

FORUM

Discussion & Information Bulletin
of the Independent Socialist League

Contents

RESOLUTIONS FOR THE CONVENTION OF THE INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST LEAGUE

1. International Resolution (2 parts)
 - a. Independent Socialism and the Third World War.
 - b. The Meaning of the British Labor Government.
2. On the Situation in the United States
3. Resolution on the Jewish Question, Israel and Palestine.

VOL. NO.

April, 1951

15 cents

2478

NOTE

The following resolutions are presented to the ISL by the PC as material for the pre-convention discussion period. The resolutions on the war and Great Britain are parts 1 and 2 of the International Resolution. Two additional sections, Jugoslavia and Asia, will be completed shortly, to complete that resolution.

April 15, 1951

INDEPENDENT SOCIALISM AND THE THIRD WORLD WAR

1) Since the last convention of the ISL, war has actually broken out in the world. To be sure, the Korean war is not yet the third world war but it is universally recognized as a preliminary to it.

We endorse the analysis and position taken by the Political Committee in its Declaration on the outbreak of the Korean war. The consequences of the Korean war fully confirm the views there expressed on the reactionary character of the foreign policy and aims of Washington and Moscow.

2) The outbreak of the Korean war has given rise in all U.S. political circles to new debates and discussions on the war threat. In this so-called "Great Debate", there have been especially counterposed (a) the line of the Truman-Acheson administration, and (b) proposals from various sectors of bourgeois and liberal thought for policies which are put forward as means of eliminating or lessening the war danger, as compared with the Truman-Acheson line.

The way in which the two have been counterposed to each other permits us once again to underline the distinctive features of the Independent socialism which opposes and rejects them both.

3) The Administration line, as the current and prevailing policy of U.S. imperialism, may be summarized as follows:

a) It is necessary, in the interests of maintaining and expanding the power of U.S. capitalism in the world, to carry on an aggressive foreign and military policy to stop and drive back Stalinism and Stalinist-Russian expansion.

b) This is to be done by relying primarily and mainly on military force (as in Korea, Indo-China, Malaya) and by building up more military force through an armaments race, atomic warfare preparations and power alliances.

c) These military (and secondarily diplomatic) steps are entirely subordinated to the reactionary social and political program of U.S. capitalism, which is incapable of making any effective appeal to the peoples of the world outside of that framework. In consequence then, nowhere does the U.S. seriously attempt to meet Stalinism, in Europe or Asia, with political weapons which can counter its appeal. It is for this reason, not merely shortsightedness or stupidity, that its perspective for the struggle against Stalinism is an essentially military one -- war and destruction to the bitter end, with only pious hopes that this will not entail the feared consequences of destroying the heart of civilization along with the Kremlin's power, even if it is militarily successful.

d) In line with this perspective, the U.S. has (increasingly since Korea) openly followed the policy of seeking military alliance with every reactionary force and power in the world which is also opposed to Moscow: Franco, Chiang Kai-shek and his remnants on Formosa (reversing the White Paper policy), Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai, etc. Its policy has forced even the Indian Nehru government into open opposition in the UN, where it has pushed through its line with a display of blackmail and threats rivaling in cynicism the activities of the Moscow imperialists themselves.

4) U.S. policy banks any hope of avoiding full-scale atomic warfare only on frightening its Russian rival into quiescence. To people of more than one school of thought, this age-old claim of "preserving peace through superior military power", which preceded both World War I and II, can have no different result in this pre-war period. In reaction against the Truman-Acheson war policy, a group of proposals arise which mark themselves off from it WITH RESPECT TO ITS POINT (a) ABOVE. This is their common point of approach. Three varieties of this approach have been put before the American people:

a) The line put forward in its starkest form by Herbert Hoover, in attenuated degree by Senator Taft, and informing much of what is left of isolationist sentiment in the U.S., by and large emanating from some of the more reactionary sections of U.S. capitalism: retreat in foreign policy to the Western Hemisphere and its conversion into a "fortress". This policy, which, like that of Acheson-Truman, sees no effective political means of combatting Stalinism, goes even further in its involuntary acknowledgment of the bankruptcy of world capitalism inasmuch as it finds no reason for relying upon West-European capitalism's will or ability to defend itself from Stalinist conquest. It is false to charge Hooverism, as the Acheson-Truman supporters do, that it sees no need for allies in the war against Stalinism. What is true is that it frankly sees no European allies in existence (except England, to serve as an American airfield, and Franco, to serve as the only reliable bulwark of democracy on the continent) and is resigned to fighting for survival virtually alone. Its perspective for a beleaguered "capitalism in one country", bristling with arms, could only mean a speedier acceleration of the trend toward the militarization, bureaucratization and totalitarianization of the country.

b) "Neutralist" or "third-force" policies based on the theory of "peaceful coexistence" of the two worlds. It is the basic programmatic element in views as various otherwise as those of many American anti-Stalinist liberals, Stalinoid liberals, as well as the World Federalists and Titoists. Its central plea is that the U.S. and Russia "learn to live together", and not the need to stop and destroy Stalinism. Although not often explicitly, the practical program is a form of appeasement -- going under the name of "negotiations for peace", i.e., a deal between imperialist regimes for a momentarily acceptable division of the world, as at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam; in another form, its practical program is "world government", a utopia so long as the imperialist regimes are maintained; in another, its program depends on the illusion that the Kremlin's aggressiveness is a reaction to "Western encirclement" and/or that the West's war fever is the product simply of baseless fear. All of these variants are naive or suicidal. But it must be recognized that a positive aspect of these schools of foreign policy is that their supporters are freed, by the terms of their ideas, to be highly and justly critical of the actual foreign policy and acts of both American and Russian imperialism.

c) The policy of a breathing spell -- postponement of war -- by any means, on the ground that anything is better than an outbreak of atomic war. Since this approach does not necessarily depend on any of the political views or illusions noted above, it is to be found even in socialist and pacifist circles. There can be no quarrel by Independent Socialists with the general idea that the postponement of war for as long as possible is a positive good, since it 2481

permits the longest possible time for that regroupment and revival of socialist forces which is crucial to any progressive solution of the world crisis. But this consideration does not point to a peace-at-any-price ideology. A "breathing spell" gained at the expense of more basic considerations only ensures the worst possible outcome of the crisis and disarms the working class and Third Camp forces. In any case, over-emphasis on the need for a "breathing spell" as an overriding consideration can serve the deleterious end of preparing their thinking for reactionary solutions.

5) We reject entirely all such proposals which, in reaction to the Truman-Acheson line of anti-Russian belligerency, aim to or tend to abandon or de-emphasize the **NEED TO FIGHT FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF STALINISM**, even if this is done under the slogan of "Peace!" We take this stand in the interest of and from the viewpoint of the working class and the future of the socialist struggle, for the following reasons:

a) Labor and socialism **CANNOT** "coexist peacefully" with Stalinism in the same world. The rebuilding and the victory of the socialist movement require the destruction of all Stalinist influence in the working class -- indeed, it can be rebuilt only through a program which includes an uncompromising fight for the destruction of Stalinism.

b) Given the fact that the antagonism between the Stalinist and capitalist sectors of the world is a basic one, rooted in the inherent antagonism between these two rival social systems both forced to reach out for complete domination of the world, "coexistence" for any length of time can neither be "peaceful" nor permanent. It means no resolution of the world crisis but rather a perspective of cold-war-in-permanence -- a perspective which can be accompanied, in the U.S. and the West, only by a concomitant permanent war economy and the deepening and hastening of all reactionary tendencies in present-day capitalism.

c) Not least of all, furthermore, is the fact that we, as internationalist socialists, cannot callously take the attitude that it is no concern of ours if one-third of the world suffers under the most monstrous totalitarian slavery. This is no consideration for the U.S. bourgeoisie, which can and would be thoroughly unconcerned by the fate of any other peoples, if it were not that their power and aims are at stake.

The Independent Socialist movement, however, which is founded on the struggle for socialist democracy against both capitalism and Stalinism, is the **MOST IRRECONCILABLE** enemy of Stalinism in the fullest sense. (a) The American bourgeoisie and government, for the reasons noted above, are not. While their interests inevitably drive them into conflict with the Stalinist empire, and this conflict in the long run cannot be reconciled, this takes place **IN SPITE OF** their own preference (if it were possible) to strike a deal with Moscow which would confine the latter to a minor portion of the earth, at the expense of the working class and people of any and every country. Sections of the bourgeoisie and government are anxious to do this right now. Even the Truman-Acheson policy-makers (Moscow willing) may come to some such over-the-counter arrangement, temporary as it may be. (b) Nor is the Independent Socialist movement poisoned by the conceptions rife in some parts of the world socialist movement which looks on Stalinist expansion as some kind of road toward socialism.

If the destruction of Stalinist tyranny and its replacement by a democratic regime -- not the maintenance and expansion of U.S. capitalism -- were REALLY the politics from which Washington's foreign policy flowed, socialists would be in duty bound to support (however critically) its preparations for war and the war itself. But the claim that this is so is a lie -- proved a lie by every concrete aspect of its actual policy and acts, including its A-bomb diplomacy. But it is this side of the Truman-Acheson line, its "strong" policy against Stalinist expansion, which attracts a mass of workers (not the most backward either!) in support of its foreign policy, while other sections of the masses of people are attracted to counter-programs on the basis of their fear of war. Fear of Stalinism or fear of war, the need to fight against Stalinism or the need to fight against war, hatred of the old system of exploitation or dread of the new one -- these are the poles between which the progressive aspirations of the peoples are divided. The task of Independent Socialists is to demonstrate that its program alone offers a road to fight both Stalinism and war, both the old system of capitalism and the new tyranny of bureaucratic collectivism. That is why we reject any program which illusorily subordinates the need to destroy Stalinism to the need for peace, just as we reject any program to make peace with capitalism in order to fight Stalinism.

6) It is a fundamental error, because of the CONCRETE nature of the coming imperialist war, even to POSE THE PROBLEM in terms of : Which is more important -- to continue the traditional socialist struggle against capitalism and imperialism at home, or to fight the new enemy Stalinism?

Marxists do not base their opposition to imperialist wars simply on the abstract ground that imperialist governments are involved and that support of war by any imperialist government is excluded on a priori principles. In each case, a CONCRETE analysis is necessary of a given imperialist war.

In the present world crisis, the Marxist CONCRETIZATION of the imperialist and reactionary character of the third world war is based on precisely the NEW features which distinguish this war from the preceding world wars of our epoch. These new features are three:

a) It is a war not merely between two rival imperialist blocs, but between two different and mutually antagonistic social systems.

b) It is a war not merely for a redistribution of the colonial and undeveloped areas of the world between different exploiters, but a struggle for domination and control of the entire world, including the leading nations themselves.

c) It is a struggle which bears within itself the potentiality for the destruction of all civilization, if not of the world itself. We recognize it as a fact that this potentiality exists today for the first time, as a result of the distortion of modern science and technology into a monster rather than a benefactor. Any war which depends on the matching of the new atomic arms to the bitter end of mutual annihilation raises a NEW (though not an independent) element in the considerations of socialists on the war question.

Each one of these factors points to a REINFORCEMENT of the Independent Socialist policy of opposition to both war blocs. At bottom, this is

so because each one is a concrete expression in today's terms of the imperialist nature of the struggle for the world.

7) I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SOCIAL ANTAGONISM. -- This has already been dealt with basically in the 1948 resolution of the ISL on Capitalism, Stalinism and the War, summed up in sections 8, 14, 67, 68.

Because of its anti-capitalist character, Stalinism can and does make a political and ideological appeal to the peoples of the capitalist and semi-feudal world against their capitalist and imperialist rulers, an appeal which has been a tremendous weapon in its expansion and a potent one in its "little wars". To those peoples who have had as yet no experience under its rule, it demagogically offers a revolutionary and dynamic program of change from the old system of exploitation (landlordism, capitalism and capitalist imperialism) which the people know too well and which they are determined to destroy. Even to people under its rule and disillusioned by knowledge that this change is TO a new system of oppression, the result tends to be, not active revolt, but passivity, confusion and illusions about "democratization" of Stalinism, as long as the only alternative offered is a restoration of the old system of capitalism.

Capitalism, any appeal based on capitalism, and any power which fights in the name of capitalism cannot gain the active, sacrifice-stirring devotion of the masses of the peoples such as could bring down the Stalinist empire by crumbling it from within. Neither the Stalinist empire nor Russia is as monolithic, solid and united under terror as both its leaders and bourgeois enemies often make it out to be.

It is possible, to be sure, for the Stalinist empire to be defeated by purely reactionary military force -- but not without laying waste the world and not without the consequences for capitalist society itself (intensification of all trends toward bureaucratization, militarization and totalitarianization) which are analyzed in the 1948 resolution.

