Revival of Stalinist Hooliganism

PL-SDS GANG ASSAULTS
BOSTON SMC MEETING

50,000 WORKERS RALLY AGAINST WAR, NIXON!
BUILD LABOR PARTY!
LABOR MARCHES

More than twenty unions were represented at the labor rally against the war and repression, Thursday, May 21st. The top three pictures on page 3 are of SIEU-371 contingent, 3,000 strong, which marched to City Hall from the garment district.

BY A BULLETIN REPORTER

NEW YORK, May 21—Over 50,000 workers and students demonstrated at City Hall Park today against Nixon's Cambodian invasion, for immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Indochina, and against the bloody repression at Kent State, Jackson, Miss., and Augusta, Ga.

At the very center of the demonstration was an historic participation by upwards of twenty union contingents representing a major section of the New York labor movement. Along with thousands of serious students from the major high schools and colleges in the New York area, the union contingents were out in force with their colorful hats and banners.

ENTHUSIASM

The demonstration was marked by the spirit and enthusiasm of young workers and students. More than 5,000 workers and students marched from the garment center into the City Hall demonstration chanting and shouting antinuclear slogans. At the core of this march was the contingent of over 9,000 from SIEU-371 (District Council 37, AFSCME), chanting slogans like "Nixon Out—Workers In," and "Build a Labor Party Now—Power to the Workers." The SIEU Committee for a New Leadership played a key part in the march, distributing "Build a Labor Party" signs to the marchers, proudly carrying its own labor party banner and taking the lead in the chants. As the march proceeded downtown, garment workers leaned out of windows showing their support for the demonstration.

LABOR PARTY

As the marchers entered the City Hall area, another hundred labor party signs prepared by the Workers League were eagerly grabbed up by the SIEU ranks. high school and college students and workers from many of the other unions present. It was indeed an historic step in the struggle for a labor party by the American Trotskyist movement.

While the SIEU along with other sections of District Council 37, had the largest contingent, other unions with large contingents were District 65 (Districtive Workers), UE, UAW, CWA (telephone workers), Local 1199 (Hospital Workers), Par and Leather Workers, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, United Federation of College Teachers, and IUE District 3. More than 100 truck drivers from Teamsters Local 389 were at the rally as well as a group from the Telephone Operators Association, Film Editors Against the War (an unofficial group from the IATSE) and the Bank and File Committee of the TWU.

Among the ranks of the demonstrators were thousands of black and Puerto Rican workers. Far more minority workers were mobilized in this one march by the labor movement than in any demonstration for the "community" organized by any of the nationalist leaders or groups in the past decade.

STUDENTS

Among the students at the rally were many from the City College Labor Action Workshop, which had distributed thousands of leaflets for the rally to other students, campus workers, garment workers, hospital workers and others. Many had posters calling for "Build A Labor Party Now," and other posters linking the war with the attacks on American workers. Student contingents from the New School, NYC Community College, New York University, Stonybrook, and other campuses who had built for the rally among students and workers, were present in large numbers. Thousands more students from many different high schools and colleges demonstrated at this first mass rally of labor against the war.

The strength of the labor movement was expressed in the rally despite the role of the labor bureaucrats who called the march. Even the meagre spokesmen of the participating unions, Victor Gotbaum, President of DC 37, had earlier estimated a turnout of only 15,000 outside of the SIEU and District 65, very little effort was made to mobilize the rank and file workers.

In the hospitals organized by Local 1199 where there is tremendous antiwar sentiment, little effort was made by the leadership to turn out the ranks. When questioned about this, an official of 1199 replied that the hospital workers "were with them in spirit" but after all, it was necessary for them to look after the hospital patients. This is the very same argument the Mayor and hospital administrators have used against hospital strikes.

BUREAUCRACY

Clearly, although calling the demonstration in the name of labor, the bureaucrats did everything they could to try to keep it on a level of token participation by labor and to keep it under the domination of liberal politics. Their invitation to strikebreaking Mayor Lindsay to speak at the rally and District 65's President Livingston's remarks that "we are here to save America" indicated the bureaucrazy's program. Despite all their power, it is understood that only 50,000 leaflets were put out by the officials sponsors of the demonstration and these were almost without political content.

In contrast, the Workers League, with the help of students from many campuses, distributed 25,000 leaflets in the garment center and to other workers and students around the city, calling for the rally and raising the demand for a labor party, immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Southeast Asia, and an end to attacks on students.

Again showing that the power and discipline of the working class dominated the demonstration despite the bureaucracy, a defense guard of more than 600
AGAINST WAR IN NYC

DEFENSE
The core of the defense guard was made up of workers from District 65, Teamsters, electrical workers and UAW Local 259. At one point a group of counter-demonstrators from Broun's New York Building Trades Council appeared along the side, shouting, cursing and waving American flags. The captain of the UAW Local 259 defense marshals walked over in their direction and began shaking his fist at them. Calling them traitors to labor andhirings of the bosses, he asked, "What happens when your contract expires and you go on strike? Are you expecting support from the UAW? The bosses and Nixon sure won't give you any."

ATTACK
The police who were implicated in the attacks on students and antistar demonstratorS in the Wall Street area during the last few weeks, were looking for an opportunity to attack the demonstration. But did not find it until the demonstration had officially ended and demonstrators were marching up Broadway. Many of these marchers were students and youth led by Young Against War and Fascism, who wanted to march to Bryant Park. After initial resistance by police who said that the marchers lacked a permit, they agreed to let the march proceed to Bryant Park. But at 39th Street, one block before the park, the police stopped the march, declared it to be an illegal march and after telling the crowd to disperse, suddenly charged into the crowd, swinging their clubs and beating demonstrators who had been knocked to the ground.

It is clear from this incident that the police were trying to "get even." They were angry that the City Hall rally has brought together thousands of students and workers openly in the name of labor. The police were counterattacking against what was a mighty step forward to overcome the division of workers and students that is promoted by all the forces of the ruling class—from the fascists to Nixon and Agnew and the "liberal" New York Times.

