

To quote an oft-forgotten statement by Trotsky: "The most important, best established, and most unalterable rule to apply in every maneuver reads: you must never dare to merge, mix, or combine your own party organization with an alien one, even though the latter be most 'sympathetic' today. Undertake no such steps as lead directly or indirectly, openly or maskedly, to the subordination of your own party to other parties, or to organizations of other classes, or constrict the freedom of your own agitation, or assume responsibility, even if only in part, for the political line of other parties. You shall not mix up the banners, let alone kneel before another banner..."

But it is precisely those who today speak of intransigence who only yesterday entered into agreement with Thomas to liquidate the Appeal caucus and paper, in the name of "strategy", "tactics", and "flexibility". Wasn't this constricting the freedom of our agitation? The fact that we urged the workers to vote for the reformist Thomas, wasn't this taking responsibility for the political line of an opportunist outfit? Why was it correct to confine ourselves to a "narrow, restricted internal discussion" yesterday, and today the Appeal resolution considers this no more to be correct? Why does the Appeal plenum blab about "we must make our voice heard publicly" since this "is an elementary duty of the Marxists"? when only yesterday they were quite willing to give up this elementary duty? To tell the workers that the SP was "the only revolutionary party" certainly was not fulfilling a Marxist duty of speaking the truth. ~~Neither was it "strategy" on Shachtman's part to tell the workers just two months after the SP convention had demonstratively proved a shift to the right, "that the SP is crystallizing in a Marxist direction".~~ What was a settled question to Lenin, that the social democracy is a dead corpse and could not be reformed, is something entirely different to the Appeal leadership - "this served in the last analysis simply to leave open the question of whether the SP would become the revolutionary party of the American working class". (Socialist Appeal, August 14)

What evidence have we that the Appeal leadership has repudiated its reform perspective? None!!! Quite the contrary. The Appeal plenum resolution says: "...the affiliated parties of the two internationals, together with the executive bodies of the two internationals, have already gone over openly and fully to social patriotism..." And what conclusion does it draw? "It is, of course, true that there are many individual workers, and perhaps entire party organizations (our emphasis), now affiliated to one or the other the two internationals, that can and will be won to the side of the proletarian revolution..." ~~xxxxxxx~~ First, to the obvious contradiction if the affiliated parties of the two internationals are social patriotic, as the Appeal resolution itself says, why therefore this hope of reforming them? This contradiction is not an accident. It is because the Appeal leadership still has not given up its ideas of reforming reformism. The latest exit of the Appeal from the SP is not based on a desire to be independent. No, these people are afraid of dependence. It is because the Altman-Clarity people will no longer tolerate even such a meager "left wing" as the Appeal, that these people are forced to seek an exit from the SP. Sooner or later

therefore able to overthrow) the bourgeoisie (whose interests are represented by the centrist and open reformist organizations). The general principle of the independence of the revolutionary vanguard is best brought into focus upon the present situation by the simple question: "What aids, what hinders, the building of the revolutionary Fourth International?"

While there is no basic difference between the content of centrism and the content of open reformism, yet there sometimes is a basic difference between affiliation to a centrist grouping and affiliation to an open reformist organization. An open reformist organization is at all times able to exact politico-organizational subordination from its affiliates. But a loose centrist federation may find itself forced, through the conjunction of its own revolutionary pretensions and its revolutionary rank and file, to allow a revolutionary organization to affiliate without the latter at all relinquishing its full politico-organizational autonomy. Thus, a difference that in one connexion is only superficial, may in another connexion be fundamental.

Under most circumstances affiliation by a marxist organization to a non-marxist organization or grouping violates basic revolutionary principle. That is to say, under most circumstances such relationship necessarily entails the politico-organizational subordination of the marxist vanguard. Under all circumstances, joining an open reformist international, as the WP did, inevitably involves surrender of the possibility of independence against social democracy and its keeper, capitalism. Joining POUM, ILP, or other individual centrist party would constitute effective liquidation of a revolutionary organization. Affiliating to a grouping that has already crystallized on a centrist basis for the purpose of making this organization revolutionary, necessarily leads to capitulation. To give up one's independent internal and external organs of political expression is to give up one's categorical duty. If an organization--before, during, or after affiliation to a centrist grouping--fails of maximum propagation of the full marxist program and maximum exposure of all non-marxist organizations, specifically; by name, then this constitutes capitulation. Subordination of the activities of one's members (as in unions) to the discipline of non-marxists is another name for liquidation.

