

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

(FORMERLY INTERNATIONAL NEWS)
DEVOTED TO THE THEORY OF MARXISM

VOLUME 2, No. 3

(Labor Donated)

AUGUST 1936

C O N T E N T S

Civil War in Spain

The Left Flank of the Roosevelt Regime - the Stalinites

The Agrarian Program of the Socialist Party

The French Turn Crosses the Frontier

The "Left" Socialist (Centrist) International

Published by

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE of the U. S.

28 EAST 14th STREET, NEW YORK CITY

2159 W. Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

10 cents a copy

\$1.00 a year

THE LEFT FLANK OF THE ROOSEVELT REGIME - THE STALINISTS.

The ninth convention of the "Communist" Party of the United States closed Sunday, June 28, in New York, after selecting an election platform and nominating Browder and Ford for President and Vice-President. Seven hundred and ten delegates from all parts of the country, representing about 45,000 members, followed the Stalinist leaders in their opportunist proposals.

Convention swings to the right.

In this convention the Stalinists, like the Socialists in their convention, took a big step toward the right. The concepts of the class struggle and of the social revolution were unheard and were absent from the reports and speeches of the convention and from the line adopted for the election campaign.

Main election slogan - reformist.

The dominating slogan of the ninth convention is "A free, peaceful, prosperous, happy America - the dream of the vast majority of the nation." This is a BOURGEOIS DEMOCRATIC SLOGAN and has nothing in common with a slogan representing the CLASS INTEREST of the working class at this stage of American capitalist decay. Neither freedom, peace, prosperity, nor happiness can be achieved by the American working class through the machinery of bourgeois democracy and its election campaigns. Such a goal can be reached only AFTER the revolution which overthrows the exploiters and their state - otherwise it is a "dream". Otherwise absolutely any capitalist agent could campaign on this slogan and serve his masters well. It would help the capitalists against the workers. It is a reformist slogan.

The Left Flank of the Democrats.

The Stalinist slogan against the twin parties of capitalism is so worded as to leave the door wide open for the workers to support Roosevelt. The slogan and the line is a mild 'left' criticism of Roosevelt and a blast against the Republicans.

"The Communist Party declares without qualifications that the Landon-Hearst Wall Street ticket is the chief enemy of the liberties, peace and prosperity of the American People. Its victory would carry our country a long way toward fascism and war." Thus, without qualification, the Stalinists expose their opportunist position and their open support of the "liberal" bourgeoisie against the reactionary bourgeoisie.

By referring to the Landon-Hearst WALL STREET ticket, the Stalinists imply that the Roosevelt ticket is against Wall Street. This is absolutely false. The Republican Party represents one group of imperialists and the Democratic Party and Roosevelt represent another group of imperialists and another group of Wall Street capitalists.

With 16 million unemployed, with the United States definitely in the period of world capitalist decay, the old methods of holding the workers in line will no longer work; "new deal" methods of political, economic and 'legal' subjection are necessary. In this respect the Roosevelt Democrats are doing the job of holding the workers in check

far more effectively than the old deal capitalists within both parties. They are doing it with billions in subsidies for the exploiters, at the price of crumbs and promises for the workers. Browder and the Stalinists accept this as "progressive". It is plain betrayal of the working class.

In the Saturday, June 27th issue of the Daily Worker they have a big caption: "Lenke, Landon, Hearst -- Labor Must act now to defeat Tories." By omission and implication this means that Roosevelt is O.K. The Stalinist Party has become the left flank of the Roosevelt regime. In Mexico, Greece and many other countries the Stalinists openly support the capitalist governments. In France, the United States and other countries they carry on a policy of acting as the left flank of the government.

Stalinist line the same as Roosevelt's.

The main line of the Roosevelt campaign strategy is: liberalism vs. conservatism, the New Deal vs. the Old Deal, the defenders of the peoples' rights vs. the privileged few at the top. The main slogan and the main line of the Stalinists is in content identical. The only difference is in the words. The Stalinists use words to the left of the Democrats. Instead of liberalism vs. the reactionaries, the Stalinists say "Democracy vs. Fascism". Instead of New Deal vs. Old Deal, the Stalinists say "Landon-Hearst-WALL STREET ticket is the chief enemy of the liberties, peace and prosperity of the American People". Instead of the common people vs. the privileged few at the top, the Stalinists say "Build the American Peoples Front (Farmer-Labor Party) to halt the rising menace of Fascism in the United States".

Stalinists and Socialists hand workers over to the capitalists.

The Peoples Front and its American counterpart, the Farmer-Labor Party, is the organizational instrument to which the "democratic" section of the bourgeoisie tie the working class. It is the means whereby the Stalinists and Socialists turn the workers over, bound and gagged, to the "democratic" section of the capitalists, under bourgeois leadership. This is reformism, opportunism, betrayal;- the role of allies of the bourgeoisie.

To cover up his betrayal Browder misquotes Lenin.

Browder, speaking of Lenin, says "He taught us when, how, under what conditions, the Communist could not only vote for but even enter into alliances with bourgeois candidates and parties, against the threatening attack of overwhelming reactionary forces." Then Browder quotes Lenin, Vol. 3, page 153:

"Can a class-conscious worker ignore the democratic struggle for the sake of the Socialist struggle, or ignore the latter for the sake of the former? No, a class-conscious workers calls himself a Social-Democrat (that was when the Communist Party was called Social-Democratic Labor Party.--E.B.) precisely because he understands the interrelation between the two struggles. He knows that there is no other road to socialism but the road through democracy, through political liberty. He therefore strives for the complete and consistent achievement of democracy for the sake of attaining the ultimate goal - socialism. Why are not the conditions for the democratic struggle the same as the conditions for the socialist struggle? Because the workers will necessarily have different allies in those two struggles. The workers wage

the democratic struggle together with a section of the bourgeoisie."

The quotations we have given here from Browder and from Lenin have nothing in common. Browder makes several fundamental errors. It is Browder who speaks of VOTING and ELECTIONS, subordinating the workers to their allies, and it is precisely Lenin who speaks of the INDEPENDENT struggle of the workers for DEMOCRATIC demands and for SOCIAL demands, pointing out that the workers will have different ALLIES in these different phases of the struggle.

Lenin spoke of allies and alliances, but this was always, in his views and activity, kept within the framework of the POLITICAL and ORGANIZATIONAL INDEPENDENCE of the revolutionary Marxian organization. As Trotsky sloganized the relationship: "March separately and strike together." But now, even Trotsky, with the turn of the International Communist League, has reverted to his war-period revisionist position on this fundamental question.

Browder's concept is the opposite of Lenin's. Browder, through the "Peoples Front" subordinated the working class and its party politically and organizationally to a section of the bourgeoisie which is fighting another section of the bourgeoisie. This is the same theoretical concept of the four-class party which Stalin inflicted on the Chinese revolution, thereby subordinating the Communist Party, the proletariat and the peasantry to the Koumintang and Chiang Kai Shek. Browder, having taken part in beheading the Chinese revolution, is now repeating this "Leninist" strategy in the United States.

Reformism, not Fascism as the Stalinists claim, is the immediate danger.

Browder says that voting for bourgeois candidates and forming alliances with bourgeois parties takes place when the workers are threatened with an OVERWHELMING REACTIONARY FORCE. Is that the case today? No, it is not.

The Stalinists have manufactured the Fascist danger in America and distorted the facts. The real immediate danger of the working class is REFORMISM - reformism led by the Stalinists and Socialists who are tying the workers to the "democratic bourgeoisie" through the Farmer-Labor Party, to the Lewis trade union class collaboration movement through a class collaboration unemployed movement. The same methods and the same results apply in the case of their petty-bourgeois Negro movement, their petty-bourgeois agrarian program, their petty-bourgeois youth program, etc. etc.

The Stalinists label every form of reaction: Fascism. But many of the labor struggles of the past in the United States were larger, more violent, and were fought against more violent forms of reaction than are being fought today - yet they were not "Fascism".

To label every form of reaction as fascism is to cover up the real fascist forces. The Stalinists today are guilty of the same crimes that the social-democrats were guilty of when the Stalinists called them social-fascists, and if we used Stalinist labels we would have to call the Stalinists themselves "social-fascists". But we condemned their crimes of yesterday when they lumped all forms of opposition to the revolution into one camp, and we condemn their action today when they label all forms of reaction as fascism and call this the immediate danger when the real immediate danger to the working

class in the United States is a short period of deadly reformism.

Against armed insurrection.

The Stalinists, like the Socialists, have come out for reform and against armed insurrection, against the social revolution. Browder's speech to the Convention dealt with this:

"The Communist Party must use the opportunity of this election to smash once and for all the superstition, which has been embodied in a maze of court decisions having the force of law, that our party is an advocate of force and violence, that it is subject to laws (Federal immigration laws, state 'criminal syndicalism' laws), directed against such advocacy. The Communist Party is not a conspirative organization, it is an open revolutionary party, continuing the traditions of 1776 and 1861; it is the only organization that is really entitled by its program and work to designate itself as "sons and daughters of the American revolution." (Quotation, including emphasis, from Daily Worker, June 25, 1936).

