
July 1943

Fourth International

*Manifesto of the Fourth International
on the Dissolution of the Comintern*

**Roosevelt and Labor
after the Third Coal Strike**

by Felix Morrow

The Detroit Pogrom . . . by David Ransom

Behind the Argentine Coup by Terence Phelan

The Giraud-De Gaulle Dispute by Marc Loris

Sidney Hook on Trotskyism by M. Morrison

INTERNATIONAL NOTES: Good News from India

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

The most significant events of the month, from the Business Manager's point of view, were two subscription campaigns in New York and Cleveland.

The wind-up report from New York speaks for itself. We quote:

"A successful campaign for subscriptions to *The Militant* and *Fourth International* was concluded this week by the Central Branch of Local New York, Socialist Workers Party. In the four weeks of the campaign 51 subs (23 of these were subscriptions to *Fourth International*), amounting to \$93.00, were brought in.

"Six competing teams participated in the campaign, with the winning team, 'The Activists,' bringing in 25 subs and a total of \$40.

"The campaign wound up on Sunday, June 20, with a party in honor of the winning team. A special prize was awarded to Clare Hopkins who turned in the highest number of subs—eleven, amounting to \$18. Clare sold in addition two copies of Leon Trotsky's 'In Defense of Marxism' and other party literature.

"Much enthusiasm was aroused by the campaign. The comrades reported that our press is very well received by contacts. The consensus of all reports is that once a worker reads our press he is willing to take a subscription. This has also been the experience of other branches throughout the country, and many comrades have reported, 'All you have to do to get subs is to go after them.'

"The comrades of Central Branch feel gratified with the results of their campaign. They feel they have aided in the accomplishment of important political tasks."

* * *

Cleveland wrote in at the conclusion of its subscription campaign:

"As organizer I have been riding the branch for sometime to get some contacts seen and some subs sold. There were many excuses — lack of time, working hours, tired out, etc., etc. I recently changed jobs myself, from an office job to a tough job in a steel mill. I took the occasion of my change of job to start this campaign in which I challenged

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Volume IV July 1943 No. 7 (Whole No. 35)

Published monthly by the
Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up.

Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: FELIX MORROW

	Page
Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Dissolution of the Comintern.....	195
The Giraud-De Gaulle Dispute..... By Marc Loris	199
Labor and Roosevelt after the Third Coal Strike..... By Felix Morrow	202
The Detroit Pogrom..... By David Ransom	206
Behind the Argentine Coup..... By Terence Phelan	209
Sidney Hook's Attack on Trotskyism By M. Morison	212
<i>From the Arsenal of Marxism:</i>	
It Is Time to Build the Communist Parties and the International Anew..... By Leon Trotsky	215
A Marxist Book on Maritime..... By C. Thomas	218
<i>International Notes:</i>	
India.....	220
Uruguay.....	222
Argentina.....	222
	214

the rest of the branch put together, and said that no excuses could be accepted anymore. We put a little stake on the outcome.

"The result was an even tie, 23 points apiece, a number of new contacts, and a real demonstration that *we could get results if we worked*. We combed our contact list, got a new appreciation of its value, and maybe will get several new members as a result of this activity.

"The rules of the contest were simple: (1) One point for each dollar turned in, *Militant* or *F. I.*; (2) Your own sub counts.

"I am enclosing a list of the subs obtained."

* * *

Other branches also realize the importance of getting subscriptions:

Chicago writes that they "are planning a sub drive soon and expect to do as well as Central Branch or better."

Portland asks us to increase the *Fourth International* bundle and says: "We are having considerable success here in converting our bundle orders to paid subscriptions. The *F. I.* has grown from 2 to 9 paid subs and *The Militant* from 7 to 12. We feel confident of con-

verting into subscriptions all papers distributed."

Seattle informs us it is now making a concerted drive "to do something about the expired subscriptions and the contact list" from which it is hoped to realize many subs.

* * *

Minneapolis and St. Paul recently conducted a thorough discussion on *Fourth International* and from this discussion came many invaluable and interesting opinions. Some of them are:

"The *F. I.* must maintain a high theoretical level, inasmuch as it is the leading organ of theoretical Trotskyism in the world. As such, the *F. I.* must educate Trotskyists and friends of the Trotskyist movement throughout the entire world on the necessity for theoretical clarity in the analysis of their own social and political problems.

"... Contrary to an opinion in the Manager's Column of the May issue, the magazine makes good reading for streetcar riding.

"One housewife gave the opinion that the *F. I.* is much livelier than the *N. I.* was and that she does not regard reading the *F. I.* as a chore.

"Among our friends there is general agreement that the *F. I.* is far superior to the old *New International*, and that no comrades need feel any hesitation about circulating the magazine among worker-contacts."

* * *

The following letter, signed "An *F. I.* and *Militant* Reader," just reached us:

"I just want to let you know that I think the June issue of the *Fourth International* is an excellent edition. I have been reading the magazine since the first of this year and it seems to improve with every edition. All of the articles in the June issue were outstanding, and what was unusually inspiring was Larissa Reissner's article. It brought out the human interest which several people believe is lacking in the magazine. It made the whole theory of the revolutionary movement assume real and dynamic shape. I, for one, would like very much to read more of this woman's writings."

The editor informs us that more of Larissa Reissner's articles are forthcoming.

Ready For Delivery Now
Bound Volume of
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

1942

Price \$3.00

Order now from

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

116 University Place

New York City

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME IV

JULY 1943

NUMBER 7

Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Dissolution of the Comintern

Upon the occasion of the burial of the Third International by its murderer Stalin, the Fourth International addresses the workers of the world, and particularly those who have adhered to the Comintern.

Members of the Communist parties! You thought the Comintern was yours, you devoted your lives to it, but you were permitted no voice in deciding its fate. That fact alone should make clear to you that the Comintern was not yours at all, that you misplaced your devotion, that Stalin and his puppets have betrayed you. On May 22 the Presidium of the Comintern made public its resolution for dissolution—made it public in order to confront you with the accomplished fact. Less than three weeks later, on June 10, the Presidium announced, in the language of a bankrupt shopkeeper, the appointment of a four-man committee “to wind up the affairs, dissolve the organs and dispose of the staff and property of the Communist International.” By what authority was the Comintern dissolved? Ostensibly, in the few days between May 22 and June 10 a long list of Communist parties had approved the resolution of dissolution. Who really approved it? The so-called Central Committees hand-picked by Stalin and his Presidium, but the membership was not even consulted. Among the parties listed as approving, are those of Germany and occupied Europe. But who could pretend to speak for them within three weeks, except a few degenerate bureaucrats living in Moscow? The bureaucratic method of dissolution showed what the Comintern has really been for nearly two decades—a totalitarian instrument in the hands of a clique alien to the interests of the world proletariat.

The last act of the Comintern, characteristically, was a vicious attack against proletarian internationalism. Every reason given in the resolution for dissolution is reactionary to the core.