It is possible that circumstances under which affiliation to a centrist grouping would not violate revolutionary principles never arise. And it is possible that wherever such circumstances do arise, it may be tactically disadvantageous to affiliate (or even to enter a united front, for that matter). But it is false that under all circumstances affiliation to a centrist grouping necessarily involves surrender of politico-organizational autonomy.

ZIMMERWALD

For example, on their road to the Third International, the

Bolsheviks affiliated to the Zimmerwald conference -- a centrist grouping. Lenin put his signature to the Conference manifesto-- a centrist document, whose non-revolutionary complexion is attested to by the fact that it was signed also by Ledebour, P. Axelrod, and Robert Grimm!

But the Bolshevik organizations did not at all subordinate itself to this centrist set-up. The "Sotsial-Demokrat" (central organ of the Bolsheviks) promptly published the draft manifesto introduced at the Conference by the left wing delegates, and two further declarations of the Zimmerwald Left. The revolutionary position was circulated officially among the left groupings throughout the entire world. The independent strength of the Bolsheviks was not weakened by the affiliation to Zimmerwald, but enhanced. Zimmerwald was a stepping-stone toward Moscow, toward the Third International.

Similarly today: while organizing a new Zimmerwald is not the road to the revolutionary Fourth International, yet affiliation to a new Zimmerwald may be necessary for broadcasting to left workers through the world the antithesis between centrism and marxism, and blasting the centrist obstruction forever out of the path to the Fourth International.

#### PSEUDO-LEFT POSITION

For Milton Davis and the ultra-lefts, however, the central principle to be observed in the relationships of marxist organizations to centrist groupings is not refusal to surrender one's politico-organizational independence, but refusal to affiliate, in itself. They argue further, then, that there can be no important difference between affiliation to a centrist grouping and affiliation to social democracy a la Cannon. (Comrades who do not understand centrism cannot fight it; the Davisites cannot fight Cannon politically, and their group must capitulate to his line.)

They say that the misleaders of a centrist set-up will at all times and under all circumstances be free to have their own sweet way in dictating to all applicants for affiliation and preventing them from exercising their politico-organizational independence.

Furthermore, they say that the centrists at Zimmerwald put one over on Lenin: the Bolsheviks, "so-called", subordinated their organization and program to reformism. They were dead wrong, and terribly retarded the movement for the Third International. For us, under like circumstances, to affiliate to such an outfit would be a betrayal of the working class. Of course, say some of the Davisites, for Lenin it was not a principled error, for he, unlike ourselves, did not have his own example to learn from, so he could not know any better! For them, whether a given action violates revolutionary principle depends upon subjective factors in those responsible.

The Davis position shows not a principled intransigence, but a childish rigidity. It is a true example of "Left-wing Commun-

ism: An Infantile Disorder'. It betrays an unseasoned skittishness, a lack of trust in a marxist organization (actually, in themselves) to execute a manoeuvre without falling into opportunist betrayal. Davis's head adorns the same coin whose other side is graced by the Trotsky-Cannon image. Cannon, in form shifting over from being a peulant "Left Opposition" to the Stalinern (even after announcing an independent orientation), concentrated his hopes upon another ready made outfit-- the American section of the social democracy, and finally liquidated into it to continue tail-ending it from the inside. Davis, ostensibly horrified, would shrink from every kind of affiliation to any kind of non-marxist set-up under all circumstances.

But the source of each melody is exactly the same. It is the lack of revolutionary boldness; lack of confidence in themselves, in their line, in a revolutionary organization, and in the working-class; and therefore lack of desire or power to pursue a firm, independent course in the class struggle. Davis's political cowardice will send him crying back into the arms of open opportunism. His line leads straight to capitulation. Ultra-leftism of phrase is accompanied regularly by opportunism of deed.

