



Vol. 3 No. 10

June 1938

Devoted to the Theory of Marxism

Featuring

The Mexican Oil Struggle

Revisionism and Burocracy

The New Zimmerwald line

« Youth Must Be Served »

The Roosevelt Program

Dialectical Materialism —

Mind and Matter

10 cents

**REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE
2159 W. DIVISION STREET
CHICAGO, ILL.**

Volume 3

June 1937

Number 9

T H E
F O U R T H I N T E R N A T I O N A L

Published monthly by
THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE

C O N T E N T S

The Struggle Over Oil in Mexico-----	P.1
Revisionism and Burocracy-----	P.6
"Youth Must Be Served"-----	P.10
The Road to the Fourth International-----	P.13
<u>Dialectical Materialism</u>	
Chapter III - Mind and Matter -----	P.18

Subscription Rates - \$1.00 a year

Bundle Rates - 7¢ a copy

Per Copy - 10¢

2159 West Division St.

Chicago, Ill.

THE STRUGGLE OVER OIL IN MEXICO -

The expropriation of the Anglo-American Oil properties by the Mexican government reveals the deep ferment in the working class in Latin America. Oil has always been one of the key commodities of dispute among the imperialists. Above all between the British Dutch Shell and the American Standard Oil Company. These two powers and their governments have fought battles all over the earth for this black gold. In the Mexican oil struggle the same conflict proceeds regardless of the surface manifestations. Oil is one of the two basic industries of Mexico.

THE CARDENAS GOVERNMENT

In essence there is no difference between the former Calles government and the present Cardenas government. The difference is due to the degree of CLASS PRESSURE and the need of a more "left" government to hold in check the workers and oppressed masses. In 1925 Calles, as a "left" gesture, threatened to give the Light and Power works of Mexico City to the workers. These were British owned. In the same year, Calles broke the railroad strike. The railroads were owned by the Morgan interests.

Likewise in 1936, Cardenas made the Light and Power interests yield to the workers' demands, while he broke the railroad strike. The Anglo-American conflict in Mexico in these cases was concealed behind this "radical" action. It must be remembered that in 1937 Cardenas broke the Ponza Rica oil strike - fields controlled by Standard Oil.

Calles and his labor agent, Morones, now residing in the United States, continue as representatives of a powerful group of American Imperialists; while Cardenas and his labor agent, Lombardo Tol-edano, represent another powerful United States group, and as such are in the main puppets of American Imperialism. The Mexican bourgeoisie, seeking to advance its own interests, can do so only through serving the interests of its imperialist masters. In this sense, Cardenas represents the rising "democratic" Mexican bourgeoisie. The deep crisis and class relations at the same time force Cardenas to broaden his base and rest upon layers of the workers and peasants while serving these masters. This is no different in content from the methods of a Blum or a Caballero.

THE OIL EXPROPRIATIONS

The expropriations developed out of the refusal of the Anglo-American companies to recognize the Mexican government's decisions in the disputes between the companies and the workers. It was not

primarily a question of "workers rights", even though this entered into the dispute; rather it was an impasse the country faced with the deepening crisis and pressure from the proletariat.

British interests have been constantly improving their holdings and tapping oil, while American interests, facing an overproduction at home, were to a large extent able to hold in reserve their Mexican Oil. Washington is satisfied with a promise to pay the original investments, while London, for the first time since 1917, sends in direct protests to Mexico. This fact reflects the economic difference between the two imperialisms. The threat to cut off the silver purchase, which in reality is a subsidy to Mexico by the Roosevelt government, and then the "understanding" whereby the Treasury continues to purchase silver, point to the backstage dealings and indicate that Uncle Sam does not expect to lose in the long run - but, rather, to gain.

The Silver subsidy of Uncle Sam's part must not be understood to be an act of charity or love. On the contrary, it was an attempt to bolster up a tottering structure for fear of Communism or an unfriendly dictatorship in Mexico. This method of fighting against a social revolution, Roosevelt's "good neighbor" policy, is cheaper than the big stick policy. The latter can always be used as a last resort.

MEXICO AND THE "DEMOCRATIC" IMPERIALISTS

The expropriation of the oil wells by Mexico from two of the "democratic" imperialist countries was accompanied with a statement that Mexico would not sell its oil to "fascist" capitalists. However, if the United States and England do not buy the major part, Mexico, to survive, must sell to Germany, Italy and Japan. In a round about way that is actually what is taking place.

MEXICO AND THE WORKING CLASS ORGANIZATIONS

The conditions in Mexico have for many years demanded extreme measures to keep the workers and peasants in line if the exploiters desired to retain state control. This they did, especially through the Cardenas government, by a very "liberal" labor and peasant policy. It did not represent anything thrown from the Gods above to the exploited below; rather it represented the most effective method of holding in check and disorienting the rising consciousness of the workers and peasants. To accomplish this, as is the case in Europe and the world over, they needed capable labor agents in the ranks of the workers to do their bidding. The Stalinists have done well in this respect. The majority of those numbskull liberals who term themselves "Marxists" have praised the labor and peasant policy of Cardenas. This policy is nothing less than a social-reformist position as old as European "labor" politics, only dressed in proper Mexican costume.

