

# On Social Democracy in the U. S.

## A CP Sub-Committee Report

IN MOST of our Party's material there is repeated emphasis on the decline of Social-Democracy and the victory of the Communists in the world labor movement. There is much truth in this. But we would be making a very serious mistake if we were to underestimate the influence of Social-Democracy, or reformism in general, or neglected to consider how it particularly expresses itself in the United States.

It is true that the Communists make up not only the sole or leading Party in the lands of Socialism, but also major parties or significant mass parties in countries like France and Italy in Europe, Indonesia and India in Asia, and even in such countries of Latin America as Brazil.

Yet it is also true that the Social-Democratic parties are the main parties of the working class in countries like Britain, West Germany, Holland, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, and Australia, where they also dominate the trade-union movement; while in countries like Italy and France, where the trade unions are split, these parties are strong, though different in character in some

countries, as for example the Saragat group and the Nenni Socialists in Italy. The Social-Democratic Party is also a mass party and the main party of the working class in Japan, and there are reformist parties in a whole number of countries in Asia and in Africa. In the United States, while we have no mass Social-Democratic party, nevertheless reformism does dominate our growing labor movement.

It is clear, therefore, that Social-Democracy, nearly four decades after the Russian Revolution and the formation of the Communist Parties, remains a force not to be ignored in the capitalist world. It did not disintegrate, it did not disappear, although changes of all kinds undoubtedly took place, and are continuing to take place. Here too, in regard to these changes, dogmatism and doctrinairism will not help. We must study what is new and concrete in the situation. We have seen in a number of countries, in given specific circumstances, the merger of Social-Democratic Parties with Communist Parties, as in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, Hungary. We know the specific role

of the Nenni Socialists in Italy, which is not entirely the same as the Social-Democratic Party in other countries. In some respects this is also true of the united party of socialists in Japan — following the merger of the two socialist parties. We know of the differentiation in the British Labor Party, the role of the forces led by Bevan, the role of such leaders as Cole. *In fact, under the new conditions and the new situation, new possibilities exist now for new relations and the question becomes very important for us to establish where we and Social-Democrats agree and where we disagree and what the possibilities are with regard to united action, with regard to cooperation of all kinds, and with regard to a united party of Socialism.*

#### NEED FOR NEW APPROACH

Most of us are agreed that we need a new approach to the question of Social-Democracy, but we may not all agree on what this approach should be. There is the tendency which maintains that there is nothing new, so that some comrades constantly repeat the old formulas about Social-Democracy, its character and its role. This is, of course, a tendency which will not be very difficult to defeat. Life itself is already doing that, and we find from our experience that we can cope with that.

On the other hand, there has de-

veloped a position—we are not sure how widespread—that there are already practically no differences between us and Social-Democracy. This tendency falls into two categories. Some say that this is so because of the new world situation and new relations of forces and the new concept which we have developed in regard to the peaceful transition to Socialism, etc. There are also others who take the position that not only are there no differences of any consequence, but that there never should have been a split in the first place. We refer now not to the split in any particular country, but in general, on a world scale. We will deal with this a little later, but this is not the most difficult question which we shall be compelled to deal with, for it is not difficult to prove it wrong.

We think the most important question will be the following: There will be comrades who agree that there is something new, that we need a new approach, but it will be limited in practice in these comrades' thinking merely to the need for more skillful methods of exposing Social-Democracy; that just as we are now using less sectarian methods in general, we should also have a less sectarian approach to this question. *But this limiting of the problem to one of better tactics is not merely inadequate, but fails to see what is new in the situation, and is absolutely wrong.* It will not lead us to the kind of approach which is necessary. We must see that

even though there are obviously differences between us and Social-Democracy, these differences have a history, and they will remain with us for some time. There have been many new things, new possibilities, that have a direct and immediate bearing on all our work, not only in the daily tasks, not only in regard to the basic aims we place before ourselves in the building of an anti-monopoly coalition, but also in relation to our socialist objectives, and the perspective for a United Marxist Party in our country. Those who continue to repeat the old phrases of "labor lieutenants of imperialism," who always speak of the Meanys and Reuthers along with the Charles E. Wilsons, Dulleses, etc. are not only following narrow, sectarian, self-defeating tactics, but are in fact theoretically and politically wrong. And since this line is put forward and defended in the name of Marxism-Leninism, let us listen to these words from "*Left-Wing Communism—An Infantile Disorder*":

