

SEP 7 '48

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

IX NO. 3

Price; 10 cents

Labor donated

CONTENTS

A
U
G
1
9
4
8

TROTZKIISM: A FORM OF CENTRISM

Wallace
and the "Progressive Party"

Published by

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS
LEAGUE

U. S. A.

JACK B

TROTSKYISM

A FORM OF CENTRISM

We have and have had many forms and varieties of centrism, the political group that stands half way in between social reformism (socialist, stalinists and anarchists) and revolutionary Marxism, or what Engels termed, "Scientific Socialism." Serious students of the revolutionary movement and the working class know how difficult it is for workers to pass over the obstacles of social reformism on the road to revolt against exploitation. We can remember after the first world war, in spite of the victorious October revolution and the organization of communist parties (not stalinism) the Second (socialists) International still held a majority of the workers under their domination. Now after the second world war the Stalinists have taken over this position and on a world scale hold sway over most of the workers organizations, etc. In both cases the war and the revolutions that followed moved the workers to the left, but in each case they met these traps of reformism, and today they are faced with the counter revolutionary structures of both the Socialists and Stalinists.

When we realize how slow and difficult it is for the workers to jump these hurdles (not to speak of other bourgeois reformist stumbling blocks such as the A.F.ofL. and CIO leadership, we can begin to understand how much more difficult it is for the workers to pass the next obstacle--different forms of centrism. Because centrism is to the left of these reformists in words, but with them in DECISIVE actions of the class.

The socialist parties have their share of centrist groups that grow and wither away with each passing class turn and crisis. The iron clad undemocratic control of the Stalinist's parties prevents new growths of centrism, etc., to crystalize in large organizational forms.

But the most hybrid and dangerous form of centrism today is Trotskyism, which had its birth in the womb of the Stalinist parties and has been educated in "Bolshevik-Leninist" terminology, but which today triesto crawl back to the socialist parties wherever this is possible. Trotskyism represents revolutionary phrasiology and reformist deeds -- and the RESOLUTIONS OF THE SECOND WORLD CONGRESS, as published in the June, 1948 FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, CLEARLY REVEALS THIS.

For a worker who is not trained in precise terms and in revolutionary Marxism, the material of the Trotskyites reads well, sounds revolutionary. But it contains all the political false formulations and trick clauses as are contained in the legal terms of any crooked capitalist lawyer and business contract that workers innocently sign and then pay and pay. We will try to pick out some of the false formulations, some of the centrist formulations of the Trotskyite resolutions so you can see what we mean.

The second Congress of the Trotskyites met in Paris in April of 1948. And like all centrist documents they have many correct statements and formulations, far ahead of the socialist and stalinists, but which fall short when one needs special guidance over difficult political trouble spots.

Several tricks that centrism always used, which we must deal with at the outset, are the methods of confusion. How do they do this? Very simple. By one or more of the following methods: The Trotskyites succeed in confusing yet in appearing "revolutionary" by errors of omission, by stating a proposition with words that can be read two or more different ways, by placing two almost opposite statements in the same statement in different parts of the document, by stating a thought in radical terms which when analyzed becomes clear that the steps proposed cannot lead to workers success and can only lead to reformist deeds. These and more are some of the errors within the resolutions which we will deal with in the following polemics.

DEPRESSION AND CRISIS

The resolutions have confused and contradictory statements on this subject. First let us list a few statements: "On the basis of the fundamental crisis of capitalism in the imperialist epoch the war opened up for the world bourgeoisie a new and long period of unstable equilibrium," (Page 98 "But in the absence of a revolutionary solution the sharpening crisis of capitalism threatens to lead once more to fascism and to war, which, this time, would imperil the existence of the future of all mankind." (page 98) "For some time, American economy has been showing signs pointing to the coming depression." (Page 99) "The outbreak of war under present conditions would mean its rapid transformation into an international civil war, the outcome of which would be hazardous." (Page 99) "The time when the economic crisis will break out in the U.S. and the content of the crisis, will largely determine the development of that country's policy and will in any case step up the race between war and revolution." (Page 99)

Nowhere in the whole document is there a precise and clear statement pointing out possible variants and the road they predict for the crisis, depression, war, revolution and what not. There are a lot of abstract sentences disconnected that can be read anyway one desires. For example, in the above statements the present period is a LONG period of unstable equilibrium, but American economy shows signs of a depression, and when the crisis and depression comes we will be in a race for war and revolution (which means the long period is over and a new war and revolutionary period has started) but the whole situation would be hazardous for all of us, and, and

Let us restate this problem as Marxism should present it. We must be precise where we can and since the RWL formation in 1936 we have stated many major problems in advance as predictions based upon our analysis.

