

# Young Socialist Discussion Bulletin

---

vol. XVII, no. 5

December 1973

40¢

---

## CONTENTS

Page

SOME CRITICISMS OF THE IEC MAJORITY TENDENCY

"DRAFT POLITICAL RESOLUTION," Oral Report Given in  
Madison in Support of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, by  
Bones Levitt, Madison Local

3

COMRADE GERMAIN FORGETS THE "FORGOTTEN EXAMPLE,"

by Peter Archer, Chicago Local

13

SOME COMMENTS ON THE NEC "DRAFT POLITICAL  
RESOLUTION," by Jon Hillson, Denver Local

16

NEO-CAPITALISM AND THE INTELLECTUAL CRAFTS:

A PERSPECTIVE, by Kurt T. Hill, Jamestown, New York,  
At-Large

20

Page 2 :

was blank in the  
original bulletin

- Marty April 2014

## SOME CRITICISMS OF THE IEC MAJORITY TENDENCY "DRAFT POLITICAL RESOLUTION"

Oral Report Given in Madison in Support of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction

By Bones Levitt, Madison Local

In this report I intend to outline the major differences between the supporters of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction and the supporters of the IEC Majority Tendency over the "Draft Political Resolution" submitted by the IEC Majority Tendency (I will refer to it as the IECMT). A counter-resolution written by the LTF will be forthcoming. This report is based upon previous contributions to the international discussion, for the most part.

There are three points in the draft resolution that I will focus on, concerning Vietnam, Chile and the United States. I will take up a few other points, though in less detail. But first, before the comrades of the Internationalist Tendency throw it in as a red herring, let me state at the outset that we supporters of the LTF agree on the characterization of the period we are in as a period of a rise of world revolution. We might question the dating of this period as beginning in 1968--why not date it from the Cuban Revolution, or the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 or from some point during the revolutionary struggles in Southeast Asia or Africa? This is of only minor concern, actually, for we are agreed that the world revolution is on the rise. Nor will I spend much time on the economic analysis drawn in the draft resolution, for we agree with most of it. Where we don't, I'll expand upon later. What we disagree with are certain political conclusions drawn in the draft, some of which have little if anything to do with the economic analyses.

### Vietnam

There are two paragraphs that are particularly relevant for our discussion here. They appear on page 6 of IIDB, Vol. X, No. 20. Speaking of the situation in Vietnam following the cease-fire, the draft states:

"It means that the Indo-Chinese revolution is continued within a relationship of forces that is improved for it by the halt to direct American intervention, as long as this halt is not accompanied by a demobilization or disarming of the forces of the South Vietnamese NLF, nor by a halt to North Vietnamese aid to the revolution in the South, and as long as these forces as a whole do not cease in their efforts to overturn the puppet Thieu regime. But it means that the course of the revolution will take time; that for a period it will avoid full-scale frontal battles with the Thieu army; that the emphasis will move to the expansion of the agrarian revolution, to the consolidation of new organs of power set up in the countryside, to the attempt to achieve the politico-social disintegration of the counterrevolutionary army..."

It continues to list other tasks of the revolution in the present period. Later on, in the second of the two paragraphs, we read:

"In the last analysis, everything depends on the engagement of the living class forces on the ground, on their relationship of forces, on their willingness to fight, on the orientation and resolve of their leaderships. For an entire period, the situation will remain one of dual power from top to bottom in a large part of South Vietnam. The outcome of the revolution will without doubt be decided by its ability to extend this dual power toward the cities..."

This analysis was first drawn by the comrades of the IECMT in the Sterne-Walter resolution on Vietnam presented at the December 1972 IEC meeting (see IIDB, Vol. X, No. 6). That resolution, comrades may recall, stated that:

"... the relationship between the CP and the South Vietnamese mass movement is not simply a function of the CP's political authority, but also of the unusual pressure of the revolutionary masses on a party which in its practical orientation has broken with Stalinism's classical Menshevik line in the colonial countries and which is independent of the Moscow and Peking bureaucracies."

We disagree that the treaty has improved the relationship of forces in Vietnam for the revolutionary forces. The treaty was imposed upon the Vietnamese by the combined pressure of imperialist assault and the arm-twisting by the Moscow and Peking bureaucracies. The imperialists had to turn for aid to these bureaucrats, for it was becoming increasingly clear that "Vietnamization" was incapable of saving the Thieu regime. While it is true that Washington agreed to remove its troops and stop the bombing, and that this was a concession reflecting a failure by Washington to achieve all of its original aims, the overall impact of the accords reflected a set-back to the revolution. In return for this US concession, Hanoi and the PRG had to give up more--including restraining their military operations under threat of renewed US bombing and re-escalated US intervention. The accords signify that the US imperialists do not have an iron-clad guarantee of preserving a capitalist Indochina in the period ahead, but they certainly do feel they have a better than even chance. We do not characterize the accords as a definitive blow to the revolution at this stage, but we do say that the revolution is now facing a worsened international position. Moscow and Peking, who gave aid to the revolution through an eye-dropper, now have the perfect excuse to cut that aid even further. Peking has even gone so far as to say that the war in Vietnam is over! Not only that, but they have pledged to enforce the accords.

The comrades of the IECMT base their contention that the accords are to the advantage of the Vietnamese revolution on the assumption that the present leadership of the struggle, the Vietnamese CP, intends to continue and inten-

sify the revolutionary struggle. But to do this, the Vietnamese CP would have to break the accords. This conflicts with its hailing of the accords as a victory, and its stated goal to fight for the implementation of the accords, which include limitations on the inextricably combined political and military struggle. When we get right down to it, the IECMT places political confidence in the leadership of the Vietnamese CP. Comrades should note that criticism of the leadership of the VCP in the section on Vietnam in the IECMT draft resolution is notable by its absence. Not one word of criticism of the VCP for hailing the accords, with all their limitations, the call for a coalition government, and so on, as a victory. Note, too, the complete absence in the draft of the call for the construction of a Trotskyist leadership in Vietnam. Implicit throughout the draft's listing of the present tasks facing the revolution is confidence that the present leadership will press for the completion of these tasks.

We place no confidence in the Vietnamese CP. We hold that the Vietnamese CP is a Stalinist party. To explain what we mean by that, I refer comrades to the excellent article by Gus Horowitz entitled "On the Differences Over Vietnam," IIDB, Vol. X, No. 15. The quotes below are from that article.

"Sociologically speaking, when we describe the privileged Soviet bureaucracy as Stalinist, we mean that it is a hardened anti-proletarian social layer, petty-bourgeois in composition and spirit. Because it is a petty-bourgeois layer of a new type, but not representing a new historical ruling class, Trotsky suggested calling it a caste, a parasitic petty-bourgeois caste fastened onto the workers state. In place of a proletarian program, the Stalinist bureaucracy promulgates policies alien to the working class--at home and abroad. These policies block the advance of the socialist revolution, that is, they are counterrevolutionary. The development of Stalinism in the Soviet Union led over time to the transformation of the Communist parties all over the world from proletarian parties seeking to advance the socialist revolution in their own countries into instruments of the petty-bourgeois Stalinist bureaucracy.... But Stalinism is not reducible to pro-Moscow slavishness.... When you consider that Stalinist parties function in scores of different countries, under a variety of political regimes, and in situations of quite different levels of the class struggle, you would expect there to be variation. And when you further consider that there is no longer a single workers state and a single Stalinist bureaucracy, but several, and that these bureaucracies often have rival national interests, you expect even greater variation.

"Perhaps there is an oversight on this score on the part of Comrade Sterne, in his discussion article on Vietnam (IIDB, Vol. X, No. 7). He makes a point of the fact that there are divergencies between the line of the Vietnamese CP and the foreign policy of Moscow

or Peking. So what? The line of the VCP is subordinated first of all to the narrow interests of the privileged bureaucracy of North Vietnam, not primarily to Moscow or Peking. Hanoi, under direct fire from imperialism, naturally responded far more aggressively than the regimes in the other degenerated or deformed workers states--without, however, going beyond the political framework of Stalinism. The line of action of the Vietnamese CP in the South, as expressed in the program and practice it puts forward for the NLF and PRG, fits well within that framework.

"One important thing to keep in mind is how a Stalinist party expresses its subordination to the interests of a privileged bureaucratic caste. It is not a simple matter of following orders--although that does occur. More fundamentally, this subordination is expressed through their program--their objectives, as envisioned and carried out, ... In the colonial and semicolonial countries, instead of the working class program of permanent revolution, Stalinist parties put forward the petty-bourgeois Menshevik line of the two-stage revolution.

"In many of the colonial and semicolonial countries, the Communist parties have become petty-bourgeois parties in composition as well as in program. That is what happened to the Chinese CP, and to the Vietnamese CP as well. Each became a peasant party with a petty-bourgeois leadership....

"On a world scale, Stalinism can be summed up as a petty-bourgeois tendency functioning in the workers movement. In that sense, and in that sense only, can Stalinist parties be described as workers parties.

"Now, for such a party to break from Stalinism would require that it break in both program and practice from the theory of socialism in one country and revolution by stages. We do not rule out this possibility. We do not say, once a Stalinist party, always a Stalinist party....

"The Vietnamese CP has certainly been affected by the revolutionary upsurge there. And it is not far-fetched to think that at least a section of this party could reject the Stalinist program of that party. But this has not happened yet. The Vietnamese CP does not advance a program for socialist revolution in the South or workers democracy in the North. Not in its theory, not in its practice, which is in conformity with its theory.

"There is no time here to go into a detailed account of the history and present practice of the Vietnamese Stalinists. A very good account is contained in the recent article by George Johnson and Fred Feldman, 'On the Nature of the Vietnamese Communist Party,' International Socialist Review, July-August, 1973."

If you have read that article, you know a bit of the past

history of the VCP. How it welcomed back the allies to Indochina. How it slaughtered many of our comrades. How it went along with the Geneva accords of 1954. How it subordinated the revolutionary struggle in the South to the construction of "Socialism in Half a Country." You will know something of its program, which, contrary to the claims made by Comrade Sterne and others, is clearly a two-stage program, both on paper and in practice. If you haven't read that article yet, make it a priority.

To quote Horowitz once again:

"The program of the VCP clearly expresses the subordination of the interests of the socialist revolution in the South to the needs of a narrow-minded bureaucratic leadership in the North. That explains the limits put forward in the program of the NLF and PRG on the agrarian revolution, and the absence of a clear program of proletarian demands designed to mobilize the urban workers for their own class interests against the bourgeoisie.

"It is not ruled out that the momentum of the revolutionary struggle that has been unleashed will go beyond these limits. Comrade Sterne, for example, admits that there is an 'evident gap existing between the moderation of the objectives set down in the programs of the Vietnam (earlier) and the NLF (today)' and the depth of the agrarian reform that has developed (IIDB, Vol. X, No. 7, p. 9). This testifies to the necessity--and possibility--for the masses to break with the obstacle represented by the Stalinist program of the Vietnamese CP. Comrade Sterne, however, reads into this that the stated position of the Vietnamese CP is just a clever tactic designed to conceal their real, pro-socialist aims. That is an apology for Stalinism that we have heard many times before, and we reject it."

The major argument used to defend the position that the Vietnamese CP is not Stalinist is that it led a revolution that ended in the establishment of a workers state in North Vietnam, and that it is not possible for a Stalinist party to do such a thing. For a thorough refutation of this argument, comrades should read the Gus Horowitz article. I expect other comrades to take up this point during the discussion as well.

The draft resolution presented by the IECMT also states: "For an entire period, the situation will remain one of dual power from top to bottom in a large part of South Vietnam." We say, not so. There is a fundamental reality of two armed camps facing each other, based on two different social forces that are irreconcilable in the long run.

"But what the situation is not is one of dual power from top to bottom. It is not a situation where governmental institutions, institutions like soviets that can take over the rule of Vietnam, occur everywhere from top to bottom, not only in the countryside but in the cities as

well. That would be dual power from top to bottom, and it would be a situation that could not last for long.

"Such a situation could come into being very rapidly if there were mass mobilizations of the workers and students in the cities in Vietnam and mass mobilizations of the peasants in the countryside. But it is not true today. Instead, what we have, for the moment, is a stalemated civil war, with two armed camps facing each other." (Jack Barnes, "An Evaluation of the December 1972 IEC Plenum," IIDB, Vol. X, No. 9)

There are not two competing governmental bodies, analogous to the Provisional Government and the Soviets in 1917, in Vietnam today. The draft resolution confuses the military confrontation, which is the reality in Vietnam, with the political battle for the allegiance of the masses that a situation of dual power would reflect. Since the signing of the accords, the position of Thieu's capitalist regime has, if anything, been strengthened in the cities of South Vietnam. There are no competing governmental bodies within the territory controlled by Thieu, which includes all the major urban centers in South Vietnam.

Let's take a look at another aspect of the program of the Vietnamese CP, which as we have noted above is implicitly supported by the IECMT draft resolution. What did the Bolsheviks do when faced with a situation of dual power? Did they join in a coalition with bourgeois parties in the Provisional Government? No, they didn't. They set out to expand the base of support of independent organs of working class power, the Soviets. But what is the position of the Vietnamese CP on the question of a coalition government? Why, they're all for it! They called for a coalition government in their seven-point peace plan, in their nine-point peace plan, and they hailed it as a great victory when the call for a coalition government was included in the peace accords that were finally signed. The Vietnamese Communist Party does not include in its program the creation of independent organs of working class power in South Vietnam. What it does include is a government of national concord, a coalition government with the capitalists.

