The article below is an edited version of a document titled "For a Communist Women's Movement vs. Feminism," which was written by Cairo Turner and Mónica Mora and adopted by the 16th SL/U.S. National Conference last year. As the article motivates, the feminist program is an obstacle to advancing women's rights. Since the overturn of Roe v. Wade this past summer, attacks on abortion rights have continued unabated. Last month, a federal judge in Texas issued a ruling invalidating the Food and Drug Administration’s approval in 2000 of the mifepristone abortion pill. The Supreme Court has temporarily stayed the ruling, pending appeal, which preserves the threat of a national abortion pill ban.

What is necessary to fight these attacks and open the way to women’s liberation is to build a communist women’s movement today.

For decades, women’s rights in the U.S. have been under attack, culminating in the recent overthrow of Roe v. Wade. Hundreds of thousands of women and youth protested during the “summer of rage” because the democratic right to abortion was taken away. The conditions of most women, particularly black and immigrant women, are worse now than they have been for generations: crushing inflation, unemployment, evictions, medical bills piling up—the threat of a national abortion pill ban.

Last month, black Democrat and former teachers union organizer Brandon Johnson was narrowly elected the next mayor of Chicago in what is widely viewed as a major victory for the party’s “progressive” wing in advance of the 2024 presidential elections. Liberal union bureaucrats and fake socialists like the Freedom Road Socialist Organization hailed Johnson’s win over white “establishment” Democrat Paul Vallas, who liberals and their left tails portray as a stand-in for Trump. For their part, the reformists of Socialist Alternative and Socialist Revolution acted as left advisers to Johnson. Despite the anticipation of the changing of the guard at City Hall among black people, activist youth and trade unionists, this outcome is no victory for workers or black people.

We reprint below the April 3 WV leaflet titled “Chicago Elections: Union Tops/Left Betray—No Vote for Johnson or Vallas!” which lays out why Johnson will trample on the aspirations of labor/black Chicago. Responsibility for the attacks to come lies squarely with the union bureaucrats and reformist left, who sowed illusions in this capitalist class enemy. Against these misleaders who push trans-class political alliances that prepare defeats, we point workers and the oppressed to the only path forward: independent class struggle for their needs on the basis of a program for the multiracial proletariat to run society.
of a suffering homeless population; and the prices of everything keep rising while wages fall far behind. Unemploy­ment in the ghettos remains at depression levels, and cop terror continues. All of this, despite waves of protests, strikes and union organizing drives enveloping the city over the last decade. The question below, Leon Trotsky polemicizes against Latin American populists who argued that unification of the region and nationalization of foreign-owned companies could be achieved by the blessing of U.S. imperialism. It would be radically erroneous to draw the conclusion from what has been said that the policy of the United States will continue to unfold in the same direction in the future as it did in the past. If we are not working on greater possibilities for peaceful unification of the Latin American people and the working masses of the whole world into the mass movement of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie of the most reactionary, aggressive and fascist tendencies. The “Good Neighbor” policy will inevitably be replaced, and probably in the very near future, by the open conflict of forces between the U.S. and British imperialists, the antagonisms of World War II and, particularly, the intensification of the class struggle in the U.S. that led to the CIO’s formation in the '30s. Trotsky stressed the need for revolutionary collaboration between the U.S. proletariat and the oppressed Latin American peoples against their common enemy: U.S. imperialism. We can state that the very fact that a parallel struggle goes on will work in the interest of the country, and the American working class. But the bourgeoisie is fighting to maintain the forcible oppression, and they will inevitably clash with the workers union smashing them outright or through back-channel dealings? Neither of these Democrats represents the interests of workers and the oppressed, and anybody telling you otherwise is lining you up behind the same liberal leaders that got us to this crisis in the first place. No vote to Johnson or Vallas! What Is To Be Done The problems facing the working class and the oppressed demand major struggle to take the country and class and the interests, not support to their representa­tives. To even begin integrating Chicago would require massive public works proj­ects to build low-cost, quality housing. Ending mass unemployment in the ghettos requires shortening the workweek and spreading the available work with no loss in pay, and training and hiring thousands of people. Even these basic measures are fundamentally counterposed to the inter­ests of capital. The bourgeoisie requires black oppression to drive down all work­ers’ living standards and to prop up their rule by keeping the working class divided along racial lines. The sorry state of education in Chicago is only going to be improved by building student organizations of the working class, and the very fact that a parallel struggle goes on will work in the interest of the country, and the American working class. But the bourgeoisie is fighting to maintain the forcible oppression, and they will inevitably clash with the workers. The revisionist left, the preferred candidate option and strategy, that is to say by revolution, or more exactly, a series of revolutions. In those struggles the class struggle engendered the “New Deal”; a further intensification of the class struggle as part of a broader strategy for workers power. The race to replace Lightfoot is yet another example of workers’ leaders push­ing a dead-end strategy. Like everything else in this city, this election is polarized along racial lines. The leadership of the working class is building the campaigns of Brandon Johnson, a black Democratic Party “progressive,” and Paul Vallas, a white establishment Democrat. The reformist left backing Johnson presents this as a titanic contest between “prog­ress” and “reaction,” between racism and anti-racism. Don’t be fooled! As mayor of Chicago, an executive officer of the cap­ital state, it will be their job to defend capitalist profits and maintain the forcible segregation and oppression of black people. The mayor runs the city on behalf of the LaSalle Street bankers and bosses, not workers or the oppressed. They command the cops that terrorize the poor people, legalize the ghetto, blacken pugil­ists, beat demonstrators, break picket lines and bust unions. While Valls­on has lexical difficulty figuring out on the most effective way to administer capitalist misery, they are both committed to defending the interests of workers and the oppressed, and anybody telling you otherwise is lining you up behind the same liberal leaders that got us to this crisis in the first place. No vote to Johnson or Vallas!
The following document, written by SL/U.S. Central Committee member Jake Jots, was endorsed by the 16th SL/U.S. National Conference last year.

The catastrophe created by COVID-19 is a consequence of capitalism, criminally compounded by the clear class treason of labor’s leaders and the left. Capitalism created the miserable conditions fueling the crisis: deceptitious housing, horrible health care, dilapidated schools, dangerous work conditions, scarcity, oppression, etc. The reactionary response of the ruling class multiplied the misery of the masses: workers were laid off in droves; whole sections of industry, schools and childcare facilities were closed; “essential workers” were subject to massive attacks, speedup and givebacks and were forced into life-threatening conditions where over a million died. The leadership of the unions and the left utterly betrayed the workers: preaching class collaboration and reliance on the state, they disarmed our class and prevented the struggle necessary for workers to defend themselves against both the deadly threat of the virus and the devastating offensive of the bourgeoisie. Labor’s leaders and the left were complicit in the disastrous ruin of workers worldwide.

The ruling class pushed the lie that the only way for the workers was to forfeit their lives and livelihoods for the “greater good,” and that they must look to the state—the violent apparatus of the bourgeoisie—to save them. The labor bureaucracy fell in line, proudly leading “essential workers” to sacrifice in the name of “national unity,” while pushing class-collaborationist illusions about “having a seat at the table” in the bourgeoisie’s management of the crisis. The fake socialists followed suit and offered nothing but a militant veneer on the treachery of the pro-capitalist bureaucracy, agreeing that the only option was to pressure the government for minor changes in policy (in many cases more closures and repression), while accepting the devastating measures and the omnipotence of the state. In the U.S., the program offered by these class traitors dovetailed perfectly with the Democrats’ 2020 election campaigns, in which they exploited Trump’s anti-science ramblings to posture as the “rational” wing of the bourgeoisie, further duping workers into supporting the destructive designs of their class enemy and thwarting any effective struggle for the defense of workers’ lives. Contrary to the suicidal strategy of subjugation, the working class needed to fight against the closures and repression. During the pandemic, as always, the interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat remained irreconcilably counterposed, and the state remained a tool for the defense of capital. The measures enacted by the bourgeoisie and carried out by state did not represent a progressive path forward. For that, they needed to take matters into their own hands: take control of safety in workplaces and redistribute the existing resources. It was the duty of communists to intervene and chart this course, starting from the immediate needs in the pandemic and linking the struggle to the necessity of taking state power.

