



Nahuel Moreno

**The Trade Union Bureaucracy:
An Essentially Ideological or
Socio-Economic Phenomenon?**

Nahuel Moreno

The Trade Union Bureaucracy: An Essentially Ideological or Socio-Economic Phenomenon?

8 September 1959
Archival material

English Translation: Daniel Iglesias

Cover and interior design: Daniel Iglesias

Editor notes: Daniel Iglesias, Agustín Gigli

www.nahuelmoreno.org

www.uit-ci.org

www.izquierdasocialista.org.ar

Copyright by CEHuS, Centro de Estudios Humanos y Sociales
Buenos Aires, 2026s
cehus2014@gmail.com



Foreword

In September 1959, the party received an excerpt from the “Open Letter on Our Fundamental Differences,” signed by Moreno and addressed to the “Rodin” faction, made up of some trade union leaders.

Between 15 and 17 August 1959, the First Congress of Palabra Obrera (Workers’ Word) was held. Among the debates was an assessment that identified an union deviation and the lack of political work within the main unions as major shortcomings. This gave rise to a central controversy of the period: the nature and role of the trade union bureaucracy. Within the congress, the debate was led by Vasco Bengochea, on behalf of the Palabra Obrera leadership, and the Peronist leader Alicia Eguren, wife of John William Cooke, who had been invited to represent him as he was in hiding.

In this debate, Héctor Fucito (Rodin), an important party trade union leader, sided with Eguren. For them, it was necessary to win over the leadership of the 62 Peronist Organisations to revolutionary positions, based on ideological debate.

In the text we reproduce here, Moreno argues that the position of the leadership of the 62 Organisations, against the workers and their struggles, is not merely an ideological issue, but rather stems from an economic and social issue rooted in the privileges they enjoy as leaders in the bureaucratised trade unions.

Shortly after the congress, the members of the “Rodin” faction broke with Palabra Obrera and in September 1960, after the defeat of the conflict at Productex, in which they applied their orientation, they disappeared as an organisation.

For more information, see *El trotskismo obrero e internacionalista en la Argentina* (Working-Class and Internationalist Trotskyism in Argentina), González, Ernesto, coordinator. Vol. 1, tome 3, Editorial Antídoto, 1999. Available at <https://nahuelmoreno.org/el-trotskismo-obrero-e-internacionalista-en-la-argentina/> (only in Spanish).

The notes are by the editors.

The editors

January 2026

The Trade Union Bureaucracy: An Essentially Ideological or Socio-Economic Phenomenon?

(Excerpt from the “Open Letter on Our Fundamental Differences” addressed to the comrades of the Rodin faction).

Buenos Aires, 8 September 1959

Every theoretical problem, of characterisation, is reflected in all aspects of the activity. This is why there is no problem that differentiates us more than the characterisation that we have of the trade union bureaucracy. We have, with regard to the faction, completely opposite, antagonistic characterisations. From these antagonistic characterisations emerges a diametrically opposed characterisation and overall program.

“(...) the trade union bureaucracy as the **agent of this bourgeois conception embedded in the workers' movement**” (p. 21). “(...) fall into the **vulgarity of fighting the trade union leaders exclusively for traitors and lovers of armchairs and not because of their ideology**” (p. 25) “(...) We believe that the essential thing is to fight the leadership of the 62 Organisations¹ because of the bourgeois ideology in which it is oriented, its discipline and its adherence to the bourgeois leadership, be it Peron, Frigerio,² Frondizi³” (p. 20).

This characterisation, that leaves no room for doubt, is the historical culmination of the definition from two years ago, “it is a leadership that as a whole reflects the state of mind of the working class” (...) (p. 4).