"For many years the Red Army and the Chinese Communists attempted to find ways of entering into a coalition government with Chiang Kai-Shek's forces and paid a tremendous price as a result. Will this happen in Vietnam? We hope not. Will the masses struggle against the Thieu regime? We know they will. Does the Thieu regime have any solid social support in Vietnam as such? No, it's a creature of American imperialism, a parasitic, corrupt outfit. But whether or not masses will be mobilized to smash this regime will depend upon the political leadership given by the NLF and the Communist Party. The call for national reconciliation and concord, and a coalition government, is an obstacle." (Barnes, IIDB, Vol. X, No. 9, p. 28)

We think the IEC Majority Tendency has made some great mistakes in its draft political resolution on the question of Vietnam. The greatest mistake lies in granting political confidence to the Stalinist, class-collaborationist Vietnamese Communist Party. In addition, we cannot, as principled revolutionaries, lend political support to peace accords that include coalition governments with the bourgeoisie.

### Chile

The section of the draft resolution dealing with the defeat in Chile (page 10) is no more acceptable than was the section on Vietnam. Perhaps the key paragraph in this section is this:

"What was revealed in Chile is, therefore, more a new demonstration of the bankruptcy of reformism, i. e., of the attempt to arrive at socialism by the 'legal' and 'peaceful' road, within the framework of the institutions of parliamentary bourgeois democracy, without destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus, than an experience of coalition government with the bourgeoisie."

Wrong! The crucial point that must be explained as the root cause of the defeat of a promising revolutionary situation in Chile was the "experience of coalition government with the bourgeoisie." The Unidad Popular was created by the reformist Socialist and Communist Parties for nothing other than a coalition government with the bourgeoisie. The draft resolution treats the Unidad Popular as if it represented some sort of unity of action of the workers movement. The only unity of action represented by the Unidad Popular was the unity of the reformist misleaders of the Social-Democratic and Stalinist parties in attempting to dampen the struggles of the Chilean proletariat by holding the workers movement to the limits set by the bourgeois partners in the governing coalition. This was unity in betrayal, and nothing else. The lessons of popular frontism must be drawn clearly and emphatically. This the draft resolution fails to do, telling us instead that Allende's regime "differed from a classical popular front regime by the fact that it openly proclaimed its resolve to enter on the road of socialism, and that it openly based itself on the organized workers movement."

So what? The Unidad Popular was no different in essence from the classical French and Spanish popular fronts of the 1930s. When the Socialist and Communist Parties, which we classify as tendencies within the working class, got together to launch the Unidad Popular on a common program, what resulted was an electoral bloc having a different class character than either of the two parties making it up. The Unidad Popular was not an action coalition but a programmatic, electoral bloc, that solicited the participation of parties and groups not part of the working class movement. This bloc was based on a program acceptable to the bourgeoisie. From its very inception, the Unidad Popular rep-

resented a bloc with bourgeois forces, the goal being a coalition government.

Just as in the section on Vietnam, the draft fails to explain the crucial necessity of a Leninist combat party to successfully lead the workers movement to victory. The draft tells us:

"The Chilean workers movement is paying heavily for having left the initiative to the enemy, for having delayed the generalized organizations of organs of the soviet type, for having delayed the general arming of the people, for having equivocated in face of the compelling need to seize all the stocks of food and merchandise, while striking a deathblow against the black market and the capitalist middlemen...."

Does the IECMT believe that all these tasks would be carried out by a workers movement lacking the leadership of a revolutionary party? Would the "vanguard" in general be an adequate instrument? A revolutionary party, armed with the political program of building the cordones industriales and uniting them in a closely-knit national body of independent organs of working class power; of working within the armed forces to win the allegiance of the ranks to obeying the authority of these new organs of dual power; of working within these organs of dual power to gain political hegemony-- for all this, nothing short of a revolutionary party was adequate. Such a party, amongst other things, would have sharply opposed the "coalition government with the bourgeoisie" that the draft nicely soft-pedals.

And after the coup?

"The heroic resistance the Chilean workers and the vanguard militants set into motion against the military coup d'etat shows, however, that the Chilean bourgeoisie and American imperialism will not install their bloody dictatorship with impunity.... It (the resistance) will without any doubt be continued under multiple forms, including perfectly justified armed resistance.... The Chilean bourgeoisie will learn at its own expense that the fruit of its crimes of the summer of 1973 will be a bitter fruit."

Such fine words. Unfortunately, they tell us precious little of what our Chilean comrades should do now. Should they try to explain the lessons of the defeat, the bitter fruit of class collaboration, and try to aid the working class to regain its confidence by engaging in defensive battles against the military regime, fighting to hold or regain elementary democratic rights, engaging in whatever limited struggles that may arise, all the time clearly explaining our politics? Or should they immediately launch "armed struggle" while the workers are demoralized, their organizations smashed, 25,000 of their fellow workers and leaders dead? Should our comrades follow the advice of Hugo Blanco: "... since there was no leadership, we could not expect miracles.

The best thing the workers can do now in Chile is to scatter and reorganize, build a new vanguard party. I hope that the Trotskyist comrades will build the organization that was lacking" (Intercontinental Press, Nov. 19, 1973, p. 1328)? Or should our Chilean comrades pick up the gun? Comrade Charles, when in Madison, speaking on behalf of the IECMT, stated that our comrades should undertake "armed struggle." If they do so, they will find themselves dying side by side with cadres of the Chilean CP, which has recently adopted a new "military orientation." (See the November 26, 1973, Intercontinental Press.)

The draft resolution is unacceptably ambiguous on an orientation for revolutionaries in Chile today. It downplays the crushing defeat that has been inflicted upon the Chilean masses, and by doing so leaves open the suggestion that guerrilla warfare should now be launched, in conditions that would make such an action complete adventurism. Soft-pedaling the essentially class-collaborationist program of the Unidad Popular, down-playing the defeat that resulted from this class collaboration, and completely failing to mention the necessity of a Leninist vanguard party are all errors too serious for us to let pass.

#### United States

This section of the draft resolution (page 8) briefly acknowledges the radicalization that has been taking place in the United States:

"Among other things, this society has seen, in the course of the last ten years, a massive revolt against its basically racist structure; the largest mass movement ever seen in history against a counterrevolutionary war of their own bourgeoisie; a very broad questioning of the bourgeois family; the massive loosening of the classical 'values' of the bourgeoisie."

The resolution also notes a crucial problem: "But the bulk of the work force has not yet begun to stir in the United States."

But how does the resolution view the radicalization?

"The absence of a centripetal thrust of the working class also explains the sectoral fragmentation of the radicalization, which, in the absence of a solution of a total socioeconomic alternative to monopoly capitalism, in turn delays a massive entry of the proletariat onto the political arena." (Emphasis added)

Exactly wrong! What that sentence says is that the radicalization we have seen so far (the rise of the Black and Chicano movements, the antiwar movement, the women's liberation movement, etc.) is acting as a brake on the entry of the proletariat into political action. This reflects a hostile attitude toward what is really happening today, reminiscent of our sectarian opponents like the Workers

League. The radicalization of the past decade, which has hammered away at the wall separating workers from political action, has according to the draft resolution strengthened the wall! The draft itself outlines the effect the radicalization has had: "... the traditional structures of power are not any the less shaken for it, objectively as well as in the eyes of the masses." Why then the hostile attitude toward the radicalization?

Because the radicalization we have seen so far has not centered on "workers struggles." But never fear, for the draft has the solution! Well, it has a mechanical schema at any rate:

"Consequently, the most probable variant for the immediate future in the United States is neither the prolongation of the present temporary decline in the mass movements of revolt, nor the rapid evolution of the country toward a military-police type dictatorship, even of the fascist type. It is, on the contrary, that of an explosive new thrust of the mass movement, this time centered on workers struggles set in motion in reaction to inflation, unemployment, the deterioration of conditions of life, work and environment--phenomena that will be aggravated in the course of the next recession."

The immediate future, according to the draft, means 1974 or 1975 ("All this makes it possible to forecast that this inflationary boom will only be short term, and that the recession that will follow it, in 1974 or 1975... " (p. 3)). We think it is quite possible that there will be a strong recession in 1974 or 1975. And it is possible that this will spark "an explosive new thrust of the mass movement." But we're not going to bank our course of action on a mechanical timetable, and blind ourselves to what is really going on. We'd be overjoyed if the draft's "most probable variant" came true, but just as no one could predict May-June 1968, we're not going to determine our course of intervention into the real mass movements of today according to a timetable.

The draft recognizes the bulk of the work force in the US has not yet begun to stir. We have yet to see the emergence of class-struggle left wings in the unions. But don't worry, says the draft, within the next two years the creation of an independent, mass labor party will once more be on the order of the day. It's possible, but we think the draft is a bit too optimistic on this point.

#### The Detente

The detente receives short shrift in the IEC Majority Tendency draft. Their view of the detente is pretty accurately summed up in this sentence:

"That is why it is entirely improper to speak of a new Yalta, in the sense of the ability of Washington, Moscow, and Peking to divide the world into spheres of influence and to maintain the status quo." (p. 5)

This misses the point completely. Even the "old" Yalta didn't divide the world into spheres of influence and maintain the status quo. It was an attempt on the part of Washington and the Kremlin bureaucracy to do that. The very fact, however, that the IECMT includes Peking in its list now shows us that Yalta didn't accomplish and couldn't accomplish a maintenance of the status quo. The Chinese Revolution was not part of the script written at Yalta. Neither were the overturns of capitalism in Eastern Europe, by bureaucratic-military means or otherwise. When we speak of the detente today, we are not talking about a reversal of the rise of world revolution. The detente may result in some setbacks to the world revolution, but it will not guarantee maintenance of the status quo. The detente does imply that the competition between Moscow and Peking to gain favors with imperialism will lead them to play a much more open and direct counterrevolutionary role. They will find new ways to use their pressure and influence to the detriment of the world revolution. Vietnam was the first such example, and it appears that the Arab East will be the setting for the second.

The IECMT draft states that the "economic crisis that the Soviet Union is today undergoing... was the determining factor in leading the team of Brezhnev-Kosygin-Podgorny to seek a rapprochement with American imperialism..." While the crisis faced by the Soviet Union due to bureaucratic mismanagement played a role in the detente, we don't see that as the major cause for the detente. It is part of the program of the Soviet bureaucracy to seek a deal with imperialism, and has been since the rise of Stalinism. The detente occurred on the initiative of the imperialists; seeking such a deal is nothing new for the Stalinist bureaucracies.

The United States ruling class was interested in a detente at this time because, in the context of an upsurge in the world revolution, they were having problems playing world cop. The other imperialist powers, along with the US, are interested in the potential scope of the markets, and the resources potentially available in the so-called "Eastern Market."

Jack Barnes, in his report to the SWP National Committee, (SWP Discussion Bulletin, Vol. 31, No. 12) discussed the detente at some length. Looking at some of the elements of US strategy, he pointed out:

" 1. Acceptance of the workers states as here to stay for the next historical period. Washington's policy is to block any extension of socialist property forms but to recognize that it is not now realistic to more toward a military rollback of the existing 'socialist' boundaries, ..

" 2. Recognition of the need for and the possibility of obtaining collaboration from the Chinese and Soviet regimes in holding back the colonial revolution, especially the tendency of independence struggles to turn into socialist revolutions. One of the big lessons the imperialists learned in Vietnam was the importance of

assistance from these counterrevolutionary quarters. The collaboration of the Moscow and Peking bureaucracies was ultimately the only source of at least temporary salvation for imperialism in Vietnam in view of the economic and political situation faced by the American rulers internationally and at home. Moscow and Peking, following the Stalinist policy of peaceful coexistence, proved only too eager to render such assistance. And their assistance will not be limited to the colonial world....

" 4. The detente does not involve just Washington, Moscow and Peking. Each of US capitalism's competitors is jockeying for maximum individual advantage.... (p. 4)

"What both sides seek to accomplish in the detente, and a necessary ingredient of its success, is a large measure of stability, that is, class peace. But as recent events have indicated, stability and class peace are very elusive goals in this period of the decay and decline of capitalism as a world system....

"The class struggle has not been halted, reversed or annulled by Nixon, Brezhnev and Mao; it continues but within an altered set of conditions.

"The problem is not the combativity or the revolutionary potential of the working class and its allies. The problem remains the crisis of proletarian leadership." (p. 6)

The draft makes another serious mistake when it discusses the Chinese role in the detente, or more accurately, before the detente:

"The change in attitude of imperialism toward the People's Republic of China, first shown by European and Japanese imperialism since the 1960s, then by American imperialism from the beginning of the 1970s, greatly contributed to putting the Chinese bureaucracy definitively on the road of 'peaceful coexistence'.... The radicalism of Maoism in the 1960s had not been solely verbal, but real, as was the case of the ultraleftist radicalism of the Kremlin in the 'third period.' The passing over to a policy of international collaboration with imperialism corresponds... to both a new stage of international policies, and to a new stage of conservatism of a consolidated bureaucracy."