And this is not an abstract generalization! Already once before precisely the same line has led precisely the same individual to outright capitulation to the line of Cannon-Shachtman-Altman. Davis used to be a member of a group that fought tooth and nail for his position. And then, promptly on schedule, this stalwart revolutionists, who on principle would fight to the death affiliation to a centrist grouping, this Red Rebel, beside whom Lenin looked like a pale pink,-- what did this fearless fighter do?

Meekly, with sheepish glances around, his whole group liquidated into the open reformist swamp of the SPUSA, and Davis sobbed on the broad breast of Papa Cannon, whom a little before they had called such bad names! Davis is only a "left-wing" Glee, an antistrophe to Cannon.

### FALSE RE-EVALUATION OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Reformism comprises the whole gamut of shadings, talking of social improvement without fighting consistently for the world proletarian revolution. Under one pretext or another, reformists always fight against revolution, thus forming part of the defenses of capitalism. Reformism is an agency of the bourgeoisie inside the ranks of the proletariat.

The classic embodiment of reformism is the "Labor and Socialist International", "the social democracy". The world war, laying bare the decisive capture of this 2nd "International" by reformism, found the social democracy the right-hand man of the respective general staffs, mobilizing the workers of the various countries for mutual slaughter under the banner of Socialism, but in the interests of capitalism. The breadth and depth of this betrayal conclusively demonstrated that the social democracy had irrevocably passed to the

side of the bourgeoisie, was a very organ of the bourgeois body politic, and could never break with the bourgeois state. Although the bourgeoisie, when forced to employ the totalitarian form of rule, smashes the social democracy, still the social democracy cannot break with the bourgeois state. The class content of the social democracy had, like the class content of the bourgeois state, crystalized about itself an organizational form that made it, like its master the bourgeois state, incapable of being captured and used for proletarian purposes.

The Menshevik Martov, in No. 12 of Golos, 25 Sept. 1914 (quoted in Lenin: Collected Works, Imperialist War, p. 419, n. 45) hoped that an intransigent attitude against the war would "be approved at the future meetings of the International, when it shall have been restored and ridden of the deserters of Socialism." However, Lenin took a different view: "Overwhelmed by opportunism, the Second International has died. Down with opportunism, and long live the Third International, purged not only of the "deserters" (as the Golos would wish it) but also of opportunism." (Ibid, p. 89). This view of the social democracy appeared in Sotsial-Demokrat, No. 33, under the date of November 1, 1914!

Again, in the summer of 1915, Lenin and Zinoviev wrote as follows: "This betrayal of Socialism means the collapse of the Second (1889-1914) International." (Ibid, p. 229). Lenin, who of course made many serious mistakes, did not think that the social democracy could break with the bourgeois state. If he had, he scarcely would have been instrumental in organizing a dual Third International separate from and against the Second.

Rosá Luxemburg made very serious mistakes, but had very good reasons for her declaration that the social democracy was a "stinking corpse", so far as concerned the working class. Lenin and Trotsky and the other revolutionists of the old Comintern days used to agree with this. But Trotsky must, in the trials he has had to undergo, have either relapsed into his old pre-1917 conciliationism, or else have fled to the comforting religious doctrine of the resurrection of corpses, so putrefied that they stink. In contrasting the first three of the following extracts from Trotsky with the fourth, bear in mind Trotsky's characterization of Bukharin, "whose safety lies in the shortness of his memory". (Third International After Lenin, p. 39.):

#### TROTSKY: OLD STYLE:

(1) "The Social Democracy, the hanger-on of the bourgeoisie, is doomed to wretched ideological parasitism."

(What Next, p. 20, 1932)

(2) "The social democracy, though composed of workers, is entirely a bourgeois party, which under 'normal conditions is led quite expertly from the point of view of bourgeois aims (retaining its support by the workers, -MPC), but which

is good for nothing at all under the conditions of a social crisis....The social democracy lost votes and seats because capitalism, on account of the crisis, has revealed its authentic visage, The crisis did not strengthen the party of 'socialism', on the contrary it weakened it...Can more undebatable proofs of the bourgeois character of this party be produced?"  
(Ibid, p.26. Our emphasis)

"Is it possible to reform or renew the Second International, pervaded by crimes and treacheries? the war and all post-war events answer: No!...Social democracy is devoted body and soul to the bourgeois regime."

