

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

DEVOTED TO THE THEORY OF MARXISM

VOLUME 2 No. 10

MARCH, 1937

Contents

New Strike Struggles and the C.I.O.

More Moscow Trials

Spain: Three Bourgeois Armies

Trotskyist Fourth International

Published by
REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE OF THE U. S.
2159 W. Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

10 cents a copy



\$1.00 a year

An Open Letter to members of the Socialist Party

Once again the Socialist Party is facing the crucial question of its own fate, how to stave off the disintegration eating out its vitals. The Party is torn with internal strife and factionalism resulting from the inner contradictions of its various tendencies and the general disintegration of the labor movement on an international scale.

Since the Cleveland convention, the Socialist Party has consistently moved to the right. The unprincipled bloc formed at the convention against the New York Old Guard was torn asunder right after the convention, particularly with the entry of the Trotskyites, who, in their anxiety to remain loyal and disciplined members of the Socialist Party, attempted to picture the bloc in left phrases, as a step toward "revolutionizing" the Party.

The Trotskyites, to justify the liquidation of their independent party, shouted at the top of their lungs that the SP is becoming Marxist. Behind this treacherous screen, the SP stifled the remnants of the leftward movement created in the party by the German and Austrian defeats.

The movement to the right can best be characterized by

- 1 - the reformist line of the election campaign.
- 2 - the opportunist alliance with the Farmer-Labor Parties in Minneapolis and Wisconsin.
- 3 - support of the People's Front government in Spain.
- 4 - support of Caballero and the Socialist Party in Spain.
- 5 - utilization of the Moscow Trials for an attack on the proletarian dictatorship.
- 6 - unequivocal support of the CIO and Lewis in the auto and steel sellouts.
- 7 - a shameful and unprincipled bloc with the Stalinists in the W A A.
- 8 - a policy of open class-collaboration in the trade union and unemployed fields.
- 9 - a policy of friendly collaboration with the remnants of the Old Guard on the last convention basis -- "We want our Old Guard".

What are the main tendencies in the SP today? The ALTMAN group is definitely orientated towards Stalinism and liquidation into the Labor Party. The bloc with the OLD GUARD (HOAN, etc) will no doubt be consummated at the next convention. Around this group are a great variety of reformists and pacifists. With the HOAN - ALTMAN combination in power, all vestiges and pretenses of left phrases will disappear and an open drive toward the right and the Labor Party will take place. This line the Stalinists will support fully.

On the other hand, the TROTSKYITES represent a purely negative anti-Stalin tendency. They are a centrist force striving to unite other centrist elements against Stalinism and for the reform of the SP. At present, their main endeavor is to stave off expulsion through the organization of a national "left wing" bloc with the Zam - Tyler group.

They have given up every principle they once advocated. They fight to maintain a homogeneous party in the bosom of the Second International while claiming to stand for the creation of a "Fourth International".

The ZAM - TYLER outfit maintains a precarious position between those two forces, seeking to hold them together, and to hold the balance of power. Its roots are in the Altman group. It opposes the Peoples Front in words but supports it in action. The independence of the Socialist Party is a principle question with them, but - they are for a Labor Party. The Old - Guard group and the Pacifists play a secondary role, in relation to these main groups.

On the side stands the LEADER, Norman Thomas. He represents no distinct Thomas force. As an individual he symbolizes all the vacillations and contradictions in the Party.

The Trotskyites find themselves at a disadvantage. With Trotsky in Mexico under the heel of American Imperialism, they need the SP cover more than ever, but his coming to America has caused fear and alarm inside the other groups in the SP. Whatever the other factions do, they lose. A bloc of Altman and Zam against the Trotskyites will result in their expulsion. If, however, the Trotskyites succeed in pulling in Zam-Tylér, they must first give up their already threadbare claim to Marxism. Such a combination will force a split with the Altman-Hoan outfit, and eventually lead them into the Labor Party, possibly retaining the SP identity. The probability is that no sufficiently strong line-up will be consummated either way, and a definite "solution" will come only after the convention.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY CANNOT BE REFORMED. It can maintain itself only as a left support for the bourgeoisie. Even as such it is forced to play a secondary role as long as the bourgeoisie can use such reformist types as the Farmer-Labor Parties and the Lewis-Dubinsky crowd. Only when the workers are moving to the left of these will the Hoan-Thomas variety of reformist be called in by the bourgeoisie. And this is exactly what the advocates of the Labor Party have in mind to accomplish.

The only road to the new social order is the Marxist road, the road of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism. For this task is needed a revolutionary Marxist party, based on the experiences of the successful Russian Revolution and the lessons of the Spanish and world events, and applying them to American conditions. There is no other road. This party must be created, by direct participation in the class struggle independent of and against the two bankrupt internationals, the 2nd & 3rd. To help in this task is the duty of all class conscious workers.

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY: No matter to what faction you may belong, your fight against capitalism and for a socialist society can be successful only if conducted in line with the interests and needs of the working class. The present convention will expose in glaring light the bankruptcy of the S.P. for this task. There is no group in the S.P. today that stands on this position. Such a group must be built. Build a left wing group on the basis of a revolutionary Marxist policy. Break with reformism and centrism. Join the Revolutionary Workers League.

FOR AN INDEPENDENT MARXIST PARTY IN THE U.S.A.!!!

FOR THE COMMUNIST FOURTH INTERNATIONAL!!!

Revolutionary Workers League

2159 W Division St

Chicago.

M O R E M O S C O W T R I A L S

The attention of the whole world is focussed on the Moscow trials recently held in the Soviet Union. With synical delight the bourgeois press uses this opportunity to attack the Soviet Union and discredit the Proletarian Dictatorship. Workers watch the Trials with growing incredulity and fear. Where is the Soviet Union going and what is the meaning of the Trials?

The execution of the 13 prisoners in the Soviet Union, many of them such leading figures in the Bolshevik movement for 25 years as Piatakov, Seribriakov, etc, the sentencing of four others to jail terms, including Radek and Sokolnikov, the execution of another large group last August, including Lenin's co-worker, Sinoviev; the wholesale arrest of thousands charged with "plotting", "thievery", "sabotage" and "terrorism"; disaffection in the Red Army - cannot be attributed to accidental causes but have deep social implications. Even were we to take the word of the Stalinist burocracy that the 17 condemned men were plotting together with German and Japanese imperialism, to overthrow the Workers State - we would come to the obvious conclusion that socialism is non-existent in the Soviet Union, that Stalinism is moving toward an impending social cataclysm.

How does it happen that in the second year after the 7th World Congress of the Comintern, which declared "Socialism in the Soviet Union has been definitely and irrevocably established", we find a growing resentment among the Russian workers and a sharpening of internal struggles? Under capitalism, a low standard of living accompanied by need and misery, drives the workers into open conflict with their exploiters; but we should expect that the much vaunted "classless society" proclaimed under Stalinism would have eliminated these antagonisms. The fact that the internal antagonisms are sharper indicates that the class struggle is sharpening instead of abating in the Soviet Union.