About the only correct statement in that paragraph is the recognition of the change in attitude toward China on the part of imperialism. That is why Peking is included in this detente, not because the Chinese bureaucracy is only recently on the road of "peaceful coexistence." The Chinese bureaucracy has been on that road since 1949, and the Chinese CP from long before then. What else did the pleas on the part of the CCP for a coalition government with Chiang Kai-shek signify? What else did the "New Democracy" stand



for? Was the Chinese bureaucracy really radical at the 1954 Geneva conference? How about in 1955, at the Bandung conference, birthplace of the much-heralded "five points of peaceful coexistence?" (Yes, they use the term.) And 1965 and earlier in Indonesia, as blatant a case of peaceful coexistence as can be found anywhere--was that a "radical" policy, verbal or otherwise? No, the policy of the Chinese bureaucracy since 1949 has been the Stalinist policy of "peaceful coexistence." Chairman Mao has been looking for a way to swing a deal with the United States for a long time. The US finally offered him a chance--and the workers and peasants of Ceylon, Bangladesh, the Sudan, Vietnam, to name just a few--know that Mao accepted the offer. The detente means that Peking will now openly vie with Moscow to see who can betray the world revolution more blatantly.

Because the IEC Majority Tendency so badly underestimates the effect that the detente can have, they paint an overly rosey picture of the situation in Southeast Asia, and they misjudge the pressures the Vietnamese CP will be under to live up to the accords, even when faced with intense military pressure from the puppet regimes.

The IECMT even sees some good in the detente:

"In dissipating the climate of 'cold war' and militant anticommunism among the Social-Democratic and trade union leaders and cadres of several imperialist and semi-colonial countries, the 'detente' facilitates collaboration and lasting agreements between the SPs and CPs in several countries. Despite the strict reformist limits, namely the objectives of class collaboration, that the leaders of these organizations assign to agreements of this type, they unleash an objective dynamic of unity in action within the working class..." (Draft, p. 15)

We don't think the Unidad Popular or the Union of the Left represented unity in action within the working class, and we don't think any future agreements like these between the CP and the SP would represent it either. The detente will facilitate agreements between the CP and the SP to tie the working class to the bourgeoisie, and we're opposed to that.

#### Other Unacceptable Points

I will not be able to cover all the other unacceptable points in the document; there are too many of them.

Most glaringly unacceptable is the complete absence of a call upon the sections of the Fourth International to help create independent youth organizations in their respective countries. The draft does mention that Trotskyist cadres "have played a leading role in the struggles of the student youth involving tens and sometimes hundreds of thousands of college and high school students, especially in France, the US, Canada, Belgium, Mexico, Japan, Colombia." We

have just seen tremendous student upsurges in Thailand and Greece. The openings for recruitment to the Trotskyist movement in student and youth work are tremendous. Why then no mention of the need for youth groups, an orientation unanimously accepted by the United Secretariat before the last world congress? In the absence of any such discussion, we can only assume that the IECMT fully approves the liquidation of the youth groups in Europe, which we think was a terrible mistake. This contradicts a later point made in the draft:

" d) Many of the organizations of the Fourth International continue to manifest a sectarian attitude on the question of recruitment in not exploiting all the opportunities offered for substantially strengthening their ranks...."

The draft tells us:

"The education of new cadres and of mature national leaderships inevitably slows the growth of the organizations, in the same way that the political and organizational strengthening of the international center retarded the growth of the world movement."

This sentence strikes me as being completely backward. What our international movement is all about is building parties all over the world, with mature national leaderships able to lead revolutionary situations through to victory in whatever country they happen to be located. The education of new cadres and of mature national leaderships can only strengthen our movement.

The final section, "Specific Tasks of the Fourth International in the Forthcoming Period" is unacceptably ambiguous. To run down them briefly (these are paraphrased):

a) To carry out the campaign of international support for the Indochinese revolution, etc. The draft fails to indicate along what lines these campaigns should be built. Are they to be aimed at involving masses of people, such as the antiwar movement in the United States, or are they to be aimed at "the vanguard" such as the IMG's involvement in the struggle against British troops in Ireland?

b) To develop solidarity movements with important strikes and workers struggles; fine, but how? Comrade Charles, when he was here in Madison, suggested it might have been a good idea if the whole ex-Ligue Communiste had gone to Besancon to physically take back the Lip factory. Is that what the draft means?

c) To develop a movement of solidarity with the immigrant workers. OK, but solidarity expressed in what fashion?

d) To develop a movement of international solidarity... with the victims of repression directed against the revolutionaries of the imperialist and semi-colonial countries.

We're all for it, but does this include actions like the bombing of the Argentine embassy in Paris, or the fire-bombing of Honeywell-Bull, both of which were praised by Rouge?

e) and f) are much the same, leaving the methodology wide open.

g) To expose on an international basis the new betrayals of revolutionary struggles by the Moscow bureaucracy and the Peking bureaucracy. Terrific, but I hope the comrades of the IECMT will be clear on their characterization of the Stalinist bureaucracy in Peking, and not speak of it as a "revolutionary bureaucracy" as Rouge has done.

h) To begin an international discussion, which can be public, of a draft of a complete program of the Fourth International, etc. This calls into question the democratic-centralist structure of the International. Do the comrades of the IECMT feel it would be advisable for us to open before the public the kind of discussion we are in the midst of now, for that is what such a discussion would most likely be?

i) To develop theoretical analysis. That's one of the most important reasons we have an international. Of course we agree on this point.

j) To develop press and publication instruments for the leadership of the International, with the goal of making possible a more rapid flow of information and political elaboration for the benefit of the sections and the sectors of the vanguard they already influence. Most necessary, in our opinion; we will do the best we can given the limited resources our movement possesses.

We agree with some of the tasks listed in the draft, but most of them are too vague, and point toward the "initiatives in action," "armed struggle," "teach the bourgeoisie in practice that we will use arms" type proposals that we have met, and rejected, earlier in our discussions.

### An Unexplained Contradiction

"One of the most striking features of the development of the colonial revolution in the course of the last years was the gradual conquest of autonomy of action--including political action--on the part of the proletariat in a growing number of colonial and semicolonial countries...." (Draft, p. 9)

The supporters of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction wholeheartedly agree with this. As a matter of fact, we pointed it out before the last world congress, during the discussion on Latin America. But the majority at that congress, whose line is now staunchly defended by the IEC Majority Tendency, predicted that the petty-bourgeoisie and peasantry would be playing the major role. Thus we read in the resolution on Latin America passed at the last world congress:

"In fact, in most of the countries the most probable variant is that for a rather long period the peasants will have to bear the main weight of the struggle and the revolutionary petty-bourgeoisie in considerable measure will provide the cadres of the movement." (International Information Bulletin, Discussion on Latin America, 1968-1971, p. 6)

Several of the comrades presently members of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, particularly Comrade Joseph Hansen, pointed out time and time again that the trend was toward the classical model, of urban insurrections of the proletariat. The IECMT has, in the draft resolution now before us, admitted that Hansen was right, without saying so. This contradicts their steadfast defense of the line on Latin America approved by the Ninth World Congress.

And later on, we read:

"In a more general way, the clearly proletarian forms taken by the struggles of the masses in numerous semi-colonial countries have become pronounced: strike of metal workers in Egypt; ... Popular Assembly in Bolivia."

I was rather surprised to see the Popular Assembly included in this list, for the documents of the IECMT have all tended to downplay or dismiss the importance of the Popular Assembly. The comrades of the Internationalist Tendency in Madison didn't think that the Bolivian POR (Gonzalez) should have had an orientation toward the Popular Assembly. For the IECMT to include the Popular Assembly in their list of "clearly proletarian forms taken by the struggles of the masses in numerous semi-colonial countries" would certainly imply a change in their favorable view of the actions of the POR (G) during the period in question; this the comrades of the IEC Majority Tendency and their supporters in the YSA have staunchly refused to do.

### Democratic-Centralism and the Fourth International

In order to avoid confusion as to the view of the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction in regard to the application of democratic centralism on the scale of the International at our present stage of development, I would like to call to comrades' attention several articles. First, and probably of greatest value for the discussion in this local, is an article by Comrade Milton Alvin entitled "Democratic Centralism and the International (SWP DB, Vol. 31, No. 2). I would really like to simply read the entire article here, but for time considerations I'll try to shorten it as much as possible.

"There can hardly be room for a dispute in the ranks of the International about Leninist democratic centralism. It can be taken for granted that, generally speaking, all parts of the International agree with and support this concept. This is not the source of present differences. The problem is not in the general concept of democratic

centralism but in the relationship between democracy and centralism....

"A mechanical solution of this problem, by imposing positions which it cannot accept upon whoever turns out to be the minority is not the best way to resolve this problem at this time. I stress the time element because there are times when a majority has no choice, when circumstances are such as to make it imperative to shift the emphasis from democracy to centralism very sharply and firmly. Is this such a time? That is the question.

"Comrade Germain (in 'In Defence of Leninism: In Defence of the Fourth International') continues, '... our movement is perfectly capable of a worldwide organized fully democratic discussion, in which all the key issues in dispute are presented before the membership, in which the membership can read and listen to the full debate in swing, then make up its mind and elect a world congress...'...

"This is precisely where a good deal of the trouble with the discussion since the last congress is to be found. 'Our movement' has not shown itself to be capable of a worldwide organized fully democratic discussion, to say nothing of being 'perfectly capable.' Only a part of the International has seen 'all the key issues in dispute.' Perhaps only a minority will be found to have had access to all the written material and a chance to discuss the conflicting views....

"It is not only a question of publication of documents and making them available to the ranks of the International, but following that a discussion in all sections, and, finally, electing leaderships on the basis of who supports which point of view. Any procedure that eliminates or deforms any of these steps cannot be and should not be called democratic or Leninist.

"It is not in the best interests of the International to hold the next congress without adequate preparations as outlined above. No matter what disadvantages there are in further delaying an already postponed congress, they are not as great as the injury that would be inflicted upon the International by holding a congress in which many representatives of sections would appear without the writ of their members.

"... later Comrade Germain ... asserts that under circumstances where two international tendencies confront one another '... a given degree of democratic centralism on an international scale becomes recognized as an indispensable organizational infrastructure of the world Trotskyist movement.' If this means anything at all, it is that all majority decisions must be honored by any minority and not just those of a 'general political nature.'

"This would, of course, substitute centralized dis-

cipline in the International on all questions for the present method of 'de facto collaboration' which Comrade Germain wishes to 'go beyond.' The problem now posed is whether or not the International can best grow under strict centralist methods of leadership or under de facto collaboration....

"In one part of his article Comrade Germain answers the question we have posed, that is, whether or not the emphasis is to be shifted away from de facto collaboration to centralized forms of functioning. He writes, 'We are neither based on mass trade-unions nor on mass parties nor on workers states.' This really tells the whole story, if it is correctly understood.

"Everyone in the International knows that the various sections are still small and are only at the stage of recruiting and training cadres who will eventually make up the central core of leaders in each of them. Out of these central cores will come the leadership of the International. But this day has not yet dawned for world Trotskyism; the reality is that the International is not based upon powerful infrastructural foundations except in its program of Marxist principles.

"Under these actual circumstances the International should function not under strict centralist methods as individual sections do, but under the formula Comrade Germain uses and which we have quoted, that is, de facto collaboration. This is made necessary not because of anyone's personal predilection for one method or the other but because the point has not yet been reached on a world scale where any section or tendency can claim to be authoritative leadership and to be accepted as such by the International as a whole....

"The obvious necessity for the International and all its sections in this period is to conduct all aspects of revolutionary activity in such a way as to convince by example. Formal impositions of majority discipline cannot replace the power of successful examples of party building....

"There is no contradiction in making a differentiation between national sections and the International on the question of democratic centralism. What is suggested here is that the emphasis in the International remain on the democratic side of the formula until circumstances permit a more even balance between democracy and centralism.

"As a matter of fact, even the democratic half of the formula has yet to be achieved. Until such a time as all the members of national sections have had their democratic right to read, discuss and vote upon all points of view in dispute, even the first step has not been taken in reaching the goal of democratic centralism for the International as a whole."

Two other articles that comrades should read if they are interested in the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction's view of democratic centralism are: 1) "The Underlying Differences in Method," by Joseph Hansen, in IIDB, Vol. X, No. 12, and 2) "An Evaluation of the December 1972 IEC Plenum," by Jack Barnes, in IIDB, Vol. X, No. 9.

We think the function of the International leadership at this time should be to help strengthen the national leaderships, through such things as international coordination of specific campaigns, such as was done at times during the anti-war movement, around defense of the ex-Ligue Communiste, and so forth. But the primary task of the International leadership today is to assist the process of political clarification as much as possible, most particularly by insuring that a full, democratic discussion is held in all the sections and sympathizing groups of the International. We favor a postponement of the world congress not out of any obstructionist designs, as the IECMT has recently insinuated, but out of the desire to insure that all points of view are made fully available to the ranks of the Fourth International.

The comrades of the Internationalist Tendency of the YSA have tried to brush off the question of document translation as just a straw man. Being the organizer here, I'm quite familiar with comrades supporting both the IT and the present YSA majority asking me, "Have any new documents come in this week?" I usually answer yes, for most weeks we have received at least one new document, often times more, and this has been the case for months. Now how would comrades like it if all of a sudden, two months or a month and a half before the world congress they were handed all twenty-two of the International Internal Discussion Bulletins that have come out so far this year? And then be told

that they had maybe two months to read it all, discuss it, and vote? That is about the best we can hope for in most of the French and Spanish speaking sections. It's worse for sections whose members speak other languages. The chance of the ranks of these sections reading the great number of crucially important contributions on the Latin America discussion alone are slim, let alone having a fully organized discussion in their local units.