451 Calif Labor Leaders Hit War
Joining the growing movement of the American working class against the Vietnam war, 451 labor leaders in the Bay Area have signed a statement addressed to Nixon declaring "We've Had It" on the war. It notes: "Working people and their families are deeply disturbed at your expansion of the war into Cambodia." It concludes: "We want a cease-fire—Now! We want out of Cambodia—Now! We want out of Vietnam—Now! We've had it!"

Particularly significant is the wide range of unions involved, including a large section of the construction trades, the UAW, Teamsters, AFT as well as the ILWU. The statement was issued simultaneously with the giant labor rally held in New York City. Like the labor rally in New York, it was buried in the press. The New York Times reported it on page 58 even though it has given front page coverage to the pro-war demonstrations of construction unions.

Among the signers were: A. Figone, executive secretary of the San Francisco District Council of Carpenters; Daniel Del Carlo, chairman of the San Francisco Building Trades Council; Charles Brown, executive board member of Ironworkers Local 790; G.P. Campbell, assistant business manager of the Boilermakers; Samuel C. Churchwell, business representative, Local 224 of the Plasterers. Also Einar Møln, second national vice president of the Teamsters and head of the Western Conference of Teamsters; Joseph Diviny, first national vice president of the Teamsters; Larry Vail, secretary of the State Retail Clerks' Union.
**BULLETIN**

**EDITORIAL**

**The Way Forward--Build A Labor Party**

Last week's demonstration of over 50,000 workers and students against the Indochina War and repression at home marks a whole new stage in the struggle of the American working class. It was the first mass rally ever held by the labor movement together with the students. It was the most important labor antirwar rally held since the beginning of the war.

But it marked more than that. It marked an important step towards the formation of a united front of the working class as a whole against capitalist attack. This was no ordinary strike for specific trade union demands but rather a powerful rally of the labor movement as a whole, as a class, over political issues of a far reaching character--imperialist-war, armed attacks by the capitalist state against workers and students, racist repression. It was a demonstration of class against class with labor taking the lead. It was thus the beginning of the united front of the working class.

The sudden burst of patriotic flag waving within sections of the labor movement, openly supported by the bosses and their leaders, is but another indication of the same thing.

The capitalists now realize that labor is in the center of the state. Fearing its unity against them, not only here but internationally through struggle against imperialist war, the capitalists wish to split the working class and seek to turn a section of the workers in support of capitalism.

**political**

The powerful forces of the future confrontation will be all present at City Hall last week. It will be precisely through the leadership of young workers, particularly black and Puerto Rican workers, that we can turn the students around a united class fight that the working class as a whole can be brought into action, breaking down all the divisions that are indispensable for capitalist rule.

**leadership**

At the same time it must be understood that the construction of the united front of the working class requires above all a political fight for the labor party as its political expression, and a bitter POLITICAL fight against the bureaucratic and the revisionist and Stalinist "radicals." It is clear the labor union leaders called this rally only when they had no alternative, as they became squeezed between the movement of the ranks and the students on the one side and the more open opposition of the bosses within the labor movement on the other. Once they called the rally they acted as a brake upon it, limiting the level of mobilization for it.

Again at the rally the labor leaders, rather than REFLECTING this independent movement of the working class, politically opposed it, seeking to transform it into a DEPENDENT capitalist political action within the two parties which are responsible for the war and the repression.

**What The Editors Think...**

Reports of the labor march of over 30,000 trade unionists and students in New York City on May 21st has been widely discredited and falsified by the capitalist press in New York. In all the accounts published of this very first mobilization of the trade union movement against the war, no mention has been made of the black bloc.

This stands in direct contrast to the fact that a large and well-organized demonstration of construction workers in New York in opposition to the Vietnam war was covered by the city's newspapers, television stations and national magazines.

The New York Times headlined its front page article on the rally with "9 Hurt in Pepe Group "Kruck" Demonstration." This demonstrates the difference between the picture of the poor and the rich and the left and the right.

The article continues with a description of the confrontation of youth with the police (a confrontation that followed the police and occurred after the rally). It is only when you turn to the Times to find that it is revealed that only 3 were even involved in the rally. The picture both the Times and the supposedly more conservative Daily News try to point to is that of a student confrontation with the police.

Like the Times, the Daily News distorts the size of the demonstration, contrasting it with the "mammoth meeting of hard hats" the day before. The News goes on to whitewash the role of labor, emphasizing the participation of the students and the presence of "rock music" and "saukanners."

The real class interests of the press are revealed in its distortions and in its tremendous enthusiasm for the demonstration in support of Nixon the previous day. Like the marchers that day, the press stands with the "Establishment." Their lies only reveal their backwardness to the working class. The "liberal-New York Times which is supposed to be against the war views this rally as against the labor movement in a different way than when it is built by the labor movement. At the heart of these reports is the real fear of the working class and the demonstration action of the working class against capitalism. It is precisely this rally that was held on May 21st.

Only the Bulletin can give a true account of this historic rally and the way forward for the working class. At the heart of the work of the Bulletin is indispensable in this period of the offensive of the class as capitalist. Its press takes up the battle against the defense against the capitalists the Bulletin went weekly last fall in print against for these struggles and why it must be built today. We urge all our readers to contribute in every way possible by subscribing by sending the paper, by submitting articles and by contributing financially in its growth.
INTRODUCTION

BY LUCY ST. JOHN

WE ARE REPRINTING here three documents from the internal discussion bulletin of the Trotskyist Progressive Labor Party. The first two documents by "Comrade X" and Morti Scheer were contained in an internal discussion bulletin published by PL in November, 1969.

This discussion was initiated in an internal PL National Committee report in which the leadership revealed that they had "come to the conclusion that we are working over one important aspect of revolutionary strategy—the universal significance of the struggle against the concept of whether nationalism can be revolutionary."

