

The SCI's Rejection of Dialectics Is Taking the FLTI into the Centrist Swamp

As the Programmatic Differences Are Deepening, the Class Roots of the Factions Are Consolidating

In every **intense** factional fight, Marxists must seek the relationship between the political positions, the method, and the class origin for each faction. That was clearly the case in the famous 1939-40 fight in the SWP. It is also clearly the case in the present factional fight within the FLTI. There are some basic similarities between 1940 and today. Then, as today, big world events rocked the revolutionary movement. When Stalin made a pact with Hitler, the petty bourgeois sector of the SWP could not stomach it. On the eve of the Second World War, they capitulated to bourgeois public opinion and abandoned the basic principles and duties of the Marxists and the proletariat: to defend the USSR and the gains of the revolution despite the criminal actions of the Stalinist bureaucracy. As the factional fight developed in 1940, the class roots and the method of the opposition were revealed: It was a petty bourgeois opposition that rejected dialectical materialism: the engine of Marxism, which is the method that explains everything in the present class society and the universe.

It would be wrong, of course, to mechanically compare the SWP factional fight in the 1940s to today's factional fight. Yet we cannot avoid noticing that some of the **fundamental** ingredients are the same. The events that led to the Second World War were big changes in the hierarchy within the imperialist pack, that is, the decline of British imperialism and the rise to dominance of American imperialism. As in the 1930s, world capitalism today is in deep crisis. As the crisis continues to evolve, we are witnessing a change in the imperialist pack order. We are witnessing the decline of American imperialism (which is still the dominating imperialist power) and the rise of a new imperialist power: China, which is backed up by Russia. The "stability" of the period of American dominance is over, and it is most likely gone forever, because ultimately the conflict between US imperialism and the Chinese/Russian bloc can only lead either to the destruction of the world or to the world proletarian revolution.

The SCI and its leader comrade Munzer live in the past, in the era in which American imperialism dominated the world without question. By refusing to recognize the rise of Chinese imperialism, the big elephant in the room, the SCI is retreating in panic from Marxism in the many arenas of revolutionary politics that are affected by the present rise of China. The opposition's leaders in the SWP who broke with Trotsky and the Fourth International supported the rising imperialist power in the Second World War after they left the SWP; that is, they supported one of the most destructive imperialist powers that has ever existed, American imperialism.

Today, the SCI, if it stays on its present course, will end up like the opposition in the SWP: supporting the rising new power – but this time around, it is China. In both cases we see a fundamental departure from Marxism: support for an imperialist power in the case of an imperialist war (direct or proxy war) is impermissible and is a betrayal of the working class and

the world revolution. Yet this is the direction toward which the SCI is sliding. Thus, if the fundamental differences between the majority and the minority cannot be resolved, we will end up on the opposite side of the barricades when diplomacy gives way to other means of conflict as the tension between the imperialist blocs rises.

For now, the SCI is becoming the extreme left wing of the WSF. For Chavez and company, China is a “progressive” country. In other words, the Bolivarian regimes seeks economic deals, and hope for big concessions from Chinese imperialism, as they posture themselves to the masses as “anti-Yankee imperialism.” “American imperialism is the enemy,” say the Bolivarians to the masses, as they make deals with Chinese imperialism behind the masses’ back. “China is progressive,” say Chavez and company to the masses, so “You don’t need to worry about China.” In this respect, comrade Munzer and the SCI are rapidly becoming the left tail of the Bolivarian regimes. Completely ignoring the rapid expansion of Chinese imperialism into Africa and Latin America, comrade Munzer and the SCI tell the minority and the masses that: “We don’t see much Chinese investment in Latin American and Africa. To say that there is a substantial amount of it is a lie. And if there is Chinese investment, it is American investment dressed in Chinese clothes!”

Don’t you see that the Bolivarian regimes and the SCI are both telling the masses the same thing: “China is not a threat, don’t worry about it. It is not China that exploits you, but MAINLY the Yankees.” The Bolivarians are saying this to deceive the masses, to better exploit them. As Chinese imperialism is penetrating Latin America and Africa, Chavez and company scream: “Fight the Yankees, build the Fifth International” while they try to fool the masses who are increasingly exploited also by Chinese imperialism. What the SCI is saying is similar (minus the Fifth International). There is no Chinese imperialism and Chinese presence in Latin America and Africa, the SCI tells us. And comrades Munzer and Shaheed announce that they refuse to say “Chinese imperialism out of Latin America and Africa!” Of course, unlike the Bolivarian regimes, the SCI is not consciously betraying the working class in order to grab a small piece of the profit from Chinese imperialism. But whether the SCI likes it or not, they are becoming the left appendix of the Bolivarians and the WSF – that is, unless they start recognizing the reality that is hitting them in the face.

The factions are evolving in opposite directions

The FLTI minority has written its analysis explaining the reasons for the rise of Chinese imperialism, and given it to the majority. So I will not repeat here the substance of the debate between the factions on China. Rather, in this document I will connect all the dots and show the picture of what is causing the SCI to slide toward centrism because of their fundamental error, that is, their failure to see the elephant in the room and the subjective method behind this failure.

The problem is that the SCI has lost any objective understanding of the objective reality, and it now resorts to subjective methods that are alien to Marxism. This is the case in regard to China, and it is spreading to all other areas of politics. During the July Congress the leaders of the SCI accused the minority of revising the program of Trotsky, Lenin and Marx. In other words, the minority was accused of being totally revisionist in regard to Marxism. The LOI (CI) reacted very strongly to how I characterized the majority reaction to the minority on China in the Congress. My answer is very simple. If the majority meant that the minority are total revisionists

of Marxism, they should have split from us. Why does the majority want to be in the same international with people who are revising Marx, Lenin and Trotsky? The minority would not stick around if they thought that the comrades meant what they said. If the majority did not mean what they said, then the only explanation is that the majority reacted subjectively because they were not able to answer the minority on China.

This subjectivity is reflected also in the majority's political arguments. For example, that the rise of a new imperialist power can only be accomplished through the development of the productive forces, and since this contradicts the basic theory of Lenin on imperialism (that in the imperialist epoch capitalism cannot develop the productive forces), the minority supposedly has revised Marxism. At the end of this document I give a full answer to this childish and subjective argument. Why childish and subjective? Because the economic expansion of a new imperialist power in the imperialist epoch of decay does not entail the development of the productive forces in a progressive way. I illustrate at the end of the document what it means as far as the rise of Chinese imperialism is concerned, and it is not pretty. But insisting that our describing the rise of a new imperialist power means that we are saying that capitalism is still progressive is not only very dogmatic and distortive but also very subjective and childish; because the minority is supposedly saying (in a revisionist way) that we are back in the 19th century when capitalism was developing the productive forces! Let's be serious, comrades.

The subjectivity of the majority's leaders was also illustrated at the Congress in their argument that what we are seeing is not Chinese imperialism, but Chinese banks and companies that are really Western imperialist banks and companies! So, according to the leaders of the majority, if Chinese companies dig coltan in Africa, the coltan is for the electronics companies in China that are really Japanese companies! The comrades at the Congress said this without producing any concrete proof. What is even worse is that the majority's leaders did not change their position after the minority produced a document that showed **in great detail** that Chinese banks and the SOEs in China are the main source for outgoing FDI, and they are clearly owned by the Chinese and not other imperialists. Yet the majority still insists that what we say is evidence of Chinese imperialism in Africa, Latin America, and Asia is really attributable to other imperialists in Chinese clothing (and again without any proof). This amounts to saying that all the basic business data reported by the financial press is lies. Why should they lie when they are reporting facts that their bourgeois masters want to be able to rely on in making their business decisions? And the business data from the capitalist press that Marx used to write *Capital*, was this also lies? The majority's position reflects an infantile and subjective attitude toward obvious information that only a subjective person chooses to ignore. In sum: At the Congress the arguments and evidence of the majority were non-Marxist (China is a puppet of imperialism) and dogmatic (no new imperialist power can emerge, the forces of production cannot develop, etc.). The subjectivism behind this position, as illustrated above, set the stage for the further subjective degeneration of the SCI after the Congress.

After the Congress, comrade Shaheed made it a habit to criticize the HWRS whenever he sensed the opportunity to do so. We have no objections to criticism, of course. But the problem with comrade Shaheed's criticisms was that they consistently rejected the Transitional Program and its method. After we wrote the flyer on Toyota, to be distributed **at the union meeting of workers to be laid off**, comrade Shaheed came up with a serious criticism of our flyer. He insisted that we include many more demands, thus transforming a flyer that should have been

agitational flyer calling for workers' control and for the plant's occupation into a purely propagandistic flyer **with the full maximum transitional program**. The only thing that was missing in comrade Shaheed's demands was the insurrection and its timing. The SCI backed comrade Shaheed 100 percent. We have to admit now that we made a mistake by agreeing to most of comrade Shaheed's and the SCI's amendments. So the flyer that was sent to Japan – to which we never received one word of response from the JRCL(RMF) – was pure propaganda.

After we realized that we had made a mistake, I sent a letter to the SCI saying:

“I think that our leaflet to the JRCL in regard to the Toyota solidarity campaign was a mistake the way it was written. It was a fine example of how to write **propaganda** with practically our maximum program, but it was a bad leaflet for **agitation** at the factory gates using the method of the transitional program. . . . We take responsibility for this mistake. However because of time pressure (we wanted to have the signature of the JRCL to the leaflet that we distributed at the Toyota union hall) I think that we gave in to the wrong suggestions from WIVL that we [should read were] backed up by SCI. Because of other wrong criticisms that we received from Shaheed, I think we will need to discuss at the congress how to use the transitional program as an **agitation** at the factory gates. This is critical for the advancement of the workers' struggles in the direction of smashing capitalism and imperialism.”

To date we have not received one word in response from comrade Shaheed or the SCI to this letter. This leads us to conclude that they don't have a problem with going to the factory gate with an agitational leaflet that includes the complete maximum transitional program, even though the auto workers are far from ready for it. In our view, comrade Shaheed's method is a rejection of the method of the transitional program, as well as a rejection of a living, dynamic, and dialectical approach to the class struggle the way it was defined by Trotsky. As Trotsky wrote:

“It is necessary to help the masses in the process of the daily struggle to find the bridge between present demand and the socialist program of the revolution. This bridge should include a system of *transitional demands*, stemming from today's conditions and from **today's consciousness of wide layers of the working class** and unalterably leading to one final conclusion: the conquest of power by the proletariat.