The comrades of the YSA should realize that the discussion we have undertaken over the last few months, in a fraternal youth group of the International, has been far fuller than the discussion on International questions in many, if not most of the official and sympathizing sections. That is why we want the world congress postponed. And that is why, among other reasons, we say it is completely unrealistic to expect the leadership that will be elected after this coming world congress to be able to wield its full statutory powers to the extent that the comrades of the Internationalist Tendency think it should. Democratic centralism is based upon the fullest democratic discussion, a reasonable degree of political homogeneity, and confidence in the leadership. None of these will be present to the degree they could be if the world congress were postponed.

\* \* \*

I hope that this report has helped clarify some of the differences we have with the "Draft Political Resolution" submitted by the IEC Majority Tendency. I have not tried to explain all our criticisms of the draft, nor to develop a coherent counter-proposal. For that comrades will have to wait for the counter resolution to be submitted by the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction.

December 3, 1973

By Peter Archer, Chicago Local

In the course of the current discussion, the question of "armed struggle" has been raised by the IEC Majority Tendency a good many times--always of course "in general." This is typical of the method of this tendency; as long as they remain within the realm of generalities they are able to hold their own. However, as soon as concrete reality rears its ugly head, they find themselves in difficulty. In order to solve this dilemma, they have begun to elevate theories above facts.

This is particularly the case with the contribution of Comrade Germain, most of which ranks as a masterpiece of abstraction. In several places, however, he has condescended to lower his argument to the level of reality. It is on this level that I wish to discuss his analysis of Peru.

In his article "In Defence of Leninism: In Defence of the Fourth International" (IIDB, Vol. X, No. 4), Germain introduces what he refers to as "the forgotten Peruvian example" to bolster his argument in favor of armed struggle. His "example" consists of proving to us that Comrade Hugo Blanco, during the peasant struggle in La Convencion Valley, utilized guerrilla warfare as a method of struggle. He quotes extensively from Blanco's book to prove that the method used by the comrades of the majority at the last world congress in determining the orientation of the Fourth International in Latin America was the same as that used by Comrade Blanco in Peru.

Comrade Germain asks:

"If it hadn't been an error to turn to armed confrontation growing out of a regionally limited mass movement as was that of the La Convencion valley in Peru, how can one argue that it was an error to turn to armed confrontation growing out of the mass struggles in Bolivia and Argentina which were much wider and more generalized than those of the 1962 peasant movement in which comrade Blanco was involved?"

We note in passing Comrade Germain's statement that a turn towards "armed confrontation" was made at the Ninth World Congress. The admission is a welcome one. This point has been in dispute for some time.

To answer Germain's question, we should first look at Blanco's own explanation for his use of guerrilla warfare in Peru. Blanco writes:

"Frankly, our analysis of the situation was not clear at the time. In the dynamic of the struggle, the necessity of imbuing the peasants with optimism fills one with a greater optimism than would result from an absolutely unemotional analysis. Not having a party organization,

as was the case in La Convencion, aggravated this phenomenon.

"Nevertheless, I still think it was correct to choose the armed confrontation, even if all the guerrillas had been massacred and the repression against the peasants had been even more severe. The error was not in turning to guerrilla warfare. It was in having neglected from the start to build the party, which would have organized, extended and centralized all aspects of the struggle (armed struggle among them), in all their variations." (Land or Death, p. 69)

Germain points triumphantly to this passage as a vindication of his argument. However, he overlooks two extremely important points regarding it.

Firstly, Blanco, unlike Germain, prefers to speak of guerrilla warfare in a specific context. In a passage just prior to the one quoted above, he says:

"We had to choose between dying of malaria and going down fighting. We chose the latter, not through romanticism, but for a political reason. We considered it necessary to educate the masses, to show them how the peasantry must fight the armed force of the enemy even to the last; to show them that although the peasant fell under bullets, the enemy could meet the same fate..."

Further:

"We had to defend not only the honor of Trotskyism, but also the honor of the revolution itself from the attack of the opportunists. Against the reformists, we had to defend the revolutionary methods to their ultimate consequences." (Land or Death, p. 68)

So Blanco is not speaking of armed struggle "in general" or "on a continental scale." He is referring to a concrete situation in which a particular set of circumstances confronted the revolutionary forces.

In another situation, Blanco described a situation in which guerrilla warfare was not felt to be appropriate to the given circumstances:

"Then a Peruvian comrade returned from Argentina, influenced by El Combatiente. After incorporating himself in the leadership and in all the party bodies without having been elected, he began to arbitrarily alter the line of the party. He openly declared that the line of the FIR was 'obsolete' and without a previous discussion began to alter the line against the program of the FIR

that was voted on and ratified by the plenum. He utilized the majority of a leadership that had been elected to carry out our line in order to shift the party towards a verbal guerilla-ism." ("Letter from Hugo Blanco to Joseph Hansen--January 1970" reprinted in Discussion on Latin America, International Information Bulletin, p. 54)

In Land or Death, Blanco comments further on this incident:

"The Latin American Trotskyist movement, enthusiastic as it was about this (Cuban) revolution which confirmed the theory of the permanent revolution, could not remain immune from the negative influences, and was also affected by them in various degrees. We can enumerate the most important characteristics of this negative influence: the underestimation of the Leninist principle of constructing a Bolshevik type party as a fundamental instrument for making the revolution; the underestimation of the transitional program, substituting for it the so-called strategy of armed struggle, or even the strategy of guerrilla warfare; the substitution of audacious actions by a courageous group for mass actions,

"This tendency was stronger in Comrade Pereyra who was sent to reinforce our work. For this reason, along with the positive accomplishments of his work, there was the negative influence of his putschist pressure, which is the name given to this deviation because of its characteristic reliance on the blows struck by individual hands." (Land or Death, p. 75)

We can see from this passage that Blanco specifically disassociates himself from the "strategy of armed struggle or even guerrilla warfare" which Germain now advocates.

Secondly, Germain overlooks Blanco's polemic against those who feel that armed struggle can occur outside the context of struggle by the masses. Again, from the pages of Land or Death:

"We are not able to predict what form that armed struggle will take or at what moment it will begin. In Russia, the civil war began after the seizure of power and its main form was not guerrilla warfare. In Cuba, the armed struggle came first, led also by a party, but without combat organizations among the masses. It began in the form of guerrilla warfare carried out from a foco.

"Nevertheless, in both instances, it developed after the masses had come to see that armed struggle was the only solution. I emphasize the role of the masses because that is the part the ultralefts do not understand; they believe that what is necessary is for us, the revolutionaries, to understand that the revolution will have to employ violence." (Land or Death, pp. 62-63)

Blanco refuses to make a fetish out of armed struggle. As he puts it, "It is a necessary phase of the revolution, but it is only that--a phase." It is seen in the context of defense of the mass movement by the masses. This is a qualitatively different conception from that held by Germain. His view of armed struggle is outlined clearly in an article written jointly with Comrade Knoeller in November, 1970, entitled "The Strategic Orientation of Revolutionists in Latin America." It is reprinted in the International Information Bulletin, Discussion on Latin America.

In this article, Germain and Knoeller outline four possible "variants" of armed struggle. These are: 1) The so-called classical variant in which the arming of the masses grows out of the development of the mass movement. The authors cite the Russian, Spanish, German and Vietnamese revolutions as examples of this variant. 2) An ultraleft variant in which confrontations between the party and the bourgeoisie take place "prematurely". 3) An "intermediate" variant, lying somewhere in between the first and second variants and 4):

"... the instance of autonomous detachments of the mass movement which launch a struggle for one of the following reasons: to extend the fight being waged by the mass movement, with the aim of forcing the counter-revolutionary army to disperse its forces and relax its pressure on the centers of working class agitation; to facilitate resumption of the mass struggle after a grave but not definitive defeat... The guerrilla war in Russia in 1906, in China after 1928, in Yugoslavia under the Nazi occupation, and in Vietnam after the start of imperialist reconquest all fall under this category." (Discussion on Latin America, p. 92)

Overlooking the somewhat arbitrary nature of this division, let us first point out that it is surprising that Germain and Knoeller view the arming of the masses through the mass movement as being merely a variant of armed struggle and by no means the only acceptable one. Certainly this is not the way in which Marxists in general and Comrade Hugo Blanco in particular have viewed armed struggle. Blanco views the effect of armed struggle upon the political and organizational consciousness of the masses as paramount: "The revolutionary struggle is a process through which the masses rise in their organizational level, in their consciousness, in their forms of struggle, guided by their conscious vanguard, the revolutionary party" (Land or Death, p. 62). Germain apparently looks upon this process as being merely a product of the "classical variant of armed struggle."

It is particularly interesting to note Germain and Knoeller's fourth variant, that of "autonomous detachments of the mass movement." Since Germain and Knoeller give no indication of how concretely these detachments are to arise, we are led to conclude that either they feel the problem has an obvious answer (which it most certainly does not!) or they

simply do not know. Certainly, where such "detachments" have existed in the past, they have not been linked to the mass movement outside of their own verbalizing. Regis Debray, the major Guevaraist theoretician of the Latin American revolution, openly acknowledges this fact. In his book Revolution in the Revolution?, Debray writes:

"... self-defense /specifically mass self-defense--P. A./ denies the role of the armed unit, which is organically separate from the civilian population. Just as reformism aims to constitute a mass party without selection of its militants or disciplined organization, self-defense aspires to integrate everyone into the armed struggle, to create a mass guerrilla force, with women, children and domestic animals in the midst of the guerrilla column." (Revolution in the Revolution?, p. 29)

Debray is correct in saying that self-defense seeks to involve the population as a whole. He is wrong in condemning this. It is notable that he attributes the recent growth in the concept of mass self-defense throughout Latin America to the activity of the Trotskyists. I suspect that one major reason for this is the work done in La Convencion Valley by Comrade Hugo Blanco.

Comrade Germain attempts to make Comrade Blanco's experience in Peru fit his schema of armed struggle. In reality the experience of the peasant movement in La Convencion Valley refutes this. Germain's "autonomous detachments" have a dynamic of their own. Once separated

from the masses, they begin to politically rationalize this separation. Rather than becoming linked to the mass movement, they begin to look upon themselves as outside "defenders" of the mass movement, Zorros who sweep down from the hills when the moon is bright and fight off the power of the bourgeois state. Individual heroism is substituted for involving the masses in struggle. This was the logical development of the line of the Ninth World Congress, which called for our sections to engage in guerrilla warfare on a continental scale. It reached its culmination in the break of the PRT/ERP with the Fourth International. Nor is this experience confined to Latin America alone. It has been the constant thread running through the development of the republican movement in Ireland for the last fifty years.

In 1939, Leon Trotsky wrote:

"If one proceeds only on the basis of the overall characterization of the epoch, and nothing more, ignoring its concrete stages, one can easily lapse into schematism, sectarianism or quixotic fantasy. With every serious turn of events we adjust our basic tasks to the changed concrete conditions of the given stage. Herein lies the art of tactics." (Writings, 1939-40, p. 103)

Trotsky clearly understood that the problem of armed struggle and the question of workers self-defense cannot be subjected to an artificial schema. Hugo Blanco has assimilated this lesson. Comrade Germain evidently has not.

December 4, 1973

## SOME COMMENTS ON THE NEC "DRAFT POLITICAL RESOLUTION"

By Jon Hillson, Denver Local

The National Executive Committee "Draft Political Resolution" states:

"... at the present time, there is no single issue like the Vietnam war that is serving as a focus for mobilizing masses of people in action, but many varied struggles are occurring and receptivity to our ideas remains high."

The absence of such a focus--whether it would be that of opposition to imperialist war or a mass action campaign around a domestic issue--serves to deepen and intensify a growing frustration in the American people. While it is action, mass action, that confirms and extends the questions produced in a period of radicalization, the events of this period--the Watergate scandal, the energy crisis, Nixon's saber-rattling performance over the Middle East, etc.--point to in sharper relief the inability of the capitalist system and its two parties to provide any real answers to those and other problems.

The greater the delay between the general understanding of the need for something to be done, and the upsurge produced by those social tensions, the more intense, the more powerful, the greater the sweep of that upsurge.

Several new ingredients are churning beneath the surface of that inevitable explosion. The apparent refusal of the Democratic Party to wage an impeachment campaign against Nixon is a symbol of the gross impotence of that capitalist alternative to the Republican Party. Masses of the American people believed that the punishment of Agnew was too lenient and that Nixon is a criminal, meriting the punishment of being found guilty of charges raised by impeachment. The vacillations and temporizing of the Democrats have exacerbated a rapidly declining confidence in their "lesser evilism."

While impeachment is the ultimate legal safety valve for the ruling class, used but once in the 200 years of the American presidency, it is a contradictory phenomenon. On the one hand, the ruling class requires a highly centralized administration, a strong executive branch, to deal efficiently and effectively with international and domestic economic and social crises. The weakening of the presidency through impeachment would set a precedent among the American people that the mass pressure that produced it once, could do it again. The after effects of impeachment, especially if Nixon were removed, would have the result of inhibiting the acts of a president whom rapidly breaking events, a disintegrating economy, and a social radicalization and whose capacity as chief executive of capitalist order demands he act swiftly and without the restraints of antagonistic public opinion.

At the same time, both Democratic and Republican

politicians alike know that waning public trust in their two party system must be revived, and that a cleansing operation, including the removal, by resignation, hopefully, of Nixon, would fit the bill.