"PL saw earlier to maintain its mistrusted approach towards China, the discussion was opened by the leadership in order to arrive at a line. As Milit Rosen puts it in the introduction to the discussion bulletin: "Hopefully, by the end of this discussion, our participation should help the leadership arrive at a more logical policy for the development and the future of our party and the international communist movement." In publishing these documents PL developed its ideas into "the hopper" the PL leadership hoped to come up with a strategy.

It is not the place, and what Rosen did not foresee, was that there would be no discussion of "revolutionary strategy" without confronting the central historical question that is posed in the Trotskyist class—class the question of Trotskyism versus Stalinism.

This is the importance of Comrade X's document, which correctly points out that clarity in the question of nationalism and the popular front without setting the record straight on Trotsky. But it is precisely this clarity that is missing today. The question of Trotskyism is the one question that does not fit into their hopper. It is this question that PL has refused to confront from its original split with the Comintern. This clarity has been achieved on the question of nationalism in PL, Stalin and Stalinism are to be confronted with.

Scheer's reply is a collection of all the standers, lies, and distortions straight out of the books of the Communist Party. It is almost word for word a copy of Rumanian newspapers (Sept. - Oct., 1963). "50 Years of the Communist Party USA 1912-1963." These same distortions have been dealt with in the current series in the Bulletin by Fred Mueller "Stalinism and Trotskyism in the USA."

straight

It is not just that he is not taking his training in the American Communist Party but PL has not really taken a position on its failure to stand as a real question of that party. When PL is talking about its "dictatorship of the proletariat," its "alliance with the labor movement" and its "worker's program" it is all based on a reformist program, its refusal to pose the break of the American working class from the capitalist parties amount to one thing and one thing only—"political support" to capitalism and the capitalist parties in the U.S.

Scheer raises one question which reveals the central weakness of Comrade X's document: If Trotsky had "a correct Marxist-Leninist line" how could he have permitted "his party" to vote for the "Nationalist revisionist"? Comrade X opens himself to this because of the way in which he approaches Trotsky. Comrade X attempts to separate "Seo's task" and "the essence of Stalin's betrayal in Germany, France, and Spain as well as within the Soviet Union from Trotskyism and the Trotskyist movement. "

Trotsky's analysis is abstracted from his struggle for international leadership for the international working class, the founding of the Fourth International and its program.

You can no longer separate Stalin and his "mistakes" from Stalinism and its historical evolution that you can separate out Trotsky's correct analysis from the rule of the Trotskyist movement. Trotsky at one point saw the development of theory and his struggle against Stalinism as central to the construction of a party. The theoretical gains made by Trotsky become the basis and armament for the working class in the building of an international party capable of leading the working class to power.

The separation of theory and practice poses the greatest difficulties for Comrade X who actually has to admit "that this aspect (Trotsky's "counterrevolutionary role") of Trotsky's history should be rediscovered and is a new light in the eyes of the Communist Parties of this period then played and today." Comrade X's analysis has no new light in the eyes of the Communist Parties of those periods. It is based on the theory that leads him to further propositions in conflict with China and Mao.

In Chinese, and Mao and the Chinese movement contends that Mao "resurrected" Lenin and Trotsky's fight for internationalism and that Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution "is the essence of the new theory of the PCI, theory of nationalism and the Mao Tse Tung theory of revolution under the democratic front". But Comrade X then cannot explain why they cannot base themselves on the perspective of "socialism in one country".

While Mao broke empirically with Stalin in 1939, he never broke from Stalinism and built a leadership based on the preservation of the bureaucracy's privileges and the subordination of the international working class to "building socialism in one country." Unlike Lenin and Trotsky, Mao fought throughout their lives to construct an international based on the victory of the working class in China. But in the rest of the country, Mao has substituted for the international an internationalism of national corporatist alliances with bourgeois nationalists such as Sukarno and in Pakistan.

logic

The logic of Comrade X's method is reflected in the role and contribution of Arno Twickel's discussion of Trotsky. Twickel was one of the founders of the American Communist Party and the Trotskyist movement in the U.S. He played a leading role in the Trotskyist movement in the 1930's when it led the working class against the policies of the Comintern. When SWP was expelled from the Socialist Workers Party which had long since rejected Trotskyism, he turned not to the Trotskyist movement in the International Committee of the Fourth International but to PL. Twickel turned to PL because he did not like the roots of the degeneration of the SWP and its adaptation to Stalinism.

Twickel, a renegade from Trotskyism, becomes the henchman for Stalinism. At a time when whole sections of the membership of PL are raising questions about the revisionary "un revisionary" and its relationship to the popular front, at a time when it is not being raised within the party, Twickel becomes the greatest defender of Stalinism. His article, while attacking the Popular Front and "diluting the Trotskyist line of SLB" contains not even mention Trotsky. Essentially SWP becomes Trotsky's real back man up and stands with the PL leadership against those who are seeking to get at the roots of revisionism. This is but one more example of how revisionism in the Trotskyist movement bolsters Stalinism.

no compromise

The point is there can be no compromise between Stalinism and Trotskyism. While Comrade X today seems to have picked up hits and notions from Trotsky's analysis, the foundations of PL and its program are based on Stalinism. This is made abundantly clear by Trotsky's analysis, the position of PL by Mr. Scheer.

Faced with the question of Trotskyism and Stalinism would destroy the whole base for the "progressive Labor movement," the Party would just as Trotsky's whole struggle against Stalin posed the destruction of the bureaucracy in the workers state. Just as Stalin had to liquidate Trotsky and the entire Bolshevik party to carry through his counterrevolutionary policies, so has PL had to crush all opposition within PL—opposition which poses the question of Trotskyism.