All Guilty

Radek, Piatakov, Sokolnikov and others in the Kremlin dock are not unknown figures in the history of the Russian movement. Their opposition to Stalin in the PAST is known to the whole world. So too is their abject submission and capitulation to his policies. As part of the Stalinist clique they have carried on a vicious struggle against Marxism and the international proletariat. This is the overwhelming crime of which they are ALL guilty. But, are Radek and the others guilty of the charges which brought death and imprisonment?

First, let us state, the real criminals were not on trial. Stalin, Molotov, Vorishilov and Co were the accusers: not for the interests of the working class, but against its interests. Stalinism accuses Radek, the leading journalist of the burocracy (who from his prison cell demand-

ed the life of Zinoviev), as well as Piatakov and Sokolnikov, all Stalinists, of treason. But between the accused and the accusers there is no fundamental class difference. Objectively or subjectively they are all enemies of the working class.

Whether the accused are guilty of the specific charges is a secondary question. For their real crimes - the revision of Marxism, the betrayal of the world proletariat - Radek, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Piatakov and the others were not put on trial. Specifically, it is charged that Radek and Piatakov and Co. plotting with Germany and Japan, under the leadership of Trotsky, planned to overthrow the Soviet Government and re-establish capitalism! What is the truth and significance of these accusations?

The charge that Radek and Sokolnikov conspired with German and Japanese imperialism, is an answer by the Stalinists to the German-Japanese agreement to fight communism. It is an attempt to weaken the diplomatic and political position of these imperialists, by charging them with meddling with internal affairs of the Soviet Union and a bid for the support of American Imperialism. Stalinism seeks to demonstrate its "reliability" to imperialism as a whole, and to one set of bourgeois bandits against another. Stalinism does not charge that Radek and the others conspired with the world bourgeoisie against the working class, but that they conspired with GERMAN imperialists, the "bad" ones, Germany and Japan. Stalinism charges they conspired with the "wrong" imperialists.

Lenin's Co-Workers

Is it possible that men like Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Sokolnikov, Smirnov, Piatakov, Muralov, etc, fighters and leaders of the October Revolution, many of them Lenin's close collaborators; is it possible that these men under the leadership of Trotsky, organizer of the Red Army, co-leader with Lenin of the October Revolution, plotted to dismember the Soviet Union and hand over sections of it to the fascist powers? In the service of fascism, we are asked to believe that they would turn themselves and the whole Russian working class over to a fascist firing squad. These are men who have spent many years in struggle against capitalist property relations and the capitalist system. What could they possibly have gained by such a conspiracy? To raise the question is to give the lie to the whole monstrous and contemptible frame-up.

Stalinism charges that these men, who in the course of their work to develop the strategy of mass struggles, educated a generation of revolutionists against the use of individual terror, have become its advocates. It is true that these men, by their capitulations to Stalinism since 1927, have thereby abandoned the Marxist basis for the struggle against individual terror. And as Stalinists they have assisted and condoned the persecution and extermination of revolutionists.

But to have us believe that they all should adopt individual terror as a method of political struggle requires PROOF!

M O R E M O S C O W T R I A L S (con't.)

If what the Stalinists say is true, that there are mass desertions to fascism by former Marxists, they must state the political basis for these desertions. This would be an unprecedented phenomenon which could be explained only on the basis of the reaction of these people to some development in the class struggle. The failure of Stalinism to present that political basis is POLITICAL disproof of the charges.

But, someone will say, this is hardly convincing. There is the matter of evidence. Evidence? Not ONE single letter or document was produced. Not ONE single witness, except the accused to verify conversations, meetings and flying visits. Is it possible, for instance, that Piatakov flew to Oslo, went to see Trotsky, and then returned to Russia without a single person or the Norwegian or Russian Governments knowing the first thing about it? Even Piatakov couldn't answer this question at the trial. Trotsky, according to the efficient Vishinsky, had written reams of instructions to his conspirational coterie. Yet with tons of correspondence in its possession, with every avenue open freely for investigation, the GPU could not produce one single PROOF of the guilt of these men. And this was not accidental. They produced none, for the very simple reason that there was nothing to produce. But lacking proof, Stalinism resorted to another medium - the instrument of the Inquisition - "confessions".

After years of terrorism and sabotage, intrigue and murder, 17 rogues suddenly become penitent and make full "confessions" can best be judged by Radek's statement, "I am guilty of ALL the charges of ALL the terrorist plots - even those I didn't know about". That IS a confession!

In bourgeois democratic countries confessions alone are not considered ample evidence to convict anyone. But in "socialist" Russia, these "confessions" were considered sufficient "evidence" to shoot down the remnants of Lenin's Central Committee.

Exactly how these "confessions" were obtained we cannot say. But there are general methods which history has recorded, and we can be certain that the compelling needs of Stalinism demanded their usage.

1. Violence, force, torture.
2. Threats to the families of the accused.
3. Use of the GPU as "defendants".

Only those who "confess" are brought to trial. Why? There are hundreds under arrest who refuse to confess. ONE such person in the Kremlin court would have exposed the whole vile treachery and betrayal; would have exposed the myth of the popularity of the regime among the workers; would have destroyed the edifice of "confessions" so carefully and malevolently erected by Stalinism. For every one

M O R E M O S C O W T R I A L S (cont.)

who "confesses" there are hundreds who resolutely refuse and are never brought to trial.

Two points in the trial demand special attention.

First, the worst rogue of all, Radek, who admitted every crime and stated he was one of the leaders was let off with only 10 year sentence. Others were shot. One must now ask, how does it happen that the biggest "rogue" got off with a light sentence which he will probably never serve? One answer is that this is a concession to world opinion which still remains incredulous. The other is that Radek is being "saved" for Bucharin and Rykov just as Kamenev and Zinoviev were "saved" in the earlier period to implicate Radek. Stalinism must behold every effort at ORGANIZED resistance of the masses.

Secondly, the Stalinists accused these prisoners, and their "leader" Trotsky of plotting with two foreign imperialisms, Germany and Japan. After Kirov was assassinated in 1934, the Stalinist Bureaucracy accused Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Trotsky of "ideological" responsibility for his death - not for direct implication with it. Zinoviev and Kamenev were sentenced to 2 years in Siberia. Only during these two years was it "discovered" that they were the actual murderers and they had plotted more assassinations. And now the bureaucracy is adding one more accusation, that these "plots" are concocted with the aid of fascist governments.

A D E S P E R A T E B U R O C R A C Y

In the FIGHTING WORKER, October 15, 1936, under the caption, Radek and Bucharin Next, we said, "Now the desperately frightened bureaucrats are finishing off the last survivors of the cadre which made the revolution with Lenin; Radek, Bucharin, Piatakov". Already Stalinist terror has spread into the Red Army; Generals Schmidt and Putna; Shaposhnikov, Director of the Academy of the General Staff; and now, Tukachevsky, Vice-Commissar of Defense under Vorishilov, are under arrest. (Mrachkovsky and Reingold, both testified in the earlier trial that Schmidt was to have personally carried out the terroristic act against Vorishilov. Schmidt was not produced as a witness, for the simple reason that the testimony of the two accused contradicted each other as to WHEN Schmidt was recruited, and HOW the act was to be carried out). We repeat again, that only a frantic and desperate bureaucracy finds the need for such treachery and terror.