Yet even the most verbal of the partisans of impeachment, and, in terms of key Democrats and Republicans they are but a handful, operate on the basis of plodding caution. Robert McCloskey, the liberal Republican who represents little in Congress in terms of real power, told an audience of students at Colorado College a month ago that while impeachment was in order, "It should not be taken into the streets, but be a subject of debate."

Clearly, the proponents and opponents of impeachment in the two capitalist parties differ on tactics; but the possibility of mass action crystallizing the mass sentiment that has prompted the two-party politicians to raise impeachment and resignation seriously in the first place is an anathema to both.

The longer the time to a vote on impeachment, the greater the possibility it will be ruled out, especially in the absence of any serious campaign--for instance, organized by the AFL-CIO and liberal Democrats. The AFL-CIO, for all of Meany's official bluster, will hardly be likely to deliver on a real political campaign involving the ranks of labor for impeachment.

Faced with the dilemma of restoring public confidence through impeachment or avoiding a crippled centralized state administration in a time of crisis, the bourgeoisie may indeed opt for the latter.

Especially in that context, the role of the YSA's support to the 1974 SWP election campaigns assumes greater significance. The socialist campaigns can provide the all-important answers to wider and wider layers of the population confronted with the refusal of the Democratic Party to remove the criminal Nixon. From that point of understanding, more people than ever will give credence to our analysis of the Democratic Party as a capitalist party, run by and for the same interests as the Republicans.

While the implications of the Watergate revelations--not to mention those of the Pentagon Papers--have drawn closer parallels between the Democrats and Republicans, the headlong hand over foot stampede by the two parties into the Israeli camp during the fall Zionist aggression and their ensuing response to the energy crisis manufactured by the capitalist system they defend further narrow the breach between them.

One of the features of the reaction of the American people to the Arab-Israeli war was a markedly less partisan attitude



for Israel. A Gallup poll taken during the midst of the war indicated that while 47% of the population supported Israel and 6% the Arabs, a full 22% were neutral and 25% had no opinion. That is, that a majority of the population was not consciously pro-Israel during the war.

The legacy of the antiwar movement, coupled with increasingly apparent acts of Israeli aggression, have forged this new awareness. Israeli kidnappings, terror bombings, assassination squad attacks, its colonization of Arab lands and the wider--though still limited--understanding of the plight of the Palestinians have served to erode the moral facade of Zionism. That facade--the aggressed against Israeli David fighting the enormous Arab Goliath--has been a key ideological weapon of the Zionists in mobilizing American opinion. The obvious weakening of it has led not only to stepped up and more frenzied slanders of the YSA for its "anti-Semitism" by the Zionist establishment, but, more importantly, has given us greater opportunities to talk to more people and gain a more favorable hearing about the socialist position on the Middle East.

Decreased sympathy for Israel, the rise of "neutrality" on the issue as well as a modest growth of pro-Arab sentiment represent a qualitative leap forward for the radicalization and a greater political sophistication on one of the thorniest questions it has faced. The moving towards an objectively defeatist position on Israel by more and more young people--which has been concretely aided by campus teach-ins, the sales of our literature and press, etc.--is a sign of the growth of a deeper and more profound criticism of US imperialism than has heretofore existed. That is, the "good" parts of imperialism, the support of "socialist" Israel, are being seen as a lie.

The fact that the Middle East remains the bull's-eye for imperialist intervention abroad, that it is the acid test for the detente, that the racist, anti-Arab hysteria cultivated by the Democrats and Republicans is a critical facet of the energy crisis charade, all underline the significance of the shifting campus, and general, opinion on the Middle East.

The possibilities of intervention in the Middle East by US troops and the tensions flowing from the energy crisis dramatically highlight connection between the domestic crisis of American capitalism and the bind which US imperialism finds itself in the Arab-Israel conflict.

The explosive possibilities of this connection are not only those associated with the perspectives of mass antiwar response to deepened military involvement abroad, but massive discontent with the capitalist methods of "relieving" the energy crisis.

The mass of American working people who refused to sacrifice wages for the imperialist war effort in Southeast Asia, especially in this period of inflation and shortages, will be likewise obstinate in "sacrificing" heat, travel, employment, working conditions, etc., for the "national ef-

fort." The energy crisis, which imposed artificially by the capitalist class in its drive for profits, is none the less "real" in effect. And we have not yet felt the full effects of the "crisis." While the shutting off of Christmas lights and business advertisements after dark will produce no real social strain, the early shutting down of businesses and shops reduces the amount of time people can work and earn money, which, from the bosses' point of view, means increased speed-up. The imposition of lowered speed limits may mean the raising of food prices by the monopolies in order to gouge the public, while blaming drivers who are paid by the mile, who will no doubt ask for higher wages. And, to mention only one more result, we can expect higher prices based on the imposed scarcity of oil and the enormous amount of commodities which use petroleum in their production process.

The uniformity of Democratic and Republican strategy, their calls for rationing, their attacks on the Arabs' right to control their own natural resources, their arrogant calls for abolition of the token anti-pollution and anti-strip mining and other environmental protection laws can only exacerbate mass alienation from the two-party system. While this estrangement from the institutions and values of capitalist government is reflected in a cynicism that gives, at present, only modest credence to the potential of a socialist alternative, it is by placing ourselves at the center of any motion that arises that we will win the allegiance of those masses when that cynical crust is broken by mass action.

The development of mass struggle arising from a period characterized by the absence of a national focus for mobilizing masses of people is in part produced not by the reaching of "intellectual" conclusions by the masses after their mulling over all possible alternatives. Rather, it is when decisive layers are compelled beyond relative levels of toleration by events, by rapidly changing or deteriorating situations, to move. It is when the material need to resist breaks through the attitudes of impotence and cynicism cultivated by capitalist ideology. It is when the need to act can be organized and channeled correctly, directed by a revolutionary organization armed with a scientific program keyed to the most immediate needs of the masses and anticipating the demands leading to the social revolution that will overturn capitalism.

The absence of an "issue" focus, the absence of a labor party to in some way represent the interests of the working class, of a Black party to champion the struggle of the Black community, that is, the absence of any mass party or mass alternatives that could lead struggle to relieve aspects of human misery, has created a reservoir of frustration and rage in American society.

In the political sphere, Watergate. In the economic sphere, unabating inflation, the possibilities of recessions and depression. In the social sphere, the energy crisis, which federal experts have predicted lasting five years. These phenomena intertwine with and expand an existing

radicalization domestically and internationally.

The propaganda period which we are now in accurately reflects the fact that the tiny Trotskyist nucleus, in the absence of a period of generalized mass action and activity, can best advance our own influence and the radicalization through propaganda campaigns keyed on sales of our press, election campaigns, etc. But the period we are in, as a totality, and especially because of the events of the last year, means that a variety of local actions, some whose size will compare favorably with the mass actions of the antiwar movement, are real possibilities. These actions, around jobs or inflation in the larger cities, around cutbacks on the campus, etc., can serve to inspire the masses about the very possibilities of action which they are told by the bourgeois media is frivolous and largely impossible.

\* \* \*

There is a discernable, if altogether modest, change in mood on the campuses, a product of the events of the last year or so. This is reflected not only in the increased sales of our press on the campus, the response to the teams, the election of YSAers to student government, etc., but the general increase in the number of struggles around local issues over last year, the size of meetings around Chile, the Middle East and impeachment. No doubt, as the impact of the energy crisis deepens, this facet will be added.

This shift in mood is by no means synonymous with a drastic change in the level of activity produced by the radicalization on the campuses, but is indicative of a lessening of the level of demoralization which flowed from the lull in action of the Black movement, the decline of the antiwar movement and Nixon's landslide victory. It is also a reflection of the fact that the student population is less prone to the false belief, pushed by the capitalist class, that a return to the 1950s accompanied by the rule of society by Nixon's conservative "new majority" was the wave of the future, that the radicalization was very dormant, if not dead.

This less pessimistic mood is in many ways preparatory to a greater readiness for action when the issues and focus arise, when dramatic events shake society and call for mass response, when crises on campus occur, etc.

In our campus election campaigns, in our propaganda work in general, we should expand on these points. Masses of students both need and want the kind of information and analysis we can provide on events and moods which offer the healthiest and most hopeful signs of advancement of struggle.

Contrary to the ignorant perceptions of all of our opponents--fake "Trotskyist," the Maoist "new communist movement," and the CP--the campuses remain key to the exerting of significant influence over the course of the radicalization and mass struggle and for the recruitment of cadre. The growth of our opponents is based on, among other things,

a critical backwardness which has recoiled against the form and content of the youth radicalization. Their conservatism, workerism and sectarianism are uniform in both disqualifying them from revolutionary leadership, and, at this point in time, are responsible for their attraction to certain "vanguard" layers in the radicalization.

The Maoists--whether in the two key groups, the Revolutionary Union and the October League, followers of the Guardian, collectives, etc. --are a case in point. They see the "decline" of the student movement as a necessary pre-condition for and anticipation of the "workers radicalization." They falsely conclude from the inability of students to make a revolution (a profound discovery!) and the present state of the student movement that the next, immediate and sole wave of action will be initiated and led by the proletariat, dragging the student movement behind it. And they believe that the lessons of struggle forged by the student movement are a heritage of petty-bourgeois frivolity that must be rejected and overcome.

It isn't my intention to go into the variety of errors this outlook combines. The point is that outlook has its most conscious adherents in the most "advanced" layer of the radicalization, the layer characterized by its ideological "sophistication," and its "clear" perception that the real enemies are capitalism and imperialism and that a socialist revolution is necessary. It is the layer, with some differentiations, that sees itself above the mass of students, apart from their problems and concerns, and which has graduated from the student struggle to the "real world" of workers struggles (and their knowledge of, participation in, and strategy for real developments as the working class evokes new, albeit modest, signs of radicalization, is as insipid and dim-witted as their "analysis" of the student movement and its potential).

In fact, it is precisely because of the events of the past year, including the possibilities of American aggression in the Middle East (not to mention Southeast Asia), Watergate, the energy crisis, etc., that the student movement has greater power and greater ability to detonate mass action in broader layers of society.

The correctness and healthiness of the antiwar and broadly "antigovernment" actions of the student movement have been confirmed by the Pentagon Papers and Watergate revelations. The respect for the actions of the student movement has grown and deepened in the population as a whole. The motion of the student movement in the coming stage of the radicalization will therefore have, at the outset, greater confidence placed in it by the masses and its capacity to influence the masses will consequently be greater than at the time of the antiwar movement. The consciousness of both the masses of the American people and the student movement has grown wider in its critique of capitalist society's values and norms and institutions. The relative power of the student movement is increased. And at the same time, the strength of the revolutionary youth vanguard, the YSA,

is stronger, the ultraleft current is, like that of the reformists, weaker, and masses of students generally grasp the fact that the whole of society must be brought into motion to effect decisive change.

More than ever, the scope, power and potential of the student movement is maturing, and will inevitably play the role not of spectator to the workers radicalization, but continue to spark, push forward, ally with and anticipate it.

The careful explanation of our program, in campus forums, election campaigns, support to the SWP campaigns, in sales of our press and in the real action around issues and events we will initiate and participate in must reach out to the masses of students and young people. It is the most advanced of these numbers, those whom the impact of economic strain, Watergate, the possibilities of war in the Middle East, etc., is further radicalizing, that will join the YSA. The "vanguard" layer in which petty-bourgeois cynicism and a fear of social revolution has developed

"Marxism-Leninism" will come around in the heat of action, at best.

We cannot predict the time and event from which will come a big renewal of a period of mass action, a period in which we can take on large scale agitational tasks, like the antiwar movement. But one thing is clear. The past year has represented both a widening of the scope of the radicalization, on campus and in society in general, and an improvement in the mood on campus favorable to the growth of the YSA. It has also represented a year in which the YSA, confronted with hard tasks in a propaganda period involving an increased level of activity in the YSA, has numerically grown and, most importantly, become politically and organizationally strengthened in the meeting of those challenges head on.

Whatever next year holds for us, we are more prepared than ever to get the most from it.

December 5, 1973

By Kurt T. Hill, Jamestown, New York, At-Large

In his Marxist Economic Theory, Ernest Mandel provides a basic theoretical understanding of the dynamics of capitalist development since the Great Depression of the 1930s. He notes that after that economic cataclysm, the advanced capitalist countries have experienced an accelerated pace of technological change; a transformation of such historical importance, that he terms it a "third industrial revolution."

This uninterrupted transformation of the techniques of production possesses several novel characteristics. According to Mandel, some of the specific features of this transformation include the tremendous expansion of state intervention in economic life, including government underwriting of a highly sophisticated permanent arms race. He also notes a process of continual expulsion of manual labor from traditional industry, coupled with the introduction of intellectual labor into the productive process on a massive scale for the first time in history.

Mandel denies that this "third industrial revolution" (neo-capitalism) has eliminated the cyclical crises inherent in the capitalist system. He notes that each period of technological expansion has been followed by a cycle of stagnation and decline. He points out, for instance, that the technological "boom" of the late 19th century was followed by a long-term period of economic stagnation lasting approximately 30 years. Although temporary "recoveries" occurred, the general trend during this period was downward.

If the period 1940-1970 can be considered a long-term cycle of economic expansion for neo-capitalism, the period in which we are now living can be considered the beginning of a long-term cycle of capitalist economic stagnation.