There will NOT be any prolonged period of unstable equilibrium.

Marxism divides its periods or stages (depending upon how the Trotskyites are using the term) into stages of wars (imperialist and civil) and stages in between imperialist and civil war. We have just been through the second world war and the revolutions that followed. We are now in a stage of "unstable equilibrium" between the second world war and the coming "third" war of imperialism against the Soviet Union. The period or stage between the second world war and the coming war against the Soviet Union (imperialist and revolutionary war fused into one) will BE OF SHORT DURATION historically speaking, practically and concretely speaking. When the "shooting war" starts against the Soviet Union (no matter who claims who started it) that will be the end of the present period or stage, and that will be the beginning of a new period from the standpoint of Marxism.

Trotskyism is fundamentally false on this point.

Let us not leave this dangling in the air, in abstraction like the Trotskyites do. Let us not say we need concretization. Let us concretize. It is obvious that since the new primary antagonism (since the second war -as we stated over two years ago) is between US and USSR, as compared to the relation of forces when Germany and Japan and Italy were in the axis and Great Britain and France were still strong -- that this depends to a great extent upon crisis and depression in the United States and the American imperialists' ability to hold in check social revolutions on a world scale. First let us consider the internal situation and "desires" of the Wall Street gang. United States hopes to be better prepared before "egging on a shooting war" against the Soviet Union. Their aim is to get the following countries on their feet so they can furnish the supplies and use these peoples as cannon-fodder and their countries as land bases for invasion against the Soviet Union -- these countries are primarily Japan, China, Germany, Italy, France and England.

Will U.S. succeed in holding off open war for awhile until these countries are at least better bases for attack? She will unless, (1) social revolution does not break out in advance, or (2) one or both countries do not make some clumsy blunder from which retreat is not possible.

Is the big depression around the corner in the US as these and other people would have us believe perpetually? No. By that we mean precisely this, as we stated it before over a year ago: as long as the capitalist government can absorb part of overproduction in foreign loans, donations, etc., and as long as there is a shortage of the basic commodities within the capitalist, American capitalist structure, the big crisis and big depression will be held off. Small crises and small depressions of readjustment, yes; but the big story, worse than 1929, this is at least four or more years away. Only one exception can alter this -- the outbreak of war and social revolution, because now the two are bound up into one knot.

Therefore, we exclude a LONG period of unstable equilibrium, and at the same time exclude a rapidly approaching big crisis in

the United States. The long period the Trotskyites speak of can at most be six years before war and revolution breaks out--therefore, it is a short period. And the rapidly approaching crisis--which will accelerate war and revolution is four or more years off in the United States. If we err at all, we will err on the short arm of this ratio, the crisis, which means that the LONG period the Trotskyites speak of is even shorter than we would estimate. Once the war of invasion breaks out the period is over and a new period starts just like in 1939, when Hitler invaded Poland, when a new imperialist war started and a new period or stage opened up.

WAR AND REVOLUTION

We must give you a few more quotations on war and revolution. In the above discussion we have by no means exhausted that phase of the subject. Speaking of American imperialism the resolutions say: "The object of the campaign is to win public approval for the "cold war" America is now waging against the Soviet Union and at the same time to prepare for the shooting war, when and if Wall Street finds it necessary." (Page 100) "A third world war, in the form of an attack by world imperialism under American leadership--against the USSR is inevitable if successful social revolutions do not materialize in the interim." (Page 115) First we have a statement "if" Wall Street finds it necessary to go to war, and then we have a statement that it is inevitable. The last statement is correct. The first is mumble-jumble. But that is the way Centrism writes--two or more formulations on each and every question.

But let us return to our first argument. If it is a LONG period of unstable equilibrium than this inevitable war is a LONG way off, but if the inevitable war is a matter of years, and a few years at that, and even shorter if one or both sides blunder, than the long period is reduced to a short period.