The petty-bourgeois Democrats (including the Mensheviks), invariably vacillate between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between bourgeois democracy and the Soviet system, between reformism and revolutionariness, between love of the workers and fear of the proletarian dictatorship. The proper tactics for the Communists to adopt is to *utilize* these vacillations and not to ignore them; and utilizing them calls for concessions to those elements which are turning towards the proletariat . . . while simultaneously fighting

those who turn toward the bourgeoisie.

Obviously the above was also written in a specific and concrete situation and should not be viewed as dogma or doctrine. The only reason it is brought forth is to show that the one-sided view of one aspect of Lenin's characterization of Social-Democracy, namely "labor lieutenants of imperialism," at one time in a given situation, which is held by some comrades even today, was never correct. It was not a Leninist position. Simply to keep repeating "labor lieutenants of imperialism" and to attack everybody and make them the main enemy is wrong and alienates us from the masses.

#### DIFFERENCES WITH SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

We turn now to another question: Do we and the Social-Democrats stand on the same platform? Politically, ideologically? Here we do not refer to the Nenni Socialists, or to a Cole, or in our country, people like Muste. Nor do we refer to people around the *Monthly Review* and similar groups with whom we have much in agreement. It is important to have a correct approach to what is generally called reformism, that is, Social-Democracy as it is today practiced through its main organizations and leaderships particularly in countries like Britain, West Germany, France and those who occupy the same position in the political spectrum in our country. We know that

Social-Democracy or reformism, the reformist trend in the labor movement, matured in the era of imperialism and in the first place essentially reflects the rise of a labor aristocracy, the privileged section of the working class in certain privileged nations. It continues to this day, and challenges scientific socialism as put forward by Marx and Engels; it is certainly hostile to Marxism and it has been further developed in the era of imperialism.

Today, taking the official position of these organizations, we certainly have many differences with them. Not unimportant is the different view on dialectical materialism. The more we study today the history of the Chinese party, the more we can see in our own country that we will never develop fully our own independent approach to Socialism, our own independent approach to problems of our working class until we master more thoroughly the philosophy of our movement—dialectical materialism.

One of the reasons many of us, leaders and rank-and-file comrades, find it hard to keep their bearings today is because they feel everything is lost. Now it is true there are many new things and we shouldn't be afraid to face them. But there are certain things which are basic, certain approaches to society, a certain approach to the whole concept of the development of the world, of humanity and of how knowledge develops. The history of the Chinese Communist Party shows that masses

can master these and not only a few, not only a small group of intellectuals. This is true, if it is brought down to earth on the basis of experience which these masses can grasp.

But these Social-Democratic parties do not stand on historical and dialectical materialism. Eclecticism is the common denominator of their philosophy and includes many different philosophies and religious approaches, empiricism probably being predominant. We know for example that the concept of class struggle, which used to be elementary, is no longer accepted everywhere, even formally. And in one form or another class collaboration is the dominant approach. We know that there are differences with regard to internationalism, the colonial question, the national question in general, the agrarian question, on imperialist war, the role of the working class and the concept of allies of the working class, not to talk of their challenge to our conception—where they still formally profess belief in Socialism—that Socialism is not simply a series of capitalist reforms but a radical reorganization of society. The difference is not solely upon how we are going to arrive at Socialism. And on this question, in my opinion we very often fail to fully and convincingly win over our comrades to the new conceptions which we have tried to develop over the years and which the world movement has now accepted, because we confused very often our position

with the parliamentary road the Social Democrats talked about and which has as yet nowhere led to the establishment of Socialism.