John L. Lewis as a "left" bourgeois reformer is far to the right of the needs in Mexico, just as Green is far to the right of the exploiters' needs in the United States. Lewis sent a wire "congratulating" the trade unions of Mexico in their position on expropriation - a telegram that was out and out class collaboration between the exploiters' government and the working class. The Second International yellow trade unions wrote a much more clever telegram of "support".

THE POSITIONS OF THE POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

The line of the Stalinists and Socialists to support "democratic" exploiters' STATES was expressed again by their action in the Mexican oil expropriations. The Trotskyites have gone far beyond their past capitulations. Their support of the Spanish exploiters STATE through "material aid and political criticism", and their support of the Chinese exploiters' STATE through "support of Chiang Kai Shek's fight against Japanese Imperialism", is cast aside for an open, brazen support of the Cardenas government - that is, support of a puppet government of American Imperialism.

Jim Cannon and Max Shachtman, leaders of the U.S. Trotskyites, issued a statement on the question which in part reads as follows: (Socialist Appeal, April 2, 1938).

"Our brief visit as tourists to beautiful and hospitable Mexico has been made doubly pleasant by the announcement of this governmental action taken in the interests of the toiling people."

GOVERNMENTAL ACTION IN THE INTEREST OF THE TOILING PEOPLE ? ? ? ?

"We have no doubt that the decree issued in regard to the foreign oil companies will engender a campaign of agitation and misrepresentation against the government." AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT? ? ?

"That in our opinion is all the more reason for the workers of the United States to come out in support of the Mexican Government's action." SUPPORT OF THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT'S ACTION? ? ? ?

This is a complete capitulation to a puppet government of American imperialism. It is a revision of Marxism on the state, on the colonial question, and a false presentation of the FACTS. Cardenas did not expropriate the oil wells in the INTERESTS OF THE TOILING PEOPLE. The Mexican government did not deliver any blows against American imperialism; rather the objective conditions and facts prove that these were blows against British Imperialism - and in the end American Imperialism will obtain the Lions share of the spoils.

CARDENAS A PUPPET OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

The support of the Mexican government is the support of a puppet of American imperialism. Expropriations are nothing new under capitalism. The form of expropriation depends upon the stage of class struggle. Everyone knows that in the United States where a

social revolution is not on the order of the day, some of the more farsighted and staunch defenders of the capitalist system advocate the expropriation of rail-roads, of the coal mines, and of other sick industries: expropriation by the state with compensation, not expropriation a la the proletarian revolution. These proposed government ownership measures are TO SAVE THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM, not to destroy it.

In Mexico, the class relations are far to the left- there is a danger of a rapid development toward a show-down between Communism and Fascism - to a social revolution - if the silver subsidy is cut off, if Cardenas fails to guide the "capitalist ship of state" through the storms. There, it was not a matter of talk about a few government ownership projects to save capitalism - action had to be taken, signifying greater weakness.

... SPECTIVE OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

British imperialism, as well as others, has been pursuing a policy of obtaining oil from those wells far from her military base in times of peace and conserving as much oil as possible near her military strongholds. Latin America is one such place. When the imperialist war is declared it will be difficult for England to keep the Atlantic open and exploit the Latin American fields. If Uncle Sam is on the other side of the struggle it may be entirely out of the question.

On the other hand, today the "short range" needs of the American Oil interests, in order to KEEP UP PROFITS, leads to curtailing production in the home fields. This restriction of production runs parallel to the long range policy and needs of American imperialism. The more oil they can conserve in America's back yard - the whole of Latin America - the better it fits into the imperialist policy of the United States against Great Britain and other imperialists.

For the sake of argument let us assume that the United States, instead of having surplus which demands curtailment, had an actual shortage of oil in the States - and then Mexico "expropriated" the oil wells. The United States would have sung a different song and the wells would be back in her possession in due course. But we may add that the American imperialists will still not only retain the upper hand in Mexican oil, but had a hand in the deal from the very beginning.

It is the threat of the struggle between Communism and Fascism on the one hand, and the struggle of the Anglo-American oil interests on the other hand, that explains the oil struggle in Mexico. The Stalinists, Socialists and Trotskyites have fallen into the trap of supporting one group of imperialists against the other. They do not explain this conflict to the workers nor organize the work-

ers for INDEPENDENT ACTION. Rather they tell the workers to support a capitalist STATE. There can be no talk of INDEPENDENT WORKING CLASS ACTION, let alone the independence of the revolutionary Marxian organization, when "leaders" tell the workers to support a capitalist STATE, ANY capitalist state.

In the colonial and semi-colonial countries, on the basis of the political and organizational independence of the vanguard party to assure the independent action of the working class, it is correct to carry on parallel, and under specific conditions, joint action with "allies" in these countries: peasant forces as well as sections of the "democratic" national bourgeoisie. But this united action, which never passes beyond the stage of "march separately and strike together", at no time is a policy of SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITALIST STATE.

