

APR 16 1946

# INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission

Volume 8 No. 4

10 cents

## CONTENTS

**The Objective Situation  
In The U.S.A. ( Part 2 )  
Analysis Of Socialist-Stalinist  
Governments  
Imperialists Look To Iran  
To Weaken Soviet Union**

A  
P  
R  
I  
L  
  
1  
9  
4  
6

Issued by the Revolutionary Workers League for the International  
Contact Commission.

Affiliates

**REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS ASSOCIATION OF GREAT BRITAIN  
Central Committee of the Red Front of Greater Germany  
Revolutionary Workers League of the U. S.**

Mail address of publishers

**DEMOS PRESS**

708 N. CLARK STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
Labor Donated

# IMPERIALISTS USE IRAN TO WEAKEN THE SOVIET UNION

The Stalinist Red Army has been reported moving "rapidly" through Iran, like a knife through butter, for over a week, in a newspaper created "crisis" which has attempted to arouse indignation over Iran and use the situation in the oil-rich country as a wedge for organizing the forces of counter-revolution against the Soviet Union and revolution in other countries. War rumors have been widely spread. What is really happening?

Prince Firouz, propaganda director and political under-secretary of state, has already declared: "There is no danger to Teheran. The Russians have been in the country 4½ years without attacking us. There is absolutely no threat of attack here now."

Sole factual basis for news accounts of Soviet war moves is the increase of the garrison at Karaj, Iran from 700 to more than 2,000 troops. War Minister Amir Ahmedi denied he had told a news conference that the Iranian army would fight "to the last man" if Soviet troops moved on Teheran, and declares his remarks were "completely misinterpreted" by a war department interpreter.

The remarks were misinterpreted for a very good reason, as we shall attempt to prove. But first let us show the general picture of the Soviet side of this struggle.

## STRUGGLE FOR OIL

The real struggle over Iran is a struggle for control of the oil-rich country. The Stalinist bureaucracy claims that on four different occasions - 1921, 1923, 1937, and 1939 - Iran (Persia) made oil concessions to British and American imperialist interests in violation of a Soviet-Iran treaty written at the conclusion of World War I. But this in no way gets around the fact that Stalin agreed in December, 1943, to withdraw Soviet troops from Iran if British and American forces were withdrawn.

The crisis has revealed that the real rulers of Iranian oil are the British who have a monopoly in most of the country. Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, has shown already that Britain is willing to make some concessions to the Stalinists by giving them access to a share of oil production. This is supposed to be in line with giving the Stalinist's an "out" in their desperate attempt to get some kind of northern Iran oil concession so that the Stalinist Bureaucracy's stooges can come before the UNO Security Council which meets March 25, with a minor oil deal in north Iran. Recognizing the Soviet pressure, the British have taken a "soft" attitude in hopes that Stalin's forces will not move to take over all the oil in the area.

## KARS, AZERBAIJAN, DARDANELLES

Struggle over two areas now held by Turkey has broken out. Kars and Azerbaijan formerly under Czarist rule for a long number of years, had been granted to

Turkey under the German imperialist-imposed peace of Brest-Litovsk in 1918. The Stalinist bureaucracy is demanding return of the two provinces, and has massed troops on their borders.

Demands have been made on Turkey for concessions to the Soviets in the Dardanelles sole entering point by water to the Black Sea. Under the Montreux Convention, Turkey, which now controls both sides of the Straits of Bosphorus, had been able to prevent shipment of war materials through the Dardanelles to the Soviet Union; shipments had to be routed through the Persian Gulf and overland across Iran to Baku. Now the Stalinist bureaucracy, recognizing the danger of possible avenues of entry to Soviet territory from the Middle East, are demanding control of some shipping through the strategic, narrow straits, and land concessions.

Demands placed before UNO for a controlling interest by the Soviet Union in the former Italian-held colony of Tripolitania in East Africa on the Suez-to-India route extend more emphatically the policy of Stalinist penetration into the Middle East, to counter the British imperialists and strengthen themselves.

Thus wherever the Soviets and opposing imperialist forces meet, a struggle for power in the area goes on, now quiet, now open and warlike.

#### AIM OF STALINIST BUREAUCRACY

On the side of the Stalinists, it appears that they have two objectives: one, to get oil in order to strengthen the hand of the Stalinist bureaucracy, give it valuable raw materials (which is part of the explanation for stripping of seized areas); and two, to force a change in Iran government in order to get official Iranian authority for retaining Red Army forces in Iran beyond the withdrawal date of March 2. Iranian law at present prohibits oil talks until foreign troops leave.

Thus the key to the "crisis" is that the Red Army is still in the country. On their side, the Stalinists have declared that the Kurds living in Iraq, Turkey and Iran had been cruelly suppressed in their endeavor to "gain respect for their national rights." This pose as the friend of "small nations" will fool very few workers. The claim that an uprising of Kurds is imminent appears to have some foundation in fact.

The propaganda barrage against the Soviet Union is very sharp, very well handled. To counter it, the Stalinists have begun withdrawing troops from the Danish island of Bornholm at the entrance of the Baltic Sea. Reports are in the press of Soviet withdrawals from Eastern Europe for the first time since V-E Day on May 8, 1945.

#### STALINISTS OUTMANEUVERED

Regardless of what actions the Stalinists have taken to withdraw from Bornholm and Eastern Germany, they have done their best to retain capitalism in Iran, Manchuria, Rumania, Hungary, and nearly all other areas under Red Army occupation. In Iran, the Stalinists helped build the Tudeh ("masses") Party in order to get a "favorable" capitalist government in Iran. In other and occupied areas they have attempted to set up friendly capitalist governments.

At no time have the Stalinists appealed to the masses of Iran, Manchuria, Eastern

Europe to rise up against capitalism, consummate the proletarian revolution and smash imperialism in Europe and Asia.

Failing this, Stalinism has been outmaneuvered by the imperialists and made to appear as an "aggressor" against small nations. The Stalinist weak diplomatic position arises out of their weak political position of playing ball with favorable capitalist groups in small countries on Soviet borders.

Thus the Stalinists by their stupid blundering have shoved the masses of the small countries farther away from giving aid to the Soviet Union, have helped restrain these masses and prevented them from moving towards revolution.

As a result, the imperialists of America and Britain have been able to do a considerable amount of propaganda damage to the Soviet Union, and to move forward another notch their plans for building an iron ring around the Soviet Union and for crushing revolution in other parts of the world.

#### IS STALIN OUT OF POWER?

The claim has been advanced by General Anders, leader of the Polish Expeditionary Forces in Italy, that these actions and the statements of Stalin, indicate that Stalin is no longer the real power in the Soviet hierarchy, but that he has been superseded by the powerful military section of the bureaucracy. He explains that usually when Stalin gave his "word" that he would clear out of an area or do some other political action, he carried out the agreement. Anders believes that the fact the Soviet troops were not withdrawn from Iran by the agreed date of March 2 indicates the military caste, enormously expanded and strengthened by the war, has assumed dominance over Stalin's group.