In our conception of the peaceful and constitutional road to Socialism, the transformation of parliament into a real people's parliament is necessary. We view this as occurring on the basis of the struggle of the working class and its allies, which creates the conditions to make such a majority possible, which creates the climate where other classes can be affected, won over, or neutralized. We see the possibilities of containing or restraining violence on the part of the bourgeoisie—which will never like the situation—through the strong movements which will bring into being the conditions for this peaceful transition and which will enforce it by strength, by its vigilance, by its fight for this goal. All this shows that while we have much in common with Social Democracy, and this must be emphasized, many fundamental differences remain.

#### THE SPLIT DURING WORLD WAR I

Now, as regards those who believe the split following the First World War was a mistake. The history of Social Democracy immediately preceding and during the first World War, proves that the Second International was destroyed, not by the Communists or anybody else, but by the policy it pursued and which was proven utterly bankrupt. The Octo-

ber Revolution and the attitude towards the revolution which was developing in Central Europe at that time further sharpened the crisis in Social Democracy and exposed its policies. When we examine those questions we see that what we have today which creates the new world relationship, the new concepts, the possibility of peaceful transition and the fact that wars are no longer inevitable, would have been impossible had there not been this struggle against reformism, this birth of the Communist movement and parties and the carrying forward of this struggle along the lines that developed during and immediately preceding the first World War and the revolutions.

In saying this we do not want to say that no mistakes were made in premature splits. We think that in the United States hindsight shows that many mistakes were made. Undoubtedly the Left should have been more patient in winning over the masses. Nor can we deny the Leftist reactions after the split and the Leftist programs which were developed which further isolated us from the masses and which made impossible any collaboration with those from whom we split away. These mistakes have to be recognized. But they can only be recognized after you recognize first of all that the split on a world scale arose on the basis of material conditions that had been developing—the rise of imperialism, the struggles that preceded the war, the first world war itself,

the October Revolution, the new policies needed for the new situation,—policies resisted by the reformists. Of course it is true that the policy that was pursued at that time by the Communists on a world scale was based on a post-war perspective which included the probable development of a revolution at least in Europe, immediately following the Russian Revolution. And had there been a revolution in Europe at that time obviously its effect would have been enormous on the rest of the world. And then, of course, many questions which we examine now would have had a different aspect.

#### THE POST-WAR ERA

From 1921, however, Lenin already raised the cry against sectarianism and also laid central emphasis on the united front tactic. In the subsequent period it was clear that the Communists were trying to rectify the situation, to meet the problem created by the breach in the working class, particularly since the revolution outside of Russia was subsiding. The united front tactic didn't arise just out of nowhere. However, that tactic too, particularly after the death of Lenin, was not fully developed, was not developed boldly or consistently, was not broadly pursued, was dealt with in a sectarian manner, on a world scale. We do not have any doubt as to the character of the mistake that was made in classifying Social Democracy as social fascism; this hindered the

struggle against fascism. Certainly after it became clear that partial stabilization had set in and the revolution was not developing further, there was an underestimation of the reformist influence among the masses. In saying this, some may feel we are trying to absolve the role of the Social Democratic leaders. But that's not the point we are dealing with here. We're dealing with *our* policy, with *our* mistakes, treating *them* as an objective fact, although in some respects our mistakes played a role also in determining to what extent the Social Democrats were able to hold on to the masses and hence also limiting the pressure of the masses upon them, which would have resulted in a different policy.

#### WHAT IS REALLY NEW?

Now as to the third tendency: those who recognize something new in our approach to Social Democracy, but see only a new tactical approach, and fail to see something radically new. Relevant is a portion from the Khrushchev report to the XXth Congress:

Life has put on the agenda many questions which not only demand rapprochement and cooperation between all workers' parties but also create real possibilities for this cooperation. The most important of these questions is that of preventing a new war. If the working class comes out as a united organized force and acts with firm resolution, there will be no war.