And again, Browder the reformist, in his May 30th speech at Chicago, handled the question of armed insurrection as follows:

"Let me briefly repudiate some of the most serious charges made against us. Some say we "advocate violence", that we are conspirators and terrorists, that we are against democracy. That is not true. It is far from correct as if those charges were made against Washington and Lincoln. We know too well how the toilers suffer from reactionary violence. When, however, we say that we are not pacifists, not non-resisters, we are in the best traditions of Americanism. Since when have Americans been pacifists? We support and fight for democratic rights of the masses. We would subscribe to such a declaration against violence which would not be a pacifist repudiation of America's birth as an independent nation or of the great Lincoln."

Perhaps Browder can find a quotation from Lenin to soften his seat in the same boat with "the Father of his country" and "the great emancipator" -- three men in a boat, anti-capitalist revolutionaries!

For reform. Against the overthrow of capitalism.

Nowhere in the election platform of the Stalinists do they connect up properly the struggle for immediate demands with the struggle for ultimate demands, democratic demands with socialist demands. Nowhere does the platform, program, or propadanda flowing from it properly present the question of overthrow. In fact, the Stalinists give the opposite of the correct position. Speaking of their program Browder says "This is not a program of revolutionary overthrow of capitalism. It can be realized within the framework of the present economic system by a peoples government backed by the organized masses, determined to fight and to keep Wall Street and its Fascists out of power."

This is sowing parliamentary illusions. It is not the revolutionary utilization of parliament for the interest of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. A revolutionist cannot present immediate demands in an election program for use on the POLITICAL field which are entirely void of a proper reference to and connection with the question of HOW the WORKING CLASS will TAKE POWER.

In addition, the same fundamental error which runs through the whole works of Stalinism crops up in the above quotation. The Stalinists are going to have a peoples' government within the framework of the capitalist system that will keep Wall Street out of power. This is one of the theoretical fountain-heads of the Peoples Front error and the Farmer-Labor Party error. No party under capitalism, in the name of the people, the farmers, the workers or the middle class, can serve these classes. They all, of necessity, serve the interests of one section of finance capital against another section, one section of Wall Street against another section of Wall Street, the new deal imperialists against the old deal imperialists. To speak of a peoples government against Wall Street is to ape Roosevelt with left phrases.

The Stalinist Party and their Lovestone camp followers, the Socialist Party and their Trotskyite followers both present reformist, opportunist election programs for the 1936 election. Only the Revolutionary Workers League presents an election program of class struggle and revolution. The workers interests in the 1936 elections are represented by the Revolutionary Workers League and the Young Workers League.

Support the Revolutionary Workers League.

Support the Workers Vote.

Support Garrett and Roberts in the 1936 Elections.

For the Overthrow of Capitalism.

For a Workers Government in the United States.

FRENCH STALINISTS REMOVE CRITIC OF PEOPLE'S FRONT

We learn from La Lutte Ouvriere (July 11 organ of the Trotskyite Internationalist Workers Party, that Ferrat, member of the Political Bureau of the C.P. of France, has been removed from all posts and invited to 'recognize his errors'!

Ferrat had written a letter to L'Humanite stating that those hands of rank and file Communists opposed the Sacred Union (Stalin-Laval), the uncritical support of Blum, the policy of restraint in strikes, and the whole new line of chauvinism and class collaboration.

The resolution of the Central Committee of June 13, in which the Stalinists take Ferrat to task, should serve as an eye opener to Communist workers. The CP does not hesitate to say that the views expressed by Ferrat are incompatible with membership.

Last year, when a similar situation arose on a smaller scale, the Trotskyites were unable to influence it because they were members of the SFIO. Today, though formally independent, they are again excluded from effective intervention because, since they have refused to condemn their past course and have organized their new party on a Left Socialist (Centrist) program their influence upon the workers will be negative.

The Agrarian Program of the Socialist Party.

The Agrarian Program of the Socialist Party adopted at the Cleveland Convention which is based on the line of the "Commonwealth Plan" endorsed by it, is a bourgeois reformist program and even more narrow-minded than the New Deal and Republican programs. The new deal agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture as well as a host of bourgeois New Deal farm experts have already instituted far greater "radical" measures and reforms since 1931 than are proposed in the Socialist Party Program.

Some Agro-economists of all shades, (New and Old Deal) industrialists and bankers when dealing with the agrarian crisis in the U.S. are forced to admit the interdependence between American agriculture and world trade and world prices, and they, therefore point out the utter futility of attempting superficial remedies unless the fundamental and basic reasons behind the agrarian crisis, namely, the present system of land tenure, capitalist private property, commodity production, and the world market are modified. The Socialist Party program does not even raise one elementary slogan which can in any way ameliorate the present suffering of the share-croppers and poor farmers; on the contrary, its program is drawn up in such a way as to aid the middle and wealthy farmers at the expense of the poor. Concerning the ultimate emancipation through the organization of the agricultural laborers and poor farmers into councils for the seizure of the large landholdings, plantations, etc., the abolition of private property in land, there is not a word.

Reactionary Theory of "Family Farming".

The Program "proposes the abolition of tenant and corporation farming". The program does not state how this will be accomplished. To this the "Commonwealth Plan" replies that the Government will "acquire" such lands and "the owners will receive "compensation" for such lands. The "Commonwealth Plan" specifies that only "land owned in absentee" will be acquired by the Government. How then does the Socialist Party "propose" the abolition of corporation farms not owned "in absentee"?

The plank further calls for the substitution of the use and occupancy title for family farming". Now what will the occupancy titles assure the farmers? What is really proposed here is the institution of subsistence farming, not to compete with the large farms and "co-operatives" either on the domestic or foreign markets. In so far as the above plank attempts to reintroduce "self-sufficient" farming (in line with the Republican and New Deal programs) it is reactionary. The whole idea of "buying" out the land from the exploiters instead of expropriating it without compensation, is reactionary and can only work against the revolutionary interests of the masses in America.

The second paragraph deals with "marketing, processing and distribution,..... to be taken over by bonafide co-operatives". The "Commonwealth Plan" proposes that the "Federal Government will establish marketing and processing agencies which will include elevators, mills, canneries, etc." What hypocritical ignorance can be embodied in one paragraph! The history of "bonafide"

co-operatives under reformist leadership, and the Non-Partisan League of North Dakota has been forgotten by these gentlemen, or else, through their confusion and verbiage, they are consciously betraying the working masses. The New dealers have already instituted the "marketing" agencies necessary for the transformation of hundreds of thousands of farmers into subsistence farming. This in reality, has driven them off the land.

The co-operative movement is proposed by the S.P. (and all other bourgeois economists) as the best of possible marketing agencies, presumably to aid the poor farmers. It is no secret to the S.P. that the agencies most responsible for the repression and exploitation of the poor farmers are the reformist controlled co-operatives. Most of them are reactionary agencies set up and organized especially against the poor farmers in order to eliminate them from free access to the markets, both domestic and foreign. The provisions for membership in most of the farm co-operatives are beyond the economic conditions of most poor farmers and tenants. Unless controlled by the poorest strata, such agencies inevitably fall into the hands of the rich farmers and become agencies of oppression and exploitation against the poorer layers of the rural population.

Prices and Cost of Production.

Finally, the program sums up its third "ultimate" slogan with a proposal that "farm prices be established at cost of production to the working farmer, etc." Statistics for the whole post-war period of the agrarian crisis prove the fallacy of such "proposals" and show the real nature behind capitalist price fixing. (See the article "The Decline of World Agriculture"

How do the Socialist Party "economists" propose to "stabilize" prices on the basis of the cost of production, - by whom? By "representatives of organized farmers and consumers". Sheer ignorance and idocy. Who are the consumers? Do the Socialist Party "economists" perhaps mean workers through their unions? Aren't the capitalists also consumers? And the world market which reflects the world prices of all commodities and regulates the prices of agricultural produce, on a world scale? Do the S.P. "economists" propose to abolish this with the one little stroke of their little finger? What standard cost will the S.P. "economists" use as a basis for their "stabilization" of prices? The average cost of primitive subsistence farming on a local scale, or the relatively low cost of large industrialized farming on the basis of wage labor? The whole idea of "working Farmer" is deliberate confusion. A farmer whether he owns a \$5,000 or \$50,000 farm is a working farmer in so far as he performs some kind of work on it. But the cost of production for the "working farmer" on the basis of wage labor and machinery will certainly be much lower than the cost to the "working farmer" who toils without hired labor and with primitive tools.