We believe that what is essential in the **characterisation of the leaders of the Argentine trade union movement is the “vulgarity”, the tragic “vulgarity”, that they are “traitors and lovers of armchairs, who are an socio-economic sector, a privileged economic caste within the workers' movement, the freeloaders of the Argentine workers and that is characterised by the opposite of what they (the members of the faction) say, because ideology”, “the bourgeois conception”, “discipline and their adherence to the bourgeois leadership are of almost no importance to them.” The adherence and discipline of the union leadership is to their chair, with its material and social advantages. For these advantages they are willing to break “discipline” and “adherence to the bourgeois leadership” a thousand times over, as well as to abandon or fabricate a new ideology.**

This is the great problem of the world workers' movement: the bureaucratic apparatuses and the trade union and political bureaucracy of the workers' movement. It is precisely our workers' movement that supports one of the strongest and most sinister bureaucratic apparatuses of the world workers' movement, not because of their adherence to bourgeois discipline and ideology, but because of the way in which

1 The **62 Peronist Trade Union Organisations** were the organisation of struggle of the Argentine workers' movement against the regime of the “Libertarian Revolution,” born of the coup d'état that overthrew Perón in 1955. Later they were transformed into a nucleation of the bureaucratic leadership of Peronist syndicalism.

2 **Rogelio Frigerio** (1914-2006) was an Argentine economist and politician. An adherent of developmentalism, in 1958 he was Secretary of Socio-Economic Affairs in the critical Economics Ministry.

3 **Arturo Frondizi** (1908-1995) was an Argentinian lawyer and politician elected President of Argentina between May 1958 and March 1962. He was elected on the ticket for the Intransigent Radical Civic Union (a splinter group from the Radical Civic Union). He won with the support of Peron who gave the order and was massively taken up by the workers, to vote for him. Under his program of “Developmentalism”, he encouraged increased foreign investment. He was overthrown by a military coup d'état in 1962.

they balance the powerful trade union organisation of the Argentine workers' movement. The bureaucracy is essentially **a privileged section of the workers' movement and not a section ideologically influenced by the bourgeoisie.**

Like any social group, the bureaucracy has an ideology and a political discipline **that modifies and adapts to its privileged socio-economic interests.**

The analysis of the bureaucracy in general, of Argentina in particular, must revolve around socio-economic problems and not ideological ones. These are important but secondary, because the bureaucracy, like any privileged sector, if it did not have an ideology, would invent it. The trade union bureaucracy, because of its character, is highly contradictory: it depends on the organisation of the workers' movement but lives at its expense. Its ideology and political discipline are constantly changing, its ideological and programmatic conservatism, its hatred of the independent mobilisation of the working class while continuing to defend and fight for its economic and social privileges.

Specifically: the constant ideology of the trade union bureaucracy is the vulgar hatred of any independent control and mobilisation of the workers' rank and file because it can make them lose or endanger their privileged existence within the workers' movement. The misfortune of the world workers' movement is precisely that: that it suffers the leadership of a privileged bureaucracy which lives at the expense of the workers' movement and that, as a consequence, fights against any autonomous, free revolutionary mobilisation of the workers' movement.

None of this means that there are no links between the bourgeoisie and imperialism, fundamentally the bourgeois state, and the bureaucracy. But these links are **fundamentally socio-economic and not ideological.**

That is, we can define historically the workers' bureaucracy as agents of the bourgeoisie, and the fundamental sectors of the trade union bureaucracy of the backward countries as agents of the national bourgeoisie, provided that we clarify that it is for socio-economic reasons and not for ideological reasons. The great apparatuses and strong bureaucracies cannot be explained without the complacency or protection of the state and, to a lesser degree, of the bourgeoisie.

We can define the bureaucracy as an agent of the bourgeoisie, as we do with the bourgeoisie in relation to imperialism. If the bourgeois state or a section of the bourgeoisie allows the bureaucracy its privileged existence, this is its agent. Structurally, it is also an agent of the bourgeoisie because its privileged existence is historically safe only if the bourgeois regime continues to exist. But, again, the fundamental factor is the role of the state: without a benevolent, conciliatory state, there is no possibility of the existence of a powerful trade union bureaucracy.

The tremendous strength of the Argentine trade union bureaucracy, as well as its cowardice and incapacity, come from the fabulous control, handouts given to it by the Peronist state. Hence its sinister counterrevolutionary character.

This explains the profound deficiency to judge the future of the Argentine union bureaucracy in 1957, when we pointed out its transitory nature. And our analysis was confirmed, although apparently it may not seem so because **the Peronist bureaucracy has survived thanks to a political-economic factor and not an ideological one: the triumph of Frondizi with his Law of Professional Associations.** In 1957, we could not have foreseen this political-economic phenomenon, the Law of Professional Associations and the Frondizist state semi-protection. In this sense, we again make a prediction: the current bureaucracy cannot endure one or two years of Aramburu-style⁴ trade union politics, it is a transitory phenomenon, it can only settle on numerous privileges that for economic and social reasons each day will be more difficult to obtain. That was and is the basis of our analysis of the bureaucracy as an agent of the bourgeois state and the bourgeoisie.