Workers needed to fight against the attacks and for safe conditions. They needed to fight for more and better schools and childcare facilities, for more production, for more jobs, for more wages and for the unions, not the state, to determine what conditions are safe for work. To wage this struggle, they needed to fight against the repression, atomization and devastation of the working class. The fundamental prerequisite was to break workers from the “saving lives”/“national unity” blackmail peddled by the capitalists and their labor lieutenants, which dictated that nothing could be done but to support government measures. Workers required a revolutionary strategy to break the bonds to the bourgeois state and conduct class war for their defense. It was incumbent on the working class to defend itself by taking matters into its own hands, breaking with the labor traitors and “national unity,” and put forward a program of revolutionary opposition to the state.

The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: “The ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admits that lockdowns may slow the rate of infection, but only to dismiss this. Does it recommend any public health measures that deal with the deadly coronavirus—selective quarantines, emergency hospitals and isolation facilities for those who have contracted the disease or are in danger of infection, anything at all? Nothing. Nor does it even mention that worldwide, over 3 million people have died of COVID-19. Frankly, these poseurs who besmear the name of comrades have their perfidious program of reliance on the bureaucracy’s, is an obstacle to the advancement of working-class interests, and even to basic defense. The IG objects to our statement that the lockdowns were reactionary public health measures that thwarted the fighting ability of the working class: ‘So the ICL admit...”

IG: Lovesick for Lockdowns
Crossing the Class Line in the Pandemic

Homeless man in front of bank, New York City, July 2020. “National unity” was a lie; we were not “in this together.” Rule-clas blackmailechoed by labor tops and lefleft, was wielded to force acceptance of reactionary health measures, attacks on workers, oppressed.

Statement of the ICL International Executive Committee (19 April 2021)
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of workers' health and safety is a grave threat for workers that called for immediate action. Our difference is the class line. The interrelation of a revolutionary party was necessary to raise the class consciousness of workers and to employ management as a tool for isolating and atomizing the working class. The IG's position places them firmly on the wrong side of the class line, where they attempt to obscure by derogating the marvelous effluvia spewed by the capitalists to instill submission to their dictat. Behind the supposed concern for “saving lives,” the capitalists conceal the brutal pursuit of their class interests, and the IG, their touching faith in the bourgeois state. Behind the IG's refusal to break workers from the bootlicking and betray them, we see the capitalists' reaction to their interests and that nothing else was possible, but they also echo the reaction of the union bureaucracy, which fought to keep schools closed and remote. This is an abdication of the fight for safe working conditions, as it makes any struggle impossible; it guarantees the IG won't fight for free, quality, integrated public education. Far from “necessary,” the closures were antithetical to the needs of the working class and premised on accepting the miserable state of education and childcare. The school closures and remote learning schemes were oppressive to white workers that were cut off from social interaction and fell behind in basic education. Black students, already segregated into failing facilities, were able to operate during the pandemic underscored the misery of the black people, women, youth, and workers. The IG knows this and elaborates on many of the horrific consequences in their article. They even polemically argue that the IG offers the same “solution” as the capitalists, even with the IG's devastating measures and criticism against CORE (Chicago Teachers Union leadership). The elite private schools, with their small class sizes and superior facilities, were able to operate during the pandemic, and there is no “scientific” reason for sacrifice using the same justifications pushed by the IG. The IG has already yielded to the “necessary” of workers to wage even the most minimal struggle. Moreover, this subordination to the bourgeoisie limits the struggle to impotent half measures that are acceptable to the ruling class. While the IG recognizes the bourgeoisie's support to the Democrats as a brake on militancy, they share the same framework that binds workers to the state and leaves them prostrate before their enemy. In the pandemic, as always, the workers needed a revolution—might and power to defend themselves and for solutions that are necessary those of the First Unitarian Church.)
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The Bankruptcy of Trade-Union Economism for Revolutionary Leadership of the Unions

We print below, edited for publication, a report to the 16th National Conference of the Spartacist League/U.S. by Central Committee member and Workers Vanguard production manager François Donau.

In this period of capitalist decay—the epoch of imperialism—none of the problems facing the working class and oppressed can be resolved within the confines of the economic struggle. Fights for higher wages and better contracts and conditions are necessary battles along the road to revolution but cannot resolve the fundamental issues facing the working class. To end the special oppression of women and black people and to liberate the workers and oppressed from their miseries requires a revolutionary reorganization of society. Any serious struggle to qualitatively improve the conditions of workers and the oppressed runs up against the interests of private property and the bourgeois state.

Even if reformist trade-union leaders distrust the cops and the courts, they will inevitably disarm workers locked in struggle against the class enemy, which has at its disposal a state apparatus of organized violence that protects its interests. Thus, they do not have the Marxist understanding of the capitalist state. Every major strike confronts the repressive force of the bourgeoisie: pickets are attacked by cops; they face court injunctions; their leaders are jailed, etc. This was true of the 1981 PATCO air traffic controllers strike; it was true of the 2005 New York City transit strike that defied the Taylor Law, and it is now true of the rail workers strike, which Biden and Congress spiked. Even the organizing drive at Amazon and Starbucks are embroiled in court battles with no end in sight.

The only program that can politically arm workers for these confrontations is one based on the understanding that the capital is unity of labor and capital is counterposed: build a Leninist party: the intervention of a vanguard is necessary to resolve the epoch of imperialism—1919-1943. Rather than link today’s struggles to the necessity of the working class to change society, the SL/U.S. has been that the low level of class consciousness ‘in the masses’ is just the result of the low level of class consciousness ‘in the masses’. The only program that can unify the working class is the program of the Spartacist League/U.S. by Central Committee member and Workers Vanguard production manager François Donau.

Revolts are understandable, the patriotic feeling is understandable, but this is not enough. The only program that can politically arm workers for these confrontations is one based on the understanding that the capital is unity of labor and capital is counterposed: build a Leninist party: the intervention of a vanguard is necessary to resolve the epoch of imperialism—1919-1943. Rather than link today’s struggles to the necessity of the working class to change society, the SL/U.S. has been that the low level of class consciousness ‘in the masses’ is just the result of the low level of class consciousness ‘in the masses’. The only program that can unify the working class is the program of the Spartacist League/U.S. by Central Committee member and Workers Vanguard production manager François Donau.

A program of militant struggle cannot inoculate workers against the dead end of class collaboration. Only a leadership that fights for revolution understands that the power of the working class lies in its mass strength, solidarity and independence and will not sacrifice these for illusory alliances with representatives of the class enemy.

While reformist trade-union leaders might express Platonic solidarity with other unions, the bosses will be able to pit the unions against one another because these leaders will inevitably sacrifice the interest of the class as a whole for inadequate and ephemeral gains. Unions will scab on each other’s strikes and raid each other’s members. The only perspective that can unify the working class is the fight for power, because it links the struggle for workers’ immediate interests to their historic mission as gravediggers of capitalism. This understanding can only be introduced to the working class by a revolutionary party.

There is no middle ground between reformist and revolutionary leadership. As Trotsky says in “Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay” (1940):

“In other words, the trade unions in the present epoch cannot simply be the organs of democracy as they were in the epoch of free capitalism and they cannot any longer remain politically neutral, that is, limit themselves to serving the daily needs of the working class. They cannot any longer be anarchistic, i.e., ignore the decisive influence of the state on the life of peoples and classes. They can no longer be reformist, because the objective conditions leave no room for any serious and lasting reforms. The trade unions of our time can either serve as secondary organs of imperialist capitalism for the subordination and disciplining of workers and for obstructing the revolution or, on the contrary, the trade unions can become the instrument of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat.”