“Classical Social Democracy, functioning in an epoch of progressive capitalism, divided its program into two parts independent of each other: the *minimum program* which limited itself to reforms within the framework of bourgeois society, and the *maximum program* which promised substitution of socialism for capitalism in the indefinite future. Between the minimum and the maximum program no bridge existed. And indeed Social Democracy has no need of such a bridge, since the word *socialism* is used only for holiday speechifying.” (The Transitional Program, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1938/tp/tp-text.htm>, italics in original, bold added)

Comrade Shaheed clearly does not understand that the Transitional Program is intended as a bridge to the masses, and that one does not start at the far end of the bridge (the maximum program). In one criticism after another, he insisted that **we must call for a general strike in the entire United States!** Even at the height of the class struggle in the US in the 1930s, Trotsky and the SWP did not call for a general strike in the entire US. So why should we call for such a general strike today, when the level of class struggle in the US is quite low in comparison to the 1930s? We tried to explain to comrade Shaheed that this is an abstract and meaningless slogan (particularly for a group centered at one end of the continent), and that there has never been a general strike in the US, because the US is de facto many countries (states) with different cultures and traditions. But comrade Shaheed chose to remain in the abstract and lifeless dimension of the maximum program, and he never responded to what we wrote. Instead, he continued to insist on the call for a general strike in the entire US. **Meanwhile, the SCI in Argentina has remained completely silent on the dispute between comrade Shaheed and HWRS in regard to the call for a general strike in the US. Yet in Argentina, the LOI(CI) distributes many agitational leaflets that do not always call for a general strike, even in a country with a recent tradition of revolutionary upheavals.** This makes it seem to HWRS as though there is an unprincipled bloc between comrade Shaheed and the SCI in Argentina that started with China and has begun to spread to many other areas of politics.

Comrade Shaheed was not satisfied with his criticism. He had to keep on going, trying to prove that after all, it is HWRS that . . . does not understand the transitional program. So he criticized our call for a workers/labor party, saying that: “Your notion of a workers party is nationalist.”(!!!) (Sep. 24, 2009). According to the “expert” in the maximum program, HWRS is an opportunist group corrupted by nationalism. Yet, as we patiently tried to explain to comrade Shaheed, it was Trotsky and the SWP who developed the notion of the Labor Party. We don’t think that the conditions have changed significantly enough to stop raising the need for a workers/labor party in the US. Yet comrade Shaheed – who has no clue about the contradictions between the objective conditions and the subjective consciousness of the workers in the US – insists that we drop the demand for a Workers/Labor Party on the ground that it represents nationalism. But for us, it is a bridge (like in the transitional program) to a **political** struggle, linked to the mass upsurge in the factories and the workplaces, as the workers break from the imperialist Democratic Party in the course of the actual living struggle.

Millions of workers who are not ready yet for the socialist revolution are ready to fight for class independence. The only forces that stop them are the labor bureaucracy and the reformist left. This was clearly illustrated at the WERC conference, where Alan Benjamin and the Stalinists (Clarence Thomas) refused to call for a workers’ party (class independence), and instead they sent a letter to Obama begging for help. And yet we are not mechanical about the labor party like comrade Shaheed (yes or no to the Labor Party). We are not wedded to the slogan of the Labor Party. If the class struggle and the rise of the subjective factor within the working class (the revolutionary party) shows us that this slogan is outdated, we will stop raising it. Such is the difference between a dynamic dialectical approach to the class struggle, and the black and white method of the sectarian who rejects dialectics. And, as usual in disputes between HWRS and comrade Shaheed, the SCI in Argentina received all the communications between HWRS and comrade Shaheed, but it remained silent on this issue as well.

The explosion around SZ and the JRCL (RMF), and how comrade Shaheed and the SCI switched to the opportunist method

Before the explosion around SZ and the JRCL (RMF), we believed that the differences over China and so on could be worked out. We did not foresee the panic of the SCI. It was truly astonishing, if one considers what ostensibly led to it. It was a simple letter forwarding to the SCI some information that comrade Charles came across. Here is the letter:

“I ran into Steve Zeltzer who asked me if I knew anything about the JRCL ‘which our international is fusing with’ and its history. He said they are cult-like and that they supported the privatization of the railroads and that they accuse him of being with the CIA. I told him we were not fusing but were holding discussions. He implied that this is not a revolutionary current and that we did not know what we are getting into.

“Well what could I say. I have yet to see Kuroda’s writings, have seen next to nothing of the transitional method coming from their English material, don’t know if they did or did not support privatization of the railroads or not. Does anyone know how they responded to the railway privatization?” (Oct. 18, 2009)

What evolved within the next month was astonishing. I am not just talking about the slanders that came from the SCI against comrade Charles and later HWRS. I am talking about the entire political degeneration of the SCI, expressed in the more than 60 pages that we have received so far. In the entire 38 years that I have been in the Marxist movement I have not seen anything like this.

China still remained the invisible big elephant lurking behind it all. When we received the letters from comrade Rene and comrade Martin, the minority had submitted its 26 page document and it was in the process of translation. We had not yet heard anything meaningful from the SCI about China, other than their usual pathetic line that “we already answered all your arguments.” But that was not satisfactory even to comrade Shaheed, who wrote:

“[F]or us it is a massive problem that the majority position has not been published; we think that the HWRS, the CWG and JRCL are all incorrect in their analysis and make a concession to a bourgeois conception of China that has serious implications for the working class.”

So everybody was aware about the importance of China. I think that the irrational explosive response to CR’s letter about SZ corresponded directly with the inability of the majority to respond to the strong theoretical level of the minority in any shape or form. The SCI was stuck in the dogmatic position that a new imperialist power could not emerge, the forces of production cannot develop, and China is a ‘giant maquiladora.’ So because the SCI could not see the dramatic change in the objective world situation, and the implications of that change for the class struggle and the program of the revolutionary vanguard, they responded by changing course and switched to the subjective method of proving that China could go from a maquiladora to a workers’ state via the offensive of the FLTI. This took the SCI from the abstraction of the maximum program to an opportunist course toward the JRCL (RMF), which comrade Munzer and the SCI believe will be the bridge toward China – which they believe is already today in a . . .

. pre-revolutionary situation. Thus the FLTI and the revolutionary vanguard could lead the revolution in China in the coming period. Such is the zigzag of the SCI and comrade Shaheed on the road toward centrism. We can say that as a whole the SCI (which was following Shaheed) was doing a zigzag from the maximum program (the method of the ultra left) to opportunism (in particular in regard to the JRCL), which is typical of subjective centrists in retreat.

I want to explain that we are not criticizing the approach of the LTI toward the JRCL (RMF) before the July 2009 Congress, because it was not opportunistic (or at least not obviously opportunistic). The opportunistic approach clearly started after the July Congress, when the SCI started to panic because they had no understanding of the world situation and the nature of China. So they rushed to Japan with a program for China. In their delusional attempt to reach China and the rest of Asia **via the JRCL** (RMF) they “forgot” to criticize the JRCL (RMF)’s positions on China, and they failed to raise any serious criticism against the JRCL (RMF) while comrade Martin was in Japan.

The JRCL (RMF) is not a Trotskyist party, despite the fact that the SCI keeps on referring to it as the “Trotskyists” in Japan. From reading their positions, both in the letters that they have sent us and from whatever we can read on their website, the JRCL (RMF) is more pacifistic and reformist than the fake Trotskyists that the SCI ruthlessly criticizes daily. Incidentally, we would like to remind comrade Shaheed that it was not us who first said “our JRCL.” (Even we only used this expression at a time of confusion, as a shorthand way to distinguish the JRCL-RMF from the JRCL-NC.) Instead, it was comrade Martin who first used the word “our” in reference to the JRCL, when he defended the JRCL (RMF) against the so-called slanders against it (“so-called” because we don’t know who did what in the bloody fights between the two JRCLs):

“Therefore, as a second step of this international offensive, let’s take the initiative of propelling, with the leadership of the JRCL, through an official letter, a campaign for an International Moral Tribunal to accuse the snitches of the CPGB, that have launched a slander campaign against **our** comrades of the JRCL, saying they kill each other with no class moral nor principle.” (Sep. 3, 2009, bold added).

When comrade Martin was in Japan, where were the hard discussions with the JRCL (RMF) leaders about the major differences in principle that separate the JRCL (RMF) from the FLTI? We have read nothing about them in any of Martin’s reports; nothing about his making a hard criticism, directly to the face of the JRCL (RMF)’s leaders, about their pacifism – which Lenin called a betrayal of the working class. In Martin’s reports of his visit, there also is nothing about any pointed discussions with the JRCL (RMF) regarding their betrayal of Trotskyism and their refusal to defend the degenerated/deformed workers state as a matter of principle; nothing about any critical comments to the leaders of the JRCL (RMF) concerning their rejection of Trotsky’s transitional program, or their dangerous characterization of the current regime in Japan as “friendly neo-fascism,” and so on. Indeed, the keynote speaker from the JRCL (RMF) at the 49th Anti-War assembly did not raise a single revolutionary or transitional demand for the Japanese working class, and comrade Martin in his speech did not say a word about this omission.

This kind of opportunism was typical of centrists throughout history. Trotsky observed that groups like the German SAP always went to anti-war conferences without raising the harsh

Marxist critique of pacifism and disarmament. This is what he had to say about the SAP and company's participations in the anti-war assemblies before the Second World War:

“Our present situation is fundamentally different from that of the past. There is no war as yet. Ninety-nine percent of the reformists and centrists who are now harping on with the pacifist phrases (“against war,” “for disarmament”) will turn out on the side of their governments in the event of a new war. Today, in times of peace, a doubly strict revolutionary selection is necessary. The criteria for this selection are clarity in theory and a practice corresponding to theory. **Leaders, who *en route* to an “international” [anti-war] conference, forget to take along their “principles” (these are not cigarette cases or matches!)** do not give the slightest guarantees for revolutionary conduct in times of war. . . . The Bolsheviks have no reason for uniting with the centrist leaders (“*unity*” ... once every year and a half at a conference!). Hollow international parades are of no use to us. **Revolutionists do not flirt with centrists at conferences but carry on tireless day-to-day work against them in their own countries**, and they participate at their own revolutionary international conferences, where they do not blow soap bubbles but discuss and decide the questions of the class struggle.” (Leon Trotsky, *Centrist Alchemy Or Marxism?*, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1935/04/centrism.htm> , emphasis added.)