On his part, Bevin, Labor Party Foreign Minister of Great Britain, in his public statement on Stalin's reply to Churchill, has indicated that breach of the March 2 agreement would not have been consummated by Stalin, and that this constitutes evidence of a far-reaching change in governing circles in the Soviet Union.

Other reports exist on the differences between sections of the Stalinist bureaucracy particularly the powerful military. But not one of them presents any real proof of a switch in the top leadership that in any way is operative clearly enough to explain the seemingly baffling moves of Soviet policy in Iran. Differences unquestionably exist. They may be considerable, but they do not appear to be determining factors in altering Stalin's control of the bureaucracy.

#### IMPERIALIST ALLIANCE

Churchill's two speeches - at Fulton, Mo., and at New York City - demanding continuation of the Anglo-American military alliance has been denied only in part by Secretary of State Byrnes.

Byrnes says, "We do not propose to seek security in an alliance with the Soviet Union against Great Britain or in an alliance with Great Britain against the Soviet Union." But in the next breath he defends his stand for universal military training of a large army. His conclusion that he puts his trust in UNO for keeping the peace is the real clue to American policy towards world revolution and towards the Soviet Union.

Present military situation of the U.S. is not too good. The Army, Air and Naval forces are steadily shrinking while Russian forces continue large. But the U. S. imperialists, by Stalinist blundering, have been able to get up considerable sentiment for continuing the draft beyond May 15. They point to the "Iran Crisis" and demand more troops be ready. Byrnes sends a note to Stalin protesting Soviet non-withdrawal of troops from Iran by March 2. Another note asks the Stalinists to explain removal of machinery from Manchuria and seeking joint control with China of Manchurian industries. The U. S. makes clear that it is interested in Manchuria and in keeping all agreements with China on an "open door" basis. Byrnes declares it is American basic policy to intervene in any situation which it deems affects American interests. It thus declares in effect that there is no longer an "isolated" war, that American imperialism is interested in all these situations and will strive to control revolutions in any areas, or to use Iran, China, and other countries as bases against the Soviet Union.

The American imperialists are not exactly stupid. They do not make all their moves openly and bluntly. For example, they have said the Soviets can have a billion dollar loan if they cooperate with the International Monetary Fund, if they enter the World Bank, if they participate in the World Food organization and other international agencies. If Stalin will subordinate Soviet Union policy voluntarily to American imperialist control in international organizations dominated by her huge block of votes - is one if the Stalinists will probably reject.

The U.S. tie-up with Britain is a military alliance which has not stopped now that the war is over. Byrnes simply cannot declare this alliance as openly as Churchill did in his first speech.

#### U. S. IMPERIALISM MOVES

Besides Byrnes wants to use the full weight of a more legal-appearing device to stop the Stalinist bureaucracy - the UNO. Byrnes wants the Stalinists to agree to accept the UNO decisions, but the Stalinists insist on retaining the veto power. On this score, the Stalinists have been outmaneuvered repeatedly and American and British imperialism has had an opportunity to pose as friends of "democracy." If the Soviet Union should withdraw from UNO, which is a possibility, than the alliance of Britain and the U.S. would be more open, would be solidified. Steps to set up the International police force to curb revolutions will go on with or without Soviet participation. The U.S. is determined to have the means legally for crushing any and all revolutions.

Already steps are being taken to get bases encircling the Soviet Union, and to fortify them. General Marshall is in China to organize a new and united Chinese Army. He has declared to reporters that America has a "vital" (in its "accurate" sense, says Marshall) interest in a stable Chinese government, that U. S. troops will remain in North China for another 18 months. China is getting the beginnings of a Navy from the U.S. The U.S. has an air base with military rights for three years in Saudi Arabia within bombing distance of Soviet oil wells at Baku. The U. S. has shown no intention of clearing out of many areas. In the North Atlantic the U.S. is striving to obtain a permanent base in Iceland. It conducts maneuvers in the Arctic, off Greenland. It is testing winter warfare methods in Northern Canada. It sends the battleship Missouri, symbol of Japanese capitulation, to Turkey to take back the body of the late Turkish Ambassador. The American

ambassador in Iran states the U. S. will back Iran and Turkey against Soviet "aggression." It permits an immense propaganda barrage against Stalinist presence in Iran. But this is not enough. War psychosis in the U.S. is gone. It is almost impossible to raise it without some kind of a Pearl Harbor, and the Stalinists are too smart to give American imperialism such an excuse for intervention. But open skirmishing for the more violent collisions is growing.

Iran is not the only sore spot. Nor is the Stalinist bureaucracy the only one in areas where it has no business being. Britain and the U.S. are in the Middle East, Greece, China, and other countries too. They plunder areas also. They place whole populations on starvation rations. They are organizing, as Churchill's proposals make it clear, for counter-revolution anywhere in the world.

#### IMPERIALISTS USE SMALL COUNTRIES

Everywhere the imperialists attempt to use small countries as possible bases for operations against revolution and against the Soviet Union. They are creating the International Police Force to be ready for intervention in any area where revolution threatens. They are determined not to permit an "isolated" war or "isolated" revolution to occur. As in Java, or Greece, the major imperialists will cooperate in drowning the revolutions in blood.

In the present skirmishing for position in Iran and Manchuria, what policy should workers in the Soviet Union and workers in countries bordering the Soviet Union have?

1 - In the Soviet Union. The policy should be to oppose Stalinist aid to capitalist parties in Iran, Manchuria and elsewhere. In the Red Army, workers should have a policy of opposing the officer caste, of arresting officers, of creating Soviets and on the spot in Iran and Manchuria, of helping the Iranian and Manchurian workers with their revolution against Iranian and Manchurian capitalism. The general policy is for smashing the Stalinist bureaucracy, reconstituting the Revolutionary Party, Soviets, Trade Unions, Armed Workers Militias, in the political revolution to reorientate the Soviet Union forwards toward socialism, even during hostilities.

2 - In Iran or Manchuria. We are for the proletarian revolution to smash capitalist state and property relations, to set up Soviets, seize the land, and appeal to workers of the world for assistance against imperialist intervention, and to the rank and file of the Red Army to help the workers revolution. Where the Red Army moves against workers organs of power, we are for resisting the Red Army, including military resistance.

DONT FORGET TO  
RENEW YOUR SUB

# SOCIALIST-STALINIST GOVERNMENTS

## TREACHEROUS POLICY OF THE TROTSKY CENTRISTS

With the success of the Labor Party in the elections in Britain in the summer of 1945, the various reformist and centrist groups within the ranks of the working class, found a "new" way of posing their support of popular front governments, of people's frontism, and in last analysis of retaining capitalist governments. This new way was opened up to these groups (Socialists, Stalinists, Trotskyists) in part also because of the virtual annihilation of the older and more openly reactionary capitalist parties in the various countries formerly dominated by German imperialism in its heyday of conquest under Hitler.