EXPelled

The December 1968 issue was the first to come out under our new leadership. In addition to that both of us worked in the Progressive Labor Party, and in the New York City Community Center. About five months ago we started to prepare a discussion paper to work with the SWA, and was transferred to the so-called intellectuals club, in discussion about the idea of our work with the SWA. We took over the main responsibility of the paper. Up to the time of our removal from the paper and expulsion we have been doing this work. We feel that over all we have done good work for the party to the best of our abilities. During these last two and a half years we were never negatively criticized. On the contrary, we were always told that the paper had improved tremendously both in content and in form. We do not claim to have been "100% pure Bolsheviks" or that there is no room for improvement in our work. But we were using our thumbs or collecting cucumbers during this time.

Despite Milit Rosen's statement in the introduction to the discussion bulletin, "No one should feel constricted from airing their position." From the fact that it was the leadership itself which had opened up discussions on "New Democracy" and the "Popular Front" disciplined actions were taken against these two comrades. First they were removed from responsibility from the paper. On March 5th they were informed that the Steering Committee of the Party had decided to expel them on the grounds that they held "Trotskyite" positions. They were denied even the basic right of appeal. After their expulsion they fought to stay in the party and appealed to the rank and file for support. In their appeal they explained the real basis for their expulsion: "It is our opinion that this action of the party's leadership fully confirms what is said in Juan's document. This action proves that the party's leadership, despite its sterile "criticism of Stalin" and its struggle against the revisionism of the Comintern, has not outlived its usefulness for the party's methods of dealing with internal political differences: organizational maneuvers and expulsions instead of principled political struggle, Stalinism instead of Leninism."

It is no accident that this struggle within PL should come to the fore today. As the working-class center comes before us, politically and organizationally and the central question of leadership is posed, all of the crucialities of the struggle between Stalinism and Trotskyism are raised. It is Trotskyism which bases itself on a struggle for the victory of the working class against the betrayals and defeats of Stalinism.

This is why today our struggle is so timely and the
At Milt Rosen's request (second from right), Mort Sheer (right) has come to the defense of Stalin against Comrade X. Where do Fred Jerome (far left) and Bill Eaton stand on these questions and on the expounding of the editors of *Densauft*?

All but the expoudings and holigan talk of those on the Left Trotsky, the edicts of Stalin, the talk of the other elements in the Comintern.)

But all of the expoudings and holigan talk of those on the Left Trotsky, the edicts of Stalin, the talk of the other elements in the Comintern. It is simply the case that there are those who argue that we can 'defeat the bourgeoisie' without social struggle. The question is not whether or not it is to be expected that one who has ever been a Trotskyist will ever build up a complete socialist society in the USSR will turn the edicts of Stalin and the slogans of the socialist revolution on their heads. For the defense of the latter argument or not very different, if that means halting revolution or uniting with the bourgeoisie after 1917, or rejecting the same in essence. And similarly, the United Front reflected against it.

These international policies of the Stalinist bureaucracy, which by this time eliminated all of the "old Bolsheviks" of the Comintern, that is, the Leninists, was reflected in its flip-flop between a series of alliances with Baku, Stalin's crass betrayal of the separation of the Tatars, and in the repressive policies of the government. The officials referred to the first edition of *The New Economic Policy*. This work was published after Lenin's death, only in the second edition, several months later that he rediscovered "Leninism".

Lennin's view on this question in 1915 were well-known as the arguments used in his defense of the "degeneracy of the proletariat". In 1915, "It is possible to win the bourgeoisie, but it is not possible to unite with them. It is absolutely necessary to overthrow the bourgeois order and to create a new society." In the first few years of the revolution, the bourgeoisie was, in fact, the most powerful force in Russia, for the second proletariat of other countries.

And in that point we must elucidate what is in those days was meant, in general, by the "socialism of the bourgeoisie"—an organization of a planned pattern of social relations, the satisfaction of human needs. Collective ownership of the means of production, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not yet socialism but only its political prelude. And just as the problem of a socialist society cannot be abstracted from the problem of the socio-economic forces that exist now, is a struggle for a society and the development of new, socialist society. This is the way Trotsky described it in his series of articles in "Problems of Leninism" (1922) which could have been used by Mao as a handbook for the cultural revolution. He advocated planned industrialization with a growth rate of 40%, ridiculed by his Chinese critics.

Prokhorovskiy advocated using the peasant army, the state, and industrialization drive, of the effects of which, on the other hand, the principle of collective ownership of land is the most important. In the spirit and though it demonstrated the selectivism of socialist planning and organization (which is not recognized), but, (as we will see) it did not result in such tremendous upheavals. The first years of the life of the country, that the inevitable mass struggles that would arise, the transition to the so-called collective administration by Stalin's own bureaucracy. That period was not even concealing his petty bourgeois nationalist position as his report to the fifth Congress of the Comintern. His approach indicates. This speech didn't even bother with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat or criticism of the principle of the perspective of the same work too well from Lenin not to mention now and then..."

**DICTATORSHIP**

Why is it important to do all these post mortems? To dig poor Mary Jo out of her grave? Because from 1905 on Trotsky was putting forth the line of either the dictatorship of the proletariat or the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in the currency of the time. In 1917 he was writing: "There is no revolution in the history of mankind, we are living at the crossroads of two states, one Socialism and the other state, having become too nar-

Documents

**Soviet Trotsky**

The first question of the hierarchy of socialists is to be fulfilled, because of the lack of cor-respondence between the political and economic prerequisites of socialism. Lenin wrote: "It would be an irremediable mistake to declare; that it is only a question of correspondence between our political and economic forces, to recognize, that the way, forgetting that there will never be a 'correspondence', that there cannot be, as in the evolution of society, only by way of an industrial revolution and a revolution of the bourgeoisie—can complete socialism be created by the ALIENATION of the proletarians of all countries."

Mr. Sheer finally quotes Stalin as say-\ing:"The question of company stocks in the USSR is one of overcoming our own national bourgeoisie, the question of the history of socialism is one of overcoming the world bourgeoisie." Isn't that well, especially now when the historical experience of the Chinese in the last encirclement (leading to the Great March) the reformation of the German bourgeoisie, etc. We shall return to this point later."