Let us now turn to the phenomenon of Peronist bureaucracy. This has a very relative clerical, national, bourgeois ideology. Let us take a supposed example: the bureaucracy of the cotton textile branch,

4 **Pedro Eugenio Aramburu** (1903-1970) was an Argentine Army general. He was a major figure behind the military coup self-named Liberating Revolution against Juan Domingo Peron in 1955. He became de facto president of Argentina from November 1955 to May 1958. He was kidnapped and executed by Montoneros.

if it has good relations with the bosses of the branch, if these bosses allow it to enhance its branch and its material advantages, it will be closely linked to those bosses, it will be their agent. The same with silk. And if silk bosses are pro-imperialist and cotton bosses are nationalist, both bureaucracies will be ideologically the same, respectively.

We should transfer this schematic, but essentially correct, analysis to the entire Argentine trade union movement and it will give us fundamental results to understand the Peronist bureaucracy, mainly to explain how within the Peronist bloc there are different wings, groups or factions that have to do with the different socio-economic situation of each union and bureaucracy. The extreme right of the bureaucracy is that of the Meatworks; they negotiate and make pacts with the imperialist companies. The extreme left is in negotiations with the national, light industry, which depends on the internal market.

This also explains why there are sectors of the union bureaucracy that were with Frigerio and the pro-Yankee plan, to the right of bourgeois nationalist ideologues. For them, the fundamental, the **essential thing** in their dealings with the bourgeois and imperialist sectors, as well as with the government and political parties, is to know **whether they respect the union with its impressive material advantages, salary, car, visibility, etc.** Their ideology and discipline will be subordinated to this fact: they will help those who respect it and help them maintain their privileges within the union organisation. The Argentine union leaders respect and abide by the ideology and discipline of those who respect their organisation and privileges.

That is also the reason for the opposite, when the bureaucracy **breaks** with its bosses or with the state, it is when these bosses or the state attack the union organisation and the bureaucratic privileges. Then the bureaucracy resorts to adventurist or desperate methods of class struggle.

In other words, the bureaucracy is a very special agent of the bourgeoisie and the national state. It can be much further to the right and in outright opposition to the bourgeoisie and national state. **It all depends on the prospects of its socio-economic privileges.** Also, the privileges and only the economic privileges, explain how a bureaucratic apparatus can have different ideological influences (some clerical leaders, others atheists, Peronists, Radicals) that do not affect its unity and, in opposition to this, they can be under the same bourgeois ideology and discipline (being Peronists) and yet being disunited. This has happened and happens, for example, with the Peronist blocs at all levels. They break up and sometimes a Peronist sector acts in total agreement with integrationists, Radicals and other stuff like that.

Who is our main enemy in our workplace: the national bourgeois ideological campaign or the trade union bureaucracy?

From this total difference in the characterisation of the bureaucracy arise all our other differences, which are no less important, but which arise from it. Every movement or tendency must clearly distinguish who is its main enemy. Between the three signatories of the note and us there is a profound difference about the character of our enemies.

“That our agitative proposals (we must do this, that and vote for so-and-so) as **long as they did not counteract the bourgeois ideological pressure on the workers’ ranks meant in practice handing over the masses and their leaders to their class adversaries**” (p. 6).

And so that we have no doubts, on page 21 you round off your position by clarifying which enemy must be fought to structure our “revolutionary proletarian tendency” (in our case within the national movement), “we can only understand it as a process of **ideological and practical decantation** within the mass movement; ideological, insofar as it combats the **bourgeois, clerical, and military nationalist conception of the popular movement; practical insofar as it denounces the trade union bureaucracy as the agent of this bourgeois conception embedded in the workers’ movement.**”

Both ideologically and practically, the main enemy is the “bourgeois conception”. That conception won the February plenum. We can bring a whole series of quotes like that.