Why the Comintern Was Founded

Attempting to conceal the abyss which separates the Comintern of Lenin and Trotsky from the Stalinized Comintern, the resolution is silent on why the International was originally founded. It merely says the International “was founded in 1919 as the result of the political collapse of the overwhelming majority of the old pre-war workers’ parties.” But it dares not recall by a single word what that political collapse actually consisted of: support of the war and of their “own” capitalist governments by the parties of the Second International. The Comintern parties have likewise become supporters of capitalist governments and their war, making necessary the founding of the Fourth International for exactly the same reasons for which the Third International was created. The last Comintern resolution falsifies the origins of the Third International in order to conceal the historical necessity for the Fourth International.

For the same reason the resolution falsifies the aims of the

Comintern of Lenin and Trotsky, saying that its “historic role” consisted “in upholding the principles of the working class movement,” helping “vanguard” workers in a “number of” countries to work for “the defense of their economic and political interests and for the struggle against Fascism and war.” In the whole resolution there is not even a mention of socialism, capitalism, or class struggle. Contrast this with the Platform of the Communist International adopted at its Founding Congress in 1919, which stated its purpose as “the conquest of political power” by “the dictatorship of the proletariat” for “the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the socialization of the means of production.” Likewise the first Article of the Statutes of the Communist International, adopted at its Second World Congress in 1920, read:

“The New International Association of Workers is founded for the purpose of organizing a joint action of the proletariat of different countries, aiming at a single and identical goal, viz, the overthrow of capitalism, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of an international republic of soviets which will make it possible completely to abolish classes and bring about socialism, the first stage of communist society.”

All the documents of the first four Congresses of the Communist International—one each year, from 1919 to 1922—were similarly couched in ringing words, for the International under Lenin and Trotsky was in the direct tradition of the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, which proudly proclaimed that “The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims.” Stalin’s resolution of dissolution, like all the Stalinist documents, belongs to an entirely different tradition, alien in spirit and language to everything revolutionary.

In the light of the real origins and internationalist aims of the Comintern of Lenin and Trotsky, one can see clearly how false and reactionary is the claim of the Stalinist resolution that the workers no longer need an International. Already in 1848 Marx and Engels adduced the necessity of the International from the fact that bourgeois society was world-wide in scope and required an international proletarian revolution to overthrow it and replace it by a socialist society. Still more concretely, Lenin and Trotsky declared the necessity of an International which should not be a mere sum of national parties but a single World Party with sections everywhere. The unevenness of development of economy and the workers’ movements in the various countries, far from being an argument against internationalism, was one of the main reasons insisted upon by Lenin and Trotsky for the establishment of the Third International. They never tired of stressing the mutual need which the proletariat of advanced capitalist countries and the peoples of the colonies have for each other—the workers of Britain and the masses of India, the U.S. proletariat and the toilers of Latin America, etc.—in their common struggle against the imperialist overlords.

It is against this century-old Marxist principle that the Stalinist resolution declares that "the deep differences in the historical roads of development of each country of the world," and "the difference in level and rate of their social and political development," create such "various problems" that their solution "through the medium of some international center would encounter insuperable obstacles." If these arguments were true, and since the same essential conditions existed in 1919, then the International should never have been founded. But every world is false.

Piling one lie on top of another, the resolution asserts that the International was needed in "the first stages of the working class movement, but it has been outgrown by the growth of this movement" and the dissolution is "taking into account the growth and the political maturity of Communist parties and their leading cadres in separate countries." What a horrible joke! Nobody except the class enemy dreamed of dissolving the International when it was really at its height in 1922, numbering many millions of members in the capitalist world, with great mass parties in Germany, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Scandinavia, Poland, Yugoslavia, France, etc. Now, when these parties have been destroyed as a result of Stalin's false policies, when the few parties which still exist have been reduced to marionette impotence with the strings held in the Kremlin, this is called "political maturity"! The cruellest satirist could not have invented a more grotesque formula.

Stalin orders his hireling professors to embellish his crimes with historical precedents from "Marxism." Even they, however, could not conjure up a "quotation" from Lenin to justify the dissolution. Lenin stood for burying degenerate Internationals by building new ones immediately. Apparently hoping that fewer workers will know the facts about an earlier "precedent," the resolution adduces "the example of the great Marx" who dissolved the First International "as a result of the matured situation creating mass national working class parties." The only truthful item in this lie is that the First International was dissolved in 1876. Marx, Engels and its other revolutionary leaders were compelled to dissolve the First International because it had suffered mortal defeat: the objective situation resulting from the crushing of the Paris Commune had paralyzed it, and the internal struggle with anarchists and adventurist elements threatened it with degeneration. It was dissolved, moreover, not in an epoch like the present, when world revolution is on the order of the day, but in the 1870's, at a time when still-expanding capitalism had before it the perspective of still further development and the socialist movement correspondingly had time for the regrouping of its forces. Nor did the leaders of the First International present its dissolution as a triumph, but honestly called it a defeat. It left the scene beaten but undegenerated, with its banner unsullied and its historical lessons an inspiration to the workers of the world. Far from denying internationalism as Stalin does, Marx and Engels promptly set about gathering the forces to build a new International—a task accomplished within thirteen years by their followers. There is no analogy whatsoever between the clean death of the First International and the tardy burial of the malodorous corpse of the Third International.

The real analogy with Stalin's action is the shameful death of the Second International in August 1914. As the first imperialist world war was the decisive test of the Second International, so has this war been the acid test of the Comintern. Stalin's model is not Marx or Lenin but the bankrupt leaders of the Second International, the Kautskys and Plekhanovs. The parallel is inescapable. The "political maturity" claimed for the Comintern is the same kind of political rot-

teness exhibited by the Second International leaders, whom Lenin called "social-chauvinists"—socialists in words, chauvinists in deeds. Just as the social-chauvinists pretended to see a basic principled difference between the warring camps in 1914, so the Stalinist resolution of dissolution asserts "a deep dividing line" between the present warring imperialist camps and imposes on the workers in the Anglo-U.S. bloc "the sacred duty" of "national unity"—that is, the abandonment of the class struggle.

That this treason to the interests of the working class is as black as that of the Second International is obscured, in the eyes of many revolutionary-minded workers, because Stalinism presents it as the way to defend the Soviet Union. These workers, startled into awareness by the dissolution of the Comintern, must now thoughtfully re-examine the basic questions involved.

How To Defend the Soviet Union

The Fourth International stands for the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union. Despite the degeneration wreaked upon it by the Kremlin bureaucracy, the Soviet Union retains as its foundation the nationalized property created by the October revolution. This remaining conquest of the first successful proletarian revolution must be defended by every worker. The real defense of the Soviet Union, however, requires entirely different methods than the false course pursued since 1924 by the Kremlin bureaucracy.

Every serious worker must learn to understand what has happened to the Soviet Union and the Comintern since Lenin's death. Only then will he grasp completely the fundamental difference between Lenin's method of defending the Soviet Union and Stalin's false method which made it possible for Hitler to invade the USSR, lay waste its richest areas, murder the flower of its manhood and, though Hitler should fail, leaves the way open for the "democratic" imperialists to go still further, whether by "peaceful" or war means, toward re-introducing private property.

