

PHASE II AND THE PAY BOARD:

WORKERS BETRAYED BY UNION "LEADERS"



AFL-CIO Bureaucrats at Fla. Convention: From left, George Meany, AFL-CIO Pres.; Thomas Gleason, ILA; I. W. Abel, Steelworkers.

The criminal traitors who call themselves labor "leaders" today stand as the main obstacle to a working-class defense against the attacks of the ruling class.

Nixon's New Economic Policy is designed to solve the accelerating crisis of American capitalism by squeezing the American and international working class. The two-pronged attack—driving down the living standards of American workers and curbing the competition of foreign products—can only be accomplished by curbing the combativeness of the trade unions. In short, the success of Nixon's NEP rests on the cooperation of the trade union bureaucracy, and the fact that the bureaucrats have proven so eager to cooperate is indicative of their fear of rank-and-file unrest.

Phase I: Test of Strength

Phase I of Nixon's program was simply a test of the combativeness of the trade unions. Clearly no real price control was intended—the only machinery set up for that was a pool of phone-answersons to field questions. Such machinery could not possibly control the thousands of ways

of hiding price increases. The central focus was the blatant abrogation of legal contracts of the large industrial unions such as the UAW, who had scheduled contractual wage increases. The Wage Freeze was eagerly and quickly "administered" by the capitalists themselves, and the workers could not possibly "sneak" in a wage increase as the capitalists have been slipping in price increases. So much for bourgeois legality! In a single stroke Nixon ripped up thousands of contracts, and the only opposition was brief public relations squawks from the labor "leaders".

George Meany had been calling for wage-price controls all along, but suddenly changed his tune to put up a show of opposition for the rank and file. Meany has even suggested that he would give a no-strike pledge if labor was allowed sufficient "representation" in its own repression! What he really would prefer is a wage control administered by Democratic "friends of labor," who might accord him more respect by giving him greater control over administration of the program. When the "friends of labor" like McGovern all rushed to support Nixon's program,

Meany was left with nothing but hot air.

The "opposition" of other labor leaders proved also to be non-existent. Woodcock's early talk of a "war" with the government of course never materialized. Fitzsimmons of the Teamsters backed the President from the beginning, not even bothering to make fake statements of opposition. Bridges of the ILWU, caught in the middle of a major strike, merely pleaded for a special exemption, and quickly whipped the men back to work with the help of a Taft-Hartley injunction. The most extreme official opposition was a few token demonstrations organized by some bureaucrats, such as the Detroit AFL-CIO demonstration in late September.

Phase II: Second Punch

Nixon thus had the green light to proceed with the second wave of his attack against the working class—Phase II, which represents an attempt to make permanent the wage controls, with the active collusion of the labor leaders. The participation of the five major labor figures (Meany, Woodcock, Fitzsimmons, Abel, Smith) on the Pay Board

continued on page 2



Their Real Enemy Behind Them, Indian Troops Advance in Pakistan.

FOR REVOLUTIONARY DEFEATISM ON BOTH SIDES IN THE INDIA-PAKISTAN WAR!

Once more the power rivalry between India and Pakistan has broken out in war. Seeking control of all Bengal and elimination of Pakistan as a significant rival, India has absorbed under its direct command the military forces of East Bengal (Bangladesh), entirely subordinating the just Bengali struggle to the ambitions of the Indian bourgeoisie.

The bourgeois nation building era of capitalism's youth is long past. In the 19th century one might have given cold-eyed critical support to a drive by the Indian bourgeoisie to unify the subcontinent under its hegemony correspondingly advancing the growth, organization, and power of the proletariat. But in the era of imperialism only proletarian revolution offers the masses a road forward. For the Bengali masses only the international client relationships of their masters will change through an Indian victory. The Indian bourgeoisie vies with the Pakistani in viciousness toward national minorities and perhaps exceeds it in hypocrisy. It is a ruling class without a future. But a proletarian revolution which turns the guns of both armies against their own rulers will be a brilliant giant leap forward in the world struggle for socialism.

As Bogus International
Unity Stands Exposed —
FOR PRINCIPLED UNITY
AGAINST REVISIONISM!
FOR LENINIST
INTERNATIONALISM!

IC Fraud Explodes:

**Reconstruct the Fourth
International!** pages 4-5

CENTRIST DEBACLE
IN BOLIVIA pg. 3

LEARN TO READ —
LEARN TO THINK.. pg. 7

Continued from Page 1

WORKERS BETRAYED BY UNION "LEADERS"

merely veils the fact that the Board is a weapon of the capitalist state against the unions. Meany no doubt knows that the five "public" members, hand-picked by Nixon, will vote against labor on the key questions. After all, who are these "public" members? They include: William Caples, a college president, director of the First Knox National Bank of Mount Vernon and executive of Inland Steel from 1946 to 1968; Neil Jacoby, an "economic adviser" who presently directs Occidental Petroleum Corp.; Arnold Weber, the man who worked under Secretary of the Treasury Connally to set up Phase I; and so on. These "public" members are merely professional administrators of the capitalist system.

It was therefore no surprise when the Pay Board voted 10 to 5 to deny retroactive pay to labor. Meany's threat to walk off the Board if retroactive pay was denied turned out to be just a bluff. Similarly, his earlier threat to walk off if the Board did not have final say in rulings was empty rhetoric—what did it matter, since the Board itself is stacked against labor? Paul Schrade of the UAW recently threatened a "general strike" against the NEP, though his own union supports the NEP through Woodcock's presence on the Pay Board!

Not surprisingly, the Price Control program is full of holes for the capitalists to walk through. For instance, officials admit that nearly one-fifth of the goods and services making up the average worker's cost of living are excluded from any price control, such as homes, used cars, taxes, interest rates, and raw agricultural products. Furthermore, the 2.5% limit on price raises is intended only as an overall goal, not a limit on individual businesses, which are allowed to increase prices to compensate for "higher costs" (the reason always given for raising prices!). Meany & Co. have called on unions and individual workers to form "watchdog committees" to check on price rises, but they do not explain how working people are supposed to distinguish a "legal" price rise from an "illegal" one. The entire price control program is buried in complicated-sounding economic formulas which in effect leave it to businesses to decide what is a "legal" price rise.

Meany and the other bureaucrats know all this. Meany himself served on wage control boards during World War II, when the labor bureaucrats gave a no-strike pledge and agreed to enforce wage controls. This policy of class collaboration, endorsed by the Stalinist Communist Party, led to the impoverishment of the working class as prices skyrocketed ahead of wages. It was only a rank-and-file rebellion reluctantly led by John L. Lewis which broke the wage controls and brought some economic relief through a series of strikes beginning in 1943 and blossoming in 1946. (The rank-and-file of the UMW appear again to be the leaders of a defiant revolt against the bureaucrats and government controls. In their tradition of "No Contract, No Work," the coal miners struck on September 30 and have won wage and benefit increases far in excess of the Pay Board "guidelines," and many have remained on strike demanding Pay Board approval of their contract!)

The Taming of the Trade Unions

One cannot understand the spinelessness of the labor "leaders" without understanding the nature of trade unions. To the extent that trade unions are organizations of struggle thrown up by the working class, they represent a potential source of working-class political power opposed to the rule of the capitalists, who hold power through the state apparatus. On the other hand, to the extent that the trade unions accept capitalist property forms and merely bargain for crumbs, they become institutions of capitalism. This contradictory nature of trade unions is a reflection of the existence of contending classes—working class

and bourgeoisie. The capitalists may permit the union movement to exist so long as it acts to discipline the working class, but in times of crisis they will seek a way to abolish the unions to remove all potential sources of independent working-class power. Ultimately either the working class takes political power in its own name, or the capitalists will wipe out all the gains of the working class in order to "solve" the capitalist crisis.