Communists Must Fight for Leadership

For 30 years, the starting point of the SL/U.S. has been that the low level of class struggle fundamentally changed the tasks of communists, and we shelved the Transi- tional Program. Rather than link today’s struggles to the necessity of the working class taking state power, the SL/U.S. explicitly separated the “fight to forge a new class-struggle leadership” from the future formation of a revolutionary workers party. In the “Lessons of the Battle of Longview” (IWV No. 996, 17 February 2012), we say, “The road forward lies in the fight to forge a new class-struggle leadership of the unions that will wage the battles of which a revolutionary workers party can be built” (emphasis added).

Abandoning a revolutionary perspective, the SL/U.S. pushed the program of social democracy, the historical political outlook of the “militant” trade-union sects. To get organized workers to confine their activity to a minimum part consisting of struggling for reform demands now and a maximum part consisting of revolutionary struggle in the indefinite future. Correspondingly, a mil- itant reformist party would be built now, and in the future class struggle would give birth to the “revolutionary party.” This is a purely Pabloton conception, the cult of spontaneity substituting for build- ing a Leninist party: the intervention of a vanguard is not necessary to bring revolutionary consciousness into the working class, but rather this consciousness is the natural outgrowth of the economic struggle. It sounds just like the Communist Interna- tional in 1928: transitional demands when the tides are rising, but a reformist program when it ebbs. The draft program for the Sixth Comintern Congress, the one that Trotsky criticized in The Third Interna- tional: After Lenin (1928), argued: “When the revolutionary tide is not ris- ing the communist parties, taking as their starting-point the workers’ daily needs, must put forward partial slo- gans and demands and link them with the chief aims of the Communist Inter- national. They must not advance tran- sitional slogans which presuppose the existence of a revolutionary situation…”—Jane Degrus, ed., The Communist International 1919-1943, Vol. 2.

The SL/U.S., like the Comintern in 1928, had no need for a bridge from the struggles of today to the conquest of power, because it was on the path to social democracy, for which revolution is good only for holiday speechifying. Without the bridge, all that remains is the impotent reformist program.

The Then and Now SL/U.S. pamphlet, the central weapon of the section for combat in the working class for nearly a decade, is pure economism. It is not a tool to raise the consciousness of the working class to communist consciousness; rather, it pushes narrow militancy. It blurs the line between trade-union economism and rev- olution, that is, the transformation of a reform and revolution. As Lenin taught us, the economic struggle alone can only lead to the class struggle. The principal enemies of labor and capital are counterposed: build unions, fight the bosses and struggle for...
Robertson and Liz Gordon explained: the Stalinists a “class-o was…a new bureaucracy that shackled the liberal president, and enforcing a no-Roosevelt, that is, a political alliance with to the popular front around Franklin D. Roosevelt. Unions...

February 1986: SL-supported NYC transit union caucus rally in defense of tock drivers, James Grimes, who faced charges for defending himself on the job. Revolutions in union linked defense of Grimes to broader program for black liberation.

workers. The Then and Now pamphlet barely mentions black oppression because its purpose is not to win workers to the need to fight for power. If it had been, the pamphlet would have put front and center that question, which is strategic for the American- socialist revolution. Instead, it pushes the idea that economic struggle alone will unite black and white workers.

Slavish to spontaneity, WV repeatedly presented the temporary unity between black and white workers sometimes achieved on the picket line as sufficient. For example, the article “Racism, Fear- mongristy, and the “Solidarity Line” (WV No. 1144, 16 November 2018) states: The anger and discontent of the American working class needs to be expressed in class struggle. It is through such struggle that workers can overcome the racial and other divisions furthermore the bosses.” No! Genuine unity requires consciously uniting the struggle for black freedom with the struggle for the protection of inalienable parts of a program to free the black community.

Moreover we must always be aware that workers can overcome the racial and other divisions. Such a leadership would have

...masses and all workers from the chains of capitalism. This unity can be achieved only by winning black workers to fight for black liberation, overcoming the skepticism of that possibility among black workers. A program of trade-union mili tancy cannot achieve that goal because it doesn’t challenge workers’ consciousness, and restricts itself to what is considered possible under capitalism.

To win white workers to fight for black liberation, they must be won to the understanding that only the destruction of capitalism can free themselves from exploitation. In turn, black workers need to be broken from the illusion that liberal integration or black nationalism can improve their plight. They must understand that genuine integration and equality can only be achieved by the destruction of the capitalist order.

The New York City transit workforce is heavily black and Latino, and the system is riddled with deeplyrooted racism, and rejection and inequality that workers call the systematic plantation justice.” The incumbent board of New York City Transit Workers Union (TWU) Local 100 is, at best, indifferent to this discrimination. This is challenged by a black nationalist causus, Progressive Action (PA). A number of black workers look to PA to fight against the racism on the job because the union is not defending them.

The article “TWU Tops Push Through Rotten Contract” (WV No. 1168, 17 Janu ary 2020) criticizes the incumbent bu reaucracy for not being militant enough, while criticizing PA for “playing into the bosses’ divide-and-rule plot.” At the same time, WV does not put forward any program to fight the oppression of black workers in that industry. For WV, the fact that black workers are fighting against their special oppression is what divides the working class. This is criminal; it alienates both the bosses and the Local 100 leadership. Furthermore, it strengthens the political hold of PA on black workers. All this is what a program of trade-union militancy means.

The role of communists is to fight for a revolutionary leadership that exclusively takes into account the question of black oppression. How this fight will benefit the whole workforce. In contrast, the programs of both the union leadership and that of PA are dead ends that can only further the bosses’ efforts to pit workers against each other. Communists must fight against both wings of the bourgeoisie.
Pandemic... 

(continued from page 4)

Conversely, workers shutting down the system in their struggle for safety could have actually resulted in improvements. But because the leadership of the TWU intervention in the union, the end to the racist disciplinary system, etc., must be raised in a way that addresses the specific needs of black workers and benefits the workforce as a whole. This program must be the fight against the central control held by the bureaucrats, black and white, who support segregation. But the fight for leadership on a communist program, the SL/U.S. crawled for years before “progressive” black bureaucrats like those atop ILA Local 10 in the Bay Area. They have built their credentials instead of striving to break workers, just as the Imperialist Beast was done.

For Revolution in the Belly of the Imperialist Beast

The Biden administration is aggressively pursuing U.S. imperialism’s strategic interests in Ukraine, overseeing the expansion of the war and pushing counterrevolution in China. Unconditional opposition to imperialism is the elementary duty of a revolutionary party in the U.S.

The union bureaucrats act as direct agents of U.S. imperialism. They support Ukraine in the war and sanctions against Russia. They push anti-China protectionism and work hand in hand with the State Department and the imperialists’ program of class collaboration, deluding the working class. Pushing the lie that lasting peace is possible without the destruction of capitalism means pushing workers into the arms of liberal doves, bourgeois politicians who prevent the working class from taking power and allowing the U.S. to better plunder the world.

The “peaceful” settlement of the war is the outcome of imperialist front war, because the imperialist powers relentlessly struggle to redrive the world. This is the underpinning. Those who win the working class over. To even though W9 raised empty slogans for “internal peace,” the peace and llevar los de la peor guerra. But rather than fight for leadership on a communist program, the SL/U.S. crawled for years before “progressive” black bureaucrats like those atop ILA Local 10 in the Bay Area. They have built their credentials instead of striving to break workers, just as the Imperialist Beast was done.
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Feminism... (continued from page 1)

post-pandemic “new normal.” The lockdowns exacerbated the burden of domes- tic work for women stuck at home caring for children and elderly people, while they tried to keep their own jobs and do more housework. Many women never returned to work after the lockdowns. There has been a constant erosion of abortion rights for years, including under Trump. The strategy of Republicans during the Trump administration was to pack the courts with anti-woman conservatives.