All this places an historic responsi-

bility upon all leaders of the labor movement. The interests of the struggle for peace make it imperative to find points of contact and on these grounds to lay the foundations for cooperation, sweeping aside mutual recriminations. Here cooperation with those circles of the socialist movement whose views on the forms of transition to Socialism differ from ours is also possible and essential. Among them are not a few people who are honestly mistaken on this question, but this is no obstacle to cooperation. Today many Social-Democrats stand for active struggle against the war danger and militarism, for rapprochement with the socialist countries, for unity of the labor movement. We sincerely greet these Social-Democrats and are willing to do everything necessary to join our efforts in the struggle for the noble cause of upholding peace and the interests of the working people.

And the following from the speech of Suslov:

No one will deny that the split in the international labor movement, at a time when the energies of the peoples should be united to combat the war danger, is doubly intolerable. The movement is faced with problems of overshadowing importance, and on these we can find common ground with the Social-Democrats. It should be possible, therefore, to establish working contact, closer relations and cooperation on these problems. Such a possibility stems, above all, from the fact that in the present situation, the paramount issues confronting the labor movement are defense of peace, national freedom and democracy.

Here we see not only a departure

from the old conception of stand-patism on this question, or merely dealing with the question of greater skill in fighting Social Democracy. It is something new to speak of "rapprochement and cooperation" between all workers' parties. They are being called workers' parties, whose views on Socialism and politics differ from ours; notice that reference is made to Social Democrats who stand for active struggle against the war danger, militarism, etc.

*While we have to develop the most thorough and friendly discussion on all questions, including differences on ideological questions, between us and the Social Democrats, trying to find a basis of agreement where and with whom we can, and to continue and develop good relations with those, it is on the basis of issues confronting our people that we must try to develop unity, unity of action of all kinds. And in doing that, life itself will contribute much to the dissolving of many of the past differences which we cannot resolve simply by discussion. In other words, it is not that we say we have no ideological differences (although on some questions they have narrowed). The new is first of all that we see that the paramount thing is the fight for peace and the fight for democracy and the fight on other immediate questions which is a life-and-death matter, on which we can find common ground. And also that even where we disagree, we disagree in a different way. We look upon them as workers' organiza-*

*tions as such, including the elected leaders, and not through the so-called united front from below. We deal with these organizations fraternally and not as enemies. We strive for their cooperation, not liquidation.*

### THE SITUATION TODAY

Clearly, we have no mass Social-Democratic Party in the United States today. As a matter of fact, as we know, at one time there was a much greater Socialist movement in the United States, not only through our own party, but in the old Socialist Party. Its high point was probably around 1912. The reason for the decline of the Marxist movement, so that there is a dilution of socialist consciousness among the American working class taken as a whole, was due to many factors. Undoubtedly, the most important one was the objective factor, the new role of American imperialism following the end of the first World War, and its constantly increasing role on a world scale—something to which we have not always given full attention and which is at the bottom of many of our errors.

The second factor is a subjective one, first in the way the split took place and in the mistakes of our own party. This has been over many years; we do not refer to the present alone. For example, one of these is the 1932 elections. After we had led many important struggles against wage cuts and unemployment, for unemployment insurance, for Negro

rights, and so on, even then the Socialist Party's vote was about ten times ours in 1932. In other words, if we really want to trace the matter, we will find many mistakes that we made, of all kinds, not only in the last ten years, with regard to how to combine the fight for immediate issues with the fight for Socialism. And to a certain extent we are trying to deal with that question in our Draft Resolution. But be that as it may, as we know, at the present time, there is no mass Social-Democratic Party or Socialist Party, although we have to give much more attention to the existing Socialist groups whose influence in the labor and people's movement cannot be measured solely by the numerical strength of these organizations or their current activities.

We have a trade-union movement which is different from other countries, in that the majority of its leaders support capitalism openly, although a number of some of the very important unions are people who have a Social-Democratic background, like Dubinsky, Reuther, Rieve, and others.

Obviously, therefore, the problem does not present itself to us in the same forms as in Britain, or in Germany, or in other countries where mass Social-Democratic Parties exist. In some cases, Communist Parties of a mass character exist side by side, in some cases the Communist Parties are much smaller, as in Western Germany and in the Scandinavian countries.