Yet, it is clear that the SCI has learned nothing from its errors, or from the questions raised by the minority on China, about reviewing the SCI's characterization of the JRCL as “centrist.” On Dec. 4, 2009, we received a copy of a new letter from the SCI to the JRCL (RMF). In this new opportunistic letter there is not one word of criticism of the JRCL. Even though the SCI agreed to ask the JRCL (RMF) to call for an International Moral Commission in regard to SZ's claims about the 1985 strike, there is nothing about it in the Dec. 4 letter. What we saw was a lot of huffing and puffing with abstract “revolutionary” slogans and a lot of opportunistic sycophancy toward the JRCL (RMF). This is the truth.

We can now see why the SCI reacted in such a panic when they received the accusation from SZ in regard to the strike of 1985. It is because they are afraid that there is potentially some truth to SZ's claims. That would totally destroy their opportunistic road to China through Japan and the JRCL(RMF). **This is why we saw an atomic bomb explosion from Argentina. It is because the SCI has entered into a rotten bloc with a pacifist tendency – which never defended China as a DWS – in order to get into China to make a socialist revolution!** It is a combination of total confusion about the world situation and the nature of China that has led the SCI down the road of opportunism in Japan. When SZ's episode potentially placed many land mines along the road to China, the SCI reacted with defensive dismay. But we Marxists must say **what is** to our centrist friends:

“Conduct yourself with the greatest attentiveness towards these groupings which actually tend towards us; lend a patient and attentive ear to their criticisms, to their doubts, to their hesitations; help their evolution towards Marxism; do not fear their

caprices, their threats, their ultimatums (the centrists are always capricious and susceptible); do not make any concession of principle to them.

“Yet once again: Do not fear to state that which is.” (Leon Trotsky, *Two Articles On Centrism*, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1934/02/centrism.htm>)

Is China in a Pre-Revolutionary Situation?

The minority said many times that China is a key for understanding the international situation. I think that on this we may have an agreement with the majority. But the SCI does not understand the role of Chinese imperialism, both externally and internally. The centrist and the subjective person regularly substitutes wishes for the objective reality. The SCI and comrade Shaheed have become specialists in subjective wishes and delusions. So what happened? A month or two ago they found out that Chinese workers killed the manager of one steel factory and prevented (for now) the privatization of that factory. According to their subjective method, this event – which took place in July, 5 months ago – has transformed the internal situation in China. Now, all of a sudden, China is in a pre-revolutionary situation.

This does not surprise us. After all, the SCI's opportunistic direction toward the JRCL (RMF) necessitates a subjective and unrealistic assessment of the class struggle in China. The SCI gave us a preview of what will come next when they wrote:

“And this is our honor commitment as revolutionary workers and we affirm that: we’ll not re-found our party by the hand of SZ and Obama’s servants, and neither Charles nor any petty bourgeois from imperialist countries will convince us. **They’re upset because Trotskyism is reaching China where the future of the world working class will be defined.**” (Nov. 11, 2009, underline in original letter, my bold)

Well, since all roads lead to China through the JRCL (RMF) we are not surprised that all of the sudden China is in a pre-revolutionary situation. This change has developed after SZ set powerful mines between Japan and China, that is, from the subjective delusional point of view of the SCI. Now with further opportunism toward the JRCL (RMF) the bridge between Japan and China (in a pre-revolutionary situation) is maintained! The SCI had a choice when it heard about the allegations in regard to the role of the JRCL (RMF) in the 1985 strike: They could investigate what really happened in the railroad strike of 1985 in Japan (or tell us what they already knew), or find a distraction to avoid objective inquiry. To resolve the dilemma, the opportunists (the SCI in Argentina) and the sectarian (comrade Shaheed) combined forces and imagination. Comrade Shaheed, who wants to see that the maximum program is applied right away, regardless of the objective conditions, was the first to declare that China is in pre-revolutionary situation, without conducting any serious analysis of the class struggle in China. (See comrade Dave-CWG's answers to comrade Shaheed and the SCI on China.) Well, from comrade Shaheed's point of view, if China is in a pre-revolutionary situation, then the full transitional program is on the agenda in struggles such as Tonghua. For comrade Munzer and the SCI, China being in a pre-revolutionary situation meant that the FLTI must get there at once. How? By deepening the opportunistic “offensive” toward the JRCL (RMF)!! That is why the SCI letter to the JRCL (RMF) of Dec. 4, 2009 was so lame. Politically, for lack of a better term to describe it, it was an

ass kissing (sycophantic) letter – to the point that comrade Akira Kato from the JRCL (RMF) responded immediately:

“We just received your message. This truly encourages us.” (Dec. 4, 2009)

Now, together with the “Internationalists” and “Trotskyists” in the JRCL (RMF) in Japan, the FLTI can march into China and lead the revolution that is waiting for them at the border! Who said that sectarians and opportunists cannot combine forces well. After all, they are on opposite sides of the same coin. Trotsky wrote that:

“The sectarian looks upon the life of society as a great school, with himself as a teacher there. In his opinion the working class should put aside its less important matters, and assemble in solid rank around his rostrum. Then the task would be solved.” (*Sectarianism, Centrism, and the Fourth International*, Oct. 22, 1935).

This roughly summarizes the subjective delusions of comrade Shaheed (who initiated the claim that China is in a pre-revolutionary situation) and the SCI about China.

So why is China not as of yet in a pre-revolutionary situation? Unlike China today, France *was* in a pre-revolutionary situation in 1935-36. Trotsky describes precisely what this meant:

“The June strikes have shown how much indignation and readiness for struggle have accumulated, under the deceptively passive exterior, in the proletarian masses of the towns and countryside during the years of crisis and reaction. They have disclosed the sympathy of the broad masses of the urban petty bourgeoisie and of the peasantry with the struggles of the workers. Finally, they have shown the extreme instability of whole regime, the lack of self-confidence of the ruling classes, their vacillations between Leon Blum and de la Rocque. These three conditions—the readiness for struggle of the *whole* of the proletariat, the acute dissatisfaction of the lower strata of the petty bourgeoisie, the confusion in the camp of finance capital—*provide the basic prerequisites for the proletarian revolution.*” (Leon Trotsky, *The New Revolutionary Upsurge and the Tasks of the Fourth International*, July 1936, Writing 35-36, page 332, italics in original)

Two of Trotsky’s requirements for a pre-revolutionary situation are clearly not present in China today. There is no doubt about the dissatisfaction of the Chinese proletariat and its willingness to fight. But it has no leadership, and it faces a brutal, repressive regime. So, while there are important strikes in China, they remain sporadic, and **they are not coordinated as a powerful proletarian movement that challenges the rule of capitalism**. As a result, finance capital or industrial capital are not in retreat in the face of pressure from “the *whole* of the proletariat.” The capitalist state in China **is not beginning to fall apart** because of the proletarian struggles – despite comrade Shaheed’s talk about a “split” within the bourgeoisie in China. What split? And if there is a significant split, it must be because there is a surge in the class struggle on the part of the *entire* working class; this is what Shaheed needs to prove in order to justify calling the situation pre-revolutionary. On this question the SCI and comrade Shaheed live in the **subjective** world of fantasy. And what is even worse, they rely on the so-

called “pre-revolutionary” situation to justify entering into deeper opportunistic relations with the JRCL (RMF).

A, from ABC of Dialectics

The situation finally led to a total rejection of the dialectic method by comrade Munzer and the SCI, particularly (as I will explain shortly) in regard to SZ and the Peace and Freedom Party (PFP). I am not talking about their rejection of ABC of dialectics. I am rather talking about the rejection of A from ABC of dialectic. In his letter of Nov. 13, 2009, comrade Munzer writes:

“Do not ask us objectivity in relation to our convictions. **We do not have it and we will not have it**, because we have political positions and we will defend them.” (my bold)

This was a shocking statement to us, because objectivity is the most important element of the dialectics and the most important thing for being a Marxist. Without dialectics – the engine of Marxism – there are no revolutionary politics. Thus, without objectivity there is no Marxism, and political positions are purely subjective and idealist. Objectivity was the starting point of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. All those who reject objectivity end up as opponents of Marxism and the dialectics, and we indeed know that the main problem in the centrist swamp is that it is filled with subjectivity and falsehood.

Do I need to prove that without objectivity there is no Marxist politics? It is too easy, but I’ll do it. For such an easy task, it is sufficient to use only Lenin. When Lenin summarized dialectics, he provided 15 elements of the dialectics. **And number 1**, the most critical element, is:

“1. the *objectivity* of consideration”

(Lenin, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1914/cons-logic/summary.htm>)

Lenin wrote a whole book, *MATERIALISM and EMPIRIO-CRITICISM*, in defense of objectivity and against subjective idealists. There he wrote:

“The sole conclusion to be drawn from the opinion of the Marxists that Marx’s theory is an objective truth is that by following the *path* of Marxist theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following *any other path* we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies.” (The Criterion of Practice in the Theory of Knowledge, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/mec/two6.htm>)

We are not surprised to find that comrade Munzer’s renunciation of objectivity where his “positions” are concerned leads only to pure subjectivism. Here is how Lenin described – in very unflattering terms – another person who shared comrade Munzer’s rejection of objectivity in favor of subjectivism:

“Bogdanov’s negative answer to the latter question is clear: if truth is *only* an ideological form, then there can be no truth independent of the subject, of humanity, for neither Bogdanov nor we know any other ideology but human ideology. And

Bogdanov's negative answer emerges still more clearly from the second half of his statement: if truth is a form of human experience, then there can be no truth independent of humanity; there can be no objective truth Bogdanov's denial of objective truth is agnosticism and subjectivism.

“For the first point of view, i.e., agnosticism, or, pushed a little further, subjective idealism, there can be no objective truth. **For the second point of view, i.e., materialism, the recognition of objective truth is essential.**” (Lenin, Does Objective Truth Exist?, my bold, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1908/mec/two4.htm>)

Applying Lenin's analysis, if comrade Munzer starts from his emotions and convictions, and not from objective truth – which is the most important element in materialism and the dialectic method – he is nothing more than a subjective idealist.