The expropriation of British and American oil holdings can be used by the workers and peasants of Mexico as a step forward if they work on the above independent line. Their independent class pressure, under the leadership of a Marxian organization which explains these moves to the workers of North and South America, can become a revolutionary center of opposition to American imperialism and all of its Latin American puppet governments. The workers in the U.S. must give support to the Mexican and Latin American workers in accomplishing these tasks.

WAR DRIVE

RELIEF CRISIS

RAILROAD CUT

in the

FIGHTING WORKER

JUNE ISSUE

Read About It

REVISIONISM AND BUROCRACY

Since the rise of Stalinism in the Soviet Union the question of burocracy and its relation to revisionism has been an important debated question in the labor movement, and as a result the Marxist position today is being challenged by confused people more than ever before. The Moscow Trials and executions, and the new defects of the proletariat in no way help to clarify this issue.

WHAT IS THE CAUSE OF BUROCRACY?

First let us take up the question of burocracy in general as a definite material condition of society and later deal with revisionism and burocracy in a Marxian organization. Burocracy is a product of a class society, historically evolved through chattel slavery, feudalism and capitalism. Burocracy must not be confused with normal centralization. Burocracy is an abuse of power. Burocracy as a growth within the superstructure, resting on the ruling class ideology of bribery, corruption, etc., finds its roots in the modes of production, of the exploitation of man by man. But within the superstructure its real backbone exists within the state. From the state, burocracy spreads to all avenues of the social organization.

BUROCRACY AND THE WORKERS STATE

With the overthrow of the rule of the exploiters and the establishment of the rule of the former exploited a change takes place, but by no means the complete disappearance of burocracy, just as the political ideology of the bourgeoisie is by no means done away with. The abolition of the capitalist mode of production is a big step toward the elimination of the condition of burocracy, but classes continue to exist, and with the classes a state continues to exist, even though it is a new type of state. Within this class society and this state, burocracy still finds a place and can be fought against and eliminated only by an expanding productive force, by steps toward socialism, by steps that make for the elimination of classes and with it the elimination of the state.

Since the revolutionary Marxian Party finds a burocracy a material factor around it under capitalism and will find it as a carry-over into transition economy and under the workers' rule, the Marxists must constantly struggle against burocracy and its development. The party with its democratic centralist structure and the state with its dictatorial measures against the former exploiters and its democracy for the toilers based on workers councils, is the best political and organizational means and forms for this fight.

REVISIONISM AND BUREOCRACY

Any and every party that has a program that does not represent the interests of the working class must resort to bureaucracy to defend its positions. To put through its non-workingclass positions, in the name of the working class in so-called workers' organizations, the leadership must resort to these measures. Likewise, since the party of the proletariat does not live in a vacuum, its program is also subject to the bourgeois pressure and reformist concepts. This can only be fought against on a scientific program for the workers' class interests. A Marxian program is not something separate and apart from the organizational aspects of the struggle, it is not theory divorced from ACTION. A Marxian program includes organization and action. This is what sectarians and petty-bourgeois radicals cannot understand. Bureocracy grows only as a result of hidden or open non-Marxian positions or program in a Marxian organization. A Marxian program makes it possible to fight off such revisionism and bureaucracy, but is no guarantee against them.

Presenting us an example the revisionist concept of socialism in one country and the rise of Stalinism and its bureaucracy, let us present the inner relations of these forces. Revisionism and bureaucracy both raised their heads in the Soviet Society and likewise in the Communist Party. This will be true as long as we have a class society and a state, but marxists distinguish themselves by a day to day struggle against such revisionism and bureaucracy. A healthy party and proletarian state developing toward socialism can cast out this foreign element just like the healthy organism disposes of waste in its own body.

But adverse conditions, such as the defects of 1923 in Germany, the ebb in the revolutionary wave, the temporary stabilization of capitalism with the aid of the American dollar, and the increased difficulties in backward Soviet Economy surrounded by world capitalism, laid the MATERIAL BASE for REVISIONISM TO DEVELOP and make headway. The revisionists could not defend their position in the party against the marxists on the basis of democratic centralism; and of necessity had to utilize and develop bureaucracy, had to open the flood gates of the latent force. Bureocracy was the organizational form of revisionism, the other side of the coin.

Revisionist theories have their material basis, even though non-Marxist concepts often seem to emanate from the minds of petty-bourgeois elements who try to remould the movement to their own liking. Revisionism utilizes not only bureaucracy to further its ends; under different conditions revisionism utilizes a main belt system of bourgeois democracy. It is no accident that Stalinism has led to the new constitution and forms of bourgeois democracy. Stalinism has led to rapid strides toward bourgeois democracy in the Soviet Union, and on a world scale its parties have supported reformist bourgeois democratic measures and parties. Bureocracy

leading to bourgeois democracy? No, revisionism utilizing two aspects of the same process.

It is likewise no accident that petty-bourgeois individuals in small Marxian organizations, in their struggle against Marxism and democratic centralism combine, at one and the same time, bureaucracy against their opponents and a demand for unlimited individual rights, "inalienable" rights, for themselves.