## DIFFERING APPROACHES

Over the years we had a different approach to this problem. At one time we concluded that because there is no mass Socialist Party in the United States, therefore the problem is not a very important one for us, and in fact both in theory and in practice we were adhering to the idea of a "skipping over" stage—that the American workers would skip over the influence of reformism. When we spoke of organizing the unorganized, we spoke of the misleaders of labor as being bankrupt, that they would never do anything. The whole concept was that we would organize the unorganized under our own leadership, and the Trade Union Unity League was transformed from the Trade Union Educational League with that concept in mind. Of course, we said we would still work in the AFL, but we never had any feeling that the AFL would grow again, but rather that the growth would be from the new unions. When in fact some of the outstanding leaders of the AFL unions did form the CIO and launched a successful campaign to organize the unorganized, we did not analyze the significance fully and draw all conclusions from it. Perhaps the emphasis on Left-center unity tended to prevent us from freeing ourselves completely from the "skipping over" theory. This coincided with a certain estimate of American capitalism; because, after all, if we think that capitalism is

collapsing, then the illusion in capitalism will collapse, and reformism has no basis any more.

Or take the Labor Party question. Wasn't it our conception that we would organize the kind of Farmer-Labor Party that would skip over the reformist stage? Of course. If you study the period in the early twenties and study our Labor Party slogans, you will see how we split with everybody, including La Follette in 1924. Later on when we stopped using this as a slogan of action, we said that now the main thing is to organize the unorganized, and when we do, we will create the basis for a Labor Party. But the conception of the "skipping over" method of organizing the unorganized was carried over into the conception of organizing a Labor Party. What kind of a Party was it to be? It would not be Communist in the sense of having a complete Communist program, but neither would it be anti-Communist. And the whole conception was that we would skip over the reformist stage. Can we say that our support in launching the Progressive Party in 1948 was not also influenced by this skipping-over theory? Or our policy towards the Negro Liberation movement? Or the thinking of many on trade union unity?

We cannot free ourselves completely from sectarianism unless we understand that and have a different attitude to the reformists. Where and when we did recognize that there was something wrong with that

position, and that there is such a thing as Social-Democracy, some went to another extreme, labelling everybody Social-Democrat irrespective of any facts. So that Beck is a Social-Democrat, Reuther is a Social-Democrat, Lewis is a Social-Democrat, and so are Dubinsky, and Murray, and everybody else.

### THREE CURRENTS

To a certain extent, three currents have merged and operate jointly on the American scene in the labor movement and the people's movement. The three currents are the "legitimate" currents that grew out of the conditions in the country—*bourgeois reformism, labor reformism, and social reformism*. By bourgeois reformism we have in mind people like Lehman, Humphrey, etc. By the labor reformists we mean the majority of the trade-union leaders. By social-reformists we have in mind loosely those who have a socialist background or a socialist affiliation. *And the whole of them put together, operating through ADA, through COPE, and through many other organizations, are performing the function in this country under specific conditions which is performed by the organized Social-Democrats in others.*

The specific development of reformism in America dictates also a specific approach to this question. But the point to be specially noted is the inevitability of a certain stage which cannot be skipped over and of which we must not be afraid.

To speak programmatically, *at this particular moment*, most Socialist Parties today are not so far apart in their ideology from the reformists of the United States, despite their different origins in the past. Take, for example, Britain today. In Britain there are groupings in the Labor Party. But the dominant leadership of the British Labor Party, whose ideology was never really Marxist, has an outlook today that is based on the concept of a mixed economy—part private enterprise, part nationalized. This is well established and documented in a book by one of the leaders of the British Labor Party, Williams, whose theory runs like this: He wants to have the kind of Socialism which is democratic. Experience, he says, shows that it is impossible to have democracy with a one-party system. But we also know, he says, that parties are a reflection of classes and therefore if you want to have more than one party, you have to maintain more than one class. How can you do that? Well, you can only do it in one way, by maintaining part of the capitalist class side by side with Socialism, which to him is in reality nationalization of certain industries. In this way you will assure two classes, two parties, and democracy.