The Western capitalist war bloc cannot defeat Stalinism without such reactionary consequences, both for the peoples of the world and at home, as to make the "defense of bourgeois democracy against Stalinist totalitarianism" through support of war a suicidal illusion.

The U.S. war bloc may defeat RUSSIA militarily -- if indeed there is any distinction between victor and vanquished -- but CAPITALISM CANNOT DEFEAT STALINISM in any sense which means victory for any of the progressive aspirations of the people.

II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NATIONAL ELEMENT. -- The war blocs fight for control of each others' nations, not simply for control over backward peoples. This means that ON BOTH SIDES -- for the people as well as for the ruling classes and governments -- the very existence of the nation (national independence) is in peril. Few other facts underline so clearly the reactionary nature of such a war even in comparison with World War I and with World War II (where this element already partly showed itself).

This fact has two more concrete significations:

- a) It reinforces our view that Independent Socialism must

reject any "peace" program which abandons the fight for the destruction of Stalinism. If it is true that capitalism cannot defeat Stalinism without reactionary consequences -- any more than Stalinism can defeat capitalism without equally and even more reactionary consequences -- it is also true that only OUR road of struggle can, in any progressive sense, DEFEND THE NATION against the enemy without and DEFEND THE PEOPLE against the class oppressor at home. Even from the point of view of the American people, capitalist imperialism can defend their national existence only at the expense of the national existence of all other peoples and at the expense of their own social existence.

b) But if the national existence of the American people is endangered by defeat in a military struggle, THIS IS ALSO TRUE FOR THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE. It is not true that the masses who suffer under Stalin's iron heel are indifferent to the national consideration: this was demonstrated by them in Russia's war against German invasion in World War II, at least by sufficient numbers of them to make clear that the character of the coming war as an imperialist struggle for control of the whole world serves to TIE THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE CLOSER TO THEIR OWN OPPRESSORS, makes more difficult the destruction of STALINISM (as distinct from the occupation of the Kremlin by an American Military Government) and assures that an American imperialist victory can be achieved only through atomic-war-to-the-bitter-end.

III. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ATOMIC WAR. -- The abolition or restriction of atomic weapons (or of any of the new weapons spawned) by agreement between the existing powers is a utopia. No PROGRAM can be founded on the hope that the coming war can be kept from being an atomic war. But this is precisely why OPPOSITION to the war is doubly reinforced by this new element and why it is necessary for socialists to combat the war danger on this ground also.

For us it is not a PACIFIST ground, politically speaking. Not to speak of the Stalinist dictatorship (whose lack of scruples about using any and all weapons need not be discussed), the fact that the U.S. has no other weapons at its disposal except the threat of frightful military power determines the key role of atomic warfare in ITS calculations.

The potentialities for destruction raised by atomic warfare must flower in any resolution of the world crisis which is military or decisively military. The only program which can destroy the Stalinist empire without war -- or at least, without war to the bitter (atomic) end -- is one which can blow up that empire from within. Such revolt can be stirred only on the basis of an appeal which is not only anti-Stalinist but anti-capitalist. But it does not wait only on the coming to power of genuine working class governments in the West. Short of that, the rebellion of Stalin's enslaved peoples will be given impetus and encouragement by demonstrations of the West's working class that THEY are not tied to their imperialists' chariots, that there is a force in the West which offers a road to a solution which does not revolve between capitalism and Stalinism: that is, a strong, powerful and meaningful Third Camp of socialist democracy.

Our road, which seeks to build such a Third Camp, is a road which can avoid atomic destruction. It is not the least of reasons why we drive along that road with all energy and determination.

The Independent Socialist League, while rejecting the standpoint that it is necessary to support American imperialism in the war with Stalinist Russia, is, however, not indifferent to the question of the conduct of the war or its outcome. It rejects as reactionary and criminal the policy, put forward in the name of socialism, of "defense of the Soviet Union" - unconditional or otherwise - a policy which serves, at best, as a cloak and apology for Stalinist imperialism, its enslavement of the working classes, its subjugation of nations and its extirpation of the socialist movement.

It rejects as reactionary and deceitful the policy, put forward in the name of democracy, of supporting American imperialism in the war or pre-war period - a policy which, at best, confers upon the last bulwark of rotting capitalism the task of saving democracy which it cannot possibly perform and which, by subordinating the working class to imperialism, precludes it from performing the tasks of democracy and socialism it is called upon to accomplish. One of these tasks in the present period is precisely the defense of the nation and of the only consistently progressive and democratic class in the nation, the working class. In the Third World War, unlike the First, the national integrity and independence of the country are at stake. This applies both to Russia and to the United States. The I.S.L. recognizes that if the working classes are unable to prevent the outbreak of the Third World War, and they alone can prevent it, the triumph of Stalinism in the war would mean the subjugation of the United States and most other nations and the enslavement of the working class by the totalitarian bureaucracy. But these are exactly the dangers that cannot be warded off by entrusting the "defense of democracy" to the imperialist, reactionary bourgeoisie of the U.S.. It is not at all concerned with the question of the freedom or enslavement of the working class but only with its preservation as a producer of unlimited profits. It is not at all concerned with the question of the defense of the nation's integrity, except in the sense of an imperialist metropolis which is in a position to dominate and dictate to the rest of the world and to check or repress all popular democratic movements throughout the world, that is, it is animated by those very considerations which have brought world-wide discredit upon the nation and produced the very situation and war danger that imperil the nation and its working classes. The socialist movement does not have, and the working class should not have, the slightest confidence in the democratic pretensions or intentions of the American capitalist class, its government, its war, its conduct of the war, its war objectives, its war allies. The socialist movement places its confidence exclusively in that class whose very political existence makes indispensable and imperative its attachment to democracy, democratic rights and institutions, namely, the working class and its labor movement. This applies to the pre-war period and, if it is not averted, to the war itself. Faced by the coming war crisis, the socialist movement will more urgently than ever call upon the working-class movement to take command of the nation and, should it prove necessary as a result of the reactionary and imperialist drive of Stalinism, to take command also of the defense of the nation. Even if, at the outset, a labor government, which takes over the nation and defends the interest of the working people on the basis of a genuinely democratic course in foreign and domestic policy which is not in fact subordinated to the interests of capitalism and imperialism, should not yet be a socialist labor government, the socialist movement stands pledged to support and defend it in word

and in deed in any war in which it is threatened by a reactionary enemy, Stalinist Russia included. It is precisely by confiding the national defense to the reactionary capitalist class, which has and can have only reactionary purposes, that the working-class movement abandons its great responsibility to the true and best interests of the nation, to the true and best interests of itself, and what is related to them, to the true and best interests of democracy all over the world. The task of the defense of the democratic nation is the task of the working class itself.

8) We use the term "Third Camp" as a vivid pointer into the key idea of the Independent Socialist position on the war. On the negative side, it means political opposition to both war blocs in the struggle for the world today. On the positive side, it can only mean in the last analysis a rebuilt and revived socialist working-class struggle against both capitalism and Stalinism.

It thus points up a PROGRAMMATIC DIRECTION, a political line. The problem is the creation of a labor and socialist mass movement which will fight along that line. Such elements not only exist but exist in abundance in the world today. They are unorganized, inchoate, politically confused, immobilized by the same dilemmas which have weakened the socialist movement itself. But in every country of the world, masses grope toward a line which will permit them to oppose consistently both systems and both blocs. Inconsistently, hesitatingly, as yet without a broad political perspective, millions already think along these lines.

The alternative programs which are discussed above (Section 4) are, to be sure, blind alleys or worse, but it is indisputable that much of their popular appeal to supporters (and their meaning TO THOSE SUPPORTERS) exists because the latter are thinking along these lines. This is true of "neutralism" in its various forms, in part of the world government movement, the pacifist movement and the like. A distinction must always be made between the leaders of these movements and the following they arouse, between the illusoriness of the formal program and the popular aspirations they express to one degree or another. This is of the utmost importance in determining at once our critical and sympathetic approach to these movements and its ideologies.

Such Third Camp tendencies are a natural reservoir of strength for a revival of the socialist movement. But while most sections of the socialist left are still weak, the same tendencies manifest themselves and exert their pressure and even influence through other channels. It is essential that Independent Socialists be ready to seize upon, point to, and further develop ALL tendencies in this direction, wherever they appear, in order to facilitate their development toward the consistent and fully thought-out Third Camp position which characterizes Independent Socialism.

Among other things, it must be understood that in the junior partners of the Western bloc, especially the smaller countries, even the bourgeoisies and government circles of those countries have little or no enthusiasm for the coming war, win or lose, since U.S. victory-- with accompanying destruction and American hegemony -- offers even the junior capitalist partners little to fight for. It goes without saying that such circles themselves, whatever the degree to which they tend to "neutralist" sympathies now, will not enter into the

building of a Third Camp force. But even their hesitations today reflect in some measure not only their own doubts but also the pressures of the masses behind them. And to the degree that they separate themselves from the more adventuristic and narrow-nationalistic performances of Washington, to that degree the working-class vanguard must point to these phenomena and utilize them to drive home their own message to the people. Of far greater significance and symptomatic importance for the power of the forces of the Third Camp, is the course followed in foreign policy by the British Labor Government and the Nehru nationalist government. To the extent that they follow and will continue to follow the leadership of American imperialism in the war and the preparations for the war, they disclose their failure to break out of the reactionary framework of imperialism and their economic and military dependency upon American capitalism. However, both governments are distinguished from all others in the American bloc by the fact that they are the direct product, in the one case, of a powerful socialist working-class upsurge, and in the other case, of a no less powerful national-revolutionary and anti-imperialist people's movement. In both countries, the peoples represent the most advanced forces of the Third Camp in existence anywhere in the world, in that both strive vigorously to free themselves from attachment and subordination to American imperialism without showing any indication of supporting or coming under the control of Stalinist imperialism. The fact that both the Laborite and Nehru governments have come into more or less open conflict with the American government on questions of international and war policy, reflects, at bottom, the pressure of the powerful popular forces they represent. Likewise, it constitutes a striking confirmation of the existence of vast forces of the Third Camp, which require, for their victory, only greater organization and greater consistency of expression than can be given by the governments now representing them. It is a socialist task to point up the significance of these forces, today best represented by the Indian and British peoples, to defend them from malicious and reactionary attacks, to utilize their example and aspirations for political education everywhere, aiming only to rally support to them and to give the movement they represent more cohesiveness, deeper understanding, clarity and purpose.

9) To this end, the Independent Socialists, as always, do not limit themselves simply to proposing socialism as the answer to the threatened world war. It is, furthermore, a central view of Independent Socialism that "the key to the struggle for socialism today is the struggle for democracy -- the fight to awaken a mass movement behind the most thorough-going democratic demands as an indispensable means of leading this fight on to socialism." (1948 ISL Resolution.)

Therefore, as against the war danger, we must propose -- in the first place, as a foreign policy for the American labor movement, which today has virtually no foreign policy of its own but tags after that of the Fair Deal administration -- programmatic demands which aim at both the threat of Stalinism and the threat of war by this capitalist government. What is needed is a program to fight Stalinist expansion which counters it with its own revolutionary, dynamic AND DEMOCRATIC appeal.

10) Such demands would include the following:

- a. Complete and unconditional solidarity with and support of the fight against imperialist domination and for full national independence of all the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.
- b. Complete and unconditional solidarity with and support of all popular democratic, revolutionary and reform movements in colonial, semi-colonial and otherwise oppressed countries.
- c. Irreconcilable opposition to political or military support to any imperialist government engaged in any action to maintain its rule over other countries or to deprive them in any way of their elementary democratic right to self-determination.
- d. Withdrawal, in particular, of all political and military aid to puppet regimes like Chiang Kai-shek's in Formosa or Bao Dai's in Indo-China, to England in its suppression of Malaya and domination of Hong Kong, to France in its suppression of Indo-China and Morocco, etc.
- e. No political, economic or military alliance with or aid to such ultra-reactionary regimes as Franco's in Spain.
- f. Withdrawal of all occupational forces from Japan and Germany, recognition of their complete independence and national sovereignty, immediate peace treaties with these nations without annexations or tribute and the granting of their unrestricted right to determine their own economic and political, as well as military, life.
- g. A complete reversal of the prevailing trend to convert the Marshall Plan more and more into a means of facilitating and even forcing the militarization and dependency upon American imperialist policy of the countries included in the Plan.
- h. The elaboration of a world-wide program of fraternal financial and technical aid to all underdeveloped, underprivileged and backward countries with no political strings attached, with no imperialist concessions exacted, and with unambiguous guarantees against imperialist exploitation.