The great contradiction of the American working class has been its extreme militancy in the economic sphere—typified by the great CIO strikes of the late 1930's—combined with barrenness and backwardness in the political sphere, reflecting low class consciousness. This backwardness was developed into a policy by the Stalinist Communist Party around 1936, when the CP began to call for labor support to the "progressive" bourgeoisie in the form of FDR and the Democrats. The privileged bureaucracy which immediately arose in the formative years of the CIO quickly entrenched itself through the systematic suppression of independent working-class politics and the limitation of the trade unions to "bread-and-butter" issues.

The merger of the AFL and CIO in 1955 was a reactionary development crowning the firm entrenchment of the conservative labor bureaucracy through the suppression of political life within the unions. The two top posts went to narrow-minded craft union leaders from the AFL, especially George Meany. The merger was the culmination of a witchhunt in the unions to drive out all militants and possible political oppositionists; a whole series of unions were expelled from the CIO in 1950 for "Communist influence" (ILWU, UE, etc.) and the labor bureaucrats bowed to the government's "right" to purge the unions of militants through such laws as Taft-Hartley. The class-collaborationist policies of the CP helped feed the reaction by disorienting militant workers. The AFL-CIO constitution codified the witchhunt, dropping previous references to class struggle in favor of anti-communist clauses. The bureaucrats would bargain for economic concessions; political power they conceded to the government, and policed their unions on the government's behalf.

Political Struggle Essential

Thus in the political sphere the labor bureaucracy tends to merge with the capitalist state, and both react in common hostility to any signs of rank-and-file independence. In return for their service the bureaucrats receive tremendous privileges. The creation of the breakaway ALA by Reuther in no way represented a break from the bureaucracy, but only an attempt to put on a new face—Woodcock today joins Meany on the Pay Board. The bureaucrats dare not admit that the state is owned and run by the capitalists; that would be to admit the necessity for socialist revolution. As Trotsky noted:

"... In the eyes of the bureaucracy of the trade union movement the chief task lies in 'freeing' the state from the embrace of capitalism, in weakening its dependence on trusts, in pulling it over to their side. This position is in complete harmony with the social position of the labour aristocracy and the labour bureaucracy, who fight for a crumb in the share of super-profits of imperialist capitalism. The labour bureaucrats do their level best in words and deeds to demonstrate to the 'democratic' state how reliable and indispensable they are in peace-time and especially in time of war. By transforming the trade unions into organs of the state, fascism invents nothing new; it merely draws to their ultimate conclusion the tendencies inherent in imperialism.... The trade unions of our time can either serve as secondary instruments of imperialist capitalism for the subordination and disciplining of workers and for obstructing the revolution, or,



George Meany



Harry Bridges



Leonard Woodcock

on the contrary, the trade unions can become the instruments of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat."

—from *Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay*

In this period of general capitalist crisis, it becomes impossible for the bureaucrats to draw a line between the political and economic sphere, as the capitalist state intervenes directly to roll back union gains. Yet the bureaucrats today are incapable of launching a unified political assault on the capitalist state, since such an assault would unleash forces which would sweep away the bureaucrats as well. The bureaucrats fear the development of proletarian political consciousness and sabotage working-class unity at every turn. The ILA, for instance, went on strike in spite of the wishes of Gleason, who supports the NEP and was content to stay on the job under the old contract; only blatant employer attacks and rank-and-file unrest forced a strike. Yet through lack of any elemental class solidarity between leader-

ships, the nationwide longshore strike was quickly divided by Taft-Hartley injunctions and other government intervention (see *Workers Vanguard* #3). The only political alternative the bureaucrats can come up with is more support to the Democratic "friends of labor"—the same "friends" who are rushing to back Nixon's program.

The AFL-CIO Convention in Florida was a disgusting display of the decay of the trade union movement. The Convention should have been the place to map out a strategy for a working class counter-offensive against the bourgeoisie, and the publicity should have been used to expose the lie of Nixon's program. Instead, the bureaucrats invited in the bourgeoisie to present its views on national television. Meany & Co., despite their widely publicized row with Nixon, allowed the convention to be used literally as a forum for Nixon to defend his policy. After Nixon, they featured a speech by Senator McGovern, the "friend of labor" who supports Nixon's NEP. Thus the labor bureaucracy took a further step toward merger with the capitalist state.

The Pay Board's approval of the contract settlements of the coal miners and railroad signalmen, far exceeding official guidelines, demonstrated how easily Nixon's guidelines can be broken, and how much the NEP depends on the labor bureaucrats' cooperation to succeed.

Clearly, for the organized working class to move forward, there must be a rank-and-file movement with a political program to throw out the bureaucrats and break the stranglehold of the capitalist government. Rank-and-file union caucuses must fight against government interference in the unions and for independent working-class political action through a workers' party, opposed to the two capitalist parties, to fight for a workers' government. Most immediately, all militants must demand that the labor "leaders" immediately resign from the Pay Board, since their presence on the Board masks its real function as a weapon of the capitalists. Militants must demand a general strike against Nixon's program and for all retroactive wage increases. A fight must begin now against the drift toward World War III, manifested by the capitalists' attempt to stir up resentment against "foreign" workers and the rush for greater armaments. The bureaucrats are eagerly lining up with the capitalists in the demand for trade curbs on imports, which merely shift unemployment to the working class of other countries, especially Japan, and strengthen nationalist hatreds. Instead there must be an international working-class fight to increase the total pool of jobs through the shorter workweek and ultimately through the expropriation of industry under workers' control and a govern-

continued on next page

The issue of the role of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario in the recent Bolivian events has become inevitably a factional football in the power fight between the Healyite (SLL-WL) and Lambertiste (OCI) wings of the now split International Committee. But in addition to providing a test of the revolutionary capacity of both wings of the IC, the lessons of Bolivia are important in their own right, as a verification, in the breach, of the lessons of the October Revolution of 1917.

The POR is an avowedly Trotskyist organization under the leadership of Guillermo Lora, which since 1970 has claimed agreement with the anti-revisionist avowals of the IC. Despite its opportunist policy following the 1952 Bolivian uprising in conciliating the left wing of the bourgeois nationalist MNR government of Paz Estenssoro, the POR is an organization which must be treated seriously because of its considerable implantation in the most militant sector of the Bolivian proletariat, the tin miners.

People's Assembly

The POR played an active role in the People's Assembly which came into existence under the bonapartist regime of left militarist General Juan Jose Torres, which was overthrown by the rightist coup of General Hugo Banzer in August. The People's Assembly was composed of a majority of representatives from working-class organizations and included representatives of the significant left political organizations. The basis for adherence to the People's Assembly was defined as support to the Theses of the Fourth Congress of the Central Obrera Boliviana, the main trade union federation, which is heavily influenced by left nationalists and Stalinists. The People's Assembly pledged to lead the struggle against imperialism and for socialism:

"The People's Assembly is a revolutionary anti-imperialist front led by the proletariat, constituted by the Central Obrera Boliviana, the trade union confederations and federations of national character, the people's organizations and the political parties of revolutionary orientation.

"It recognizes as its political leadership the proletariat and declares that its program is the Political Theses passed by the Fourth Congress of the COB, held in May 1970....

"The People's Assembly constitutes itself as the leadership and unifying center of the anti-imperialist movement and its fundamental goal consists in attaining national liberation and the establishment of socialism in Bolivia. (from the statutes of the People's Assembly, reprinted in the POR organ *Masas* of 13 July 1971)

According to the POR, the People's Assembly was a body of the soviet type which had the potential to become an institution of dual power—i.e., that it was an embryonic workers government within and in contradiction to the bourgeois government under Torres. *Masas* engaged in occasional sharp criticism of the CP for pursuing a "rightist and pro-government line" in the Assembly but did not systematically expose the CP and the other reformist parties for their betrayal of the working class in attempting to subordinate the Assembly to Torres, devoting at least as much emphasis to praising the Assembly and defending it against "leftist" detractors.