While the Trotskyites were only speaking of a "Third World War" and we were criticizing this label and stating that it must be clearly explained that the so-called "third world war" would be an attack on the Soviet Union, a revolutionary war as well as an imperialist war, events have moved forward and the above formulation of the Trotskyites is to the left of their former position.

The Trotskyites say, "The race between war and revolution will probably accelerate when the economic crisis in the US breaks out and unfolds." (Page 108) The race between--what does this mean? Does it mean that we will have a war and a revolution separate and apart from each other? It is the old formula we criticized a few years ago and it contradicts the above formula we stated was to the left. It is not a question of BETWEEN WAR AND REVOLUTION; it is war and revolution; no matter which phase comes first the two will blend into one.

ENEMY NUMBER ONE

"Stalinism is obstacle number one for the world proletariat on its road of revolutionary mobilization." (Page 114) This is nothing

more or less than one of the many formulations which we term the Trotskyite "Anti-Stalinist Orientation". Marxism counterposes to this false formulation the anti-capitalist pro-communist orientation. Stalinist, socialism, anarchism or any other opportunist group at best can only be an AGENT of the exploiters. At no time can the agent of the exploiters replace the exploiters. The capitalist is the main enemy, is enemy number one. The whole orientation of the Trotskyites and our "friend" Marlin is rapidly warped on this question. Enemy number one, the main enemy is the capitalist, the exploiter. Stalinism at present is the number one enemy--as AGENT of the capitalists. This is not a quibble of words. This is a different orientation within the class struggle.

We of the RWL, the founding core of the RWL, as a faction in the old Left opposition, from then till now have been criticizing the Trotskyites for this and many other errors. The last fifteen years. Its form changes, but the content always reappears.

THE FRENCH TURN AGAIN

And speaking of the devil, here it is again. In the past when we first started our fight against the liquidation of the revolutionary Marxian party into the stinking corpse of the Socialist Second International, it took on the form of the argument of the "French Turn," because in that country Trotsky proposed first that the LEFT OPPOSITION liquidate its political and organizational independence within the French Socialist party--to be followed in other countries as fast as the leadership could sneak upon on the problem and line up the members. Here is what the resolution of 1948 says, "In the European countries controlled by the Soviet Bureaucracy, members of the Fourth International will choose to group themselves within the Social Democratic organizations, and will aid every movement of the masses which aims at defending their living standards and their liberties against the bureaucratic police regime dominated by the Stalinists." (Page 109) Once the principle error is made it will return over and over again. As if the interests and living standards of the masses can be defended from inside of the stinking corpse of the Social-Democrats.

Only on the basis of INDEPENDENT WORKING CLASS ACTIVITY AND ORGANIZATION can the interests and living standards of the workers be defended. Only on the basis of scientific socialism, revolutionary Marxism, can the workers positions be advanced. Nor within or through Stalinism or Social Democracy.

THE LABOR PARTY

Naturally in the United States they speak of a labor party based upon trade unions. This is their form of tailing the reformists for special US conditions. Many arguments could be presented but we have issued much literature on this (which we will be glad to send anyone who will write in for copies) and at present we only want to say that the centrist Trotskyites try to leave the impression (which is nothing more than an illusion) that there is a Wallace REFORMIST Labor party and a Cannon revolutionary labor party. History proves,

facts prove, that there CAN ONLY BE A REFORMIST, CAPITALIST, THIRD PARTY, LABOR PARTY. No other labor party has existed or will exist.

Continuing our discussion on the labor party, it must be pointed out that although the Trotskyites advocate a "revolutionary" one based upon the trade unions, in the 1948 election they will run an independent ticket. Even if there were a labor party based upon trade unions, and even if this party has a program as radical in words as some that the Minnesota Farmer Labor Party had in its early days, this would not be the decisive change that would make this party anything more than a third capitalist party in labor form..

In regard to the Wallace movement, the resolution on page 103 says, "The movement is a bourgeois attempt to channel the broadening current of politicalization of the American working class, and to divert the latter away from building an independent labor party and toward the road of a "liberal" and "pacifist" third capitalist party." These weasel words are an attempt to justify the Trotsky position against the Wallace Party, and at the same time it attempts to make a line of demarcation between the Wallace Party and the Cannon "Labor Party."