"Immediate" Demands

The above mentioned planks represent a program of long range perspective, with ultimate (sic) demands. The following is what the S.P. proposes "in the meantime".

1. "That immediate relief be provided for debt-laden working farmers by advancing credit on such carrying charges as do not threaten the farmer with the loss of his "farm". And the system of rent payments, mortgages, taxation and a host of ills which burden the tenants and poor farmers? This will not be disturbed.

2. "That social-insurance be provided against crop failure, the cost of such insurance to be covered by income from inheritance and corporation taxes".

Crop failures are not the major evils behind the agrarian crisis. Bumper crops are the greatest of all evils to small scale farmers. On the basis of capitalist production, overexpansion is a natural tendency, which becomes the determining factor on world prices. Insurance against crop failures therefore does not even touch the issue involved. Under Socialized production of course this assumes an entirely different meaning. Because Socialist economy as a whole is planned economy whose aim is the establishment of a real economy of abundance and not of scarcity.

The S.P. "economists" have submitted a document which is void of any struggle for the basic and fundamental needs of the farmers. It falls far behind the New Dealers and even the Republicans on immediate demands. From the broad, historical point of view it is bourgeois reformist, and in the present stage of decay capitalism - Reactionary!

Socialist Party Americanism

The Socialist party program reveals the national narrowness which it covered up in other planks of its general program. It fails to see the International aspect of the problem. It attempts a purely national solution for the agrarian crisis. It omits such immediate demands as even the reactionary Republicans recognize and state in their program. The Republicans state that their "paramount object is to protect and foster the family type of farming, traditional in American life". This is also the avowed object of the New Dealers. Wherein does the Socialist Party platform differ from either? The triple-A has long ago stated such "solutions" and on this basis achieved the opposite, - so eliminate hundreds of thousands of poor farmers from production.

But where the Socialist Party satisfies itself with the mere statement in favor of "family-sized farms" as the solution, the Republicans recognize the necessity "for policies, which will bring about an adjustment of agriculture to meet the needs of domestic and foreign markets". This is a slap in the face of the philistine nationalist "solution" of the S.P.

But aside from this, there are no fundamental differences between the capitalist parties, and the parties who parade around in the name of workers, and farmers, namely- the Socialist, Communist, and Farmer-Labor, - all are bourgeois reformist parties and the only difference between them is the degree of demagoguery and phrase-mongery they use. We hope to deal separately with the Communist and Farmer-Labor Parties in a future article. Here we want to ask only this question: If the present program of the S.P. is the "maximum" program, what will the minimum program of the Farmer-Labor Party look like? How much more "conservative" (read reactionary) will it be?

Socialist Party Evades Vital Questions

The whole question of land conservation, so important in a socialist society, is not even dealt with by the S.P. "economists". What are the proposals of the S.P. as to the present trade treaties, 14 of which have already been signed by Roosevelt, whereby whole sections of poor farmers, share croppers and laborers were forced into utter misery and starvation?

What does the S.P. really offer to the tenant farmers and laborers organized in the S.P. controlled Southern Tenant Farmers Union for the many sacrifices the membership suffers in the struggle against the plantation owners? On the basis of the S.P. program they can only be tied more firmly to the capitalist state and permanent wage slavery.

The Revolutionary Road

The argument for the setting up of "family farms" thru the abolition of "absentee" corporation farming is repeating the old bourgeois reformist theory that small holdings, worked by farmers on a subsistence basis is a superior economy to large farming and carries with it the "economy of abundance" (S.P.-Republicans, etc.) Nothing is really further from the truth than this reactionary theory. The superiority of large scale farming, thru the use of modern machinery and rotating crops has been demonstrated time and time again and only narrow-minded reformists refuse to see this. Small scale (peasant) subsistence farming wastes away the productivity of the soil and the energy of the farming population, and means the forced maintenance of a low standard of living for the great masses of poor farmers. Revolutionists must counterpose to this reactionary slogan the slogan of Collective farming and large scale co-operative farming on a socialized basis as part of a program of socialization of economy generally, which can be carried out only thru international revolution.

The poor farming masses cannot find a short-cut thru a reformist program for their emancipation. They must rally around the agricultural and industrial workers organized into a genuine revolutionary Marxist party.

The Revolutionary Workers League maintains that the only road towards emancipation of the American masses - workers and poor farmers, - is the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the capitalists and their government and the establishment of a workers government.

"---The Second International is in fact by its real and historical and political role---an organization of the agents of international imperialism operating within the labor movement, pervading it with bourgeois influence, bourgeois ideas, bourgeois lies and bourgeois corruptions."

-Tasks of the Third International. (Lenin's emphasis)

"Communists do not want a weak Socialist Party which is no asset to the working class."- (Daily Worker, May 25, 1936.

"We are convinced that --- agreement for joint struggle will result in the strengthening of the Socialist Party as well as the Communist Party." (Letter to the S.P. national convention.)

THE "FRENCH TURN" CROSSES THE FRONTIER

THE INTERNATIONAL EFFECTS OF THE LIQUIDATION OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST LEAGUE INTO THE SFIO- THE NEW ORIENTATION

-continued from the July issue.

Take the case of Spaak and the left wing in the Belgian Socialist Party (POB). Spaak was the leader of the left wing which gave battle inside the POB to the bureaucracy of Vandervelde, one of the most corrupt in the entire Second International. By the summer of 1934 Spaak had moved so far to the left that he made a trip to see comrade Trotsky. According to the reports, he came away favorably impressed, resolved to push the fight against Vandervelde, unfolding it in the direction of revolutionary Marxism.

Today, Spaak sits shoulder to shoulder with Vandervelde and De Man in the cabinet of His Majesty, the King of Belgium, helping to execute the imperialist colonial policy of the Belgian bourgeoisie and to prepare Belgium's share in the coming blood bath- - - a traitor to the left wing, to the Belgian labor movement, to the international working class. And the left wing? It is weak; lefts are barely tolerated, says the Charleroi district committee of the Belgian Communist League.

What caused this volte face by Spaak? And the debacle of the left wing? Several factors combined to produce this result. For one thing, the Belgian bourgeoisie did not, as it

FRENCH TURN CROSSES THE FRONTIER -6-

will later, turn a hostile face to "its" social democracy. It has work for it to do! To hold the unrest of the workers in check, lower their standards of living, etc. The internal crisis in the POB consequently did not develop to the left but made a demarche to the right. The hand of the right was strengthened, the left weakened. This is in the realm of objective considerations.

But still what impelled Spaak to reverse his direction? Personal considerations? Ambitions? Possibly. But what political considerations turned him away from the perspective of sharpening the fight? The new orientation of the ICL, unquestionably; that is: the entry in France. For the line of march of the French Bolshevik-Leninists was into the SP. How could Spaak or anyone get a hearing for the idea that the road lay away from Vandervelde and the corruption of "his" social democracy to the Fourth International, when the banner of the Fourth International was borne into the Second International itself? - and even hauled down for months as it was by the Bolshevik-Leninists inside the SFIO?

Demagogues will claim that we attribute responsibility for the treachery of Spaak to Trotsky! Let them. Our position is clear. The entry in France, which followed hard on the heels of Spaak's visit to Trotsky, took away from Spaak the ground on which he stood and indicated a new line of march: into the SP and consequently for those who are in it, deeper into the SP. From that point Spaak's course is to be explained in terms of Spaak, his weaknesses, his opportunism, his lack of revolutionary integrity. Laurent, Professor of Economic History in the University of Brussels, writing in the August CURRENT HISTORY, says of Spaak, "that the Premier, Van Zeeland, with De Man's help, drew the teeth of the left wing fight against their treacherous abandonment of the De Man plan by offering Spaak a cabinet post. M. Spaak accepted at once and thus began his career as a minister in a somewhat questionable fashion." Only there is nothing questionable about it. It is treason to the working class.

The shift in the relation of political forces in Belgium, the entry in France and the evolution of Spaak to the right, which later culminated in his outright treason - these are the factors which weakened and confused the left wing in the Belgian Socialist Party. The subsequent entry into the POB with the gracious permission of Vandervelde and Company, of a number of members of the Communist League of Belgium from Charleroi on a platform of capitulation has not encouraged them to break with their social patriotic leadership.

T H E S A P

Not the least of the many evils which have flowed from the new orientation of the ICL is the effect that it has had on the SAP. As is known, the SAP in August, 1933, signed the Pact of Four for the Fourth International, together with the ICL and the two Dutch parties which have since fused to form the RSAP. Shortly thereafter, the SAP began to conduct a course which has

FRENCH TURN CROSSES THE FRONTIER

made the work of building the Fourth International even more difficult than it would nominally be. Responsibility for the failure rests on the SAP leadership, whose course has been directed against the Fourth Internationalists and on the new orientation of the ICL. In the SAP the ICL confronted a complicated problem: the contradiction between the leadership and the rank and file. The leadership came to the SAP from the Communist International and the Brandler so-called International. It is right-centrist. The rank and file evolved from the social democracy. The direction of the line of march of the leadership was and is to the right; of the rank and file, to the left, toward revolutionary Marxism. There are more than a few revolutionary proletarian elements among them. Under the impact of events and the pressure of the rank and file in the first months of Hitler's rule, before the Fascist terror was perfected, the lines of the leadership and the rank and file coincided at the point of signing the Pact of Four for the Fourth International.