The SCI's Subjective Method in Practice

As we saw, subjectivism is the main force in the FLTI's leadership's slide toward centrism. The main problem in regard to their position on China is not simply their dogmatism, but the subjective method behind it. We, Marxists, always denounce the chauvinism from the oppressor countries, and we normally see the hatred of the masses toward US imperialism as a healthy component in their struggle against imperialism. But, without clear objectivity, comrades from the oppressed nations can transform this justified hatred into a misguided and very dangerous subjectivism. We fully support and understand the hatred toward American imperialism: it is the imperialist power that enslaved the masses for decades. But for a Marxist it remains a subjective hatred if it blinds the comrades to see the rise of a new imperialist power that rests on a very oppressed proletariat. In this sense, we can say that the comrades capitulate to what is emotional and backward in the masses' hatred toward American imperialism.

The Bolivarian regimes manipulate these elements well in order to subordinate the masses to the native bourgeoisie in Latin America and the new rising imperialist power, China. The masses in the oppressed nations and each of us share the solidarity for the masses in China who suffered throughout history a lot of pain from imperialism. But that should not blind us to see what their ruling class is doing, and for the possibility that the China can become an imperialist country. This inability to separate the solidarity toward the Chinese working class with an objective analysis of China's role in the world, and China's role in the comrades' backyard, is what keeps the SCI so subjective.

The SCI's subjectivity ties the oppressed masses in China to its ruling class. The SCI is not objective about the opposite interests of the Chinese bourgeoisie from that of the Chinese working class, and this blinds the SCI from seeing objectively what role Chinese Finance and its capitalists play in world capitalism. I showed how this subjectivism spread to other areas of politics (in some cases it was already there to begin with). So in the last analysis the differences on China are ultimately about the objectivity of Marxism versus the subjective idealist method of the SCI.

It is the same subjectivism that is responsible for the wrong characterization of the FLTI's majority of the state of Israel. We did not have a serious debate on the Zionist state last Congress, so I will summarize my observations here. The method of the FLTI's majority toward the Palestinian revolution is the subjective method of the ultra-leftist. Together with sweeping statements that the Zionist state has been fascist throughout its existence, FLTI's majority says that the Jewish working class majority is completely Fascist. They don't see contradictions and grey areas inside the Zionist bourgeoisie (they are all Fascists) and the Jewish working class (they are mostly Fascist). But this subjective childish black and white method is very dangerous in real life. It is not enough to make sweeping programmatic statements in regard to the Palestinian revolution and call for the Palestinian masses led by the proletariat to destroy the state of Israel. The Palestinian masses will be crushed (as it happened many times) without the support of the Jewish workers. So the Israeli army and the working class must be split and broken from Zionism to complete the Palestinian revolution. For this to happen we need to build a revolutionary party in Palestine that will build roots in both camps: The Palestinian working class and the Jewish working class. Without such a revolutionary party the Palestinian workers will be crushed again and again. But the subjective ultra-leftist once again is blinded by his/her hatred to the oppressor nation and he/her extends this hatred for the Zionist ruling class to the Jewish working class: they are mostly fascists after all. And without a clear objectivity there is no revolutionary theory and practice. Hence the black and white and incomplete program for the Middle East. By ignoring the importance and *objective* interests of the oppressor nation's working class the FLTI does not have a complete program and method for the victory of the proletarian revolution in the Middle East.

To sum it all up I say that without to capacity to be objective there is no capacity to really understand and implement the dialectical method. Without the dialectics one cannot understand the big shifts in world capitalism and their meanings. This cannot be done **without the objectivity of the dialectics**. Without the Marxist method there is no revolutionary theory. As Lenin once said, "without a revolutionary theory there is no revolutionary practice.

Objectivity and the matter of SZ and the PFP

The subjective factional needs of comrade Munzer, in defense of the opportunist approach to the JRCL (RMF), led the SCI and comrade Munzer to characterize SZ as a provocateur and a spokesman for American imperialism. And since comrade Munzer and the SCI needed to discredit SZ for maximum effect in the factional fight, they transformed the PFP (of which SZ is supposedly a big leader) into an imperialist party. But it is more accurate to say that the "imperialist" SZ and PFP developed as a fiction in the imagination of comrade Munzer to discredit the HWRS and defend "our" JRCL. The PFP as an **objective** phenomenon, with its contradictions that derive from its objective character in the American left, is totally ignored by our subjectivists. (As for SZ, HWRS considers him as a centrist with real contradictions.)

The level of serious political communication between the SCI and HWRS is exactly zero. It has been months since the SCI asked for our input in characterizing organizations in the American left. Although we have known the PFP for decades, apparently that means nothing to the SCI. Why does the FLTI need an American section if the SCI knows everything about the left in the US better than the American comrades do? Yet the SCI's knowledge of the PFP is dangerously wrong. They declared that the PFP was formed by the CP and the KGB! This is an

absurd joke. The PFP was formed by a number of people who were not in the CP or the KGB. The subjective comrade Munzer, who is driven by factional considerations, completely confuses the fact that today the PFP is dominated by the Stalinists in Los Angeles, with how it started in the 1960s.

Comrade Munzer and the SCI have the idealist/subjective method of the petty bourgeois that unfortunately is ruining the Trotskyist movement. For such people, life is always black and white. The contradictions are absolute and purely subjective. So what really happened? Since it was SZ who raised the accusation against the JRCL (RMF), the SCI had to find something really bad to which it could tie SZ. Motivated by purely subjective factional considerations, comrade Munzer found the PFP, and in order to make it fill this role, he had to transform it into an imperialist party. Thus, the PFP – which in reality is a complex phenomenon that has many grey contradictions and is neither black nor white – was transformed into a black “evil” that is primarily led by . . . SZ – who in reality plays a relatively minor role in the PFP.

As we explained to the SCI in a letter we sent on Nov. 22:

“SZ is not a leader of the Peace and Freedom Party (PFP). In the San Francisco Area, the PFP consists of a small group of activists (that’s why we don’t pay much attention to them). They are small and desperate to the point that anyone who shows up at their meetings becomes a Central Committee (CC) member. SZ does not announce himself in meetings as a leader or a member of the PFP. He just occasionally uses them for his own selfish and opportunistic reasons, such as using their name as the sponsor of a meeting when he thinks it will draw more people. SZ is a busy bee building dozens of projects simultaneously, and belonging to a dozen organizations or fronts. He does not care in particular about the PFP. That’s why he came into direct conflict with the PFP when it supported the mini popular front between the SF Labor Council and the Democrats. The fact that he is in the CC of the PFP meant nothing to him.”

If the SCI were a real revolutionary leadership with objectivity, they would pay at least **slight** attention to what the comrades in the field (who are thousands of miles from Argentina) know. But comrade Munzer and the SCI decided to ignore every single word in the letter quoted above.

Initially, when the SCI dropped the atomic bomb in regard to SZ and the JRCL (RMF), comrade Shaheed was cautious. He did not buy into the rubbish that SZ is imperialist or that there is an artificial separation between politics and morals. In a letter from November 9, 2009, comrade Shaheed wrote:

“We characterize SZ as a syndicalist; our relations (as WIVL) with him go back a few years. . . . Can we say that SZ is CIA- we have no evidence of this so we have to deal with him on his politics”

SZ’s politics have remained the same for decades. He has no idea that there is a fierce factional fight in the FLTI because the leadership calls him an imperialist politician. But comrade Shaheed have no problem to change his mind in regard to SZ in accordance with the SCI’s subjective factional needs For comrade Shaheed, because the SCI’s factional politics requires him to reject any exposure of the opportunist maneuver in Japan (which includes the

denial of objective inquiry of the 1985 strike), SZ is no longer a centrist and a syndicalist, he is now a bourgeois counterrevolutionary:

“SZ and his cohorts do everything to keep the masses away from real organization and a real fight against the system. He comes and creates a diversion for us away from the very questions he cannot ask, as it would expose his counter-revolutionary role. The morality of SZ is not proletarian morality- it is in this sense that we agree that the cdes R, M and Carlos Munzer have tried to protect the FLTI from any millimetre of influence of bourgeois influence within our ranks.”

Comrade Shaheed’s role somewhat resembles that of Shachtman (the centrist) in relationship to Burnham (the right wing). He pretends for a short period to be independent from comrade Munzer and the rest of the SCI; but not for very long. He has proven to be a “yes man” for the SCI in factionalizing on the question of China, and now on the dispute on SZ. In his last letter Comrade Shaheed goes even further by claiming that SZ is an enemy worse than the Democrats and the Republicans! We should remember that only few months ago SZ was a syndicalist and a centrist according to Comrade Shaheed.

Comrade Shaheed in this affair shows his complete bankruptcy as an objective thinker, and he has manifested that behind his “maximum program” there is an opportunist without principles who is only eager to cover up the ignorance and the black and white method of the SCI.

The Peace and Freedom Party: petit-bourgeois/reformist bloc or imperialist party of the bourgeoisie?

(Here is a link to the PFP’s platform as published on the Web:

<http://www.peaceandfreedom.org/home/about-us/platform/>)

The SCI claims that the PFP is a bourgeois imperialist party that supports imperialist interventions. The SCI claims the PFP does not have a socialist program because they do not call for expropriation of the bourgeoisie. Both of these claims are fallacious, and do not arm the working class with an understanding of the class dynamics of this organization – which we must do if we want to counter its role in the class struggle correctly and effectively.

A bourgeois imperialist party has a program that defends capitalist property relations; it both objectively (by its actions) and subjectively (by its beliefs) supports the imperialist war machine. **And most importantly, a bourgeois imperialist party also directly represents one or more wings of the bourgeoisie, which counts on such a party to do their dirty work.** The claim of the SCI that the PFP is a bourgeois-imperialist party falls flat on all these counts. The PFP does not have any connection to Wall Street or even the “left” wing of the liberal industrial bourgeoisie.

First let’s look at the claim of the SCI that the PFP does not call for expropriation of the bourgeoisie. Paragraph two of their platform reads:

“We support *social ownership and democratic management* of industry and natural resources. Under capitalism, the proceeds of labor go to the profits of the wealthy few. With socialism, production is planned to meet human needs.” (Emphasis added.)

If that is not clear about which class the PFP says should plan the economy, let's look at the next paragraph of their platform:

“To us, socialism is *workers' democracy*, including the principle that all officials are elected, recallable at any time, and none receives more than a worker's wage. Socialism can only be brought about when *we, the working class, unite and act as a body in our own interests*. Our goals *cannot be achieved by electoral means alone*. We participate in *mass organization and direct action* in neighborhoods, workplaces, unions and the armed forces everywhere.” (Emphasis added.)