Where in Spain and France before the second world war, the reformists and centrists were for "combined" governments of capitalist parties and "workers" parties today, they are for governments comprised only of "workers" parties. The capitalist parties are to be reduced to a minority, or even to be excluded. Thus in various countries, capitalist property relations, the capitalist state, the capitalist army, capitalist domestic and foreign policy are all retained - without the openly capitalist parties ruling the country. In their place, on the foundations of a continuation of capitalist economy, state and policy, the so-called "workers" parties propose to rule-for capitalism.

This change in the old formula of supporting a capitalist government is highly important because the reformists and centrists are enabled to hide their treachery behind the claims that "workers" parties rule; that there is no agreement with capitalist parties. But capitalism remains intact.

Long ago, Marx and Engels, and later Lenin, declared that it is the task of the proletariat not merely to take hold of the capitalist state apparatus, but to smash the capitalist state to pieces, to destroy capitalist property relations, and to establish a workers state - nothing else than the dictatorship of the proletariat over the minority class of exploiters - based on armed workers power. Any other kind of state represents a surrender of the historical interests of the working class to the existing capitalist state.

Historically there have been several capitalist governments which "workers" parties directed for the bourgeoisie. The very worst historic example is the Scheidemann-Noske Social-Democratic government in Germany in 1918 which beheaded the German revolution and murdered its leaders.

### BELGIUM

In Belgium, the clearest example of this new way of posing of their treacherous support of capitalist governments, has been made by the centrists. The Belgian Trotskyists adopted a Manifesto at their 5th Congress in which they "criticize" the Stalinists and Socialists for "trying to reconcile the interests of the workers and bourgeoisie at the expense of the working class" and for being partisans of the bourgeois state. Then they call on these parties which they have just denounced as tools of capitalism to form a Socialist-Stalinist government! How such a government would in any way alter the Socialists' and Stalinists' role as bourgeois tools, the Belgian Trotskyists blithely fail to show.

Instead they declare: "The example of France, of England ... has clearly shown that an absolute majority of the population wants a government composed solely of representatives of the working class parties."

Quite clearly the Belgian Trotskyists have forgotten the proletarian revolution which is historically the only way to destroy the capitalist state and seize state power. They have placed their faith in bourgeois elections, elections which Trotsky when he was a Marxist has proved again and again (see "Terrorism and Communism") in no way can affect basic capitalist control of the state and economy. These treacherous centrists regard it as their task not to smash bourgeois rule by proletarian revolution (out the window goes their former advocacy of the "permanent revolution" against all forms of bourgeois state, including a capitalist state headed by "workers" parties) but to make capitalist "democracy" operate a little more effectively in strangling the workers' revolution in Belgium.

They carry their betrayal of Marxism and of the workers to the lowest stage possible when in criticizing the Belgian monarchy, they pander to the most backward bourgeois illusions by raising the slogan - "For the republic." That republic can be only a capitalist state. In the epoch of wars and revolutions, where world imperialism has brought capitalism to its final stage, there can be only two basic forms of state power: the dictatorship of capital, or the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Belgian Trotskyists have declared their allegiance to the dictatorship of capital.

Their crowning betrayal, an indication of complete muddle-headedness, is their assertion that the Stalinists and Socialists are "workers" parties. This is really too much. The mass base of these parties may be in the working class, but the class base, the program, is what decides the class character of these parties. It is necessary to state that these parties are not workers parties at all; they are the parties of the petty bourgeoisie, operating in the ranks of the workers to behead the workers' revolution, to tie the workers to "left" forms of the dictatorship of capital, to channelize the revolutionary pressure of the workers for bread and the seizure of state power into harmless bourgeois channels of parliamentarism - voting for traitorous reformist and centrist groups. Not that we oppose participation in parliament, but we are for telling the workers the truth; the vote is an auxiliary to mass action.

### FRANCE

The imperialist war and German imperialist occupation of the country for almost five years resulted in severe dislocations and virtual collapse of French industry which had been concentrated mainly in the north of France. For over a year and a half after "liberation" the French capitalists have been unable to raise materially the standard of living of the mass, nor to stabilize French capitalist economy.

In their desperation in the face of huge demonstrations of industrial workers, deportees, unemployed, returned prisoners and unable to utilize any of the established capitalist parties, part of whom were destroyed, and all of which were tainted with one degree or another of conniving and collaboration with the German Fascists, the French ruling circles called on the reformist and centrist parties in the working class to form a government.

The French Socialist and "Communist" parties were asked to form a coalition government with the MRP (Catholic Radicals), after the government of national (capitalist) unity headed by De Gaulle had fallen apart. The coalition government has for its program: Carrying out of bourgeois deflation policies; wage fixing on starvation levels; stabilizing the French franc by forcing the working class to pay huge taxes.

An example of how this vicious, anti-working class coalition operates was shown when Louis Saillant, a close collaborator of the "Communist" Party in the C.G.T. (General Confederation of Trade Unions, similar to the A F of L), served as an arbiter in a recent strike of Parisian printers. Saillant ruled against the workers demands on the ground that granting the workers' wage demands would "conflict with the government's deflation program." Such is the living reality of Socialist-"Communist" "government."

#### SCHACTMAN SUPPORTS CAPITALISM

That agile mental gymnast, one Max Schachtman, performed the difficult tripple flip-flop on a French Socialist-Stalinist government.

Writing in "Labor Action" on November 5, 1945, Schachtman said the only solution to the crisis in which the French workers found themselves was to overthrow capitalism and that "This cannot be achieved by a Blum-Thorez government., that is a Socialist-Communist regime. Such a regime could only mean the rule of France by Stalinism, which would control the means of propaganda, justice, and police to begin a reign of terror against all revolutionary elements in the country."

And even if the Socialist (not the Stalinists) ruled, would such a regime be different in any essential class respect? The basis for Schachtman's ensuing flip-flop was made even in this seemingly "correct" and very very "revolutionary" declaration.

By January 28, 1946, in an editorial in "Labor Action", Schachtman had discovered: "No other central political slogan is possible for the revolutionary Marxist and none corresponds better to the needs of the situation than: a government of the Socialist Party-Stalinist Party-C.G.T."

This is where support of the Socialist Party in the French Turn of 1935 has led the Trotskyists internationally: into the morass of open support of capitalist governments. Their attitude towards the Labor Party in the U.S. is the American manifestation of their sell-out policy of capitulation to the capitalist state by backing its principal reformist agents in the ranks of the working class.

Carrying out this theory of support of "workers" parties, Schachtman, in the name of "independent" labor action, has backed "Communist" Party candidates in the American Labor Party in New York.

#### CANNON SUPPORTS STALINISTS

Not to be outdone, Cannon's section of the American Trotskyist centrist forces, called on the workers to support Johannes Steel, a Stalinist stooge, running on a "Save the Roosevelt Program" platform on the A.L.P. ticket in New York state.