The Democrats’ and feminists’ response was to hold back until the Supreme Court did away with Roe v. Wade. But even that was the answer of the feminists, whose single issue was to bring back Roe. As was obvious to everyone, the Demo- crats used the topic of abortion to get themselves elected. Those who voted for them hoped that they would pass a law codifying Roe, which most people already see is not happening, or that maybe some Supreme Court cases would come around the same time so the president, in turn, could appoint pro-abortion judges. Well, the midterm elections came and the Demo- crats have been elected and what has hap- pened? Literally nothing. And what are the bourgeois heads with bourgeois propaganda than to vote for the anti-abortion Hyde Amendment, as they have been doing for decades. And now that the feminists have achieved the impossible, they have a confrontation with the bourgeois. The feminist program is an obstacle to that because they want to preserve unity with the bourgeoisie. And it seems to be going quite well for the bourgeoisie. Women are inter-connected. Therefore, the revolutionary working-class character of the feminists and their movements.

The strategy of the feminists is count- erposed to this perspective because their whole program is to seek formal equality under capitalism, not to overthrow the bourgeois state. Instead of fighting to sweep away the state through workers revolu-
tion, their strategy is to use the state (the repressive apparatus of violence whose whole purpose is to maintain bourgeois rule) to better serve women. If your start- ing point is not the need to make a revolu-
tion, it is necessarily the preservation of capitalism, which means the preservation of the family and betrayal of the fight for women’s liberation.

What about improving the conditions of women under capitalism? Plenty of women live in deceptively housing with abu-
sive partners and can’t even make ends meet. Fighting for a pay raise, affordable housing and women’s shelters is urgently needed right now. But it is the feminist program that imprisons figures of women in another way. To achieve these measures requires a confrontation with the capitalist class. The feminist program is an obstacle to that.

The need for Communism to Emancipate Women Women’s oppression is rooted in the system of capitalism, which preserves the bourgeois family. This institution is key for the ruling class to pass property. Quality, free 24-hour childcare requires expropriating large amounts of the bourgeoisie’s property to build nice, clean facilities where kids can play and get healthy meals, plus hiring and train-
ting tons of new staff, such as teachers and early childhood experts.

But who is going to do this? Get the Demo-
crats in Congress to pass a bill for childcare, laundries and public functions of the family. To even begin to address their oppression requires going right up against capitalist profits and property. Quality, free 24-hour childcare requires expropriating large amounts of the bourgeoisie’s property to build nice, clean facilities where kids can play and get healthy meals, plus hiring and train-
ting tons of new staff, such as teachers and early childhood experts. To free these women from their dou-
bly oppression as workers and domestic servants requires the socialization of the functions of the family. To even begin to address their oppression requires going right up against capitalist profits and property. Quality, free 24-hour childcare requires expropriating large amounts of the bourgeoisie’s property to build nice, clean facilities where kids can play and get healthy meals, plus hiring and train-
ting tons of new staff, such as teachers and early childhood experts.

Any struggle against women’s oppress-
sion, including against restrictions and bans on abortion, must take place inde-
pendently of any bourgeois force, cen-
trally feminism. What’s clearly called for is a communist women’s movement. It is a basic demand to demand that the bourgeoisie could grant it if wanted. But full, unhindered access cannot come through legalistic means. Revolutionaries are best at waging even the struggle for reforms because they understand what is necessary to win.

The precondition for advancing the fight for women’s liberation or even for full abortion rights is a split with the femi-

nists and all those who conciliate them. This is the job of socialists, but instead,

Women workers have an extra special treat of having to grind away at work all day for less pay in terrible conditions and then go back home to their terrible and crumbling housing to look after kids and hus-
bands.
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Our journal Women and Revolution (1971-1990) was a weapon against feminists and reformists, like the Socialist Workers Party’s single-issue WONACOA campaign in the 1970s, which limited the movement to reforms acceptable to Democrats. In contrast, we fought for a clearly defined revolutionary perspective, embodied in a program of transitional demands to build a mass, class-conscious women’s liberation movement.
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**For Women’s Liberation Through Socialism!**

Central to the fight for “women’s liberation through socialist revolution”.

The entire goal of War & Revolution articles was to provide revolutionary leadership by drawing a class line against feminism. The articles were intensely polemical, one concrete issue of the time, W&R went against all popular fronts and confronted the feminists and their reformist socialist comrades in the Socialist Workers Party, exposing how they negotiated nothing more than what is possible under capitalism and how they invited bourgeois politicians to their events and excluded us. Our goal then is now to give a working-class character and orientation to the women’s liberation movement. What the IG often counterpoises, as W&V did, is a labor-continuer struggle for a class struggle and the need to break with the Democrats. But without taking on feminism as the bourgeois force that ties the struggle for women’s rights to the ruling class, the call for labor mobilizations is just a social-democratic cover for the feminists’ aims.

Until recently, W&V echoed the liberals in hailing the feminist movement of the ‘70s as the model: “The ‘reasonable’ legal abortion and contraception were not a gift from the courts or bourgeois politicians. They were concessions granted during a relatively brief but intense period of convulsive social struggles...” This struggle was not just for abortion.”

In a forum that the IG published in November 2022, the word “feminism” isn’t even mentioned. The IG’s failure to break with the Democrats means nothing, not even their shadow, W&R defends this understanding to better merge with the popular front, making its Marxian verbiage indistinguishable from a break that abortion means women’s liberation.

The IG and W&V criticized feminism and the social-democrats for being sectoral and bourgeois and staying in the framework of capitalist politics. The IG says: “Revolutionary Marxists fight intrinsically for the rights, and full liberation, of women and all the oppressed. It would be hypocritical to falsely tell the truth that all the talk of ‘socialist feminism,’ feminism is a bourgeois ideology, poisoning a sectoral struggle along gender lines that keeps the oppressed within the framework of capitalist politics” (“Su- premacy Court Cases: Trigger for Ultra-Rightist Mobilization,” August 2022). What the IG doesn’t say is that the program of feminism is the direct cause of the all-out retreat on women’s rights, that a compromise is needed to be built in complete opposition to all bourgeois forces, above all feminism, and that it is the job of socialists to carry out this split. To polemicize against feminism the way that the IG does and W&V did gives liberal cover to all those who disavow “white feminism” and want a feminism that is “intersectional” and champions the working-class. By doing so while covering themselves in loud phrases about the class struggle, they help maintain unity with the feminists.

Recognizing the popular front is not enough: revolutionaries have to take on feminism, the main thing that chains women’s struggles to the bourgeoisie. Just saying it’s a bourgeois ideology and therefore needs to be opposed is an example of the IG not seeing their job as breaking young women away from feminism, but it is the job of socialists to carry out this split. That is the political obstacle. This is totally compatible with the pro-aborticn popular front, which presents the reversal of Roe v. Wade as the fault of Trump installing a “conservative Supreme Court.”

W&V’s No. 1161 article is a glaring example of the longstanding betrayal of the SL/US in not fighting for a commun- ist women’s movement. It’s a revision of basic Marxism, embracing the framework where the dangerous pro-abortion people vs. backward anti-abortion people. Instead of trying to break women away from feminism, the only purpose is to keep the bourgeoisie from banning abortion rights and chains the women’s movement to the bourgeoisie. This presents the same political obstacle. The only way that can be overcome is to organize a communist women’s movement needs to be abandoned the task of fighting for feminism today, leaving the leadership of the women’s movement to the bourgeois politicians. For the working class to take up the fight for women’s liberation requires breaking with them from feminists, and that means forming a communist pole in opposition to all bourgeois forces.

To better understand what the IG most ap- pletes, the SL/U.S. said in the WV No. 1161 article: “In the U.S., the democratic right to abortion raises the question of wom- en’s freedom.” No, it doesn’t. Abortion is a democratic demand that the bourgeois society can grant. W&R defends this understanding to better merge with the popular front, making its Marxian verbiage indistinguishable from a break that abortion means women’s liberation.