Similarly the "discovery" of new crimes with each trial indicate the same thing. Is it possible the GPU discovered new evidence between 1934 and today? If so, where is the evidence, the witnesses letter, documents, etc.? Isn't there something suspicious about new charges without new, or even, old evidence. Under these cir-

M O R E M O S C O W T R I A L S (cont.)

Substantiates the "confessions" do not prove new "crimes" on the part of the accused, but new NEEDS of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

But why? Why must Stalinism resort to these methods? What are the political needs?

Against the Extension of October

Stalinism, on the one hand, reflects the pressure of an enormously weakened world and Russian proletariat, and on the other, the constant and stronger pressure of international imperialism. Stalinist policies rest on alliances and pacts with imperialists. It fears the power and might of the working class. Serving the interests of the petty bourgeoisie within the Soviet Union; it conspires with the French bourgeoisie against the French workers and oppressed colonial peoples; with the Spanish capitalist Madrid-Catalonia governments against the heroic Spanish workers; and with the international bourgeoisie against the extension of the October Revolution.

In 1934 Stalinism executed its right shift from adventurism to reformism. From the era of "soviets everywhere", "united fronts from below", "social-fascism" and "red trade unions", it now comes out openly **AGAINST** the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and **FOR** support to bourgeois democracy. Out of the 7th World Congress came Peoples Fronts with the "social-fascists" of yesterday, Leon Blum, Caballero and Norman Thomas; and with the "democratic" bourgeoisie like Cardenas and Azana. It was only one step to call for National Fronts to include De La Roque and a "brotherly union" with the Italian fascists. (See Inprecorr Vol. 16 No. 38)

Building "socialism in one country" has subordinated the Soviet Union, under the leadership of Stalinism, to the "good" capitalists, the so-called democratized countries, against the "bad" capitalists, the fascist countries.

Within The Soviet Union

Within the Soviet Union, the policies of Stalinism have been carried on with devastating consequences. The spread of income between the peasants and the industrial workers has created a basis for distinct class differentiations. The petty bourgeoisie is receiving a relatively larger share of the national income than the worker. Land has been given to the collective farms (corporations of farmers) in perpetuity; private property has been legalized and extended; the petty bourgeoisie has been given the dominating place in the political set-up by the elimination of soviets with their industrial representation in favor of a parliamentary system with their geographical representation (in the soviet system the

MORE MOSCOW TRIALS (cont.)

proletariat has the majority, in the parliamentary system, the bourgeois elements must inevitably gain the majority); Stakhanovism has introduced new methods of speed-up, dividing the workers and creating a labor aristocracy.

Workers are living in poverty; deprived of freedom of movement thru the use of the internal passport. A new word has found common usage among Soviet workers, "sovbour", meaning a Soviet bourgeois.

In June 1936, the SU outlawed abortions. Divorces have been made more difficult for the poor. Prostitution and thievery have made appearance in Soviet society. All under "socialism".

As a result there is dissention and dissatisfaction which is seething and boiling over into CLASS STRUGGLE. To defend itself and terrorize the working class, Stalinism must find political scapegoats. It must check the resentment and find new channels for the attention of the world proletariat. The class struggle is reflected in disaffection in the ranks of Stalinism itself; whole sections of the bureaucracy are eliminated; every voice raised in criticism is terrorized.

Transition Economy

These developments have led many people to erroneously conclude that capitalism has been restored in the Soviet Union. Soviet economy is a TRANSITION ECONOMY. It is neither capitalist nor socialist. It contains elements of both. The existence of PRIVATE AND SOCIALIST forms, side by side, is characteristic of the transition period from capitalism to communism.

Stalinism has its base in the capitalist (petty bourgeois) sector of Soviet economy. Its role is to defend and extend it, and to breach the socialist sector. Thus, Stalinism steers the Soviet Union back toward capitalism.

It is false to say that STATE CAPITALISM exists in the Soviet Union. It is true that the property relations have been breached and are continually extended in the direction of capitalism. But the PREDOMINANT mode of production is still Transition Economy.

Stalinism PAVES the way for capitalist restoration, but it cannot restore it. For this would mean the destruction of Stalinism itself. Social Democracy paves the way for fascism, but it does not institute fascism. Either the restoration of capitalism or the re-establishment of the political power of the working class will crush Stalinism.

MORE MOSCOW TRIALS (cont.)

With political power in its hands, Stalinism makes its own laws and cannot be removed by legal methods. It can be removed only through the violent struggle of classes; by a POLITICAL revolution. The international proletariat must give the Russian workers every possible aid in the solution of this task. This requires a new revolutionary party in the Soviet Union as a section of the Communist Fourth International.

Trotsky's Role

This is the instrument for the overthrow of Stalinism. Those who do not use it are not fighting Stalinism, but strengthening it, by failing to expose its CLASS character. That is the case, unfortunately, with Leon Trotsky and the Trotskyists who have departed from Marxism and are now busy proving it in practice.

It will of course be said that Trotsky and his groups are the ones singled out for the most vicious attacks. How, therefore, can they be capitulating to Stalinism? In this connection let us point out that the American bourgeoisie frequently arrests men like Norman Thomas. Very few people will assert that Thomas is anxious to overthrow Capitalism in America. His arrest, therefore, would not be because he is a Marxist, but it is a method of delivering a blow against the Marxists. Similarly with the Trotskyists and Trotsky. Stalinism can never be destroyed with the Trotskyist program. The Trotskyists are being used to cover-up the non-Marxism of Stalinism and to deliver a blow at the growth and development of Marxian theory and practice.

Axis of Trotsky Defense

The axis of Trotsky's defense is, 1. I, Trotsky, am not guilty. 2. I can prove it either in the bourgeois courts of Norway or America, or before an "Independent" international commission.

Trotsky demands that he be tried by an "impartial investigation commission" to decide whether he is guilty. Such a commission can be useful to investigate the legal aspects of the evidence. It cannot be the axis of his defense, nor can it be given a free hand to attack the proletarian dictatorship and opportunity to frame Trotsky. The axis of the Trotskyists is not the independent struggle of the working class but a complete subordination (in Stalinist style) to liberal bourgeois methods.

In return for Trotsky's asylum in Mexico the Trotskyists have deliberately avoided exposing the role of Cardenas in Mexico. The Mexican president uses Trotsky to broaden his base for class-collaboration amongst the masses. This "left" move serves the purpose of (1) putting pressure on the Soviet Union in the interests of American Imperialism, and (2) of weaning the working class away from independent class action and making it dependent on the government. But the Trotskyists have not said a word about this. This is a horse trade with Mexican capitalism and American

MORE MOSCOW TRIALS (cont)

Imperialism.

Trotsky is content to let an "impartial" international commission settle who is guilty. As if that were primary! What is needed is to expose the manoeuvres of Stalinism leading the workers back to capitalism in the Soviet Union, and to call for a new Communist Party to fight the impending counter-revolution. It is this fight which the Trotskyists have abandoned.

It marks another stage in the degeneration of Trotskyism.