The Militant, March 31, 1934, p.1. Manifesto  
"FOR THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL", of the IS,  
League of Communist-Internationalists.

- (3) "Both Fascism and the social democracy are tools in the hands of the bourgeoisie." What Next, p.59.

### TROTSKY: NEW STYLE

- (4) "The destiny of the proletariat depends, in large measure, in our epoch, upon the resolute manner with which the social democracy will succeed in the brief interval which is vouchsafed it by the march of development, in breaking with the bourgeois state, in transforming itself, and in preparing itself for the decisive struggle against fascism."

New International, August, 1934, p.70).

NOT "SAFETY", BUT POLITICAL DEATH LIES IN SUCH "SHORTNESS OF MEMORY" !

In adopting the view that the social democracy can break with the bourgeois state, transform itself, and prepare itself for a "decisive struggle against fascism", Trotsky has already in essence extended the hand of conciliation to the social democracy, made his peace with reformism, the agency of the bourgeoisie, and capitulate to capitalism. And of course Cannon-Shachtman trail Trotsky, just as Trotsky trailed Stalin in the revisionist theory that the Socialist parties could serve the interests of the working class.

### ENTRY ONLY AN APPENDAGE TO RE-EVALUATION

So what could be more logical, since the fate of the proletariat was hanging in the balance, than to join the social democracy the better to help it transform itself, and to force through its break with the bourgeois state! The essential step had already been taken by the re-evaluation of the social democracy. To modify the analysis of the social democracy as servant of the class enemy, to spread the idea that it can become the servant of our own class-- this is already to relax the implacable fight against the class enemy, to compromise the independence of one's own program and o can-

ization, and to subordinate one's own organization to anti-marxist, anti-proletariat forces.

Formal liquidation of one's party into the social democracy then becomes a matter of indifference to the working class. Indeed, it is better not to stay outside and spread illusions by a specious and superficial independence. A person not in principle opposed to the re-evaluation cannot in principle oppose entry--witness Glee, Satir, Glotzer, Heisler. If one does not understand that the re-evaluation is itself a violation of principle, then all opposition to entry not only is bound to cave in, but it is also essentially irrelevant to the revolutionary movement.

However, the ultra-lefts don't seem to appreciate this. While agreeing in words when pressed, nevertheless for all practical purposes, they regard entry itself as the principal deviation. Thus their line has no insuperable obstacle to entry, and in point of fact it leads straight to capitulation. And as narrated above, Milton Davis, who puts so much stress on the act of affiliation itself not only affiliated to, but with his whole group completely liquidated into the social democracy. Sic transit ultra-leftism! And comrade Davis is the chief guide and mentor of the group in NYC.

#### REVOLUTIONARY DEFEATISM NOT APPLICABLE

MPC BULLETIN No.2; on pages six and seven, summarized the reasons why revolutionary defeatism does not apply to the present war in Spain. But the Davis group had never come out clearly against the raising of this slogan for the war. His group, pressed from the left by the MPC and from the right by the Appeal officials, hesitated to come out boldly in favor of what both left and right denounced. However, their ultra-leftism calls for this position, and their lack of clear understanding makes it impossible for them to hold it-- until they roll down into the slough of open reformism. NOT

Here again, ultra-leftism is a form of capitulation. Cannon-Trotsky, qualitatively exaggerating the difference between the two bourgeois camps in Spain, fall into giving support to one of them, thus capitulating to the class enemy. The ultra-lefts, tending to deny any important difference between the two bourgeois camps, fall into deserting the fight against once camp of the native bourgeoisie, thus likewise capitulating to the class enemy. One's chief enemy is in "one's own" country, and to support any section of this class "or relax the fight against any section, is like leaving a gap in the dike. They are the opposite sides of the same medal, and in essence are the same position-- aid to the class enemy. The MPC fights against this position altogether.