It should have been clear from the first that the lines would part as they have done. The leadership functions in exile. As Hitler's rule was fastened on the country and bore with ever greater weight on the working class and the under-ground movement, connections with the rank and file became difficult to establish and maintain, dangerous and uncertain. This, of course, is true of all German working class parties today. As a result the SAP leadership is not subject to even that nominal, formal control which a rank and file can exercise in bourgeois-democratic countries. It has had practically a free hand to unfold its line in the SAP press which it controls and in the London-Amsterdam Bureau, the Stockholm-Oslo Youth Bureau, where it has advanced its false line to the detriment of the movement of the Fourth International and the struggle against the new orientation of the ICL. In the key questions, it has moved far to the right, until today it has arrived at a Stalinist-pacifist position on the struggle against war.

Today, the rank and file of the SAP cannot speak in its own name; it is inarticulate. But there is no reason to assume that its line coincides with that of the leadership. On the contrary, its past, its evolution from social democracy, the daily bitter reality which it confronts heroically, the fact that those who still remain in the party have done their duty while thousands who were in it have fallen into demoralization and apathy or gone back to the Second International - all this gives us reason to hope that if it had the opportunity and the means the rank and file would reject the line of the leadership and the leadership with it. By themselves, in their present circumstances, they cannot do it. It was the duty of the Fourth Internationalists, of the ICL and of Unser Wort, in the first place to assist them to do it, thus to exploit the contradiction between the leadership and the rank and file in the interests of the Fourth International.

But that which the situation and the interests of the Fourth International demanded the ICL could not do. What chance it had before the summer of 1934 it lost completely after it

FRENCH TURN CROSSES THE FRONTIER

liquidated the French Communist League into the SFIO. To the workers in the SAP, who had come out of the Second International and the German social democracy, and were aspiring toward Marxism, the entry must have appeared as the capitulation of traitors. Talk of the Fourth International on the part of the ICL must have seemed to them a hollow mockery. The subsequent entries in Switzerland and Italy, and the capitulations from the ICL to the social democracy, could only confirm them in their opinions. The bitter polemics of Bauer who was wrong in joining the SAP helped them to these conclusions. A wall rose between them and the ICL - the wall of the new orientation. It cut off all hope, as long as the flag of the New Orientation floated over the ICL, of winning the SAP workers for an independent revolutionary party in Germany in collaboration with the ICL.

In recent months, the differences between the SAP leadership and the ICL have touched profound levels. Unser Wort, official organ of the German section of the ICL, concludes an article "Centrist Alchemy or Marxism?" in its issue dated the end of May: "It is clear that the work of fusing the revolutionary forces under the banner of the Fourth International must proceed apart from the SAP and against the SAP". (The entire article appeared in the NEW INTERNATIONAL, July, 1935). Insofar as this applies to the leadership, it is correct. Insofar as it applies to the membership, it is a false policy. Certainly, this is not the way to separate the rank and file from the leadership. That is the way to drive the rank and file closer to the leadership into bitter hostility toward the ICL and the Fourth International.

It leaves the ICL without a word to say to the SAP workers. It cannot bid them maintain their independence. For, from the point of view of the ICL, the SAP must be liquidated. The new orientation, which acts like a clarion summoning workers to enter the social democracy, gives the lie to any appeal for or pretension to independence. The ICL cannot with any degree of realism or hope of success ask the workers in the SAP to join the German Communist League. Who in the SAP would take it seriously? Confronted with the contradiction of its own making, its inability to speak to the SAP workers, the ICL "solves" the contradiction by wiping out the distinction between the leadership and the rank and file of the SAP. It lumps them all together and excommunicates them from the movement for the Fourth International. Bureaucratic stupidity! On the basis of its new orientation, the ICL can succeed only in driving the workers in the SAP further away.

▲ correct policy toward the SAP today requires an appeal to the rank and file over the head of their leadership and against their leadership, an appeal to them to force their leadership to realize the programmatic line of the Pact of the Four, to collaborate in building the Fourth International, to build an independent revolutionary Marxist party in Germany. That course is sure to bring fruitful results, weaken the SAP leadership and speed up the development of the membership. It will strike responsive chords in the breasts of those workers whose revolutionary instincts must seek creative expression against the dead weight of the corpses of the Socialist and Communist parties and the opportunist line

of their own leadership. Such a policy can light new sparks of hope in the breasts of the SAP workers by showing them that those outside the tomb which is Germany are eager to extend to them a comradely hand in the gigantic struggle for the Fourth International and victory. The first condition for the success of such a policy is a clear and open repudiation of the new orientation. Without that any advice the ICL can give the SAP workers will fall on deaf ears, its appeals for an independent party will remain without reaction in the rank and file.

Unfortunately, there is no sign that the ICL will change its course to a Marxist one. It still marches stubbornly on the road to disaster. And if it is not stopped it may ruin forever the promise of revolutionary developments in the SAP.

Another danger is involved in the policy of the ICL in reading the SAP out of the movement of the Fourth International. The present leadership of the German Communist League supports the new orientation. It is not itself a party. Like its brother sections, the German League confronts the task of building a revolutionary Marxist party in "its own" country. If it declares that it cannot do it with the SAP, but even against the SAP, it must seek other allies, other hopes. Where will it look for them? The SAP rank and file stands at the left pole of centrism in Germany. In rejecting the SAP the ICL must look to the right for its allies. The weight of the new orientation, which it supports, will impel it to apply that orientation in Germany. The new policy toward the SAP is a step in the application of the new orientation to Germany. Not the first step; others have preceded it: the theft of Unser Wort from the majority of the leadership which opposed the entry in France by a minority which supported it, endorsement of the entry in France; a split in the section, and the defections of some members to the CP; but the latest step. Unless we can prevent still further steps along this line we will reap more rotten fruit of the new orientation.

SOME FURTHER RESULTS OF THE NEW ORIENTATION.

By confusing and disorienting left wings and left wing elements in the socialist parties and outside, the new orientation strengthens the illusions of those workers in the Second International - and their number is legion - who think that their revolutionary aspirations can be achieved within the social democracy. Where the new orientation does not actively disorient these workers it retards their development to revolutionary Marxism, as in the U.S. The confusion of the left workers plays into the hands of their centrist leaders, who in turn, according to the laws of politics, especially where there is no clear Marxist counterweight, play into the hands of the right-wing bureaucrats. In the end, the Vanderveldes, Blums and the other brethren of the reformist, social patriotic fraternity, reap the greatest benefit from this process. That is its fatal logic. In retarding the development of lefts and disorienting them from breaking with the Second

FRENCH TURN CROSSES THE FRONTIER

International, in strengthening their illusions that the Second International can become the center of revolutionary unity, the new orientation not only strengthens the reformists and centrists in the Second International, but it strengthens the social democracy politically and organizationally against the Marxists. The proponents of the Fourth International whom it weakens organizationally and politically.

The disastrous results go deeper and extend wider. The new orientation strengthens Stalinism against Marxism. Where the new orientation is applied it results in a weakening of the struggle against Stalinism. The open pressure of the Marxists on the Stalinist workers is given a different and false content. Formerly, the ICL called on the Stalinist workers to leave the CI and join the ICL. Now it cannot do that; it cannot call on the French Stalinists to join the French Communist League, for it has been liquidated! and that is true in Switzerland and Belgium, etc., wherever the new orientation is applied in whole or in part. The struggle against Stalinism goes on. That is true. But no immediate, concrete, organizational conclusions, with respect to the Fourth International, are drawn from this line. La Verite, organ of the French Bolshevik-Leninists, runs long articles to prove that Stalinism is the main enemy. But it draws no conclusions for the Stalinist workers with respect to the central, all-important and decisive question: of the revolutionary party.

Left elements in the CI are disoriented. Marxist oppositions cannot develop by themselves in the Stalinist parties any more than they can in the social democracy. They need the constant guidance of an independent center, which outside the CP directs and supports the fight they make inside. Abandonment of the independent organization of the Marxists must lead inevitably to the weakening of the opposition work inside the CI and to theories of its hopelessness, fruitlessness, etc; that is to say, to its abandonment. (See our article on the application of the new orientation to the W.P.). After Doriot a second opposition group has developed in the CP of France. It publishes a magazine, QUE FAIRE. To circumvent the Stalinist bureaucracy the nominal editor is not a party member, Landau, who once was a leading figure in the German Left Opposition, played a miserable role in it and split away from it. It is not Landau who is decisive here but the existence of an organized group in the Stalinized Communist Party, the second within a year. Yet this phenomenon goes unsung in La Verite and the ICL press. The ICL had no hand in it. Now it passes it by in silence. It has nothing to say to these workers who need Marxist clarity and guidance, no word of encouragement or advice. Confronted with the reality which its policy denies the ICL through the Administrative Secretary of the International Secretariat, comrade Adolphe, denies the phenomenon altogether! (See Adolphe's reply to Oehler on the question of organic unity).