For a Communist Fourth International

There will be more trials. But they are only the surfact phenomena of a society poised on the edge of a social cataclysm. The real struggle against Stalinism must be directed against the broader aspects of its counter-revolutionary acts and policies.

The working class must restore Lenin's Constitution and go forward to the extension of the October Revolution. For this the indispensable instrument is a new Communist Party in the Soviet Union section of the Communist Fourth International.

#####

IN OUR NEXT ISSUE:

THE CASE FOR A NEW COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES

TITANS IN STRUGGLE: MORGAN AGAINST ROCKEFELLER

Read
"The Young Workers"
ORGAN OF YOUNG WORKERS LEAGUE, U.S.A.

SPAIN: THREE BOURGEOIS ARMIES

The creation of a regular army in Catalonia, consisting of nine infantry regiments and three artillery regiments, adds another bourgeois army to the two already existing in Spain, - the army of the "rebels" (Franco) and the army of the "Loyalist" (Azana-Caballero). Three bourgeois armies instead of one, that is thus far the most tangible result of the civil war! Taken together with the entry of one working-class organization after the other into either the Azana-Caballero or the Companys government, with the gradual incorporation of the workers' militias and councils into the regular army and the state apparatus generally, with the successful infiltration of "loyalty" to the state into even the most revolutionary layers of the working-class, and last but not least with the physical decimation of the workers' ranks on the battlefield, - the creation of still another regular army by the Catalan government brings the strengthening of the state apparatus of the Spanish bourgeoisie and the weakening of the proletariat to a culmination point. It is plain now that whichever side wins the war, the victor will be a ruling class many times stronger than before the civil war, unless a Marxian organization is able to change the relation of forces.

Civil War Into Imperialist War

The great historical lesson to be learned from this experience is that a struggle of the oppressed masses jointly with one section of their oppressors against another section in the final result leads only to the joint victory of both sections of the oppressors over the oppressed. There have been since 1848 many such experiences from which the proletariat could learn this lesson. But none of them has taken such extreme forms as the present one. These extreme forms are due on the one hand to the depth of the crisis of Spanish society and the tremendous militancy of the Spanish masses, on the other to the interest which the bourgeoisie of the world has on the eve of another world war, in transforming the struggle of classes into a struggle of regions and nations, i.e. in the final analysis into a struggle for the benefit of the few great imperialist powers of the world. To meet an extreme forms. It is these extreme forms, that is, actual war, that is deceiving even the most revolutionary workers in Spain and internationally. But it is precisely these extreme forms that are yielding the Spanish and world bourgeoisie the desired result: the weakening of the proletariat, the strengthening of the state, the gradual transformation of civil war into imperialist war.

Increased Intervention

The degree to which they have succeeded in this even at this stage is shown by the fact that the intervention of the great powers has not only not decreased but increased, and that it is more and more their intervention that determines the course of events in Spain. The intervention of Russia, far from signifying a return to the days of active support of revolutionary movements in all countries only hastens

SPAIN: THREE BOURGEOIS ARMIES

the inclusion of Russia, in addition to the great imperialist blocs that are to-day bending every effort towards winning the "support" of the working masses for their "cause", and thereby facilitates immensely the task confronting the ruling class. Thus it is not only the Spanish state which has increased its strength (although in the contradictory form of being temporarily divided), but every state.

Only Road - The Party

This victory of the exploiters is a powerful blow against the proletariat and the proletarian revolution.

There is only one road for the proletariat and their allies. The task is to create as quickly as possible, a revolutionary Marxian Party, which alone can assure the smashing of the Bourgeois State and the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

#

THE FIGHTING WORKER

central organ of
THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE of the U.S.
1 cent per copy - 50¢ for six months

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

theoretical organ of
THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE of the U.S.
10¢ per copy - \$1.00 per year

YOUNG WORKER

organ of
YOUNG WORKERS LEAGUE, U. S.
1¢ per copy - 25¢ for six months

2159 West Division St.
Chicago, Ill.

232 East 14th St.
N.Y.C.

THE TROTSKYIST FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

At the end of July 1936, the Trotskyists held a conference in Geneva. According to them "The aim of this first conference was to re-assemble the international forces of the Fourth International in a new coherent organization, to arm them with a solid ideological armory and to create a new international center, larger and more fitted for work. It signifies both the direct adherence to the movement for the Fourth International of organizations which up to now had not formally adhered to the International Communist League, and an important step toward the unification of the forces of the Fourth International in countries where up to now there had existed several groups separated by tactical differences.....The conference set up a commission to work out within three months a draft program, following which there will be a four months international discussion, after which the first congress of the Fourth International will adopt a definite edition of the program as the foundation document of the Fourth International" (Fourth International, theoretical organ of the French Trotskyists, October 1936 1936)

It is clear that the Trotskyists are proceeding with the organization of the "Fourth International."

But when we examine the connections of this "International" with the world working class, we find that in so far as an international in the revolutionary Marxist sense is concerned there is none at all.

The French Trotskyists' organ states that there were present delegates from the French party and youth; two Belgian organizations, the expelled left Socialists and Vereecken's group which have fused since; the Dutch party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party; the Marxist Action group from Zurich, Switzerland; and "observers from America" (Muste). The Austrian, Czech, Rumanian, Greek, Polish, Swiss (Basle) and Dutch youth groups were invited but did not attend. The Bulgarian, Danish, Spanish, Lithuanian, Canadian, Mexican, Brazilian, Argentine, Chilean, Cuban, Peruvian, Bolivian, Puerto Rican, Chinese, Indo-Chinese, Australian, and South African groups were not even invited. The reasons given are lack of time and the situation of these groups.

The list is imposing. Analysis will show its fake character. First of all, if we are to take the Trotskyists at their word, seventeen countries were not even invited. These countries include Spain where a civil war is being fought. Is this an excuse for not inviting a revolutionary organization from that country, if there were one? Certainly not. Just the contrary. Especially when setting up a revolutionary international. The Third International was founded in Russia and met there in 1920 while civil war raged over that land and other countries in Europe and Asia. The delegates to the founding congress came from many countries and had to overcome the most difficult conditions in getting there. They had to pass through the allied blockade of Russia. Had there been a revolutionary group in Spain and had they been invited would they have sent a delegate? We think so. We must note that the centrist POUM was able to send Gorkin to the recent conference of the International Bureau of Revolutionary

Socialist Unity in Brussels.

The Truth of the matter is that the Trotskyists have no organization in Spain. Comrade Negrete reports from Barcelona that there are a few fighting in the ranks. These behind the lines spend their time in cafes making negative criticisms. A revolutionary international with no organization in Spain is no international at all, in the Marxist sense. The "failure" to invite the non-existent Spanish section is typical Trotskyist fakery.

Of the same odor is the inclusion of the Puerto Rican "section", Disorganized by the liquidation of section after section into the Second International the Puerto Rican comrades last summer liquidated their group into the Third International.

The other groups are small, in the list of those which were not invited, and without serious influence in the working class of their countries. Their total number is very likely less than a thousand. Either singly or together they do not make a base for a Marxist revolutionary international.