It is obvious that this period of stagnation will provide revolutionary communists with an ever-increasing sympathetic following. Under the impact of this crisis, the present mass movements will swell in numbers, and eventually, will be joined by the legions of labor. The question of state power--the question of which class shall rule--will be posed in the not too distant future.

This paper will deal with an important component of the coming socialist revolution: the highly trained graduates of America's colleges and universities.

Under neo-capitalism, the high degree of technological sophistication necessitates an ever-increasing intellectual workforce to manage, operate, repair, and develop the highly complicated instruments of production.

One presently finds many occupations formerly considered "professional" or "semi-professional" increasingly subject to the same conditions of work prevailing in the traditional

manual occupations: a growing mechanization of tasks (rationalization), personnel standardization and interchangeability, and an increasing concentration, regimentation and supervision of intellectual workers employed by huge bureaucratic institutions.

Intellectual labor, formerly a service performed for a client by an autonomous professional, has been transformed by neo-capitalism into labor performed by skilled wage workers employed by gigantic industrial and governmental institutions. This dynamic has shattered the traditional professional model of client-specialist relationships.

A college education was once the special preserve of the sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie, and those managerial elements who were to serve the interests of capital--both organizational and ideological. These students of half a century ago numbered in the thousands.

Under the impact of neo-capitalism, however, education has expanded dramatically. Students presently undertaking instruction now number in the millions. Because of their numbers, university trained individuals have a social weight never before possessed by this group.

The question arises, how should Marxists view this ever-increasing number of college students and university trained specialists. Should we continue to utilize the traditional Marxist concepts and define these individuals as members of the professional petty-bourgeoisie? Or, have qualitative changes occurred in this segment of society which must alter our evaluation?

Perhaps one of the best "traditional" analyses of university trained people occurs in Leon Trotsky's work, "The Intelligentsia and Socialism," originally published in 1910 as a review of Max Adler's book, Socialismus und die Intellektuellen.

In his work, Adler presents the thesis that it is possible to win the support of the university trained elite to socialism by emphasizing "factors--though not purely economic ones, but drawn from another sphere" which can influence the entire mass of the intelligentsia to join with the movement of communist workers for the socialist reconstruction of society. He felt that by stressing the inability of the capitalist system to meet the "spiritual" (intellectual) interests of this stratum, these elements could be recruited en masse to the socialist cause.

Trotsky took issue with Adler's analysis. He objected to Adler's thesis on the grounds that the Austrian had not demonstrated in fact that the "cultural requirements" of the intellectuals (such as the development of science, art, tech-

nique, etc.) were more powerful than other factors such as "class suggestions radiating from family, school, church or state, or the voice of material interests" (p. 4). Trotsky observed that the more the socialist movement grew, and thus, the easier it became for the masses of workers to comprehend their historical mission, "the more decidedly have the intellectuals recoiled from it" (*Ibid.*). Thus, reasoned Trotsky, there must exist some "deep-going social changes" which have hindered the development of the intellectuals in a socialist direction.

What were these changes? Trotsky states that the best elements of the university trained were absorbed by the expanding capitalist empires. Concerning the remaining elements in secondary positions, "the cultural interests to which Adler appeals cannot be strong enough to independently direct their political sympathies towards the socialist movement" (p. 6).

In addition, Trotsky states:

"A worker comes to socialism as a part of a whole, along with his class from which he has no prospect of escaping. He is even pleased with the feeling of his moral unity with the masses, which makes him more confident and stronger. The intellectual, however, comes to socialism breaking his class umbilical cord, as an individual, a personality, and inevitably seeks to exert influence as an individual." (*Ibid.*)

In the beginnings of the socialist movement, Trotsky stated, intellectuals won "honored places" in positions of leadership. Now, however, "Thousands of labor leaders who have automatically been promoted from their class, constitute a solid apparatus at the head of which stand honored veterans of recognized authority, figures that have already become historic" (p. 7).

Since only men of exceptional ability will obtain leadership positions in the workers movement, intellectuals follow the line of least resistance and enter the realm of industry and the state. This material dependence on the capitalist class would preclude any militant political activity. Therefore, this "spiritual" nature offered by Adler would bind them to the possessing class and develop a "constant antagonism to the workers, against whom they are obliged to uphold the interests of capital with administrative responsibilities" (*Ibid.*).

For Trotsky, the university:

"... is the final stage of the state organized education of the sons of the possessing and ruling classes, just as the barracks is the final educational institution for the young generation of workers and peasants. The barracks fosters the psychological habits of obedience, and discipline appropriate to the subordinate social functions to be fulfilled subsequently. The university, in principle,

trains for management, leadership, government." (p. 11)

As late as 1940, Trotsky apparently felt that this analysis of 1910 was still essentially accurate. Even a cursory reading of In Defense of Marxism will bear out this contention.

The foremost American Trotskyist, James P. Cannon, also accepted the traditional interpretation of intellectuals constituting a petty-bourgeois social layer:

"The conflict between the proletarian revolutionists and the petty-bourgeois intellectuals in our party, as in the labor movement generally... does not at all arise from ignorant prejudices of the workers against them. It arises from the fact that they neither 'cut themselves adrift' from the alien classes, as the Communist Manifesto specified, nor do they 'join the revolutionary class,' in the full sense of the word... they hesitate half-way between the class alternatives." (Struggle for a Proletarian Party, p. 20)

Placed in the context of the times, one need not quarrel with either Trotsky's stance of 1910, nor with the analysis of the Shachtman-Burnham opposition. Each of these analyses was correct when it was written.

However, as Marxists, we base our conceptions upon a scientific evaluation of social reality. Dialectical materialism forms the foundation of this scientific model. We know that reality continually changes; the Marxist model which reflects and organizes this reality is not a dogma, but rather, a guide to action. The model itself is based upon empirical reality and is sub-ordinate, not super-ordinate, to objective reality. Since all reality changes, one should examine new developments with an eye to assessing whether purely quantitative changes, or qualitative leaps have occurred.

Are the observations made by Trotsky in 1910, and reaffirmed in 1940, still valid approximations of objective reality in the 1970s? Should we re-evaluate our positions in light of new empirical evidence?

It is my contention that the development of neo-capitalism renders this traditional Marxist view of educated people generally obsolete. College educated people, by and large, no longer are a part of the petty-bourgeoisie, but rather, constitute the most skilled layer of the proletariat.

In order for one to fully comprehend the import of neo-capitalism upon the university trained, it is necessary to briefly survey the development of education in America, and its relationship to the development of the capitalist system itself.

In 1870, five years after the triumph of Northern industrial capitalism over the Southern slavery system, farmers comprised nearly one half of the labor force. "White collar"

workers of all descriptions (clerical, professional, and managerial) comprised less than ten percent of the American work force. At this time there were approximately 80,000 students enrolled in high schools of all kinds in the US, most of whom were attending private tuition academies. At this time, there were fewer than 500 public high schools in the country, most of which were concentrated in the industrial Northeast (Cubberley, 1934, pp. 255, 627).

The 16,000 students who received their diplomas that year were only about two percent of the seventeen-year-olds in the nation (Historical Statistics, . . . : 1960, p. 207). After obtaining a classical liberal education, the bulk of these students continued their education at the university level. In 1870, the total college enrollment was only about 52,000 (Ibid.).

However, by 1910, there were over 1,000,000 high school students, ninety percent of whom were enrolled in over 10,000 public high schools throughout the nation. They comprised approximately fifteen percent of the 14-17 year-olds (Trow, 1960, p. 438).

Although the dynamic of the expanding capitalist system necessitated a larger number of educated personnel, the academic preparation of most of these public high school students terminated with their graduation. High schools had indeed been transformed into mass institutions, to fulfill the new needs of an expanding bourgeois economy.

It should be emphasized, however, that only a numerically small proportion of high school graduates continued to pursue their studies beyond this point. A college education remained the special privilege of the ruling class and its highly trained functionaries.

After the second world war, high schools began to be transformed once again. By 1940, more than 50 percent of persons 17 years old were attending high school. Only about 15 percent of high school graduates were attending college. With the advent of neo-capitalism, however, the percentages of high school graduates attending universities increased substantially. By 1958, 24.1 percent of high school graduates were studying for college degrees; by 1970, this figure had climbed to nearly 30 percent. By 1980, it is estimated that nearly 40 percent of high school graduates will be attending a college or university (Statistical Abstract, 1972, p. 127).

One of the most striking indications of the impact of neo-capitalism upon higher education has been the development of the junior (or community) college. These institutions enrolled a mere 153,970 individuals in 1948. By 1970 however, this figure had increased to more than 1,630,000 (Op. Cit., p. 128).

The number of junior colleges has also increased dramatically. In 1950, there was a total of 528 (299 public,

229 private). By 1970, there were 827 junior colleges--603 of which were publicly funded (Ibid.).

The intervention of the state in higher education is not confined to junior colleges. In 1957, there were 1,618 publicly financed colleges or universities, compared with 1,142 private institutions. By 1970, there were 5,194 public institutions and only 1,826 private schools (Op. Cit., p. 129).

Thus, state intervention in higher education under neo-capitalism parallels the expansion of public high school education during capitalism's last expansion phase following the Civil War. The reasons are also parallel: economic need. Between 1950 and 1970, the proportion of technical and other highly skilled intellectual workers in the American labor force rose from 7.1 percent to 14.5 percent. A certain percentage of this increase occurred in the "traditional" professions, such as law and medicine. Most of this increase, however, occurred in such neo-capitalist initiated fields as data processing (Karabel, 1972, p. 552).

Academic apologists for the bourgeois system insist that this trend indicates a "democratization" of the university, and that Marx's conception of the increasing proletarianization of the petty-bourgeoisie is incorrect. It is not the "middle class" that is going out of existence, they state, but rather the industrial proletariat. The working class, they insist, is becoming absorbed into the petty-bourgeoisie. They assure us that continued advances in capitalist technology will increasingly provide upward social mobility for the working class. In brief, they claim that capitalism is the gravedigger of the working class.

If one were to dogmatically cling to Trotsky's analysis of 1910, one would have to admit the truth of these academics' claims. For the fact of the matter is that since 1920, the industrial proletariat has remained a consistent 40 percent of the population. In fact, they have declined slightly through the increasing rationalization of industry. As the years advance, this decline will grow more pronounced. At the same time, since the 1950s, "white collar" workers, including the college-trained elements, have surpassed the classic working class in numbers (Trow, p. 438).

Was Marx wrong in his belief that the working class would eventually become the overwhelming majority of the population in the advanced capitalist countries? Does the petty-bourgeoisie increase, rather than decrease, under capitalism?

To these taunting questions, Marxists should reply with an emphatic "No!" What is actually occurring is that neo-capitalism is creating a new layer of the working class, not a mass petty-bourgeoisie.

Autonomy--independence--is the keystone of the petty-bourgeoisie. These strata possess the means of satisfying their own needs. They either own their own businesses (small stores, farms, etc.) or in the case of the traditional

professions "own" a certain esoteric knowledge. The traditional petty-bourgeois intellectual is an independent professional engaged in a professional-client relationship, for which he or she obtains a fee for the services performed.

Suspended as they are between the big capitalists on the one hand, and the working class on the other, the petty-bourgeoisie cannot act as an independent social force. They must attach their aspirations to one of the two major social classes. Their social position fosters habits of individualism; for unlike the proletariat, they are not concentrated in large numbers in one specific location (such as a factory) whereby communication and a common experience can foster an in-group consciousness. Hence, their ideology as well, must derive from one of the two major classes.

Prior to the advent of neo-capitalism, university trained people constituted a social elite composed of the children of the ruling class, and small groups of individuals who were destined to perform the organizational and managerial functions for the bourgeoisie in both industry and the state. It has been demonstrated that the number of these people was relatively small by comparison to the total college-age population.

Under neo-capitalism, however, this situation has changed dramatically. We are fast approaching the point when 40 percent or more of the college age population will be receiving university instruction. The elite nature of a college education is diminishing; a university degree is fast becoming not a privilege, but a necessity in modern capitalist society.

Unlike their forebearers, today's university educated do not possess the essential prerogatives of the traditional petty-bourgeois intelligentsia--the aspect of independence from outside control.

In a number of spheres essential to neo-capitalism (including education and research), one is confronted with a new reality: the breakdown of the old, professional-client relationship, and its replacement with large, impersonal bureaucratic institutions. We are witnessing an ever-increasing consolidation of functions, and an ever-growing concentration of personnel in these institutions.

Bureaucracies aim at predictability; and predictability, especially in large institutions, can only be achieved by increased standardization. This standardizing process destroys the independence of the intellectual worker by creating an atmosphere where the achievement of tasks is seen as independent of the particular individuals who perform these various functions. This "task specialization" results in breaking down the necessary work into pieces, each individual performing only one or two minute tasks towards the complete goal. Thus, there is an ever-increasing compartmentalization of knowledge in the intellectual fields which is beginning to parallel the compartmentalization of skills of industrial workers on the assembly line. Or as Mandel

states, neo-capitalism

"... is repeating in the whole society what the first industrial revolution achieved inside the factory system: a growing indifference towards the particular skill of labor, the emergence of generalized human labor..."  
("Workers Under Neo-Capitalism," pp. 6-7)

University educated individuals are no longer independent professionals, but rather, are highly skilled wage workers--members of intellectual crafts created or greatly transformed by neo-capitalism. Just as the first industrial revolution smashed the guild system, and turned members of these occupations into manual craft workers, so has neo-capitalism transformed professionals into intellectual craft workers. The broadly educated intelligentsia of the 19th century have been transformed into "specialists," each of whom possesses only a fraction of the available knowledge in his or her general field.