We completely disagree with this interpretation. First of all, we will clarify that we are referring to the fundamental, internal enemy, within the place where we are active. Our tendency does not work in general

within the popular or national movement but, much more specifically, **within the Peronist union movement, that is, the 62 Organisations.**

Our main enemy within the 62 Organisations is not the bourgeois conception but the bureaucratic apparatus and the union bureaucracy, that is, the current union leaders, with their current conception and discipline.

A class is different from a party in its internal life. A party, because of its ideological character, is superstructural, much more susceptible to propagandistic ideological pressures than a class with its sectors is. The life and dynamics of a class are fundamentally based on the contradictions between its socio-economic sectors with their policies and ideologies. Let us take an example. Within the Argentine industrial bourgeoisie, there are different socio-economic sectors: those linked to the internal market who do not want to completely crush the working class; those closely linked to large imperialist companies; those who defend the developing heavy industry and, finally, those who depend on exports, closely linked to British imperialism. Each of these sectors has different interests, different ideologies and different policies. The policy of the bourgeoisie as a whole depends on the clash of these sectors, on the overall situation of the bourgeoisie in the face of the working class and imperialism.

Let us suppose that the majority of the bourgeoisie became convinced of the need to crush the organisations of the working class, and that a minority, reflecting the light sectors, is against crushing them. Let us further suppose that this sector of the bourgeoisie, to impose its interests and its policy, were to call for a workers' mobilisation in its support. How would the bourgeois laugh if some idiot said that their greatest enemy is the proletarian conception and that the light bourgeoisie is the agent of this ideological conception.

The enemy of the politics as a whole is a bourgeois sector that because of its socio-economic position, and not because of its proletarian ideology, is against the majority of its class because of the needs of its socio-economic position.

The same thing happens with the working class. There are different sectors that dispute its hegemony, its leadership. These sectors reflect different socio-economic situations in their ideology and politics. Of these sectors, the most sinister, the most conservative, because of its privileged socio-economic location, is the union bureaucracy, supported by the petty bourgeois sectors of the workers' movement. We reflect, ideologically, politically, and historically, the opposite socio-economic sector, the most exploited, miserable sectors, as the uncompromisingly anti-capitalist and anti-bureaucratic vanguard and working-class youth place it.

Our main enemy within the workers' movement, in this case within the unions, is the union bureaucracy since, because of its privileged socio-economic location, it is counterrevolutionary by nature. Hence, we must fight it to the bitter end for what it is, as our main enemy in our fundamental workplace. But not to fight it for its role as an ideological agent but for a much deeper reason: for its socio-economic privileges, or to put it vulgarly, for its "armchairs and betrayals" that make it an agent of the exploiters.

Is the union bureaucracy not to blame for our defeats?

On page 6, we learn that the February plenum, which gave the government a truce, was "**a very important victory for the reactionary nationalist campaign and the bourgeois leadership, which for months had been exerting itself over the union leadership.**" This is radically false. The February plenum was a triumph of the bureaucracy against the workers' movement and the best activists, a reflection, consequence of Frondizi's triumph over the workers' movement in the January general strike. Put another way, the workers' movement has two exploiters: one internal and one external. The external ones: imperialism and the bourgeoisie. The internal one: the bureaucracy. When the external enemies, imperialism and the bourgeoisie, symbolised by the Frondizi government, beat up the workers' movement, the internal enemy becomes stronger against the working-class ranks. The same will happen if the metalworkers' strike is completely defeated; Vandor⁵ and Co. Ltd., dominated the metalworkers' union

⁵ Augusto Timoteo Vandor (1923-1969) was a trade union bureaucrat who led the recovery of the UOM (Metalworkers Union), which had been taken over after the military coup that overthrew Perón in 1955. In the 1960s, he tried to promote a "Peronism

to the death but not because the bourgeois ideological campaign triumphed, but because the workers' movement is objectively and not ideologically defeated and, therefore, its retreat is general against all its exploiters inside and outside the movement: imperialism, the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy.

Often, this victory leads the bourgeoisie to attack the union organisations and bureaucratic privileges. Only then does the bureaucracy weaken, along with the workers' movement. But if the workers' movement is defeated and the bourgeois state and the bourgeoisie respect the privileged interests of the bureaucracy, the bureaucracy finds itself with enough strength to win an additional victory against the workers' rank and file and its vanguard. This happened in February.