Marxists can easily defend their position, their program, through the procedure of democratic centralism. But when Marxists struggle against bourgeois democratic concepts in the organization, they are called by these petty-bourgeois individuals, bureaucrats. Bureaucracy is used by the non-Marxists to defend and extend their revisionist concepts. As bureaucracy develops, based upon a revisionist program, the bureaucracy in turn is transformed into a cause of greater deviation.

The dynamics of the process of revisionism and bureaucracy, from its inception within a Marxian organization to the transformation of that organization into a non-Marxian organization takes on the following development: A negative change in the objective conditions, including difficulties of maintaining a collective leadership giving revisionism (which is dormant in the organization) a favorable base for GROWTH. Revisionists must resort to non-democratic centralist methods to further their ends. They utilize bureaucracy and bourgeois democracy as a vehicle to further their ends.

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM
CONCRETIZED -

CONSTITUTION

10¢

OF THE

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LG.

2159 W. DIVISION

CHI., ILL.

10¢

"YOUTH MUST BE SERVED"

"Youth must be served," says the old saw. And this is one old saying that the U. S. exploiting class is taking very seriously. They are today making plans to make sure that the youth are served to the hungry God of War, and on the altar of capitalist profits. Because the profits are getting smaller, the capitalists must sacrifice all the more to the coming world war in both material and human resources. The net profits of 280 leading industrial corporations for the first quarter in 1938 was \$100,364,000 as compared to \$308,877,000 in the first quarter for 1937. The fact that the net worth of the capital and surplus of these corporations increased by almost \$500,000,000 and the rate of annual return declined from 12% to 3% indicates that under the present set-up, the finance capitalists cannot invest their large amount of idle capital profitably.

As a result of the present depression, many new millions have become unemployed. Youth from sixteen to twenty-five years old, conservatively estimated, today make up about one-third of the unemployed army. A decisive section of these youth have never been employed and are also for other reasons, the most helpless of the unemployed. It is these youth who roam the country, haunt the salvation army, take to crime, or just brood around, their youthful hopes shattered, their youthful energy allowed no socially useful outlets, but directed inward instead, causing all kinds of neuroses and mental scars.

UNEMPLOYED YOUTH USED AGAINST WORKERS

The developments which make for war force the bourgeoisie to slash into the living conditions of the working class. The younger members of the working class, in the bourgeois scheme of things have been created by the all-wise, Eternal, to break the unity of the proletariat. In this case, too, the approach of the bourgeois government is philanthropic consideration of specific youth problems. Can the bourgeoisie help it if the conditions of youth under capitalism fit in with their mission of exploitation?

Thus it is that the Roosevelt government has created federal departments which have done much research in "exposing" the conditions of youth. They have made some serious analyses of the problem for their purposes. They are emphasizing the fact that youth are suffering because they, as a rule, lack vocational training. Arthur L. Brandon, staff member of the American Youth Commission, tells us in the "Vocational Guidance Magazine" of January 1938: "A recent inquiry in Connecticut reveals that more than 73 per cent of the unemployed youth, who were high school graduates were not trained for any skilled trade, while 40 percent of these were not ready for any vocation. Likewise, in Minnesota 40 per cent of the exploring group being investigated by the Employment Stabiliza-

cent of the unemployed youth, who were high school graduates were not trained for any skilled trade, while 40 per cent were not ready for any vocation. Likewise, in Minnesota 40 per cent of the 'Exploring group' being investigated by the Employment Stabilization Research Institute were without jobs because of inadequate preparation."

In the Journal of Education Society of April 1938, another representative of the Roosevelt administration, Roswell Ward of the Division of Guidance and Placement, National Youth Administration, bears out the Marxian contention of many years standing, that capitalist education is disgracefully one-sided, and of little value for life itself. Marxists have for years insisted that the academic training, to be of interest and of value, must be applied in social practice as a part of the educational curriculum. But Mr. Ward cannot see it in just that light. He sees it from the need of the bourgeoisie to limit education, and to use this need to corral the youth for the purpose of smashing labor solidarity and organization. Thus two birds are killed with one stone.

A few months ago, Mr. Johnson, Superintendent of the Chicago schools, conceived the idea that teachers and principals should give "advice" to working class students to forget academic courses and to switch over to vocational training courses. After the course, which saves money because the pupils need not remain in school so long, the school would get employment for the pupils. The plan was obvious even to Fitzpatrick, reactionary leader of the Chicago Federation of Labor. The Chicago Board of Education intended to use these youth under their control to smash the building trades and other unions, especially the AFL craft unions. The CFL objected but after some conferences agreed to a modified form of the plan. The Young Workers League did not object to the vocational training but agitated for a combination of academic and vocational training which alone could fit the student for social existence. The Chicago bourgeois agents were clumsy, and pressure in which the Young Workers League was a strong factor caused a retreat.

But it is not alone the rotten Kelly-Nash machine of Chicago that has such lovely plans to serve youth on the altar of profits. Others, however, are cleverer about it, and have better chances of success. In dealing with this subject, Ward of the NYA, stated:

"Therefore, just to arraign the schools and say they had been too preoccupied with cultural objectives, and with expansion to meet the tremendous demands for more high-school and college education is not enough. The leaders of education are slowly becoming aware of these things. The critics on the outside will do better to back up their efforts to reform themselves by preparing youth and public opinion to accept these reforms voluntarily and with

Complete understanding rather than as an apparent coercive effort to limit academic opportunity." (Our emphasis)

We begin to see why Roosevelt befriended the youth with his NYA.