The first part of the sentence is true, not only in relation to the Wallace Party, but it is also true for ANY KIND of a labor party, i.e. the Socialist Parties in Europe, and Peasant Parties here and there.

The only correct distinction that can be made between the Wallace Party of today and the hoped for "independent" labor party of tomorrow is this: Its organizational structure will be somewhat modified with more trade unions; and above all, the degree of radicalization of the masses will be more to the left. Capitalism helps along those forms and varieties of third capitalist parties depending upon the degree of class struggle. First the mild bourgeois reformist labor parties; then the social reformist labor parties; then the outright socialist parties and Peoples Front Blocs of Stalinist-Socialist and Peasants Parties. Cannon is waiting for the social reformist labor party instead of the bourgeois reformist labor party. It is neither "independent nor revolutionary."

But there is more to this present boycott of the Wallace party by the Trotskyites than strikes the eye. It is a known fact that even though the Stalinists are following Wallace POLITICALLY as to reformist program, it is also a known fact that the Stalinists are the second strongest force in this party, and since the Wallace forces are heterogeneous, it means that actually in political organization the Stalinists are the strongest and in some cases control state and city parties. With the Stalinists in such a favorable position, the Trotskyites cannot get to first base in such a party. So they boycott because the Stalinists would make life more than miserable for them.

We assure you that if the 1948 set-up was similar to the 1924 Lafayette set-up, with Socialist and AFofL officials in the party, you would see the Trotskyites inside "with the masses."

The American Trotskyites are not now in the Socialist Party and

are not now supporting the national set-up in the 1948 Labor Party. This is a tactical consideration. They still retain their false theoretical premise on both questions and can return to them with radicalization of the masses overnight.

TRANSITIONAL DEMANDS

The resolutions again reaffirm their support of the Transitional Demands of the Trotskyites. We first dealt with these transitional Demands in our publication back in the August 1938 issue. This was before the second world war. They continue these demands with a few secondary modifications. They have in ten years established transitional demands into PERMANENT demands even though we have passed through four different stages of capitalist decay, i.e. the prewar period leading up to 1939, the imperialist war stage, the Hitler attack on the Soviet Union, which brought in the revolutionary element, and the post war present period, with the new US-USSR antagonisms.

Immediate demands and ultimate demands are not sufficient for the Trotskyites. They had to tack into the Transitional Demands a hybrid in between the two, and at that a hybrid that in content is not Marxism.

In a prerevolutionary period of short duration, when capitalist "civil peace" is rapidly being transformed into civil war, transitional demands to win the masses are in order--but in reality, in this PREREVOLUTIONARY period, the transitional demands are IMMEDIATE DEMANDS which yesterday under "civil peace" were PART OF ULTIMATE DEMANDS, and were at best propaganda slogans.

It should be stated here that the section of the resolution of the Trotskyites dealing with centrism takes up small groups such as the ILP, PSOP, Pivert, Archo-Marxists of Greece which are listed as deserting to pastures further to the right; while the POUM is in internal struggle (as are the Trotskyites); but the significant thing is that since these resolutions are a guide to action, the PROGRAM of centrism is not listed. Why not list the program of centrism on the principle questions of Marxism? To do so would reveal that Trotskyism is also in this camp.

STALINISM AND THE SOVIET UNION

The resolution dealing with Stalinism and the Soviet Union is in the main a repetition of the old Trotsky position and formulations on the subject. At least one thing is to their credit, for we must give even the devil his due, they retain the position of defensism and have defeated the Burnham-Schackman position of defeatism in relation to the Soviet Union. This defeatist position with its "new class" and "red imperialism" is rampant within the ranks of the Trotskyites.

We have already dealt with their anti-Stalinist approach and have pointed out that no agent of capitalism can take the place of the capitalists as the number one enemy of the working class. We have also stated that the Marxists present an anti-capitalist, pro-communist orientation instead.