When the Second International joined the war-mongers in August 1914, Lenin and his co-workers immediately proclaimed its death as a revolutionary body and the need for a new, Third International. The program of the new International was worked out during the war years, and it was on that program that the October revolution triumphed. This victory, the Bolsheviks understood, was but the first link in the world revolution; without other victorious proletarian revolutions the Soviet Union could not maintain itself indefinitely in capitalist encirclement. Hence the "Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People," which was the charter of the Soviet Union (until it was replaced in 1936 by the Stalinist "Constitution") established as the "fundamental task" of the new regime "the establishment of a socialist organization of society and the victory of socialism in all countries." That was Lenin's method of defending the Soviet Union. The indispensable instrument for that world task was the Third International, officially founded in March 1919.

Irreconcilable struggle against all the capitalists and their reformist agents, their peace and their wars, against their "democracy" and their repressions, for the revolutionary overthrow of all capitalist regimes and their replacement by the distatorship of the proletariat and the World Federation of Soviet Republics—that, succinctly, was the program of the Third International under Lenin and Trotsky. Its first four Congresses, from 1919 to 1922, gathered together the revolutionary general staff of the entire world. The revolutionary offensive which it led very nearly put an end to the capitalist

system in all Europe—that is attested to by the memoirs of the capitalist leaders who have since confessed how nearly they were overwhelmed by the proletarian upsurge. That wave of revolution saved the young Soviet republic.

But by 1923 the revolutionary wave was temporarily thrown back by the capitalists with the aid of the reformists in the labor movement. And before the next wave began, the revolutionary weapon, the Third International, had been blunted beyond use.

The Role of the Stalinist Bureaucracy

It was blunted by a bureaucracy which arose in the Soviet Union. The Soviet bureaucracy was similar to the labor bureaucracies in the capitalist world in its higher standard of living and other special privileges as against the workers, its conservatism, fear and distrust of the workers. Its rise and seizure of power can be attributed in part to the economic and cultural backwardness and poverty of the predominantly agrarian country inherited from Czarism. Above all, however, the bureaucracy was enabled to have its way because of the failure of the European revolution. In the resultant isolation of the first workers' state in capitalist encirclement, exhausted by years of bloody imperialist and civil war, the Russian workers let the power slip into the hands of a bureaucracy of which Stalin became the spokesman. The bureaucracy entrenched itself by destroying all the democratic instruments—the party, the soviets, the trade unions—leaving only totalitarian caricatures completely in the hands of Stalin and his clique.

The bureaucracy distorted and revised Lenin's ideas, above all on the international character of the October revolution. In Lenin's theory socialist construction in Russia and socialist revolution elsewhere formed parts of an organic whole. In its place Stalin advanced the theory of "socialism in one country," asserting that an isolated socialist society could be built in Russia without the aid of socialist revolutions elsewhere—a theory which is a repudiation of proletarian internationalism.

Fortunately for the future of humanity, Bolshevism did not remain without its defenders. Lenin's principal co-worker, Trotsky, led the Left Opposition in the Russian Bolshevik Party and the Comintern in struggle against the bureaucracy.

The Left Opposition warned that the Stalinist bureaucracy was transforming the Comintern from an organization of world revolution into a mere instrument of Kremlin foreign policy, a mere border guard of the Soviet Union. Nor would the process stop there. From the bureaucracy's loss of faith in the ability of the international working class to make the world revolution it was but a step to loss of faith in the ability of the world workers to defend the Soviet Union.

In the light of the dissolution of the Comintern, the workers who have adhered to it should ponder the prophetic words written by Trotsky in 1928 in answer to Stalin's theory of "socialism in one country": "If our (Soviet) internal difficulties, obstacles and contradictions, which are fundamentally a reflection of world contradictions, can be settled merely by the inner forces of our revolution' without entering the arena of the world-wide proletarian revolution, then the International is partly a subsidiary and partly a decorative institution, the Congress of which can be convoked once every four years, once every ten years or perhaps not at all."

The history of the Stalinized Third International is one of uninterrupted catastrophes perpetrated upon the world working class. We can note here only the most terrible landmarks of Stalin's false policy.

In 1925-1927 came the great Chinese revolution, marching forward to major triumphs over the imperialists and their

native puppets. Its real strength came from the workers and peasants who were revolting against all exploiters, both native and imperialist. Stalin desired to weaken imperialism but, with characteristic lack of confidence in the masses, ordered the Chinese Communist Party to subordinate itself to the bourgeois Kuomintang under Chiang Kai-shek. Closer to imperialism than to the Chinese masses or the Soviet Union, Chiang in 1927 reached an agreement with the imperialists and was enabled to carry out a bloody extermination of the militant workers and peasants who had been disarmed by Stalin's endorsement of Chiang.

In England, Stalin tried to lean on the trade union bureaucrats, with whom he formed the Anglo-Russian Committee of the trade union bureaucracies of the two countries. The British labor bureaucrats were thus enabled to cover themselves with the prestige of the Russian revolution at a time when the British proletariat was rising in a struggle which culminated in the British General Strike of 1926. Using the Anglo-Russian Committee as a shield against the wrath of the workers, the British trade union bureaucrats betrayed the general strike. Even then Stalin insisted upon continuance of the Anglo-Russian Committee. Shortly afterward, when the defeated British working class lapsed into passivity, the British trade union bureaucrats abandoned the Committee which had served their counter-revolutionary purposes.

In Germany, Stalin perpetrated the most terrible defeat of all. Here his lack of confidence in the workers took an "ultra-left" form, beginning in 1929. He launched the theory of "social fascism," terming the Social Democratic Party and the trade unions it led as the "twin" of fascism, hence "social fascist." This theory denied the possibility of a united front of the Social Democratic-led workers' organizations and those of the Communist Party for a common struggle against the rising Nazis. The pseudo-radicalism of this theory, which insisted that all the workers must first submit to the leadership of the Communist Party, actually led to disunity and passivity. The task of the hour, Trotsky warned, was to demand a united anti-Nazi front between the Communist and Social-Democratic parties. Should the Social Democratic leaders refuse, they would be exposed before their own members, who would then turn to the Communist Party. For this advice Trotsky too was dubbed a "social fascist" and the Stalinist leadership persisted on its disastrous course. Only thanks to this false policy was Hitler enabled to take over the country in 1933. The Stalinist leadership capitulated to Hitler, making no attempt, despite six million followers, to strike even such a blow as the socialist workers of Vienna struck against Dolfuss a year later.

The German catastrophe showed that Stalinism had corrupted the Third International beyond redemption. Until then the Left Opposition led by Trotsky had, though bureaucratically expelled from the Comintern, stood for return to it and reform of it. Now it became imperative to proclaim the need for a new, Fourth International. During the next five years the movement gathered its forces and in 1938 in Paris held the Founding Congress of the Fourth International.

The Comintern Sold to Imperialism

The correctness of the establishment of the Fourth International was demonstrated by the defeats perpetrated by the Stalinist Third International since 1933. Whereas previously Stalin had made opportunist pacts with the Chinese bourgeoisie, the British trade union bureaucracy, etc., now he sought alliances with the imperialist powers. Stalinism evolved from lack of faith in the ability of the workers into deliberate betrayal of the workers.