The same fakery runs thru the list of those which, altho invited did not attend. The Greek section number some fifteen. The Archio-Marxists who broke with Trotsky some years ago number several thousand, publish an influential press and are entrenched in the trade unions. The other groups in this "category" are about as weak as the Greek "section".

Now for those which did attend.

The French Trotskyist organ of September, says: "Delegates from organizations in the principal countries were represented: USSR, Belgium, England, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, Italy, France."

The inclusion of the "organization" from the USSR is a piece of pure bravado. Since this congress was held the events in Russia in connection with the civil war in Spain and the trials and their murderous aftermath have demonstrated that the Trotskyists have no organization there. At a meeting in New York, Shachtman was forced to admit it. As is known, the Italian "organization" consists of two people who are in Spain fighting in the ranks against the counter-revolution. The German "organization" is not above a hundred. The Swiss group is in the Swiss Social Democratic Party and there is no indication that having participated in the "founding" of this "Fourth International" it has followed the French Trotskyists in setting up its own "independent" centrist outfit. The English Trotskyists are a mere handful dispersed in and out of the Labor and Independent Labor Parties.

On the scale of the Trotskyist movement, the French party is a substantial section. The figures given in their press in connection with their recent conference, at which a split took place, indicate a membership of about five hundred. Already there are signs of disintegration in this section. The Belgian group is a hodge-podge of Trotsky loyalists, Vereecken's followers who have returned to the fold, and some expelled left socialists. On the whole the Belgian

set-up is a duplicate of the French original, just as it was two years ago when the new orientation began to spin its course toward disaster.

After this congress had passed into the limbo of history, one of the leaders of the Dutch party, Schmidt, followed Muste into the bosom of the church. The United States was represented by no less a stalwart revolutionist than Abraham Jacob Muste who was so impressed by the steps taken to found the new revolutionary party, which is to lead the exploited and oppressed of the earth to freedom, that he forthwith returned to the United States and made his peace with God.

When Lenin's Third International was founded it demonstrated an enormous recruiting power. Its second Congress stated officially that the danger lay in being swamped with centrist recruits. Trotsky applies the dialectic according to the logic of his revisionism begins by losing members!

The theoretical labors of this congress also shows a non-Marxian content. The main thesis is called "New Revolutionary Upsurge and the Tasks of the Fourth International", and bears the unmistakable stylistic impress of the master himself. To speak of a revolutionary upsurge as taking place now in Europe is to fail to understand the situation. The Trotskyists show as little grasp of reality and as little Marxist analysis as did the Stalinists when they proclaimed the Third Period upsurge. Less if anything, for in 1929-1933 Fascism had not won the signal triumphs it has since.

The most amazing thing about the Trotskyist "upsurge" is that it does not include Spain. The opening paragraph reads:

"The June strike (in France) opened a new period in the political development of France and Belgium and undoubtedly provoked not only the sharpening of the class struggle in these countries but also, to one degree or another, mass movements over important sections of Europe, including Great Britain and also perhaps on the other side of the Atlantic".

This was written, no doubt, before the civil war in Spain broke out. But the civil war had cast a long shadow before it. People who presume to organize revolutionary internationals must foresee such things as civil wars.

The entire thesis revolves around the situation in France. Some years ago Trotsky justly condemned the theoretical bankruptcy of the Stalinists who, in 1928, foresaw an immediate revolution in France and missed the Spanish Revolution of 1931. What's sauce for the Stalinists is sauce for the Trotskyists!

But if the thesis was written before the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War, it was voted on during the second week of that civil war. How shall we understand the failure to change it to conform to the imperative correction of the class struggle? In voting for this thesis, the Trotskyists, signified that they had broken with Marxism finally, completely and irrevocably. Under the shock of the Spanish Civil War the Trotskyists wrote a postscript to their thesis as its text plainly indicates. The postscript itself is therefore a con-

denunciation of the thesis. The sole purpose of the postscript is to make a point about the French Peoples Front on the basis of the civil war in Spain: "The July days in Spain have completed and deepened with extraordinary force the lessons of the June days in France---whatever may be the result of the Spanish civil war it will bring a death blow to the Popular Front in France and in other countries. It must now be clear to every French worker---"

The Centrist Trotskyites laid down no line for the Spanish workers to follow in the hour of their mortal need! Even for their own members they made no analysis. The Spanish civil war is just a question of some July days! And these people call themselves revolutionists!

ZIG - ZAG ON ORGANIC UNITY

On the question of organic unity the theses display the opportunism of the Trotskyists in high relief. "Pitiable and insignificant appears in the light of the June events the slogan of 'unity' of the two internationals which, such as they are, have already in effect united to betray the interests of the proletariat." From which we ought to conclude that the Fourth Trotskyist International is opposed to organic unity. This is not so. Trotsky and his International secretariat declared in May 1935 that organic unity could play a progressive role under certain circumstances. Those who wish to make the autopsy can investigate the matter in the May, 1935 New International, former theoretical organ of the defunct Workers Party, and in the pamphlet on organic unity published by the Revolutionary Workers League some time ago. Unless these errors are uncovered the position in the Theses is only a deceiving fig leaf.

Moreover the question of organic unity is one of the questions tied up with the question of the line for the Communist 4th International. As long as the Trotskyist position on this question is false they cannot have a Marxist position on organic unity.

On the question of the line for the Fourth International the theses say:

"The sections of the Fourth International....participate in every act of struggle and give it the greatest clarity and organization. They bind themselves to the best of the worker, pushed forward by the movement and hand in hand with them build the new revolutionary leadership. By their example and criticism they speed up the formation of a revolutionary wing in the old parties drawing it closer to them in the course of the struggle and pushing it on the road of the Fourth International". Words! Empty, dishonest words! How create the revolutionary wing in the old parties? On what line? The line of the "French Turn"--the new orientation? On Lenin's line of the political and organizational independence of the revolutionary Marxist organization? If the former why do the theses not say so openly? If the latter was the new orientation incorrect? Then why is there no condemnation of it and analysis of its errors? What lessons do the theses draw for the greatest clarity and organization of the workers? Why is the door left open for a repetition of the same errors in the future?

Idle questions? The truth is that this new international stands on the political and theoretical ground of the new orientation. The proof is contained--not in these theses--but in a sep-

arate resolution adopted by the conference on the question of the liquidation of the Workers Party of the United States into the American Socialist Party. In this resolution the liquidation is approved. And the perspective of the liquidation--to convert the Socialist Party into the party of social revolution--is approved. Thus the "independent" Trotskyist Fourth International begins by endorsing the new orientation!

What perspective do the theses offer for the creation of the Fourth International as a force in the life of the working class? Empty words! "To participate directly in the mass movement with its class slogans pushed forward to the end, a clear perspective and independent banner, to be intransigent with conciliators, pitiless with traitors; this is the road of the Fourth International. It is ridiculous and absurd to discuss whether or not it is opportune to "found" it. An international is not founded like a co-operative, but is created in the struggle. To the question of pedants on the "opportunity", the June days (in France; not the Spanish Civil War) have replied: "there is no room for new discussions". So!