In West Germany, where to my knowledge there is no immediate program among the Social Democrats that calls for any kind of Socialism, when the American bourgeoisie views the elections of 1957 and the possibility that Adenauer

may be defeated by the Social-Democrats, the main fear is in the orientation of foreign policy. Nobody dreams that there is going to be Socialism, because their official policy today is one of co-responsibility. Workers should help to determine policy and wages in factories, etc. In the Scandinavian countries, where Social Democrats have been in office for a quarter of a century, the thing common to all of them is the "welfare state," a certain amount of nationalization, but certainly not Socialism. We know the French party is in office today, and that in Algeria they are trying to save imperialism, but nobody even accuses them of doing anything to introduce Socialism.

In fact, reformism in the United States has this much in common with reformism in these other countries: the welfare state, certain elements of state capitalism, and in some countries nationalization, something which has not yet arisen in this country in any serious form. But this also cannot be ruled out under certain conditions. Of course, this official policy is being challenged to one degree or another, as in Britain and in other countries. The ideal of Socialism remains among the millions and in the first place among the worker members of the Social-Democratic parties. Of course, the Nenni socialists have a different conception. There are other policies in other countries with which unfortunately we are not fully familiar; these require very careful study.

## ON OUR PARTY

We do not propose to go into the basic problem of the future of our Party, its program, its structure etc. except to say that our Party is now, and always will be, a Party based on scientific socialism, Marxism, Marxism-Leninism, as we interpret it. And not only that—Marxism not merely as we *apply* it to conditions in the United States, but as we *develop* it on the basis of the concrete conditions in the United States. This does not mean merely to pay lip service to the peculiarities and then forget about them because there may be some danger that they may lead to some *exceptional* conclusions. There was a tendency in our Party that while we paid lip service to the peculiarities, we seemed to get frightened by every difference. We have to approach this question a little differently now. Already on a world scale there are new concepts with regard to the inevitability of war, peaceful transition, etc. We ourselves are beginning to develop our own thinking with regard to economic questions, civil liberties, etc. Undoubtedly, as we go on trying to study and understand better our own situation, there will be mistakes, there will be dangers. But there is an equal, perhaps a greater danger, in not boldly and courageously facing up to the new situation and new tasks. Whatever we do at the Convention, we are certain to emerge as a Marxist organization. Our country, the people, the working class of

the United States need such a Marxist organization. And when there is developed in the United States a broader, united socialist organization, it will also be a Marxist organization. It is not a reformist, Social-Democratic organization that we have in mind when we speak of the eventual emergence of such a broader Marxist party.

There is some confusion because some comrades, and some people outside our Party, mix up the need for a labor-peoples coalition with the new united Marxist party. We will have to be careful on that, too, because a lack of clarity on this question can lead to a Leftist-sectarian position on a people's coalition and an opportunist position on the united Marxist party. It is clear that the struggle for both movements will develop simultaneously. They will generally support each other objectively in what they do or don't do. But they are distinct movements, with distinct objectives which we have to keep in mind and clarify for our own Party and for those with whom we want to collaborate.

Now the reformist movement in the United States and in the other countries will not stand still. It is possible there will be among them significant forces moving to the Left. It is to be expected that many forces will move in the direction of an anti-monopoly coalition program and nationalization. It is even conceivable that side by side with this movement there may grow socialist currents in the reformist movement. This is not

excluded, particularly when we bear in mind the new impact of Socialism on a world scale and that given a number of years of peace the socialist countries will really be able to show what they can accomplish, especially now with democratization taking place and with the new conditions and new possibilities developing. The experience of the rise of the Nenni Socialists in Italy cannot be looked upon as some freak development, something incapable of happening in other countries under certain conditions. Of course, let us bear in mind that this took place also with a very strong Communist Party which knew how to win over the masses. There is a big lesson for us in this.

Togliatti more and more deals with the possibility, in fact what he accepts almost as a certainty for Italy, that Italy will come to Socialism through a Socialist party side by side with the Communist Party and perhaps other democratic parties. It is not accidental that at the present time when there is talk of the merger between the two socialist parties in Italy, there is no talk of merging the Socialist Party with the Communist Party. This, of course, does not mean opposition to such a merger in principle. But it does show the probability of a number of workers' parties existing side by side and cooperating, and that the Communist Party, no matter under what name, is a Marxist party in every sense of the word.