It is no longer a question of a group in the CP. It is now a problem of crystallizing revolutionary forces out of the seething ferment in the Communist Party of France (and tomorrow in the other parties of the CI). Since Stalin signed the notorious Stalin-Laval communique the monolithism of the French Communist Party has been smashed to little bits. The following

FRENCH TURN CROSSES THE FRONTIER .

International, in strengthening their illusions that the Second International can become the center of revolutionary unity, the new orientation not only strengthens the reformists and centrists in the Second International, but it strengthens the social democracy politically and organizationally against the Marxists. The proponents of the Fourth International whom it weakens organizationally and politically.

The disastrous results go deeper and extend wider. The new orientation strengthens Stalinism against Marxism. Where the new orientation is applied it results in a weakening of the struggle against Stalinism. The open pressure of the Marxists on the Stalinist workers is given a different and false content. Formerly, the ICL called on the Stalinist workers to leave the CI and join the ICL. Now it cannot do that; it cannot call on the French Stalinists to join the French Communist League, for it has been liquidated! and that is true in Switzerland and Belgium, etc., wherever the new orientation is applied in whole or in part. The struggle against Stalinism goes on. That is true. But no immediate, concrete, organizational conclusions, with respect to the Fourth International, are drawn from this line. La Verite, organ of the French Bolshevik-Leninists, runs long articles to prove that Stalinism is the main enemy. But it draws no conclusions for the Stalinist workers with respect to the central, all-important and decisive question: of the revolutionary party.

Left elements in the CI are disoriented. Marxist oppositions cannot develop by themselves in the Stalinist parties any more than they can in the social democracy. They need the constant guidance of an independent center, which outside the CP directs and supports the fight they make inside. Abandonment of the independent organization of the Marxists must lead inevitably to the weakening of the opposition work inside the CI and to theories of its hopelessness, fruitlessness, etc; that is to say, to its abandonment. (See our article on the application of the new orientation to the W.P.). After Doriot a second opposition group has developed in the CP of France. It publishes a magazine, QUE FAIRE. To circumvent the Stalinist bureaucracy the nominal editor is not a party member, Landau, who once was a leading figure in the German Left Opposition, played a miserable role in it and split away from it. It is not Landau who is decisive here but the existence of an organized group in the Stalinized Communist Party, the second within a year. Yet this phenomenon goes unsung in La Verite and the ICL press. The ICL had no hand in it. Now it passes it by in silence. It has nothing to say to these workers who need Marxist clarity and guidance, no word of encouragement or advice. Confronted with the reality which its policy denies the ICL through the Administrative Secretary of the International Secretariat, comrade Adolphe, denies the phenomenon altogether! (See Adolphe's reply to Ochler on the question of organic unity).

It is no longer a question of a group in the CP. It is now a problem of crystallizing revolutionary forces out of the seething ferment in the Communist Party of France (and tomorrow in the other parties of the CI). Since Stalin signed the notorious Stalin-Laval communique the monolithism of the French Communist Party has been smashed to little bits. The following

items from Le Proletaire d'Avant Garde, of July, published by Lhullier, leader of the minority of the French Communist League which fought the "French turn" on principled grounds and tries to maintain an independent existence, will give some idea of what is taking place in the French Communist Party:

"In the unit of St. Charles, of the 15th rayon, a strong unit of about 30 members, the majority of the unit has voted for a resolution demanding the expulsion of Stalin from the CI and has distributed material dealing with this question in the unit. From a comrade."

"A D'ole (Jura) - the conference of the rayon showed such hostility that the representative of the Secretariat of the CP did not dare to put to a vote the resolution approving Stalin." etc. etc.

"We repeat this information is only a small part of the movement of protest against the new policy.

Extract from Que Faire #7".

In another unit a worker made a motion to expel Stalin from the CI!

What is happening now is what the ICL itself once predicted. But the ICL, which sowed the seed by its years of struggle against Stalinism, cannot reap the harvest. It is far afield gathering strange crops. Is this rebellion going to assume significant proportions and organized forms? That depends in large part on what the Marxists do. While they are in the SFIO they are in no position to do anything. What can the ICL advise the rebellious Stalinist workers to do? Remain in their parties? No? Leave them to build new ones? Then how explain their own liquidation into the Second International? Isn't it clear that the only course they can indicate to the Stalinist workers on the basis of the new orientation is to follow them into the Second International? But the Bolshevik-Leninists do not propose this in their press? Then they propose nothing? No, for their course proclaims it for them! Into the Second International! Reform it! Transform it into an instrument of proletarian revolution! But the fact remains that the Stalinist workers, contrary to the expectation of Trotsky, do not follow the Bolshevik-Leninists into the SFIO. Strange irony that their mad gallop into the social democracy should isolate them now from this tremendously important development! Weird and poisonous fruit of the new orientation!

Compare the situation of the ICL in France in relation to the ferment in the CP to its relation to earlier developments in the CP in Spain where the Spanish Communist Left voted against the entry in France and decisively rejected the application of the new orientation to Spain. The Internal Bulletin of the Spanish Communist Left (#11) dated March 15th reported that both CP and SP elements came over to them. In Extremadura an entire unit of the SP applied for membership! The Madrid organization of the CP was undergoing a terrific crisis and

FRENCH TURN CROSSES THE FRONTIER

many of its members, especially the youth, joined the Communist Left. "Above all in the Southern section the passage of comrades to our organization is enormous. The bureaucrats are desperate. They attempt expulsions, but the answer to such attempts is the solidarity of entire nuclei with those being expelled."

The difference between the situation of the ICL in France and in Spain is the difference between the liquidation of the Marxist vanguard force and the maintenance of its political and organizational independence. On the basis of an independent organization, independent politically and organizationally, the Bolshevik-Leninists might recruit substantial forces from the CI now for the Fourth International.

Apparently, some idea of this is beginning to penetrate the thinking of the ICL leadership. On June 10th Crux wrote another of his letters in which he "discovers" that the majority of French workers are not in the SFIO but outside of it, in the CP, the trade unions and the unorganized, and calls for a "new turn" on the part of the Bolshevik-Leninists, which can mean only one thing - a split from the SFIO. This might well be the beginning of wisdom in the ICL, a step toward a Marxist party in France and the winning of the rebellious workers in the CP. But, unfortunately, it is not. The letter begins by affirming the correctness of the previous course thereby failing to correct the false theoretical basis of the new orientation, leaving the field free for its further extension, prejudicing the possibilities of the "newest turn", and introducing fresh contradictions into an already badly confused movement. Nonetheless, in attempting to react to the developments which threaten to pass by the ICL, the Crux letter is unwilling testimony of the bankruptcy of the past course. (See "What is the Future Course of the Bolshevik-Leninist Faction in the SFIO" by Stamm, and Ochler's reply to the Crux letter).

Who has benefited from the policy of the ICL? The Marxists? Obviously not. But the Stalinist bureaucrats do. They are strengthened against their rank and file. The confusion which the ICL introduces into the ranks of the left elements in the CI strengthens the bureaucrats absolutely and relatively against them. Moreover, the bureaucrats make big capital out of the ICL's new orientation. It gives them - the social patriots - the political offensive against the Fourth Internationalists. They paint it as a desertion to the social democracy, counteract the impression made on their rank and file by the correct criticism of the Bolshevik-Leninists, appear in the eyes of thousands of workers, who might otherwise be made to see the truth, as true Leninists, genuine Marxists, are able to maintain their hold over these workers and influence thousands of others.

It is true that in charging the Bolshevik-Leninists with desertion they contradict their own slanderous accusation that the Bolshevik-Leninists are counter-revolutionists. But pointing out the contradictions of the Stalinists is not an answer to the charge they make. It is true that the Stalinist bureaucrats cannot understand the orientation either from the

FRENCH TURN CROSSES THE FRONTIER

point of view of its proponents or that of its opponents, that is to say, from the point of view of the fundamental promise of both - the Fourth International. It is true they continuously attack the Fourth Internationalists. And it is also true that for twelve years the Bolshovik-Leninists have rebutted and refuted the slanders and lies, carried forward the banner of Marxism. But what answer can they make now to the workers in the Stalinist parties? How can they explain their course? They can point to their "success" in the SFIO. We have demonstrated the character of that success. How will they explain the Belgian capitulation? The blunt truth is that on this score the ICL cannot answer the Stalinist bureaucrats convincingly to the Stalinist workers. Nor to the working class.