Both the IG and W&V criticized feminism and the social-democrats for being sectoral and bourgeois and staying in the framework of capitalist politics. The IG says: “Revolutionary Marxists fight intrinsically for the rights, and full liberation, of women and all the oppressed. It would be hypocritical to falsely tell the truth that all the talk of ‘socialist feminism,’ feminism is a bourgeois ideology, poisoning a sectoral struggle along gen- der lines that keeps the oppressed within the framework of capitalist politics” (“Su- premacy Court Cases: Trigger for Ultra-Rightist Mobilization,” August 2022). What the IG doesn’t say is that the program of feminism is the direct cause of the all-out retreat on women’s rights, that a compromise is needed to be built in complete opposition to all bourgeois forces, above all feminism, and that it is the job of socialists to carry out this split. To polemicize against feminism the way that the IG does and W&V did gives liberal cover to all those who disavow “white feminism” and want a feminism that is “intersectional” and champions the working-class. By doing so while covering themselves in loud phrases about the class struggle, they help maintain unity with the feminists.

Recognizing the popular front is not enough: revolutionaries have to take on feminism, the main thing that chains women’s struggles to the bourgeoisie. Just saying it’s a bourgeois ideology and therefore needs to be opposed is an example of the IG not seeing their job as breaking young women away from feminism, but it is the job of socialists to carry out this split. That is the political obstacle. This is totally compatible with the pro-aborticn popular front, which presents the reversal of Roe v. Wade as the fault of Trump installing a “conservative Supreme Court.”

W&V’s No. 1161 article is a glaring example of the longstanding betrayal of the SL/US in not fighting for a commun- ist women’s movement. It’s a revision of basic Marxism, embracing the framework where the dangerous pro-abortion people vs. backward anti-abortion people. Instead of trying to break women away from feminism, the only purpose is to keep the bourgeoisie from banning abortion rights and chains the women’s movement to the bourgeoisie. This presents the same political obstacle. The only way that can be overcome is to organize a communist women’s movement needs to be abandoned the task of fighting for feminism today, leaving the leadership of the women’s movement to the bourgeois politicians. For the working class to take up the fight for women’s liberation requires breaking with them from feminists, and that means forming a communist pole in opposition to all bourgeois forces.
The following article is reprinted from Workers Hammer (No. 249, Spring 2023), newspaper of our comrades of the Spartacist League/Britain. The NHS [National Health Service] has been gutted and bled dry. The entire system is collapsing and access to even the most basic care is on the line. For the working class in Britain, this is literally a life-and-death question. The strikes by the Royal College of Nursing (RCN), Unite and other NHS unions are certainly about wages, but also much more. The very survival of a publicly funded healthcare service is at stake.

This reality is widely recognised. The question is: what to do? Every single politician swears up and down that they are entirely committed to “saving the NHS.” To count on them is to count on an arsonist to put out a fire. The Tories have ground the NHS down and are now slamming the door on nurses’ modest wage demands. As for Labour, [party leader Keir] Starmer promises to go back to the legacy of … Tony Blair, the very man who opened the doors wide for the private sector in healthcare. The SNP [Scottish National Party], Lib Dems and Greens offer nothing better. Clearly the politicians don’t have the answer.

Social progress comes from one place in this reactionary kingdom: the struggles of the working class. Clearly the unions are vertebral, ravaging the NHS. On the other hand, for 40 years the unions have utterly failed to put a stop to the destruction the NHS and the erosion of living standards. The fault lies not with the unions themselves but with the disastrous course followed by the union leadership. Instead of building unions as tools of struggle which can defend the basic needs of workers, unions in this country have been hollowed out and are wielded as pathetic public relations puppets.

This is apparent in the strategy currently being pursued by the RCN. After almost a century of opposing strikes, allowing its members to work the NHS and then “force the government to stop and listen to what the health care workforce is asking for” (RCN Magazine, 16 October 2020). All well and good, but a few spread-out strike days will not “force” the government to do anything. In fact, while the government hasn’t budged, the RCN cut its pay demands in half, from 19 to 10 per cent after only two strike days. The government will not be made to “recognise” the true worth of NHS work.

Program for NHS Strikes in Britain:

**High Wages, Quality Health Care, Women's Liberation!**

**Programme for NHS strikes:**

- **High wages**
- **Quality healthcare**
- **Women’s liberation**

Order from make checks payable to: Spartacist League/Britain

PO Box 42886, London N19 5WY, Britain (Cheques in US$ should be made payable to Spartacist League/Britain in US$)


Marxist newspaper of the Spartacist League/Britain

**Workers Hammer**

Striking nurses at University College London Hospital, January 18.
and educational standards for the mass of the population has receded. Today more and more of the economy relies on a thin layer of highly trained technocrats and specialists. This has meant that as the competitive selection for general public all have become “wasteful” expenses in the eyes of the capitalist. These services simply do not contribute enough to “productivity” to warrant meaningful investment. As public services receive less funding and the general welfare of the population is degraded, the strain on the public healthcare system becomes untenable. This is the reason for the NHS crisis. It is caused not by a heartless “ideology” or “greed” but by the fundamental interests of the ruling class. This understanding has to be at the centre of the struggle for better healthcare and better public services.

Lesson of the Pandemic: NHS Workers Should Call the Shots

Looking back at the pandemic through this lens leads to clear conclusions. It was criminal that the Labour Party, unions and left—to support the lockdowns. This meant leaving full control of health and working conditions in the hands of the demented Boris Johnson government, which obviously could not have cared less about protecting the working class in the pandemic. Instead, what was needed was a determined struggle by the labour movement to take matters into its own hands. The working class should have fought for all social resources to be mobilized to respond to it. Creches, home visits, care homes and other health facilities should have been built urgently. The housing stock should have been redistributed to ease overcrowding and unsanitary living conditions. NHS wages and staffing levels should have been doubled. These are only a few examples of basic measures which should and could have been taken to address the pandemic. They would also have had a beneficial long-term effect on the health of the population and the state of the working class.

The obstacle to taking any of these measures is the fact that most resources are in the private hands of a small number of families. Requisitioning the assets of the capitalists (and royals) is obviously a big red line for a government that does not have the purpose to defend the interests of those very people. So instead, it shut everything down, removed the power of the private profits of Tory donors and squeezed NHS workers to the breaking point. The RCN and other NHS unions entirely bought into the national unity, “We’re all in this together” propaganda, submitting to the government. Rather than fighting for improvements in working and living conditions, they begged for more of the same. Instead of well-planned and determined struggles, they lead to half measures, compulsion and capitulation. Whether it is working conditions, public services or the status of women, it is crucial to understand that incremental and constant progress is impossible within capitalism. The NHS itself, while a crucial gain, was not a step towards socialism. It was part of the measures taken to shore up collapsing British imperialism after WWII. Attlee and arch-reactionary Churchill broadly agreed on such measures at the time. Since then, the NHS has been under constant attack. As the whole social fabric of the country is hollowed out by the ruling class, the only prospect for the future under capitalism is decline and misery.

In contrast, a workers government which would expropriate the capitalist class would be able to take immediate and long-term measures to increase the quantity and quality of public services. With productive forces used rationally and planned on an international level, more and more of the burden which today rests on the family can be taken off by society as a whole: cooking, cleaning, healthcare, education, child-rearing. As the role of the family declines, the social role of the family will gradually wither away and with it the oppression of women.

Trade Unionism and Women’s Oppression

The crisis in this country is crushing working people in every aspect of their lives. The ruling class is in perpetual crisis and social stability is rapidly eroding. The whole system is in complete and total crisis. Ultimately the whole system should be run by workers from top to bottom.