11) We Independent Socialists do not believe that a DEMOCRATIC foreign policy can be expected of this government or any capitalist government. We know, however, that most American workers will not agree with this conclusion today. We invite them to fight for such a policy -- not merely for this or that partial concession to such a policy, especially those that cost little more than words, but for a foreign policy which as a whole can accomplish the needed ends. We are confident that such a fight, if carried on consistently and without retreat, if carried on vigorously and as an appeal to the people will speedily demonstrate that the interests of the working class, and the interests of democracy and peace, cannot be defended by the capitalist class and its government, with whose interests they conflict at every important point, and that their consistent and effective defense requires that labor take its rightful place at the head of the nation.

On the question of war, unlike some specific question of wages, there is no room for lasting compromise between the aims and interests of American capitalist imperialism and what the working class wants, and wants to fight for. Such a program, as a meaningful whole, could be carried out in the U.S. only by a workers' government which does not hesitate to move outside the framework of capitalist interests and

policy, which carries it through regardless of and against the opposition of the capitalist class. The creation of such a government -- and in the first place of an independent labor political movement toward it -- is the prime responsibility of the American labor movement toward the peace of the world and the progress rather than the destruction of civilization.

THE MEANING OF THE BRITISH LABOR GOVERNMENT

I.

1) The five years of existence of the British Labor government confronts the Marxist movement with a new political problem. Its record of achievement is in important respects one unanticipated by Marxists, in the light of previous experience with social-reformism in office. While the 1948 convention resolution of the ISL on "Capitalism, Stalinism and the War", particularly Section I-D on "The Role of the Social-Democracy", is our starting point for a consideration of this new phenomenon, a fuller examination is required of the specific development of the Labor government and its meaning for the socialist movement of the world.

The great significance of the Labor government development will remain even if a new election should restore the Tory party to power. That development may than come to a temporary halt or slow-down, but this would neither eliminate its influence on British society nor diminish the importance of understanding it.

2) The enormous progressive potential of Labor's victory in Britain was conferred upon it and still exists today by virtue of two facts:

a) Emerging directly out of the Second World War, in 1945, the workers and decisive sections of the middle class repudiated the social leadership of the Tories and Churchill -- that is, of the capitalist class -- and voted for the Labor Party as the standard-bearer of a socialist reorganization of society, for the first time giving a clear socialist mandate to the Labor Party which took over the government with an absolute majority in Parliament. Never before had the British workers so clearly and unitedly manifested their socialist aspirations. After years of uninterrupted defeats inflicted on the working classes of Europe and the world by the Stalinists, by the fascists and by the bourgeoisie, the workers of Britain demonstrated that the working class is capable of organizing itself in virtual complete political solidarity and winning a major victory over its class enemy. For the workers of the world, they gave an example which came at a vital point in historical development. For no country of the world is this example more important than for the politically backward American working class, which still faces the task of creating its own political arm. The victory in Britain demonstrated that the political forces of labor can take over the nation; that the masses of the people, including the middle class, will turn to labor as the bourgeoisie shows its inability and unwillingness to satisfy their needs and interests. This fact alone is of tremendous importance. The British workers opened for themselves a road of political opportunity unequalled anywhere since the days of the Spanish revolution and civil war.

b) The labor government in power proceeded to nationalize decisive sections of the basic industry of the country, including steel, thereby undermining bourgeois property relations. This occurs, moreover, at a decisive juncture in world history: the deep-going degeneration and disintegration of world capitalism alongside the emergence of Stalinism as a world social, political and military force embracing a third of the globe. In Britain itself, in particular, the capitalist ruling class is a weak and decaying class, its empire fallen

apart, reduced to junior partnership in the Western capitalist bloc in subordination to the U.S.; while the position of the working class, better organized and more cohesive than ever, has improved and strengthened. While the decay of the capitalist class made the Labor victory possible, the anti-capitalist measures taken by the victorious Labor government in its turn are striking at the heart of capitalist society.

Never more than in the case of this post-war upsurge of the British workers have socialists been justified in their confidence in the recuperative powers of the working class and its necessary emergence as the only progressive force in society.

3) As against the Tories, we stand as unconditional defenders of the Labor Party and its government, urging the firm conviction that it is the duty of British Marxist socialists to be the most energetic and enthusiastic supporters in every electoral contest of the maintenance of the Labor Party at the head of the government and the nation, while within the Labor Party they settle the vital questions of program and policy which will decide the historic course of the Labor victory. In the United States, where the whole bourgeoisie, as well as the more conservative sections of the trade-union bureaucracy, attempts to discredit and denigrate the rule of the Labor Party in the eyes of the American people, we stand as defenders of the British working class and its government against such traducers. We exercise the right of defenders to criticize and make proposals from our own socialist standpoint, but only for the purpose of strengthening the progressive and revolutionary aspects of the British Labor government. We have nothing in common with those who attack it for the purpose of demoralizing the British workers -- and of discouraging those American workers who would follow the example -- as we are determinedly opposed to those whose praise of the British Labor government is calculated to gloss over those aspects of it which point away from socialism, let alone those who claim that the Labor government is even now "building socialism".

The British working class has opened the road to socialism in its country. Whether it enters upon that road and travels it firmly, determinedly and boldly depends upon it and upon what happens within its party, the Labor Party, in the course of the visibly developing antagonism between the socialist aspirations of the mass of workers on the one hand, and the political course of the British Labor bureaucracy on the other. It is in this context that our analysis of the latter is put forward.

II.

1) The problem which the record of the British Labor government has posed, or seemed to pose, before Marxists revolves around the claim of a "rebirth" of reformism as a road to socialism.

On the one hand, (a) the claim is made that Britain is advancing toward socialism under the leadership and policies of a reformist party as can be found among the Social-democracy; that reformism is therefore "proving" itself; that it is vindicating the peaceful parliamentary road to power as against revolutionary Marxist criticism.

On the other hand, (b) many or most left-socialist critics of the BLP, have by and large taken the view that the BLP leadership has essentially been following the same course as classical reformism, that it seeks to do, and in fact does, no more than prop up and patch up capitalism and bourgeois power; that, in other words, there is no important difference between the role and course of the British Labor government today and of the German Social-Democracy after World War I.

We consider both of these views as basically incorrect, and as sharing the same defect: both, from opposing points of view revolve within a circle of ideas which ignore the new phenomena of the present stage of capitalism.

2) A sine qua non for a Marxist analysis of the British Labor government is recognition of the fact that, unlike classical reformism, its course has been anti-capitalist. The Labor government has already taken over ownership and control of some of the most decisive "commanding heights" of the economy - basic industries. With steel it has nationalized up to 20 per cent of the economy. This nationalized sector, in addition, swings a greater weight throughout the economy than the figure indicates and cuts into bourgeois property rights much more deeply. It is enough to establish that bourgeois economic power has been significantly undermined - not yet abolished by any means - but undermined.

This fact is not canceled out by the argument, correct and important in itself, that the Atlee government has also been under pressure from the Labor Party left wing and from the ranks of the workers, who voted for the Labor Party twice with the understanding that it would follow a forthright socialist policy. That the working-class pressure exists is important in indicating the temper of the class, and it undoubtedly has influenced the Labor government's course. That it does not by itself explain this course is indicated by the record of the post-1918 German Social-Democratic government which never took any significant anti-capitalist steps in spite of its birth in a mass revolution and in spite of even stronger working-class pressure.

To belittle the significance of this with the argument that the Labor Party government is really merely bolstering capitalism with reforms is self-defeating blindness. Since it is not in accord with the reality and therefore cannot convince the workers, it leaves the field free for the claims of the reformists and sterilizes the real struggle which has to be made against the policy of the bureaucracy.

3) The anti-capitalist trend of the Labor government's course does not, however, mean that the Labor Party bureaucracy and government is leading Britain toward socialism. Anti-capitalist nationalization, no matter how far carried through, does not of itself add up to socialism. This has been already brought home in our epoch by the phenomenon of Stalinism, which destroys capitalism, and nationalizes economy without permitting the working masses themselves any new power or participation in the life of society; which destroys capitalism in favor of the power and prestige of the state bureaucracy acting as a third social force.

In fact, the formula "nationalization equals socialism" is a false concept common to both Stalinism and reformism and representing a link in basic theory between the two.

4) The emergence of the state bureaucracy as a third social force is the result, in our epoch, of two things: the disintegration and degeneration of capitalism and capitalist imperialism as a viable social system in most of the world (including England); and the failure of the working class as yet to organize its forces to dump that system into the scrapheap of history and build its own socialist power. These two accompanying phenomena create a vacuum, which must be filled; it is the state bureaucracy which steps in to fill it.

This is the general character of the trend. The emergence of Stalinism is only one form of this tendency, a form moreover decisively influenced by (a) its origin in one of the most backward countries of Europe, Russia, and (b) the fact that the Stalinist counter-revolution succeeded to a revolutionary (i.e., thorough and complete) destruction of capitalist power in the country.

This tendency is operating in England where the working class is one of the tightest-knit and best organized in the world, and where the power of the capitalist class has not been previously broken but where it has merely been wasting away. The process is slower and only at its beginning, and not at all to be identified with the Russian development. Its meaning for us today is that it illuminates the objective historical role and direction of the third social force arising. The issue and the fate of British society and socialism is yet to be determined by the struggle.

The role and direction of the third social force which steps into the vacuum is that of bureaucratic collectivization.

5) This social tendency, which results from the disintegration of capitalism and the failure of the working class to give that system its coup de grace, like every other social tendency forces its way through different social channels. It does not and cannot operate uniformly throughout the capitalist world, nor in a straight-line development. Not the least important fact, with regard to its form and tempo, is who executes it. In many capitalist countries, the bourgeoisies themselves (or rather sections of the bourgeoisies) act as vehicles of this trend to greater or lesser degrees - even in the United States, where capitalism is still strongest and the tendency therefore weakest.

But where bourgeois elements move in this direction, in spite of the historical pressures pushing them along these lines they are held back and their efforts cut short, distorted or aborted by their direct ties with immediate capitalist interests and by their own mass base. This tendency of our epoch, we have seen, can be pushed more freely and pushed even further by elements not directly or personally tied to the old system - just as, analogously, it was the Junker Bismarck who was able to do for 19th century German capitalism what the timorous bourgeoisie would not do for itself. They can be more ruthless and less timid about stepping on particular capitalist toes. Since furthermore an extrapolation of this tendency leads outside the framework of capitalism, there is no question of capitalist class loyalty involved for them.

For such reasons, not only is the reformist Labor bureaucracy one of the vehicles through which bureaucratic collectivization expresses itself but it can be indeed even more effective and thoroughgoing in this direction than any section of the bourgeoisie. As a phenomenon accompanying the dissolution of a social system, this aspect is not new.

The reformist Labor bureaucracy is moreover peculiarly fitted to act as the vehicle of this tendency not only for the negative reason that it is non-bourgeois, but also - positively - because of its conception of socialism as noted above. The Stalinist bureaucracy, in its inception, also drove along this road in the conviction that it was building socialism.

The need of holding society together at all in our epoch of capitalist disintegration imperatively demands some form of collectivization. Where the socialist forces do not take up the historic task, the bureaucracy develops toward an independent social force to do the job in its own way -- a way which is also collectivist in form, but reactionary in content and anti-socialist in consequences. Where this tendency is showing itself, as in England, where furthermore the socialist working class forces are undefeated and still aspiring to fight, the most disastrous mistake would be to mistake this tendency for the road to socialism, in a manner analagous to the way in which neo-Stalinists look on the totalitarian collectivism of Russia as a form of or road to socialism.

It is this tendency which defines the objective direction and historical character of the politics and program of the British Labor bureaucracy, as one of the social forces in Britain.

6) If the Labor bureaucracy were genuinely socialist in its political program, the disintegration of the British Empire and the degeneration of capitalism -- together with the firm organization and clearly socialist aspirations of the British working class -- would offer it an unparalleled opportunity for a relatively peaceful road to socialism, at any rate, a better opportunity for such a highly desirable road to socialism than the world has ever seen before.

Revolutionary Marxists have always allowed for a peaceful road to socialism at least as a theoretical possibility. They envisaged this as a theoretical possibility even when capitalism was still a going concern. Today, when the capitalist social system is no longer viable but rather gangrening within, at a time when the loss of confidence in the capitalist system has never been so widespread among the people and even among the bourgeoisie itself, when it cannot survive no matter who or what wins, the possibility of a peaceful road to socialism is even stronger. In any case, it is not this question which is of itself the crux of the difference between the reformist and Marxist lines.

The hallmark of the reformist Labor bureaucracy in today's situation is, we stress, not its expressed desire or hope to introduce "socialism by peaceful means". Rather, it is not utilizing the unparalleled opportunity noted, to follow a genuinely socialist path at all. It is following another. The opportunity exists; it is precisely the policy of the reformist Labor bureaucracy which would close the door to it.