One open betrayal after another began with the Stalin-Laval pact of May 1935. Seeking implementation of that pact by direct military collaboration, and similar pacts with Britain and other "democracies," Stalin wooed them by demonstrating how useful the Comintern could be to the capitalists. In August 1935, after a lapse of seven years, he convened its Seventh (and last) Congress, which ordered the Communist parties to enter Popular Fronts—only the name was new, the policy of class-collaboration and government coalitions was one which revolutionists have always branded as a betrayal of the working class.

The fruits were soon to be seen. In France the Communist Party deputies voted for the capitalist government's military budget—precisely the act of the German Social Democratic deputies on August 4, 1914 which Lenin had branded as the death-sentence of the Second International. The Stalinist leadership openly joined in breaking the famous sit-down strikes of June 1936—a revolutionary upheaval which should have opened the road to proletarian revolution—with Thorez uttering the classic formula of betrayal: "Comrades, we must know when to call off a strike." The Stalinists declared the French bourgeois state was a true friend of the Soviet Union, enabling it to crush the workers' movement precisely because the Stalinists had presented it to the workers as a friend.

In Spain, where the civil war had begun in July 1936, and the workers were fighting back not only on the field of battle but by beginning the social revolution, Stalinism openly showed its counter-revolutionary character. To demonstrate his uses to the "democracies," Stalin constituted himself the guardian of private property in Spain. In return for scanty arms for the Loyalists, Stalin extorted political concessions which enabled the Spanish Communist Party and the GPU to crush the workers' factory committees, the peasant collectives of Aragon and Catalonia, to assassinate hundreds of Trotskyist, anarchist and socialist militants, and establish a government under Negrin sufficiently "respectable" to meet the approval of the "democracies." But this process of repression of the Spanish revolution destroyed the morale of the workers and peasants and the Loyalist armies, while winning no arms from the "democracies." Thus Stalin facilitated the victory of Franco.

Nor did these betrayals gain Stalin his goal. Despite all his grovelling, Britain evaded concluding a military alliance. The Stalin-Laval pact was never implemented by military discussions and ended by becoming a dead letter. Thus Stalin's 1935-1939 policy of wooing the "democracies" collapsed in failure. Now, outraging the anti-fascist sentiments of the workers of the world, Stalin wooed Hitler.

The period of the Stalin-Hitler pact brought the Comintern to new depths of degeneration. Along with grain and oil, its services were sold to Hitler. The Comintern branded his opponents as "imperialists" and "war mongers," while Stalin's message to Ribbentrop in December 1939 hailed the Hitler-Stalin alliance as "cemented by blood," presumably the blood shed in their joint partition of Poland. This period of the Comintern is sufficiently characterized by the slogan of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.—"The Yanks are not coming"—a policy of defeatism without being revolutionary. Blind to the real course of events, the Kremlin bureaucracy flattered the Nazis, Molotov declaring that "A strong Germany is an indispensable condition for a durable peace in Europe."

This vile policy, in turn, collapsed on June 22, 1941, when Hitler, having completed the conquest of the continent, was able to choose his own moment for invading the USSR. The day before, the Stalinist press was reviling the "war-mongers" who were spreading "rumors" of an impending Nazi invasion.

Overnight the Kremlin's puppets became again supporters of the "democracies."

Such is the indisputable record of Stalin and his Comintern. These false policies made possible the plight of the Soviet Union. Bled and impoverished by the Nazi invasion, the USSR, even though Hitler is vanquished, will still be left facing its capitalist "allies," who are no less opponents of nationalized property than is Hitler.

In the course of its degeneration the Kremlin bureaucracy has hardened into an ossified caste alien to the interests of the Russian and world proletariat. For it there is no turning back to Lenin's method. The bureaucracy would be one of the first victims of a successful revolution in Europe, for then, freed from the fear of invasion and backed by new workers' states, the Soviet proletariat would no longer tolerate the totalitarian bureaucracy. The Kremlin will attempt to pursue to the end its policy of wooing and adapting itself to the imperialists.

That is the meaning of the dissolution of the Comintern. It is but the latest episode in the Kremlin's concessions to the capitalist world. The Communist parties have become the most rabid strikebreakers in England, the United States, Australia, Canada, etc. In India the Stalinists have played openly the role of tool of British imperialism in repressing the revolt of the Indian masses. Stalinist propaganda against Germany, making no distinction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, paves the way for a second and worse Versailles Treaty of imperialist vengeance; and the resolution dissolving the Comintern says not a word in solidarity with the German proletariat. The 20-year Anglo-Soviet pact is predicated on the reconstruction of a capitalist Europe with Stalin's cooperation. The dissolution of the Comintern is simply another sign by Stalin that he is ready to adapt himself still further to the rule of capitalism.

Like all his previous policies, Stalin's present "alliance" is a mortal danger to the Soviet Union and leaves the initiative to the irreconcilable imperialist foes of the workers' state. It enables them to seize the most favorable times for ever-greater demands for economic inroads into the Soviet Union designed to undermine the nationalized property and for a renewed attempt to crush it altogether. Like Stalin's previous false policies, this one too will collapse under conditions most disadvantageous for the Soviet Union.

What Will Save the Soviet Union

But neither Stalin's concessions nor his aid to the imperialist masters can stabilize society in the period which Lenin called the epoch of imperialist wars, colonial revolts and proletarian revolutions. The world is not only ripe but overripe for the transition to socialism. World economy has been ready for the proletarian revolution for thirty years. All the objective conditions indicated by Marx and Lenin exist for the socialist revolution; the only thing that has been lacking is precisely the International which Stalin asserts the workers do not need.

Capitalist society has been in permanent crisis since 1914, having exhausted its potentialities. In its decline capitalism has inflicted upon humanity two world-wide imperialist conflagrations, and in between them innumerable lesser wars and imperialist aggressions against the colonial and semi-colonial peoples. Capitalist degeneration has expressed itself in the scourge of fascism, the most brutal and desperate form of capitalist rule, for the twin purposes of crushing the workers' organizations at home and launching imperialist adventures abroad.

The terrible fate of Europe, the most civilized of the

continents, has shown the price that humanity is paying for the failure to extend the October revolution after the last war. There it is crystal-clear that the continuance of capitalism would inevitably mean a Third World War. Amid the tens of millions of victims, the workers must remember with bitterness the arguments of the Social Democracy and the Popular Front against "bloody" revolution. There is no hope for the physical survival of the peoples except through ending the Balkanization of the continent by establishing the Socialist United States of Europe.

The first wave of revolution in Europe in 1917-1923 aroused the huge populations of the colonial and semi-colonial world—the overwhelming majority of humanity—to enter the political arena and boldly challenge their imperialist enslavers. The coming wave will spread even more quickly to Asia and Africa—the great masses of India are already advancing to meet it.

The events on the other continents will give a decisive impetus to the revolutionary development of the proletariat in the United States. During the last decade the U. S. proletariat has learned that it is not immune to the evils which afflicted its European brothers. It has witnessed the Europeanization of America—permanent unemployment and hunger in the midst of plenty. The millions of workers who got their first jobs only when war industry mushroomed, and those who survive of the millions who never had jobs before they were put into uniforms, can have no expectations of returning to anything but a worsened version of the economic crisis since 1929. Stripped of illusions about their own future under capitalism, the American workers in uniform will prove to be no pretorian guard against the European revolution.