Centrist Vacillation

Even on the basis of insufficient documentation, what emerges clearly is a pattern of centrist

vacillation on the part of the POR. For example, in an article written by Guillermo Lora after Banzer's coup is the admission:

"At this time [October 1970] everybody thought—including we Marxists—that the arms would be given by the governing military team, which would consider that only through resting on the masses and giving them adequate firepower could they at least neutralize the gorilla right. This position was completely wrong...." (*Bulletin*, 27 September 1971)

To have placed any confidence in Torres to arm the masses shows the most severe disorientation on the part of the POR over the crucial question of the class nature of the state. Torres was a bonapartist seeking to balance between the working class, roused by a foretaste of power and

major article in the 31 May *Masas* exposes the plan for "worker-participation" in COMIBOL as "the point of departure for the bureaucratization and political control over the 'worker-managers' on the part of the state," counterposing to this the demand for "workers control with veto rights" and pointing out that workers control does not obviate the class struggle.

A severe blunting of a hard Leninist edge is apparent in an article in the 9 May *Masas* which states:

"...the fundamental contradiction in Bolivia is nothing else than that which exists between the proletariat and imperialism."

Our question is simple: what role does the national bourgeois play in this schema? For the fatal illusion fostered by the nationalist-Stalinist cabal

was precisely the conception of the "anti-imperialist" bourgeois as an ally. What was required of the POR was precisely to break the working class from subordination to the "revolutionary," "anti-imperialist" regime of Torres. To Marxists, the counterposed class forces are the working class supported by the peasantry on the one side and the bourgeoisie—both the puppets of imperialism and the "progressive" nationalist wing—on the other.

The OCI's response to the grave accusations levelled against the POR is an attempt to bluff it out. The 19 September statement declares:

"...the coup d'etat organized by the CIA and the military dictators of Brazil and Argentina and facilitated by the action of the Torres government is the proof that the

policy carried by the POR was fundamentally based on the interests of the Bolivian proletariat....

"...All those who attack the POR through this, represent the enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They take the sides of imperialism and Stalinism. They are agents of counterrevolution and are enemies, conscious or unconscious, of the Fourth International."

This kind of argumentation can simply be dismissed out of hand. As Trotskyists, we have listened too many times to the hysterical accusations of Stalinists of all stripes along the same lines: the ferocity of U.S. imperialism's aggression against the NLF and the North Vietnamese regimes proves that their leaderships have not sold out; all those who attack Chairman Mao are taking the side of imperialism; Trotsky was a conscious or unconscious agent of fascism; those who stand in opposition to the United Secretariat are against the Fourth International; ad nauseum. We note only that this "defense" of the POR proves nothing about the POR but a great deal to the discredit of the OCI.

The OCI asserts that the People's Assembly was "under the leadership of the Trotskyist party, the POR." This statement is open to question. In an interview in the 9 August *Bulletin*, POR leader Victor Sossa states that "the POR represented only around 20 per cent of the delegates, perhaps a little more." Yet he expected that the Assembly, still predominantly influenced by Stalinists, bourgeois nationalism and "ultra-left adventurist petty-bourgeois groups," to do the following:

"In the case of a coup the People's Assembly will call a general strike, will assume the military and political command of the masses. The decision to go over to the systematic organization of militias is geared to this perspective and prepares the working class for the inevitable confrontation, the fight to fully install its own government, the workers and peasants government."

The question here is not whether the POR had already established its hegemony over the workers organizations, but whether it was struggling to do so—whether the POR's perspective was to expose the reformists' and nationalists' treachery before their supporters by demanding that the Assembly counterpose itself to the regime, breaking all ties with the regime and struggling to establish a workers and peasants government—i.e. the dictatorship of the proletariat. It would appear that the POR placed political confidence in the Assembly under its existing leadership.

Soviets: Form and Content

What was the role of the POR within the People's Assembly? The OCI notes that:

continued on page 6

Centrist Debacle in Bolivia



Armed Bolivian Miners Arriving in LaPaz

eager to struggle for its own class rule, and the reactionary generals—at the head of a bourgeois state. Although forced to grant concessions to the masses, Torres, as Lora points out:

"...preferred to capitulate to his fellow generals before arming masses who showed signs of taking the road to socialism and whose mobilization put in serious danger the army as an institution."

The issue is clear, but the attitude and role of the POR is not. For in the 31 May 1971 issue of *Masas* we find a call for the formation of independent workers and peasants militias and the categorical assertion that: "General Torres will never arm the workers and peasants militias."

An article in the SLL's *Workers Press* of 24 August quotes POR leader Filemon Escobar:

"...we will work for political objectives that help radicalize the present process—for example, worker-participation in COMIBOL [Bolivian Mining Corporation]."

And Lora's *Bulletin* article speaks of "the danger to the state that majority working class participation in COMIBOL would mean." Yet a

ment of workers in their own class interest:

1. GOVERNMENT STAY OUT OF LABOR STRUGGLES—NO RELIANCE ON THE CAPITALIST STATE. BREAK THE WAGE FREEZE; FOR A GENERAL STRIKE AGAINST NIXON'S WAGE PLAN. REPEAL ALL ANTI-LABOR LAWS SUCH AS TAFT-HARTLEY. RELEASE ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS SUCH AS ANGELA DAVIS AND JIMMY HOFFA.
2. FOR LABOR STRIKES AGAINST THE WAR: HALT THE FLOW OF ALL WAR GOODS. FOR IMMEDIATE UNCONDITIONAL WITHDRAWAL OF ALL U.S. TROOPS FROM S.E. ASIA. FOR INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS SOLIDARITY: VICTORY TO THE VIETNAMESE REVOLUTION!

3. BREAK FROM THE CAPITALIST PARTIES—BUILD A WORKERS' PARTY BASED ON THE TRADE UNIONS. TOWARD A WORKERS' GOVERNMENT!
4. END UNEMPLOYMENT—30 HOURS WORK FOR 40 HOURS PAY, JOBS FOR ALL! A SLIDING SCALE OF HOURS AND WAGES—FULL COST OF LIVING ESCALATORS IN ALL CONTRACTS. STRIKES AGAINST LAYOFFS.
5. NO TRADE PROTECTIONISM, NO GOVERNMENT CREDITS FOR BUSINESS—SUPPORT THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING-CLASS FIGHT TO CREATE AND ORGANIZE JOBS!
6. EXPROPRIATION OF INDUSTRY UNDER WORKERS' CONTROL. ■

IC Fraud Explodes— *RECONSTRUCT THE*

The "International Committee," which for nearly two decades proclaimed itself the embodiment of authentic revolutionary Trotskyism opposed to the Pabloist revisionism of the "United Secretariat," has now crumbled under the weight of years of gross political deception perpetrated against the international Trotskyist movement. The IC combination sought to present itself as a political tendency but was in fact a rotten bloc between the political bandits of the Socialist Labour League of Britain and the left centrists of the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste of France. Years of jockeying for hegemony within the IC while seeking to preserve the criminal fiction of basic programmatic agreement came to a head as the OCI increasingly gained the whip hand, especially by the affiliation to the IC of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario of Bolivia, which was lined up from the first with the OCI against the SLL. The IC has finally broken apart completely in open rupture, with the OCI-POR on one side and the SLL (and its U.S. sycophants, the Workers League) on the other. The split in the IC—together with the increasingly strained relations within its major international competitor, the United Secretariat—represents the fragmentation into chaotic chunks of the organizational configurations of ostensible Trotskyism which have existed essentially since 1953.

The SLL-OCI split is at once inevitable, unprincipled and opportune. Its inevitability was obvious to anyone familiar with the wide political distance separating Gerry Healy's SLL from the OCI of Pierre Lambert, joined in agreement not to disagree. The internationalist masquerade thinly concealed the reality of unprincipled bloc between two power centers with keen competing appetites for satellites. The split, accomplished by calculated SLL-WL provocation over the issue of the policies of Guillermo Lora's POR of Bolivia, is as unprincipled as was the erstwhile posture of unity. The split can be of great objective assistance in rebuilding the Fourth International of Leon Trotsky, by breaking unprincipled combinations as a prerequisite for political clarification and internal political struggle within national groupings previously insulated by the comforting assurance of "internationalism"—i.e. membership in one of the unprincipled international blocs.