Thus, objectively, there are now three distinct divisions of the working class: the manual craft workers, the workers in mass industry, and the newly created or transformed intellectual craft workers. Each of these divisions corresponds to a period of capitalist economic development. The manual crafts were formed during the first industrial revolution, the workers in mass industry were forged under the impact of the assembly line, and the intellectual crafts were developed to meet the unique needs of neo-capitalism.

Historically speaking, there have been two basic aspects to craft unionism. The first of these aspects is control of the recruitment and training process--the regulation of the number of trained craftsmen by the occupation itself through the apprentice system. In this sense, the manual crafts represent outgrowths of the guild system.

The second aspect has been the lack of standardization of the work performed. Due to the relative scarcity of trained personnel, there has been less task specialization and standardization of work performed by craft workers. This aspect has prevented the total rationalization of these occupations, with the ensuing minute divisions of labor. The craft worker, therefore, not only receives a greater income, but has developed defenses against alienation lacking in the industrial field.

Taken together, these two aspects have molded the manual crafts into the "artocracy of labor." The manual crafts, through the direct control of the recruiting and training process, practice the exclusion of unwanted competitors as a means of maintaining their relatively higher living standards. The feature of exclusion, while generally ensuring economic prosperity for the manual crafts, gives them a decidedly conservative coloration. George Meany, a plumber by trade, is the supreme embodiment of the craft union mentality.

The intellectual crafts (such as teaching, research, en-

gineering, etc.), do not possess the two traditional attributes of a craft: control over the recruitment process, and the lack of task specialization. The recruitment and training of the intellectual crafts take place on the college or university campuses--which are beyond the control and supervision of these occupations. Market demand, i. e., the needs of the capitalist class, and not the needs of these occupations, determine the availability of college training, as well as the number of jobs available for university graduates.

Like the manual crafts, the intellectual crafts have been socialized to internalize certain attitudes beneficial to the capitalist class. Unlike industrial workers who are continually supervised by management, both the manual and the intellectual crafts have been taught to be somewhat more self-regulating. External supervision exists (and is constantly increasing), but it is aided and supplemented by internal controls. However, intellectual workers, unlike the manual craft workers, do not yet possess (by and large) the organizational forms to modify or eliminate either of these two forms of control, i. e., trade union organizations.

In order for one to correctly assess the potential of the intellectual crafts, it is necessary to comprehend how the laws of uneven and combined development apply to this unique development under neo-capitalism.

Comrade George Novack once gave an excellent capsulization of the essence of these two laws. He stated that:

"The mainspring of human progress is man's command of the forces of production. As history advances, there occurs a faster or slower growth of productive forces in this or that segment of society, owing to the differences in natural conditions. These disparities give either an expanded or compressed character to entire historical epochs and impart varying rates and extents of growth to different peoples, different branches of economy, different classes, different social institutions and fields of culture. This is the essence of the law of uneven development.

"The variations among the multiple factors in history provide the basis for the emergence of exceptional phenomena in which features of a lower stage are merged with those of a superior stage of social development. These combined formations have a highly contradictory character and exhibit marked peculiarities. They may deviate so much from the rule and effect such an upheaval as to produce a qualitative leap in social evolution and enable a formerly backward people to outdistance, for a certain time, one more advanced. This is the gist of the law of combined development." (1972, p. 82)

After centuries of splitting cogitative creation from the purely manual aspect of labor, neo-capitalism has re-integrated the intellectual element into the productive process again--but in a lopsided manner. Parallel with the uninter-

rupted expansion of capitalist production techniques has been the uninterrupted expansion of knowledge necessary to manage and operate such sophisticated instruments of production, and the complex social systems which generate them. Nearly all intellectual occupations have become dependent upon neo-capitalist technology: either directly (engineers, computer programmers, data analysts, etc.), or indirectly, by providing the necessary tools to utilize these techniques or to manage their social impact (social researchers, teachers, social workers, skilled clerical workers, etc.).

There are several disparities of development evident in the quarter century of neo-capitalism. Firstly, while declining in numbers relative to the intellectual crafts, the industrial working class and the manual craft workers both possess a powerful legacy from the previous labor upsurges--their trade union organizations. Most intellectual crafts, though objectively ceasing to be "independent professions," have yet to go beyond the traditional "professional associations" of the past. Secondly, the relative incomes of the manual workers and most members of the intellectual crafts are appreciably more comparable in the 1970s than they were fifty years ago. Intellectually skilled people, in fact, are now much closer economically to the manual workers than at any time in history.

We are therefore witnessing a growing homogenization of the working class--both manual and intellectual. Social mobility is increasingly horizontal in nature, rather than vertical. That is, large numbers of people from industrial working class backgrounds are obtaining a college education only to find that they have not advanced into a higher economic class, but rather have simply "transferred" from one section of the working class into another. Rather than finding "professional independence," they discover that their hours are externally regulated, they are under increasing external supervision, and that they are receiving a financial compensation increasingly similar to that of the rest of the working class.

Intellectual workers are also increasingly subject to the possibilities of unemployment upon graduation, a situation which was almost non-existent even ten years ago. This reality is already the subject of much concern, and it will continue to become problematic in the near-future. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has projected that by 1980, there will be significant unemployment among elementary and secondary school teachers in the US, since the aggregate supply is expected to "exceed quite significantly" the demand. Large surpluses of social researchers, social scientists, mathematicians and life scientists are also expected (MLR, 1970, p. 33).

These large surpluses of intellectual workers will increase the trend to "upgrade" the requirements for various jobs. Upgrading compels those with a particular level of education to accept jobs which are below their actual skill levels.



In effect, upgrading (under-employment) depresses the value of intellectual labor. One can expect that as this trend continues, college graduates will be assuming jobs which high school graduates obtained several years ago. Also, an increasing number of university-trained people will be forced to take jobs in traditional industry, because of the large surpluses of people in their fields.

One should also take into consideration the tendency towards permanent inflation inherent in neo-capitalism. State intervention in the economy as manifested by government expenditures for arms, space research and education creates purchasing power in an identical way in which the production of consumer goods or producer goods does. However, unlike the two fundamental sectors of classical economy, there exists "no compensatory increase in the mass of merchandise, either consumer goods or producer goods, whose sale can be absorbed by the purchasing power thus created" (Mandel, 1964, pp. 67-68).

In an attempt to reduce the inflationary pressures thus generated, the capitalist state can lay off personnel on governmental projects, cut back on orders to private firms, and reduce the amount of funds available to educational institutions. This deprives significant numbers of people (particularly intellectual workers who are increasingly dependent upon government financing, directly or indirectly) of their usual buying power.

Thus, the ideology of "professional self-regulation" (independence) taught in the institutions of "higher learning" must of necessity eventually come into conflict with the objective social reality. While many university trained people will continue to manifest petty-bourgeois attitudes, hold petty-bourgeois values, etc., a belief system appropriate to a pre-neo-capitalist period cannot continue to exist for a prolonged period of time once large numbers of people begin to realize the discrepancy between the old ideology and the new, concrete reality.

At this particular juncture, one question naturally presents itself: what model of organization shall be chosen by the intellectual crafts to further their interests? If the traditional "professional" model is increasingly unrealistic, only two organizational precedents remain: the manual craft form of organization, and the industrial unions of mass industry.

The old manual crafts cannot be realistic models for the new intellectual crafts. Most of the manual craft unions were established during a much different phase of capitalist development, a period which preceded the rise of the industrial unions. Their strategy is therefore different from that of the industrial unions. That is, they attempt to maintain their present standard of living through the exclusion of unwanted competitors.

The intellectual crafts, however, were formed under a much different period of capitalist development--neo-capi-

talism. If they are to gain realistic control over their working lives, they must adopt the most advanced form of union organization, industrial unionism, the strategy of which is based upon a policy of inclusion, of extending control over the supply of all potential members of that occupation. In order to accomplish this, however, the intellectual crafts must become part of what the CIO was in its early years--components of a mass movement for social change.

To successfully gain occupational control, the intellectual crafts must, of necessity, demand a re-structuring of national priorities. Since such a restructuring would undermine many of the basic underpinnings of neo-capitalist society (such as arms manufacturing), these demands would encounter stiff resistance from the ruling class. To obtain allies in their struggle, the intellectual crafts would have to unite with those social forces who would benefit from the peaceful application of neo-capitalist advances in technology and education.

To sum up, the uneven development of the intellectual crafts is demonstrated by the fact that although they objectively constitute a section of the working class, they have not achieved the relative occupational security of the older divisions of the working class which possess instruments of defense--trade unions.

In order to secure such instruments, the intellectual crafts cannot rely upon the traditional craft strategy of occupational exclusion. Rather, they must combine the inclusiveness of industrial unionism with a general offensive against basic aspects of neo-capitalism. This in turn necessitates an alliance with much larger social forces (the national minorities, students, women, etc.) who would also benefit from a thorough reconstruction of society.

The role of revolutionists, naturally, is to demonstrate that such a reconstruction can only be undertaken on a socialist basis. We must intervene in these struggles, raising demands which will unite the various groups, stressing the mutuality of class interests.

In order to demonstrate the possibilities of such a united struggle, let us take two intellectual crafts--teaching and engineering--and briefly trace how the struggles of each of these groups for occupational control compliment the struggles of other mass movements.

Prior to 1870 and the development of mass, terminal secondary education, the teachers in the preparatory academies and universities shared a similar social status. They generally taught the same classical subjects to the same kinds of students, and movement from an academy to a college or vice versa was not at all unusual.

With the advent of the mass, terminal high school financed by the state, this situation changed dramatically. The new mass secondary schools could not simply be exten-

sions of the old elite preparatory systems. The needs of the expanding capitalist system required a new curriculum, and a different teacher training program. Thus, new state departments of education and state-financed teachers colleges were created to meet the new needs (Trow, p. 439).

With the growth of industry in major metropolitan centers, large numbers of individuals have settled in these cities hoping to obtain jobs and educational opportunities. The latest of these migrant groups are the Blacks and other oppressed nationalities. Parallel with the migration of Black and other minority groups into the central cities has been the flight of the middle and upper income groups to the suburban areas to escape the deteriorating conditions of the inner cities.

The changing composition of the cities readily becomes apparent when one views the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs); urban centers with a population of 50,000 persons or more. These metropolitan areas have absorbed nearly two-thirds of the population increase between 1950 and 1960. During this period, the 212 SMSAs grew by about 23.5 million people, as opposed to those areas outside the SMSAs, which increased their populations by about 4.5 million persons. This was an increase of about 7.2 percent as opposed to the 84 percent increase in the metropolitan areas (Corwin, 1965, p. 111).

However, most of the SMSA growth did not occur within the urban centers themselves. Rather, this growth took place in the contiguous suburban areas of these central cities. Between 1950 and 1960, the suburban areas had a growth rate five times that of the urban centers. That means that nearly 80 percent of the population growth in this period occurred in these residential areas (Ibid.)

An excellent example of this trend towards the suburbanization of higher income groups, and the urbanization of the poor, can be found by studying New York City. The total population of New York has remained relatively static, declining slightly from 7.9 million people in 1950, to 7.8 million in 1960, followed by an increase again in 1968 to about 8 million. In 1950, whites made up about 87.3 percent of the population, while Blacks were 9.6 percent and Puerto Ricans stood at 3.1 percent. In 1960, the white population had declined to 80.9 percent, while the Black and Puerto Rican populations had increased to 12.4 percent and 6.7 percent, respectively. By the end of the decade, the white composition of New York had declined to less than 74 percent while the Black and Puerto Rican populations had increased to 17.0 percent and 8.9 percent of the total (Bernstein, 1969, p. 19).

From the beginnings of free, compulsory public education, the great bulk of revenues for the payment of teachers' salaries and benefits, and for the financing of the educational system itself, have come from the property tax. In effect, this is a tax upon the "wealth" of working people and

the petty-bourgeoisie. The major sources of wealth, however, are stocks and bonds (bourgeois wealth); property accounting for only 8 percent of the nation's income. Thus, one of the smallest forms of wealth accounts for 54 percent of the income for public school education (Bendiner, 1967, p. 97).

Since 1930, the national income has risen 375 percent, and total tax revenue itself has increased 935 percent. The tax revenue for educational programs and services has increased one-half of that, or about 435 percent. By 1967, the federal government accounted for 63.4 percent of all tax revenues collected in the United States. All of the state governments combined collected 19 percent, while the thousands of local governments collected only 17.6 percent.

However, the local government share of education costs is about 52 percent. The state government share is about 40.3 percent, and the federal government share is only about 7.7 percent of the costs of education. Thus, the sources of school monies are available in a reverse order from that of their abilities to provide such financing (Ibid., p. 129).

It is obvious that those who need educational services the most (the oppressed nationalities) are increasingly those who can least afford to pay for such services. Consequently, educational services are increasingly being curtailed--some systems even being closed temporarily because of the lack of funds.

The deterioration of education in major metropolitan areas is being met with strong opposition in two areas: the Black and Third World communities, and the teachers' organizations.

Under neo-capitalism, the primary method by which socially and economically deprived people can advance their social status is by obtaining the necessary educational skills required by today's job market. Ghetto schools, however, have failed to adequately provide such skills.