Clearly the PFP does not incorporate all the lessons of *State and Revolution* into their program. But the program's language explicitly calls for social ownership and socialist planning, and for the planned economy to be administered by worker's democracy by the working class acting in its own interests. This means that the activists see themselves as members of the working class, not the bourgeoisie or even the petit bourgeoisie. How does the PFP plan to achieve this social ownership? On this, they are vague, but their program does state that it “cannot be achieved by electoral means alone,” and calls for participation in “mass organization and direct action.”

Later in their document, they expand on the concept of “mass organization,” calling for a “rank and file socialist-oriented labor movement to mobilize working-class people to assume ownership and control of the economy.” This phrase indicates that they may harbor the belief and give credence to the illusion that a mass “socialist-oriented labor movement” combined with a victory at the polls will lead to socialism. So we can argue that the PFP has a left social democratic program. The “left” content of the program is there because over the course of the PFP's history, the fake Trotskyists who have joined the PFP have inserted some transitional demands into its program. At the same time, this electoral bloc has a historic appeal to the radicalized layers of the black and oppressed communities, going back to when Dick Gregory, Eldridge Cleaver and later Leonard Peltier ran for President on the PFP ticket. Intentional ambiguity is the end result of this electoral bloc. The socialist platform gets watered down in the drive to appease the reformist base.

Is the PFP a supporter of, or the left leg of Imperialism?

Not that one's program is always an indication of one's role, but let's look at the PFP's program for a moment:

“*No U.S. intervention anywhere*. End all support and aid to repressive regimes and all military and police training aid everywhere. End efforts to destabilize foreign governments. End U.S.-directed economic warfare against other countries. *Abolish the CIA, NSA, AID* and other agencies for interference in other countries' internal affairs. *Withdraw all U.S. troops and weapons from all other countries*.” (Emphasis added.)

What other imperialist party in the USA or the entire world calls for the abolition of the CIA, NSA, and AID, and calls for the withdrawal of all U.S. troop and weapons from all countries in the world that it has military bases? The PFP calls for a total abandonment of the bases in all

other countries (some 130 at last count), which together with the brutal regimes in these countries, protect the investments of imperialism. So we ask the SCI: how can a party be an imperialist party if it has never held the power to administer imperialist affairs, and it calls for the total abandonment of all US overseas bases and an end to US political and economic intervention in other countries? It may be a petty bourgeois party, but it cannot be an imperialist party.

An imperialist party or a petit bourgeois-socialist bloc?

The SCI cannot prove their claim that the PFP is an imperialist party, because it is based on ignorance and subjective factionalism. If we abandon the vulgar subjectivism of the SCI, we can see the real dynamic and dialectical contradictions of the PFP.

In effect, the PFP is a political shell with a prize of 70,000 voters. It swings between the anti-corporate wing of the petit bourgeoisie and the reformist workers movement. At times, its candidates reflect the petit bourgeois base of progressive voters, and at other times the PFP runs candidates from reformist workers parties. In Northern California, the candidates are often activists who identify themselves as revolutionary socialists.

The socialist activists in the PFP's leadership lament the fact that they cannot control the membership, in other words, anyone can join and vote for the PFP, and anyone can run as a candidate in the PFP's primary elections. Thus, as a ballot party the PFP **leaves itself open to invasion by any organized petty bourgeois current which can mobilize enough votes to for its candidates in their primary.** The primary candidates for the PFP are historically chosen from reformists or centrist organizations, from class war prisoners, and from petit bourgeois activists. The PFP's primary battle in 2008 was a three-way contest among Ralph Nader; representatives of the Party for Socialist Liberation (a split from the Workers' World Party); and the Socialist party. Each of the three groupings eagerly signed up as many registrants as it could to vote in the party primary. Nader got the nomination because his anti-corporate consumerist movement has many supporters among the progressives, and it also gets the electoral support of the ISO.

The PFP is a contradictory bloc between petit-bourgeois reformists and self-styled socialists. This bloc is based on anti-Republicrat progressives, not on the working class and its organizations. It switches between petit bourgeois and reformist politics depending on who has taken control of the PFP at the time by winning an open primary. We can characterize the PFP in a lot of ways: reformists, incrementalists, Bernsteinites, a petit bourgeois play-pen for socialists and progressives, etc. But it is not an imperialist party.

The CP and the KGB did not start the PFP. The CP jumped on the PFP's bandwagon after it had started. The CP is strong in the PFP in Los Angeles, but the PFP's main activists in Northern California consist of different varieties of centrists (including Trotskyists) and reformists.

Overall the PFP is a complex phenomena. We consider the PFP to be a party which is an unprincipled bloc of petty bourgeois elements with reformist socialist elements. Which elements are in control change from decade to decade and sometimes from one year to another, and it depends on who wins the elections in the primaries. The PFP is a strange animal. It has a socialist program. But the program has very little to do with what its registered voters and

members do, which is typical, by the way, of most reformist parties. Most of them never read its program because the PFP is mostly an electoral front that is used by left groups to run their candidates. The “masses” of the PFP view it as a vehicle to cast their protest vote once every so many years, and as nothing more than that. In the “bad” years when it looks like the Democrats are going to lose in California they vote for the Democrats; in a “good” year when it is clear that the Democrats are going to win in California they feel safe to cast their protest vote for the PFP. What kind of a base is this? It is mostly a petty-bourgeois “progressive” base that consists mostly of white “progressive” liberals, but there are also plenty of workers who vote for the PFP. The PFP reflects the voters’ general lesser evil approach to electoral politics. Though registered members like idea of socialism, they view it as “idealistic” fantasy. But it is also the case that many voters are loyalists who are socialists who vote for the PFP on a regular basis.

The PFP is a frozen formation for the registered members until election day. In general there is only one reason to vote for it – to keep it on a ballot as a democratic right for the left organizations, since it is so difficult to get the massive signatures to qualify to run in an election. This is a basic democratic right that left organizations who want to use the PFP should have. But this is very different than a political critical support for a PFP which I believe is wrong because The PFP is not really based on the working class.

But here comes the contradictions that make the PFP a bloc between the socialist reformist left and the petty-bourgeois elements who from time to time kidnap the PFP. **The Left is the only living component within the daily life on the PFP.** The PFP is an arena for many factional battles in which the winners have the precious prize of running its candidates. Most times the candidates are leftists who could be reformists or centrists. I personally have a long history with PFP. In the 1980th the IWP(LIT) and Workers World Party (WWP) had bitter factional fights over who should control the PFP. One thing I can guarantee you: As we went door to door talking to thousands of PFP’s registerants, (to get their signatures and “win” them over to the IWP) very few knew what the left was fighting about, or what the program of the potential candidates was. As if it mattered anyway. Why do I say this? Well, both the IWP and the WWP watered down their program to be accepted by the “lesser evil” consciousness of the registerants of the PFP, hence the petty bourgeois character of the PFP in a bloc with reformism and centrism. The IWP used different rotten electoral combinations and blocs to this end. So we carried a big factional fight inside the IWP arguing against opportunist electoral blocs inside the PFP. We wrote that such politics violated everything that the Bolsheviks and Trotsky wrote about electoral politics (I still have the documents if anyone is interested). Trotsky wrote that electoral blocs between different left groups can only result in opportunistic compromises of their program (if they have one).

In the late 1980^s and the first half of the 1990^s things came down in the PFP. This was the time that some “Trotskyists”, in particular one named Tom Condit, pushed for the PFP’s current program with some transitional demands. This was very easy. Only a few people came to the meetings, and all were the usual suspects from the Left. There was not much opposition to the proposed program.

The PFP’s program is not a living program which creates contradictions and interesting dynamics inside the PFP. At the moment the program is a dead abstraction inside a static party. But it turned out that there was intense opposition to Nader’s nomination in Northern California,

and the South won only after a bitter factional fight against the North. Nader himself is not a bourgeois politician but rather a petty bourgeois politician. He calls for a very “left” “egalitarian” capitalism . He has no connection to Wall Street or even the liberal bourgeoisie. He has no connection to any sectors of the big bourgeoisie. In fact he is hated by the liberal bourgeoisie because they blame him for taking votes from the Democrats and allowing Bush to take power in 2000. After the election in 2008 Nader and his people left the PFP. They only used it as a temporary bus for their agenda. Even though Nader made millions of dollars, he canalizes most of the money back into his political campaigns.

As we saw the PFP has many shades of grey and many contradictions. It is a dynamic living body that switches between petty bourgeois politics and politicians to reformist politics and politicians, and to even to centrist politics and politicians. It is an empty bus that gets used by many dynamic forces. Most of them are hostile to revolutionary socialism. Yet it is not the vulgar picture of the SCI. The SCI in its pathetic rejection of the dialectics developed an “imperialist” PFP to cover up the opportunistic politics toward the JRCL (RMF). Indeed the “imperialist’s” PFP is only a subjective idea from the SCI because they thought that they could cleverly link the PFP to SZ and the HWRS. But as usual, because of the primitive black and white method they turned the PFP “clever” idea only against themselves.

How the SCI turns against the class war prisoner Leonard Peltier.

The HWRS asks the SCI and comrade Shaheed if they defend Leonard Peltier. Leonard Peltier has been in the USA federal prison for the last 26 years. He was framed up for allegedly killing two FBI agents at a shoot-out on the sovereign aboriginal land known as Wounded Knee South Dakota. Leonard has denied his role in killing the two agents and has proclaimed he will take the name of the person who killed the FBI agents to his death. For the last 26 years revolutionary workers have embraced him as a class war prisoner for defending the rights of Native American people to self-determination and for refusing to back down and turn on his comrades. But now that the SCI has designated SZ as an imperialist politician for being in the CC of the PFP, we have to look at the implications of this designation for Leonard Peltier because of his role as the presidential candidate of the PFP in 2004.

In 2004 Leonard Peltier ran for president in what the SCI categorizes as the imperialist butcher Peace and Freedom Party. So comrades, does the FLTI distance itself from this hero of the struggle for indigenous peoples’ right to self-determination? **Does the FLTI stop calling for the freedom of Leonard Peltier, who according to the FLTI, is now by association a class enemy and a imperialist butcher politician?** WILL THE SCI JOIN THE HWRS AND DEMAND THE FREEDOM OF LEONARD PELTIER? Or will the SCI still demand the freedom of an imperialist butcher if the SCI insists on its criteria for the PFP? This hero who fought imperialism stands accused by the SCI of being a tool of the very imperialism he is in prison for fighting. His very placement on the ballot was a spit in the eye of imperialism, not an act in its defense. Objectively that campaign raised the spirits of oppressed people. Did it give them the tools to become revolutionary Marxists? No, but it served as a reminder, in the first year of the Bush blood fest, that deep in the bowels of America’s prisons was a voice of the oppressed that would not surrender. The PFP gave Leonard a voice, a voice against imperialism. Yet with the subjective method of comrade Munzer and the SCI, Peltier should be denounced as

much as SZ. We challenge the SCI to denounce Peltier. And if you won't do this then at least honestly re-examine your subjectivity in regard to the PFP that only gets you into a deeper hole.