But the rebuilding of the Fourth International does not proceed automatically from the collapse of the ersatz, revisionist and centrist conglomerations. The possibilities for revolutionary regroupment in authentic democratic centralist international tendencies defined by programmatic cohesion are sharply enhanced in the present period of heightened class struggle and growing instability in the imperialist world order; but the dangers of new unprincipled combinations built upon congruent appetite rather than principle likewise increase; only a vigorous fight by the revolutionary Trotskyists can prevent the creation of some new centrist swamp to trap and disillusion militants and breed revisionist confusion.

Healyite Provocation

The IC split was precipitated by the British and U.S. Healyites' public attack on the policies pursued in Bolivia by the POR in the events which culminated in the August rightist military coup. The denunciation, appearing in the U.S. for the first time in the 30 August issue of the WL Bulletin, was a device for accomplishing quickly the desired break with the increasingly powerful OCI wing. By 8 November the Bulletin was able to print documents confirming the split, with the SLL-WL and smaller associates claiming to be the majority.

According to the Healyites, however, the "real" issue is not Bolivia. Bolivia is a "smoke-screen"; the real issue is Essen, the youth conference called by the OCI in July 1971, during

which the two centers of the same "international" voted against each other's motions. In a sense Healy is right—for reasons which hardly redound to his credit! Healy, accustomed to the organizational whip hand in the IC, was understandably chagrined to find himself opposed and outvoted by the OCI supporters; perhaps the unkindest cut of all was the presence (afterwards apologized for by the French) of a Spartacist League observer. Having lost organizational control, the Healyites determined upon split, and chose to strike an orthodox Leninist pose over Bolivia as an excuse for a precipitous break. No, Bolivia was not the "real" issue, Comrade Healy; that it was not is shown by your own egregious opportunism over popular frontism in Ceylon and Chile, as documented below. It was only when the POR's policies came to their inevitably disastrous fruition in a rightist coup, and when the SLL-WL needed a factional stick to beat the OCI-POR, that the Healyite bandits rediscovered Trotskyism for Bolivia. In this they are strikingly reminiscent of their supposed polar opposites, the Hansen-SWP wing of the United Secretariat, which suddenly remembered Leninist orthodoxy in order to polemicize against the petty-bourgeois guerrillaist adventurism of Mandel-Maitan.

Will the Real IC Please Stand Up?

That the main impetus for the split was a power fight can be seen in the hilarious gyrations of Tim Wohlforth and his Workers League over the POR—not over its politics but over the question of its putative IC membership. In the 19 July Bulletin the POR, then riding high, was described simply as the "Bolivian section of the International Committee." By 30 August the connection between the POR and the IC had been disappeared:

"...Lora was carrying forward a political course begun over a decade ago, from which he has consistently refused to veer. At every point this course has received support within the Fourth International or forces claiming to represent the Fourth International...."

If the reader knew who the suddenly organizationally anonymous Lora was—well, okay. If not, Wohlforth wasn't telling.

The United Secretariat's *Intercontinental Press* was, of course, delighted to be able to point out that the man Wohlforth was denouncing was a member of Wohlforth's own IC. On 4 October the Bulletin attempted to reply to the charges of unprincipled combinationism and sectarianism, but did not deny the POR's affiliation although such a denial would have been the most effective answer to the attack. But the 24 October SLL-WL statement declares that the POR "is not a section of the International Committee." The OCI has consistently claimed that it is. The treatment of this question—at first boasting of the link with the influential POR, then ignoring the connection, then not denying it when asserted by the United Secretariat, then denying it later when a Healyite "majority" in the split is needed—not only casts doubt on the present SLL-WL claim but, much more importantly, illustrates the utter hollowness of the IC pretense of Leninist internationalism. A prerequisite for any genuine organization, obviously, is knowing who is in it! Nothing illustrates more clearly the rottenness of the IC—bordering on organizational non-existence, which claimed to be an international (and the Fourth International, at that)—than its inability to agree on its own membership.

In fact, the IC never even managed to agree on its own name. According to the SLL, it was "the IC of the Fourth International"; the OCI has always called it "the IC for the reconstruction of the Fourth International." Two fundamentally different evaluations of the very nature of the IC were expressed in the difference over nomenclature: the British held the IC to be the simple,

linear political and organizational continuity of the international founded by Trotsky; the French insisted that the international had been destroyed by Pabloist revisionism and the central international task of Trotskyists was to wage a struggle for its rebuilding. This difference was debated at the 1966 London IC Conference and an internal exchange occurred between the SLL and OCI over this question in 1967; yet both wings continued to insist that their adherence to "the IC" was a priori proof of their internationalism (one might paraphrase "the IC position" as: the Fourth International no longer exists and we are it!). The SLL position is merely another example of its much-vaunted "method"—the creation of cynical and shabby Potemkin villages by which it seeks to dupe its followers—in this case simply sidestepping the struggle to rebuild the Fourth International by a dogmatic and sectarian assertion that the task was completed in the form of the IC. And the French were content to coexist with the Healyites despite their numerous differences, not the least of which was what their common organization was and who was in it!

The IC: Rotten Bloc

Healy and Wohlforth are now seeking to create an orthodox Leninist image for themselves against their picture of the OCI as unprincipled centrist maneuverers. But the mask keeps tearing, revealing the ugly features of an organization qualitatively worse than the grossly defective OCI-POR. For on every issue on which they indict the Lambertistes, the SLL-WL have in their readily verifiable history swung far to the right of their former bloc partners, in response to the most trivial appetites, ignoring even the limitations on opportunism observed by intelligent reformists in pursuit of the "main chance." The OCI is a serious political current with a persistently centrist thrust—i.e. an opportunist practice; the SLL-WL are both hilariously sectarian and egregiously opportunist.

The chief opportunist sin of the OCI is precisely the one with which the Healyites will never charge them: their service for years in shoring up Healy's claims to internationalism. The grave charges which both sides are now flinging at one another include not only sharp differences over current and recent issues, but positions of years' duration—public positions of the competing wings when both sides claimed adherence to the same IC as proof of their internationalism! The main SLL-WL statement, dated 24 October, denounces the OCI for supporting a wing of the Algerian nationalist bourgeoisie, the MNA, in the 1950's; the 19 September OCI statement included a veiled attack on the Healyites ("those who attack the POR... are the same people who...") for having "characterized Ho Chi Minh as a revolutionary" and having "subordinated the Palestinian resistance to Nasser, then to the petty-bourgeois leaders of the Palestine resistance."

We ask the OCI: If these things disturb you now, how is it that you remained in an international bloc—which you foisted off on the world movement as a political tendency—with Healy and Wohlforth who shouted from the housetops their capitulation to Vietnamese Stalinism and Arab nationalism? The Bulletin's laudatory obituary for Ho Chi Minh, which painted him as a sincere revolutionary betrayed by Stalin, glossing over his own role in the repeated Stalinist sellouts and the murder of Trotskyists, was no more than a vulgar but consistent extension of the SLL-WL's years-long policy of critical (and sometimes not so critical) political support, rather than principled military support against imperialism, to the NLF. This position was of a piece with the Healyites' shameless enthusiasm over Mao's "Red Guards" in the 1968 "Cultural Revolution" intra-bureaucratic fight, treating Mao's mobilization

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL!



