

SPECIAL CONVENTION ISSUE
For Appeal Members only

BULLETIN

of the
Marxist Policy Committee

(Address all correspondence to: C. Becket, 23435 N. Elaine Pl., Chi.)
Vol. 1, No. 6

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX
28-December-37

All comrades not having a complete file of the 6 issues of the MPC BULLETIN are urged at once to telephone Buckingham 3972, or write to C. Becket.

Contents

1. Summary of differences between MPC and Trotsky-Cannon.
2. For a Revolutionary Party, for Soviets, and for Independent Militias in China.

MARXISM VERSUS TROTSKYISM

Summary of differences between MPC and Trotsky-Cannon.

This convention is the battleground of Marxism against Centriism. All fine shadings, all personalities, all organizational questions recede before the central struggle of the revolutionary line of the MPC against the centrist line of Trotsky-Cannon. The job of the convention is to choose between these two irreconcilable tendencies. Every important question has demonstrated the Marxist character of the MPC program and the centrist nature of the Trotsky-Cannon position.

SPAIN

The MPC position on the war in Spain: fundamentally a struggle between communism and fascism; no aid to the P.F. capitalist state; march separately, strike together against the fascists; for 4th Internationalist party, soviets, workers' independent militias. Trotsky-Cannon position: "fundamental character" is a "struggle between the camp of the Spanish bourgeois democracy and the camp of Spanish fascism" (I.B. #1 p.38); calls for "defense of the Negrin government" (id.p.40), and material aid to the P.F. capitalist state--embellished by "political criticism" consisting of revolutionary phrases; vacillations on POUM, varying from "revolutionary Marxist" (S.A., Sep. '36) to traitorous.

CHINA

MPC position on war in China: imperialist invasion of a semi-colonial country; no aid to Chinese bourgeois state (Chiang forces); march separately and strike together against Japanese imperialism; for 4th internationalist party, soviets, worker-peasant militias. Trotsky-Cannon position: war is "at present" merely war of national liberation; workers must "support the people of China and their army, i.e., the Chinese bourgeoisie (Trotsky, S.A., 16 Oct. '37); "Chinese patriotism is legitimate and progressive" (IB#1 p.53); military and material aid to the capitalist state, adorned by "a spirit of total independence" - spiritualism (Trotsky, SA, 16 Oct. '37).

Second and Third Internationals.

MPC on 2nd and CI: Second International irrevocably anti-proletarian since 1914, Third since 1928. Impossible for "even" a national section of either one to become bolshevik. Contrary position is conciliation with reformism, which is agency of bourgeoisie.

Trotsky-Cannon position: "The social democracy" may "succeed in breaking with the bourgeois state, in transforming itself, and in preparing itself for the decisive struggle against fascism." (New International, Aug. '34); liquidated ICL sections into the social democracy; "perhaps even entire party organization" of the LSI and CI "can be won for revolutionary internationalism." (SA, 14 Aug. '37); as long after 1914 as 14 August '37, (in the SA) Cannon-Shachtman speak of "the possibility of normal development" in which the SPUSA "will go mightily forward... preparing as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class for the final conflict." Apparently this "possibility" still exists.

LABOR PARTY

MPC on "labor Party": the only party that can represent the interests of labor is the Marxist party; all other parties in reality aid the owning class. Cannon-Shachtman openly leave room for concept of "revolutionary labor party" apart from Marxist party. (SA, 14 Aug. '37, p.4), and "oppose" support of ALP and FLP movements only "At the present time" (id); supported FLP candidates in Minneapolis elections; liquidated WP, disorienting many workers and strengthening illusions in the (pro-"Labor"-Party) SP.

UNION AND JOBLESS QUESTION

MPC on labor union and unemployed question: for class struggle policy, internal democracy, organization of the unorganized, industrial structure and, union unity on basis of these policies; leadership of and policies of AFL, CIO, RR brotherhoods, MESA, etc., act as brakes upon the struggle of the workers; need to build progressive groups in all unions on basis of foregoing policies; need for organizing unemployed on class struggle policies; ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ closely tied up with the employed workers; for progressive group in WAA, etc. Cannon-Shachtman: subordinated all activities to reformist SP discipline; no independent role in strike wave; liquidated its National Unemployed League.

WAR

MPC on war; turn imperialist war into civil war; the first enemy is in "our own" country; the Marxist organization in a country must work for the revolutionary defeat of "its own" bourgeoisie; for the intensification of the proletarian class war in "democratic" countries no less than in fascist lands during war.

Trotsky-Cannon: on question of whether to work actively for defeat of "our own" bourgeoisie, the key to revolutionary defeatism, their centrist ambiguity is fatal. "NOT that defeat of one's own country is the lesser evil as compared with the defeat of the enemy country" --Trotsky, "War and the Fourth International," p.26, a position flowing from Trotsky's position in the first world war, "Neither victory nor defeat"; "for the defeat of their own government--NOT for its defeat by the opposing capitalist power"--WP, "War and the Workers," p.13, our emphasis); on question whether to support French bourgeoisie when "allied" with SU, fatal equivocation ("The Case of Leon Trotsky," pp. 289-290).