The SCI's Method of Falsification and Manipulation

We got used to the SCI's falsification of facts over the PFP and SZ. So we are not surprised that it now links HWRS to the PFP. **But the plain truth is that since we revived our group we had nothing to do with the PFP.** We have no formal contact with them, and we do not hold any discussions with them. Thus it is a pure falsification to write:

“that Charles and HWRS have been hiding to the entire FLTI the program and the character of the party which this alleged ‘independent cinematographer’ leads: a petit-bourgeois imperialist party, a left leg of the butcher’s Democratic party. . .” (SCI letter from November 11th 2009).

Again the SCI shows that it is not familiar with the basic facts of class composition and alignments. The SCI tells us that: “We propose that the million workers march is again put in place against the war and that the unions opposed to the Rengo unions of Japan call a rank and file congress to unite the US and Japanese working class.”(Ibid). The million workers march (rather strike) was partially organized by the ILWU and Local 10. The only problem is that Local 10 is linked to SZ and the Doro Chiba railroad union in Japan that is linked to JRCL (NC), a “minor” fact that the SCI decides to ignore. Thus, the subjectivists twist the facts to accommodate their opportunistic zigzags at the time, this time it is for a greater connection to the JRCL-RMF.

What really concerned us is that comrade Munzer is driven so much by his own convictions and exaggerations, that it has reached a point of a false reality. He writes in his letter of 13/11/2009 that:

“Without question, when Obama starts to lose his prestige in the left of the American workers movement, and is seen as a common chatter by the American working class, it is not enough with Alan Benjamin the class traitor to liquidate the million men march. Now –watch out FLTI!- the “left” imperialist bourgeois party Peace and Freedom, Chukaku and LIT –the Morenoites- have all of them concentrated in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Oakland and in all California to directly contain the local 10. In order to prevent the local 10 from organizing the million men march and fighting against Obama as what he really is: a continuity of Bush, executioner of the working class and the oppressed people in the world. **The tragedy of this discussion is that our comrades from HWRS are not seeing this concentration of counterrevolutionary forces and centralized action, whose main aim, to be able to settle down, is to destroy the FLTI under the LIT’s command, under the discipline of Nader, for whom LIT called to vote together with the Pabloites from Argentina of MAS.**”(my bold)

Not only that this is a fantastic inflation of the FLTI's strength, but to write that the PFP, Chukaku (meaning SZ), Alan Benjamin and the LIT are concentrated in California to . . . destroy the FLTI! I guess the HWRS as representative of the FLTI should accept this conspiracy by the

above individuals and organizations with pride! But to say that they are here to stop the massive class struggle! Alan Benjamin, the LIT, SZ and PFP have less than 30 people in the Bay Area. And outside Benjamin they have little influence in the union bureaucracy. They are too small to impact the class struggle here. So what about the real forces that stopped the mobilizations of the working class? **The powerful union bureaucracy and the reformists with real influence that so far crushed any attempts of serious class struggle?** Comrade Munzer is so engaged in his world of fantasy that he forgot to even mention them. But such is the subjective world of the SCI. Subjectivity, subjectivity and more subjectivity . . . to the point that they forget the real objective world and the real contradictions in the class struggle.

How the PFP, Jeff Mackler, Alan Benjamin, and the SCI join forces to protect imperialism from the amateur filmmaker SZ.

Comrades, there is one recent action by the PFP from which we can link this organization to imperialism. When the San Francisco Labor Council had a breakfast fund raiser for Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi the PFP rejected the call to picket this event. The PFP (through its leader Tom Lacy) acted along with Jeff Mackler (Socialist Action USEC), Alan Benjamin (Socialist Organizer) and the SCI (which jumped on board after the fact) , in refusing to expose the mini popular front of the San Francisco Labor Council with the Democratic Party. By refusing to support the picket lines against the unions' bureaucrats and the Democrats (after Mackler ordered them not to picket the event) the SCI, the Peace and Freedom Party, Socialist Action and the Lambertists objectively hide the true role of the trade union bureaucracy which supports the real imperialist candidates while posing itself against the war in its holiday messages to the working class.

This unholy alliance came together (the SCI joined *post facto*) to protect the betrayers of the working class in the San Francisco Labor Council (SFLC). So in this respect the PFP is no worse than the comrades of the SCI who (*post facto*) joined in hiding the truth about the trade union leaderships betrayals' of the working class. The SCI is siding with this rotten lot of reformists and renegade Trotskyists all because they want to denounce SZ for being a leader of their mis-categorized imperialist party: the very PFP the SCI climbed into bed with. It is essential that the SCI immediately reconsider its embrace of Jeff Mackler's role in this affair. We will expose those who opposed the picket line against the SFLC popular front with Nancy Pelosi. We would prefer if our comrades were not among those named for such a betrayal.

We explained to the SCI how serious this matter is. We explained that as long as the SCI sides with Mackler and Socialist Action in this mini-popular front with the Democratic Party it constitutes a principled and irreconcilable difference between the HWRS and the SCI. But the subjectivity of centrists always overrides the necessity of saying the truth to the workers when they are betrayed. In the letter from Nov. 24th the SCI defended this betrayal again because it claims that what is at stake here is the independence of the working class! And in this twisted subjective logic SZ, the "imperialist politician" is the one who proposed the pickets lines in front of the breakfast for the Democrats first. Thus the independence of the working class was broken by SZ, the "imperialist politician" said the SCI!! What is more important, the individual who propose the picket lines (SZ, the centrist-syndicalist, who is now an imperialist politician according to the SCI) or the picket lines of the working class? In reality the SCI is siding with the traitors of the working class (that includes the PFP), who stopped the mobilization of the

working class against the alliance of the Democratic Party and Union bureaucracy for the imperialist war!! **These traitors stopped the independence of the working class** by calling off the picket lines against the mini-popular front. What a wretched logic of the confused subjective centrists. And what is even worse is that the SCI would rather remain in this confused subjectivity even if the SCI ends up in a bloc with working class traitors!

On the Separation of Morality and Politics and Why the SCI has the Morality of the Petty Bourgeois

When the atomic bomb exploded within the FLTI, one of the reasons for the severity of the explosions, was that the SCI cried: SZ breached proletarian morality, therefore we cannot discuss any of the questions that he raised; it is up to an International Moral Commission to deal with him! One of the “moral” accusations against SZ by the SCI was that he claims that the JRCL (RMF) calls him a CIA agent. Well he provided the proof but it was not good enough for the SCI that insisted that only a moral commission can deal with it. Really? We thought that the establishment of the moral commission was ridiculous since we can just ask the JRCL (RMF) if SZ’s allegations are true. So that’s what we did and we received a letter from the JRCL (RMF) saying that yes they indeed believe that SZ is a CIA agent. So was it necessary to detonate a massive explosion over this, when it was possible just to write to the JRCL (RMF) and ask? The same applies to his allegations that the JRCL (RMF) betrayed the critical railroad strike in 1985. We are still waiting for a reply on this.

The discussion on the question if revolutionaries can separate proletarian morality from politics became explosive for good reasons. Behind it lies explosive principled differences. I will deal with the sources of the differences below. For now it is, suffice it to say, that here again the differences boil down to the differences between the vulgar, subjective method of the SCI and their tradition versus the Marxist dialectical method. For the Marxist there is no separation between different aspects of phenomena. They are always connected.

The moral and political aspects of Stalinism are deeply connected and can never be viewed separately. The Stalinists’ method of assassinations and slanders of political opponents are directly connected to the Stalinist politics of betrayals of the working class. To say otherwise is like saying that the electrons in an atom are separated from the protons and neutrons. If one looks at an atom in a microscope one sees electrons as if they are separated from the core of the atom. But that, of course, is a deception. In dialectics, Marxists call it the deception between form and content. The form looks separated from the real dialectical whole. So an atom without electrons cannot be an atom, that is, it cannot be whole. And the Stalinists’ methods of slanders and assassinations cannot be explained or dealt with without referring to the Stalinists’ counterrevolutionary politics.

We, of course, agree with the CWG that there is no separation between politics and morals as Trotsky wrote: "Problems of revolutionary morality are fused with problems of revolutionary strategy and tactics. The living experience of the movement under the clarification of theory provides the correct answer to these problems". (*Their Morals and Ours*, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1938/morals/morals.htm>).

The above was clearly illustrated in the sessions of the Dewey commission. Nobody in the commission acted as if there were any separation between the Stalinist politics and the Stalinist brutal “morality”. **Trotsky and all other participants in the sessions of the commission constantly connected the reasons to convene the Dewey commission, (to prove that Trotsky was innocent from the Stalinists slanders and accusations) with the Stalinist politics.** Anyone who reads the testimony in the Dewey commission can only be astonished that it can occur to a revolutionary that morality and politics are separate issues. Here we give few examples from session of the commission to illustrate the above:

Ninth Session

“GOLDMAN: After Hitler took power, what was your attitude towards the relationship between Hitler and the Soviet Union?

TROTSKY: I didn’t try to provoke a war. **But I showed in my writings how the Soviet bureaucracy in their hopes to remain in good relations with Hitler were absolutely wrong.** Then I wrote in the French press in 1933 or 1934 – I wrote a series of articles in the bourgeois press denouncing the genuine plans of Hitler. You know, Mr. Chairman, I had a very peculiar manner of serving my allies, Hitler and the Mikado.

GOLDMAN: You mean your alleged allies.

TROTSKY: Yes, my alleged allies. (*Laughter*)”

(<http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1937/dewey/session09.htm> , my bold)

So Trotsky clearly linked Stalin’s politics toward Hitler with the Stalinist slanders that Hitler and Mikado were Trotsky’s allies. And in the next segment of Trotsky testimony Trotsky makes the connection between proletariat morality and the Stalinist politics even *stronger*:

“GOLDMAN: Can you tell us briefly if there were any new questions that arose after your expulsion from the Party, upon which there were differences of opinion between the Left Opposition and the Stalinist majority?