Gerry Healy



Tim Wohlforth

of the student youth (and the army) as a surrogate for political revolution in China. The SLL-WL's campaign of political support to the so-called "Arab Revolution"—i.e. the Arab government's attempt to deflect the aspirations of the Arab working masses for social revolution into wars against Zionist Israel—was in flat contradiction to the OCI line of revolutionary defeatism for both sides; where was the OCI outcry then? It is not enough to have published your own positions while for years lending your weight to the cynical fiction that the IC was a disciplined international body. Such unprincipled combinationism contradicts the OCI's pious assertions of its commitment to struggle "for the reconstruction of the Fourth International."

OCI and NSA

The conduct of the OCI at their Essen youth conference on 3-4 July demonstrates that on the question of the relationship between the youth and the working class the Lambertistes' rightist course places them on common ground with the past and present practice of the Healyites. Under the guidance of the OCI and its youth affiliate, the Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme, the call was put forward for "the Revolutionary Youth international":

"Youth wants to live, in hope and freedom, and in order to live it must struggle. Youth aspires to life, youth needs exhilarating perspectives. Bureaucrats and bourgeois offer only a sordid life, unemployment, misery, failure, war and suffering."

A main slogan of the conference was "Long live the struggle of the youth against the Stalinist bureaucracy and imperialism!" The posing of the struggle against Stalinism and capitalism as equivalent reflects not only a persistent tendency on the OCI's part to fail to distinguish political revolution in the Sino-Soviet states from social revolution in the capitalist states, but also a capitulation to current moods among petty-bourgeois

radical youth. The conference and the propaganda surrounding it constituted an adaptation to youth vanguardism; the very concept of a "youth international," unless it is indissolubly linked with and politically subordinated to an international proletarian party, can only be at best an illusion, and at worst a capitulation to anti-Leninism. "The youth" are not a class: proletarian youth are generally one of the most militant sectors of their class; student youth are the most volatile sector of the petty-bourgeoisie, many of whom can be won over to a proletarian revolutionary perspective but only by becoming in effect traitors to their own future class interests. Thus the youth movement must be linked—in conception, program and organization—to the revolutionary party, which is firmly rooted in the working class and encompasses the historical and living experience of previous generations of proletarian militants. In short, a "revolutionary youth international" cannot be independent of the vanguard party and it cannot be anything less than Trotskyist. The OCI line over the Essen conference is an accommodation to youth vanguardist and spontaneist moods in the petty-bourgeois student milieu.

Moreover, at Essen the Lambertistes were openly courting the Spanish POUM and even the U.S. NSA. (The NSA was in the past disgraced by the receipt of CIA funds. In projecting the NSA as a likely seedbed for the U.S. revolution, the OCI has compounded its opportunist appetites by gross ignorance.) While chasing after rightist elements, the OCI committed a gross violation of workers' democracy by forcibly preventing an oppositional Trotskyist tendency, the International Communists of Germany (IKD), from distributing outside the hall a leaflet criticizing the OCI's refusal to base the "revolutionary youth international" on an explicitly Trotskyist program. Although it lacks the Healyites' world-wide reputation for thuggery, the OCI shares with the SLL-WL the reprehensible position that the use of force and recourse to the capitalist state are legitimate means for settling disputes within the workers' movement.

The Healyites in effect boycotted the Essen conference—they sent a delegation of perhaps two dozen headed by Cliff Slaughter (by way of contrast, the SLL-WL demands that virtually the entire WL membership turn out for yearly rallies in England)—while bringing in an "orthodox" motion that the youth international must base itself on revolutionary theory, the Fourth International and the IC, which the Lambertistes voted down.

Healy and YSA

That the Healyite opposition to the OCI's policies at Essen was a provocation empty of principle is shown by the SLL-WL conduct of many years' standing. The abysmal political level of Healy's own model youth operation, the Young Socialists, is well known and exposes his new-found concern for the importance of Marxist theory among the youth as a fraud from start to finish. The WL's several ill-fated attempts to build a youth group in the U.S. have been notable for their singular absence of anything resembling Trotskyist politics; having once launched a short-lived youth group called "Revolt" whose program was determined by what the WL thought would be most attractive to Maoist street confrontationists, the Wohlforthites' most recent exploit is a call for "a Conference of Revolutionary Youth" based on an economist "Program for Youth to Fight Back" whose section on the Vietnam war does not even mention military support to the NLF against U.S. imperialism.

The Healyites now denounce the OCI for its appetites toward the NSA, but their own orienta-

tion for the U.S. is no better. An internal WL Political Committee directive dated 15 March 1970 earnestly explained the need to tone down criticisms of the SWP's Young Socialist Alliance because:

"The perspectives document agreed to in England proposed that the road to the American working class is through the YSA and it meant just that."

One wonders what the SWP oppositionists, rebuffed in their campaign to make the SWP adopt even the most rudimentary working-class orientation, would think of this apparent affirmation of the YSA's proletarian credentials!

The Healyites' chase after the Pabloists—perhaps motivated by the awareness that their own international rotten bloc was coming unstuck—reached its high point in the summer of 1970 when, on Healy's initiative, they approached the United Secretariat leadership with a proposal for private discussions toward the aim of joint work and the holding of a joint international conference. The overture, which had the effect of shoring up the Pabloists' Trotskyist pretensions at precisely the time when they were experiencing significant left splits in several countries, was spurned by the United Secretariat as Joe Hansen, lavishly covering himself in orthodoxy, explained that such discussions without a firm basis in a deepening programmatic agreement would not be principled. The incident illustrated the symbiotic relationship between the IC and the Pabloists, each episodically making the other look good by comparison.

From Red Guards to Stalinophobia

At the national convention of the SWP's anti-war front group last July the Wohlforthites pledged their physical support to the group's sponsorship of bourgeois speakers in the anti-war movement and joined the SWP goon squad in beating and evicting the militants, including supporters of the Spartacist League, who were vociferously protesting the presence of a U.S. senator. The slogan under which they justified this capitulation to popular frontism to their membership was "Stalinism vs. Trotskyism"—which in this case meant excluding the (ex-Maoist, now theoretically state capitalist) Progressive Labor and the (Trotskyist) Spartacist League, in the service of the (ex-Trotskyist) SWP and the (pro-Moscow) Communist Party. (This convenient Stalinophobic pose rests very uneasily on the WL, which enthused over the "Red Guards" maneuver and the Stalinist NLF and in its frenzy of appetite toward PL once went so far as to justify an incident of gross PL violence against SWPers.) Now Wohlforth—who at the time of the 24 April anti-war demonstration categorically ruled out seeking a united front, based on a class line against the war, with left-wing Stalinists ("In any event we will not have joint actions with Maoists")—is castigating the OCI for... Stalinophobia!

Where will the components of the former IC go from here? The Healyites, endlessly veering from egregious sectarianism to blatant opportunism, have never shown themselves loath to abandon any and every one of the ostensible principles in pursuit of new allies, dupes or masters. The OCI, in the past more stable in maintaining connection with a fundamental class line, but now loosed from its IC moorings by a rotten split—in which it cast itself as a left cover for the POR debacle—and launched on a youth vanguardist capitulation, may find itself moving further to the right than most of its cadres ever dreamed. The only perspective which can open the road to authentic Trotskyism for these militants is intransigent internal struggle. Only by a ruthless examination of the IC split and its roots in unprincipled combinationism can the struggle for the rebirth of the Fourth International go forward! ■

Continued from Page 3

Centrist Debacle in Bolivia

"...the setting up of the People's Assembly expresses the fundamental trend of the period, the will of the proletarian and peasant masses to enter into the struggle for power."

But Allende's Popular Front government in Chile, for example, also without doubt represents "the will of the proletarian and peasant masses to enter into the struggle for power"—yet we know that the Chilean masses have been terribly deceived and they are likely to pay for their misleaders' promises in blood. The willingness of the working masses to struggle is not in dispute. In Bolivia, as in Chile, Spain, Vietnam and dozens of other instances, the question is whether their combative heroism has been betrayed.

The OCI declares:

"It is the unity in and around the People's Assembly, organ of dual power, which under the leadership of the Trotskyist party, the POR, dominated the whole revolutionary process before and after the confrontations of August 20-23."