#### FOR A MARXIST POLICY IN SPAIN

We fight to send representatives to Spain to help organize a revolutionary Fourth International party and to establish channels through which to aid revolutionary workers in action against the class enemy, as on the barricades, forming soviets, forming workers'

militia independent of capitalist agencies, or socializing land. We favor arrangements by independent working class forces with the People's Front for synchronizing and co-ordinating our blows against the fascists with their weak, timid, half-hearted, treacherous, and merely military essays. And it goes without saying that workers should not hinder these essays in themselves, nor yet refuse the draft and be isolated in jails. And inside the Popular Front army, in actual fighting against the fascists, workers must shoot to kill, not up in the air.

Withal, on the other hand, marxists do not voluntarily surrender a man, nor a gun, nor one cent to the control and disposal of the class enemy. They organize soviets in the army as well as behind the lines. They do not desert the front against the fascists, but if there is a good opportunity in the country as a whole for the success of a seizure of power by the proletariat, or if the workers are compelled in self-defense to fight for power, then they should have no hesitation to shoot their officers at the front, organize their own army then and there, stay at the front, and put up a proletarian fight against the fascist forces.

In regard to aid or sabotage of shipments to groups in Spain, the criterion must be in each individual case. Which class will be served by the particular shipment in question is the determining factor. Inevitably there are doubtful cases, but this does not invalidate the class criterion, nor justify any other. After all that has been stated in MPC BULLETINS, it is unnecessary to add that shipments for fascist forces should either be seized for proletarian purposes, or else completely sabotaged.

In spite of the counter-revolutionary suppressions and attacks of the Popular Front, we recognize that in general the fascists constitute a menace more acute against the proletariat. We recognize that a military victory of the fascists over the Popular Front would demoralize and destroy workers' organizations, while a military victory by the Popular Front over the fascist forces would not destroy the workers so quickly, and would tend to increase their morale and spur the permanent revolution. Notwithstanding, that is not at all to say that it would be a victory for the workers, nor necessarily make this possible.

To refuse to support either camp of capitalism is not at all to raise the slogan "neither victory nor defeat". This was a slogan defended by Trotsky in the world war, before he joined the Bolsheviks; and was severely condemned by Lenin, who of course fought for revolutionary defeatism, the only correct policy for an outright imperialist war. (Imperialist War, ed. cit. pp. 197-202, esp. 200.) We have already shown why this slogan is today inapplicable today in Spain, and where the interests of the proletariat lie with respect to military victory of the Popular Front and the Fascists over each other, and the victory of the proletariat over both.

The term "defensism" has always meant defense of the "country", and the government where one lives. It should be obvious that



the workers, prior to socialism, should defend only their own government-- the dictatorship of the proletariat, and not--like Cannon and Trotsky--the capitalist People's Front state in Spain or anywhere else. That is desertion to the class enemy--unwittingly performed by hundreds of thousands of workers temporarily. But when they are brought to their senses, what will they have to say to Stalinism, social democracy, and Trotskyism which have laid down a "theoretical justification" for this course?

### SOCIALIST APPEAL ASSOCIATION

Centrism is not a basic political tendency, but flickers between reformism and marxism. It uses revolutionary phrases, but does not follow a revolutionary course. Reformism serves the interests of the capitalist class. Marxism represents the interests of the working class. Centrism corresponds to the historic position of the petty bourgeoisie. The latter as a class is reactionary, and centrism is a variety of reformism, the enemy of revolution. The intermediate class vacillates according to the shifts in its living standards and the attractive powers of the camps of the two main classes. Similarly centrism veers according to the pressure exerted on its respective flanks. Many peasants, professionals, and shopkeepers go over to the side of the proletariat from an intermediate centrist stage, as do many industrial wage-workers as well.

The Appeal Association has been from the beginning centrist. It has never adopted a marxist program, it has violated principle in order to stay longer inside the social democracy, and it has not put into practice even so much of a revolutionary struggle as it talked. Nevertheless, the Appeal is still very definitely to the left, in form, of Altman and the SP generally. This is accounted for primarily by the fact that the SAA contains: (1) native socialists moving to the left-- quite a few of whom were restrained from deserting to the WP only by Cannon's admonition to stay in the SP; and (2) comrades formerly in the WP, but who belatedly have been waking up to the nature of the political line of the leadership. It is the pressure of the rank and file, and especially of the left wing crystalizing around the Marxist Policy Committee, that has slowed up the headlong plunge to the right by the leadership.