7) This is so because the basic hallmark of reformism in all its forms is: lack of confidence in, and fear of, the self-action of the working masses themselves; and the substitution of bureaucratic action from above for it. But the emancipation of labor must be accomplished by the laboring masses themselves. The substitution of bureaucratic action-from-above leads in a different direction from socialism, and it is the underlying reason why the Labor bureaucracy's ideology and politics are alien to the principles of workers' democracy, for all of its subjectively democratic "principles". This fundamental characteristic of reformism defines the course of the Labor bureaucracy - as it determined the course of the developing Stalinist reaction.

8) This character of the politics of the Labor bureaucracy is visible in fundamental aspects of the Labor government's domestic program as well as of its foreign policy.

In domestic program, the key to the bureaucratic form and content of the Labor government's nationalizations is the question of workers' control - that is, of its absence in the functioning and very structure of the nationalized sector.

While this is clear to and already a focus of struggle among broad sections of the British working class, it takes on wider significance in the context of the present analysis. For the Marxists it provides the political center of their fight against the Labor bureaucracy's policies on the domestic field.

But much of the present and growing antagonism between the workers and their bureaucracy's policy is derivative from this central question. Because of the lack of active workers' participation in the control of nationalized industries, the workers do not and cannot respond to the Labor bureaucrats' pleas for sacrifice, austerity, restraint in strikes, etc. The many cases in which the Labor government has used force and repression to break workers' struggles do not, therefore, justify themselves in their eyes - not even in the eyes of most of the advanced and pro-Labor workers - as necessary measures to protect a common enterprise. The wage struggles and other strikes and struggles of the ranks break out and cannot be exorcized by appeals to the "national interest" - in which the workers have been given no tangible part.

The working class finds itself defending its own rights and interests and conditions not only against the capitalist class but also against the Labor bureaucracy, whose state policies and program become increasingly separated from those of the working masses and increasingly independent over against them.

9) Furthermore, the structure of the bureaucratically nationalized industries - public corporations, etc. - is such as to give an impulsion to a merger of the old bourgeois elements with the Labor bureaucracy. This also has a bearing on the question of compensation for the nationalized industries.

There is, to be sure, no question of principle involved in the question of compensation per se, even of such over-generous compensation as has been accorded by the Labor government. Marxists have always, with good

reason, proclaimed their willingness to buy off the capitalists' resistance to expropriation wherever and whenever that is feasible.

In the context of the Labor government's bureaucratic nationalization, however, compensation is in fact playing the role - at least for a long while - of maintaining the "expropriated" capitalists as a powerful moneyed class, still exercising the powerful social and economic force of their wealth. At the same time, many of the capitalist elements are allowed to remain as the de-facto managers, administrators and overseers of the nationalized industries even though now as appointees of the state. Contributing to the bureaucratic nature of the Labor government's nationalization is the bureaucracy's aim of "neutralizing" the opposition of the bourgeoisie not only by maintaining it (or its "nationalized" sector) as a moneyed power through compensation, but also by giving its men commanding positions in the nationalized industries. The point is that, at the same time, the only possible counter-balance to however much of this is necessary - workers' control - is rejected and non-existent.

It is to be expected that an uninterrupted continuance of this course would lead also to a growing tendency toward a merger of the personnel of the disintegrating bourgeoisie and Labor bureaucratic circles; i.e., the entrance of more and more "enlightened" bourgeois (denominated "progressive") not only into the managerial structure of the nationalized economy but also into the political bureaucracy which stands behind the economy.

This "neutralization" (i.e., assimilation) of the bourgeoisie is another factor which tends to make the Labor bureaucracy an increasingly independent social force with respect to the working class.

In fighting for workers' control the socialist workers have to fight against the whole system of "neutralizing the bourgeoisie" thus represented. Individual struggles like limited wage struggles are part of this fight. Not only do the workers face the prospect of their class struggle increasingly coming up against their own bureaucracy, but in practice it tends to come up against a merger of this bureaucracy with the ex-bourgeoisie.

10) The character and program of the Labor bureaucracy on the domestic field is at bottom related to, and interacts with, the continuing policy of imperialism being carried on by the Labor government on the field of foreign policy.

It is no more part of the task or concern of the labor bureaucracy to liberate its colonial peoples than to emancipate its own working class. Except obviously where it had no choice, where colonial independence was forced upon the rotting British Empire by the colonial peoples themselves. The Labor Government is holding on (as in Malaya and Africa) or has tried its best to hold on (as in Palestine) to whatever colonial power it can. This is not in the interest of the British working class, let alone of the colonial peoples. It is in the interests of "Britain", that is, of the British government, that is, of the Labor bureaucracy which runs and controls the government as an increasingly autonomous force.

11) Side by side with bureaucratic collectivization at home goes the ideology and practice of "national-socialism". National-socialism is based on the program of "building socialism" in one country. It is a blood-brother of the theory of "socialism in one country" as developed by early Stalinism. Like the latter, the Labor bureaucracy conceives of building socialism not only without the active participation of the British workers (as subjects and not merely as objects of bureaucratic action), but also without the aid of, and independent of, the working class of Europe and the world. The horizon of the bureaucracy is limited to England in a fashion typical of the narrow mentality of every bureaucracy.

But even less than in Russia, England cannot build socialism in one country. None of the problems of British society can be solved on the national plane. England does not have the natural and manpower resources which Russia possessed and which at least for a period made the program of socialism-in-one-country an attractive one for its tired masses.

The problems of British society - even of its present society, and doubly so for the building of a socialist society - can be solved only on the European and world plane. The road to such a solution from the socialist point of view, is given by our program for an independent Western Union.

But the Labor bureaucracy, lacking a genuinely socialist policy in foreign affairs as at home, does not orient toward alliance with the socialist and working class forces of Europe and the world. It has been precisely in connection with the need for European federation that the British Labor bureaucracy's pronouncements have most clearly formulated its national-socialist ideology.

Instead, the main line of the Labor Government has substituted in foreign politics, the politics of the cold war and the U.S. war bloc. Two qualifications, which are given greater stress in Part I on War, can be noted: (1) As is also true of the other governments in the U.S. bloc, it tries to strengthen its own position inside this bloc as against the overwhelming dominance of American capitalism, and the sources of U.S.-British antagonisms from both sides are unconcealed. (2) As a Labor government, based on the working-class organizations, this government is subject to, and in several conjunctures reflects, the pressure of the ranks of labor against the coming war. But its main line in foreign policy is acquiescence to and dependence on Washington in this field.

The Labor bureaucracy's national-socialism not only leads it to its role as a junior partner in the Western war bloc, but this role also decisively affects its domestic policy, through two channels:

(1) U.S. pressure for "moderation" in its domestic policy, which can be more effective in the future than in the past especially given a strengthening of Tory influence; and (2) the responsibilities of membership in this war bloc (Atlantic Pact obligations) leads to an armament program which imposes an even greater squeeze on the workers and widens the gap and deepens the antagonisms between the bureaucracy and the workers at home. An intensification of this antagonism has a dual effect: (1) it pushes the workers into the necessary path

of struggle against the bureaucracy's policies, and (2) it also pushes the bureaucracy to seek ever more independent points of support as against the working class, even while it still rests on a working class mass base.

Bureaucratic collectivization and national-socialism are two sides of the same whole, with a reciprocal effect on each other.

12) It is of the highest importance to underline the qualification which has already been applied to all of the above analysis of the politics of the Labor bureaucracy.

If the present basic economic trend were to continue uninterruptedly in Britain, the means of production and exchange would tend toward concentration in the hands of the state and the state in the hands of an independent all-powerful bureaucracy, which in that case would take on all the characteristics of a class. Beginning in different forms, with different origins, along different roads, at a different pace, but in response to the same basic social impulses, Britain would then develop toward the type of totalitarian collectivism which is the distinguishing mark of Stalinist society (the Stalinist state in Russia being only one national form of this type of society).

But this is an extrapolation, of political value today mainly in defining and understanding the social trend which has to be fought, and in guiding the development of an adequate socialist program. For that purpose it is a necessity.

For the prosecution of the genuine socialist struggle in Britain, however, it is equally vital to note that the consummation of such a development is still a long way off. Besides the differences between the contexts of the British and Russian developments noted in Point 4, the British workers still have a relatively democratic party in which they can raise their voice and influence the course of events, whereas in Russia Stalinism arose in a party which was already substantially bureaucratized; furthermore, when the Russian bureaucracy manifested its power, the Russian workers were already virtually exhausted. The British workers stand at the tentative beginnings, and not at the end, of such a development. They face it with their movement strong and vigorous, feeling their own power, inspired by socialist hopes and convictions, in a position to debate their problems freely and openly, unbound by a police state, and restive with the government because it does not move fast and firmly enough along genuinely socialist lines.

Moreover, they face it with a mass party, the Labor party, which is not to be automatically equated with the party's labor bureaucracy. Regardless of their opposition to, suspicion of, or restiveness with regard to the policies of the bureaucracy and government, they -- the better elements among the workers included, as far as masses go -- look upon the Labor Party as their party. In a real sense it is their party, not only the party of the bureaucracy. The task which they pose before themselves is to win their party to a genuinely socialist policy.

This can be done; at any rate (and sufficient for the point) it is not excluded either by the experience of history with such parties or by

any particularities of the BLP, despite its bureaucratized structure and operation. In any case also, it is a fantasy to dream of organizing a meaningful party of the working class outside of a struggle to win the Labor Party.

It would be self-defeating for British independent socialists to take the attitude of "a plague on both your houses" as between Labor and the Tories. On the contrary, socialist left-wingers should stress that labor must fight within its party against any policy of compromise with or concession to the Tories (or to the American bourgeoisie).

It would be equally self-defeating for British Marxists to carry on this fight within the mass party of Labor only as a "raid", as a group of "borers-from-within", or for that matter as a closed sect. The task is to create, assemble and develop a broad socialist left wing based on all of those questions which distinguish the road to genuine socialism from the road of the Labor bureaucracy; and to do this openly and boldly with the aim of changing the course of the party, to win it for its views and to choose a leadership corresponding to them. Even if, as cannot be predicted now, this proves impossible with regard to the party as a whole, it is only such a course consistently followed that could lay the basis for a genuine mass party of socialist democracy.

The course of the Labor government has led Britain not to socialism but toward an historic fork in the road. Never more than today has the working class road to socialist democracy loomed close and within the grasp of the British workers. What the British working class will do in the promising days ahead depends in no small measure upon the political understanding, undogmatic flexibility and devoted enthusiasm of all proletarian socialists, the British in particular.

RESOLUTION ON SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

All the important social and political problems facing the classes in the United States will be determined for the entire next period by the development of the war economy.

The war economy is here to stay, in the United States above all countries. This is due to the unique position the United States occupies in the world today. Russia, while also forced by her regime to maintain a permanent war economy, is nevertheless able to supplement her military strength, and thereby compensate for its comparative inadequacy, by powerful political instruments in the form of popular mass movements organized everywhere and led by Stalinist parties and devoted to her defense. The United States has no such popular movements at its disposal in any other country, nor even governments so completely in its service as Russia has in her satellite governments; and in the conflict between the two big imperialist camps, it must therefore depend, more than any other regime, upon overwhelming military force and that force alone. Other capitalist countries, while incapable of playing the decisive international role of the United States or Russia, are capable of using their political positions for the purpose of maneuvering, in their own interests, between the two big powers, and in some cases they are even forced to engage in such maneuvers.

The United States, however, is not in a political position to force the other capitalist countries into line with its policies by maneuvering, or threatening to maneuver, against them in alliance with Russia. The preservation of its international interests compels it to depend more and more upon alliances with these countries. It can offer them security from undermining by Stalinism at home or in their colonies and Stalinist conquest from without, and therewith win them as more or less willing allies in the world conflict, only by a display, again, of overwhelming military power. The purely economic assistance which the exceptional industrial and financial power of the U.S. has enabled it to provide the collapsing capitalist world, has not been and could not be an adequate substitute for the military power which the U.S. must force upon other countries and, in largest measure, must supply directly.

The third consideration that dictates the maintenance and extension of the war economy in the United States is the realization that has grown since the Second World War and is now a rooted conviction, not only that capitalism, in particular its only remaining vigorous representative, the United States, cannot live peacefully side by side by Stalinism, but that capitalism can defeat Stalinism on a Russian, and therefore world scale, by military means, by war, and by no other means.

The immensity of the task confronting American capitalism is only partly indicated by the immensity of the proposed national budget, the largest by far in the peacetime history of the country. For all the alarm felt over the budget by sections of the bourgeoisie, the ruling classes and their two political parties are fundamentally united on it. They see no alternative to it and offer none. Not even the most "isolationist" Congressional group, on one side, or the

most "economy-minded" Congressional group, on the other, has proposed any modifications in the budget that would reduce the total figure to a substantial degree. Moreover, a 1951-52 budget of some seventy billion dollars affords only a preliminary glimpse of the war economy as it will and must develop. It is quite conceivable that in the period of preparations for the outbreak of the war, there may be stages of comparative lull in the intensity of the conflict between the two big war camps. But there is no ground for the belief that there will be any real relaxation of the armaments race for more than a fleeting moment, and even that is possible only under the most favorable and exceptional circumstances. American imperialism is and must be embarked upon a serious, extensive, long-range preparation for war. The national budgets will show this more and not less emphatically in the coming years.