What does it mean to acclaim the "unity in and around the People's Assembly"? If the People's Assembly was indeed an embryonic soviet form, how was the struggle for its leadership carried out? A soviet is a united front of the working class raised to the level of struggling for power. There is nothing sacred about the soviet or any other united front form. Soviets arise, even spontaneously, in revolutionary crises as the proletarian axis in the dual power situation, with the potential under revolutionary leadership to oust the bourgeois state power and become the agency of working-class rule—i.e. to consummate the revolution on the national plane. They are the best arena in which the Bolsheviks can demonstrate their superiority in carrying forward the tasks implicit in the soviet as an embryonic form of the state of a different class: the seizure of power and the dictatorship of the proletariat. A Menshevik-led soviet, for example, may indeed be an authentic soviet—but it will inevitably betray. Thus a Leninist call for the formation of soviets, for power to the soviets, must contain within it the perspective of struggle within the soviet; in order to demonstrate to the workers that it is they, unlike the revisionists and reformists, who have nothing to fear from soviet power and that only their policy can achieve and defend it. The existence of a soviet is in itself no guarantee of revolutionary principle. (Even the Stalinists have called—bureaucratically, to be sure—for the formation of soviets in their "left" zigzags, after having doomed the workers in advance by their policies—policies which guaranteed the ruin of the soviet.) Without the presence of revolutionaries intransigently struggling at every point to expose before the working class the traitorous misleaders within its ranks, the People's Assembly offered no more promise for the Bolivian proletarian revolution than George Meany's AFL-CIO raised to the political level. Does the OCI really want to boast that the POR expounded "unity in and around the People's Assembly"?

When questions of power politics between the wings of the IC were not so clearly and ultimately posed, the OCI was willing to take a more critical attitude toward the POR on precisely this question. A letter to the POR leadership dated 30 July 1970 and later published in the Lambertistes' public theoretical magazine discussed the COB Theses which the POR had helped prepare and voted for. The sections of the COB document singled out for sharp criticism by the OCI include the following:

"In order to attain socialism, it seems necessary first of all to make a unity of all the revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces. The people's anti-imperialist revolution is linked to the struggle for socialism. The people's front is an alliance of related classes, and the unitary instrument for making the revolution. ... The expulsion of imperialism and the realization of national and democratic tasks will render possible the socialist revolution." (La Verité, October 1970)

What this paragraph sets forward is the Menshevik theory of stages, pure and simple—first national liberation, then socialist revolution. It is the classic reformist rationale for class collaboration, which has led to the most bitter and bloody defeats for the working class. And yet the POR supported this resolution and continued to acclaim it in Masas. Instead of struggling around this question, the POR compromised around a contradictory hodge-podge document which contained affirmations of internationalism, condemnations of class collaboration alongside praise of the so-called "socialist" nations and clear popular frontism.

It speaks well of the Lambertistes that they were willing to raise to the POR and subsequently make public their criticisms of the POR's departure from principle. Now, however, the OCI's opportunism has gained the upper hand, and so all critics of the POR become "agents of counter-revolution"!

And what of the POR's conduct since the coup? The 6 December issue of the SWP's intercontinental Press reprints a declaration signed by the POR—along with the Communist Party, the "POR" of the Moscoso Pabloists, left nationalist groups and General Torres himself! The document again pays lip service to "the leadership of the proletariat, the ruling class of the revolutionary process" but the tone of the document is nationalist-populist ("revolutionary priests," "revolutionary officers," "patriots," "the power is now in the hands of foreigners," etc.) and its core is the following:

"... Therefore, the need is undeniable to build a fighting unity of all the revolutionary, democratic and progressive forces so that the great battle can be begun in conditions offering a real perspective for a popular and national government...."

"This is not a battle that concerns only one sector of the exploited people, or one class, institution or party.... Any form of sectarianism is counterrevolutionary. Let us be worthy of the sacrifice of those who fell August 21 defending Bolivia." (our emphasis)

In fact, the declaration is a classic popular front which subordinates the working class to alien class forces and ideologies to which it is in fundamental and irreconcilable opposition.

Healyite Pop Frontism

For the political bandits of the Healyite SLL-WL, the OCI's decision to march in lockstep behind the POR is a godsend, a cheap way to assert their Leninist orthodoxy and cast themselves as the principled left wing in the IC split. But the real difference between the Healyites and the POR on proletarian policy toward a "leftist" bourgeois government is that the POR has had the opportunity to wreck a pre-revolutionary situation and the Healyites have not. Healy-Wohlforth have seized on Bolivia as a pretext for ridding themselves of the OCI, which was increasingly play-

ing a dominant role in the IC—and that's all. For although they would now prefer to bury it, the Healyites have a shining example of how they would deal with a Popular Front bourgeois government: Chile.

The 21 September 1970 Bulletin advised the workers of Chile:

"There is only one road and that is the revolutionary road of the October Revolution... as a step in this understanding the workers must hold Allende to his promises...."

Wohlforth's road is not that of the October Revolution, but of those Bolsheviks, Stalin prominent among them, who very nearly ruined the chances for October by their policy—denounced by Lenin and Trotsky—of support for the bourgeois Provisional Government "insofar as it struggles against reaction or counterrevolution." Wohlforth's statement parallels the notorious Pravda articles capitulating to Menshevism in February and March of 1917, filled with statements like the following:

"The way out is bringing pressure to bear on the Provisional Government with the demand that the government proclaim its readiness to begin immediate negotiations for peace."

Against this policy Lenin declared: "To turn to this government with a proposal of concluding peace is equivalent to preaching morality to the keeper of a brothel." And Trotsky, in Lessons of October, said:

"The programme of exerting pressure on an imperialist government so as to 'induce' it to pursue a pious course was the programme of Kautsky and Ledebour in Germany, Jean Longuet in France, MacDonald in England, but never the programme of Bolshevism."

One must be sharply critical, as was Trotsky, of those Bolsheviks who would have let slip a revolutionary opportunity if it had not been for the sharp correction of Lenin. But more than criticism is merited by the Healyites, who claim to stand on the shoulders of the Bolsheviks, to have assimilated the "lessons of October."

Lenin expressed his policy in an uncompromising formula:

"Our tactic: absolute lack of confidence; no support to the new government; suspect Krensky especially; arming of the proletariat the sole guarantee;... no rapprochement with other parties."

Against Lenin's policy stand both the centrism of the POR-OCI and the Healyite pseudo-Leninist posturing.

And now the Healyites sanctimoniously denounce the POR-OCI for the same kind of Pop

continued on next page

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist Working-Class Monthly
Published by the Spartacist League

Editorial Board: Liz Gordon, Marv Treiger,
Nick Benjamin (managing editor).

Production manager: Karen Allen.
Circulation manager: Janet Rogers.

West Coast editor: Mark Small.
New England editor: George Foster.

Subscription: \$1 yearly (11 issues). Bundle rates for 10 or more copies. Address: Box 1377, G.P.O., New York, N.Y. 10001. Telephone: WA 5-8234. Opinions expressed in signed articles or letters do not necessarily express the editorial viewpoint.