### REACTIONARY ALTMAN EXPULSION DRIVE

The splits in the SPUSA consequent upon the formation of the Third International drained the last revolutionist, the last drop of red blood out of the SP. It was a fit limb of the "stinking corpse" sprawled on top of the backs of the workers over five continents. Like its sister parties, it epitomized reformism, class collaboration, reactionary miasmas. From time to time, as a revolutionary voice made itself heard, the offending comrade would be expelled.

Then, after the German events of 1933 had exposed both social democracy and its former mortal foe, the Comintern, before increasing numbers of the workers, the old SP had to put some red fard

on her withered cheeks in an attempt to appear attractive to her own members in this period and to attract workers moving left who were rightly wary of Stalinism. The party did not and never can budge a hair's breadth from reformism, but, to meet the needs of the times, it was assuming additional camouflage of its bourgeois role.

Accordingly it took in train the drooping cortege of Cannon-Shachtman. Like a good Christian, Cannon offered first one cheek and then turned the other, and so far as he was concerned was prepared to continue thus in masochistic bliss indefinitely. But Altman finally had to turn him out of the house because the Appeal rank and file not only didn't "assimilate" fast enough to social democracy, but--as anyone could foresee--there was bound to form amid the currents confluent in the Socialist Party a separate and non-miscible current, revolutionary marxism. Already there had been rumblings of revolt in the Appeal, and about the same time as the expulsion drive began, this revolt began to take the form of a caucus organized nationally to fight for a marxist policy-- the MPC.

The line of the Appeal administration cannot fight that of Altman in any fundamental way, because it is fundamentally the same. Why, Cannon even today says that the SPUSA--Altman and all, it seems--could become a progressive force. Altman supports a "labor" party today, and Cannon's position is that it may be correct to support one tomorrow. (Socialist Appeal, V.I, no 1., p.4 New series). Altman supports the People's Front without criticism, and Cannon supports it with criticism. Centrism cannot fight open reformism; only an organization with a marxist line can fight decisively against open reformism or against centrism.

#### PSEUDO-LEFT POSITION

As noted before, Davis and the ultra-lefts cannot be bothered with trivial distinctions between centrism and open reformism. Altman? Clarity? Appeal? All one balck reactionary mass-- can't be bothered. The Davisites refused point-blank to adopt a characterization of Altman and Appeal and the MPC and the expulsion drive of the SP-- and this in spite of their best members insisting that it was necessary to make and present an analysis of every question and phenomenon in the labor and radical field.

Why, to characterize the expulsion drive as a reactionary move was to support the line of Cannon! (For them, to fight the fascists must be to support the Popular Front!) To utilize this continuation of the 1919 split, to expose the sterile reaction of the SP is, in the minds of these infantile leftists, tantamount to fighting to remain inside this charnel-house! They declare that for their part, the fight against Altman (read: social democracy and the bourgeoisie) "is dead and buried". Their fight, they say, is against Cannon-Shachtman, against centrism, the most slippery agent of capitalism.

As Marlen conceives it, his peculiar function is to cling to the back of Stalinism, getting in his jabs and trying to pry loose

members only to have them join him on his perch; as Cannon practiced his kvostist "left" opposition yesterday upon the CI, today upon the LSI, and tomorrow upon an FLP; and as social democracy and Stalinism hitch themselves onto "democratic" capitalism; so does Davis suck like a leech onto the festering politics of Trotsky-Cannon.

This "independence" of any fight against Altman can not but lead to an "independence" of the fight against centrism too, and of the fight against capitalism.

While the Davis group is able to maintain its Olympic view of the fight, they have yet no hope for the rest of the Appeal membership. "Hopelessly demoralized", not worth seriously bothering about, not a "convert" in a carload! Surely few workers on the outside will heed their gospel of anti-Cannonism, so if the inside is hopeless, Davis may, with quiet dignity, occupy a secluded vantage point inside or just outside of the Cannon organization, or else go home and wait for the workers to come up to his level. The Davis group is thoroughly defeatist and sectarian.