The resolution says (page 114) "The foreign policy of the bureaucracy has undergone an essential and definite change following the second world war. Before this war that policy was based upon the possibility of neutralizing the pressure of the capitalist environment of the USSR by setting off against one another the antagonistic imperialist blocs, and to a lesser extent, by manipulating "national Stalinist" parties. The subject reflection of this policy was the "theory of socialism in one country" which was based on the conception of a more or less gradual development of productive forces in Russia independent of the development of the capitalist world."

This statement has several important errors. There is no definite and essential change in the foreign policy of the Stalinists. Whereas yesterday there were several imperialist groups, and all powerful, today there is only one strong imperialist group, the US-- and now the antagonism is between the US-USSR, with England a lesser partner of the U.S. This is only a tactical change in the overall strategical foreign policy and in no way represents a principled change. When you speak of a definite and essential change one has the impression that a fundamental change of line has taken place. The same Stalinist policy exists adapted to the new situation.

But when the statements say that the subject reflection of this policy (referring to the past policy) was the "theory of socialism in one country", the concept is entirely wrong.

The foreign policy of the Stalinists yesterday and today, FLOWS FROM their principle revision of Marxism, their "theory of socialism in one country." The vague formulations in the statement leaves the impression that since the foreign policy has been essentially and definitely "changed", and since the "theory of socialism in one country" is the subject reflection of this (past) policy, therefore, the new foreign policy will bring forth a new "subjective reflection." Rubbish. This is pure and simple centrist mumble-jumble of basic Marxian principles.

We repeat. The foreign policy of Stalinism before the war, during the war and now after the war, flows from the revisionist concept of the "theory of socialism in one country." Get a Marxian leadership in the Soviet Union (by a political revolution) and replace this false theory with Marxism, with revolutionary internationalism of Lenin's days, and you will see an internal change and a completely new foreign policy which will have "undergone a definite and essential change."

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE UKRAINE

The resolution continues Trotsky's old error and asks for an independent Soviet Ukraine and includes the Baltic countries. These slogans are nationalistic and play upon the nationalist and bourgeois elements in these areas. The trotskyites are trying to turn history backward and to turn the theory of national liberation upside down. For backward areas which are developing their capitalist production, these nationalistic slogans to win petty-bourgeois allies against imperialism is a strategical permission within the framework of the proletarian road to power through a social revolution. But in

the Soviet Union, in the political revolution against Stalinism, these slogans can play only a REACTIONARY ROLE and help nationalism and imperialism.

Let us repeat one of our Marxian fundamentals. In the Soviet Union we want a political revolution; while in the capitalist countries and the Stalinist Satellite states we want a social revolution. Now it is no accident but it is just the sloppy way that centrism writes, that in their resolutions they continually speak of THE NEW REVOLUTION in Russia. But as centrism always has its two different formulations, they do in one place speak of the content of a political revolution in Russia. But when you couple together the nationalistic slogans for an independent Ukraine, Baltics, etc., with the main emphasis merely speaking of the NEW REVOLUTION, one can understand that the emphasis is toward the pettybourgeois layers instead of the proletariat.

Why not call a spade a spade and educate your membership to the different kinds of revolutions and speak of a POLITICAL REVOLUTION IN THE SOVIET UNION?

The Trotskyites will retort that this is slander. But let us see. If you are not so interested in the NATIONALISTIC pettybourgeois and bourgeois influences in the Ukraine and the Baltic countries, then why call for an "INDEPENDENT WHITE RUSSIA" or an "INDEPENDENT SIBERIA"? If you are mainly interested in the workers, if you are not going to try to turn the wheels of history backward to precapitalist slogans, if you want a revolution against Stalinism--why?

Upon the Marxian premise of independent working class action (in the USSR) the group, Marxian force, Marxian party, and the workers, call for a political revolution and wherever the heat of the struggle reaches a high point, no matter which soviet republic returns to workers democracy and establishes genuine Soviets--that is where we will establish an INDEPENDENT SOVIET, within the Soviet Union.

THE FIVE YEAR PLAN

The following is a typical centrist formulation on any subject. You at least have to give the Trotskyites credit. Whereas most centrists will say one thing in the first part of a document, and the opposite thing later on in the document, the Trotskyites are so well educated that they can say two different things in one sentence.