Comrade X insists that the record be set straight on Trotsky, his analysis of and struggle against Stalinism of the CP, and its alliance by reading this article. Such
MORT SCHEER ON STALIN

ONE OF THE serious consequences of the revolution takeovers and the sub sequent transformation of the first socialist state into a reactionary bourgeois dictatorship has been the disintegration of Trotskyism. The complete negation of the positive contributions of the young revolutionaries and even comrades within our party.

The negation of Stalin was a consequence of the policies of the revolutionary revisionists at the 20th Congress of the CPSU. It was essential for them to negate Stalin in order to negate his contributions and Marxism-Leninism. A correct summation of the positive and negative aspects of Stalin's leadership is necessary, not only because Stalin's works are worthy of study but also to draw the conclusions of this study and both avoid and combat the counterrevolutionary Trotskyite Tendency.

The accompanying letter by a comrade on this question reveals a number of the essential characteristics and features of the revolutionary features of Trotskyism.

1. The theoretical and organizational contributions of the Communist International under Stalin's domination differ in no way from those of the First Congress. It was, in fact, making all along." This view is completely false. The contributions of Stalin's leadership, our criticisms are warranted, are not characterized as a Marxist-Leninist leader and the Soviet Union under his leadership a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

Trotsky on the other hand viewed Stalin, the CPSU leadership and the Soviet govern ment as counterrevolutionary obstacles that had to be made secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

2. The question does not arise as to whether Trotsky's errors were made on the principle of the international national bourgeoisie and the world bourgeoisie, a principle that is as valuable to the international proletariat as the principle of the national bourgeoisie and the world bourgeoisie. Stalin's leadership is to be given the credit in the interest of Stalin's leadership.

Trotsky's errors vis-a-vis Stalin's leadership was to make secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

3. The error of Stalin's leadership is to be made as a Marxist-Leninist leader and the Soviet Union under his leadership a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

Trotsky the other hand viewed Stalin, the CPSU leadership and the Soviet government as counterrevolutionary obstacles that had to be made secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

2. The historical question of the October Revolution reveals quite clearly the principle of the international national bourgeoisie and the world bourgeoisie. From this principle, we can see that Stalin's leadership is to be given the credit in the interest of Stalin's leadership.

Trotsky's errors vis-a-vis Stalin's leadership was to make secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

3. The error of Stalin's leadership is to be made as a Marxist-Leninist leader and the Soviet Union under his leadership a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

Trotsky the other hand viewed Stalin, the CPSU leadership and the Soviet government as counterrevolutionary obstacles that had to be made secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

4. The error of Stalin's leadership is to be made as a Marxist-Leninist leader and the Soviet Union under his leadership a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat.

Trotsky the other hand viewed Stalin, the CPSU leadership and the Soviet government as counterrevolutionary obstacles that had to be made secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

5. Stalin's defeat of Trotskyism because Stalin defended against Trotskyism. In the period of the great debate, the Trotskyites were openly and truthfully debated throughout the entire party. Trotsky was completely defeated by the party.

Stalin's leadership is to be given the credit in the interest of Stalin's leadership.

The Trotskyite Tendency has been defeated and condemned by the Soviet Union and the Soviet government as counterrevolutionary obstacles that had to be made secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

5. Stalin's defeat of Trotskyism because Stalin defended against Trotskyism. In the period of the great debate, the Trotskyites were openly and truthfully debated throughout the entire party. Trotsky was completely defeated by the party.

Stalin's leadership is to be given the credit in the interest of Stalin's leadership.

The Trotskyite Tendency has been defeated and condemned by the Soviet Union and the Soviet government as counterrevolutionary obstacles that had to be made secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

5. Stalin's defeat of Trotskyism because Stalin defended against Trotskyism. In the period of the great debate, the Trotskyites were openly and truthfully debated throughout the entire party. Trotsky was completely defeated by the party.

Stalin's leadership is to be given the credit in the interest of Stalin's leadership.

The Trotskyite Tendency has been defeated and condemned by the Soviet Union and the Soviet government as counterrevolutionary obstacles that had to be made secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

5. Stalin's defeat of Trotskyism because Stalin defended against Trotskyism. In the period of the great debate, the Trotskyites were openly and truthfully debated throughout the entire party. Trotsky was completely defeated by the party.

Stalin's leadership is to be given the credit in the interest of Stalin's leadership.

The Trotskyite Tendency has been defeated and condemned by the Soviet Union and the Soviet government as counterrevolutionary obstacles that had to be made secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.

5. Stalin's defeat of Trotskyism because Stalin defended against Trotskyism. In the period of the great debate, the Trotskyites were openly and truthfully debated throughout the entire party. Trotsky was completely defeated by the party.

Stalin's leadership is to be given the credit in the interest of Stalin's leadership.

The Trotskyite Tendency has been defeated and condemned by the Soviet Union and the Soviet government as counterrevolutionary obstacles that had to be made secondary questions. The main aspect of Stalin's leadership in Trotsky's view is just the opposite.
Desafia editors accuse Shechev of reviving all of the old slanders of Stalin (here with Ryzhov on right) against Trotsky and relate this to errors and confusion in the revisionist camp worldwide.

Soviet Union and throughout the world. They prepared the ground for composition of a new, revisionist, Stalinist program from the point of view of the proletariat and all the advanced countries are needed for the victory of this program. These quotations show clearly that "socialism in one country" never crossed the boundaries of Stalinism and everyone who knows a few other things as well: Trotsky's views on the question of the October revolution are just as important a question as the question of the October revolution (as far back as 1905, Trotsky wrote: "If the Bolsheviks are incapable of building the Communist International, then the revolution in one country..."