Denying any hope for anyone but themselves inside the Appeal, and refusing to recognize the genesis and evolution of the left-wing elements in the Appeal, they must seem to themselves not a part of the inevitable product of the action of developments upon the currents of the Appeal, but only accidental, superior individuals who formed a club for mutual admiration and for casting their pearls of insight before the unresponsive rabble, so that some day they would have proof positive that "they told us so". Not appreciating the origin, the natural evolution, the strength, and the possibilities of the MPC, they cannot appreciate their responsibilities nor carry them out. Their attitude leads straight to saying: "Well, after all, we're just an accidental, small handful of peculiarly gifted individuals, isolated, out of the main stream, so what can we do alone? Of course, we'll in our hearts keep the vestal fires burning before the sacred altar of our ideas, but really, we're too weak to function outside of some other organization, so maybe we'd better moderate our fight a little, purely as a tactical measure." This line, comrade Davis, led you last time to the bed of social democracy; the prospects are just as bright for the next time.

#### MPC AGAINST WALKOUTS

While never having anything essentially in common with the unprincipled, abject clique-politique documents of Glee, Most, and Heisler, the MPC opposes walkouts. In the SP we have only to fight for a marxist policy, and this will automatically effect the separation of the marxists from the SP. Even the fight for a centrist policy will suffice for expulsion. To be sure, the confirmed Cannonites talk about expelling the MPC from the Appeal with all the savor of cannibals dancing around the boiling pot! We condemn the expulsion talk, as well as name-calling, the Riga rumor factory in Room 1069, and the complaints about "tone", as just so many desperate expedients for diverting attention from the vicious reaction of the Trotsky-Cannon

line. We fight for a marxist policy: let our opponents either show where our line is false, or else, by dragging in extraneous, unprincipled considerations, expose their political bankruptcy before the entire membership. Only the outcome of the principled fight shall decide who expels whom, after a full, free discussion and convention.

However, the Davisites can't be bothered with all this. To hell with the SP--no use fighting, may as well just walk out--any other course is just going to Canossa. And the Appeal is just about the same. Not only is this an evidence of defeatism, but it shows a fatal sectarianism. Like good Catholics, they believe in salvation by faith alone. They're it, they know it all, the Olympians too proud to fight, looking down on the average worker, to hell with your fight for the rank and file--they're not worth the trouble. It cannot be a marxist line that does not drive its adherents to fight to win those who are less clear, to change the world, as well as understand it.

### RESPONSIBILITY vs. FAINEANTISM

The MPC, recognizing and accepting the responsibilities imposed by a marxist program, toured the United States from coast to coast to press our fight for a marxist policy. Since the Appeal bureaucracy has refused to circulate our position, we ourselves have undertaken to broadcast our documents to every Appeal member we could reach throughout the country. We carry on a national correspondence. We have organized our work, and appeal for funds as a serious caucus. We heard of Davis's group, achieved contact with it, analyzed and criticized its document, entered discussions with it, sent a representative hitch-hiking a thousand miles to negotiate with it, forced it to call meetings, to elect a secretary to take minutes, to initiate a regular system to secure funds, to get out a new document, and in general to begin to look like a serious organization.

Their proud intellectualist faineantism is epitomized by sitting in the back of a hall and heckling. It is a commentary on their political line that they have no conception of doing those additional things necessary for a serious, principled faction fight. They cannot, without Cannon's help, even organize a passable fight in the Appeal. How is such a group to organize the proletarian revolution?

This group, as at present constituted and on its present line can only capitulate, despite the best intentions of some of its members. We hear that they now claim to be the "official" MPC, with the assistance of Cannon, who is in need of a heftier straw man than Glee to knock down.

We call upon the members of this group to break with ultra-leftism, the reverse side of opportunism. To the Appeal rank and file we say:

AGAINST ALL FORMS OF OPPORTUNISM!!!

FIGHT FOR A MARXIST POLICY!!!

JOIN THE MARXIST POLICY COMMITTEE!!!