These are the revolutionary developments, sure to come, which will save the Soviet Union from capitalist encirclement. It will be saved in spite of Stalinism and against Stalinism.

The Fourth International

The revolutionary wave began in 1917 in spite of the fact that the war had begun with the collapse of the Second International. In 1914 only a handful of workers' leaders had remained true to proletarian internationalism. Their task of digging the workers out from under the ruins of the International and creating a new International may well have seemed insuperable. But history was on the side of this handful.

The collapse of the International caught the workers'

vanguard unawares in 1914. Amid the war they had to begin the new International. This time, however, the revolutionary vanguard was forewarned. On all the continents and in all the principal countries there were established cadres of the Fourth International long before this war began. Everywhere they stood the decisive test of the war and remained firm in their revolutionary internationalism. While the Third International broke its silence during the war only to dissolve itself, and the Second International has given no sign of life, lacking even the energy to bury itself, the Fourth International has spoken out throughout the war, working and preparing for the revolutionary wave that is coming.

As Trotsky correctly predicted at a time when the tiny Fourth International was a subject for jest among the reformist leaders, the critical test of the war has destroyed every International and international grouping except the Fourth International. Nothing and nobody can dissolve this International, the heir of the Communist International of Lenin and Trotsky.

Workers of all lands! Rally to the proud and stainless banner of the Fourth International! We are approaching the fifth year of the second imperialist world war. It is a year certain to outstrip all the others in human slaughter and material devastation. Before it closes, however, the first great battles of the proletarian revolution may already begin. Once again out of the vast sea of human suffering of war will arise the unconquerable spirit of the international proletariat, determined to complete this time the task begun with the October revolution. The aroused workers will drop like cast-off garments the habits of servitude and dare to make a new world. In struggle the great masses will find in themselves inexhaustible reservoirs of revolutionary fortitude and heroism. In those days, nearer at hand than many of you dream, the cadres of the Fourth International will speedily become transformed into great mass parties leading tens and hundreds of millions in the final conflict. Comrades and fellow workers! Above all else the toiling peoples now need the International to lead them. There is only one International now, the World Party of Socialist Revolution, the Fourth International. Enter its ranks and prepare with it to lead the successful struggle for the world revolution!

The Executive Committee of the
World Party of Socialist Revolution
(Fourth International)

June 12, 1943

The Giraud-DeGaulle Dispute

By MARC LORIS

The events in Algiers are worth watching closely. We are witnessing there an attempt at the political regroupment of the French bourgeoisie. The difficulties that are arising in the process tell us much about the future of Europe.

Crushed militarily in June 1940, the French bourgeoisie went, under the leadership of the Petain government, along the road of "collaboration." But with Germany's military difficulties this road has led to an impasse and the Vichy government has no perspective to offer for the future. The atomized French bourgeoisie has to regroup itself around a new political center.

An important step in this political rebirth of the French bourgeoisie was the formation at Algiers on June 3, after

lengthy negotiations between Giraud and De Gaulle, of the French National Committee of Liberation. It is true that this new regime did not appear in France proper, but in the very special conditions of a colonial milieu. Nevertheless, the history of its formation offers us, to a certain degree, important indications for forecasting what will happen in the countries of Europe after the collapse of Nazi rule. Although distorted by the colonial conditions, the picture, if we know how to read it, is of great help for determining our political perspectives.

In December, Giraud succeeded the assassinated Darlan, to whom Washington had entrusted the job of "freeing" France. Darlan had done everything to remain faithful to

the legality of Vichy. Under his regime the entire administration installed by Vichy remained. His replacement by Giraud brought no change.

Giraud's Weakness

Giraud's program was ostensibly of a purely military character: to collaborate with the Allies for the defeat of Germany. His sole political slogan was a negative one: "an end to factional fights." The reasons for this were obvious. Aside from Washington, Giraud's principal support was, and still is, the upper and middle cadres of the French army in North Africa. These cadres had actively supported or passively tolerated the Vichy government. They had nothing to offer the people of France for the future except a government as reactionary as that of Petain. They could scarcely shout about this program. In addition, their greatest desire was to have everyone forget the recent past of "collaboration" in which they had been more or less implicated. Hence their care to avoid the slightest political discussion. Giraud expressed this belated modesty in the slogan "One aim—victory."

How far the Vichy influence had remained in the Giraud administration can be judged by a few lines, buried without comment in the pages of the *New York Times* on June 7. It reported from Casablanca that "The Bank of Morocco attempted to send almost \$75,000,000 worth of gold to German-occupied France last February." This was four months after the American debarkment, and we must not forget that the Bank of Morocco is an official institution in the hands of the French administration.

Washington's deal with Darlan had alienated much of the sympathy for the Allies: the North African population had fallen into apathy, distrust and cynicism. Seeking popular support, Giraud was forced to sacrifice some of the most compromised administrators and to make a few speeches on "democracy" and the "Republic." This did not change much of anything, as we see in the case of the Algerian Jews, whom Giraud deprived of French citizenship. However, these gestures did give Washington some kind of answer to the critics of the American policy toward Darlan. Indeed, Giraud was presented as a great "democrat."

However, Giraud, a newcomer in politics, could not do this too well. The "democratic" mask could not hide his aspiration to play the Bonaparte. In a speech at Constantine on April 15 Giraud said:

"At that time [after Germany's defeat] 40,000,000 Frenchmen will say what they desire, but I have no wish to revive the follies that led to the catastrophe in 1940." The "follies" are the revolutionary upsurge of the French workers. The very construction of the phrase smells of Bonapartism: "but I have no wish to . . .!"

Giraud's regime in North Africa remained extremely precarious. His staunch supporters were compromised by their past; their only program was to keep quiet. The timid renewal of political life led to the growth of the Gaullist movement. The information which comes to us from North Africa, outside of reports of the official gestures, still remains very scarce. Nevertheless the case of Tunisia permits one to judge the situation fairly well. When the Allied troops entered the Tunisian cities, the press dispatches were of one accord in reporting that popular sentiment was very much in favor of De Gaulle, while the prestige of the Giraud regime was nil. When De Gaulle arrived in Algiers on May 30, all his factional emblems were abundantly displayed by the populace, even though expressly forbidden by Giraud in a decree a few days before. "Even soldiers and policemen

displayed the Fighting French emblem," the Associated Press reported.

Gaullism represents extremely diverse and vague aspirations.* Beginning as a purely national-military opposition to Vichy, it has developed, especially through its ties to the underground movement, toward a left-democratic program. For as long as possible Washington and London insisted on Giraud's exclusive control of Algeria. But to avert an ever increasing political cleavage, Giraud, and behind him Washington and London, found it expedient to look for a compromise to bring De Gaulle into the North African government.

The Issues In Dispute

The discussions between the two generals began with the very nature of the new power. Giraud had named his regime "Civil and Military High Command," thus revealing its essentially military character. De Gaulle demanded the creation of a political power independent of the military command. In the present condition of the French bourgeoisie, the specific weight of such a political power in face of the army can be only very weak. Even this, however, was enough to worry Giraud. He rejected all idea of a political power distinct from the military command and hastened to announce that De Gaulle meant to impose a ready-made government on the people of France. Washington and the American press echoed this accusation. That De Gaulle's aims in the France of tomorrow will be far from pure democracy is very likely. But it was comical to see democracy suddenly become the principal care of the Bonaparte-apprentice Giraud.