Johannes Steel was endorsed by former New York Mayor LaGuardia and Vice-President Henry A. Wallace, one of the leaders of the Democratic (capitalist) Party. Cannon finds himself in bed with strange capitalist bedfellows. Does this bother this treacherous opponent of proletarian revolution? Here is what he says:

"Despite the lack of a real labor candidate and program, the independent A.L.P. campaign in this by-election represents a break with the boss parties and is therefore a step in the direction of genuine independent labor politics."

The A.L.P. has consistently supported the Democratic Party, the imperialist war, and Roosevelt's re-elections. In no sense have they broken with the boss parties. The union bureaucrats who dominate the A.L.P. are open tools of American Imperialism to restrain the workers and throttle their revolutionary actions. In this criminal endeavor, Cannon and his entire party are tail-ending the bourgeois stooges in the Union hierarchy and open capitalist politicians such as La Guardia and Wallace.

The Cannonites have also supported the Stalinist candidacy of Ben Davis, Eugene Connelly and others, both in New York and in Seattle. Their record of "criticism" of Stalinism and support of its candidates stands as a monument of deceit and doubledealing that can only confuse and mislead workers honestly striving to build an independent working class party.

#### CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

Czecho-Slovakia is ruled by a Coalition of the four major parties:

"Communist" Party.  
Socialist-plus-Social Democratic bloc on the Left  
Catholics as a disguised Right  
National Socialist Party (of which Benes is a leading member), balanced in the middle.

In Slovakia itself where nationalism is more rampant, there is a further subdivision of parties.

The country is another example of how the open capitalist parties are disappearing from the scene, how the remaining capitalist parties disguise their identity under various "left" sounding names and strive to appear as leaders of the workers.

It is this seeming disappearance of the more obvious capitalist parties that gives the Socialists, Stalinists and the Trotskyists, the opportunity to declare that "workers" parties can rule the countries of Europe.

And all this is to occur without one single step towards the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into its opposite, without the nationalization of industry and of the land, without the destruction of private ownership and appropriation, without smashing the bourgeois armies and state and constructing armed workers militias. So low have the reformist and centrists fallen in their descent towards the abyss of open aid to crushing the workers attempts to move toward the seizure of power!

#### ITALY

In Italy, the Stalinists are part of a 6-party coalition with right wing Catholics under a Right Catholic prime minister. The C.P. has the ministry of Justice under the notorious Stalinist Togliatti (formerly known as Ercoli).

The Workers C.P. (Trotskyists) castigates the Stalinists as being equally responsible with the other parties for the increasing cost of living and worsened standard of living of the workers. Then it appeals to the C.P. and S.P. to "break from the capitalists and form a government which can win the Italian workers to a Socialist Italy."

This Trotskyist dream that the C.P. and S.P. can break from capitalism is one of the root errors of Trotskyism on reformist parties in the ranks of the workers, and was promulgated by Trotsky as the basis for the "French Turn" of 1934-35 when Trotsky claimed that Social Democracy was moving to the left and the rapidity of its "break from the bourgeoisie would determine the fate of the revolution." Reformist parties are not torn away from their base in capitalist society. They cannot be reformed, for they are tied hand and foot to their capitalist masters. The Social Democracy can never be an instrument of workers' revolution.

The Trotskyists have thrown revolutionary theory out the window in coming forward with the theory that there can be a government between the dictatorship of capital and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Long ago, Lenin pointed out that any government other than the dictatorship of the armed proletariat can be only a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, regardless of its form or appearance. Socialist, Stalinist, and Trotskyist revisionism of Marxian teachings on the character of the capitalist state have led all of them to support of capitalist governments, covered by seemingly left phrases.

In Italy, too, the Trotskyists, as in Belgium, call for a Republic! As if the proletarian revolution were not on the order of the day. As if a Republic can be anything else but a dictatorship of the capitalists.

#### SOVIET UNION

Among the interesting implications of the Trotskyists support of C.P.-S.P. (capitalist) governments are what they would do in the Soviet Union. When they support such policies throughout the capitalist world, it can be only consistent for them to vote for Stalin in a Soviet "election" or for C.P. candidates for lesser positions. On this score, the Schachtmanites who allege the Soviet Union is not a workers' state, are in a completely ludicrous and indefensible position. If the Stalinists are a new class then how can they be a "workers" party? How can Schachtman ask workers to vote for such people?

On the part of the Cannonites who do not allege the Soviet Union is a capitalist state, they are in an equally indefensible position. The extension of their policy of support of C.P.-S.P. governments is manifested by their policy of "unconditional defense" of the Soviet Union. This forces an abandonment of independent working class action in the Soviet Union, and outright capitulation to the Stalinist bureaucracy, which they claim to denounce. It is significant that they keep a profound silence on the need for a new revolutionary party in the Soviet Union, revival of Soviets, organization of armed workers militias, and smashing of the Stalinist bureaucracy by political revolution. Their "unconditional defense" is the formula for capitulation to the Stalinist bureaucracy, and of denying the workers of the Soviet Union any road of independent working class action through creation of working class organs of power to accomplish the political revolution against the Stalinist bureaucracy. Their craven bootlicking of the Stalinists was especially noticeable during the German-Soviet war when they asked only for the right to fill any position and be just "good" soldiers in the Red Army in the war against Germany.

#### "COMBINED" GOVERNMENTS

By the time of the Fourth World Congress of the Communist International in November, 1922, with Lenin seriously ill and Trotsky unable and incapable of influencing the policy of the C.I., the theory of "combined" governments was adopted by the Executive Committee of the Communist International (E.C.C.I.). It is one of the first big signs of degeneration of the C.I. leadership and its subordination to Stalinism.

Thalheimer, who later played an infamous role in the fiasco in Saxony and Thuringia one year later (German revolution of 1923), had written in his proposed thesis:

"It is possible that during the transition from the old to the new, 'combined types' of government will make their appearance as pointed out in the 'Rabochi Put' (a newspaper) a few days ago; for instance, the Soviet Republic as well as a Constituent Assembly." Acting on this theory, the Communist Party in Germany attempted to create a "combined" government in Germany, 1923, and brought disaster down on the German working class, paving the way for rapid degeneration of the German CP, and the ascent of Fascism. Trotsky deals with this historical event correctly and brilliantly in the "Lessons of October."

Opportunists have alleged that Lenin was for combined types of government because of an error he made on the question of the Constituent Assembly. But no one, not even Trotsky himself who opposed the theory of the 'permanent revolution' to Lenin's theory of the 'democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry' (which would be a capitalist state, if it were realizable even theoretically), has ever explained Lenin's real attitude.