In 1915 Lenin wrote:

"Unity of the proletarian struggle for a socialist revolution demands now, after 1914, an unconditional separation between the workers' parties and the party of the opportunists." (Quoted from AND NOW WHAT, volume on the Imperialist War, page 108, International Publishers edition).

"In company with opportunists and social chauvinists it is impossible to pursue the true international policy of the proletariat." (page 110).

"It would be a harmful illusion to hope to restore a real Socialist International without drawing a clear line of organizational demarcation between real Socialists and opportunists." (Conference of the Foreign Sections of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, page 145).

"It is the task of the Social-Democratic Labor Party in Russia to strengthen the proletarian unity which, in 1912-14 was created mainly through the efforts of the Pravda, and to re-establish the Social-Democratic Party organizations of the working class on the basis of a decisive organizational rupture with the social-chauvinists. Temporary agreements are possible only with those Social Democrats who are for a decisive organizational rupture with the Organizational Committee, the Nasha Zarya and the Bund." (page 150).

"Our Party has long severed organizational relations with the opportunist groups and elements....The circumstance has helped it to fulfill its revolutionary duty just as the split with the opportunist party of Bissolati has helped the Italian comrades." (Socialism and War, page 239).

"The development of the international Socialist movement proceeds slowly in the epoch of the immense crisis created by the war. Still it moves in the direction of a break with opportunism and social chauvinism....For a whole year, a process of vacillation and expectation was manifest among the Socialists of the belligerent and neutral countries;....they postponed in a thousand ways the inevitable break with opportunism and Kautskyism prevailing in the official parties of western Europe. However, that analysis of events which we gave a year ago in the manifesto of the Central Committee, proved correct....the course of

FRENCH TURN-CROSSES THE FRONTIER

events was such that at the first International Socialist Conference we found representatives of the protesting minority elements of Germany, France, Switzerland and Norway, acting against the decisions of the official parties, i.e.: practically acting in a spirit of split." (Lenin's emphasis). (The First Step, page 341).

"We do not preach an alliance with the present Socialist parties which are dominant in the Second International. On the contrary, we insist on breaking with the conciliators" (Lenin's emphasis) (Letter to the Socialist Propaganda League in America, pages 374-5).

These quotations can be multiplied many times.

Lenin's thought is simple and clear - the revolutionists, the Marxists, the internationalists must split from the social patriots; no alliance between them is possible; the test of the revolutionist is his determination to break politically and organizationally with the social patriots. This idea is the central axis of his thought, the nub of the question of uniting the internationalists in a revolutionary organization.

Failure to carry out this line, unity with the social patriots is: "To keep united with opportunism at the present time" (when they had become social patriots) "means practically to subjugate the working class to 'its' bourgeoisie, to make an alliance with it for the oppression of other nations and for the struggle for privileges of a great nation; at the same time it means splitting the revolutionary proletariat of all countries." (Lenin's emphasis) (Socialism and War, page 231). This quotation can be multiplied many times.

That is how Lenin wrote in 1915. In 1916 it was the same. In 1917 it was the same. "On the 17th of March, through friends in Stockholm, he wrote a letter filled with alarm. '....I would choose an immediate split with no matter whom in our party, rather than surrender to social patriotism...'" (History of the Russian Revolution, Volume 1, page 293). This was directed at Kamenev and Stalin.

"Kamenev and Stalin had thought that in participating in the war after February, the soldiers and workers were defending the revolution. Lenin thinks that, as before, the soldier and the worker takes part in the war as the conscripted slave of capital. 'Even our Bolsheviks,' he says, narrowing the circle around his antagonists, 'show confidence in the government. Only the fumes of the revolution can explain that. That is the death of socialism... If that's your position, our ways part. I prefer to remain in the minority.'" (page 307). Lenin was speaking on his theses at the now famous April 4th conference of the Bolshevik Party, and Trotsky adds: "That was not a mere oratorical threat; it was a clear path thought through to the end."

With Lenin, unity with social patriots was impermissible. It did not matter who or what party was involved; the split from them was a principled question.

Now, how does it stand with the new orientation of the ICL? The SFIO today is the same social patriotic party it was in the war of 1914-18. It has served notice in advance of the forthcoming war that it will support the French state, defend the imperialist subjugation of sixty million colonial people. The

FRENCH TURN CROSSES THE FRONTIER

Stalinists likewise. Lenin would have demanded of every class-conscious worker that he split forthwith from the social patriots and join him in building a new party of revolutionary Marxism against the social patriotic organizations. He would have denounced the policy of organizational unity with them and those who applied it as splitters. And Lenin would be correct.

But the ICL cannot do it. Its new orientation contradicts this course. The ICL is liquidating its sections into the social patriotic organizations of the Second International! and in pursuing its liquidationist course it cannot apply Lenin's Marxist course to the CI. In abandoning its independence the ICL must abandon its role of center of revolutionary unity, not only with respect to the left in the social democracy, but also with respect to the workers in the Stalinist parties. It cannot, therefore, correctly carry on the struggle against social patriotism in that quarter.

The ICL, as a whole, and the Bolshevik-Leninists in the SFIO, struggle against the social patriots. From the standpoint of theoretical Marxism, their position is correct. But the new orientation does not permit them to draw the necessary organizational conclusions from their struggle. It dictates false conclusions, fatal for the struggle.

The social patriotic bureaucrats of the SFIO engineered the expulsion of the leaders of the Bolshevik-Leninist youth in the young Socialist organization. La Verite denounces them for the "crime of split"! (August 12th issue). In the recent two-page special edition of REVOLUTION, organ of the Socialist youth organization, they write: "Our comrades were expelled because together with the young socialists of the Seine they fought against national defense and class peace. We do not accept this decision...."

Here the question is stood on its head. It is not the revolutionists who demand the split from the social patriots; it is the social patriots who demand the split from the revolutionists, while the revolutionists demand unity with the social patriots!

The objection will be made - it is inevitable - that left wingers in a reformist party cannot conduct themselves like Marxists who are outsiders in their own independent organization. That is true when secondary issues are involved, but not when the fundamental questions of revolutionary policy are posed categorically. That is how it stands today in the SFIO, the POB, and the entire Second International. The question of social patriotism is such a fundamental touchstone of revolutionary policy. The Marxist course demands a split. On this question there can be no distinction between a left wing inside and the Marxists outside. This is the question which should unite the Marxists outside. To pose the question the other way is to make use of a formula which is good for non-decisive issues to cover up the failure of the Bolshevik-Leninists to carry out their struggle against social patriotism to its Leninist conclusion.

But let us grant the objection. What follows? Who, what force then, is going to summon the class conscious workers in the Second and Third Internationals to split from the social patriots and build a new party? Those who defend the new orientation cannot even pose that vital question. They are busy conveying the

opposite idea: it is necessary to fight against the split from the social patriots. It is clear; the new orientation leads to abandonment of the Leninist course in the struggle against social patriotism. It may not be a pleasant reflection for those who defend the new orientation, but it is nevertheless a fact.

It is not enough to formulate correct revolutionary policies in the Second International, to struggle and make sacrifices for them. They must be concretized organizationally in terms of the independent revolutionary Marxist party. The failure to do so negates the struggle made on theoretical grounds, confuses the workers, splits the revolutionists, aids, in the last analysis, the social patriots.

This is not a new question. Lenin faced it after August 4th, 1914. Those who struggled in principle against social patriotism, but demanded of him unity with the social patriots, Lenin denounced as giving objective support to the social patriots. He demanded a clean break. We must do so now.

-----to be continued.

*

The Left Socialist (Centrist) International

The recent meeting of the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST PARTY (I.A.G.) held at Paris, May 8th-10th, 1936 shows clearly in which direction this federation of "Independent Socialist Parties" is travelling. The first point in the report of the Secretariat dealt with the Austrian RED FRONT, formerly affiliated to the I.A.G. The official minutes laconically state that the RED FRONT "after a consultation with the Secretariat and the German S.A.P., had joined the AUSTRIAN REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST (3rd International), with liberty to advocate the principles of the Bureau." Two things are clear from this:

1- The I.A.G. has to all intents and purposes ceased to be a loose federation open to all parties and groups which are against the Second and Third Internationals, (irrespective of whether they are for a new communist international or not). Instead it has become itself an international with a definite set of "principles", though with no more enforcement of these principles than in the Second International.