USSR

MPC on USSR: Marxists call for conditional defense of USSR because the decisive sections of its economy remain socialized; it remains a workers' state, a proletarian dictatorship; in other respects: workers rule, workers democracy, workers control do not exist. The party-state bureaucracy, predominantly petty-bourgeois in composition, is a force serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie but still based on the proletarian dictatorship. Defense of the USSR and aid "material" or otherwise) to the bureaucracy are MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE, whether in "peace" or during imperialist armed intervention. Transfer of state power from proletariat to bourgeoisie, decisive restoration of bourgeois property relations--these can not occur without provoking armed struggle on a tremendous scale. It is necessary to build a Fourth Internationalist party in the Soviet Union, and work toward an armed destruction of the grip of the bureaucracy (i.e., "political revolution") in order to restore the USSR to the proletarian path--to full soviet rule, workers' democratic administration, and leadership for the world revolution.

Trotsky-Cannon position: fail to recognize that the party-state bureaucracy is in its main composition petit-bourgeois although it has workers and developing bourgeois forces; discuss the bureaucracy as if extra-class, supra-class; assign dual role to the bureaucracy (progressive in so far as . . . , reactionary in so far as . . .) leading to a position of "material aid" (necessarily unconditional aid) to Stalinism, which in reality will aid the bourgeoisie. Trotsky's centrist position incapable of working for a Marxian Party in USSR.

MARXISM VS. REVISIONISM

From a statement of all these sharp concrete differences between the MPC line and that of Trotsky-Cannon, there appear basic differences upon all the fundamental concept of Marxist theory. The MPC has Marxist positions, and Trotsky-Cannon centrist revisionist, on the class nature of the state, the character of the vanguard party, the independence of this party, the independence of the proletariat, class struggle,

the path to power, centrism, open reformism, the permanent revolution, liquidationism, revolutionary defeatism, social patriotism, bourgeois "democracy."

The MPC has a Marxist proletarian class line: Trotsky-Cannon, an eclectic, dualist, equivocal line. The MPC has a line of struggle, the Trotsky-Cannon line is defeatist.

ANTI-CAPITALISM VERSUS ANTI-STALINISM

Trotskyism is an oppositionist tendency, whereas the MPC line is oriented upon the masses against capitalism, the Trotsky-Cannon line is oriented upon advanced-workers against Stalinism. This orientation leads to abject, sectarian parasitism.

Concentration upon criticising Stalinism, theoretically and practically excludes a real fight against capitalism "or" Stalinism. Merely criticizing an agency of capitalism for its "failure" to fight capitalism only disorients the workers. As long as the Appeal occupies itself primarily with tail-ending Stalinism, the workers will not even hear about the Appeal. Or any that do, will simply say:

"IF YOU KNOW WHAT SHOULD BE DONE, WHY DON'T YOU DO IT?"

But failure to apply class struggle policy results inevitably in failure to expose class collaboration. Trotsky-ism, because it cannot demonstrate the true way, cannot expose the false way.

The MPC works for the understanding of and the repudiation of the Appeal Administration's oppositionist anti-Marxist course. We fight for an independent Fourth International.

BUREAUCRACY

The Administration finally published a sketchy proposed agenda for the Convention - but only on the very eve of the Convention, only after the MPC had taken the lead in publishing a much superior agenda, and only after rank-and-file pressure had actually forced the Administration's hand.

But upon most of the questions even on its own agenda the "leadership" has been afraid to submit its theses - even to its own hyper-funigated "preconvention discussion."

Cannon-Shachtman cannot defeat the MPC politically. They have been compelled, therefore, to try to suppress it organizationally. They suppressed almost all the material we submitted to the tardy, scant internal bulletins. They published only two items, on only a single question, and even these only months after they had been submitted.

The MPC was virtually excluded from the (wholly inadequate) pre-convention discussion meetings. The secretary of the MPC was illegally, by ukase, "declared expelled." He was never furnished any written charges and was flatly denied a trial. To prevent him from making a minority report at the first (and last) "preconvention discussion meeting" called by the Chicago Exec. Com., Goldman & Co. illegally physically ejected comrade Becket from the room.

The NAC ordered Chicago to put on trial all the Chicagomembers of the MPC. Cannon-Shechtman know very well that they cannot defend their positions when confronted by a Marxist political line. So they are inflexibly determined to deprive the MPC of its right to a voice on the convention floor at any and all costs. These centrist bureaucrats violate the democratic rights even of their own loyal opposition, the LWC group. The Appeal rank-and-file must fight to the last ditch against the Administration's complete repudiation of democratic centralism. But this fight is inseparable from the fight to adopt the Marxist political line of the MPC.

FIGHT FOR A MARXIST POLICY!

Comrades of the Appeal! You must choose between the two main lines confronting the convention.

Upon the line of Trotsky-Cannon can be built only a miserable sect of criticism - that in reality only hinders the working class from building its revolutionary party.

Upon the revolutionary line of the MPC can be built a mighty revolutionary movement that will wipe capitalist exploitation off the face of the earth.

Comrades of the Appeal!

REPUDIATE THE CENTRISM OF TROTSKY-CANNON!!!

FIGHT FOR A MARXIST POLICY!!!

JOIN THE MARXIST POLICY COMMITTEE!!!