This is necessarily so because the United States has the task of mobilizing and equipping the entire capitalist world for war with Russia. In this respect, the situation is radically different from the one obtaining before and during the Second World War.

In the period of the Second World War, the military forces of German imperialism could be held in check, at least to the point of preventing their decisive victory, by the armed forces of its enemies on the European continent, primarily by the already engaged British armies and by the mobilized and later actually engaged Russian armies. The United States did not require a big peace-time army. It could mobilize after the war began and even then not until after the Pearl Harbor event. Its economic might was sufficient to help hold the German armies at bay; its armed forces were needed only to inflict the decisive defeat upon Germany and Japan. For the Third World War, it is already clear that the armed forces at the disposal of Russia cannot even be slowed down, let alone defeated, except by a United States which is armed to the teeth in advance of the actual outbreak of military warfare; and not only that, but by a United States which in addition has allies who are similarly armed and equipped. The rest of the capitalist world is, however, either reluctant or economically or politically incapable of achieving such armaments preparations by itself. The primary and main effort to arm, equip and defend the capitalist world, in order to defend itself, therewith falls upon the United States.

Merely to supplement the already fully developed war economy and armies of its allies in the Second World War required a tremendous economic effort on the part of the United States. The preparations for the Third World War require a much greater effort. Among its allies in the coming war, the United States today finds no large armies, in contrast to the huge armies of the British and the Russians with which it was allied in the Second World War. Upon the war economy of the United States for the coming period, therefore, rests the problem of creating a vast U.S. armed force and, to a very large extent, also the problem of creating, expanding and maintaining a large army in Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Japan and a dozen smaller countries. Even this does not present the entire picture of the problem of American imperialism. Its allies in the Third World War are not at all as reliable politically, and therefore militarily, as were its allies in the Second World War. This fact is already recognized, with grave feelings of disturbance, by wide

sections of the American bourgeoisie. In the Second World War, the anti-German alliance was strongly buttressed and cemented by popular movements, especially in the countries occupied by Germany and Japan. In the present pre-war period, the anti-Stalinist alliance which the U.S. is seeking to unite is rendered precarious by the outright resistance of the people in the American-allied countries, or at least, their uncertainty or indifference. For this reason, American capitalism finds itself compelled to make its war plans in terms of a much larger contribution of military manpower to the armed forces of its alliance in the Third World War than in the Second World War. This great difference in proportion is already indicated by the alignment in the Korean war. In other words, all the signs point to a far greater American armed force in the Third World War than the twelve or more million mobilized in the Second World War. The American people are being called upon to pay the heaviest blood sacrifices in their history to keep capitalism alive and around their necks.

Finally, the United States entered the Second World War with vast reserves of unemployed manpower from which to draw for its military and war-production armies. With all the prospects that the Third World War will require a much larger production effort and a much larger armed force than before, the U.S. enters decisively into the war economy with very small manpower reserves. Although war production and the mobilization of an army have only begun, there is virtually no army of unemployed today to draw upon. In some branches of industry there is even a shortage of labor power. Since some of the women who were drawn into industry in the period of 1940-45 have remained in industry, that particular source of labor power is certainly no larger now than it was for the Second World War and very likely not even as large. Hence, the more men drawn off into the armed forces and the more extensive the schedules for war production, the more acute will become the problem of labor power.

This problem can be solved in three ways. One is by importing labor to the United States - from Europe and Latin America. At most, this means could take care of only the tiniest fraction of the problem. Another is by increased restriction upon the production of consumer goods, not so much for want of raw materials as for want of labor power. Still another is by increasing and intensifying the exploitation of the labor power that is available, both in the form of the longer workday and of speedup in the process of production. The last two are the only serious means at the disposal of the government - of the government, since it must of necessity become increasingly the organizer and director of the entire economy - for solving the interdependent problems of a large armed force and a large war-labor force.

All this implies ever deeper undercutting of the standard of living of the working class and a strengthening of the foundations of what the bourgeoisie itself calls the barracks state, and increased centralization of economic and political power in the hands of the capitalist government at the expense of the economic and political positions of the working class.

The permanent war economy in the United States means a persistent drive to lengthen the workday of the working class. It means per-

sistent efforts to deprive the working class, either by legislation or by "mutual consent", of its right to strike in order to "guarantee uninterrupted production" - that is, production on terms fixed for workers who are deprived of their right and ability to affect them by open, organized, independent action of their own. It means permanent inflation whose effects fall primarily, mainly and increasingly upon the shoulders of the working class. The only means employed by the government to combat or control inflation produce consequences which differ in no important respects from the inflation itself. Inflation, to the working class, means that it can satisfy its consumer wants less and less, even if it has a nominally high income. The "anti-inflation" measures of the bourgeoisie boil down essentially to draining off or otherwise reducing the real income of the working class and reducing the amount of available consumer goods so as to concentrate more upon producing the means of destruction. In both cases, the standard of living of the working class is lowered, while monopolistic profits not only remain intact, as the last war showed, but reach fabulous new heights.

The permanent war economy means ever greater control and direction of the working class, and therefore ever greater police power in the hands of the state to enforce this control and direction. This tendency, present in every modern war period, is enormously strengthened and accelerated in the preparation and conduct of atomic bomb warfare. The atomic bomb is an exceptionally barbarous abomination not only from the humanitarian standpoint. Its use introduces a radical change in the social consequences of warfare, which its promoters and apologists gladly gloss over. The closer we come to the outbreak of the atomic war, the greater will be the restlessness, fear and even panic of the population, particularly those sections inhabiting the large industrial centers which are presumed to be the more immediate and easiest targets. It must therefore be expected that, sooner or later, the government will take the most extraordinary and rigorous measures for forced residence of workers, in one set of cases, and for forced shifting of workers to other residences, in the other set of cases. The immensity of the arbitrary police powers which the state will arrogate to itself in order to apply these measures, cannot be exaggerated and must exceed anything known in the history of the country. To believe that these police powers will be employed with any other considerations than the prosecution of the war to the bitter end, which always means primarily at the expense of the social interests and positions of the working class, is a gross illusion. Atomic bomb warfare and the preparations for it mean an extension and speeding-up of the militarization of public and private life in this country on an unprecedented scale and to an unprecedented degree.

Coupled with this trend is another which is specific to the nature of the Third World War and of which all the preliminary signs are already visible. The rival of American imperialism has at its disposal in the United States a mass movement (more or less) which is connected with and seeks to base itself upon the working class, a condition unknown in the First or Second World Wars. It is inconceivable that the state will in the future, any more than it has in the past or is in the present, combat the Stalinists in this country by any other measures, in the main, than police measures. The police powers in the hands of the state for this purpose

not only grow more and more arbitrary and extensive, but are applied, in the name of "national security" to all free-thinking, non-conformist, militant, radical, socialist and even liberal movements and individuals. There can be no question about the fact that, as the outbreak of war nears, let alone when the war is on, the red-baiting and witch-hunting drive of the ruling classes will be intensified, openly and cynically and under all sorts of hypocritical "patriotic" disguises.

From every significant angle, therefore, the threat of war and the war itself represents a danger to democracy and to the working class and socialist movements which depend upon it and seek to realize it in full. The main task of these movements, in the United States and elsewhere, becomes the uncompromising struggle against the unfolding of the reactionary trends evoked and stimulated by the war, the defense of all democratic rights and of the economic and political positions of the workers, and the intransigent upholding of the complete independence of the labor movement which is the indispensable condition for this defense.

The development of the permanent war economy is automatically also the development of state power over the economy. In turn, it is the development of the trend toward the fusion of the state machinery with the most reliable and direct representatives of capitalist industry and finance. The Truman regime has already staffed virtually all the commanding positions in the multitude of bureaus and committees for organizing and directing the economy with outstanding capitalists and bankers, as if to give spectacular demonstration of this trend. Since these bureaus and committees acquire more and more power over the functioning of all economic life, the labor movement is necessarily obliged to enter into more and more direct relations with them and less and less with the employers whose representation is taken over by the state.

Two related consequences follow. The struggle for the economic standards of the working class is increasingly directed against the government-representing-capitalists (or capitalists-representing-government!) and therefore the economic struggle perforce becomes more directly and obviously a political struggle for the working class. Secondly, the struggle for the economic standards of the working class must increasingly become, or take the form of, a fight between the labor movement and the Truman government over the conduct of the war preparations and more directly over who will bear the main burden of the permanent war economy.

That these are the forms that labor's struggle will take and that the struggles will not abate, is already indicated by numerous signs. The stupendous profits of monopoly industries appear in sharp contrast to the worker who sees a decline in his own living standards, with an even greater decline in prospect. The inequities of the Truman taxation schedule are felt by every worker and his family. The failure to control the cost of consumer goods, at the same time that efforts are made to freeze wages, is likewise felt by every worker and his family. The loading up of all the important government war boards with outstanding representatives of capital who seek to include "labor representation" for decorative purposes or as captives, has a significance which escapes few workers. The

widespread unpopularity of the prelude to the Third World War, that is, the war in Korea, only intensifies the antagonism of the working class.

Finally, the fact that the United States is not yet engaged in a full-scale war makes it more difficult for the "patriotic" demagogues to persuade labor to "curb" itself and "sacrifice" its interests. In such a situation, the gap between the labor movement and the Truman administration is widened. The sentiments of the workers make it both possible and necessary for the official union leadership to make such a sensational, even if partial and temporary, a break with "its" Administration as occurred in the withdrawal of all labor representation from the War Stabilization Board. Even if this conflict is patched up, its outbreak would be sufficient in itself to show that other such conflicts are inevitable. What is more important is the fact that such conflicts can easily produce deeper and wider breaks between the labor movement and the Truman Administration. The reasons for this are: the labor movement feels the tremendous power in its hands, and it has been neither cowed nor bridled against the use of its power; even the labor officialdom shows that it seeks more important positions and powers, which the support of the strong labor movement enables it to obtain; and the development of the permanent war economy under conditions of the bourgeois fight against inflation continually narrows down the possibilities for easily-granted economic concessions to the working class.

The struggle of labor against the war economy and the war-economy state is thoroughly progressive in that it gives an impulsion to the shift of the labor movement from the limited confines of economic struggle to the broader field of political struggle and in that it likewise gives an impulsion to the long overdue unification of the divided labor movements. That these manifest themselves today at the top, in the spheres of the leadership, only shows that the organic and irrepressible tendencies are asserting themselves, for the present, in a distorted form but are asserting themselves nevertheless. Signs of the unification of the labor movement, which would vastly enhance its self-confidence and combativity, are visible in many parts of the country and not least significantly in the formation by the CIO, AFL, IAM and the Railroad Brotherhoods of the United Labor Policy Committee authorized to speak and act before the government with the backing of virtually all the unions. Signs of the shift to political action are visible in the persistence of the Political Action Committee and Leagues for Political Education of the various unions. All these movements represent attempts, however limited, ambiguous or deformed, to free the working class from control by bourgeois political machines without leaving the framework of the bourgeois political parties, to wrest concessions from the existing political parties by organized political action of labor.

That these attempts, bureaucratically conceived and controlled, are fruitless and demoralizing to the working class, precisely because they remain within the framework of the bourgeois political parties, has been demonstrated time and again. The fact that labor officials find it necessary to make what are thus far purely verbal threats to form a "third party", is an involuntary acknowledgment of the

futility of the present political course of the labor movement. What has been likewise demonstrated, particularly in the last national election, is that there is a widespread and deepgoing political dissatisfaction in the country, which has only been strengthened by domestic and international events since last November. The downright criminality of the political policy of the official labor movement is underscored by the outcome of the 1950 national election. In almost all localities where there was a "protest vote", it took the form of a blind striking-out against the given administration, or even for conservative demagogues against demagogues denominated as "liberals". Broadly speaking, the people appeared to swing "to the right" primarily in the absence of an independent political movement offering a clear-cut, aggressive and progressive alternative to the two parties of capitalism, that is, a political party such as only the labor movement can found and build up. This blind rebellion against the political status quo is likewise represented by the great popular support aroused for Hooverism in the "Great Debate" over foreign policy, which represents essentially a successful exploitation of the healthy anti-war sentiments of the people by reactionary politicians for reactionary ends - successful precisely because and to the extent that the labor movement has not put forward an independent and progressive foreign policy of its own but has allowed itself to be used as a mere echo of the reactionary and justly unpopular foreign policy of the Truman Administration.