A number of sociological studies have emphasized the failure of the American educational system to adequately meet the needs of the oppressed nationalities. One such study revealed that the College Entrance Examination Board scores of students studying in predominantly Black colleges averaged in the 300s, with some institutions reporting median scores in the 200s (Fanti, Gittel, Magat, 1970, p. 177).

Yet this situation is not only a problem of predominantly Black, Southern schools. One study of a mid-western university revealed that 70 percent of Black undergraduates had pre-college test scores which ranked them below the 50th percentile of the college of their choice in the university (Ibid.).

Thus,

"... although the study was limited to one university, the research director said the findings 'strongly suggest' poor high school academic training... as a source of the inadequate preparation of Black students for college. (Ibid.)

The just demand of the Black and other oppressed nationalities for community control of education is the logical response to the deteriorating conditions of metropolitan school systems.

At the same time, the deterioration of these school systems has had an impact upon teachers as well. Increases in class size, the elimination of funds for necessary remedial programs, and the reductions in the size of teaching faculties have spurred this opposition.

Since the early 1960s, the American Federation of Teachers has registered remarkable growth. Largely because of the successes the AFT has scored through a militant trade union approach, the National Education Association has increasingly moved away from its traditional "professional association" approach. Today, the Association's stance is objectively identical to that of the AFT. Thus, the merger of the two rival groups into one, large trade union organization is openly being discussed for the first time in history.

It is obvious that both groups--teachers and the oppressed nationalities--have a mutual interest in challenging one of the basic underpinnings of neo-capitalist economic policy, "defense" appropriations. The monies obtained from eliminating the Pentagon's budget would more than pay for a modern, effective educational program. There is no need to have thousands of unemployed teachers when ghetto schools are crying for help. And true occupational security for teachers can only be achieved through a "full employment" policy, for thousands of unemployed teachers means, in essence, thousands of potential scabs.

Teaching, however, is not the only intellectual craft which is increasingly coming into conflict with the "priorities" of neo-capitalist society. As Mandel has pointed out, one of the primary means by which the capitalist state seeks to reduce inflation is to cut back on federally funded programs. Engineers and other intellectual craft workers have been highly dependent upon state financing, either directly, by participating in federal programs, or indirectly, by being employed by firms which have substantial federal contracts.

Nearly 20 percent of all engineers employed in the United States are employed by defense-related industries. (Among aeronautical engineers, the proportion is nearly 50 percent (Dempsey and Schmude, p. 13).) The tremendous growth of employment of scientists and engineers in the neo-capitalist economy, a characteristic of the 1960s, definitely came to a halt in 1970. That year, there was an actual decline in the employment of scientists and engin-

eers in research and development (about 4 percent from 1969) for the first time (Crowley, 1970, p. 44).

Expenditures for space research and technology, a major employer of skilled engineering workers, rose from \$400 million in fiscal 1961 to a peak of \$6 billion in 1966. By 1972, however, these expenditures had declined to less than \$3 billion. (This figure does not take into account the continued erosion caused by inflation.) Total employment on NASA programs grew from 47,000 in 1961 to a peak of 410,000 in 1966. Since the cutbacks by the federal government, this figure has dropped to about 137,000 (Ginsberg, 1972, p. 102).

The relatively high pay engineers received, plus their relative scarcity, during the 1950s and 1960s, worked against attempts to unionize them during this period. In fact, the National Society of Professional Engineers, an organization which claims the allegiance of most of these workers, has been in the vanguard of the effort to dissuade engineers from joining unions. Its basic argument has been that unionization and collective bargaining are "unprofessional" (Seidman, 1969, p. 224).

The NSPE seeks to raise the educational qualifications of engineers, and to establish licensing and registration procedures, in an effort to limit the number of such workers, and therefore obtain greater financial compensation and job security. That is, they are attempting to utilize the old craft union approach based upon the exclusion of "surplus" personnel.

However, because of the permanent technological revolution inherent in neo-capitalism, this antique strategy is doomed to failure. The universities, and not the NSPE, determine the number of engineering degrees that are to be awarded. One should remember that most teachers are licensed, and must meet minimum requirements for certification. Yet this has not prevented the bourgeois university from cranking out more teachers despite the large "surpluses" who are presently looking for work. This situation, coupled with the fact that under permanent technological change, knowledge rapidly becomes obsolete, means that younger graduates of the universities can be used as a threat by employers to keep older engineers in line.

Each of these factors demonstrates that engineers must go beyond the old craft approach of limiting, or excluding, possible competitors, and adopt a posture of inclusiveness, if their problems of job security and wage compensation are to be fundamentally solved. To do this, they must, of necessity, demand a thorough re-adjustment of national priorities--something which capitalism is unwilling to do.

The demand of guaranteed jobs for all engineers would form the basis for such an inclusive strategy. The arms and space "industries," however, would prove insufficient for such a demand. Thus, demands for housing, school, and

hospital construction--demands that national resources be used to benefit the people, not to benefit the bourgeoisie--would have to be raised.

Engineers would find ready allies in their fight to challenge the priorities of the capitalist system. Even on the housing question alone, federal statistics themselves have stated that the United States needs 15 million units. The refusal of the Congress to enact the Housing and Urban Development Bill of 1972, and President Nixon's freezing of all public housing subsidies, all demonstrate where the capitalist politicians stand on this issue (Wheeler, 1972, p. 3).

The job of revolutionists must be to expose the discrepancies between the possibilities of solving these and other such problems in a technologically advanced nation, and the limitations placed upon such a technology by capitalist property relations.

### Summary

To sum up, this paper has stressed that the permanent technological revolution inherent in neo-capitalism necessitates an ever-increasing intellectual work force to manage, operate, repair and develop these highly complicated instruments of production. Consequently, many occupations which were formerly considered professional or semi-professional are increasingly subject to the same conditions of work existing in the more traditional proletarian occupations. University trained people have, by and large, ceased to be members of a petty-bourgeois elite, and have actually developed into the most skilled division of the working class.

The new intellectual crafts are in the process of establishing their own self-defense organizations--trade unions. However, because of the uneven development of capitalist society, the old manual craft form of organization cannot be a realistic model for the intellectual crafts. Many manual crafts were outgrowths of the guild system, and have retained many of that system's features, including occupational control of the recruitment and training process of new members. These favorable aspects have given the manual crafts a conservative exclusive attitude.

The intellectual crafts, however, were forged or greatly transformed under the unique conditions of neo-capitalism. Having been formed at a much later stage of capitalist development, the intellectual crafts do not possess the privileges of the manual crafts, such as occupational control over the recruitment and training of new members. To achieve such control, they must take on a dynamic character through raising transitional demands that go beyond simple traditional "business unionism."

In order to be successful, the intellectual crafts must challenge some of the basic underpinnings of neo-capitalist society, and demand a thorough restructuring of "national priorities." By doing so, they will become the natural allies of the present mass movements, and broaden their outlooks

from trade union consciousness to actual class consciousness.

### Tasks of the YSA

The college campus is the principal operating center of the YSA. The campus is also the training center of the intellectual crafts. This fact permits YSAers to have frequent contacts with many future members of the intellectual crafts--an advantage which most members of these crafts cannot share.

The YSA is therefore in a position to assist the development of a militant intellectual craft unionism based on the Transitional Program. We can use our campus base to promote the concept of a united struggle of union members, the unemployed, the oppressed nationalities, and the potentially unemployed (or under-employed) presently receiving university training.

I therefore propose that the Young Socialist Alliance adopt the following program as a means of furthering the concept of such a united struggle:

1) GUARANTEED JOBS UPON GRADUATION IN ONE'S CHOSEN FIELD. The demand for guaranteed jobs per se, as presently stated in the Program for Campus Revolt, is ambiguous. Does this mean simply a guarantee of any job? Or, does it mean a job which one was trained to do?

In 1949, a college graduate was 6 times as likely to hold a job in the top tenth of jobs as a grade school graduate. By 1969, he or she was 15 times as likely to hold a job in the top tenth.

Conversely, the probability of a grade school graduate holding a job in the lowest tenth of jobs rose from 3 to 6 times that of a university graduate.

During this same time period, the probabilities of college trained people holding better jobs than high school graduates have risen from 2, 5 to 4 times those of high school graduates.

There has been a corresponding rise in the relative probabilities of high school graduates holding jobs in the lowest tenth viz. college graduates--from 1, 2 to nearly 2 times.

One should also remember that only 50 percent of recent college graduates were engaged in work directly related to their major field of study (Perrella, 1973, p. 41).

2) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FIRST-TIME JOB SEEKERS. It has been pointed out why university graduates, because they now generally constitute a division of the working class, are increasingly subject to periods of unemployment. In October of 1971, the unemployment rate for college graduates was 7.4 percent. While this was only about one half the rate of high school graduates in 1970-71, it was 2 percentage points higher than the rate for the total labor force (Ibid.). This demand should unquestionably be added

to the campus program.

3) NATION-WIDE STUDENT UNION. It is necessary to unite students on the campus with graduates who are looking for jobs, or who are already employed in the intellectual crafts. One of the great drawbacks of the intellectual crafts is the fact that unlike their counterparts in the manual crafts, they have no control over the recruitment of new members. Students and recent graduates who enter the labor force, either temporarily or permanently, do so in an atomized way. As individuals, they are powerless to demand jobs commensurate with their levels of skill. Dependent as they are upon the "market mechanism," they are forced to take what employment is available, even though the population in general might desperately need their skills.

At the same time, employers can easily use the threat of a readily available force of qualified scabs to blunt the militancy of those already employed in the intellectual crafts.

A nation-wide union of students could be a very powerful instrument in the class struggle. Such an organization, by demanding a thorough restructuring of "national priorities," could seriously challenge the legitimacy of the capitalist system for millions of individuals. By joining with the struggles of the oppressed nationalities and the labor movement, students would obtain allies necessary to fulfill their demands.

At this present juncture, however, the YSA has neither the cadre nor the financial resources to initiate such a student union. To agitate around this concept would be inappropriate at this time. Yet, we could easily raise such a concept in a propagandistic manner.

One should remember that the concept of the antiwar university remained primarily a propagandistic slogan until May, 1970. During that upsurge, we were able to transform this propaganda slogan into a concrete reality on dozens of campuses across the nation. A careful patient explanation of the possibilities of such a concept was necessary before we could successfully agitate around this idea. We should, therefore, begin to discuss the student union concept with the most advanced elements of the student population, and stress its relationship to the struggles of other sectors of the population.

4) PUBLISH MORE MATERIAL ON THE ECONOMIC ISSUES FACING STUDENTS. Without detracting from the coverage allotted to other problems and struggles, we should devote more attention to the economic problems facing students upon graduation. Feelings of economic insecurity are probably higher among students today than at any time since the advent of neo-capitalism. We should strive to bring the socialist analysis and solution to this ever-increasing problem. More articles on the economic plight of university graduates should be published in the Young Socialist.

Perhaps we could devote a pamphlet to these issues, and insure a large distribution.

In closing, I wish to stress that the four recommendations I have made should not be regarded as substitutes for our present general political orientation. We should continue to participate in the women's movement, the struggles of the oppressed nationalities, the gay movement, etc. We should not forget, however, that the potential for organizing the newest layer of the working class--the intellectual crafts--is a very great one indeed.

#### Notes

Bendiner, Robert, The Politics of Schools, New York, 1967.

Bernstein, Blanche, "The Distribution of Income in New York City," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 93, Washington, Sept. 1970.

Cannon, James P., The Struggle for a Proletarian Party, New York, 1972.

Corwin, Ronald G., A Sociology of Education, New York, 1965.

Crowley, Michael F., "Professional Manpower: the Job Market Turnaround," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 95, Washington, Oct. 1972.

Cubberly, Ellwood P., Public Education in the United States, Boston, 1934.

Dempsey, Richard and Douglas Schmude, "Occupational Impact of Defense Expenditures," MLR, Vol. 94, Washington, Dec. 1971.

Fanti, Mario, Marilyn Gittel and Richard Magat, "Participation and Community Control," Community Control and the Urban School System, New York, 1970.

Ginsberg, Eli, "The Outlook for Educated Manpower," The Public Interest, No. 26 (Winter 1972), New York.

Karabel, Ann, "Problems of Professional Workers," New Issues in Labor Relations, John Keating (ed.), New York, 1973.

Mandel, Ernest, An Introduction to Marxist Economic Theory, New York, 1971.

Mandel, Ernest, "Workers Under Neo-Capitalism," International Socialist Review, Vol. 29, No. 6.

Monthly Labor Review, "Highly Educated Manpower in the US Economy in 1980," MLR, Vol. 93, Washington, Apr. 1970.

Novack, George, "Uneven and Combined Development in World History," Understanding History: Marxist Essays, New York, 1972.

Perrella, Vera C., "Employment of Recent College Graduates," MLR, Vol. 96, Washington, February, 1973.

Seidman, Joel, "Engineering Unionism," The Engineers and the Social System (Perrucci and Gerstl, eds.), New York, 1969.

Statistical Abstract of the United States, Washington, 1972.

Trow, Martin, "The Second Transformation of American Education," Class, Status and Power: Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective (Bendix and Lipset, eds.), New York, 1966, Second Edition.

Trotsky, Leon, "The Intelligentsia and Socialism," London, 1966.

Wheeler, Tom, "US Needs 15 Million Houses," World Magazine, New York, November 25, 1972.

December 5, 1973