Now the Chinese comrades, for example, are speaking more and more about the existence of differences within the Party, and declaring that it is with such different points of view that a line is to be hammered out. But that is not identical with differences in ideological systems. This diversity is possible only on the basis of adherence to a common basic ideology.

The kind of party we want to have in the future—a Marxist party—is the kind of party which we should try to bring into being now at our coming convention. It is wrong to say that if we are going to have a mass party we must be willing to abandon the principles of Marxism, but that while we have our own party, we should fight for Marxism. That would be ridiculous. It is possible to make certain concessions here and there to people who are not yet fully clear, especially if this may be necessary to achieve a broader Marxist Party. But what we strive for is a Marxist party based on a common ideology and on the recognition that reformism and Marxism are not identical in ideology. We have to be clear on that. A new approach, new possibilities towards immediate struggle as well as bringing many ultimately to closer collaboration or even to organic unity, does not mean that we abandon these differences or that we leave out the probability that here too there would develop, side by side, different parties of the working class as the American workers ad-

vance more and more towards Socialism.

#### ON THE AMERICAN WAY

With regard to new roads to Socialism, we know that we will have to find the American road and it is impossible to predict everything today. We already did project, however, the need and the possibility of developing the anti-monopoly coalition as the next strategic task and we see this as one of the important steps in the direction towards that goal which we Marxists have. This is not something which will develop the same in all countries. In Great Britain, for example, it is quite possible that the Labor Party may come to power under new conditions, that the British working class will be able to carry forward in the direction of establishing Socialism, not in the same way as was done in October 1917, but still accomplishing a radical transformation of society. Now there too it is possible that it may take the form first of a partial development towards a certain anti-monopoly program. But under any conditions, given the British Labor Party, its strength, its power, its influence, the experience of the British working class, it will not be identical with the perspective as we see it for ourselves today. So when we in our Resolution projected the anti-monopoly coalition as a strategic task, this was already a major contribution as to the American road to Socialism.

It is necessary to be clear that by projecting such an approach we do not conceive that somehow at a certain point there will be this qualitative change and we'll have Socialism. Socialism still represents, no matter how it will be achieved, a radical transformation of society, a leap. We know that it is the working class that will be the leading force in this transformation; it will not be handed to us by the imperialists, who will say, "Well, we had enough already and let somebody else take over." We know that the struggles of the people, of the working class will precede, create the conditions for the peaceful constitutional path to Socialism. And the peoples' struggle will support the legal, constitutional steps in that direction.

Some say that the example of Socialism in other lands changes our conception that the masses will not arrive spontaneously at the necessity of Socialism, that this gives a new aspect to the question of spontaneity. We do not deny the inspiration the socialist countries are already having in large parts of the world, and will have, too, for the most advanced capitalist countries—given a certain amount of time and peace where they can show what they can really achieve. This will have a tremendous impact and will help determine when the masses will feel they do not want to live any longer under the old conditions. This histor-

ical moment will not arise on the basis of the masses feeling they are impoverished. There will be a whole complex of economic and political factors, including the need for peace and democracy and the intensification of all the social tensions that are building up in the country, and the example of Socialism in other lands, etc. But Socialism will still come about because of objective necessity, and not because people will decide: "Capitalism is pretty good, but can't we try something else?" It wouldn't come like that. We do not abandon the concept that Socialism will come when the objective conditions show the masses they must move to the next historic stage of development because they can no longer live under the old conditions. But we must place a new interpretation on this on the basis of the new realities and the new situation. In all this the impact of the socialist world will be a tremendous factor.

The emancipation of the working class is still the job of the working class of each country. And socialist consciousness will not develop spontaneously. Socialism in other lands will help, make it easier, but to develop consciousness is the job of the Marxists of our country. That is among the chief reasons why the American working class will continue to build—and better than ever before—its Marxist party.