In April, 1949, Lenin declared that a "socialist revolution in one country" was the theory of the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry. This theory of the "socialist revolution in one country" was based on the idea that the Soviet Union, as the first socialist country, would have to solve the problems of socialism and industrialization by itself, without the help of the working class of other countries. This view was further developed in the "Theory of the Permanent Revolution" by Lenin in 1905, which stated that the October revolution in Russia and the"permanent revolution" in the rest of the world, would lead to the development of socialism and the suppression of capitalism. But the conclusion of this theory was that a "socialist revolution in one country" was impossible and that the only way to achieve socialism was through a "permanent revolution" in the rest of the world.

SLANDER

In his attempt to maintain Stalin against Trotsky, comrade Shechev uses his article, "Don't Be a Stuart for the Russians, Nationalism Divides the Workers," to claim that Stalin was a "Marxist." He says that Stalin "devoted himself to the cause of the proletariat and socialism." But Lenin speaks for himself.

In his article, "The Political Strategy of the Russian Revolution," Lenin states: "If the socialist revolution in one country were to become a reality, it would mean that the Russian working class had to solve all the problems of socialism and industrialization alone, without the help of the working class of other countries." This was a clear departure from the "Theory of the Permanent Revolution" and a clear statement of the need for socialism to be built in a world socialist system, which would require the cooperation of the working class of all countries.

In his article, "The Problems of Socialism in One Country," Lenin writes: "The theory of socialism in one country is a theory of the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry. This theory of the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry." Lenin's article is a clear statement of the need for socialist revolution to be built in a world socialist system, which would require the cooperation of the working class of all countries.
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In his article, "The Problems of Socialism in One Country," Lenin writes: "The theory of socialism in one country is a theory of the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry. This theory of the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry." Lenin's article is a clear statement of the need for socialist revolution to be built in a world socialist system, which would require the cooperation of the working class of all countries.

In his article, "The Problems of Socialism in One Country," Lenin writes: "The theory of socialism in one country is a theory of the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry. This theory of the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry." Lenin's article is a clear statement of the need for socialist revolution to be built in a world socialist system, which would require the cooperation of the working class of all countries.

In his article, "The Problems of Socialism in One Country," Lenin writes: "The theory of socialism in one country is a theory of the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry. This theory of the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry." Lenin's article is a clear statement of the need for socialist revolution to be built in a world socialist system, which would require the cooperation of the working class of all countries.

In his article, "The Problems of Socialism in One Country," Lenin writes: "The theory of socialism in one country is a theory of the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry. This theory of the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry." Lenin's article is a clear statement of the need for socialist revolution to be built in a world socialist system, which would require the cooperation of the working class of all countries.

In his article, "The Problems of Socialism in One Country," Lenin writes: "The theory of socialism in one country is a theory of the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry. This theory of the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry." Lenin's article is a clear statement of the need for socialist revolution to be built in a world socialist system, which would require the cooperation of the working class of all countries.

In his article, "The Problems of Socialism in One Country," Lenin writes: "The theory of socialism in one country is a theory of the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry. This theory of the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union after the revolution due to the isolation of the Soviet Union and the failure of revolution in Western Europe, and to the fact that the working class in the country, as in the rest of the world, was not yet ready for a new revolution based on the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry." Lenin's article is a clear statement of the need for socialist revolution to be built in a world socialist system, which would require the cooperation of the working class of all countries.
World Economy Heads For Collapse

BY DENNIS O'CASEY

The crisis in the U.S. and world economy is rapidly reaching a breaking point, threatening new, more vicious attacks on the American and international working class.

Last week the complete inability of Nixon to make the slightest dent in the inflationary spiral was driven home once again by the fact that the Consumer Price Index rose in April at the annual rate of 7.2%.

What this means is that the pressure which drove U.S. balance of payments into a record first quarter deficit of $3 billion dollars is raging virtually out of control.

This is in spite of the fact that Nixon's efforts to fight inflation have brought the U.S. economy to the brink of a collapse on the order of 1929.

This is reflected in the unemployment figures of 4.8%. More than 4 million workers are out of work, which means that the financial institutions are capable in this period of going to the wall.

This has been starkly demonstrated by the gigantic Overseas Investment Survey which in 10 minutes of madness like Corfeland and King.

The economy is in dire straits, however, the most frightful of the U.S. ruling class clearly now has only the tiniest chance of continuing the inflationary trend and have been determined to fight it at almost any cost.

One can see that the only way things can be saved is that the working class will discover the movement against the March 20可能发生.

The working class will take over the factories and organize a revolutionary government.

The following is an article translated from the French Trotskyists' Informations Ouvrieres. The article contains important material on the possibility of a socialist revolution in Western Europe and is a call to the working class to organize for the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy.
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PL-SDS GANG ASSAULTS BOSTON SMC MEETING

BY PAT CONNOLLY

BOSTON, MASS., May 24 The Student Mobilization Committee

meeting, which had been postponed in the wake of the
disaster in the Boston, was held yesterday.

The meeting was called to order by

30 members of the Progressive Labor

Party and the SDS.

Several weeks before, eight men identified as
members of PL and SDS, and attracted by the

Student Mobilization Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, were

arrested by the Boston police.

Today at the Student Mobilization

Committee meeting, a motion was

made by Peter Campey, SWP-YSAs, that two

representatives of PL be allowed into the meeting to

represent the views of the PL contingent.

The motion was passed by a vote of 28 for and

3 against, with one abstention.

The PL-SIDAS contingent, which

was represented by Peter Campey, reportedly

opposed the motion, but did not vote on it.

The meeting concluded with a discussion of

the police action and its implications for the

Student Mobilization Committee.

LABOR COMMITTEE JOINS CP POPULAR FRONT ON GREECE

By THE EDITORS

The Labor Committee, led by

Lyn Marcus, has formed a

popular front with the Communist Party's youth organization,

the Young Workers Liberation League, as well as with the

pro-Stalinist Youth Against War and Fascism and assorted

liberal groups in the Greek resistance movement.

