resolution on the "Cultural Revolution" and Proposed Amendments Arranged in Dual Columns \*\*\*

The Differences Between the Two Documents on the "Cultural Revolution," by Joseph Hansen \*\*\*

**Vol. VII, No. 5**—June 1970 (\*)—No. 33

Report on the Third World Congress of the Fourth International Since Reunification, by Joseph Hansen \*\*

Internationalism and the Socialist Workers Party, by Barry Sheppard (Report to the 23rd National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party)

The Origin of the Differences on China, by Joseph Hansen (Report to the 23rd National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party) \*\*\*

**Vol. VII, No. 6**—July 1970 (20 cents)—No. 34

A Contribution to the Discussion on Revolutionary Strategy in Latin America, by Joseph Hansen \*\*

**Vol. VII, No. 7**—September 1970 (40 cents)—No. 35

Letter from Livio Maitan to Hugo Blanco—March 26, 1970 \*\*  
Guerrilla Warfare: The Lesson of China, Letter from a Chinese Trotskyist \*\*/\*\*\*

On the Character of Zionism and the Palestinian Liberation Movement, by Micha \*\*\*\*\*

Criticism of a Criticism (In Reply to Comrade Nishi), by F. Charlier \*\*\*

Nigeria, by Africanist \*\*\*\*\*

The Nigerian Situation and Our Tasks, by Baba Oluwide \*\*\*\*\*

**Vol. VIII, No. 1**—January 1971 (20 cents)—No. 36

Political Report at the December 1969 Meeting of the International Executive Committee, by E. Germain \*\*\*\*\*

**Vol. VIII, No. 2**—January 1971 (40 cents)—No. 37

Letter from Hugo Blanco to Livio Maitan—October 17, 1970 \*\*

Once Again on the Revolutionary Perspectives in Latin America—Defense of an Orientation and a Method, by Livio Maitan \*\*

The Strategic Orientation of the Revolutionists in Latin America, by Ernest Germain and Martine Knoeller \*\*

**Vol. VIII, No. 3**—April 1971 (80 cents)—No. 39

In Defense of the Leninist Strategy of Party Building, by Joseph Hansen \*\*

**Vol. VIII, No. 4**—June 1971 (20 cents)—No. 39

Introductory Note to the Letter Signed Domingo, by L.M. \*\*  
The Crisis of the Trotskyist Movement in Argentina, by Domingo \*\*

Correction of Translation \*\*

May 11, 1971, Letter from the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party to the United Secretariat \*\*

Statement of the United Secretariat Concerning the May 11, 1971, Letter of the Political Committee of the SWP \*\*

Reply to the Political Committee of the SWP, by Livio Maitan \*\*

**Vol. VIII, No. 5**—July 1971 (10 cents)—No. 40

Again, and Always, the Question of the International, by Alain Krivine and Pierre Frank \*\*\*\*\*

July 7, 1971, Letter from the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party to the United Secretariat \*\*

**Vol. VIII, No. 6**—November 1971 (40 cents)—No. 41

Let's Keep to the Issue, Let's Avoid Diversions! by Livio Maitan \*\*

Our Orientation to the NDP—As a Strategy—and Its Tactical Application, by Ross Dowson, approved by the Political Committee of the LSA/LSO for the 1970 Convention\*\*\*\*\*

Letter to SWP Convention from Pierre Frank \*\*\*\*\*

May 16, 1971, Letter from Stein to the National Leadership of the Socialist Workers Party \*\*

June 1, 1971, Letter from Joseph Hansen to Stein \*\*

June 15, 1971, Letter from Stein to Joseph Hansen \*\*

June 24, 1971, Letter from Joseph Hansen to Stein \*\*

June 30, 1971, Letter from Joseph Hansen to Stein \*\*

In Answer to Comrade Stein, by Peter Camejo \*\*

**Vol. IX, No. 1**—March 1972 (20 cents)—No. 42

Whom Should We Support in the Present Chinese Revolution?—Another Discussion—by Hajime Osada \*\*\*

**Vol. IX, No. 2**—June 1972 (20 cents)—No. 43

A Letter on Bolivia, Raimond \*\*

Comments on Alain Krivine and Pierre Frank's Document "Again, and Always, the Question of the International," by Hugo Blanco G. \*\*

For Good Preparation of the Next World Congress of the Fourth International, C.C. P.R.T. \*\*

For the Construction and Strengthening of the Latin American Sections of the Fourth International, by L. David, Miguel Fuentes, Antonio, Ines \*\*

A Contribution to the Discussion in the Fourth International on Tactics and Strategy in Latin America, by A. Iber, J. Montero, and T. Ismael \*\*

**Vol. IX, No. 3**—July 1972 (20 cents)—No. 44

The Lessons of Bolivia, by Anibal Lorenzo (Submitted by the PRT (Verdad) for the internal discussion preparatory to the next world congress) \*\*

**Vol. IX, No. 4**—October 1972 (50 cents)—No. 45

The Only Road to Workers' Power and Socialism (El Unico Camino Hasta el Poder Obrero y el Socialismo), by Carlos Ramirez, Sergio Domecg and Juan Candela. Presented by the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (Combatiente) \*\*

**Vol. IX, No. 5**—November 1972 (40 cents)—No. 46

Preparatory Text for the 1971 Conference of the Leaderships of the European Sections, by Vergeat and Delphin

The Building of Revolutionary Parties in Capitalist Europe (Draft Theses Submitted to the Tenth World Congress—Fourth Since Reunification), by the United Secretariat. Approved by the United Secretariat, September 1972.