Just when the labor movement will succeed in breaking the paralyzing bonds of capitalist politics and in forming its own independent party, cannot be established. Neither can it be established that it will form such a party along a road known and prescribed in advance and along no other. The most important task of the labor movement, which overshadows and determines all other tasks, remains the formation of an Independent Labor Party. Consequently, the main and most important task of the socialist movement remains the unremitting advocacy and work for the formation of a Labor Party by the unions. The war danger only gives added urgency to the performance of the task which means the declaration of political independence by the American working class.

While it is probable that the actual founding of a Labor Party in the future will be undertaken either upon the initiative or the leadership, that is, the control, of the labor leadership, it is not upon that section of the labor movement that the ISL rests its confidence and attention. The main basis of socialist activity in the labor movement continues to be the militants and leaders of the rank and file. It is these latter who are the best assurance that the Labor Party will be formed sooner rather than later, that it will from the very beginning be more rather than less democratic, that its development will be more swiftly progressive than it could possibly be under the exclusive control of the conservative or compromising officialdom. It is these militants who have always inspired and organized the progressive groups within the labor unions. Such groups were an outstanding phenomenon during the Second World War. It may be expected that, as the country - and its labor movement - are pulled closer to the Third World War, the official union leadership, generally speaking, will again fail to fight aggressively for the interests and demands of the rank and file and will even sacrifice them in the name of that "national unity" so cynically and

hypocritically proclaimed by the blood-profiteers and their political representatives. Under such circumstances, the formation of progressive rank-and-file union groups may likewise be expected. Socialist militants will at all times help in the formation of such groups, encourage and defend them, and seek to popularize the program of the ISL and win recruits to it from among these militants, without whom, as the Second World War experience of our organization demonstrated, the effectiveness of the socialist movement is drastically reduced, and with whom it is exceptionally strengthened. The great importance of such rank-and-file progressive groups is further underlined by the fact that, again as shown in the experience of the last war period, while they may start on the basis of purely economic demands or inner-union questions, they almost invariably become the vanguard of the movement for independent working-class organization and action in the political field.

The advocacy of an Independent Labor Party remains unequivocally the principal political slogan, the axis of all the political work of the ISL, which reiterates its pledge to give unconditional support to such a party and its candidates even before it has adopted a socialist program and leadership. However, the ISL is aware of the possibility that the labor movement may well pass through one or more transitional stages between its present allegiance to bourgeois political parties and the formation of a political party of its own. The ISL takes no dogmatic position on the question of these transitional stages. On the contrary, at every stage which represents to any degree a breach between the labor movement and the bourgeois parties, or which offers the possibility of sharpening the inherent conflict between the political interests of the working class and those of the bourgeois parties, the ISL will welcome, encourage and stimulate the forward step, no matter how hesitant, partial or even confused it may be at first. Even in those cases where the forward step appears initially in the form of a conflict between the interests and aspirations of the labor officialdom, on the one side, and those of the bourgeois political machines, on the other, the ISL will seek to intervene in order to explain to the workers the deeper and truer meaning of the conflict, to widen it, and by supporting the representatives of the labor movement against those of the bourgeois political machines -- even, under exceptional circumstances, in primary election fights -- help to advance the class consciousness and self-reliance of the workers toward the formation of their own independent party. The fact that the basic conflict between the classes takes the form, at certain stages, of a rivalry between bureaucracies, indicates that the conflict is still at a primitive stage but does not alter the fact of the conflict. Basically this holds true for such conflicts as occurred over policy and position in the Wage Stabilization Board and for such conflicts as may occur over official policy and candidacies of the bourgeois parties with which the labor movement is more or less allied. In all such situations, however, it is the action of the working class for independence with which the ISL is concerned, it is the movement for a complete break with the bourgeois parties and the establishment of a labor party upon which the ISL concentrates its attention.

If the main task of the labor movement is the formation of its political party, the task of developing its own political program is indispensable not only once such a party is formed but also for the

purpose of leading to its formation. In this most crucial present situation in the country, the importance of a democratic political program of its own to be put forward by the labor movement, for both domestic and international problems, is impossible to overstate.

The ISL sets itself the goal of urging and popularizing such a program. It declares that the program that it, as the socialist wing of the labor movement, puts forward for adoption by the labor movement, is not the rounded program for the socialist reorganization of society, but yet is a program consistent with the fight to preserve and extend democracy and to protect the working class and its interests from the reactionary consequences of the permanent war economy and the war itself. It does not look forward to the adoption of such a program by any capitalist government, not even the most "liberal", and characterizes any such hope or expectation as a deception or self-deception.

The political position, and what is more important, the political action of the contending classes in the United States, is, as elsewhere, determined basically by their antagonistic social positions, and not by temporary relationships, the personnel of their political spokesmen, or other superficial considerations. The more critical the situation of capitalist society becomes, the more irksome and intolerable become the rights and institutions of democracy which are available to the people in the defense of their interests. Capitalism is not identical with democracy; it is merely compatible with it (and even then only in its bourgeois form) at certain stages of development, and less and less compatible the more acute the difficulties of the capitalist economy and state. Not democracy but private ownership and profit are the basis of capitalism and therefore of the capitalist class. But while democracy is not indispensable to capitalism, it is absolutely indispensable to the working class. It cannot even exist, much less advance, as an organized class, without democratic rights. An authentic labor movement, even the most conservative, cannot be conceived of without the right to organize, which directly involves such foundation rights of democracy as freedom of speech, press and assembly. The labor movement, given a backward working class or a conservative officialdom or both, may allow the ruling class to restrict these rights, or may carry on only an incompletely effective fight to maintain and extend them, at a time when it still adheres to policies of class collaboration which in the long run only facilitate the undermining of all democratic rights. But it cannot allow these rights to be abolished without assuring by that very act its own abolition. What is a luxury to the most liberal representatives of the capitalist class, is a vital necessity to the most conservative as well as to the most progressive movement of the working class. Hence, the complete reliance that socialism places in the labor movement as the natural fortress and champion of democracy. From these basic considerations, the ISL, in presenting a program for the labor movement, reiterates its irreconcilable political opposition and complete non-confidence in any capitalist government that exists or may be established in the United States, and declares emphatically that the program which meets the elementary needs of the people can be carried out only by a workers' government in this country. In turn, only a workers' government which repudiates all responsibility for the imperialist tradition and reactionary policies of the past can expect to win that sympathy

and solidarity of the peoples of the entire world which a capitalist government can never hope to obtain but which are vital to the security and peace of the people of this land and all others.

The first and most important point in a democratic foreign policy of labor is the principle of the Right of Self-Determination for all peoples. This principle is a mighty two-edged sword which the labor movement can wield not only against capitalist reaction at home and abroad, but also against Stalinist imperialism. Even the most "democratic" warmongers and imperialists in this country wink at the gross violations of this truly democratic principle when the violations are committed in the interests of the American war camp. Labor cannot become the champion of the democratic nation and of democracy in general without cutting through the general political cynicism that prevails on this question, and coming forth as the militant champion of this elementary right, enjoyed by the United States but which its government denies or helps deny to other peoples and nations. Every people has the right to decide its own national destiny, without internal intervention by the United States (or any other power) and without having a "friendly" protectorate established over it "for its own good". The violations of this right have actually imperilled the true national -- not imperialist, but true national -- interests of the United States by bringing closer the danger of devastating war, and consequently imperil the interests of the American working class. The honest championing of this basic democratic right all over the world, and not merely lip-service to it, demands that the American labor movement call for withdrawal of all troops of occupation, American included, and American political domination and control, which deprive countries like Germany and Japan of their national sovereignty. It demands a halt to any and all American aid and support to imperialist regimes in the colonial countries, like the French regime in Indo-China. It demands an end to the shameless military alliances with arch-reactionary regimes like that of Franco in Spain and Chiang-Kai-Shek in Formosa, alliances that make a mockery even of the pretense of a fight to preserve democracy.

The labor movement, eschewing all national narrowmindedness, indifference and selfishness, must proclaim that it is as much concerned with the improvement of the economic conditions of the retarded and undeveloped countries of the world as it is with the advancement of its own economic position. It is a task and duty of the labor movement to elaborate and adopt a plan for generous and large-scale contributions to the modernization and construction of the backward countries of the world of the kind advocated by President Reuther of the UAW, but with this all-important difference: such a plan can be put into effect with fruitful and progressive consequences only by an American workers' government, which alone can dispel the entirely justified skepticism, suspiciousness and outright hostility with which any "Point Four" program put forward by American imperialism is regarded by the bitterly-experienced peoples of the backward sections of the world. The attitude of the peoples is strengthened by the fact that all talk of American economic assistance to these sections is unaccompanied by any proposal for those radical but indispensable social changes required, especially in the backward countries, before industrial and financial aid from abroad can mean anything more than exploitation from the

outside and the enrichment of the corrupt, parasitical and anachronistic ruling classes at home. The socialist criticism of such plans as put forward by Reuther is not directed against their goal, but against the illusory idea that it can be executed in a democratic non-imperialist way by an American capitalist government. It is only an American workers' government that can gain that confidence and fraternal support of the peoples of the backward and undeveloped countries which are essential to the democratic success of such a plan.

A democratic domestic program is likewise of vital importance to the labor movement. First and foremost comes the need for an unbending stand by the organized labor movement against any and all curbs upon freedom of opinion, freedom of expression, freedom of the press and assembly, freedom to organize and strike, and full academic freedom in all educational institutions. This stand must include unambiguous opposition to all attempts to deprive the Stalinists of their democratic rights. The labor movement itself has most successfully and effectively defeated its Stalinist enemy when it employed fully democratic methods in the fight against it, that is, allowing it full freedom of expression and at the same time allowing a full democratic decision against it by the voting membership. The same method must be defended in the country as a whole. It is the red-baiting, labor-hating reaction that urges and needs arbitrary police measures for its fight against Stalinism, for it is incapable of fighting it democratically. The labor movement has no need of such measures and must reject them wherever they are put forward. Without full democratic rights, the labor movement cannot live and breathe and fight. There is no civil war in the United States and a violation of the democratic rights of any section of the people can only serve to undermine the rights of the labor movement as a whole. In this connection, it is important to emphasize the need of the keenest vigilance in maintaining democratic rights within those unions where they are threatened by officialdoms grown conservative and a persistent fight to institute these rights in the unions which have long been deprived of them. It is a mockery of democracy for union officials to proclaim the need of saving it throughout the world while stifling it in their own organizations. Basic and indispensable to union democracy is complete control over the officialdom by the membership, unrestricted right of the expression of criticisms and differences of opinion, the right of every member to run for union office without any political restriction, freedom to establish groups or caucuses within unions, right to publish organs of opinion within unions, and equal access of all members to the discussion and correspondence sections of official union periodicals. The tendency toward the limitation or even suppression of these rights, usually under the hypocritical guise of fighting the Stalinists, has been on the rise in the unions. It is a socialist and working-class duty to resist this tendency wherever it is manifested.

The championing of democracy demands of the labor movement, in alliance with the entire Negro population, a more uncompromising fight than ever to abolish all forms and traces of the hideous institutions of Jim Crow, the very existence of which belie the pious claims of the imperialist democrats. The ruling classes in the past years have found themselves compelled to make many concessions to

the American Negro people. These concessions have been wrested by the militant demands of the Negro people themselves, by the support they have received from the trade unions which have organized more Negro workers than ever before. Not the least consideration in granting these concessions has been the attempt to modify the effectiveness of the international propaganda campaign conducted by the Stalinists (but not by them alone), and to mollify the burning resentment toward Jim Crow felt among the colonial peoples all over the world who despise the doctrines of "white superiority". But these concessions, valuable and welcome though they are to the Negro people, have not yet destroyed or come near destroying the foundations of the Jim Crow system under which the vast majority of the Negroes live in this country. Discrimination, in a hundred fields of social life, is still the rule for the Negro people. The tremendous enthusiasm displayed by the bourgeois press for the extremely modest concessions granted up to now, are calculated only to present the great shame of the American imperialist democracy in the most rosy light and to smother with words a continuation of the struggle for the real abolition of the Jim Crow monstrosity. The Negro people and the labor movement must take up and persist in the drive for the abolition of all discrimination against Negroes, in all its forms and disguises, for complete economic, political and social equality between Negro and white citizens, for that equal treatment in industry, agriculture, politics, education, housing, medical and health facilities, in the armed forces and everywhere else, which the great bulk of the American Negroes do not yet enjoy. That is a task of the labor movement, and it cannot fight for it consistently, let alone achieve it, without first rooting out all forms of discrimination against Negroes which still prevail so widely in its own midst.

To protect the working people from suffering most heavily from the consequences of the permanent war economy and the war danger, the labor movement must make its own a program for shifting the economic burdens where they belong.