The Road to Women’s Liberation

The fundamental problem with the strategy pursued by the RCN and other NHS unions is that it does not start from the understanding that quality healthcare for all and capitalism are incompatible. Of course, unions must start from today’s struggles and consciousness. But they must use the everyday battles to educate workers in the irreconcilable nature of the conflict. Far from doing this, the NHS unions peddle illusions that the capitalists and their government can be made to work for the common good. This is the key task for socialists today. But far from doing this, the rest of the socialist left talks about Marxism and socialism as if they are separate issues. This perspective is antithetical to every aspect of the socialist project. Only if the working class becomes unshackled and united can we move from the capitalist to the socialist world.

Take women’s liberation to the streets! To save the NHS, fight for women’s liberation! For workers governments on both sides of the Irish Sea! For workers everywhere, governments—call the shots! For workers everywhere, governments on both sides of the Irish Sea! For workers everywhere, governments on both sides of the Irish Sea!
part of their successes from the mainte-
nance of segregation. Johnson, who lived in the West Side ghetto and some largely black western suburbs on the county commission. He backed the anti-Trust pop-
ular front that blamed Trump supporters for racial oppression and brought Biden to power—a total disaster for working peo-
ple and the oppressed. On the other side, Vallas has the support of the mainly white middle class and workers in administering their property relations and maintain forcible segregation. Johnson and his supporters look to him to address the oppression of the black petty bourgeoisie, not the oppressed masses.

In this election, the racist Vallas is presented as a stand-in for Trump by his opponents, despite being a fairly main-
stream Democratic Party politician. The reformists and “progressive” trade-union leaders are doing Johnson’s donkey work by trying to replicate the anti-Trust pop-
ular front that blamed Trump supporters for racial oppression and brought Biden to power—a total disaster for working peo-
ppe and the oppressed. On the other side, Vallas has the support of the mainly white middle class and workers in administering their property relations and maintain forcible segregation. Johnson and his supporters look to him to address the oppression of the black petty bourgeoisie, not the oppressed masses.

Paul Goyette

Chicago 26 June 1982: Spartacist-initiated mobilization brought out some 3,000 anti-police, black people and others to protest Nazi provocation. Workers and oppressed must defend themselves, not rely on capitalists’ cops and courts.

Freedom Road Socialist Organization sows deadly illusions in community control of cops. Their lies politically disarm workers and oppressed, seek to involve them in the machinery of their own repression.

Cops, Crime and Capitalism

Both candidates have put crime and policing at the center of their campaigns and support gun control. While Vallas tries to gin up anti-black racism with his calls to crack down on crime, Johnson says he will stay the hand of the Chi-
cago police and hold them accountable. But crime is endemic to the poverty and oppression that flow from capitalism, which is only made worse by the decay of imperialism and the resulting lack of jobs and utter destitution facing the prole-
tariat. The bourgeois, who built bridges to the oppressed, seek to involve them in the machinery of their own oppression.

Unlike bootlickers who built bridges to Johnson, SL fought against popular front around him, shown here at Chicago State University faculty strike, April 3.
the to the use and benefit from the land, putting an end to large land ownership in the countryside.

The national bourgeoisie did not have (and does not have) an independent role; it had to perform a balancing act between the imperialists on the one hand and the insurgent peasants and the entire Mexican people on the other. The U.S. imperialists played an important role in the development of the Mexican Revolution, granting significant material resources to different factions between 1910 and 1920 as it suited them. What they sought to prevent was the formation of a strong nationalist government.

The U.S. government initially supported the [Francisco I.] Madero opposition, since Porfirio Díaz had favored British and French corporations over U.S. ones in the last years of his regime. When Madero proved unable to contain the peasant rebellion that threatened imperi­alist interests in the country, a coup d'état headed by Victoriano Huerta was organ­ized from the U.S. embassy itself, using the intact structure of the Díaz régime. The U.S. imperialists invaded Mexico in 1914 in support of [Venustiano] Carranza, who claimed the mantle of the national bourgeoisie found it necessary to incorporate the trade unions in the state. Although the capture of Mexico City in December 1914 by the Ejército Libertador del Sur (Laboratory Army of the South) and the División del Norte (Northern Division) marked the highest point of the peasant struggle but also the beginning of its decline. Due to the intermediate position of the peasants in society—a product of their nature as a class of small land­owners—whose interests are not independent of those of the two main classes in soci­ety—their leaders were unable to form a central power and develop a program for the transformation of society as a whole.

Although there was a working class in Mexico, it was dispersed and, more funda­mentally, did not play an independent role during the revolutionary struggle, being subordinated either to the radical petty-bourgeois peasant program or that of the constitutionalist bourgeoisie. Some atomized workers fought in the División del Norte, while sugar mill workers were an essential part of the Zapataista base in the state of Morelos, and railroad work­ers participated in the rebel columns of Carranza/Obrégón through their trai­torous leaderships and used to suppress the peasant revolts.

Contrary to the objective perspective held by the entire Mexican left, including the GEM previously, the fate of the Rev­olution was not predetermined. A revolu­tionary Marxist nucleus could have rad­i­cally changed the course of events of the revolution, mobilizing the proletariat in defense of the land expropriations and calling for the proper implementation of Zapata's program at the national level. Accomplishing this task would necessarily have posed the expropriation of the capitalist-owned means of production—as well as those of their local lackeys—and the seizure of power: socialist revolution backed by a peasant war. The struggle, in deeds, for a workers and peasants government would have sealed the alliance between these two classes without which a social revolu­tion was simply impossible. It would have galvanized the peasant armies by presenting them with a way forward, split the constitutionalist army, wrecked the working class from its anarchist leader­ship and served as a beacon to the more powerful U.S. proletariat.

Although the peasant rebellion was finally crushed in blood and fire and its leaders assassinated, things did not return to the old status quo; the economic regime of the hacendad and the political power of the landlords was broken. Thus, the revolution eliminated some of the threads to the modernization of the country, allowing the national bourgeoisie a cer­tain amount of room for maneuver with respect to the imperialists. The 1917 Constitution, promulgated in the aftermath of the defeat of the peasant armies, was per­haps one of the most radical of its time.

Against imperialist interests, it promul­gated that the land, water and subsistence were the property of the nation. It also laid the legal basis for significant concessions to peasants and workers, such as agrarian land distribution, public education and labor rights. At the same time, due to its own weakness, growing imperialist pressure and fear of a new radical uprising, the national bourgeoisie found it necessary to resort to a series of bonapartist military caudillos—who claimed the mantle of revolution—to stabilize their regime.

Cardenismo: Obstacle to the Implementation of the National Revolution

Despite the achievements of the Mex­ican Revolution, its fundamental tasks of agrarian revolution and national emancipa­tion were not resolved. The masses of workers and peasants could see that and continued to seethe. The distribution of land and other beneficial measures granted by the populist governments of Obregón and [Plutarco Elías] Calles were not enough to contain the struggles and aspirations of the masses. The interests of the masses clashed with imperialist domi­nation and the national bourgeois regime.

This situation, aggravated by the Great Depression, led to an upsurge of the work­ers and peasants during the government of Lázaro Cárdenas [1934-40]. He took advantage of this national context to expropriate the oil industry from the hands of the imperialists, in addition to carrying out a massive agrarian land distri­bution as never seen before in the coun­try's history. The antagonism between the U.S. and British imperialists, the immi­nence of World War II and, particularly, the intensification of the class struggle in the U.S. (which led to the formation of the CIO union federation in 1935) gave Cárdenas considerable room for maneuver to implement these measures.

The Mexican bourgeoisie balances prec­ariously between the two decisive ele­ments in the national economy: imperialist finance capital and the proletariat at home. The collision between these two forces determines the actions of the national bourgeoisie. Cárdenas carried out truly progressive measures, while resorting to semi-totalitarian methods to contain and discipline the masses. Trotsky explained: “We see in Mexico and the other Latin American countries [they] skipped over most stages of the development. It begins in Mexico directly by incorporat­ing the trade unions in the state. In Mex­ico, we have no domination of the workers. That is, foreign capital and the national bour­geoisie, or, as Diego Rivera formulated it, a ‘sub-bourgeoisie’—a stratum which is controlled by foreign capital and at the same time opposed to the workers. In Mexico a semi-Bonapartist regime between foreign capital and national cap­i­tal, foreign capital and the workers.”