Further:

"Another governmental activity is the guidance program of the NYA which is supervised by Dr. Mary H.S. Hayes. It is highly decentralized, but it is focussed on the need for more emphasis on skilled and semi-skilled occupations. It has educated many youth away from "white collar" delusions of their parents, their former teachers, and the general public....."

Once again:

"The proponents of a desperately needed program of enlarged vocational training sometimes do not realize that in the background is the financially necessary corollary of a limitation on entrance to academic high schools. Are they certain that our skills in individual judgment of student achievements are adequate for us to face the responsibility of assuming an authoritative role, far beyond that yet exerted in our schools, and flatly tell many students that their chances for success are better in vocational schools."

The liberal Roosevelt is planning a "Johnson Plan" on a national scale. The much-lauded NYA, that pride and joy of the American Youth Congress, who would improve it by the American Youth Act, is an attempt to divide and rule labor. The RWL and YWL have consistently opposed the NYA or any attempt to create separate youth relief and employment setups. These can only lead if successful to a struggle between youth and adults for jobs, and for relief. The NYA must be smashed. But the proletariat must struggle for the demands of youth. The progressive class must lead a struggle against the CCC and its militarization of youth. The youth must be given relief directly, as individuals. Reforestation, etc. must be done under trade union conditions, and youth must be organized into unions and unemployed organizations. Relief and employment must be handled by a single relief set-up, under control of the workers, which can deal with the specific youth problems through departments. The proletariat must struggle for an educational system to combine academic and vocational training under the control of the trade union movement. But this, as experience has shown, can be done only under revolutionary leadership.

YOUNG WORKER

YOUNG WORKERS LEAGUE

Y
W
L

Y
W
L

THE ROAD TO THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

To the members and delegates of the L.R.W.P. Convention:

You have come together to deliberate on program and policy to make possible growth so you can be more effective in the struggle to overthrow capitalism. If you adopt a non-Marxian position on fundamental questions which confront the movement and the class today you will be unable to play this desired role. We of the Revolutionary Workers League have read and considered your Convention documents, and have found differences on many points, some of secondary importance, others life and death matters of a revolutionary organization. We want to call your attention especially to a few of the most important of these questions.

HOW TO FIGHT STALINISM

In your documents dealing with the Road to the 4th International, many correct assertions are made, but interwoven with these correct positions are positions which negate the very essence of the building of Marxian Parties and the 4th International.

The 4th International, like the 3rd International of the past can be built only by a continual process of differentiation and demarcation of the Marxists from the centrists and reformists. It must be established on a MARXIAN program and by an implacable struggle of the Marxists against centrist and reformist organizations and forces. To compromise your program, in order to leave a basis for unity with such forces, or to fail to criticize and correctly evaluate them is the opposite of Lenin's road to the International. (We are discussing here the question of political content. This has nothing to do with the "approach" of such criticisms, whether sharp or mild.

Considerable attention has been focused in your documents on the question of Trotskyism. In the document by comrade Davis he states that "We stand united with Trotsky in the fight against Stalinism". If one does not realize that an effective fight against Stalinism cannot be accomplished without a fight against Trotskyism (and other centrist forces) at the same time (even though the issues and the tactics used are different) then one does not know how to fight Stalinism.

The Trotskyites because of their centrist line serve to cover up Stalinism. Their unconditional support of Stalinism in case of a war; their non Marxian policy for defense of Trotsky and other frame-up victims; their capitulation to the left socialists; their capitulation to the People's Front (Blum-Sachin, Caballero - CNT governments, People's Front of Action, etc.); their support of the Cardenas' bourgeois government in the oil expropriations, their pledge of material aid to the Loyalists and Chiang KaiShek. Their rejection of the Leninist concept of revolutionary defeatism and their pledge not to sabotage French industry or war-moves in case it is allied with the Soviet Union in the next war (see Trotsky's testimony before the Dewey Commission); their PRESENT REJECTION OF THE THEORY OF PERMANENT REVOLUTION and false position on the state - "we must defend even rotten bourgeois democracy from fascism", the struggle in Spain is one between bourgeois "democracy and fascism"; their liquidationist line on the Labor Party; their anti-stalinist instead of anti-capitalist orientation; - all of these fundamentally false positions unfit Trotskyism for ANY kind of struggle against Stalinism. Their "left" words, which in many instances hide the same kind of reformist actions as the Stalinists, only strengthen revisionism everywhere, including stalinist revisionism.

ONLY ORGANIZATIONAL DIFFERENCES

In the document "Are we Trotskyites" by the American section it is stated "These facts do not justify the use of the term (Trotskyist - Ed.) to refer to the LRWP in view of the differences on ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES between the LRWP and the groups around Trotsky (liquidation of revolutionary organizations, position on centrist organizations, etc.)". The document of The Canadian section on this question states that "we still agree with Trotsky on MOST principled questions... There still remains the possibility of collaborating with the Trotskyites IN THE WORK OF ORGANIZING THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. To speak of Trotskyism, therefore, as if it consisted of nothing more than the French Turn, or to speak of ourselves as if we were out and out anti-Trotskyites, would **not only** be politically incorrect, but would place obstacles in the way of UNIFYING the forces for the 4th International". (Our emphasis).