I thought this was a mere date among the many in the faction's document when, joining the dots together, I realized that we are in the presence of a partial analysis of the greatest political crime in the faction's document. It is no secret to anyone that the faction is against the chapter of our latest political report where the rogue policy of the union bureaucracy is attacked and characterised. There is a reason for this that the entire document confirms: for the faction, the union leadership is not guilty of anything, nor is it necessary to replace it, change it. They say it categorically: "To conclude, we said that if **the bourgeois ideology and leadership of the workers' and national movement is what explains its constant retreat, that without overcoming it, it will no longer be able to obtain any important victory ...**" (p. 17). Not a word about the union leadership, which has no fault in the constant retreat and does not need to be overcome.

But just as important as this is what they don't say. Nowhere in the document do they point out on their own account that the main culprit of the retreat is the union leadership and that sweeping it away is the indispensable condition for any improvement in the workers' movement.

This is too much for our "anti-bureaucratic sectarianism". The February plenum, "a very important victory of the nationalist campaign", the constant retreat explained by the "bourgeois ideology and leadership" and, to top it off, not a single word in the entire document about the urgent need to sweep away the bureaucratic leadership that the Argentine workers' movement suffers as the only possibility of improvement.

Assimilation or destruction of the trade union bureaucracy?

From a special difference in the characterisation of the bureaucracy, our main enemy and the culprit of the retreat, necessarily arises a radically different perspective in relation to the union bureaucracy.

At the last congress of Palabra Obrera [Workers' Word], all the comrades of the organisation heard a passionate discussion between Eguren⁶ and all the congressional comrades, with the exception of Comrades L. and R. (from the faction) who expressly or tacitly supported Eguren.

That discussion revolved around Eguren's proposition that the union leadership of the 62 Organisations had not betrayed but had made a mistake because of a lack of good education, that we had to be patient and educate the leaders. Comrade R. in his speech stated verbatim that Eguren was right as opposed to the congress delegates. Was that dramatic, conclusive agreement a coincidence?

If we study the document of the signatories, we can conclusively verify that R. brilliantly expressed the general position of the signatories when he supported Eguren against us and the entire congress. For them, as Eguren stated, everything is a mere merely a problem of education, ideology, conceptions. Union leaders can be won over to revolutionary positions through a strong ideological campaign together with the workers' rank and file.

without Perón", which was quickly aborted by the exiled leader in Madrid. A month after the Cordobazo, in June 1969, he was executed by a small armed Peronist group that years later would join the Montoneros.

6 **Alicia Eguren** (1925–disappeared in 1977). Argentine teacher, poet, essayist, and journalist. She was the partner of Peronist leader John William Cooke. Together with him, she participated in the conclusion of the Perón-Frondizi agreement in 1957. From 1960 onwards, she was actively involved in revolutionary Cuba. In 1959, she participated in the first Palabra Obrera congress as a guest representing Cook. See González, Ernesto. *El trotskismo obrero e internacionalista en la Argentina* (Working-Class and Internationalist Trotskyism in Argentina) Vol. 1, tome 3, Editorial Antídoto, 1999.

Let's see: "(...) they did not counteract the bourgeois ideological pressure on the workers' ranks; it meant in practice handing over the masses and their leaders to the class adversaries" (p. 6) (...) we are pushing the workers and their leaders into the arms of the bourgeois leadership (...) (p. 20). "(...) It was not taken into account that there will be no decisive changes in the class leadership as long as there is no ideological differentiation between both activists and leaders" (p. 25).

Eiguren had the same opinion: Bourgeois ideology corrupts the workers' movement and the leaders, let us carry out the pedagogical and ideological struggle against it and we will win over to revolutionary positions the masses and the leaders, or a sector of the masses with their leaders.

Just as the current characterisation of the bureaucracy is in line with the old definition from two years ago, this task of winning over the leadership for anti-bourgeois revolutionary positions is in line with what Comrade R. pointed out to us two years ago, as he himself quotes: "a) to bring to the fore the work on the 62 Organisations, aimed at structuring the revolutionary tendency within them; b) to develop Peron's "insurrectionary" instructions on **the union leadership** and propose concrete agreements to the most conscious **leaders** about this. By "62 Organisations" he meant the work on the union leadership, since we were and are agreeing on working on the ranks of the unions.