TROTSKY: New events in the Party?

GOLDMAN: Between 1927 and 1933, were there any new questions that arose upon which there were differences between you and Stalin?

TROTSKY: Yes; there was the question of the Five-Year Plan, of collectivization and industrialization, and then the question also concerning the Right Wing. The Right-Wing question was an important question. During the Fourteenth Congress, Zinoviev accused Bukharin and Rykov of a right deviation. And Stalin took their defense. He proclaimed, “You call for the blood of Bukharin.” He cried: “Zinoviev, you want the blood of

Bukharin. We will not give you the blood of Bukharin.” Zinoviev answered: “It is not a question of blood, it is a question of a political tendency. We will condemn some ideas of Bukharin at this Congress and remain good friends.

GOLDMAN: Where is Bukharin?

TROTSKY: Bukharin is now awaiting the moment when Stalin will take his blood.”

(<http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1937/dewey/session09.htm>)

What can be more convincing? First Trotsky describes the differences with Stalin’s politics and then he tells the commission that Stalin will take Bukharin’s Blood: the “morality” of Stalinism!

The reason why there are principled differences between the SCI and the minority on the issue is because the separation between politics and morality was always used by the enemies of the working class to suppress and smash oppositions and to demoralize the revolutionary vanguard. Like with any other complex phenomenon we need to use the dialectics to understand it. But the black and white method of the SCI (morals white, versus politics, black) only throws mud on the issue.

First, all the capitalist states routinely separate politics and morality. When the capitalist state imprisons a working class fighter, political testimonies are not allowed in the capitalist court. The state frames up the working class fighter by applying the bourgeois criminal code, and in most cases political statements by the accused are either suppressed (in particular in a fascist or another oppressive regime), or the Judge cannot take them into consideration in the most “democratic” regimes.

It is similar with Stalinism. The Stalinist bureaucracy never seriously debated Trotsky on the politics that separated Stalinism from Trotskyism. The Stalinist method of “debates” were limited to assassinations and slanders. Does it mean that we accuse the SCI of being Stalinists? Of course not. For the Marxist and the dialectician, there are a lot of contradictory grey areas between the black and the white, as we see below.

For example, many fake Trotskyist groups also separate morals and politics and whenever there are differences within the group, the petty bourgeois leadership always brings moral charges against the opposition in order to suppress political discussions. We know that the Revolutionary Workers League (RWL) sends oppositionists to mental institutions. It is similar to what the Stalinists did in the Soviet Union. But the RWL’s treatment of the opposition is still not the same as their treatment by Stalinism. Again we need to see the shades of grey. The RWL does not have state power, nor does the RWL have even a small fraction of the Stalinists’ international influence. So the RWL cannot use the Stalinist brutality. Instead, they make their members feel guilty and “sick”, and they manipulate them into going into a mental institution. But such methods of dealing with the opposition within a working class by socialist group is intolerable. Such a treatment is in direct opposition to proletarian morality and should be condemned by the working class as much as the Stalinist methods.

The Healyites used a similar method to Stalinism in their attacks against internal and external opposition. They accused the SWP leaders of being double agents, CIA and GPU, in their so-called rubbish literature that they called "*Security and the Fourth International*". Anybody in the Healyite's Workers League (WL) who raised opposition to the WL's politics was accused of being a SWP agent, and the political discussion was over. It happened to me in WL as I explained in "Dialectics and Alienation":

"The great majority of left organizations, including the fake Trotskyist organizations, are structured as petty bourgeois organizations (many times with the some of the characteristics of a cult or a sect. This is the case particularly in the US and England) with a bourgeois emotional consciousness that is linked to non-dialectical petty bourgeois ideology or political positions. The terms I am using here are not insults or political attacks, but precise scientific definitions of the politics of these groups, and how their politics are connected to the group's structure. By "petty bourgeois," I mean groups in which what glues the individuals together is the herd mentality, the feelings of "I belong" that prohibit independent thinking. Such groups cast out any individual who expresses doubts about the group's politics. These groups do not use the dialectic, but many times they are controlled by the political whims of the leaders. Even though such groups do not use the dialectic, dialectics controls every moment of their flat existence.

"Let me explain what I mean. I have chosen the Healyites as a target. Yes, they are an easy target with some extreme features in comparison to other left groups. But they are an excellent group to illustrate the dialectics because they were the only fake Trotskyist international that made their version of the "dialectics" the center of everything. In the 1970s, Healy and company (ICFI) functioned like the Stalinists. The adherence to the herd within its English (SLL) and American groups (WL) was based on feelings of terror and fear. Any member who raised minor criticisms immediately became a "renegade" of Marxism and an enemy of Dialectics. The Healyites correctly quoted a thousand times a day the laws of dialectics; that is, they were "teaching" the members about the dialectics by using the "dialectics" to terrorize the members and create fear within the organization. Their method showed the extent to which bourgeois society masked as 'Trotskyists' controlled and ultimately destroyed thousands of subjective revolutionaries, all in the name of dialectics.

"I was in the WL, and in 1974 I started a struggle within the WL. I was young, only 24 years old, and not very experienced. One day, I told Mike Banda (Healy's second in command) that their positions on the Middle East were very wrong because instead of criticizing the Palestinian leaders (Arafat) and the Arab bourgeoisie (Sadat), the WL praised them. (I later wrote a document about this.) So what should one expect from the so-called masters of the dialectics (Banda and Cliff Slaughter)? The ABCs of dialectics demand, first of all, objectivity. They had to check whether my claims that their press wrote articles uncritically praising Arafat and Sadat were correct. In addition, if my criticism was factually correct, then the obligation of the

‘dialecticians’ was to explain to me, using the dialectical method, why I was supposedly wrong.

“Instead, their US group (WL) reverted to methods from the Stone Age and the Middle Ages. They never discussed the contradictions of their positions (on the Middle East) with dialectical Marxism. My criticisms were never discussed. Instead, I became the enemy. Everybody was supposed to be cold toward me; I was an outcast. Finally, they prepared a Congress (1976), which most of the International Healyite leadership attended. Part of it was devoted to terrorizing me. If there is no human dialogue to evaluate the contradictions of a group’s politics, then the contradictions (dialectics) dominates every move of the group. In a very negatively charged atmosphere, I had to present my criticism. Then, every member had to denounce me as a renegade and (sometimes) as a spy of the SWP (one of the main opponents of WL at the time). In this herd-like controlled group, the topics on the table were not even mentioned. People stood there denouncing me with their hands shaking from fear. Why? Because if they used one or two “wrong” sentences in their denunciations, Banda, Slaughter or North would have come to the podium and denounced these comrades as renegades who failed to understand, yes, the dialectic.”

http://www.humanistsforrevolutionarysocialism.org/CurrentArticles/Dialectics_and_Alienation_pg2.htm)

As horrible as the Healyites were they were still not as bad as the Stalinists or even the RWL. Why? They didn’t kill anybody or send comrades to mental institutions. They “just” terrorized opposition comrades and then usually expelled them. Here again we need to study the specific shades of grey and the particular historical conditions and the specific nature of the group before we cry: Stalinism. While Stalinism is the general model for separating morals and politics since it uses brutal method to suppress oppositions, not all groups are doing it the Stalinist way, so a dialectician needs to see the relationship between the particular to the general in the historical context as Trotsky observed:

“The fundamental flaw of vulgar thought lies in the fact that it wishes to content itself with motionless imprints of a reality which consists of eternal motion. Dialectical thinking gives to concepts, by means of closer approximations, corrections, concretization, a richness of content and flexibility; I would even say “a succulence” which to a certain extent brings them closer to living phenomena. Not capitalism in general, but a given capitalism at a given stage of development. Not a workers’ state in general, but a given workers’ state in a backward country in an imperialist encirclement, etc.” (The ABC of Materialist Dialectics, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1939/12/abc.htm>)

So yes, we said that the SCI has learnt the separation of morality and politics from Morenoism. And yes, the IWP (LIT) slandered us to the point that any political discussion was impossible. It is a typical way by which the leadership of the majority in the IWP tries to isolate the minority from the rank-and-file majority, and it is common in rotten centrist groups. But that

does not mean that we are saying that the SCI is using the separation between politics and morality the same way that it was used against us in the IWP (LIT) (Once again the shades of grey comrades!). Yet by calling comrade Charles a Stalinist and by saying that comrade Dov is using a Stalinist method (LO-CI), the SCI and the National Committee of LO (CI) managed to drop a bomb and distract us from political discussions on China. And by saying that SZ's claim in regard to the 1985 strike in Japan is a moral accusation against the JRCL (RMF); and by claiming that SZ is an imperialist politician, the SCI created a subjective atmosphere and the SCI made it difficult to objectively investigate what really happened in the 1985 strike.

I am not saying that the SCI use the exact same methods that Moreno and company used in the 1980's. I do not even know if the Morenoites in the 1980's had a policy in which moral accusation could never be put in a political context and always had to be separated. What I am saying is that the SCI has created wild accusations and vast exaggerations around the SZ and the JRCL (RMF) issues because it insisted that the JRCL (RMF)'s conduct in the 1985 strike cannot be discussed openly and calmly within the FLTI. This is happening because the SCI has an opportunist approach toward the JRCL (RMF) and the SCI does not want to complicate its opportunistic approach by dealing with the 1985 strike. It is typical of a petty bourgeois leadership who scream "morality" when it is trying to stop a political discussion. And that is why I think that the morality of the SCI is the morality of the frightened petty bourgeoisie. It is not a proletariat morality. **The proletariat morality is to seek the truth, never to hide what you really mean and to say what is.** Seeking the objective truth of what happened in 1985 in Japan (the defeat of the strike was a huge setback for the Japanese working class) will only help the Japanese working class to understand better who betrayed them and who is telling the truth. The truth and the accountability of each organization to the working class will strengthen the working class and could be used as lessons and tools on the road of building a revolutionary party in Japan. The morality of the petty bourgeois (the morality of the SCI) that separates morality from politics ultimately plays hide and seek with the workers and comrades in the FLTI.