They say (Page 99), "The results reportedly achieved by the Five Year Plan seems to indicate that industrial production in general is proceeding according to schedule, but that certain key industries--for example, timber, agriculture, machinery, building material, smelting, paper, rubber, certain coal mines-- are lagging considerably."

If industrial production is proceeding according to schedule-- and if KEY industries such as timber, agriculture, machinery, building material, smelting, paper, rubber, and certain coal mines are lagging considerably--than it can be seen that production cannot be PROCEEDING ACCORDING TO SCHEDULE.

THE KEY QUESTION

The key question of the day, the inevitable conflict between dying capitalism and the Soviet Union, is treated here and there by the resolutions in a half-hearted manner. This question we analyzed theoretically about two years ago in which we outlined the general line of march possible and the most likely variant. A resolution of any world congress that calls itself revolutionary should have a resolution or at least a whole detailed section of a resolution devoted to this question following the coming war. It should propose principles, strategy and tactics for the workers of the world. What should have been elevated as a high light is lost among the sentences dealing with other secondary matters. At that the question of war between the capitalists and the Soviet Union, its relation to the Social revolution, and the question of political revolution in the Soviet Union, is mainly a series of errors of omission in the material of the Trotskyites.

August 1, 1948

WALLACE
AND THE PROGRESSIVE PARTY

The various conventions of the major capitalist political parties give a mirror-like reflection of the development of the postwar political crises in the United States and abroad.

The two major questions of the day, foreign policy and domestic policy, reveal differences in the political alignments of the various parties, but closer analysis from a class point of view will reveal that these differences are only differences in degree, rather than content.

The "Bi-Partisan" foreign policy of the two major parties is recognized by every advanced worker, no matter of what orientation, to be a direct preparation for war against the Soviet Union. It is an attempt to stabilize the economies of western Europe by rebuilding capitalism (England, France, Belgium, Italy) and repressing (Greece, Indonesia, etc.) the working classes.

The seeming exception to this is the position on foreign policy of Henry Wallace and his "Progressive" Party. But in reality Henry Wallace simply disagrees with the method used by the dominant political representatives of the Bourgeoisie in their handling of the international working class, including the Soviet Union. Bi-partisan foreign policy is for "strong-arm" methods in dealing with the European Working Class and the Soviet Union. Henry Wallace would utilize now the Stalinists Comintern to help mislead and destroy any real working class drive for power. He has as a guide here the whole history of Stalinism in Europe. He can be certain that Stalinism will never lead the workers to a fundamental change in property relations.

Henry Wallace desires to use Stalinism now for the American Bourgeoisie not only in the United States and on the international scene, but within the Soviet Union as well. Henry Wallace does not support Communism, Workers' Soviets or any other methods of real workers control. Henry Wallace would make use of Stalinism within and outside the Soviet Union to prevent Workers' Democracy and organs of workers control.

But Wallace realizes that his "peace program" will not stave off revolutions throughout the world forever, and in this case he has already assured the American Bourgeoisie that he will support the United States Government in any war in which it engages.

Briefly the differences in foreign policy between the Wallaces and the Trumans boil down to this: The Truman-Dewey policy at the present juncture is to strike at the working class, the Soviet Union and Stalinism with smashing frontal blows without resorting to the

use of Stalinism as a reformist force. Wallace on the other hand, would enlist the aid of Stalinism to mislead and destroy the working class organizations.

IN THE UNITED STATES

In the United States we see a similar lineup of forces. Nationally the "Progressive Party" was really built by the failures of the Labor-Faker bureaucracy to take any action of its own to keep their leftward moving forces in line.

The left wing capitalist forces around Wallace and the social reformists of the CP have been forced into independent organization despite all their wartime efforts to remain inside the Democratic Party. As Glen Taylor, vice-presidential candidate said, "I didn't leave the Democratic Party, it left me." Just as the Bill Greens, Phil Murrays and Dan Tobins of the labor beurocracy were freed to boycott the Democratic Party convention because of its right swing against the labor beurocracy, so the Wallace-CP bloc were driven to form the Progressive Party. The rank and file composition is of predominantly CP forces, but other significant forces were also represented, although weakly. Among those heterogeneous elements present were the anti-draft youth, Negro workers from the South, and unorganized radicalized petty bourgeoisie. (The keynote speaker was a Republican hack for twenty-five years.)