First of all comes the need for ever-increasing workers' control of production. The unions must safeguard themselves against all attempts by the employers or government to use the war situation for super-profiteering and as a pretext for undermining them and the best union militants by assuring to themselves the right to control hiring and firing. This is required also as a specific protection of the labor movement in a period of atomic bomb warfare, so that it may have the maximum assurances that the integrity of unions and the security of its most active members will not be menaced by the arbitrary powers to "freeze" or "shift" labor which the government, so openly staffed with the men of big capital, will seek to take and exert. The workers can only safeguard themselves against the shameless blood profiteering that was seen during the Second World War, and against the equally shameless attempts to freeze wages in the face of such profiteering, by demanding that the capitalists open their books to union committees. Control over hiring and firing, access to all economic information: these are the minimum rights in industry the workers need for their own protection in the war economy.

The labor movement, which should seek to establish a workers'

government and pursue a political program, at home and abroad, of its own, should not take any responsibility for the war-making or war policy of the present government. It should not allow itself to be committed to a crippling "no strike pledge" of any kind. It should not allow its representatives to be on any kind of "Defense" or "War Labor Boards" whose task is, basically, to harness labor to the war machine, or to serve them, as was the case in the last war, as part captive and part hostage. By thus taking responsibility for a course which it is not allowed to determine, labor helps to saddle itself as the docile bearer of the war burden. But this does not mean that it can fail to fight unremittingly for its rights in industry, and not leave the defense of its interests either to a government board or to the employer himself. Such a fight, to achieve and assure the most desirable objective, cannot but culminate in the demand for workers' control of production.

The permanent war economy threatens and will increasingly threaten the living standards of the workers. To counteract this threat, the labor movement cannot but demand that the economic burdens of the war and the war preparations be borne by the wealthy classes and not by the working classes. The Independent Socialist League urges the labor movement to call for: the immediate nationalization of all war industry under workers' control; a genuine shift of the tax burden to the shoulders of the rich who gained so much from the last war and expect to gain so much from the next; if there is a levy on the bodies and lives of the people, then there must be a government levy on capital to help cover the backbreaking costs of the war preparations; a 100% tax on all super-profits made out of war production; a roll-back of prices on consumer goods and rent rates to the 1950 level and the most rigid control on all price ceilings.

With these points as the basis for a labor program on domestic and international policy, the labor movement can seize the favorable opportunities that are presenting themselves to win the support of the whole working class and of the most important sections of the middle classes who want peace, security and democracy. The members and the press of the Independent Socialist League are pledged to an incessant campaign to win over larger numbers in the labor movement to this program. No socialist is doing his duty if he fails to become an active part of one of the popular organizations in the country - the trade unions and their political committees as well as such organizations as the ADA, the Liberal Party, the NAACP and the like - wherein he is able to put forward the program of the Independent Socialist movement and to win adherents and support for it.

At the same time, the ISL reaffirms the declaration of its last convention concerning its character and tasks as a revolutionary socialist propaganda organization. The ISL has the specific task of educating and training a movement of workers and students in the fundamental principles and program of internationalist socialism and socialist democracy. It has the specific task of disseminating and defending the theoretical and political positions which it alone has developed, summed up in the popular formula of

"Neither Washington nor Moscow, but the Third Camp of Socialism and Democracy". Above all, it has the task of expounding its position on the interrelations between capitalism and Stalinism which distinguish it, and it alone, from both of these forms of contemporary social decay and from the apologists and defenders of both, that is, from the official labor leadership and its Social-Democratic echo, on one side, and the Stalinist spokesmen and their "Fourth Internationalist" echo, on the other. The Independent Socialist League proudly re-dedicates itself to the performance of this task, never before more urgently necessary than today, as the task most essential to the reconstruction and triumph of the world movement for socialist freedom.

RESOLUTION ON THE JEWISH QUESTION AND ISRAEL

1. In the last five years, the related problems of Israel and the Near East, Zionism and the Jewish question in the world have been radically changed from their pre-war status by a series of political developments. While the new problems are rooted in the old, a thorough readaptation and restatement of the Marxist analysis of the questions involved is necessary, based upon an examination of these changes and of the present situation. The new situation that has been created revolves around a development previously unanticipated by Marxists: the formation of the state of Israel, carved out within the borders of Palestine, as a Jewish state. Central to the re-examination of the changes thus wrought is the fact that this took place, and the new state is operating, in a world divided between two giant imperialist blocs engaged in a cold war which is leading to a new world conflict.

NAZI
EXTERMIN*
ATIONISM

(2) At the same time the phenomena of degenerating capitalism accompanying the Second World War and its aftermath has vitally affected the character of the Jewish question in the world. The Second World War, widely looked upon in some sections of the Jewish people as a "war against anti-Semitism," actually brought about a new worsening of the conditions of the Jews in the whole world. On the Axis side, there was the unprecedented physical extermination of six million Jews - the Nazi "solution" of the Jewish problem in a barbarous manner scarcely known even in the older less "civilized" days. A distinguishing feature of totalitarian capitalist forms of anti-Semitism is the total rejection of the Jews even as abject slaves. More and more the Jewish people of the world face, not the alternative of death or oppression as is usual for subject minorities, but rather: extermination or the fight for a socialist world. Degenerating capitalism has made a new evil out of even the ancient evil of anti-Semitism.

POST WAR
ANTI-
SEMITISM

(3) With the defeat of the Axis by the Allies, far from this leading to a better lot for the Jews of the world, post-war anti-Semitism has flowered also in the democratic capitalist countries and in the lands of the Russian Stalinist empire. The remnants of European Jewry found themselves in a worse plight than that of any other war-torn people in Europe. Deprived of their possessions, homeless, without means of livelihood, in many cases bereft of relatives, friends and families, herded into DP camps which are often little better than the concentration camps which they survived, most Jews of Europe have seen no future in their old homelands and have sought to emigrate into other lands to start life anew.

While it was the great bourgeois-democratic revolutions which first liberated the Jews of Western Europe from their ghetto existence, and it was the rise of the modern labor and socialist movement which fortified their rights, today with the growing inability of capitalism to maintain any kind of stable existence economically, the capitalist class finds all democratic forms and rights increasingly incompatible with their further rule. All the great conquests of the last 200 years fall victim one by one to the onslaught of capitalist totalitarianization. The struggle for the defense of the Jewish people, of their full equality in political, social and economic opportunity, and against all forms of anti-Semitism is, therefore, an integral part of the struggle in defense of democracy and civilization, a struggle which finds its only complete expression in the struggle for socialism. This struggle against anti-Semitism is likewise of the greatest importance for the American Marxist movement in educating the American working class to the political significance of anti-Semitism and its use by fascist and reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie as an anti-labor weapon.

JEWISH NA-
TIONALISM &
MIGRATION

(4) Nazi exterminationism and post-war anti-Semitism have led to a large-scale resurgence of nationalist sentiment among Jews all

over the world. This growth in Jewish nationalism has in large part taken the form of a mass desire for a territory (Palestine in particular) where the Jewish population might be able to develop its own life under its own political institutions free from anti-Semitism. These aspirations are in themselves the legitimate democratic yearnings of a people long subjected to oppression and discrimination, yearnings which would be perfectly capable of satisfaction and achievement in a socialist world whether in Palestine or other areas. While this intensification of nationalism has inevitably also led in the post-war situation to the intensification and growth of the specific Zionist ideology, one of its strongest roots is simply the desire to escape from the hellish existence of the DPs in Europe and from the threat of worse developments.

The elementary democratic demand of free emigration and immigration, long part of every genuinely democratic program, must be most vigorously fought for in the specific case of the European Jews. All barriers to immigration to the countries of their choice must be broken down. For socialists in the U.S., the richest country in the world and the one capable of absorbing the largest population, this means the struggle against the exclusion of the Jews from this country. For this reason, independent socialists raised the slogan "Open the doors of the U.S.!" This is also why, as long as Britain held the gate to Palestine, it was also the responsibility of the Marxists, particularly in Britain as well as in the U.S., to demand: "Open the doors of Palestine to Jewish Refugees!"

(5) ZIONISM UNDER STALINISM In Eastern Europe, behind the Iron Curtain, where the rumblings of a form of anti-Semitism are heard as never before under Stalinism, the growing Jewish nationalism (in this case even in its Zionist form) can play an especially progressive role. In the totalitarian prison of Stalinism, the progressive-nationalist kernel of Zionism (not to speak of non-Zionist Jewish nationalism) inescapably comes into irreconcilable opposition with the dictatorship and can help to mobilize a part of the population under the Stalinist heel against the Kremlin and its puppets.

1. THE STATE OF ISRAEL AND ZIONISM

(6) ROLE OF ZIONISM IN PALESTINE It is, however, in its impact upon the situation in Israel that the fundamentally reactionary ideology of the Zionist form of this growing Jewish nationalism has had its most harmful effects. The Arab-Jewish war in Palestine which was touched off by partition must be considered not only as the immediate consequence of the UN act of partition, but as the culmination of the decades-long policy of Zionism and British imperialism in the Near East, together with the reactionary role of the Arab landlord ruling class. The antagonism of Jews and Arabs, which reached its highest point in armed conflict, was fed from both sides. It was fed on the criminal policy of Zionism toward the Arabs, a policy which was based on the aim of minority rule by the Jews in Palestine under the wing of British imperialism. On their side, the semi-feudal Arab rulers sought to utilize the legitimate national fears of the Arab masses against Zionism for their own reactionary purposes, to keep the Arab people separated from the Jewish masses and to maintain their own oppressive rule over their own people.

(7) THE MARXIST PROGRAM The post-war influx of European Jews in Palestine greatly exacerbated Arab-Jewish relations in the country. The Zionist leaders looked upon this influx of refugees as a means of imposing all-Jewish rule upon the whole country. The Arab effendis demanded that the Jewish people, hounded in Europe, be deprived of the right to found a new life in the country of their choice. The Marxists, firmly opposed to both, advocated a policy which would bring together the Arab and Jewish peoples in a joint fight against British imperialism in the first place, and, necessarily bound up with this, against

Jewish capital and Arab landlordism, for a Palestine freed from all foreign rule and governed by a democratic Constituent Assembly based upon equal and universal suffrage. Such a fight was desired least of all by the Jewish and Arab upper classes. In the course of a joint struggle from below, cemented by common national-revolutionary aims and common social interests, Marxists aimed for a free and independent state of Palestine, based on the coexistence of two equal peoples, with national and cultural rights and autonomy safeguarded for both. This was the only progressive solution of the Palestine question. It looked not only to revolutionary struggles in Palestine but to the upsurge of anti-imperialist and revolutionary strivings in the whole Near East, on the road to a Near East Federation of socialist republics.

(8) THE INTER-IMPERIALIST RIVALRY Another consequence of the Second World War was the extreme weakening of British imperialism, and the emergence of the U.S. and Russia as the two giants of world imperialism, neither of which was desirous of permitting Palestine to remain the unchallenged preserve of the London City; British imperialism was further weakened by the strivings of the Arab world for independence from its rule. Zionist eyes turned more and more toward Washington instead of London, in some of its sections toward Russia. Washington, keenly interested in the Near East and its oil, could look forward to ruling by the power of the dollar, once the British political fence was removed. Russia could look forward to an easier road to infiltration for the strengthening of its own sphere of influence. Under these pressures and in this interplay of the imperialist rivalries, the UN decided on the partition of Palestine and the setting up of a truncated state for the Jews - to be sure, against the bitter opposition of the British under the leadership of the Laborite government, which acted in foreign policy as the loyal caretakers of British imperialism. The state of Israel was brought into existence, however, only through the fight of the Palestinian Jews themselves, against Arab armies supported by Britain and without the help of the UN.

(9) POSITION ON THE PARTITION For the Marxists, the partition was and is no solution for either the basic problem of Jewish-Arab relations in Palestine or, still less, for the Jewish problem in the world. As against partition, we advocated a different course, one which did not depend on - and which could not rebound to the advantage of - any of the imperialists: our program for a joint Arab-Jewish revolutionary struggle for national liberation and for a revolutionary government based on a democratic Constituent Assembly. Under the circumstances of the aftermath of the Second World War and given the absence of a revolutionary Marxist party in Palestine to guide and lead such a struggle, this socialist program could not take life as an alternative to the actual course of development. The Zionist leadership (at first) and the Arab cabal also opposed partition, because they too had an alternative: the complete conquest of Palestine and the subordination of the other people, by force of arms if necessary - a reactionary chauvinistic alternative at the opposite pole from that of the Marxists. If the Zionist leaders finally accepted the partition willingly, it was because they reconciled themselves to it as a necessary installment toward their real end. There was no such reason for the Marxist view of partition to come to an end with the UN decision. As compared with the program we advocated, partition represented a setback on the road to greater understanding and cooperation between the Jewish and Arab peoples: it did indeed lead to a bloody fratricidal war in which and after which national feelings were inflamed even more and state-boundary walls were set up between the two peoples.