Lenin regarded the Soviets with the Constituent Assembly as a subordinate appendage as the concrete working out in life of his own tentative formulation of state power in Russia after smashing of Czarism (a concept worked out long before 1917) - the well known "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." Lenin did not consider the Constituent Assembly as a purely auxiliary tactic to expose the bourgeoisie; in life itself he relied on armed workers power, never putting the Constituent Assembly forward as the primary means but only as subordinate to workers mass action.

After the seizure of power in 1917, and dissolution of the Constituent Assembly in January 1918, Lenin in 1919 clarified for this epoch his attitude towards the constituent assembly:

"The ridiculous attempt to combine the Soviet system, i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the Constituent Assembly, i.e., with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, utterly exposes the poverty of mind of the yellow Socialists, and S.D.'s, their petty bourgeois political reactionariness and their cowardly concessions to the irresistible growth of the power of the new proletarian democracy." (Selected Works, Vol. VII, p.233).

It remained for the Stalinists, Socialists and latter-day Trotskyists to revive the anti-working class, "strikebreaker" role of Zinoviev, Kamanev and of Rykov in late 1917 who held the idea that the Congress of Soviets was provisional, pending the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. In their minds, the Constituent Assembly was the power, the Soviets were subordinate. To Lenin, the organs of workers power were decisive; all others were organs of the dictatorship of capital. Lenin's provisional formulation of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and

peasantry" evaporated in life in the revolution of 1917 and in the breaking up of the meeting of the Constituent Assembly in January of 1918. Now the reformists and centrists have attempted to use Lenin to support their treachery.

Radek who was present in the 4th Congress of the C.I., declares: "With regard to the demand for a Workers Government, a Workers Government is not the proletarian dictatorship, that is clear; it is one of the possible transitory stages to the Proletarian Dictatorship."

Radek had found some "non-class" state form between capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The trotskysts have found this same non-existent state. They should hearken to the words of Marx that there are two classes in society which can determine the character of state power - the working class and the capitalist class. There can be no intermediate classes in power, and therefore no intermediate state forms, no combined governments. All these creations are in the last analysis, regardless of the representation of "workers" parties in the government, only a "left" form of the dictatorship of capital.

Like the Trotskyists and Stalinists today, Radek in 1922 stated how the support of capitalism should be carefully concealed under left phrases: "In my opinion when we are concerned with the struggle for the United Front, we ought to say bluntly that, if the social democratic workers will force their leaders to break with the bourgeoisie, then we are ready to participate in a labor government so long as that government is an instrument of the class struggle. I mean if it is ready to fight beside us shoulder to shoulder."

This illustrates the fundamental errors of Trotskyism on the party - renunciation of its independence from all other parties, concept that reformist parties can break from the bourgeoisie, the basis Trotsky used for declaring the "French Turn" of 1934-5. Read the words of Schachtman, Cannon, Stalin, and the Socialists on combined governments, and invariably you will find a capitulation to "left" forms of the capitalist state. All of these gentry imagine they can dominate the bourgeoisie without having first destroyed its state and built a workers government on the ruins.

Zinoviev, then head of the C.I., spread this same erroneous concept: "The watchword of the Labor government is not a general watchword like the tactics of the united front. The watchword 'labor government' is a particular concrete application of the tactics of the united front under certain specific conditions."

Here, in the 4th Congress of the C.I. in 1922, the foundations were laid for subordination of the workers to the capitalist state through this "tactic" of supporting a "Labor" government. Later in China, 1925-26, Trotsky made an unprincipled deal to permit the Zinoviev-Kamenev theory of the "democratic dictatorship and peasantry", deliberately concealing the fact that this violated his own theory of the "permanent revolution" and constituted support of a capitalist state. This support was no tactic; it was a principled capitulation to the enemy which destroyed the German revolution of 1923 and the Chinese revolution of 1925-27, and led to the rise of Hitler to power in Germany. Combined governments everywhere have led workers to destruction of the revolution and further shackling to the control of the capitalist state.

The theory of "combined" governments has to be rooted out of the labor movement. It is a trap, a snare to catch the unwary. Its historical base lied in falsely equating advanced industrial countries and their capitalist states with the in-

complete bourgeois revolutions in semi-colonial countries in the progressive period of capitalist development. This false equation of two different stages of capitalist development is the foundation for the erroneous Trotsky concept of "transitional" program.

#### LENIN ON THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY

To cover up their class collaborationist policy, opportunists always argue that Lenin supported the British Labor in 1920.

Lenin in "Left-Wing Communism" proposed to help "Henderson and Snowden to beat Lloyd George and Churchill." This he believed would expose the Labor Party since he thought that once in power the Labor Party would show its bankruptcy. Lenin's mistake was probably on the basis of misinformation and the concept that Soviet power was on the order of the day in England in 1920, and in believing that the situation in England was therefore similar to that in Russia in 1917.

In Russia in June 1917, when dual power of Soviets existed beside the provisional government of Kerensky (representing the Russian capitalist class), Lenin made his now famous offer to the Mensheviks to seize the power:

"It should be noted that in Russia after the March Revolution the propaganda of the Bolsheviks against the Mensheviks and S.R.'s (Social Revolutionaries) gained a great deal precisely because of a circumstance like this. We said to the Mensheviks and S.R.'s: Take complete power without the bourgeoisie because you have a majority in the Soviets (1st all Russian Congress of Soviets, June 1917). But the Russian Hendersons and Snowdens feared to take power without the bourgeoisie and when the bourgeoisie delayed the elections to the Constituent Assembly because they knew perfectly well that the Mensheviks and the S.R.'s would have the majority in it (the latter had entered into a close political bloc and both really represented nothing but petty bourgeois democracy), the Mensheviks and S.R.'s were unable to wage an energetic and consistent struggle against these delays."

Lenin's proposal has been misinterpreted and misrepresented by all shades of reformists and centrists for 29 years since it was first made. Let us examine this proposal:

Firstly, Soviet power existed, with the proletarian dictatorship controlling large sections of the country and holding what Lenin called "dual power."

Secondly, therefore a transfer of all power to the Soviets would have meant an intensification of the revolution, resulting in the unleashing of the struggle for final expropriation of the bourgeoisie, crushing the remains of the bourgeois state, and really moving on to the next phase of the permanent revolution, where all power would be in the hands of the Soviets (armed workers power based on the production units.)

Thirdly, being faithful lackeys of the bourgeoisie, the Mensheviks and S.R.'s refused this offer, preferred the parliamentary road of waiting for the Constituent Assembly, and striving to turn the existing dual power of the Soviets into a subordinate appendage of the Kerensky provisional (bourgeois) government.

In England at the time of writing of "Left-Wing Communism," the class relations were entirely different.



No Soviets existed.

There was no March revolution and there was no problem of Henderson and Snowden of the Labor Party assuming power through non-existent Soviets.

Lenin's proposal therefore was a tactical error which, had it been carried into life, could have resulted in a principled error on the part of the revolutionists in England. But the proposed tactic for use in Britain alone was never carried into life. Lenin changed his mind a few weeks later and opposed this tactic.