The discussions between Giraud and De Gaulle, from March to the end of May, were centered around whether the new regime would be simply a "High Command" or if it would be a political body. To De Gaulle's program of restoration of republican legality Giraud could counterpose only a negative program of remaining silent over a past too compromising for the majority of his supporters. Therefore he found himself in an extremely difficult position in the discussions and had to take up the fight on points where he was beaten in advance.

Thus a small episode illumines the unfolding of the negotiations. At the end of April, Giraud proposed to De Gaulle a meeting at a "lonely place" outside Algiers, obviously for fear of popular demonstrations. De Gaulle insisted on a meeting in Algiers and, in the middle of May, in an insulting answer to Giraud, declared that De Gaulle was well able to assure order in Giraud's capital. At the end of May, De Gaulle, in the midst of mass ovations, made his entrance into Algiers.

The result of the negotiations was a great defeat for Giraud. A central political power was formed on June 3rd, in essentials according to the original plan of De Gaulle. The situation of the most compromised supporters of Giraud became untenable. Peyrouton, former Petain minister, brutal persecutor of the opposition in France, brought by the Allies from his Vichy Embassy in Argentina on the advice of Darlan to rule Algeria, had to resign. Bergeret, former Vichy minister, Giraud's close assistant, was dismissed. Nogues, governor of Morocco, strong supporter of Petain, resigned June 5th and even left North Africa. Boisson, whom Washington insisted on keeping as an "able administrator," finally had to resign at the end of June.

Giraud was left so isolated that the British, hunting for figures to give his faction prestige, brought out of France the old and decrepit reactionary General Georges. Giraud's

*On the character of the Gaullist movement, see my article in the March 1943 *Fourth International*.

other assistants in the new Committee are direct representatives of big business: the railroad magnate Rene Meyer, and the financiers Couve de Murville and Jean Monnet.

De Gaulle's victory, though important, soon revealed its limitations when the question of control of the army came up. De Gaulle had insisted successfully on the formation of a political power; but then arose the question of subordination of the military power to the political power.

Doubtless Giraud had not abandoned Peyrouton and Nogues with a light heart, but that was, after all, an inevitable concession. Of entirely different scope, however, was the question of control of the army. Here the very source of Giraud's power was at stake. Thus a crisis broke out as soon as De Gaulle posed the question.

Rumors of a Gaullist *coup de force* spread through Algiers. A dispatch from there in the June 3rd *New York Times* informs us that:

"... the factional strife in the twenty-four hours before the committee met today was strong enough for General Giraud to redouble the guards around his radio station. Late last night, a French tank rumbled into the grounds of his residence."

On June 4th, the Office of War Information issued a statement in the name of its head, Elmer Davis, denouncing "the cheap political maneuverings" of the Gaullists and even going so far as to say they were no better than the Vichy men, "Nogues, Peyrouton, and so on." This official declaration was undoubtedly only a small public sign of less public but more substantial actions by Washington's representatives in Algiers.

For weeks the crisis continued in the Committee, with threats of resignation by De Gaulle. He did not have enough military forces to attempt a *coup*, and moreover would immediately encounter Anglo-American opposition. On the other hand, Giraud cannot break with the Gaullist movement without seriously discrediting his regime and dealing a great blow to the prestige of the Allies in the underground movement in France. Thus the new regime leads and will likely lead for some time a chaotic existence of unstable compromises.

The first of the compromises was the division of command of the French armies, decided by the National Committee on June 22. Giraud kept command of the troops in strategically-important North Africa and the Dakar region. The far less numerous and extremely dispersed forces in the other colonies are under the command of De Gaulle. It was not concealed that Washington would not have permitted any interference with Giraud's command of the French forces in North Africa and Dakar.

The Allies and the French Problem

It has often been said that the conflict between De Gaulle and Darlan-Giraud reflected Anglo-American friction. There is only a very small grain of truth in this interpretation. Before the debarkment in North Africa, London, unlike Washington, had entered into military conflict with Vichy (Mers-el-Kebir, Madagascar, Syria) and was thus led to direct support of the Gaullist movement. But after the Anglo-American occupation of North Africa, and once Darlan was eliminated, there appeared to be a close understanding between Washington and London to utilize Giraud. Thus at the Casablanca conference between Roosevelt and Churchill at the end of January, it became clear that they had decided to shelve De Gaulle for an indefinite period and that the support of Washington and London was entirely behind Giraud.

Peyrouton was brought to Algiers while Roosevelt and Churchill were still there.

Thus Giraud's defeat, when he finally had to receive De Gaulle in Algiers and accept the formation of a joint political body, was also a defeat for Anglo-American diplomacy. A particularly clear sign of this was the resentful ridicule which the administration and the American press tried to throw on the negotiations throughout their course. The tone was set by an unnamed Washington official who was quoted in the press as characterizing the whole affair as a "farce."

There is an important political lesson in this situation. The United States now militarily dominates North Africa more completely than it can ever hope to dominate Europe. Nevertheless, its inability to give political stability to this domination has been made obvious by the events in Algiers. The weakness of the Giraud regime in the face of De Gaulle is Washington's weakness, and the Algiers events, on a small scale, help us to foresee how unstable a world *pax americana* will be even though backed up by thousands of airplanes.

In the December 1942 *Fourth International*, I wrote: "The militant patriotism of the De Gaulle movement would risk entering into conflict at one time or another with American interests." At the time this was merely a hypothesis, based on the nature of the Gaullist movement. The latest events have verified it.

The Anglo-American forces in North Africa, even though "friendly," are occupying forces. They enjoy, among other things, the right of requisition, full use of harbors and control of communications. They billet their soldiers in the homes, etc., and we can easily imagine that there are many daily incidents. During the first period of the fight in Tunisia, the French troops were hastily sent against the Germans without up-to-date arms; of a total of less than 65,000 French troops, 10,000 were killed, and about 30,000 taken prisoners or wounded—these are Giraud's official figures. Such facts easily stir up anger against the "friends." Finally, behind all the incidents is the fundamental question of the future of France, of her power in Europe, of her place in the peace negotiations, and of the fate of her colonial empire.

In contrast to the docile servility of Giraud, De Gaulle has made political capital out of this situation, and is already drawing interest in increasing influence. As early as the 1st of June, the day after De Gaulle's arrival in Algiers, the *New York Times* correspondent was cabling:

"The point emphasized by General De Gaulle is the reassertion of French sovereignty throughout the empire, a procedure that would have many difficult results for the Allies."

On June 4th the Washington correspondent of the same paper described the condescending "indulgence" with which the official milieu of the American capital regarded the Algiers events, and added:

"It was noted that General Charles De Gaulle, according to dispatches from Algiers, apparently desired to assert complete French sovereignty by taking over communications and ports now in the hands of the Allies, and it was indicated that this suggestion would not be taken seriously, since it would go beyond the bounds of the indulgence mentioned, as General De Gaulle well knew."