(10) RIGHT TO SELF DETERMINATION But if partition and the subsequent setting up and consolidation of the new state of Israel did not and could not solve the

basic problem, or advance its solution, it did pose entirely new conditions under which that solution had to be sought. For the first time, for the Marxists, the question was posed in real, political - not abstract - terms: Do the Jews in Palestine have the right to self-determination? Previously this question had been demagogically posed by the Zionists only as a misleading formulation of their actual program of minority rule over an Arab majority - therefore not as a question of democratic self-determination at all. It could be honestly posed in reality only on the basis of a partition, which however had been as vigorously opposed by most Zionist and semi-Zionist tendencies as by the Marxists, up to the UN decision. Before the actual fact of partition the Marxists could counterpose to all other programs their own program for a democratic united Palestine as part of the perspective of socialist revolution in the Near East. The outbreak of war in Palestine particularly posed the question of the right of self-determination sharply before the Marxist movement.

(11) SELF-DETERMINATION FOR JEWS A clear distinction must be made between (a) the right of a people to self-determination, and (b) the correctness or advisability of exercising this right to the point of separation under given conditions. While the Marxist view was opposed to partition and the creation of a separate Jewish state as the solution for Palestine, it is yet the clear fact that the overwhelming majority of Palestine's Jews desired it. The democratic right here involved - which involves also the democratic right to follow a mistaken policy - was attacked and contested, not by any force acting in the interest of a higher democracy or of socialism, but by the armies of a reactionary social class, the Arab effendis. The reactionary nature of this assault on the Jews' act of self-determination is not eliminated by the fact that the Arab peoples themselves suffer from the exploitation of imperialism, especially in view of the fact that the assault took place with the urging and aid of British imperialism. Also not involved is any scientific-theoretical question of "the nature of the Jewish people" - i.e., nation, race, etc.? - since (a) the problem concerns not Jews or people of Jewish descent in the world as a whole, but specifically the Jewish community in given territorial areas of Palestine, and (b) whatever the scientific-theoretical verdict might be for the Jews as a whole, it is obvious that the Palestinian Jewish community has acted and is acting exactly as if it were a national people; and this is enough for the purpose of determining a political program.

(12) POSITION ON THE WAR The politics from which the war in Palestine flowed, therefore, was - on the side of the Jews - their exercise of their right to self-determination; and - on the side of the Arab states - their aim of depriving the Jews of this right by force of arms; the war itself was necessarily fought by the Jews independently of the UN and of any of the imperialists because of the policies of the latter. The Marxist position on this war was summed up as follows:

(1) Defense of Israel against the Arab states' attack - military, material and moral support to its war but no political support to Zionism or the government. This pro-war position necessarily entailed also opposition to any intervention in the war by the big imperialist powers, and the demand in the U.S. for no embargo on arms to Israel and for recognition.

(2) For the conduct of this just war of defense around the leading ideas: (a) no expansionism; (b) wage the war, not as a war against the Arab peoples, a war of Jew against Arab, but as a war against the Arab landlords and oppressors, as a social war, to seek the alliance of the Arab masses.

(13) PERSPECTIVES FOR ISRAEL This objective could be achieved only on the basis of a revolutionary program, not on the basis of Zionist nationalism. It meant the aim of constructing Israel not as an exclusively Jewish state (even one which

treated an Arab minority tolerably) but as a "bi-national" state - a bi-national state in the specific sense of one which is planned as the home of two equal peoples, not of one master race tolerating an alien minority. The victory in war of the splinter state of Israel ensured its national existence for this period but did not solve its problems. Merely military victory, especially when associated with the maintenance of a Zionist-nationalist and implicitly expansionist perspective can only result in a permanent state of Near Eastern "cold war" between Jews and Arabs, chronic national tensions, border incidents, and permanent national hatred. Under these conditions, for a splinter state whose economic life is intertwined with that of its Arab neighbors, its future can only be that of a state-wide ghetto in an Arab world. The leaders of Israel can make this future even bearable only by dependence, and ever increasing dependence on one or the other of the predatory imperialisms, by becoming its outpost in its section of the world. The strongest imperialist force operating to subjugate Israel and break it into this role is U.S. Imperialism, operating both through the general economic power of U.S. wealth and specifically through control of the pursestrings of Israel by Jewish capitalist elements in the U.S.

(14) FOR INDEPENDENT ACTION In the longer run, the only alternative for Israel, as against a chronic nightmare existence and becoming a puppet of outside imperialism, is the perspective of the integration of Israel into an Independent Near Eastern Union of States, genuinely free from all imperialist subordination and control. As long as Jewish capital and Arab landlordism remain in control of these states this aim is not a practical possibility; the fight for its realization requires the building of a revolutionary socialist movement in Israel and of revolutionary workers' and peasants' movements in the Arab countries. In general, the development of this slogan would be along the same lines as that already proposed for an Independent Western Union in Europe.

(15) SOCIALIST PROGRAM FOR ISRAEL A special responsibility - not a one-sided one, but a special responsibility - in this regard devolves upon the working class movement of Israel, precisely because of the more advanced character and ideology and the more advanced nature of the economy upon which it rests. Without in the least counter-posing the tasks of Israeli socialists to those of socialists and consistent revolutionary nationalists in the Arab countries, or the importance of a revolutionary program on both sides of the national division, it is the particular duty of the Israeli socialist movement to develop a program making for an alliance between Israel's working class and the Arab masses against their own exploiters and ruling classes. Such a program would take its start and indicate its direction with such demands as the following:

- (a) The complete integration of both Arab and Jewish workers into united trade unions.
- (b) United political parties of Jews and Arabs in Israel.
- (c) Agrarian reform in the Arab sections of Israel, making land and capital available to Arab land-tillers on the same basis as to Jewish colonists, etc.
- (d) Policy of encouraging and facilitating the return of Arab refugees to Israel. *
- (e) The formation of an Independent Near East Union based on equal universal suffrage, complete democratic rights for all peoples, the safeguarding of national and cultural rights for all people in all countries, etc.
- (f) Economic union with Arab Palestine and/or Transjordan as a first step.

* (add) Elimination of the Arab ghettos in Israeli cities and of all laws and practices imposing special disabilities upon Arab citizens and residents in Israel.

(16) ROAD TO SOCIALISM While a progressive development for Israel cannot unfold fully for Israel unless it moves in the direction of Jewish-Arab unity within Israel and toward voluntary federation with the Arab world about it, the road to building a socialist movement which will fight in this direction does not depend only on a program revolving around this question. The development of Israel since its creation makes clear to all that within the Jewish population the class struggle of the proletariat versus the Israeli bourgeoisie is not exorcized by Zionism. On the contrary, this class struggle has been sharpened, especially under the conditions of the country's continuing economic crisis, and tends to break out of the bounds of Zionist national unity.

In its truncated section of Palestine - poor in resources, moreover - Israel's economic crisis is decisively, though not exclusively, linked with its international position in a cold-war-torn world, as a Jewish island in an Arab region and as a small country under the pressure of the imperialist blocs. Its economy is drained by its relatively enormous arms budget and by the disruption of the normal trade relations with the Arab areas around it. The socialist program on Jewish relations with this Arab world is therefore a requisite to a solution of the economic crisis also - that is, to the domestic program. In addition, a genuinely socialist domestic program would also include:

- (1) Maximum expansion of the nationalized and collective sectors of the economy under the democratic control of the workers and farmers.
- (2) An end to the labor leaders' policy of concessions to capitalist private enterprise and foreign capital at the expense of the working class and of the collectivized sector.
- (3) Complete separation of church and state - that is, the abolition of all the reactionary legislation and practices which accord medieval privileges to the Orthodox Jewish synagogue; secular marriage, divorce, education, etc.
- (4) Abolition of all laws and practices restructuring civil liberties, the press, mails, etc.

(17) ROAD TO INTERNATIONAL UNITY More than in Western Europe, more than in the Far East, the healthy development of the Israeli economy and society requires integration into a supra-national unity, through voluntary federation between the two states artificially carved out of Palestine. Most immediately indicated is the aim of a voluntary federation of Israel and Arab Palestine, bringing together once more the parts of this divided country. Such a step, necessitating not only the abandonment of Israeli nationalist, or Zionist expansionism, but also the overthrow of all Arab pretenders (like Abdullah) to control over the Palestine Arabs, would be an important step on the road to an Independent Near East Union, as a revolutionary workers' and peasants' movement develops in the Arab states under the thrones of the effendis. This is the path advocated by the Marxists toward the achievement of the great goal of a United Socialist States of the Near East, as part of a socialist world.

II. THE JEWISH QUESTION

(18) ZIONISM NO SOLUTION What remains of the specific Zionist ideology in the countries outside Palestine (the so-called Diaspora), now that a Jewish state actually exists in Israel, is more than ever utopian and reactionary. The problem of the Jewish population in the Diaspora cannot be solved by any perspective of emigration to Israel, except for a small part; Israel cannot absorb them. In the Moslem countries outside of Palestine, the situation of the Jews has been considerably worsened. The Jewish problem remains in the world, sharpened by the war and by capitalist degeneration, and Zionism no longer can even pretend to be able to eliminate it along its chosen road. The overwhelming majority of the Jews dwell, and will continue to dwell, outside of Israel. The fight for the abolition of all

injustices practised against the Jews, of all inequality in status and opportunity, of all anti-Semitic practises and prejudices, is more than ever bound up with the fight for socialism in all countries and on a world scale.

(19) ZIONISM IN THE DIASPORA In these countries Jewish nationalism, even in its Zionist form (like Negro nationalism to a certain extent), springs from some progressive roots - in particular, recognition of the trend of capitalism toward anti-Semitism and a desire to ensure a free life for the Jewish people. It is reactionary in its consequences inasmuch as it leads to the characteristic Zionist ideology: their view of the Diaspora merely as a reservoir of manpower and material aid for a future expansion of Israel as a dominantly Jewish state, both at the expense of the surrounding Arab countries and toward the eventual liquidation of all Jewish communities outside Palestine; the consequent belief that the perspective for every Jew should be to go to Palestine, as a matter of tribal solidarity and "blood"; the view that any participation by Jews in the class struggle in the countries of the Diaspora is either in contradiction with his Jewishness, or, at best, an incidental activity permissible (or even desirable) as long as he is still outside Palestine and as long as it does not conflict with his main responsibility.

(20) AGAINST JEWISH SEPARATISM In opposition to this, the Marxists propose to the Jewish people in their countries that their main responsibility is to fight at home not only against anti-Semitism in all its forms but, in order to carry out this very fight effectively, for socialism and a workers' government - which at one and the same time is the only guarantee not only for a free life for the Jewish people but also for the healthy development of Israel and Jewish-Arab relations in the Near East. Insofar as Jewish nationalism does contain or spring from progressive aspirations which we share, we seek to point out to nationalist-minded Jews that their prime duty is to join with the labor and socialist movements of their own countries in the struggle for a workers' world. This does not mean separatist organizations as Jews either politically or economically (i.e., specifically Jewish unions, Jewish political parties whether Zionist or not, etc.) but common organization with all other workers, within which common organization, special programs, propaganda and institutions need to be devoted to the special Jewish problem.

(21) QUESTION OF ASSIMILATION Outside of the above, which is the primary political proposal of the Marxists to the Jewish people regarding their relations with the labor movement in the countries outside Israel, the Marxists do not - and do not need to - take a fixed position on the theoretical and speculative aspects of the problem of "assimilation." Under capitalism, total assimilation is an unreal perspective - except, possibly, in its very worst form, i.e., forced "assimilation" (combines with extermination) by totalitarian terror and brutal constraint. Under socialism the Jewish people themselves will be free to choose their own road - whether toward assimilation, or toward some form of cultural autonomy, or even toward some form of territorial political autonomy within the framework of free socialist federation, or any combination of these. This will be decided in practice by the Jewish people themselves, under the new conditions and opportunities provided by socialist democracy, and not imposed in advance either by a revolutionary party, a workers' state, or even by any existing movement of the Jewish people themselves. Here too the Zionist movement shows its chauvinist ideology in arbitrarily seeking to restrict or interdict or wipe out Yiddish culture (language, literature, schools, etc.) both in Israel and in other countries. On the political field, however, the Marxist movement vigorously advocates the "assimilation" of the Jewish people in all countries into the labor and socialist movement of that country, for a common fight against capitalism.

(22) APPROACH TO ZIONISTS In the United States particularly, the pressure of conditions under which the Jews live is far from resembling that of the Jewish DPs in Europe. In the United States, therefore, we approach socialist Zionists, especially left-wing socialist Zionists, in the first place on the basis of a common fight for the many objectives we jointly hold in social and political action here and now, seek to develop common political action for the labor and socialist fight here and now, and seek to convince them in the course of such common struggle, of the Marxist view on the relation between the Jewish struggle and the struggle against capitalism at home.

- - -