Here too the Labor Party refused to collaborate, and an agreement was never reached. It remained to the Stalinists and the Trotskyists to support the Labor Party regardless, despite Trotsky's open opposition to this concept for a short number of years when he headed the Left Opposition up to 1935.

History proved that Lenin's prognosis that the British Labor Party would fear forming a government was erroneous. As it turned out, the Hendersons, Snowdens and MacDonalds did form a "labor" government. Were they exposed? Unfortunately no. By the time the "Labor" government got into power, the Stalinists had so corrupted the party in England that it never did expose the Labor Party as a tool of capitalism, but instead supported it. And this is what the Trotsky centrists do to this day.

Contrary to Lenin's analysis, when the Liberals and the Labor Party gained a majority in the general elections of 1923, the Liberals under Lloyd George threw their support behind the "Labor" Party government in Parliament. Lenin had considered that the Liberals would unite with the Conservative Party in keeping the "Labor" Party out of office.

History adduces no evidence that a Labor Party in office exposes itself per se. This is the source of endless mistakes. Only a revolutionary marxian party systematically raising the revolutionary political consciousness of the masses can expose the Labor Party to the masses. Despite the strikebreaking role of the Labor Party in the general strike of 1926, the majority of workers were still voting for Labor Party candidates. The majority of workers voted for the Labor Party in 1945. What has happened since Lenin's time is not too difficult of assessment:

The bourgeoisie in its desperation has found that the old fear of the "Labor" Party is not founded on any actions of the Labor Party, that it is a wondrous instrument for ruling the workers, of controlling them, of preventing their taking revolutionary actions against the basic seats of capitalist power; that better than any other form of bourgeois democratic republic, it is a prize means of deception of the workers. The bourgeoisie fears the masses' rising revolutionary sentiment. But the bourgeoisie does not fear the Labor Party. It knows that here at least it has one of its very ablest and most skillful weapons for confusing the workers, for getting their support, and for stifling revolution.

Thus the bourgeoisie historically has been pushed by rising workers pressure into a position where it has to deal with the workers through parties that claim to be "workers" parties. The openly capitalist parties are insufficient to perform this role. That is the situation in Europe today. It is a situation which has arisen with the destruction of the powerful Fascist Party apparatus of German imperialism after which no openly bourgeois party dares raise its head in the old way, with the old slogans, and with the old methods of controlling the workers.

We are living in the epoch just prior to the outbreak of the second immense round of revolutions. In this stage of class relations, the bourgeoisie will make full

use of the reformists, centrists and their other agents in the ranks of the proletariat. They have found since Lenin died that these reformist and centrist groups are not to be feared at all, that they are to be trusted by capitalism, permitted to grow so that when the workers rise or attempt to rise against the capitalist state, these "Labor" parties can derail the proletarian revolution.

Lenin's honest tactical mistake on the British Labor Party has been elevated into a principled system of treachery and betrayal of the workers by all shades of opportunist politicians. Lenin posed the problem only for England as a subordinate tactic, not as a general line of march. His general line of march was towards the seizure of state power. This consisted of building the revolutionary party and of exposing ceaselessly all other groups within the ranks of the workers. Lenin never proposed building up opportunist parties. He fought them all his life. He destroyed quite a number of them. It remained for the Trotskyists and Stalinists and Socialists to mutilate Lenin's teachings and twist them into declarations that Lenin would have favored "building" a non-existent Labor Party in the U.S. It is to his everlasting credit that Lenin at no time ever considered the Labor Party as anything else but a tool of the Trade Union bureaucracy for strangling the workers, that he exposed similar groupings in Russia as impediments to the workers revolution.

Historically Lenin has provided the answer to all the sham theories of "combined" governments. All such governments can be nothing else than the dictatorship of the capitalist enemy in any part of the globe where such a government arises, even if no openly capitalist party heads the government. It is precisely because a seemingly "workers" party is at the helm of a capitalist government that the struggle against these reformist illusions has to be pressed most fiercely. The road to power is strewn with the wrecks of political parties which strove to make one deal or the other with the capitalist states, each time considering that somehow the capitalist class was being subordinated to the working class. Again, let us focus our attention on the world historic mission of the proletariat - to destroy capitalist state power and create the dictatorship of the proletariat by building an independent new Revolutionary Marxian Party to guide the class in that direction.

---

SUPPORT THE  
INTERNATIONAL  
CONTACT COMMISSION

# THE OBJECTIVE SITUATION IN THE U.S. - INTERNAL CLASS RELATIONS

(Continued from the last issue)

## AGRICULTURE

Agriculture, permitted to expand in war-time still had to be maintained by government subsidy on the "parity" system. Now it will be allowed to fall down again within a year or two as United States imperialism finds it necessary to permit other countries to have some agricultural products to exchange for United States capital goods and finished products.

Whole Wallace approach of reduced production of agriculture goods in 1933-4-5 had the object in AAA of restoration of prices of farm products to "parity", and the major means for its attainment was getting farmers to reduce acres of surplus crops. Thus the sabotage of civilian production by permitting production to fall off at war's end is extended to agriculture which returns to its temporarily interrupted state of chronic decay and reliance on the government for support. Whole program of price rises which aids farmer in short run is blow at proletariat which pays the higher prices, and is the class which can least afford it. The Wallace theory of scarcity economics is a criminal assault on proletariat. As is confessed in his book, "60 Million Jobs," he has held this theory since 1919!

Farming is increasingly mechanized. A larger farm proletariat comparatively exists. Many farms are under control of a few large financial combinations.

As a market for surplus products of industry, American farmers cannot absorb. Capital expansion is so vast that the market for capital goods will have to be found abroad.

Moderate estimates of government assistance to farmers in order to keep prices up for the single year of 1942 give 2½ billion dollars as a minimum. About 600 million dollars is contributed directly as subsidies; parity payments, soil conservation payments and sugar payments.

Examples of subsidy are so numerous selection is simple. The farmer gets a return on wheat from government loan, or price, plus payments of about \$1.25 a bushel. Per bushel this is 60% more than in Canada, 70% more than in Australia, and 80% more than in Argentina - and these are all the biggest wheat-producing countries in the world after the U. S. and the Soviet Union. This indicates government action added 300 to 400 million dollars to the farmers' 1942 returns from wheat alone.

Two cents a pound added to cotton prices by government loan in a normal year means adding 130 million dollars to the returns from cotton.

Government loans may add half a billion dollars to the annual value of feed crops including corn.

As Alfred D. Stedman says in "The Politics of this War" (Edited by Ray Harvey and others): "The government deliberately boosted prices in 1941 and used an outright government price guarantee to get an increase in production of hogs, poultry, and dairy products quickly for war." This higher prices were paid for by only one class - the working class.