“Every government can create in a case like this a position of oscillation, of inci­tability from the imperialists to the national bourgeoisie or workers and another time to foreign capital. In order to have the workers in their hands, they incorporated the trade unions in the state.”—[La American Problems: A Transcript] (November 1938)

Because the national bourgeoisie needs the national bourgeoisie must rely on the masses to try to push back the imperi­alists. The more it tries to keep foreign finance capital at bay, the tighter its con­trol over the masses must be so that they do not threaten its regime. Thus, Cárdenas created a corporatist structure to secure a base of support against the imperialists and reaction, while at the same time regi­mentalizing the workers’ and peasants’ organ­izations, which ended up integrated into the bourgeois Partido de la Revolución Mexicana (PRM). Corporatism brought relative stability to the Mexican bourgeois regime, not only containing the outbreaks of discontent within limits acceptable to the capitalists, but ensuring, above all, that the national bourgeoisie kept in its hands the leadership of the struggle against imperialist capital.

The main lesson of the Cardenista period is precisely the need for a differ­ent leader­ship of this struggle, that is, a communist leadership. While the Mexi­can bourgeoisie is oppressed by the impe­rialists it is tied down by the threads of capitulation. Although the nationalizations of the oil and railroads—and other pro­gressive measures—infuriated the impe­rialists, the bourgeoisie cannot challenge imperialist hegemony without challeng­ing the basis of the system: the national bourgeoisie or workers. The Mexican Revolution: national emancipa­tion and agrarian revolution.

The national bourgeoisie’s leadership of this struggle is, by the same token, fearful and limited, and will ultimately lead to betrayal. Like Trotsky from imperial oppression requires the work­ers masses to wage struggle for their own interests, what the national bourgeoisie brought to the arms of the imperi­alists. What Trotsky wrote about China in 1927, is also relevant to Mexico: “Thereby to revitalize the workers and peas­ants against imperialism is possible only...” (continued from page 16)
Class collaboration cedes the leadership of the struggle against the imperialists to the bourgeoisie—a reactionary class. Those who advocate a return to Cárdenismo are condemned to repeat the betrayal of the CTM union federation and the Partido Comunista Mexicano, which subordinated the exploited and oppressed masses to the national bourgeoisie, chain ing them to the corporatist system and the PRM, in what Trotsky called the popular front in 1928.

In contrast, Trotsky fought for a Mexican section of the Fourth International that could cooperate with the national bourgeoisie for the leadership in the struggle against the imperialists. This meant both fighting to play the leading role in the defense of Mexico against the imperialists and accosting at every step the class antagonism—expressed in the masses and the interests and role of the bourgeoisie, exposing how the bour geoisie is sharpened by imperialist oppression, and that even to defend the most elementary of the struggles at every turn and breaking them to the corporatist system and the PRM, in what Trotsky called the popular front in 1928.

One of the central lies pushed by the populists is that Mexico's current devastation is due solely to neoliberal governments. Cárdenas and previous governments had brought about the devastation of the country. Instead, the populists channel the discontent of the masses and the interests and role of the bourgeoisie, exposing how the bourgeoisie is by applying the theory of populism. If AMLO gives in to the U.S. campaign to fight for this leadership is presented by the electrical reform proposed by López Obrador for Mexico to open its energy market and does not pose a fundamental challenge to the imperialists, as can be clearly seen by looking at the USMCA—US—Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). At the same time, the regime has politically subordinated the workers movement, exploiting illusions in a populist alternative, and has sought to regiment it in various ways strengthening state control over the unions with labor reform, advancing the militarization of the country and taking advantage of the pandemic to further the corporatist system and the PRM, in what Trotsky called the popular front in 1928.

We Trotskyists must fight to mobilize the working class to fight for AMLO's revolution not to fight against or confuse the workers, but rather to fight against the monopoly for economic reason. Because of their role in holding back the working class, the populists are an obstacle to fighting for a limited measure of national emancipation. At the same time that we fight for this reform, we must warn that AMLO will sabotage the struggle for national emancipation at every turn, just as he did a year and a half ago when he abandoned his populist illusions in a populist alternative, and has sought to regiment it in various ways strengthening state control over the unions with labor reform, advancing the militarization of the country and taking advantage of the pandemic to further the corporatist system and the PRM, in what Trotsky called the popular front in 1928.

If AMLO's reform is carried out, it would be a de facto nationalization with compensation of these plants. In response, workers, peasants, students, and the elderly and other sectors. However, the López Obrador regime accepted greater oversight, in accordance with the USMCA, or else they will impose millions in tariffs, threatening to reverse the purchase. Leaving this fight in the hands of the populists calls the nationalization into question and leaves it to their failure. We Trotskyists must fight to mobilize the working class to fight for AMLO's reform and to defend it against the imperialists, while preserving our political independence and agitating to carry it out through revolutionary methods of class struggle. This reform is minimal and clearly not our program, but it is benefi cial to the national sovereignty of Mexico. The masses see in López Obrador and the Morena party the force that can carry out this type of nationalization. The union leaders (SUTERM [electrical work ers], SNTE [education workers], etc.) have sought to regiment the workers movement, exploiting illusions in a populist alternative. The one most pervasive illusions is that AMLO represents a step in the right direction. What but what has his role been really been? While López Obrador has been very effective in controlling discontent and the social outbursts are not like those faced by Cárdenas, this bourgeoisie government similarly relies on the proletariat and oppressed masses to increase the degree of autonomy of the Mexican bourgeoisie vis-à-vis the imperialists. It has carried out measures in favor of the modernization of the country and in defiance of imperialist and the unions with labor reform, advancing the militarization of the country and taking advantage of the pandemic to further the corporatist system and the PRM, in what Trotsky called the popular front in 1928.

One of the most pernicious illusions is that AMLO represents a step in the right direction. One of the most pernicious illusions is that AMLO represents a step in the right direction. What but what has his role been really been? While López Obrador has been very effective in controlling discontent and the social outbursts are not like those faced by Cárdenas, this bourgeoisie government similarly relies on the proletariat and oppressed masses to increase the degree of autonomy of the Mexican bourgeoisie vis-à-vis the imperialists. It has carried out measures in favor of the modernization of the country and in defiance of imperialist and the unions with labor reform, advancing the militarization of the country and taking advantage of the pandemic to further the corporatist system and the PRM, in what Trotsky called the popular front in 1928.

One of the most pernicious illusions is that AMLO represents a step in the right direction. What but what has his role been really been? While López Obrador has been very effective in controlling discontent and the social outbursts are not like those faced by Cárdenas, this bourgeoisie government similarly relies on the proletariat and oppressed masses to increase the degree of autonomy of the Mexican bourgeoisie vis-à-vis the imperialists. It has carried out measures in favor of the modernization of the country and in defiance of imperialist and the unions with labor reform, advancing the militarization of the country and taking advantage of the pandemic to further the corporatist system and the PRM, in what Trotsky called the popular front in 1928.

One of the most pernicious illusions is that AMLO represents a step in the right direction. What but what has his role been really been? While López Obrador has been very effective in controlling discontent and the social outbursts are not like those faced by Cárdenas, this bourgeoisie government similarly relies on the proletariat and oppressed masses to increase the degree of autonomy of the Mexican bourgeoisie vis-à-vis the imperialists. It has carried out measures in favor of the modernization of the country and in defiance of imperialist and the unions with labor reform, advancing the militarization of the country and taking advantage of the pandemic to further the corporatist system and the PRM, in what Trotsky called the popular front in 1928.
The pressure of imperialism on backward countries and their subject peoples is a card truly characteristic of the basic social character since the oppressor and oppressed represent essentially different levels of development in one and the same country. There is no difference between England and India, Japan and China, and the United States and Mexico. It is so big that we strictly differentiate between oppressor and oppressed countries both in words and in deeds. Our duty to support the latter against the former is a principal characteristic of the liberation movements of semicolonial countries is a semiruling, semipartisan class.