If you have only ORGANIZATIONAL principled differences with the Trotskyites, and you still conceive of having them as part of the Fourth Communist (not centrist) International, then your position is hopeless. You correctly say that the Trotskyites have a non Marxian position on centrist organizations. But do you present a Marxian position in opposition to theirs? Where is YOUR document that deals with the fundamental question - can a centrist organization be reformed? The Revolutionary Workers League considers that a centrist organization, even though it is possible to win a majority of its members over to Marxism, can not be reformed, can not be incorporated into a Marxist Intern-

ational or Party except by a rejection of its whole past course, a purging of its leadership, a re-education of its membership, a radical reconstruction of its structure and program, in other words, a negation of its whole past history. The errors and weaknesses of a Marxist organization can be corrected and "reformed" - as Lenin did with the Bolsheviks in April 1917 - but for the line, character, structure, leadership, traditions of a centrist organization an entirely different course is necessary. As a political tendency, centrism is a non-proletarian force, against which the Marxists must conduct an intransigent struggle. Does the LRWP disagree with this position? Does it believe that the Trotskyites can be reformed from WITHIN, or does it adopt a Marxian line for a sharp, clear differentiation from this centrist force for struggle against it from without, supplemented by fraction work from within?

A "TENDENCY" FOR THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

In his document on the Fourth International comrade Erehm says, speaking of the Trotskyites, "It can at best be considered a tendency for the 4th International shot through with centrist weaknesses but by no means having a patent or monopoly on the movement for the 4th International". This is ambiguous and can mean anything. By "centrist weaknesses" does comrade Krehm mean it is a Marxian organization with only a number of errors? Does he mean that it can still be reformed, that it can still make up part of a MARXIST International? At best the Trotskyist groups can only give split-offs to the new Communist 4th International. Does by any chance the above sentence mean this??? On this basis one would not even talk of "their" monopoly for the 4th International because theirs is a possible monopoly only for a new centrist international, a 2½ or 3½ international; as a movement they will never have a monopoly or part in the new Marxist International.

Your organization considers itself Marxist. But you are presenting in these documents the theory that a centrist organization (the Trotskyites) can work with Marxists and together build the Marxist Party and International. But in essence and what life will bring forth on this line will be a CENTRIST International.

"NEW ZIMMERWALD"

This position is what is termed the "New Zimmerwald" position. It means that on the line presented you could only be part of those forces making toward a new centrist Zimmerwald. As long as there is capitalism and as often as centrist set-ups expose themselves - the IAG, etc. - new set-ups will take their place. Marxists do not take part in establishing centrist set-ups. Lenin's position in Zimmerwald was the opposite of this. Marxists attempt to build their own set-up and to blow up the centrist set-ups. If possible they work on this perspective from the outside, supplemented by fraction work on the inside. Under certain unfavo-

rable conditions, however, where it is impossible to establish a Marxist set-up, it may be necessary to affiliate to the centrist set-up for a time in order to help the process of separation, to BLOW IT UP FROM WITHIN; but this process can take place only on the line of political and organizational independence of the revolutionary Marxian organization, understanding that a centrist organization can not be reformed. The Marxists present a line to the class, a mass orientation as primary. As an auxiliary they maneuver with leftward moving centrist groups to break them up and win the best elements to Marxism. The position of New Zimmerwald is just the opposite, to work to UNITE all "left" forces (centrists and Marxists both), a process that can be achieved only by a watering down of program and principles.

Comrade Krehm concludes his thesis on the International question with the idea that since everything is chaotic in the labor movement the line is to continue loose contacts, etc. A Marxist organization may be forced into such a negative position but it does not lay this down as a line. It would state the necessity of striving to organize a centralized international bureau of the Marxist tendencies as quickly as possible, even a small one - an International Bureau based on a Marxian program and not a loose centrist hodge-podge. This would be one of the most effective means of turning the tide and revitalizing the movement.

PAST FORMS OF NEW ZIMMERWALD

In the past your organization expressed this New Zimmerwald concept in different FORMS. Nowhere in your documents have the past forms been repudiated. First was the position to affiliate to the IAG, when it would have been a fatal ~~fundamental~~ error to affiliate. You only state TODAY that you are not going to affiliate NOW. But why is there no evaluation of the past decision to affiliate? Later this concept took the form of support (with "criticism") of a centrist organization, the POUM. The RUL took the position at the beginning of the Civil War of only supporting working class organizations (trade unions, soviets, etc.) in action against the exploiters, and support on the political field ONLY TO MARXISTS. That is the position our two representatives in Spain worked on. That is the reason we supported the left wing elements in the POUM in order to help them form a faction against the POUM, against its capitulation policies to the people's front. You have not yet corrected your position theoretically; you fail even to mention it in your documents. Does this mean that you still stand theoretically for support of the "best" organization during a revolution, the organization "closest" to Marxism? Will you "critically" support, on this line, when the revolution develops in France, the Trotskyite POI, or will you come out for a new Marxian Party in France? This is a burning question of the revolution today. Unless you reevaluation your position of support to the POUM and the New Zimmerwald concept that lays behind it you will make the same errors again in other countries at other times.