2- The I.A.G. has become, just like the old 2nd International, and to-day the Third International and the Trotskyite International Communist League, a feeder to the Second International. "Revolutionary Socialist Unity", the avowed goal of the I.A.G. since its adoption of a definite policy and the consequent change of name, is being accomplished by entry of its sections into the sections of the Second International. In the case of the Norwegian Labor

Party this takes, clearly to the regret of the Bureau, the form of withdrawal (by no means expulsion) from the I.A.G., - in the words of the Bureau (Minutes, Report of Secretariat): "The Norwegian Labor Party has withdrawn from the Bureau after receiving a communication from the Secretariat pointing out (1) its continued non-cooperation with the Bureau, and (2) the divergence of its policy from that of the Bureau". (*) In the case of the Austrian Red Front it takes, on the contrary, the form of the Bureau definitely sending one of the sections into the Second International, in order there to "advocate the principles of the Bureau".

Thus the Trotskyites no longer hold the monopoly of this method of liquidation.

It is now obviously only a question of circumstances which of the parties and organizations affiliated to this "Bureau for Revolutionary Socialist Unity" will be next to effect "unity" with the Second International. The policy of the Spanish "Party of Marxist Unification" indicates that it may be next. Another "Party of Proletarian Unity", the P.U.P. of France, not yet affiliated with the I.A.G., but very close to it, may go directly to the Second International, without first affiliating with the I.A.G. A deputation from the conference met with the leader of the P.U.P. Both sides agreed "to exchange information regarding the policies of the P.U.P. and the Bureau, but, in view of the possibility of the P.U.P. merging with other working class parties, to postpone consideration of any question of affiliation until the position in France had clarified".

The general course and function of the I.A.G. is now clear. Its role is to be a feeder to the Second International. This by no means excludes that within the coming period the I.A.G. may attract leftward moving groups in certain countries. But there can be no doubt that their affiliation to the I.A.G. will result in nothing else but their ultimate entry into, or return to, the Second International. It was reported at the conference that the following organizations had applied for, or were considering affiliation: the International Youth Bureau, already in the past practically the youth bureau of the I.A.G.; the Revolutionary Socialist League of Holland, split off from the Trotskyite R.S.A.P. which disaffiliated from the I.A.G. (preferring its own, i.e. the Trotskyite road to the Second International to that of the I.A.G.); the Danish Socialist Youth League; the League of Socialist Internationalists of Palestine; the Hashomer Hatzair of Palestine; the Revolutionary Left within the Labor Party of Ceylon, from which it is "likely to withdraw"; the Left Socialrevolutionaries of Russia (in emigration); the Ukrainian Revolutionary Socialist Party (Poland, - connected with the last named); and, for the first time an organization in the Americas, the Marxist Socialist Party of Panama,

(*) Similarly "it was agreed to write to MOT DAG-Norway stating that it is assumed that its association with the Bureau has ceased", since it "has not replied to communications asking whether it wishes to implement affiliation to the Bureau and the secretariat has been informed that Mot Dag has supported League sanctions and the general policy of the Norwegian Labor Government".

"sound in its political principle and program, but small in membership", as Maurin-Spain reported to the conference. In addition the Secretariat drew special attention to its contacts with: the Revolutionary Left in the SFIO and the French trade unions; the Anti-War League within the POB-Belgium; the Left Revolutionary Group within the SP-Finland; the RPPA (now defunct) within the SP-USA; the Congress Socialist Party of India; the Federation of Trade Unions of Egypt; the Arab Trade Union Movement of Palestine. This list shows the scope of the danger the I.A.G. represents.

At present the following parties and groups are affiliated: ILP-England, SAP-Germany, SP-Sweden (indep.), POUM-Spain, SP-Italy (Maximalists), ISLP-Poland, Roumania, Bulgaria. The first four, plus the International Youth Bureau, were represented at the conference. One of the representatives of the SAP was E. Bauer. The minutes show no evidence that he presented a position different from the other SAP delegates, or that he differed with the decisions of the conference. To be more specific he endorsed, among other things, the advice given to the Austrian Red Front by the SAP and the Secretariat of the IAG, to enter into the Second International.

The conference adopted two resolutions, one on the People's Front, one on the situation in Spain. Both are characterized by a complete evasion of the questions involved. (The FOURTH INTERNATIONAL will deal with both in future issues.)

The IAG has sent out a call for an INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AGAINST WAR AND IMPERIALISM, to be held in October either in Brussels or Paris. It was reported that the following organizations had endorsed the proposal: England-ILP, SLP; France-Rev. Left in SFIO, Teachers Union; Sweden-SP (indep.), Belgium-Anti-War League, Soc. Young Guards (with reservations until annual conference); Germany-SAP, SAP-Youth; Holland-RSAP (claiming right to express their view), RSAP-Youth; Denmark-Young Soc. League, Socialdemocratic Students (with a reservation that they cannot act independently of 2nd Intl.); Italy-SP (Maximalists); USA-Communist League of Struggle (now defunct); Palestine-Left Paole Zion, Marxist Circles, Arab Trade Union Movement; International Youth Bureau.

These recent events now fully confirm the analysis and position adopted on Centrist set-ups, both in the principle aspect of "new Zimmerwald", and the tactical aspects, NOT TO affiliate to the IAG. On both the principle and tactical aspect (New Zimmerwald and TO affiliate to the IAG) the Fields group has been proven wrong.

A nine-point "basis of the congress" was endorsed "in principle". One of the next issues of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL will carry our analysis of this "basis" and a statement of the Revolutionary Workers League on its attitude toward the congress.

"The following basis of the Congress (against War and Imperialism) had been endorsed in principle", by the May meeting of the International Bureau for Revolutionary Socialist Unity:

1. No National Unity with Capitalist Governments, either in war preparations or in the prosecution of war.
2. No workingclass allegiance to the League of Nations, or acceptance of its collective system of peace.
3. Defence of the Soviet Union by resistance to all policies by Capitalist Governments which threaten it.
4. Resistance to Fascism and exposure of its war aims.
5. The prevention of the outbreak of war by organised working class opposition on such a scale that Capitalist Governments will hesitate to declare war.
6. The meeting of actual war by organised mass resistance, if the conditions for such have been created.
7. The continuation of the class struggle should war break out, and the acceptance of the first favourable opportunity by the workers of each country to overthrow their own Capitalist Government and to seize power to carry through the social revolution.
8. The refusal of subject peoples to support war by the Imperialist Governments which dominate them and the acceptance of any opportunity both to win national independence and to carry through the social revolution.
9. International Co-ordination of the activity of all working-class organisations which accept this policy.

This nine point program as a basis for an Anti-War Congress is valueless. The most ambiguous, meaningless, clutter of words, are presented as a "Marxian" "principle" position. The Bureau is against "National Unity with the Capitalist Governments", but the Bureau is for the Peoples Front.

They are for the "Defense of the Soviet Union", but they do not state HOW to defend the Soviet Union. The need of a new revolutionary Marxian Party in the Soviet Union and the Extension of the October Revolution is the axis of the defense of the Soviet Union. The words of the Bureau are meaningless twaddle.

They are for "Resistance to Fascism and exposure of its war aims". Again we have meaningless phrases, passed off as Marxian principles. Without the demand for the arming of the workers and the forceful disarming of the Fascist bands by the workers the "resistance to Fascism" is just so many words.

The Bureau advocates "organized working class opposition on such a scale that Capitalist Governments will hesitate to declare war". Another illusion. Not a word as to HOW to organize this opposition. It further leaves the impression that the working class can stop war while the capitalists control the government. This is a utopian idea and a false concept that will pave the way later for the support of war.

The Bureau is going to meet the "actual war by organized mass resistance, IF THE CONDITIONS FOR SUCH HAVE BEEN CREATED". More words, more confusion, more ignorance of the ABC of a Marxian position on war.

They want to overthrow the capitalist Governments if war breaks out but they forget Lenin's "small" point for DEFEATISM.

The nine points ignore a clearcut, unambiguous formula on the following fundamental questions necessary if one really wants to talk about, let alone ACT, against war and Fascism and for the overthrow of capitalism:

1. The defeatist position - To work for the defeat of your own imperialist army.
2. To turn the imperialist war into a civil war.
3. For revolutions of the oppressed peoples and colonies.
4. The Defense of the Soviet Union through the creating of a revolutionary Marxian Party in the Soviet Union and for the extension of the October Revolution.
5. For the creating of independent revolutionary Marxian parties in each country - for a new communist fourth international.
6. Against the Peoples Front - which is unity with the bourgeoisie through the bourgeois-democratic section of the capitalists.

In another article we will deal with this question in detail and present our full rounded position.

On the Peoples Front the May meeting of the Bureau adopted the following resolution:

1. That the Independent Socialist Parties have always been in the front rank of the struggle for the restoration of national and international proletarian unity of action against Capitalism, Fascism and the danger of War.
2. That, recognising the ever-increasing efforts for unity within the international workers' movement, they will support every step leading to unity of action; but they ask for full liberty in representing their independent revolutionary position within this movement for unity.