SUBSCRIBE NOW!
\$1.00 yearly

INCLUDES SPARTACIST

Name _____
Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

WORKERS VANGUARD

BOX 1377 / G.P.O. / NEW YORK / N.Y. 10001

Third Period Healyism— LEARN TO READ— LEARN TO THINK

The SLL-WL, seeking to make factional capital out of the disastrous policy of the Bolivian POR, have adopted a sectarian posture which only muddies the waters and sows confusion before serious militants seeking to understand the crucial lessons of the Bolivian defeat. Prominent among the Healyite charges of class treason heaped upon Guillermo Lora of the Bolivian POR was this from Wohlforth in his 30 August Bulletin:

"Together with the Stalinists the POR supported the position of threatening a general strike and military action in defense of Torres!" [emphasis in original]

Such is Wohlforth's conception of treachery against the working class. The most charitable interpretation is that Cde. Wohlforth was sorely pressed for time in grinding out turgid copy for his weekly Bulletin. More likely, Wohlforth didn't know that he had scrapped a basic Leninist tactic for defeating counterrevolution and making proletarian revolution. In his self-proclaimed fight for the continuity of the Fourth International, Wohlforth would do well to re-establish continuity with the views of Trotsky:

"The party came to the October uprising... through a series of stages. At the time of the April 1917 demonstration, a section of the Bolsheviks brought out the slogan: 'Down with the provisional government!' The Central Committee immediately straightened out the ultraleftists. Of course, we should popularize the necessity of overthrowing the provisional government; but to call the workers into the streets under that slogan—this we cannot do, for we ourselves are a minority in the working class. If we overthrow the provisional government under these conditions, we will not be able to take its place, and consequently we will help the counterrevolution. We must patiently explain to the masses the antipopular character of this government, before the hour for its overthrow has struck. Such was the position of the party...."

"Two months later, Kornilov rose against the provisional government. In the struggle against Kornilov, the Bolsheviks occupied the frontline positions. Lenin was then in hiding.

Thousands of Bolsheviks were in the jails. The workers, soldiers, and sailors demanded the liberation of their leaders and of the Bolsheviks in general. The provisional government refused. Should not the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks have addressed an ultimatum to the government of Kerensky?—free the Bolsheviks immediately and withdraw the disgraceful accusation of service to the Hohenzollerns—and, in the event of Kerensky's refusal, have refused to fight against Kornilov? This is probably how the Central Committee of Thaelmann-Remmele-Neumann would have acted. But this is not how the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks acted. Lenin wrote at the time: 'It would have been the most profound error to think that the revolutionary proletariat is capable, so to speak, out of "revenge" upon the SRs and Mensheviks for their support of the crushing of the Bolsheviks, the assassinations on the front, and the disarming of the workers, of "refusing" to support them against the counterrevolution. Such a way of putting the question would have meant, first of all, the carrying over of petty-bourgeois conceptions of morality into the proletariat (because for the good of the cause the proletariat will always support not only the vacillating petty bourgeoisie but also the big bourgeoisie); in the second place, it would have been—and this is most important—a petty-bourgeois attempt to cast a shadow, by "moralizing," over the political essence of the matter....'

"It is precisely this 'petty-bourgeois moralizing' which Thaelmann & Co. engage in when, in justification of their own turn, they begin to enumerate the countless infamies committed by the leaders of the Social Democracy." ["Against National Communism," reprinted in The Struggle Against Fascism in Germany]

Wohlforth is counting—not for the first time—on the ignorance of his supporters. He hopes that his own "petty-bourgeois moralizing," cataloguing the horrors of bourgeois regimes and the crimes of the reformists who participate in them, will cover his inability to handle them. Trotsky's devastating critique of the policies of the Stalinists and ultra-lefts in pre-Hitler Germany, "conducting politics with blown-out lanterns," applies with equal precision to the "Trotskyist" Wohlforth. More from The Struggle Against Fascism in Germany:

"One might have said, 'For Bolsheviks, Kornilovism begins only with Kornilov. But isn't Kerensky a Kornilovite? Isn't he crushing the peasants by means of punitive expeditions? Doesn't he organize lockouts? Doesn't Lenin have to hide underground? And all this we must put up with?'

"...I can't think of a single Bolshevik rash enough to have advanced such arguments. But were he to be found, he would have been answered something after this fashion. 'We accuse Kerensky of preparing for and facilitating the coming of Kornilov to power. But does this relieve us of the duty of rushing to repeal Kornilov's attack? We accuse the gatekeeper of leaving the gates ajar for the bandit. But must we therefore shrug our shoulders and let the gates go hang?' Since, thanks to the toleration of the Social Democracy, Bruening's government has been able to push the proletariat up to its knees in capitulation to fascism, you arrive at the conclusion that up to the knees, up to the waist, or over the head—isn't it all one thing? No, there is some difference. Whoever is up to his knees in a quagmire can still drag himself out. Whoever is in over his head, for him there is no returning."

continued on page 8

RCY Class Series NEW YORK

TOPICS:

- The Role of the Working Class and the Permanent Revolution
- The Nature of the Russian Revolution
- Imperialism, War and the Collapse of the 2nd International
- The Bolsheviks in Power Building the Vanguard Party

Revolutionary Communist Youth, Spartacist League youth section, sponsors a class-study series in NYC on Leninism and revolutionary strategy.

- The Socialist Revolution and Non-Class Forms of Oppression
- The National Question
- Proletarian Internationalism and Revolutionary Defeatism
- State and Revolution
- Revolutionary Strategy in the West

EVERY TUESDAY
7:30 P.M.

CALL:
(212) 831-3004
(212) 925-2426

Frontist capitulation which they themselves espoused for Chile!

Healy Covers for the LSSP

But perhaps an even purer example of Healyite hypocrisy is the question of Ceylon. The 30 August Bulletin declares:

"...Though less known than the evolution of the LSSP in Ceylon, the role of Lora and the POR has been no less treacherous and important."

For years, in endless articles, the Healyites have used the betrayal of the Ceylonese masses by the LSSP—which tail-ended the bourgeois nationalist party of Mrs. Bandaranaike and when it came to power in 1964 entered the government—as an exposé of the United Secretariat Pabloists, who covered for the LSSP until the last moment. (The Bulletin has just concluded yet another four-part series on the subject.) And rightly so, for their role over Ceylon was an important verification of the SWP-United Secretariat's departure from Trotskyism. But what the Healyites are unlikely to mention is that they themselves are tarred with the same brush!

In May 1960 the SWP, then affiliated with the IC as was Healy's SLL, began to get increasingly nervous about the line and conduct of the LSSP. On 17 May Tom Kerry addressed a letter on behalf of the SWP's Political Committee to the LSSP. It states:

"We are greatly disturbed by the parliamentary and electoral course now pursued by the leadership of the LSSP...."

"Your policy of working for the creation of an SLFP government appears to us to be completely at variance with the course of indepen-

dent working-class political action which you have always promoted in the past as a matter of principle...."

"Your new political course also appears to us to be a form of 'popular frontism' of the kind promoted in many countries by the Stalinists since 1935—that is, class collaboration between the working-class parties and a section of the bourgeoisie...."

Despite their concern the SWP leadership hesitated to raise this betrayal in the public press.

On 8 August James Robertson, then a member of the SWP, wrote to the Political Committee:

"I am addressing you on the matter of our party's public silence concerning the recent and continuing betrayal of the Ceylonese working class and of the world Trotskyist movement by the Lanka Sama Samaja Party. I refer, of course, to that party's entry into a 'Popular Front' electoral pact with the Stalinist party and with the left bourgeois nationalist party represented by the widow Bandaranaike."

"In raising this matter privately with several members of your body I was told that letters have been sent the Ceylonese and that your view is that for the present a greater advantage is to be gained by revolutionary Marxists in the LSSP through our remaining publicly silent. I must disagree and urge you to reconsider...."

The letter concludes:

"Comrades, that you condemn the Ceylonese ex-Trotskyists I have no doubt, but your failure to raise this publicly and with great seriousness does the movement internationally a disservice."

And what was the position of Gerry Healy, who now proclaims himself the world's only consis-

tent anti-Pabloist? After having written to the SWP that delicate maneuvers among the Pabloists were required in Ceylon, Healy on 14 August wrote to the SWP's Joe Hansen:

"We discussed at some length... the proposition concerning the situation in Ceylon...."

"We think that it is necessary to write again asking for the fullest possible information concerning the present situation in the party in Ceylon."