Together these forces issued a com-

mon leaflet calling for a demonstration on

May 17 to oppose the Greek parade

which supported the Colonels' dictatorship.

The leaflet speaks in the name of the

"Greek revolutionary and demo-

cratic movement" and argues the

necessity of a "popular front" with

the Greek people.

Thus the leaflet views the struggle

against the Greek military junta as a

democratic one and on this basis unites

with the liberals and Stalinists.

The line of this leaflet is that of Stalin-

ism internationally and in Greece. It

is precisely this line which facilitated the

dissolution of the first Comintern.

BLEEDING

It is a matter of bloody historical

record that Stalin came to terms with

Churchill after the war on the basis of

turning Greece over to the imperial-

ist West.

And so, when, in 1947, PL pulled

off the Greek guerrillas from supplies and

aid, it did so not as a escape from the

unknown but as a contribution to the
eastern European cause.

The great lesson of Greece is the

necessity to stand firm against the

chauvinists of the Communist Party of

Greece has insisted on limiting the strug-
gle within "democracy" which is, in cap-

talist terms, the struggle of the upper

class against the working class.

The most important lesson of Greece

is the necessity to see the struggle for working class leadership around a program of

socialist revolution. Stalinism opposes this

and therefore Stalinism stands as the

tool of the upper class.

MARKS

The Labor Committee was founded by

Lyn Marcus who is today its leader.

The Labor Committee's broad

leaflet is a policy which he has formulated and in accord with it.

Lyric Marcus spent 20 years as a member of the

Socialist Workers Party during a period when that organization was Trotsky-

ist and part of the Fourth International.

Breaking with the SWP in 1946, he spent a short time with the prerevolutionary organization of the Workers League and an even shorter time with Spartacist.

Then he began his independent political campaign which led him to his present political position.

It is significant that Marcus stood

so close to the Stalinist regime in his

lengthy communications with it, maintaining that the Spanish Republic, the Greek

capitalist class and the Stalinists, were all the same.

The Elena" is the Stalinist movement's

latest edition.

The Labor Committee was formed in

1946, when the Communist Party of

Greece was still a fledgling organization.

It has always been active in the

struggle against the Greek military

junta, which is supported by the

West.

The Labor Committee is a popular

front organization, not a party in the

true sense of the word.

Stalinism is a byproduct of the

Communist Party's failure to develop a
clear program for the working class.

The Labor Committee has a clear

program: to develop a program for the

working class.

RACIST

The group has organized itself as a

vanguard squad to "protect" Jews from

attacks by blacks as well as to defend Israel in the

Arab-Israeli war.

But the group is not interested in

working with black activists who have a different

view of the conflict.

The group has also been accused of

racism and anti-Semitism.

The group's activities have been

criticized by some Jewish leaders,

who have called for its dissolution.

The group is an outgrowth of the

Black Panthers, who were themselves

criticized for their racist views.
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criticized by some Jewish leaders,
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French Trotskyist Youth Hold First Conference

BY V. BARAT
PARIS, MAY 18—The first Congress of the revolutionary French youth movement, the Alliance of Youth for Socialism (AJS), was held here on the weekend of May 16 and 17. The movement's rapid rate of growth forseen at the AJS at its gigantic rally last February 1 at Bourget Airport have been fully verified in the course of the last three and a half months.

Most of the deliberations of the 600 delegates, each representing a minimum of 50 members, were concentrated on consolidating their new forces around a programmatic statement of the policy of the AJS. The main barrier to the seizure of state power by the working class is the law of Baldwin, which will be lifted in May as a result of the legal decision of the French Supreme Court.

About 200 more visitors and fraternal delegates from other countries attested to the international character of the AJS as the world's largest organization of its kind. It was not surprising, therefore, that the AJS held in Paris, France, which is itself an organization in France, while assembling a creation of groups throughout the world.

YOUTH INTERNATIONAL
This conference, held on April 11 and 12, was attended by delegates of the YI from Britain and the Young Guard of Germany, the AJS of Italy and Yugoslavia, the Young Communist League of Switzerland, and the YI of its own organization in France while assembling a creation of groups throughout the world.

Lindsay And MTA Blame Workers for Subway Crash

Conductor Abraham Williams (right), and motorman Anthony Haynes, (left).

BY MARTY JONAS
NEW YORK—On Wednesday, May 29, a disabled and empty passenger train on the New York IND subway line collided at regular traveling speeds with a parked rush-hour train at a station in Queens.

Two persons were killed and about seventy injured. It was the first fatality accident in New York's subway since 1928.

Three subway workers—a motorman, a conductor, and an inspector—are being blamed for the accident. Two have already been suspended pending investigation.

According to an eyewitness, the disabled train, one of the many that break down each week in the decayed subway system, was being run from the front by the motorman while the conductor signaled to him with a flashlight from the first car. This is the way they were ordered to get the train started.

According to the Metropolitan Transit Authority, which is in the process of blaming the workers on the blame, this is the standard way of moving any train which has an operative brake or on which there are agents of the railroad class who can be used to build a revolutionary league in France.
THE UAW AND WALTER REUTHER

On The Road From Militant To Bureaucrat

By Dan Fried

The Flint Sitdowns that built the UAW were a response to the mass strike wave that swept the country and built and consolidated the CIO in 1937. As a militant local leader, Walter Reuther had a role to play in those struggles. But within two years, Reuther had ceased to be a fighting militant and had become an ambitious aspiring bureaucrat who put his support for Roosevelt and the plans for war ahead of the interests of the workers.

Walter Reuther, along with his brothers, Victor and Roy, were among the workers involved in the 1937 organizing drive. Walter Reuther had already turned his back on the independent political action by labor—the working class—the labor party—in favor of the popular front policy of support to Roosevelt.