Trotsky launches his international during the period of defeats of the world proletariat, when capitalism on a world scale is on the offensive against the working class. Moreover, at the time of the Geneva congress the Spanish civil war was already in its second week. Any man with a grasp of reality would have said that the success of the Spanish workers in establishing their proletarian dictatorship and the founding of the Fourth Communist International were inextricably bound together; just as they were in the Russian Revolution. As it turns out now the Spanish workers are further away from overthrowing capitalism than they were at the end of July. Thus Trotsky reverses Lenin; he proclaims an international on the basis of the defeats of the proletariat.

On this basis it is possible to set up an international organization. But not an International in the Marxist sense of a world cadre party rooted in the masses as an objective factor with influence in the class struggle. A revolutionary International organization can convert a revolutionary situation one or more countries into a successful revolution and thereby lay the basis for an actually established Marxist International PARTY. Trotsky and his followers reveal that they have no understanding at all of the Marxist party and its relation to revolution.

Trotsky does not take up this question theoretically. He merely declares pontifically: "There was a strike wave in France in June; that has settled the question. There is no room for discussion."

What kind of an international is the Trotskyist Fourth International to be? We say we are fighting to build a Communist international. The Trotskyist theses are silent on this question. Nowhere do they speak of a Communist Fourth International. The

DO the American Trotskyists. Last June in his speech apologizing for his reentry into the Socialist Party Cannon said that he and his tribe were done with the name Communist, that the Stalinists were welcome to it.

It is not a small question. The name of an international party is not just a label. The name must express the political line. Communist is scientifically accurate. The Stalinists use it. We cannot help that. We must struggle to wrest it from them. There is no such thing as revolutionary Socialism today. Revolutionary socialism denoted the Marxist policies of Lenin which have since become known as Bolshevism. Today Revolutionary socialism means centrism.

Against the Trotskyist Fourth International we raise the slogan of the Communist Fourth International.

It is significant that the Trotskyist theses make no analysis or statement about centrism. Centrists cannot be expected to lay bare the errors of their own revisionism. Centrists can always be spotted by their silence or ambiguity on the question of centrism.

In these Theses the omission is particularly glaring because of the Spanish revolution. It is like the Trotskyists to discuss the question of a new revolutionary party without reference to the concrete question of a revolutionary party in Spain. But that is exactly what they cannot discuss because; they would have to take up the entire question of their line as tested by the Civil war. That would mean an examination of their proposal that the Spanish Communist League liquidate into the Socialist Party; their support of the traitor Fersen; their Zig-Zag policy with the P.O.U.M. First Nin was a strike breaker for refusing to join the S.P.; and the P.O.U.M. was opportunist for supporting the Peoples Front. At the outbreak of the civil war the P.O.U.M. became revolutionary Marxist. Now it must be given critical support. Better for these principle party builders to leave the question alone.

On the situation which is its axis in France, the Theses are equally opportunistic. The analysis is shallow. There is no statement on the importance of France for world economy and politics both from the capitalistic and proletarian standpoints. The international aspects of the question, the decisive ones, are not dealt with.

The situation is characterized as revolutionary. This was the end of July. How seriously can this characterization be taken? Shortly before the congress made its pronouncement, its highest authority had written that the revolution has already begun. On August 8, the Nation published an article by Trotsky written in the middle of July, under the title, Revolutionary Interlude in France, in which he said: "--within the depths of

the proletariat, as well as among the summits of the ruling classes, a well nigh automatic preparation for a new conflict is going on." What shall we say of people who declare that a revolution has begun, that the situation is only revolutionary and then that there is a revolutionary interlude? Hopeless confusion! No basis for building a world party to overthrow world capital.

The Theses declare: "These three conditions: disposition on the part of the whole proletariat to struggle; acute discontent among the lower layers of the petty bourgeoisie; breakdown in the camp of finance capital, represent the basic premises for the proletarian revolution." This is written not abstractly but to characterize the situation in France at the end of July.

In our epoch the most important premise is the revolutionary party. This is not included in the Trotskyist catalogue. And not without reason. If we want to be charitable we can say that it is loose writing; that the Trotskyists meant the basic objective premises. Let us examine them on this assumption.

The first two premises are incorrectly stated. Lenin gave better formulations. So did Trotsky a number of years ago in the old MILITANT. It is not only a question of the disposition of the whole proletariat to struggle but its determination to struggle for the overthrow of the system even at the sacrifice of its life. And it is not merely a question of the acute discontent of the lower layers of the petty bourgeoisie. It is a question of their gravitation to the side of the proletariat which attracts them to its cause by its determination and boldness flowing from its revolutionary line. But let us pass these points and come to the question of the capitalist class.

The Theses speak of the "lack of confidence of the ruling class in themselves." Immediately after this was written, the bourgeoisie put thru their devaluation program and felt themselves strong enough to reject the proposals of the government (which made them under the pressure of the workers) to put curbs on increases in prices. In September the government showed much more firmness in dealing with the strike wave than it had in June. Today it is strong enough to evict sit down strikers, use troops to break strikes and shoot down workers and peasants in the colonies. What success can be expected from a party which begins by underestimating the strength of the class enemy?

But the thing is worse than an underestimation of the class enemy. At the same time that the Trotskyists were writing—possibly Trotsky himself—that the bourgeoisie had lost confidence in itself, Trotsky was writing for the NATION: "Holding in their hands all the basic levers of industry, credit and commerce, the financial magnates shift the cost of the agreement (the June strike wave settlement) upon the 'middle classes', compelling them by reason of this very thing to enter into a struggle with the workers. In this now lies the crux of the situation.".... "The financial oligarchy which did a swimming business in the very heat of the crisis, could of course, abide both with the forty-hour week, paid vacations and so on...." How can a bourgeoisie which is strong enough to afford such sweeping reforms and then shift the burden on to the shoulders of

the middle classes and force them into a class struggle against the workers be said to have lost confidence in itself? Only people who write phrases like Trotsky and his followers could have been guilty of such lightminded "analysis".

The Theses have nothing to say on the question of fascism in France. Two years before a panic-stricken Trotsky stampeded his followers into the Second International with the cry that fascism was knocking at the gates. In July he wrote for the NATION: "...the big capitalists are confidently watching for such a turn as will make a beginning for fascism not only as a semi-military organization of bourgeois papas' sons with automobiles and airplanes but as a real mass movement in France". Now fascism is a question for the future. The opposite error. Fascism is a hundred times stronger absolutely and relatively. And it is preparing to strike.

The attack of the Theses is centered on the Peoples Front. But it is, in the main, a negative attack. There is counterposed to the Peoples Front the independent action of the working class. But this is a phrase which the Trotskyists fill with a centrist content. It must be so because of their centrist line on the creation of the revolutionary party. They do not pose the line to power and advance slogans on this basis. In the struggle in Germany they counterposed the united front to the Third Period policies without doing so on the basis of a LINE which called for the seizure of power. Now they fight the opposite error (Peoples Front) from the same centrist basis.

Only here they go a step further to the right. The central slogan advanced for the active struggle against the Peoples Front is; "Oust the bourgeoisie from the Peoples Front". Here is a fine kettle of fish. This puts the formal stamp of approval on the slogan of Zeller: A Peoples Front of Action. The Trotskyists are going to reform the Peoples Front. This is the road of tailending the Peoples Front, of capitulation to it.