"There is no doubt that they are in a severe crisis but if we take their situation and recent events in Europe it is not improbable that there will now be important developments inside the Pablo camp. This is all the more reason for us to proceed with caution—as you have in the past so rightly insisted."

"We are going to cable them tomorrow for information and we suggest you do likewise and hold up for the time being publication of anything in the Militant."

Rebuild the Fourth International!

It is their own sordid history which gives the lie to the Healyites' claims of internationalism and anti-revisionism. If the Lambertistes—who in 1952 launched the struggle against Pabloism—never transcended centrism and have now hardened themselves in opportunism by their line on Bolivia and their conduct at Essen, the Healyites' pretensions of principle have always rested on sand.

Only the Fourth International—rebuilt in the process of struggle against all varieties of Pabloist revisionism, including the inverted Pabloism of the IC—can provide the way forward toward the decisive victory of the international working class.

PL BOGGED IN "CENTER" SWAMP

In keeping with their new "anti-sectarian" line, the Progressive Labor Party called a "united front" demonstration in Boston on October 30. The demonstration around "30 for 40," "Fight Welfare Cutbacks," and "Support the Attica Prisoners' Demands," was one of several organized by PL around the country. For PL, which by "united front" understands "left-center coalition," October 30 was an exercise in trying to ally with any "center" organization it could dredge up from the swamps of reformism. At the same time, it assiduously avoided approaching competing working-class tendencies, thus abdicating in the struggle to unite the class and expose the revisionist and reformist betrayers. This concept of a "left-center coalition" put forward by PL stands in sharp contrast to the Leninist tactic of the united front. It is nothing more than the old "anti-monopoly coalition" of the CPUSA barely refurbished, and leads to the same policies of revisionist betrayal.

Trotskyist Intervention

The Spartacist League and Revolutionary Communist Youth intervened in Boston on October 30 in order to counterpose a sharp Marxist line, and to establish that Trotskyists will not be cowed by the goon squad attacks and threats we have experienced at the hands of PL (see *Workers Vanguard*, #1 and #2). We will not stand idly by, tolerating assaults on democratic rights within the workers' movement.

Drawing upon its growing membership in the Boston area, and aided by comrades from New York City, the SL organized a strong contingent, tightly disciplined and ready to defend itself if attacked. In addition, comrades of the Socialist Labor Committee and the Communist Tendency blocked with us militarily to defend the principle of proletarian democracy. Facing a determined contingent of eighty people, and eager not to alienate their "honest center" friends, PL carefully avoided provocations throughout the march and rally. The SL and RCY marched under slogans such as "For Labor Political Strikes Against the War and Freeze," "Break With the Capitalist Parties, For a Workers' Party," and "Support to Attica Prisoners, Smash the Capitalist Prisons," drawing the class line sharply and boldly.

PL Flirts With NPAC

More confirmation of PL's flip to the right came the next day at regional meetings of SDS and the University Action Group (UAG). Within these self-styled "center" organizations, PL members argued for co-sponsoring the popular front anti-war demonstration on November 6, provided they were given a speaker! They strongly opposed the SL-RCY call for a united front on November 6 around opposition to the presence of bourgeois politicians in the anti-war movement, for the independent mobilization of the working class against capitalism and the imperialist Vietnam War, and for the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. This they thought too sectarian! So instead PL, through SDS, gutlessly caved into chasing after the same liberals as the YSA, going so far as to adopt the SWP slogan, "Freeze War, Not Wages!"

This craven capitulation to petty bourgeois pacifism is simply the expression of PL's Stalinist methodology, which prevents it from even learning the lessons of its own experiences. Failing to come to terms with Trotskyism, the continuation of Bolshevism, PL is condemned to oscillate in typical centrist fashion between sectarianism and the opportunist implications of the left-center coalition.

Drawing the Class Line on Nov. 6

To sharply counterpose ourselves to PL's vacillations and the SWP's betrayal, and to indicate the way forward in the class struggle against the imperialist Vietnam War, the Boston Area Spartacist League and Revolutionary Communist Youth called for a united front contingent on November 6 around the three anti-capitalist demands indicated above. Marching in the contingent with the SL-RCY were the National Caucus



SL-RCY-Organized Contingent Marches in Boston "United Front" Demonstration.



of Labor Committees, the Socialist Labor Committee, The Cambridge Tenants Organizing Committee, and the Allston-Brighton Community Tenants Union. Marching with the pitifully small labor contingent organized as part of the SWP's recent "proletarian orientation" for the anti-war movement, over 100 people marched in opposition to the presence of the class enemy in the anti-war movement, and for the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam. At the rally the SL and RCY chanted their opposition to the speech of the liberal imperialist Ernest Gruening, ex-U.S. Senator and ex-High Commissioner to Puerto Rico. Chants like "U.S. Out of Vietnam! U.S. Out of Puerto Rico" and "No Liberal Speakers! Labor Strikes Against the War! Labor Strikes

Against the Freeze!" drove many of the petty-bourgeois pacifists to hysterical red-baiting. In sharp contrast to the left-wing thrust of their protests against Senator Hartke and Victor Reuther at the July 4 NPAC Convention, PL-SDS this time stood by in silence, apparently fearful of alienating "center" forces.

Only through the resolute fight against the class enemy and its collaborators in the anti-war movement can the struggle against imperialist war go forward. Progressive Labor must repudiate the Stalinist methodology which led it to reject its flawed revolutionary proletarian line as sectarian, and now leads it to chart a course away from "sectarianism" to mass influence through the revisionist-liberal swamp. ■

Third Period Healyism—

LEARN TO READ—LEARN TO THINK

Continued from Page 7

For the Smarter Ones

On "critical support" advocated by Lenin "as a rope supports a hanged man," Wohlforth says: "Is it necessary to point out that Lenin was referring to support to social democratic parties and not to bourgeois governments and certainly not to military dictators?"

Correct. But Lenin was referring to political support, not military defense against counter-revolution—which is at issue in the "military action in defense of Torres" for which Wohlforth condemns Lora. Leninists defend the policy of fighting militarily alongside Stalinist, social-democratic, and even bourgeois forces against fascist or rightist military uprising, while maintaining the complete independence of the working-class movement. That is the whole lesson of the Kornilov affair, and of the policy Trotsky urged to save the German workers from Nazism. But Wohlforth apparently cannot understand the difference between a policy of unified military defense with political independence and military defense with political capitulation to alien classes and class collaborators.

Further, Wohlforth's acknowledgement of Lenin's policy of critical political support to reformist working-class parties—which is not the issue in the case of military defense of the bourgeois Torres regime against the right—is peculiar in its own way, since Wohlforth (in sharp contrast to his past positions) is recently on record as refusing to engage in united front political action with Stalinists, particularly Maoists. Are the Stalinists worse than the social democrats, Cde. Wohlforth? If you claim they are, you are in your haste to score cynical factional points embracing a "method" which Trotsky ceaselessly fought against: Stalinophobia. Wohlforth's position against any common action with Stalinists is blind sectarianism, the obverse of the U.Sec. capitulation to such currents, reminiscent of Stalin's own "Theory of Social Fascism" according to which the Communists were ordered to avoid any com-

mon action with the Social Democrats, who were held to be as bad as the Nazis. When will the Healyites openly label their current position the "Theory of Social Stalinism" or "Third Period Healyism"?

The POR must, through unsparing criticism of their own history and scrapping the centrist program and leadership which led to the defeats in 1953 and 1971, discover the Leninist road to power (see article on page 3, "Centrist Debacle in Bolivia"). They can expect no help from the Healyites shouting their Leninist orthodoxy and "continuity" to cover their limitless opportunism, blind sectarianism and ignorance. ■

Marxist Bulletin No. 10

**"FROM
MAOISM
TO
TROTSKYISM"**

\$1

DOCUMENTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT
OF THE
COMMUNIST WORKING COLLECTIVE
OF LOS ANGELES

order from: SPARTACIST, Box 1377, G.P.O.,
New York, N.Y. 10001