WALLACE UTILIZED CP

The bourgeoisie press and its hired hacks make much of the open evidence of the CP behind-the-scenes control of the convention. Yet except for the whitewash of Stalin's foreign policy, Wallace gained a great political victory for bourgeois reformism over social reformism, and against the working class. It is openly for support of capitalism even if with more left phrases than Roosevelt. Wallace will let the CP do the dirty work of corralling left trends among the workers, veterans, farmers and youth to build up his machine. For this he is willing to make organizational concessions to Foster and Co. Most important of all, Wallace's connection with the CP will give his bourgeois forces a good basis to swing radicalized masses in Europe and Asia behind American imperialism when left developments again bring Wallace and other left bourgeois forces to the top "out of exile."

The clumsiness of the Stalinist hacks as compared to that of the old line liberal and social-democratic labor fakers in their organizational maneuvers will be used against them, but the growing mass discontent will provide the Progressive Party with a mass base that will more than make up for the Wallace-CP blunderings. As long as the Labor Party forces hold back, Wallace will gain.

POSITION OF THE RIGHT WING LABOR FAKERS

Let it be remembered that if most of the American trade union beurocracy also boycotted the Progressive Party convention, at the same time leading elements were officially on record of a Labor Party after 1948. The Reuther-Mazey combine in control of the powerful United Auto Workers; the Dubinsky forces of the International Ladies Garment Workers,

and others had long before the political conventions come out for a new "political realignment" based on liberals and labor forces", etc. These fakers worked with the Americans for Democratic Action, a group of New Dealers-in-Exile, who had split with the Wallace forces because of the latter's strong line for a deal with Stalin. When they could not put across the "liberal" Supreme Court Judge Bill Douglas, they simply sulked and indicated that they would emphasize the questions of Congressional elections and leave the endorsement of Truman open. Their initial friendliness toward Eisenhower's "candidacy" revealed their bankruptcy; this man, who first had Republican support, then the big city bosses, and the SOUTHERN "BOURBON DEMOCRATS" was a shotlived white hope of the labor faker-liberal combine although he had given no political position on any issue of the day. His reactionary record during the imperialist war, his jim-crow policy, his policy abroad in the AMG, etc., was forgotten in the hope they could "educate him", to develop his "liberal tendencies" (?) Their excuse that this support was a maneuver to build up support to throw to Douglas only makes matters worse by the pitiful character of such a tactic.

The previous blast against the Wallace CP bloc, in addition to their support of the "cold war" policy abroad and at home, prevented them from coming over to the Progressive Party although they had been defeated. The door is thus open for Wallace to scoop up considerable rank and file workers and petty bourgeois support, pointing out the previous opposition of the labor fakers to Truman as well as Dewey. The Greens, Murrays, Reuthers, and Whitneys, will have to maneuver with great effort to stem this trend, in order to carry out their service to Truman and the dominant sections of the capitalists.

CLASS REALIGNMENTS

Sooner or later, however, there will be a realignment, and the Wallace forces will probably be swamped by the Labor Party. At the present time, because of the contradictions in the bourgeois and labor fakers camp, the Wallace force is only the most open expression of their crisis. New great developments are ahead. The sneers of the bourgeois hacks and the furious red-baiting against the Progressive Party showed the bourgeois fear of coming class developments.

However, revolutionary minded workers must not be confused by these antics of the hired press (The Chicago Tribune supported Roosevelt in 1932 and opposed him in 1933) and the publicity bandits. The same people who oppose Wallace today will support him tomorrow in the face of a threat of independent political action on the part of the working class. Henry Wallace's program is made to order to lead the working class into believing that capitalist crises can be solved legally through the Bourgeois state. The Wallace program can lead the workers when the time is ripe, not to the left, but only into parliamentary confusion, demoralization and finally defeat.

Marxists by building a revolutionary party must draw the workers beyond Wallace's net of bourgeois and social reformism. This can be done only by an independent Marxian organization, which in principal gives no support to Labor or reformist parties and calls for an independent struggle on the part of the working class against the capitalist state. Marxists, while exposing the political treachery of the Progressive Party, must, on the other hand, unflinchingly defend the democratic rights of those workers who support the Progressive Party.