For: Delfin, Kurt, Livio, Luc, Petersen, Pierre, Vergeat, Walter  
Against: Adair, Hans, Pedro, Therese, Stateman

Not Present: Ghulam, Juan, Pia, Roca

**Vol. X, No. 1**—January 1973 (80 cents)—No. 47

Argentina and Bolivia—The Balance Sheet, by Hugo Blanco, Peter Camejo, Joseph Hansen, Anibal Lorenzo, Nahuel Moreno  
I. Two Orientations  
II. The Lesson of Bolivia  
III. The Lesson of Argentina  
IV. The Crisis in the Fourth International

**Vol. X, No. 2**—February 1973 (30 cents)—No. 48

The Real Lesson of China on Guerrilla Warfare—In Reply to a "Letter from a Chinese Trotskyist," by Chen Pi-lan \*\*\*  
On the MIR, Latin American Commission of the French Communist League

Relations of the PRT (Combatiente), Argentine Section of the Fourth International, With the United Secretariat, Political Bureau, PRT (Combatiente)

Appendix I: Statement of the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party on the Sallustro Kidnapping

Appendix II: Statement of the League for Socialist Action—Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere on the Sallustro Kidnapping

Appendix III: Excerpts from Minutes of the United Secretariat, April 15-16, 1972

Appendix IV: Motion Passed by SWP National Committee Plenum, May 11, 1972

Appendix V: Statement by United Secretariat Members Delfin, Ghulam, Livio, Petersen, Pierre, Sandor, Walter

**Vol. X, No. 3**—March 1973 (50 cents)—No. 49

Declaration of the Leninist-Trotskyist Tendency

A Criticism of the United Secretariat Majority Draft Resolution on "The Building of Revolutionary Parties in Capitalist Europe"—An Initial Contribution to the Discussion, by Mary-Alice Waters

Two Lines, Two Methods, by George Novack

Corrections in Translation of Draft Theses: "The Building of Revolutionary Parties in Capitalist Europe"

**Vol. X, No. 4**—April 1973 (70 cents)—No. 50

In Defence of Leninism: In Defence of the Fourth International, by Ernest Germain

December 3, 1972, Statement of 19 I. E. C. Members

**Vol. X, No. 5**—April 1973 (70 cents)—No. 51

Resolutions of the Fifth Congress of the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT (Combatiente)—Revolutionary Workers Party)

Resolutions of the Subsequent Meetings of the Central Committee and Executive Committee

**Vol. X, No. 6**—April 1973 (40 cents)—No. 52

Bolivia—Results and Perspectives (Adopted by a majority at the December 2-6, 1972, meeting of the International Executive Committee)

The Political Crisis and Perspectives for Revolutionary Struggle in Argentina (Adopted by a majority at the December 2-6, 1972, meeting of the International Executive Committee)  
Documents of the December 2-6, 1972, Meeting of the International Executive Committee

1. Sterne-Walter resolution on Vietnam
2. Motion on Vietnam submitted by Adair, Hans, Juan, Pedro, Stateman, and Therese
3. Statement by Juan on reasons for postponing the World Congress
4. Statement by Walter on reasons for not postponing the World Congress
5. Statement by Sandor on behalf of those IEC members who voted for the general line of the Latin American resolution at the 1969 World Congress
6. Statement by Sakai
7. Letter to the IEC from the Central Secretariat of the Communist League of India
8. Message to the IEC from Comrade Roca

**Vol. X, No. 7**—June 1973 (50 cents)—No. 53

The Debate on Indochina, by Sterne

Letter to the PRT (Combatiente), by Ernest, Livio, Pierre, Sandor, Tariq, Delphin

Some Fundamental Differences Between the PRT and the International Majority, by Ernest, Livio, Pierre, Sandor, Tariq, Delphin

Letter to the SWP Political Committee on the Formation of a Political Tendency, by Bill Massey, John Shaffer, Don Smith

**Vol. X, No. 8**—June 1973 (20 cents)—No. 54

On Comrade Germain's Half-Truths: Or How the ERP Flag Got on the Coffin, by Fred Halstead  
Lenin Vs. Germain, by Peter Camejo

**Vol. X, No. 9**—July 1973 (50 cents)—No. 55

The Issues Before the World Trotskyist Movement, Report to the Socialist Activists and Educational Conference on August 18, 1972, by Jack Barnes

An Evaluation of the December 1972 IEC Plenum, Report to the New York City-wide Membership Meeting of the Socialist Workers Party on February 9, 1973, by Jack Barnes