Every moderately informed comrade knows that a revolutionary tendency has nothing to do with a leftist tendency, least of all the signatory comrades. Among the bureaucracy there are left and right class (appeal to class) or negotiating tendencies; depending on the circumstances. What there is not and there cannot be is a revolutionary tendency within the bureaucracy, because a revolutionary tendency is characterised by its intransigent fight, among others, against bureaucratic privileges.

That is to say, there are bureaucrats or tendencies further to the left than other bureaucrats or tendencies but **what can never be structured within the current union leaderships of the 62 Organisations is a revolutionary tendency**. What can never be achieved from the union leaderships is that they abandon, even if we have ten *Mayoria* and a newspaper like *La Razon*, their anti-revolutionary, pro-bourgeois and pro-imperialist ideology because that ideology comes to them, not from outside their existence but from their own privileged daily existence as union bureaucrats.

Our attitude towards the union leadership is one of uncompromising class struggle against them. Our *raison d'être* is the uncompromising struggle against imperialism and the bourgeoisie outside the workers' movement and the same uncompromising struggle within the workers' movement against the bureaucratised workers' leaderships.

We want to sweep away imperialism, the bourgeoisie, and the workers' leaderships in Argentina, the union leaderships. We do not want to tear the union leaders out of the arms of the bourgeoisie but rather to mercilessly crush the bourgeoisie, imperialism and the union leaders. We do not believe, therefore, that the union leaderships can be saved, they are condemned by their socio-economic location to be a privileged sector; of course, some leader, like some bourgeois, like some official of some imperialist company, can join the ranks of the revolutionary workers' movement as an exception.

All this does not mean that we carefully distinguish between the working class and its "leaders" and do not put them together in the same bag as the faction does. This distinction is because our strategy is to win over the working-class grassroots **to crush, massacre, persecute, sink and when the time comes, slaughter the union leaderships**. Our strategy is not to win or rescue the "workers and their leaders" from the arms of the bourgeoisie but **to turn the workers against their leaders**.

And we do not have this strategy because we are sectarian but because we believe it is practically impossible to win or rescue the current union leaders from the bourgeoisie, because they are united to the exploiters for socio-economic and not ideological reasons.

Between us within the workers' movement and the bureaucracy, there is the same relationship as between us and the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaderships within the national movements. We can and must be in a united front when a common enemy attacks the union or the country but without forgetting that both the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy are our main enemy in the workers' and national movement respectively because they are the agents of the exploiters and imperialism. Agents for structural economic and not ideological reasons. This is why, at the same time as we make or propose a united front, we educate

and tend to educate the working class for the “revolution” against the sinister national bourgeoisies and the bureaucratised leaderships.

In other words, we are conscious that we will have a civil war or something very similar against the national bourgeoisie in the country and in the national movement, and against the workers’ bureaucracy in the workers’ movement. All this is the a-b-c that the comrades of the faction have forgotten, we do not intend to recruit the Argentine union leaders through any ideological campaign but, on the contrary, through a relentless struggle, to sweep them out of the leadership of the workers’ movement.

A program to counter the bourgeois ideological campaign or a program to act against imperialism, the bourgeoisie, the government and the union leaderships?

“Our agitational proposals (we must do this, that, and let’s vote for so-and-so), insofar as they did not counteract the bourgeois ideological pressure on the workers’ ranks, **meant in practice handing over the masses and the leaders to the class adversaries**” (p. 67). “We considered and consider that if our action is limited — as it effectively is — to pointing out or saying “this must be done”, “the leadership of the 62 Organisations must do this other thing”, “the board of the 62 Organisations has betrayed the workers”, etc., we are pushing the workers and their leaders into the arms of the bourgeois leadership, we are fighting evil for its consequences not for its causes, (...) the essential thing is to fight the leadership of the 62 Organisations for their bourgeois ideology...” (p. 20). “The constitution of a revolutionary proletarian tendency (in our case within the national movement) can only be understood as **a process of ideological and practical decantation within the mass movement, etc.**” (p. 21). “It was not taken into account that there would be no decisive change in the leadership of the class as long as there was no **ideological differentiation** between both the activists and the leaders.”