Once Again On Slanders

I hope we can all agree what is a slander and what is a political characterization. So for example, comrade Rene writes that: "He (Charles) has no right to morally corrupt our organization with the amalgams of the moral accusation with the political discussions, copying the worst methods of Stalinism from the Moscow trials, where the accused ones had no right at all to defend themselves, they were condemned beforehand. We can't allow this!" And comrade Martin adds that: "in the FLTI, we are not going to allow Charles and SZ to impose their justice of Kings, their divine justice, their Stalinist justice. . . . This is what Stalinism did in the Moscow trials." And then LOI (CI) National Committee writes that "The same did Lambert with Varga, the Lorism with Bacherer in Bolivia, or the PO (Workers Party N.del. T) with all its dissident left wings. It was just the opposite. They all had the method that Dov proposes: raising moral accusations to discredit the opponent leaders, as Stalinism did against Trotskyism in the USSR."

So if the English translation is correct, these quotes can only mean that comrade Charles is a Stalinist and comrade Dov uses Stalinist methods. I am not saying that these are slanders. These could be just political characterizations. But by calling comrade Charles a Stalinist and saying that comrade Dov uses Stalinist methods means that that HWRS has a Stalinist agent in the leadership. And that the other leader uses Stalinist methods (potential assassinations, lies,

deliberate maneuvering to destroy the FLTI). In other words comrade Dov is also a Stalinist agent, or comrade Dov is so degenerate that he uses Stalinist methods. Taking all this to its logical conclusion comrades Charles and Dov should be expelled from the FLTI, or at least the comrades that accuse comrades Charles and Dov should call for a moral commission against them.

The healthier alternative is for the comrades (Rene and Martin) and LOI (CI)'s National Committee to withdraw the accusations. If they refuse, and also if they do not propose a moral commission against comrades Charles and Dov (because, if these are political characterizations, Stalinists agents should not be tolerated within the FLTI's leadership), **the only alternative left is to interpret the above accusations as slanders.** And believe me to figure all this out, we do not need the dialectics, formal logic is sufficient for such a task.

There were many false statements made by the SCI, comrade Munzer and the LOI (CI) against the HWRS. I will not waste my time answering them. But one thing I do want to point out. I read in the LOI (CI) national committee resolution that the HWRS is only a study group. This is completely false. We stopped being a study group a long time ago. For the size of our group relative to the size of LOI (CI) we do at least as much interventions in the class struggle. We sent many letters and documents to the SCI about this. So I must ask: does the SCI translate our reports into Spanish and circulate them among the members of LOI (CI)? If the answer is positive, I guess the National Committee's members of LOI (CI) don't read our reports.

In Conclusion

I tried to show the connection between the different topics in dispute in the factional fight. The leadership of the FLTI's majority is incapable of correctly interpreting critical events in the world such as the rise of Chinese imperialism. I showed that the narrow frozen view of the SCI had developed due to fundamental inability to understand the dialectics. Hence, the lifeless view of the rapidly changing world within the subjective mind of yesterday. The subjectivity of the SCI and its failure to be objective is reflected in every single difference between the factions. The allegations by SZ about the JRCL (RMF) and the 1985 railroad strike created a panic within the SCI which reacted **with extreme subjectivity**. The SCI behaved like a petty bourgeois faction that is a reflection of an alien petty bourgeois class within the SCI. First the SCI used a petty bourgeois morality that separates politics and proletarian morals to stop serious inquiry into the past politics of our "allies", the pacifist anti-Trotskyist JRCL (RMF). The SCI and comrade Shaheed created subjective illusions, that is, anti-Marxist and anti-dialectical illusions, that by being lame and kissing the ass of the JRCL (RMF), we can create a massive split within the JRCL (RMF) and cross the bridges to the "pre-revolutionary China". I showed exactly what Trotsky said about it and I manifested that this is a reflection of a petty bourgeois leadership that takes us onto an opportunist road to Japan.

I further showed that the SCI once again, reflecting the subjectivity of the petty bourgeoisie, started to create fantastic stories about the "imperialist PFP and SZ" that have nothing to do even remotely with reality in the US and in California. Neither the SCI nor comrade Munzer asked us about what is going on in the class struggle in California and what (if any) role the PFP plays in the class struggle. This is the reflection of the arrogance of the petty bourgeois who relies on subjective stories and gossip that he/she makes up instead of rich communications with her/his

comrades who know firsthand what is the situation in the class struggle and what role different organizations play in those struggles.

The result of all this was that the SCI ended up in a counterrevolutionary and a reactionary bloc with Benjamin, the PFP, Socialist Action (Usec) and different variety of reformists who refuse to set up a picket line against the mini-popular front of the unions' bureaucrats with the real imperialist party—the Democratic Party. Such is the fate of the petty bourgeois faction that stubbornly and arrogantly refuses to listen to its proletarian comrades in the US. In the last analysis this is a factional fight between the proletariat section of the FLTI's IEC, the minority, and the petty bourgeois section of the FLTI's IEC, the majority.

It is the heavy alien class pressure that the SCI at the moment cannot resist. If it continues with its narrow subjective approach to big world events, its subjectivity will be deepened in regard to many other questions. As the minority has warned: the FLTI will become the extreme left wing of the WSF and the Bolivarian regimes. And unless the SCI starts looking seriously into the errors in its method, the present politics of the SCI will take the FLTI into the centrist swamp.

Dov

(CR helped in writing on the PFP, the unholy bloc with Socialist Action, and Leonard Peltier)

The CWG and HWRS agree with the general line of this document

PS: What is written below I wrote at the heat of the discussion on China in the middle of the Congress in July (I cut out few parts of it and make some English corrections). It has not been released before. It answers the majority argument that China can become an imperialist country only by developing the productive forces, and that this is what minority is really saying. This argument was brought up by the majority again recently. So I feel that the letter below is still a good answer to the majority on this question and should be part of my contribution to the pre-Congress discussion.

Dear Comrades,

By claiming that China is an imperialist country, the majority claims that the logic of our position is that capitalism is still progressive and it is still capable to develop the productive forces. In other words, we are revising the basic line of Trotsky and Lenin on capitalism in the imperialist epoch.

Neither Lenin nor Trotsky ever said that no new imperialist country can emerge in the imperialist epoch. Nor did Lenin or Trotsky say that that a new imperialist country, if it emerged from a state of being a relatively independent semi-colony, must develop the productive forces and therefore make capitalism "progressive."

First we need to clarify what do we mean that in the imperialist epoch capitalism cannot develop the productive forces. I hope that you do not mean that capitalism cannot develop technology. It is obviously not true. The factories today are not the same factories

(technologically speaking) that existed before first world war. Today many of the new factories are run by sophisticated computers. In 1914, capitalist technology could not send a person to the moon, and it took 40 years for the technology to develop before this took place. Before the epoch of imperialism there was no TV, computers and internet. Does their existence today prove that capitalism can develop the productive forces in the imperialist epoch? The answer is negative. The TV, for example, is not used in capitalism for the education of the workers and for the enhancement of humanity, but for the exact opposite reasons. It is used by the ruling class to dull the mind of the workers and cripple their ability to think and engage in the class struggle. This is true for the rest of the media of news and "entertainment" despite the fact that technologically they are much more developed than they used to be in the past. And in general the advancement in technology in the imperialist epoch only increases killing (better war machines, the atomic bomb that did not exist before the imperialist epoch), oppression and exploitation. For example, faster and more efficient "productive" machines in the factories means more mass unemployment, and overproductions that caused eventually wars and the destructions of the productive forces. In sum: Technology in the imperialist epoch is characterized by intense drive for profit as the rate of profit continues to decline, hence the workers, the great majority of human beings and the well being of the planet are expendable. Therefore, we see mass death from injury and health problems (cancer for example was not a big health threat in the 19th century) as technology "advanced." And lastly technological advancement in the period of imperialist decay leads only to environmental disasters. And unless this is corrected soon by socialism and international planned economy greedy capitalism/imperialism, despite the advancement in technology, is likely to destroy the entire planet, since it does not care to develop technology for the well being of the masses or the planet, but only for one reason: profit. Without the socialist revolution this will cause the destruction of civilization via the advanced military means of the imperialist countries, or disasters from climate changes.

Any development of a new imperialist country will only contribute to the destruction not the advancement of the productive forces and the well being of the working class and humanity. China is not an exception. Since the development of capitalism in China, China has become one of the great releasers of greenhouse gases that cause climate change that can endanger civilization. And since its drive to become an imperialist country in the 21st Century, China is replacing the US as the Number 1 polluter. Along the yellow river, tens of thousands of factories have erupted in the last 15 years, and the yellow river has become truly yellow, polluted to the point that the water that flows in it has been transformed into deadly poison. Hundreds of thousands if not millions of workers who work in these factories died from cancer and other causes. One area (I forgot the name, but I can get it if demanded) is being deserted, because the majority of the workers died from cancers. This is what behind the drive of China to become an imperialist country, **which is the only way it can be done in the imperialist epoch of fast and terrible decay**, and I don't see anything progressive about it. And yes, we should not forget that Chinese workers suffer from one of the worst conditions for workers in the planet, regardless if they work for Western or Chinese companies. Many of them live in places that only can be characterized as cages not homes. What is progressive about this? Of course, this is only the manifestation of life under imperialism in its last stage of decay.

Comrades, you are not trying to seriously tell us, that Chinese export of capital overseas along with the attempts to develop the Chinese sphere of influence manifest the "progressiveness" of Chinese imperialism. In Chad China delivered mass weapons (including

soldiers and workers) to inflame the genocidal war so that China can control the area and plunder the oil there. What is progressive about this? In Congo they build mines for their electronics factories in China and like the rest of the imperialists they muddle in the country affairs. The results: The intensification of the civil wars over the mines that kill millions and created huge areas with refugees. And in Iran the Chinese, who of course interested in the oil there, have a special connection and influence on the reactionary regime, a regime that as we know just killed hundreds and is torturing (many time to death) the protests' prisoners. Should we go on with the list?

Since we live in an era of dramatic increase of imperialist decay on the international scale, a new imperialist country can only function as the rest of the imperialist countries: increase the rate of exploitation and oppression wherever it sets its footprints. **In the current imperialist epoch of crisis China cannot become an imperialist country by progressing the standard of living of the Chinese workers and masses in China and the rest of the world. Quite the opposite, it is driving the masses into living hellish conditions. This is so, because in the current state of imperialist decay, this is the only way that a country can become an imperialist country and try to compete with the rest of the imperialist gangs.** It is easier for a person to jump to the moon, than it is for a new imperialist country to build its "empire" by elevating the well being of the masses in the current unstoppable decay of the international imperialist epoch.