## PART TWO

## THE POSTWAR REACTION OF THE WORKERS

The political development of the workers was raised during this period of strikes following the close of the Japanese war. 1,500,000 workers were on strike, the largest number in American history. Three immense mass actions pointed the direction of the impending class warfare in America, and showed how out of their own experiences, American workers have found the road out of the morass of postwar controls and other devices for shackling workers.

1 - Stamford, Conn. - A "Combined Strike" committee cutting across union lines, in sympathy to a strike of 3,000 workers at the Yale and Towne Mfg. Co., halted all production for three hours. The workers were in control of the area. They showed that the road forward is to create these councils of strike committees or preparatory to strikes to combine AFL, CIO, independent unions and unorganized workers also. These workers councils can build flying squads and arm the workers, as was demanded by the union leaders at Gridley, Illinois, in defense against corporation violence.

2 - Tugboat stoppage in New York - 3,500 tugboat operators tied up an entire city of over 7 million people. The workers openly defied the government seizure of the boats and refused to go back. They have shown that if enough workers defy the government seizures under the War Labor Disputes Act, these powers can be shattered into fragments and labor can go on the march to push the capitalists further against the wall. The uselessness and powerlessness of the entire capitalist class in the face of organized, mass strength of workers was proved to the hilt. The over-organization of United States imperialism which enables 3,500 tugboat workers to halt production in all of New York City shows the fatal weakness of United States imperialism. This is also shown in power and electric strikes in Pittsburgh & Philadelphia. Thus, in three huge cities, because of the over-development of United States imperialism 16,000 workers paralyzed production.

3 - Soldiers strikes - are the highest political action of class warfare against the government directly that any section of the American workers reached during the entire war period. In the army of any other country weakened by economic crisis these strikes would have meant revolution. The government would have fallen. As it stands, the United States Government was discredited, its policy of imperialism was openly denounced by the soldiers, their opposition to use as imperialist policemen and watchdogs has inspired similar mass political actions in the R.A.F., and has served as an inspiration to revolt among workers in other countries. It is the highest indication of political development to have arisen out of the present struggles. For a time it followed the workers strikes at home, then it went beyond them, and led them in a political sense. It is unfortunate that the soldiers and workers strikes were not correlated. But the absence of a political party of the proletariat made this impossible. No other force on earth can provide that measure of political organization. The need for a political organization of soldiers and sailors and workers is apparent. Whole slogans

of liquidation of the army of imperialism have to be raised in order to smash at conscription's continuation. Demands for democratization of the army are in order. Linkage with workers strikes has to be established. Military are already on picket lines with workers, indicating a basic class solidarity which has enormous importance for the future, as soldiers lend their military experience to the workers' struggles. But above and beyond this, we should raise on high the demands for recall of all U. S. occupation forces from abroad, to have U. S. imperialism clear out of all areas outside the continental limits of the U. S., and cease smashing our worker brothers' revolutions wherever they arise.

We recognize that the army of imperialism is slowly but steadily falling apart. In whole overseas areas it is disintegrating and American imperialist prestige is disintegrating with it. But this is not enough, nor is it the whole story. Already the bourgeoisie is preparing. It knows the draft will probably not be continued beyond March 15, when the law runs out. But it has a new National Guard in gestation to number some 500,000 men. Attempts are being made to mobilize veterans into militias, National Guards and vigilante groups, or into police forces. The most hideous feature of the murders of two pickets at Gridley, Illinois, was the fact that the four killers (company police) were all ex-soldiers. A struggle for the veteran is taking place, with workers having a good chance of winning the ex-soldiers over to the side of revolution. Additionally, newer means of control are developing, with the wider use of tear gas and other chemical devices, armored trains and tanks, tommy guns and similar terror weapons. The "mobile constabulary" developed to police occupied Germany may well be utilized to police "occupied America."

#### CLASS WAR ON HIGHER LEVEL

Principal characteristic of the strike period from the standpoint of the workers is that the class war is on a higher level. Government is forced to step into the strikes constantly in order to prevent their spread. The government is uneasy, has its back to the wall, is in a desperate position, for any workers' move now can precipitate the first large-scale mass political action of the workers against the capitalist state itself, as the soldiers started out to do. At all costs the capitalist government has to prevent this mass political action from developing. That is why there is such a vicious fight between Truman and DuPont to hold off using openly repressive measures in place of the present fact-finding (legal delay mechanisms) and occasional government seizure. The government is afraid of the action workers may take against any serious reprisals.

The entire significance of the strike wave lies in the problem of control and management of production, and state power. This control by the capitalists is challenged everywhere by the workers. The essence of politics is control - control of the workers by the bosses and their agents in the workers ranks. But in looking at the American state we have to remember that the open arms of state power are not in themselves decisive for control, though they are essential components of the capitalist apparatus of control. The real sources of state power lie in industrial and financial control over the workers. This lesson is pointed graphically by the experiences of various Labor and Socialist Parties who after apparently having a majority in a government find that the real power is not in their hands at all. As long as the class in control of industry and finance has not changed, no changes in government have occurred fundamentally.

However, there are differences among the capitalists. Industry is numerically

a minority group. Although many revolutionists speak of all industry as a single group or interest, in reality there are many divisions in the ranks of industry; big business and small business; durable and consumer goods industries; producers and distributors; big and small bankers. They do not all desire the same economic and political results. Some occupy favorable positions in the economy; others in the political structure of government. All compete violently with one another for dominance. The controlling interest which expresses the historic interest of all sections of the capitalist class lies in the heavy industries and in finance. Attempts to separate financial rule from heavy and light industries can be a serious mistake. There are times of social crisis when finance capital is separated from control of heavy and light industry, and where whole sections of industry war against the policies of the others as to how to control labor. DuPont wants to destroy unions; Truman wishes to use them through the labor lieutenants.

#### UPSWING IN PRODUCTION AND THE COMING STRIKE WAVE

Within the general period of crisis and decline of American imperialism there are cycles of upswing in production. But so far advanced is the technology of the country that each of these upswings produces its own immense strike wave. Such a strike wave is brewing in the reconversion period when production really gets under way. Another big strike wave may come this fall. Present strike waves will slowly peter out. It will probably be succeeded by large struggles of veterans and unemployed, although these groups are not mutually exclusive. These will be very militant struggles for one decisive feature of weakness of government control over labor is that the labor lieutenants have never been able to organize the unemployed.

The government, though not too adept at controlling labor, is aware of the coming strike struggles during the rising production phases of the reconversion period. It is preparing now to head off these strikes by continuing to use Murray and Green and Lewis and "left" sounding labor leaders like Reuther.

Company security is one phase of control of labor. It continues the no-strike policy of wartime into peacetime, with addition of clauses which make it virtually impossible to have a strike occur "legally". Also, it is carefully planned to eliminate militants from the plants and from the unions, thus ridding the boss of his fighting workers and the union labor faker of his militant opposition.