Like the Lovestoneites these people must always be reforming something. Both groups have long ago signed away any claims to an independent revolutionary position. What is more natural than that they should attach themselves to something, less perfect than they would like it to be, but which they hope to remould closer to their heart's desire.

Men and groups are measured by events. The Spanish Civil War is the measuring stick for the policies and actions of all tendencies and organizations in the working class. Judged from the standpoint of Marxism against the Spanish events we must conclude that the Trotskyist Congress definitely stamps this force as a centrist tendency moving to the right. The deliberations of this congress determine the future of all Trotskyist groups which still fly Trotsky's scolded banner. Whether they are in the Second International or outside of it, they are a centrist tendency. If the American Trotskyists should be kicked out of the Socialist Party they will adhere to the center which has been erected on the basis of the Geneva Theses.

No conciliation is possible with the Trotskyists. Unity with them is excluded. It can only take place on the basis of the rejection of their entire course, which they will not do.

Trotsky's "Fourth International" succeeds the International Communist League as the vehicle of Trotsky's centrism and revisionism and will drag on an existence of sorts; for a while sowing confusion and demoralization, to be succeeded at a later date, by another bureaucratic and administrative expedient to hide the bankruptcy of his line.

The struggle to build the Communist Fourth International must be conducted against them as a dangerous centrist tendency.

As for Trotsky the individual. The Spanish Civil war is the opportunity for him to retrace his steps, to acknowledge his errors and rejoin the Marxists in the struggle against capitalism and its opportunist agencies in the working class.

The conclusion is inescapable. Trotsky has never understood the question of the revolutionary party. Today he is repeating in a worse form the error of 1903-17. Under the impact of the Russian Revolution he corrected himself, worked with Lenin, and served the world working class magnificently. Today the Spanish revolution passes him by without positive effect. It serves only to deepen his revisionism. Trotsky takes his place with Kautsky in the camp of the revisionists.

The REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE of the United States carries on the traditions of Marx and Lenin against the revisionists and for Communist parties and a new COMMUNIST FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

Editorial Note: This article was submitted in the fall of 1936. The intervention of the Spanish events demanded that we devote our primary attention to this burning question confronting the international working class. The coming March 1937 Convention of the Socialist Party gives this article on the role of the Trotskyists (who are in the Socialist Party) a timely significance.

Just off the press!!!

"The Workers Answer to Ross War"

5¢

p20

p20 was blank in
the original I scanned.

This probably was a defect:
p20 probably had text on it.

Monty Feb 2014

fossils in the labor movement who have given up hope for the American working class.

The auto and other workers have reacted courageously to all threats to oust them from the plants they hold. Thousands were ready at one time to march on Flint. If the state were to make an attempt to oust the Dodge workers in Detroit today, there is no doubt 50,000 workers could be mobilized to picket the plant.

The workers react quickly to bold ideas. The leaflets distributed both in Flint and Detroit in thousands of copies by the Revolutionary Workers League calling for the spreading of the strikes; for a general strike for the closed shop, were received with unbelievable eagerness. The idea of a closed shop, started in these leaflets, has spread so rapidly that the CIO leader, Frankenstein, in order that the strike do not get out of hand, issued a long statement assuring the bosses that the CIO was not demanding a closed shop.

In spite of all this enthusiasm and solidarity the political level of the struggle has remained very low. So far it is a struggle for wages, a struggle on the economic plane. The large wage increases, from 20¢ to 50¢ an hour, and the elimination of speed-up; from producing 70 jobs an hour to producing only 40 an hour on the Briggs assembly line- all of these victories have been won too easily, without any serious struggles. The workers have not yet come into conflict with the state to any extent, and the treacherous CIO leadership maintains their level of development on the legislative plane- fight for the Wagner Bill and all other Roosevelt measures.

The possibilities of the situation are truly enormous. With the present fighting spirit of the auto workers, a general strike for the closed shop, 6 hour day-5 day week, in the auto industry is within realization.

The maritime strike was settled a short time ago without a real victory. In fact the Copeland black-list law- if the workers permit it to be applied- will wreck the union. The steel workers are smarting under the agreement reached between the CIO and the steel trust, which gives only bargaining rights to the extent of their membership to the CIO. The agreement has not prevented discrimination and the firing of union men. The miners' agreement expires at the end of this month. The conditions in the mines have grown much worse in the past few years. They have suffered a long period of unemployment and miserable living conditions. They are undoubtedly ready for a struggle.

Everywhere, the air is charged with dynamite. The bourgeoisie lives in dread that this strike wave will sweep the nation; get completely out of the control of the CIO and AFOFL labor fakers and assume a violent struggle with the agencies of the state.

The strategy of the bosses under these circumstances has been to give concessions NOW in order to tide them over the season and then make an attempt to smash the union. Even the Morgan section of the

bourgeoisie- the steel trust and General Motors- have been forced to give some form of recognition to the unions. At the same time the bourgeoisie is careful not to make too many concessions on recognition, ruthlessly opposing the closed shop, in order that it may be easier to smash the unions in the future.

The policy of Roosevelt and Co. has been quite a subtle one. There is no doubt that any other policy would have led to a far more violent outburst on the part of the working class. Roosevelt has pursued a hands-off policy of not interfering directly in the situation. The workers have been held in check by their faith in Roosevelt, Lewis and Co., which has been one of the prime factors in keeping the strike wave within bounds.

Roosevelt and Lewis attempted, in the first stages of the strike wave, to use its pressure to force thru the Roosevelt legislative program, which is intended to provide the necessary class collaboration basis for handling these situations. But the scope and proportions of the present strike movement threatens to upset their program. As a consequence the political struggle has become sharper and Roosevelt has taken to attacks on the Supreme Court, using the strikes as a bludgeon, in an effort to push thru his program.

In all of these maneuvers the CIO leaders have played the role of a most faithful lackey to the administration. Their policy has been to strike one part of the industry at a time and to settle it quickly for small concessions. The role of the CIO is to restrain and check the workers from engaging in strike struggles. Their task is to lead the workers into class collaboration with the bosses and the state machinery established to throttle all militant action. Very naturally, therefore, they have put forth demands which can be won without a prolonged or sharp struggle. They have carefully avoided the demand for the closed shop, which would lead to real struggles and mean gigantic victories for the American working class.

The watchword of the CIO is industrial peace. Leaders like Van Bittner, Philip Murray and others have come out against strikes. John L. Lewis, Homer Martin and the others babble constantly about establishing harmonious relations with "management" and securing "a lasting peace" with industry. One of the CIO leaflets in Detroit gives their program as a mere legislative one-Wagner Law and other bills, and the establishment of peaceful relations with industry.

The General Motors settlement was precipitated by this desire for peace with the bosses. 65,000 Chrysler workers are on strike. 11,000 Hudson workers are also fighting for recognition as the sole bargaining agency. Rather than risk the chances of a general strike in auto, the CIO prefers to push its sell-out policy.