PRESENT FORM OF NEW ZIMMERWALD

Today your New Zimmerwald concept takes on a third FORM, that of leaving the door open to rejoin the Trotskyites. First the IAG looked promising, then the POUM, and now, as bad as they are the Trotskyite centrists have come to the front (since they were expelled from the 2nd International). But this movement can give hope only to those who are not clear on Marxism and those who are in despair.

Unless this New Zimmerwald position is corrected your organization, in spite of its good positions on some of the important questions, is doomed in the end. We want to discuss this with you on a comradely basis.

This position of yours permeates everywhere. For instance on the Labor Party. Why doesn't your document on that question clearly counterpose to the Labor Party, which is a third bourgeois party the Revolutionary Marxian Party? Why does not your document point out the concrete errors of the Trotskyites on the Labor Party? What is YOUR position on whether it is permissible to withdraw your candidates as a policy in favor of Labor Party candidates - so long as they are not members of the Democratic or Republican Parties - the Trotsky position? What is your position on whether or not to support (with political criticism!!) a "Mass" Labor Party, based on the trade unions? What is your position on the present dispute in the Trotskyist ranks between Trotsky-Cannon and Schachtman-Burnham, the former of which is even far to the right of the above positions? By omitting to give an answer to these questions in your documents you leave the door open to pro-Trotskyist elements to hang their hat on that position.

It is impossible to correctly carry on a struggle against capitalism and for the 4th International without a correct evaluation against Trotskyism and against other reformist and centrist tendencies. Otherwise the basis is laid for an orientation on Trotskyism, whether you as an individual or even group ever draw the organizational conclusions or not; and for a watering of your program to make it conformable to theirs. In order to lay a basis for working towards the Fourth Communist International, you must reject the concept of New Zimmerwald in all its forms and particularly at present its Trotskyist-orientation form. You must say that this organization is centrist, cannot be reformed and that the 4th International can be built only in opposition to it.

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE U.S.

2159 W. DIVISION STREET

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

HOW DO YOU LIKE ?
THE LAST TWO ISSUES

MORE NEW FEATURES
IN COMING ISSUES

-INTERNATIONAL NEWS
-BOOK REVIEWS

MAKE SURE YOU GET A COPY -

S U B S C R I B E

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Ruth Grant, Business Manager,
2159 West Division Street, Chicago.

Comrade:

Enclosed find _____ for _____ subscription to the
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. (Subscription rates - \$1.00 a year)

Name _____

Address _____

D I A L E C T I C A L M A T E R I A L I S M

CHAPTER III

MIND AND MATTER

The dialectic process in nature and in society can be found in the thinking of man as a reflection of objective reality. "The great basic question of all, and especially recent, philosophy is the question of the relation between thought and existence, between spirit and nature. Which is prior to the other, spirit or nature? Philosophers are divided into two great camps, according to the way they answer this question. Those who declare spirit existed before nature, and who in the last analysis, therefore, assume in one way or the other that the world was created--have formed the idealist camp. The others, who regard nature as primary, belong to the various schools of materialism." (8)

"If we inquire what thought and consciousness are, whence they come, we find that they are products of the human brain, and that man himself is a product of nature developing in and along with his environment. Obviously, therefore, the product of the human brain, being in the last analysis likewise a product of nature, does not contradict the rest of nature, but corresponds to it."(9)

THE RELATION OF BEING TO THOUGHT

To the schools of Idealism the mind is the center of the universe and thereby, they explain the world through the Ego, the self, the subjective individual. The Materialists explain the self through, and by, explaining the world. For the Idealist the faculty of thought depends upon reasoning. The mechanical Materialist says that the faculty of thought depends upon sense perception. The Dialectician states the question differently. "It is not thought which determines being, but being which determines thought." Materialism recognizes the unity of subject and object but not their identity. "By acting on nature outside himself and changing it, man simultaneously changes his own nature." (10)

It is a fact well established by a great number of branches of science that inorganic matter existed before organic matter, and that inorganic matter can exist without organic matter, but that organic matter cannot exist without inorganic matter. Likewise, nature existed before man. Man is merely a late product of nature, and not such a good product that nature can brag about it yet. Of course, man has bragged about what nature gave him, but nature cannot compliment man for the way he has used the resources up to the present.

The mind of man itself is a slow evolutionary process. Matter exists without mind (mental process); but the mind cannot exist without matter, any more than motion can exist without matter; be-

cause the mental process of the mind is nothing more than a higher form, and special phenomenon of the motion of matter.

Thinking is a process of the interaction of the conscious mind and of things outside of us. Eliminate this two-fold relation and there can be no thought process. (This has nothing to do with picture images that are already stored up in the mind.) The result of this two-fold relation is that inside the mind there is a reflection of outside reality. The exactness or crudeness of the reflection of outside reality in no way alters the above problem; rather it is a question of methods of investigation to obtain a more perfect image.