On June 21, the *New York Times* correspondent in Washington indicated in some detail the reasons for Washington's alarm:

"Meanwhile reports from more than one source say that, in the opinion of recent visitors to Algiers, the Fighting French leader has acquired a substantial following in North Africa, especially among the youth, whose intense nationalism shows more than a trace of xenophobia. One Frenchman re-

ported that all the army officers below the rank of major were De Gaullists.

"General De Gaulle . . . [has won] the ardent support of many younger men.

"He appeals to their nationalism, which is all the keener because of the defeat and humiliation of France, it is said here. He tells them that General Giraud and his aides are puppets of the Allies, that France is treated worse than Luxembourg because, although her army fights with the Allies, there is no French flag among those of the United Nations, no French government represented in their councils, not even full French sovereignty in North Africa. The implication is that France is being humiliated by the Allies as well as by the Germans."

The following day, June 22, the same correspondent returned to the same subject, extremely important not only so far as France is concerned, but also for the whole post-war policy of the United States. He wrote:

"Six months ago the French political controversy was to a great extent an Anglo-American one, since London and Washington were in effect backing different French candidates for leadership. It tends today toward another alignment—the British and Americans on the one side and a resurgent French nationalism on the other.

"Nobody represents that nationalism quite so definitely as General De Gaulle. He has taken a very independent stand toward the British in spite of the fact that they largely financed his organization and fighting forces. Lately he has appeared in the role of a champion of French rights against both the British and the Americans. That revived nationalism, according to all the evidence here, has also permeated the ranks of General Giraud's followers, some having been much impressed by General De Gaulle since meeting him in Algiers and hearing him speak.

"This nationalism inspires particularly the youth . . . It represents a reaction to the renewed hope of liberation of France and resentment toward her liberators for appearing to interfere in French affairs. Of this feeling the Allies must take account in North Africa and in France, in the opinion of some observers who know France well."

In the light of these facts, the question can be raised in which of the two camps is to be found that section of the French bourgeoisie which has abandoned the perspective of "collaboration" with Hitler. Shouldn't it be with De Gaulle, who represents the most intransigent bourgeois nationalism? Apparently not, if one is to judge by the character of Giraud's

three principal assistants: Rene Meyer, Couve de Murville and Jean Monnet, all representing big capital. This indicates that the big bourgeoisie still tends to regroup itself politically around Giraud, that is, to lean completely on Washington and London. Economically debilitated by the military defeat of June 1940 and politically discredited by the period of "collaboration" with Hitler, the French bourgeoisie, at any rate the men who speak for it in Algiers, still feel extremely weak. Their present collaboration has the same reasons as that with Hitler. They feel no confidence in their ability to restore by themselves their rule over the masses of France.

Giraud's surest support is the top ranks of the army, discredited by their old-school military incompetence and compromised by their Vichy period. They have nothing but hostility for De Gaulle, who as a young colonel had dared to oppose to their senile ideas his modern theory of mechanized warfare, who broke the discipline of the army to flee to London and attack Vichy. These cadres are relatively numerous—the press reports 108 generals and admirals in North Africa which implies several thousand higher officers. This group is Giraud's surest bastion.

The Gaullist movement in North Africa is much more variegated and undoubtedly includes various tendencies which will rapidly diverge once political life becomes more active. On the basis of an intransigent patriotism, De Gaulle gathers together the lower cadres of the army, the youth, the students, the "left" petty bourgeoisie. It is difficult to say whether his influence extends among the workers, but he has the support of the Stalinists.

The quarrel between Giraud and De Gaulle shows us how difficult it is for a ruling class which has been crushed militarily to re-create its political unity. The policy of "collaboration" broke the traditional national axis of the French bourgeoisie and created divisions which will not easily be erased. Finally, the new "collaboration" with Washington produces new conflicts. The Giraud group, too servile toward Washington, is rapidly losing ground to the benefit of De Gaulle, who is thereby encouraged to come forward to defend French bourgeois interests against Washington and London. This is the most important political lesson of the events in Algiers. No, Hitler's defeat does not give much promise of bringing cohesion and stability to the ruling classes.

Roosevelt and Labor after the Third Coal Strike

By FELIX MORROW

Since Roosevelt's May 2nd radio address confidently calling on the coal miners to repudiate their union's call for the first strike, less than two months have passed. Yet already it has become well-nigh incredible that Roosevelt could have deluded himself to think that at his behest the miners would separate from their union organization and leadership. When the workers enthusiastically followed Roosevelt's leadership, he appeared to be uncanny in his masterly manipulation of their sentiments—nothing succeeds like success. But his bag of tricks looked tawdry indeed when one union and its leadership firmly stood up against him. The miners are deeply embittered at him, after three industry-wide strikes waged in direct defiance of him, and which demonstrated the most complete solidarity of the 530,000 coal miners. Their reluctance to obey the June

22 order of the union leadership to end the third strike was indicated by the fact that on June 28, six days later, more than 150,000 miners were still out, according to an Associated Press estimate. All reports testify that, far from being convinced or demoralized by Roosevelt's attacks, the miners are ready to renew the struggle at a moment's notice from their leadership. Unless the situation radically changes, the miners are almost certain to strike again if the mines are returned to the owners in spite of the union's insistence on continuation of government custodianship, or if there is no contract by October 31, the new deadline set by the union. Fuel is being poured on this unextinguished fire by the War Labor Board which, in its insane attempt to restore its irretrievable prestige, is insisting that the union be forced to sign a contract embody-

ing its decision against the miners. How the miners now feel about Roosevelt, our correspondents in the coal fields report, is indicated by this typical statement: "He was a hero to us back in '32, and I was for him in '36 and '40. But I'm against him now. He's on the side of the operators and the War Labor Board now."

This bitterness in the coal fields presages the mood of the workers everywhere. When the coal negotiations opened in March, there was widespread confusion concerning the source of the resistance to wage increases. The CIO and AFL leadership blamed it on the inadequacies of the War Labor Board's machinery, pretending that the main problem could be solved through regional offices and other decentralized machinery which would expedite cases. Even after Roosevelt's April 8 "hold the line" order, they blamed wage-freezing on unfair "interpretations" by Byrnes and other officials. These alibis for Roosevelt, repeated often enough, and buttressed by Roosevelt's own maneuvers, kept the workers from grasping the whole picture. But the miners' fight, repeatedly forcing Roosevelt's hand into the open, brought understanding to the minds of millions of workers.

As if to clinch the matter, Director of Economic Stabilization Frederick M. Vinson vetoed a wage increase for 1,100,000 non-operating railroad workers on June 23, the day after the miners were called back to work. The CIO, AFL and Railroad Brotherhoods leadership had given lip-service to the miners' demands but condemned the miners' militant methods, implying that "loyal" union leaders would fare better. Certainly the demand of the unions for a 20-cents an hour increase for the underpaid non-operating railway workers was a test case of such "loyal" methods. After months of negotiations, Roosevelt named an emergency board to mediate the case, and it brought in an 8-cent hourly increase proposal, which was accepted by management and the unions. The day before it was to become effective, Vinson vetoed it. Even a Philip Murray or a William Green can hardly pretend that Vinson could have vetoed the verdict of a Roosevelt-appointed board without a direct nod from Roosevelt. The veto came while the operating railwaymen were still arguing before another board for a 30 per cent wage increase after six months of dickering before various boards, tribunals and panels. They can guess their fate from that of their non-operating brothers. Even before Vinson's veto, A.F. Whitney, President of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, told the board: "I wonder if we have not been sitting frozen, hypnotized, watching for the seven rabbits of the President's economic program to be pulled out of silk hats of the war agency administration, while our purses were being sneaked from our pockets."