The government steps in to politicize strikes and to guarantee politically company security against strikes by the device of fact-finding boards. Where these fail the government can always use its seizure powers under the War Labor Disputes Act, whereby it halted over 40 strikes during wartime and seven in the postwar period thus far. But this is a last-ditch, desperate measure, which arises because of the government fear that if strikes are not kept down, they may lead to wide-scale political mass action which will spread throughout the country and paralyze American imperialism. Meanwhile it is the function of the labor misleaders to tie down the workers with no-strike clauses in various contracts.

The government has a 1948 election coming up and will attempt to keep production from going through the usual cycle of "boom and bust" until well after that election. Hence follows continued government controls and intervention in

strikes, and more and more collisions between labor and government directly.

#### MENACE OF A LABOR PARTY

In this struggle government will rely on the P.A.C. It is one of the dangerous tendencies of the times. Reformist and centrist and bourgeois reformist groups will grow in the present turbulent situation as the masses move steadily to the left under the impact of the big anti-union drive of many corporations and government, as these masses seek political means of bringing pressure to bear on the bosses and their government to gain working class demands. The workers are driven to mass strike action by the internal speedup and organic structure of the industry and the rising cost of living. They have seen how successful are such tieups of key industries as tugboating in NY Harbor, of power and electric in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, of an entire area as in Stamford, Connecticut. The workers will move towards the larger reformist and existing centrist groups, and will be disillusioned by them. P.A.C. will probably grow, as one form of control of the workers by the bourgeoisie. P.A.C. may seem to strike out on its own independently of capitalist parties for awhile. But this in no way changes its fundamental anti-working class character. This whole leftward swing may lead to a form of people's government.

We should remember that the U. S. ruling class is very inexperienced, relatively speaking, in dealing with labor. It has had no serious political setbacks in its control of labor. It has had the full cooperation of the labor misleaders. Where the British ruling class governs through a "Labor" party, the U. S. imperialism has no such apparatus. Can it arise? Possibly, though historically it exists to obtain social reforms for the workers; and at the present stage of decay of American imperialism such reforms cannot be forthcoming for any prolonged period. Should a Labor Party come into being, through an expanded P.A.C., or other means such as expansion of existing social reformist forces, it can last for a short time only. For the level of class warfare in this country will have risen so high that it will be swept aside as the workers move on towards the center of capitalist power. It does not appear that the existing CP, CP or Trotskyist movements can function as the Labor Party; however the union misleaders may be able to do something with P.A.C. for a time. The Trotskyists with their Labor Party, pro-"left" capitalism orientation, can also grow in this coming period; to spread confusion among the workers. A wide open field for revolutionary political action and organization exists in the coming period.

The expulsion of Browder from the CP and the split between Ickes and Pauley indicated the possible development of a big drive to push for a mass "labor" party of some seemingly left new dealish group with which to corral the labor vote in 1948 and to control the leftward swing of labor in the coming period.

Ickes split with Truman is generally interpreted as marking a big step towards reasserting the left-wing of the old New Deal, which will attempt to use many labor leaders to back a Wallace for President or similar leader. P.A.C. will probably be subordinated to this wing of the Democratic Party.

While it is prepared to utilize various forms of the Labor Party or popular frontism during the coming violent class warfare, the American bourgeoisie is readying its more openly dictatorial weapons too.

#### AFL versus CIO Battle

Return of John L. Lewis to the AFL along with District 50, the catchall union, signifies a heightened phase of warfare with the CIO, reaching the level of open union raiding as the big mass production unions in the CIO lose members to the growing army of the unemployed. Lewis will have no full control over the AFL. There are numerous jurisdictional problems which his entry raises; also he will not dominate the loosely-knit organization, though he will pull it a little to the left of where it has stood for some time, largely because the workers are veering steadily leftward. Lewis will denounce communists in the CIO, will denounce Murray's attempts to become the government recognized national labor body and this open reliance upon the government. Withal Lewis will be able to play a considerable role in keeping workers tied to various sections of the boss machine. The CIO will attempt to use the P.A.C. to strengthen its hand, will attempt to show it has won gains in strike battles, but Lewis is going to be in a position to show that AFL unions have made gains too, that timing of many CIO strikes was a cause of weakening the strikers.

From the standpoint of the interests of the workers which demand a single, national labor body, the Lewis return to the AFL has done practically nothing to promote a united labor movement. As the battle lines are laid down with the CIO, Lewis' move may be seen as preventing any unification for some long time into the future. This division of forces plays into the hands of government intervention and domination over both national labor bodies. The union split is an open cancer in the body of labor.

#### RISE OF A REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP

The old style conservative labor leaders are on their way out. Their historical role of restraining labor and emasculating strike action is exposed so clearly that they are sharply separated from the rank and file and are leaning increasingly on government for support. Both CIO and AFL have an orientation towards becoming the government recognized national labor body. It is a question of job security for the labor bureaucrats who feel they can no longer control the rank and file.

As Fortune magazine predicted in November 1943, "Slick Walter Reuther... knows how to put himself at the head of rank-and-file revolts in order to slow them up, perfectly exemplifies the type of middle-of-the-road labor leaders who will have their brief and stormy innings in the period between the collapse of the extreme conservative bureaucrats and the rise of a revolutionary leadership in the Unions."

Reuther is only an example, a particularly ineffective example at that. But the "left" sounding labor leaders will more and more have to be favored by the government. P.A.C. will get more backing.

The next phase - the rise of a revolutionary leadership in the Unions and in the class struggle generally - may be at hand sooner than we think. The class struggle in this country, with a proletariat of 45 millions, fully as large as that of all of Europe including the Soviet Union, is on the verge of exploding into mass political warfare. Truman knows this. Rank and file workers do not. The whole leftward swing of American labor is growing steadily and in the coming wave of strikes may be able - in strike action - to rise and push out

the conservative and "left" sounding leaders from the unions. However, it is our contention that they will arise, will challenge the existing burcrats, will weaken their grip, but not before a revolutionary situation breaks out will they be successful in really smashing the hold of the Lewises, Greens and Murrays on the unions. We will see whole sections of soldiers, sailors and even unorganized workers moving far to the left of the present unions, except for the mass production unions.

At the present time it is possible to construct left-wing caucuses in conventions of important unions, of building a left-wing nationally in all existing labor bodies - CIO, AFL, independents - in preparation for the coming strike struggles. At present such a left-wing cannot contest for power in the unions. But it can expose the conservative labor leaders vicious role of collaboration with boss and government. It has the primary task of burrowing in deep among the workers in preparation for coming events. With bold policies, careful preparation and immediate organization of a left-wing around the fighting slogans of union democracy, split from government and boss collaboration, spread the strikes, join hands with the soldiers and veterans - it is possible to prepare the workers for the big strike struggles and political mass struggles of tomorrow. In the present turbulent period, a Marxian organization can grow into a real force that can lead workers in political class battles. Class relations in the United States are extremely favorable for the construction, in struggle, of the revolutionary Marxian party of the American working class.