3. That, as previously, they will work with all their strength for the organisational unity of the working-class on a Marxist basis, with the goal of establishing one united revolutionary workingclass party in every country and one united Revolutionary International.
4. It is of the greatest importance in the struggle against Capitalism, Fascism and the danger of War to unite the working masses of the petty bourgeois and the peasants with the forces of the workingclass, but these efforts must not lead to a permanent policy of coalition and to a collaboration of the workingclass with the bourgeoisie. Otherwise this would lead to new dangerous defeats.

This is a position FOR THE PEOPLES FRONT AND FOR ORGANIC UNITY. We have presented our position on several occasions on both of these questions and will further elaborate our position in future numbers of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. A Bureau that stands for "left" support of the Peoples Front and for Organic Unity is sunk in the swamp of reformism and opportunism no matter how many centrist phrases they use to cover up this betrayal.

*

LENIN

"All efforts must be directed toward utilizing the sentiment of the masses in favor of peace. But how shall it be utilized? - We must utilize the sentiment in favor of peace to explain to the masses that the benefits that they expect from peace cannot be obtained without a number of revolutions. The end of Wars--- are our ideal --but only bourgeois sophists can seduce the masses with this ideal while separating it from direct and immediate preaching of revolutionary action.--"
(The Peace Question, 1915)

Browder

What is the central feature of the struggle for the maintenance of peace--? It is clear that the center of the struggle for peace becomes the effort to restrain the fascist aggressors."

(Daily Worker, May 25, 1936)

CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN.

The situation now in Spain resembles that of Russia under Kerensky. The newspapers report that the Azana government is arming the workers to fight the Monarchist Fascist revolt. Exactly the repetition of the Kornilov affair, whereby the Kerensky government was forced in the fight for its existence, to arm the masses! If Lenin's tactics in the Kornilov uprising are repeated, victory is in sight.

What is to be done?

The working class must temporarily side with the Azana government to crush the Monarchist-Fascist rebellion! In no way does that entail support to Azana and his henchmen! The Republican allies today will become the workers enemies tomorrow! The Republicans understand the danger of arming the workers, but they are helpless. In either case the workers are partially armed anyway.

One must be very careful to see that little is lost and much is gained by the temporary united front with the Peoples Front Govt. to suppress the Monarchist revolt. This can only have value if it is conceived as a step forward in the immediate fight on the Republic itself. It is quite possible that unlike Lenin, who utilized Kerensky, Azana may utilize the armed working class. That will be the case if the workers follow the Communist and Socialist parties, through the Peoples Front.

Outwardly, while allied temporarily with Azana, it may seem that one is supporting him. If a correct policy is pursued the opposite results. This temporary united front is a double-edged sword. Directed at Gil Robles, it becomes, in the act of "collaboration", directed at Azana also. While fighting for its own life, the Azana Govt. is forced to arm the workers. Something that led to the overthrow of Kerensky and may lead to Azana's collapse!

The newspaper reports speak about "Marxist militia" and "Red Committees", "Armed Liners attacking rebels at Sebastian". Exactly what the particulars are, we don't know. But one can gather that the workers are moving forward and are establishing organs which are embryo soviets. The workers form the backbone of the offensive against the Fascists! The Republican regime cannot be depended on to fight the Fascists. When the workers tail end it, the Republican will fight the Fascists. With the workers taking a more independent road the Republicans will be found on the opposite side of the barricades. Faced with a danger of a workers revolution, the Republicans will make a choice. And their choice will be the choice the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries made - unity with the White Guards, in this case the Monarchists-Fascists.

The temporary united front with Azana has nothing in common with the Stalinist or Socialist "defense of bourgeois democracy against Fascism". Social democracy was fighting in Austria for the defense of the Republic against Fascism with intent of preserving and maintaining that Republic. The Social democrats were quite willing to support and maintain Dolfuss if he only retained the Status Quo. Therein lay their treachery.

The treachery of the Stalinists and Socialists in Spain lies in the fact that they are supporting Azana and will support his government even after the Monarchist rebellion is crushed. Just the opposite what Lenin did in the Kornilov affair! Prior and after the united front with Kerensky against Kornilov, and even during the united action, Lenin carried on a vigorous struggle against Kerensky and finally overthrew him.

Even while in action with the Republicans against the Fascist uprising, we do not support Azana, or raise illusions in the minds of the workers about Azana. We raise the slogan of a workers' defense of Madrid, building up a working class militia, which alone can become a backbone of defense against the Fascists, Monarchists and Reaction.

The newspapers report that Soviets are being formed to replace the present Republican govt. We don't know exactly whether these governments take the form of Proletarian dictatorship or simply Soviets as existed under Kerensky. It is possible to have Soviets and not have a Proletarian Dictatorship. One thing is clear, however, dual power is on the order of the day.

Lenin had to wait a couple of months after the Kornilov affair to gather more strength to force a showdown with Kerensky. Spain necessarily does not have to follow Russia in that respect. The fight against the Monarchists may last longer than expected. In which case Azana could be overthrown while in the act of subduing the Monarchists. It does not follow that first we must defeat the Monarchists and then settle accounts with the Republic. If the fighting in Spain continues longer, the war on the Monarchists may be transformed into a social revolution without any lapse of time, as was the case in Russia. In which case it is sure that the Stalinist and Socialist fighters for freedom, the Republicans, will be found on the side of the Monarcho-Fascists.

The Azana government is unstable. It cannot remain long in power! The masses will become disillusioned with the Republic. They will look towards a party that is ready to fight Azana. One that is not vacillating. Not finding that a large measure of them will turn towards Fascism. Socialist and Stalinist support of Azana and Maurin's vacillations will make it possible for the Monarchists to make a comeback, if they are now defeated. But, of course, there is hope. It lies in the crystalization of a force, which will break away from vacillations and confusion of Caballero and Maurin. In a period as now vacillations mean betrayal. Hesitations mean defeat. The test for Maurin and Caballero will come now. Their meaningless phrases about "unity of the entire working class in one single party" will become in reality unity with the betrayers who support Azana. A split with Maurin and Caballero is necessary for the workers' revolution. Unity of the groups splitting from Caballero and Maurin will offer possibilities of formation of a revolutionary vanguard.

The false policies of the Stalinist-Socialists and Marxian Party of Unification in support of the Peoples Front has been revealed by the Civil War in Spain brought on by the forces of a counter-revolution. Under the cloak of the Peoples Front "victories" the forces of reaction have grown stronger and now are powerful enough to struggle for power.

Through the Peoples Front the Stalinists and Socialists hand over the working class bound and gagged to the democratic bourgeois in the "fight" against Fascism and reaction. The Peoples Front, like the Socialists in Germany paves the way for Fascism.

In opposition to Organic Unity, Peoples Fronts and all forms which hand over the working class to the democratic bourgeois, the Revolutionary Workers League raises the banner of the INDEPENDENT ACTION OF THE PROLETARIAT AND ITS ALLIES THROUGH THE POLITICAL and ORGANIZATIONAL INDEPENDENCE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIAN ORGANIZATION.

The struggle against counter-revolution in Spain which forces the government to arm the workers is the time to prepare for the next step.

The Lessons of the Kornilov uprising, the lessons of Lenin's tactics in relation to the Kerensky regime must be brought forward. The workers must not subordinate its organizations to the Peoples Front Government. The workers must take the arms. The workers must march separately (from the bourgeois govt.) and strike together (with the Peoples Front) against counter-revolution.

The workers, peasants and soldiers must organize Soviets. The vanguard element who have learned the lessons of the Peoples Front, etc., must organize an independent revolutionary Marxian Party.

The Soviets must take over power where they defeat counter-revolution.

Immediate steps to carry out the democratic and agrarian reforms must be taken. Only the dictatorship of the Proletariat can accomplish this.

The first steps of the Socialist measures must be taken at once. The struggle against the counter-revolution in the present bourgeois-democratic phase of the revolution must be carried over at once to the social revolution.

Only a proletarian revolution and the establishment of a Dictatorship of the Proletariat can solve the problems confronting Spain.

To speak of a peoples revolution, an agrarian revolution, a bourgeois-democratic revolution and LATER a proletarian revolution is betrayal of the revolution.

The Civil War will be decisive for Communism or Fascism.

Upon the basis of this line, with the will to power that the workers and oppressed masses have shown in action, the workers and their allies can seize power. This will open a new chapter in history, check the disintegration, and again start a new revolutionary wave throughout the World, and lay a firm basis for a Communist FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. It will give the Marxists the upper hand against the counter-revolutionists and Stalinists in the Soviet Union and enable the workers to save the remains of the October Revolution.

Karl Minov
July 22, 1936.

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

next issue

READ
CALL
TO
ACTION

Latest developments
in SPAIN,
FRANCE

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

△
Special articles
on the
CIVIL WAR
IN
SPAIN
▽

Subscription Blank.

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL - 23 E. 14th St. NYC

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____

1 YEAR
12 ISSUES

SUBSCRIPTION \$1.00