

assessment of policy and tactics do not serve this totally central objective, that assessment is either worthless or harmful.

People who are to be organized for struggle are not simply robots. They are real people existing in a real world and in a precise framework of class relations. They do not automatically respond to a magic wand of left-sounding phrases.

We must always keep in mind, again an elementary but hard fact of political life, that neither we nor anybody else can invent, produce, export or import, dictate by long distance or short distance, or bring about by abstract or artificial means, a socialist revolution or a revolution of national liberation. Revolutions are not "command performances."

Like strikes of workers and struggles for equality, all such movements arise from the native soil of contradictions and unsolved problems of each country. This fact does not in any way minimize the initiating, inspiring and organizing role of leadership, but rather gives the people and the movement a relationship to leadership. That leadership which would ignore the specific reality of the people seeking an answer to problems, would not last very long. Only that leadership which is closely tied to the people in a specific struggle can help make that struggle victorious.

Leaders of Marxist parties whose peoples have been victorious either over capitalism or over imperialism should not now be unmindful that their victory was possible only because of the actual unfolding of policies and tactics which reflected and were called for by a very specific set of circumstances. The working class and the people of each country are no different; they are also a product of their own experiences and their own traditions. They react to class problems and struggles based on their own conditions and understanding. In view of this fact, general exhortations with Left and revolutionary phrases can only serve to confuse and mislead some of the more advanced people.

Let us consider the question of policy as an instrument of leadership for people in motion and in struggle. Let us see what our policy would be if we were to accept the line now put forth by the dogmatists.

With such a policy, we would give up all united front relations in the peace movement. We would be denouncing as "bourgeois

pacifists" the Quakers, the Student Peace Union, Women Strike for Peace, SANE, Turn Toward Peace, the Non-Violent War Resisters, and literally hundreds of other local peace organizations. We would even denounce the World Peace Council and the Accra Assembly on "World Without the Bomb" for creating "illusions about disarmament." We would charge the United Auto Workers, District 65 in New York, and others within the labor movement, with blatant hypocrisy.

Why would we do all this? Because even though they do not oppose the policies of U.S. imperialism, they participated in the struggle to prevent an invasion of Cuba; they call for an end to nuclear tests and the outlawing of nuclear war; they oppose war over Berlin and call for recognition of China and the establishment of normal trade relations; they call for the full acceptance of China in the United Nations, and they are for total disarmament. But, dogmatists say, they do not "openly attack U.S. imperialism as the gendarme of world reaction." Therefore, if we would not denounce them we would not be giving full support to that phrase in the 81-party statement which states that U.S. imperialism is such a "gendarme."

Were we to follow the line of the dogmatists, we would have to denounce all disarmament talk as "building illusions." We would snarl into the face of the people who are now getting excited in happy anticipation of a nuclear test ban agreement. We would condemn these talks as "appeasement," as relying on the "false promises of imperialism."

We would give up our anti-monopoly line of struggle because this is "not attacking the capitalist system as a whole."

The dogmatists would have us give up our struggle against the danger of the ultra-Right and concentrate all our fire on the Kennedy Administration thereby giving the ultra-Right free rein. They would have us say that the ultra-Right is now in power and that "Kennedy is a worse fascist than Hitler."

They would insist that we forget about supporting the Negro liberation movements and struggles for equal rights and follow the policies of self-defeating adventurism and sectarianism.

If we were to accept their advice we would cut off all of our relations with trade union leaders despite the millions of workers