The policy of the popular front, of support to the Social Democrats and the Democratic Party, failed to defeat the Flint sitdowns, mainly because the rank and file strike leaders had much too healthy a distrust of these politicians to be convinced, the only one on the organization of the rank and file. Many of these militant leaders were under the influence of the Communist Party because it took up the popular front, and of the left wing of the Socialist Party which was for independent political action by labor.

LITTLE STEEL

But in the Little Steel Strike, the popular front did its dirty work. The leaders of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee, Philip Murray and John L. Lewis, together with the Stalinists prevailed on the workers to take the orders of the steel workers and legal, and the state troopers, police and National Guardsmen were called in to keep “law and order.”

The Little Steel Memorial Day massacre of striking Chicago Republic Steel workers at the hands of New Deal Mayor Kelly’s police. The workers, told by their leaders that their right to peaceful picketing was “guaranteed,” were mowed down by the Chicago police while trying to exercise their right.

But Reuther’s support for Roosevelt was far from unusual for the Socialists. Reuther had by now openly joined forces with Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers who was Roosevelt’s most trusted agent in trying to hold back the union organizing drives, most notably at Bethlehem Steel and at the Ford Motor Co. Even though the UAW leadership had officially opened a drive to organize Ford, they were at the same time trying to contain them. They knew that a solution for the union drive was to be made peacefully in forthcoming NRLB election that was the strategy of the CIO Ford Director to whom they turned over the organizing drive. Typically, their long-time friend Robert G. White House was the one to announce the day after he re-elected, Nov. 7, 1938, the UAW at the Ford 91 million to Ford of $213 million. At the same time UAW members were firing unionists from the Ford Rouge plant.

The support to Roosevelt by Reuther and the other UAW leaders did not result in defeat at Ford, where an awning-issuing struggle by the UAW rank and file did bring unionism to Ford. But the same policy led to the treachery of the UAW leaders in the North American Aviation strike. Reuther, acting with the tacit approval of Hillman and his friend Reuther, ordered the striking North American workers back to work and announced he was sending troops to open the shop strike in the interests of the “national emergency.” John L. Lewis, now a bitter opponent of Roosevelt, denounced Hillman as a “traitor” who was “standing at Roosevelt’s elbow when he signed the order to send troops to stab labor in the back.”

From the beginning the UAW International Executive Board sought to undermine the strikers through their red flags and files of the UAW, attempted to order the strikers back to work, and a mere meeting was vowed. “The next morning,” wrote Art Fries, “the bumbling workers massed at the plant. There to meet them was the first large strike of a UAW that did not result in a strike of 3,500 federal troops. Thus the United States government waged its first military engagement of World War II on American soil against American workers resisting hunger wages.”

SOLIDITY

Reuther led the attack with his constitutional amendment barring from elective or appointive office anyone who is a member of or subservient to any political organization, such as Communist, Nazi or Fascist which own allegiance to any foreign government. This amendment was a thinly veiled weapon by which the Reuther forces to solidify themselves in the leadership of the UAW against both the Stalinists and the militant rank and file. The issue of these strikes and of the convention was without doubt the crushing of the rank and file by the UAW bureaucracy in the interests of the ruling class.

During the war Reuther used his historical complexion to the Stalinists and his independence from the central UAW Thomas-Addes leadership who worked in a joint caucus with the Stalinists) to gain certain authority in the eyes of the intelligentsia who resisted the no strike pledges and wage freezes.

At the 1944 convention he attempted to qualify his support of the no strike pledge, at the same time keeping somewhat in the background. He and his brother Victor attempted to put forward as ambiguous position on the no strike pledge in order to capture the support of the militants without actually opposing the no strike pledge.

The 1944 convention was in reality the beginning of the revival of the no strike war time no strike pledge and wage freeze which crumbled into a massive strike wave at the end of the war. The high point of the strike wave was the great 113 day General Motors strike, which brought Walter Reuther, as the leader of the GM negotiations, up to the low point of his popularity at the 1944 convention and swept him into the presidency of the UAW.

Joe Curran in the National Maritime Union, who broke with the Stalinists and took leadership of the militant revolt of the ranks against the Stalinist leadership during the war, Reuther rode the crest of the rebellion against the central Thomas-Addes leadership which had collaborated closely with the Stalinists during the war. Reuther notably used his leadership of the GM strike as an economic struggle, but picked up hits and pieces of socialist policies, such as the demand brought from the Socialists, Workers Party, “Open the Books,” which he used in the GM strike.

But, like Curran, Reuther then used the GM strike to move away from the witchhunting drive to get all “communists” out of the UAW and the CIO. Indeed, Reuther jumped aboard the cold war bandwagon in this rehashing campaign unleashed by the U.S. ruling class of the witchhunting in the 1940-41 period. Reuther emerged not only as the main ruler behind Marsh and SUBA behind Philip Murray in the CIO.

In his book, “The Road From Militant To Bureaucrat” in the UAW, Reuther underwent a long process of becoming for the first time not just a union hack, but rather as a young idealistic militant. He was not only an ardent socialist, campaigning for Norman Thomas in the 1932 election, but spent nearly two years in the Soviet Union as part of a world tour to study working conditions with his brother Victor. From this tour, Walter Reuther entered directly into the struggles that built the UAW, not as an established bureaucrat, but as a militant local leader.

The Road From Militant To Bureaucrat

Pragmatism

But his experience in the socialist movement and in his travels did not take him to the point of Marxism, to the understanding that the question for the working class this side of the socialist revolution outside the task is to build revolutionary parties. Even as a socialist and militant, Reuther never went beyond the philosophy of Henry Ford and the entire American ruling class—pragmatism. Reuther never began with the class struggle and how to advance it, but with the question of, “What is going on in the world, with deals and maneuvers within the given system of capitalism. He called this policy “realism” and justified his sellouts with the same excuse we could do under the circumstances.”

He tried to make things work better for the working class within capitalism, but only ended up as a bureaucrat making things work better for the capitalists.