This confirms what we have always said about the reformists and labor fakers: they prefer peace with the bosses rather than struggles which can lead to a victory over the capitalist class. The General Motors agreement is an attempt by Lewis, Martin and Co. to throttle the strike wave and keep the Chrysler struggle from sweeping over their heads.

Homer Martin, UAWA president, put it very clear and precise at the conference to ratify that agreement. He said, "We must stop this chaos and restore order."...."We can't afford to have an organization that is constantly on strike."

Life itself, however, is pushing the working class far beyond this treacherous line- even though the workers in the main are not yet conscious of it. Highland Park Chrysler workers, for instance, took over the police duties in all the area surrounding the plant. The pot of unionism is boiling in Detroit and elsewhere; and no sooner is one strike settled than two others break out.

There is a growing suspicion on the part of many workers (especially after the General Motors agreement, which is the rankest of sell-outs) of the CIO leadership. There is dissatisfaction and a widening resentment against their policies. The G.M. agreement is already provoking tremendous criticism. After the glorious militancy of the Flint, Anderson and other workers, the CIO leaders signed an agreement which gives recognition to the UAWA only to the extent of its membership, has no specifications regarding wages, speed-up, and merely settled the points of HOW to take up grievances and seniority. The method of settling grievances is deliberately complicated to make it valueless.

The agreement abandons all claims to minimum wages. General Motor workers, some of whom are working for 25¢ an hour, must take up their claims for wage increases through the regular grievance channels. They are expected to "correct" the differentials in wages by merely appealing to the bosses in the individual plants. And they are prohibited from striking except by special permission of their international officers, and that only after the grievances have gone through the regular channels- a process of at least a month, enough time to break many stout hearts.

The agreement whitewashes the filthy policy of General Motors; its discrimination against negroes in the south, no provisions for women workers except that they take up their grievances "through the regular channels." Precisely what G.M. told the union before it went out on strike!

This settlement is even more rank when one considers that the GM workers are still on the upsurge. Eighteen sit-down strikes have occurred in twenty days in the GM plants.

In this whole strike wave the A.F. of L. is playing a secondary role. Many unions are seceding from it and joining the Lewis bandwagon. In their place, of course, Green and Co. have been able to recruit thousands of new members on the basis of the present strike wave. Possibly they have recruited many more members than they have lost. Oddly enough the Green outfit has put forth stronger demands in most instances than the C.I.O., and have often won the closed shop.

The struggle between the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. has now become much sharper, with the C.I.O. taking steps to form a dual apparatus in the various cities and states and very likely a new Federation of Labor. The bosses, of course, have not been slow in taking advantage

of this situation. They have made appeals to the A.F. of L. to step into the steel industry and form a strong dual outfit against the C.I.O. union. In Detroit a tussle between the two rival forces is now taking place in the street car unions. In the auto struggles and others the A.F. of L. is playing a strike-breaking role by demanding separate agreements and organizing separately.

The Stalinists and Socialists, with their Trotsky and Lovestone tails, are playing their miserable tail-end roles, giving full and unconditional support to the C.I.O. labor fakers. The Trotskyists have here and there put a slight left tinge to their remarks on the Lewis outfit (although Cannon's "Labor Action" is almost without criticism), but they have made no attempt to fight the C.I.O. leadership. They have not exposed a single one of all these maneuvers; they have not issued a single leaflet or written a single article demarcating themselves from the C.I.O. officialdom in POLICY. In Stalinist fashion they have mouthed words about the "progressiveness" of the industrial union proposition - without touching to any extent on the class-collaboration policy of the C.I.O., which because of the delusions it sows is far more dangerous to the working class than the Green policy.

All these are the very same forces that lined up the labor vote - directly or indirectly - for Roosevelt in the last election. They are now following that up by lining up support for the Roosevelt labor policy.

The Stalinists descend to ever lower depths. Complete and abject submission to Lewis and company - of whom they are now an integral part. What a far cry from the days when Foster travelled the country and wrote books denouncing Lewis as one of the worst labor fakers of all!

A number of Stalinists stewards at the Hudson plant and at the Dodge plant confiscated leaflets issued by the Revolutionary Workers League calling for "A GENERAL STRIKE IN THE AUTO INDUSTRY FOR THE CLOSED SHOP".

The only class struggle force in the U.A.W.A. has been a small local of 2,500 members in the fibre section of the Auto Industry - Local 205. This local has come out for the closed shop, has shown its labor solidarity by organizing sympathetic picket lines and demonstrations for the Chrysler strikers less than 24 hours after the strike was called. The few strikes it has led have been militant and have brought victories. It has taken the lead in fighting the Black Legion by forcing a number of its members out of the plants, and has begun to educate its membership against the National Guard.

This local, if it can withstand the gigantic pressure of the various political forces and the giant apparatus of the C.I.O., shows promise of becoming the polarizing force for a class struggle grouping in the trade union world - both inside and outside the C.I.O. It would be false to be over-optimistic about Local 205's possibilities; the opposition it faces is exceedingly strong. But firmness and penetration of its class struggle line can lead to great results.

The Revolutionary Workers League has been active far beyond its small numbers in this strike wave. A number of its members hold leading posts in the union and are doing important work in the Dodge Truck strike. By the thousand and thousands of leaflets and Fighting Workers the RWL has distributed it has materially affected the ideology of the workers.

What is necessary today in the auto industry is to spread the strike into a general strike for the closed shop. This has been the agitation of the League. The auto workers must especially pay attention to striking Ford's.

The working class must be weaned away from the bourgeois ideology and the no-strike propoganda of the C.I.O. leadership. Democratically elected local strike committee and national strike committees must be put up as well. And the workers must take the negotiations out of the hands of the union leadership and vest them in rank and file elected negotiation committees.

The working class can break through in these struggles only if it is weaned away from putting faith in sly politicians of the Murphy and Roosevelt stripe; if it correctly estimates the strike-breaking role of the National Guard.

The struggles in the auto industry and other industries today can materially advance the working class on the road to revolution. Those who support or fail to attack the C.I.O. leadership are holding back that development.

Have you read these pamphlets?

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE MOSCOW FRAME UP TRIALS	PRICE	1¢
THE WORKERS ANSWER TO BOSS WAR	"	5¢
STALINISM BETRAYS THE SPANISH REVOLUTION	"	5¢
BOSS ELECTIONS OR THE WORKERS VOTE	"	1¢
STALIN'S CONSTITUTION; STEP TOWARD CAPITALISM	"	3¢

In bundles of ten or more these pamphlets can be purchased at 30% discount- postpaid.

Published for the
REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, U.S.

by
DEMOS PRESS - 28 East 14 St., NYC

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

NEXT ISSUE

READ

THE CASE FOR A NEW COMMUNIST
PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES

ON THE QUESTION OF THE SLOGAN
OF SEIZING POWER IN SPAIN TODAY

TITANS IN STRUGGLE:
ROCKEFELLER VERSUS MORGAN

And other current
subjects.

SUBSCRIBE TO ~
The FIGHTING
WORKER
ORGAN OF
REVOLUTIONARY
WORKERS
LEAGUE
of the U.S.

*The
Young
Workers*

SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL - 2159 W. DIVISION ST., CHICAGO, ILL.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____