Essentially the structuring of the revolutionary tendency is a process of “counteracting bourgeois ideological pressure” of “ideological and practical decantation”, “fighting the leadership of the 62 Organisations for their bourgeois ideology” of “ideological differentiation”. Saying: “we must do this or that”, “denounce the leadership as traitors” must be done, but it is not the essential thing, the essential thing is the ideological.

We have already dwelt sufficiently on the possibility of an ideological campaign winning over the leaders, to demonstrate its impossibility. Now we are going to dwell on the possibility that this same ideological campaign allows us to win the masses and union activists for our revolutionary tendency.

Orthodox Trotskyism can only be the conscious manifestation of an unconscious process. This means that the struggle against the bourgeoisie and imperialism arises among the masses without our intervention. If this were not the case, everything we do is sterile. Our mission is to bring clarity to the masses about what they are doing and show them the path they are on so that they do not stray. There is no chance for the masses to learn outside of action. It is a more attenuated form, this is true, for the activists of the workers’ movement.

Reality and action are our main and decisive allies in the building of the revolutionary tendency. To consolidate our revolutionary class tendency, correct and concrete positions serve us much more in our struggle against the bosses, imperialism, the government and the bureaucracy than a thousand courses and a weekly propaganda magazine that denounces the most historical, theoretical, and political issues of the national bourgeoisie.

It’s the same as learning to box. There is nothing better than boxing, and specific advice, given the modality of each boxer, to teach them. There is nothing better than swimming and practical, concrete advice to improve the swimmer’s style.

Contemporary social life leads the working class to struggle against the bourgeoisie and imperialism. The same goes for the best activists in relation to bureaucracy. Life itself is what causes the greater or lesser acuity of these conflicts. But the fundamental thing is that these conflicts exist, latent or open, but they do exist. Our revolutionary tendency can only be strengthened to the extent that it provides the best objective solutions to these real, objective conflicts: how to fight the exploiters and the bureaucracy.

These objective solutions, of struggle, are the only ones that will strengthen us as a revolutionary tendency. The activist who fights or begins to fight against the bureaucracy will feel doubly linked to the organisation. First, because our positions of struggle against the exploiters fortify him in the face of the mass movement, as opposed to the bureaucracy. Second, because our positions within the workers' movement strengthen him in his specific struggle against the bureaucracy. Only in this way will the union activist feel linked to our organisation, he will see it as a useful tool in his conscious or unconscious double struggle, against the exploiters and against the union bureaucracy.

Only from there can the struggle against all ideological and theoretical influences be proposed. The formation of a broad, Marxist revolutionary conception must begin and end in the problems that the life of our class and its activists pose to us. And we must always take this into account since theoretical and propaganda training has only one aim, to return to the starting point: the struggle of our class and the activists against the exploiters and the bureaucracy. Specifically, propaganda and ideological training serve because they allow us to give increasingly better practical weapons to the class and activists for their actual, objective struggles against the exploiters and the bureaucracy.

This is why we assert precisely the opposite of the faction. The structuring of the revolutionary tendency is not essentially a process of "decantation" or "ideological differentiation", nor of "countering bourgeois ideological pressure", but rather a struggle to the bitter end, objective, practical and not ideological, against the leadership of the workers' movement – in our country the union leaderships: to the program of action against the exploiters of the leadership we propose another program. At the same time, we must now oppose a concrete program of mobilisation and internal democracy for the workers' movement that goes against the bureaucracy. We consider the ideological struggle a fundamental aid, the rearguard of the true and essential battle, the practical, concrete war, in the action of the class against the exploiters and the union bureaucracy.

In other words, the only thing that can grow and strengthen our revolutionary organisation is the program for class and vanguard action. Only this can definitively tie the activist to our organisation. Our concrete program against the metalworkers' strike strengthens us, fortifies us as a revolutionary tendency in the face of the workers' rank and file and the activists. No course can convince more than reality itself and our own program because even if it is right and that the leaders betray. The ideological can **strengthen** this, it can quantitatively expand this elementary knowledge, but the essential is there. Not even a thousand courses or theoretical analyses teach more than a specific program, life itself. To be convinced of this you only have to chat with a metalworker activist during the course of the strike.