OBJECTIVE REALITY OUTSIDE OF MIND

The determining factor in the process, in the question of mind and matter, and which is the key to the difference between the schools of Idealism and Materialism is - not the forms of matter that exist, but does OBJECTIVE REALITY exist outside of our mind, independent of the individual? The Materialists answer yes.

The Dialectician rejects the mechanical materialist approach to the question of mind and matter, which relegates man to a mere automaton, blindly shifted about by material conditions which he is bound to the same as are the wind, the hills, and the river. Man is not a mere automaton, man is a part of the process of nature, and through social development has already reached a stage where he helps remake history, but not out of the whole cloth. Before social organization, man, like the other animals, was subject to nature to the fullest extent. With society and its development, man slowly gained in the struggle against nature. Now this has been negated to a large extent by man's struggle against, and exploitation of man (Chattel, Feudal and Wage slavery). Man must reorganize social conditions, that is, the economic mode of production, to again place the struggle on its proper plane of man's united energies against nature. This is the dialectical approach to mind and matter and the relation of man to society.

MATERIAL BOUNDARIES OF THE MIND

The faculty of thought which is determined by being is the material framework of the boundaries of the mind. The material boundaries of the mind are twofold. First the material brain as the base and second, objective reality outside of us. This two-fold material base of the faculty of thought gives rise to the dialectical contradiction of the mind; the idealist revamping of this concept results in a contradiction of reality.

It is a dialectical contradiction for the faculty of thought to have this two-fold material framework and yet have the mind store ideas, assort them, and project images of material conditions, miles away, and of the past, present and, to an extent, the future. But this is no more spiritual, nor contradictory, than radio and

its material base. Whereas radio represents a dialectic contradiction of the special forms of motion and matter of a combination of mechanical and human materials, the mind as a higher product of the organic has its own peculiar "laws".

ASSOCIATION OF IDEAS

When a number of ideas are accumulated, the mental process carries with it the association of ideas, that is, two or more ideas are united, thereby creating the base for a new idea, a new concept. This association of ideas is the dialectic function of the mental process and has nothing to do with ideas descending from heaven or super-human menas. Furthermore, to the degree that man analyzes correctly a given process or stage of history, it will be possible to point out the road ahead. This function of the mind, and its ability to project accurate concepts of future trends, in turn are merely reflection of the accuracy of the analysis of the material conditions under observation. Professor Pavlov, studying conditioned reflex, presents a whole series of experiments that reveal the mental process of inhibitions, and inhibitions of the inhibition. This is another name for the dialectic process of negation and the negation of the negation.

"As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production - what they produce, as well as how they produce. What individuals are, therefore, depends on the material conditions of their production. This production first makes its appearance with the increase of population, it in turn itself presupposes intercourse of the individuals among themselves. The form of this intercourse is again determined by production...

"The fact is, therefore, that definite individuals who are productively active in a definite way, enter into these definite social and political relations. In every single instance empirical observation must show the connection of the social and political structure with production - empirically and without any mystification and speculation. The social structure and the state always arise from the life-process of definite individuals, not as they may appear in their own or other people's ideas, but as they really are, that is, as they act, produce in a material way; therefore as they produce under definite limitations, presuppositions and conditions which are material and independent of their will.

"The production of ideas, concepts, and consciousness, is at first directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men, the language of actual life. Conception, thought, the mental intercourse of men, then still appear as the direct efflux of their material relations. The same is true of laws, morality, religion and metaphysics of a people. Men are the producers of their concepts, ideas, etc., -but real, producing men as they are conditioned by a definite development of their produc-

tive forces and the intercourse, up to its most far reaching forms which corresponds to these. Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of men their actual life process. If in all ideology, men and their relations appear upside down, as in a camera obscura, this phenomenon arises just as much from their historical life process as the reversal of objects on the retina does from their directly physical life-process." (11)

"Thus...ideas...categories, are as little eternal as the relations they express. They are historical and transitory products. There is a continual movement of growth in productive forces, of destruction of social relations, of formation in ideas; the only immutable thing is the abstraction of movement - mors immortalis." (12)

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL

THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, is planning to further concretize the Theory of Marxism . A National Training School will be held in Chicago the last two weeks in June . It will be a full time course to train functionaries - to take the line of the League and carry it out in action .

**Support
THE FOURTH
INTERNATIONAL**

Subscribe to
THE FIGHTING WORKER
Central Organ of the
Revolutionary Workers League, U.S.
2159 W. Division Street
Chicago, Ill.

The Truth About the Moscow
Frame-Up Trials1c
The Workers Answer to Boss War5c
Boss Elections or the Workers Vote.....2c
Sixth Anniversary of the Spanish
Republic1c
30% discount in bundles of ten or more,
postpaid.

Published by
DEMOS PRESS
2159 W. Division Street
CHICAGO

Join, Build, support the Revolutionary
Workers League and its youth Section, the
Y o u n g Workers League. Down with
capitalism. Long Live the Workers State.

Labor Donated