"Not a Workers', and Not a Bourgeoisie?"

V.I. Lenin and Leon Trotsky, leaders of 1917 October Revolution. The Bolsheviks led workers, peasants of Russia to victory over bourgeoisie, thus becoming the first representatives of a new type of anti-imperialist struggle for democratic tasks with the struggle for socialism. By applying the lessons of this revolution, the ICL will be able to struggle for the liberation of colonial and neocolonial peoples—and the entire world—from the imperialist yoke.

The Espartaco No. 14 article states: “Ever since the Mexican Revolution, the bourgeoisie has used nationalism, opportunism, anti-clericalism and a socialist-populist rhetoric as an ideological weapon in consolidating its power against competing factions and justifying its repression of workers’ struggles and peasant insurrections.” Thus, it rants against the nationalism of the oppressed and the separation of church and state prents the populism that emerged from the Mexican Revolution as purely reactionary and nothing more than an ideological ploy to “repulse the workers and peasants. It also totally denies the contradictions of populism and that populism is also directed against the imperialists.

Both articles denounced Cárdenas because his “intention was to modernize the country for the benefit of the Mexican bourgeoisie” and because his legacy “was the consolidation of the Mexican bourgeoisie regime.” Far from being reactionary, these measures were historically progressive insofar as they were directed against the imperialists. One can only deny the progressive character of Mexico’s national development if one rejects the struggle of the peasants and workers against imperialist oppression.

To give an air of authority to our re-reading position, we misrepresented a quote of Trotsky: “Under the conditions of the imperialist epoch the national democratic revolution can be carried through to a victorious end only when the social and political relationships of the country are mature for putting the proletariat in power as the leader of the masses of the people. And if this is not yet the case, the participation of the bourgeoisie for national liberation will produce only very partial results, results directed entirely against the working masses.”

Certainly, the Mexican Revolution paved the way to a bloodbath of the peasants, and Cárdenas subdued the working masses. The problem with this, however, is that it denounces the reactionary outcome of such processes, but that it used this quote to oppose the progressive measures and objectives that Trotsky himself emphatically defended during his stay in Mexico. The actual content of this quote is that the actual crime and expression of the reactionary nature of the national bourgeoisie is to suppress at every step the force capable of achieving national liberation. Only the proletariat, at the head of the poor peasantrty, can realize this goal in an uninterrupted struggle leading to its own dictatorship and, ultimately, through the revolution, the abolition of social classes themselves. Insofar as the national bourgeoisie maintains its hegemony, then, as Trotsky wrote, “the struggle for national liberation will produce only very partial results, results directed entirely against the working masses.” By repudiating the anti-imperialist struggle, Espartaco contributed to perpetuating the hegemony of the national bourgeoisie.

This line was maintained until the last issue of Espartaco. The article “Permanent Revolution vs. Bourgeois Populism” (Espartaco No. 51, April 2019) is a long denunciation of the “reactionary outcome of a program”—a sterile line against the national bourgeoisie while rejecting the progressive character of the struggle for national emancipation. Not only did we go back to the Cárdenas period to present the same reactionary account of events against imperialism, but we went so far as to deny any reform directed against the imperialists, however limited; and, at least implicitly, we denounced the Cardenista oil nationalization by writing: “Previous governments had preferred to auction off to the highest bidder, foreign or domestic, the nationalized energy industry, by participating in a cynical network of gasoline theft. López Obrador and a wing of the Mexican bourgeoisie has been to develop and extract as much as possible from the little that remains of the national industry, knowing the latest profits that can be extracted from it.”

Given that the entire programmatic basis of every article on Mexico that appeared in Espartaco was contrary to Trotskyism, we ended our publication. We are launching, as of today a new publication under the masthead El Antiimperialista with the slogan “For workers and national emancipation!” which evokes in a condemned form genuine permanent revolution. As Trotsky stated, the anti-imperialist struggle is the key to liberation.

V. I. Lenin and Leon Trotsky, leaders of 1917 October Revolution. The Bolsheviks led workers, peasants of Russia to victory over bourgeoisie, thus becoming the first representatives of a new type of anti-imperialist struggle for democratic tasks with the struggle for socialism. By applying the lessons of this revolution, the ICL will be able to struggle for the liberation of colonial and neocolonial peoples—and the entire world—from the imperialist yoke.
For Workers’ and National Emancipation!

Down With U.S. Imperialism!

Printed below is a translation of the lead article from El Antiimperialista No. 1 (May 2023), the new press of our comrades of the Grupo Espartaquista de México. It is an edited version of the main motion voted at the GEM’s Ninth National Conference, which refounded the GEM on the authentic Trotskyist program of permanent revolution.

The main task of communists today is to forge, in opposition to the populists, a revolutionary leadership of the struggle against imperialism that is capable of leading it to victory. This is the essence of permanent revolution in Mexico. To carry out this task, we must show that only by breaking with the bourgeoisie-nationalist leaderships, particularly Andrés Manuel López Obrador (AMLO), will the working class be able to advance the struggle for its national and social aspirations. This requires destroying the lie that the national bourgeoisie—since it is also nationally oppressed—is a vehicle for achieving emancipation from the imperialist yoke and upholding the interests of the workers and peasants. With this deception, the trade-union bureaucracies and their left tails subordinate the workers movement to the bourgeoisie, leading it to one defeat after another.

To destroy this illusion, we have to show that the fundamental contradiction that characterizes AMLO’s populism is that despite the progressive reforms historically carried out by the bourgeoisie, it and its state have remained the main obstacle to social progress and the attainment of national emancipation. The central betrayal of the nationalist bourgeoisie has been to restrain the proletariat, the only force capable of achieving national liberation, in order to maintain its hegemony. What has been lacking throughout Mexican history, and what is lacking today, is a Trotskyist party that acts as a revolutionary pole in counterposing the pop- ulation to the populist leaders of the working class. Such a pole can only be built by seeking to organize and push forward the struggle for the national and social emancipation of the country, showing at every step how populism stands as an obstacle to the liberation of the masses. The task of this national conference will be the refounding of the Mexican section with this perspective.

For Workers’ and National Emancipation!

Printed below is a translation of the article on the refounding of the Grupo Espartaquista de México from El Antiimperialista No. 1 (May 2023). Esparta, the GEM’s previous newspaper, has ceased publication.

In the colonial and semicolonial countries, the struggle for national emancipation against imperialism is not just another aspect of the revolutionary program; it is the fundamental strategic question for the revolution. However, the GEM’s program since its founding has been the opposite: a capitulation to U.S. imperialism, on the basis that the main task and strategic objective for Marxists in a country plundered and devastated by imperialist predation is the struggle against bourgeois nationalism and that the main enemy is the Mexican bourgeoisie. By rejecting the fact that the whole country, including the national bourgeoisie, is oppressed by the imperialists and by rejecting the strategic nature of the struggle for national liberation, the GEM basically took sides with imperialism. This line, “Made in U.S.A.” and imposed on the GEM, was an absolute repudiation of the Trotskyist program of permanent revolution in the service of social-chauvinism. As Trotsky explained: “The internal regime in the colonial and semicolonial countries could not flourish under the economic growth model promoted by Perífriso Díaz. It initially converged with the interests of the powerful northern bourgeoisie—which sought regime change, but also the disappearance of the hacendado that was a brake on the development of capitalism in the countryside—and those of the asphyxiated petty bourgeoisie, linked to an internal market that could not flourish under the economic growth model promoted by Díaz. However, in very short order their interests clashed with those of the insurrectionary peasant masses, who fought for the egalitarian right...