After the veto, Alvanley Johnston, President of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and speaking also for Whitney, told the Board that Vinson's veto had also judged their case and it was "a farce to continue this proceeding." If these staid and conservative officials are impelled to use such language, it is certain that their members are doing all they can to push them into combat with Roosevelt.

As if nothing has happened, Philip Murray and William Green have hastened to assure Roosevelt of the continued support of the AFL and CIO. But their pledges are rapidly deteriorating in value. Already last November, after all the Murray-Green exhortations to vote Democratic, millions of workers who had enthusiastically supported Roosevelt's party in previous elections stayed away from the polls this time, finding no choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. That was a repudiation of his party but not yet of Roosevelt himself. Now the miners' fight has obliterated the false distinction between Roosevelt and his party. The top CIO and AFL leadership

cling to Roosevelt, incapable of changing their policy, but the distance between them and the millions of AFL and CIO members is speedily widening into an unbridgeable gap.

The miners' fight struck a deadly blow against the Roosevelt-labor coalition. The effects of that blow, under the given conditions, could not develop quickly enough to bring victory to the miners. They had widespread rank and file support in the CIO and AFL. But Roosevelt's labor lieutenants in the CIO made the most of the organizational separation of the miners thanks to Lewis' withdrawal of the union from the CIO in 1941, while Roosevelt's servitors in the AFL nullified any immediate gains Lewis might have hoped for from his application for re-admission into the AFL. The United Mine Workers remained officially isolated, receiving neither top AFL or CIO backing, and the Lewis leadership, limited by its business unionism outlook, was incapable of a broad working class method of speedily rallying the masses of the other unions to force their officials to support the miners. But their members will not forgive the AFL and CIO officialdom for its treachery to the miners and will find ways and means to punish it in the coming months. For Roosevelt it was a Pyrrhic victory. Certainly Roosevelt is in the position of the general who said: "One more victory like that and we are lost."

The Real Situation of Wages

The national repercussions of the miners' fight would not be so serious for Roosevelt if the workers had in their pockets the kind of wages that the incessant newspaper propaganda imputes to them by singling out isolated and unrepresentative examples. One should note in passing that the AFL and CIO leaders do not combat this propaganda by publishing the real figures. Apparently they fear it would incite their membership to provide the figures. Actually, no agency at present offers statistics on wages of trade union members as distinct from other workers.

Perhaps the most useful figures available for our purpose are those of a recent OPA bulletin.* After 10 years of the New Deal, and in a year of war, with overtime raising the take-home pay, the income of the population for 1942 was as follows (income is "income per spending unit"—per family or individual wage-earner as the case may be but with no indication given of the size of the "unit"):

<i>Spending Units (In millions)</i>	<i>Income Group</i>	<i>Average Income</i>
16.7	Less than \$1500	\$862
13.9	\$1500-\$3000	\$2139
7.3	\$3000-\$5000	\$3813
2.5	\$5000-\$10,000	\$6716
.8	Over \$10,000	\$21,074

The OPA report implicitly concedes that the most numerous group in the population—the 16.7 million "units" with an average annual income of \$862—is below a decent standard of living. It says:

"It is clear that in general consumers with incomes below \$1,500 and possibly even all those below \$2,000, are already at as low a real standard of living as is compatible with the war effort and its stated objectives. Although these groups bore only a small proportion of the personal tax burden in 1942, they have had to pay large sums in indirect taxes on consumption; and the Revenue Act of 1942 already makes it certain that income tax and Victory tax will reach much further down the income scale in 1943, placing even greater tax burdens on the poorest section of the population."

* "Civilian Spending and Saving—1941 and 1942," published by the Division of Research, Consumer Income and Demand Branch, Office of Price Administration, Washington, 1943.

And even of the second-largest group in the population—the 13.9 million “units” with an average annual income of \$2,139 which, upon deduction of taxes (not counting indirect consumption taxes) and savings (including war bonds) amounts to an average consumption of \$1,763—the OPA report admits:

“The average income of \$2,139 and the average consumption of \$1,763 probably are not much above the levels which, under existing conditions, will adequately preserve the health, efficiency and morale of civilian families.”

The OPA's estimate of the standard of living available at these income levels was of course based on price levels for that year of 1942. It estimated that money spent for goods and services in 1942 was 4 per cent higher than in 1941, but that because of price rises it really meant a 6 per cent cut in consumption for 1942. In the intervening seven months income has remained frozen for wage-earners, while prices have risen at an accelerated pace. Fully to comprehend the real situation of wages, one would have to have detailed figures, particularly on price-rises of food, the main item of expenditure for workers and also the one which is rising most rapidly. As the miners' figures on food prices in the coal fields demonstrated—they were based on actual prices paid and not on those listed or officially cited by chain and company stores to government agencies—government figures on price rises, especially on food, are becoming more and more unreliable. The official figures concede that food prices have risen over 43 per cent since January 1941, but the real figures are far higher.

The 16,700,000 “spending units” with average annual income of \$862 (these families often spend more than their income, says the OPA, by going into debt or selling some “possessions”, constitute 40 per cent of the total number of “units,” i. e., of the population. The 13,900,000 “spending units” with an average annual consumption of \$1,763, constitute another 33 per cent of the population. These two groups of course include most of the AFL and CIO membership. These figures make clear that the miners were voicing the needs of the overwhelming majority of the workers and toiling masses.

What Is Driving Roosevelt

Roosevelt absurdly overestimated his ability to keep the workers hypnotized; still, he must have known that sooner or later wage-freezing would weaken his hold on the labor movement. Why, then, did he get so tough with the miners, to the point where his direct responsibility for wage-freezing became apparent to the whole working class? This in the face of the fact that Roosevelt's main support has come from the trade union leadership and that with the loss of that backing he will get short shrift from the right wing of his own party. And Roosevelt wants to be elected President again in 1944, obviously impossible without labor support.

The answer is not to be found in Roosevelt's personality. His malice toward John L. Lewis caused him to make tactical blunders, but the basic factor is that Roosevelt, as head of the capitalist state, and at this stage of the capitalist war economy, has to try to keep wages frozen. The war economy has reached the point where there is no room for the minor concessions to labor which Roosevelt was able to make before the war. Under the profit system, war can be waged only by permitting the big capitalists to profiteer and have their way generally even more so than in peacetime. This was admitted as recently as 1940 by a governmental body, the Temporary National Economic Committee, in a document which stated:

“Speaking bluntly, the Government and the public are ‘over a barrel’ when it comes to dealing with business in time of war or other crisis. Business refuses to work, except on terms which it dictates. It controls the natural resources,

the liquid assets, the strategic position in the country's economic structure, and its technical equipment and knowledge of processes. The experience of the [first] World War, now apparently being repeated, indicates that business will use this control only if it is ‘paid properly.’ In effect, this is blackmail, not too fully disguised.” (TNEC Monograph No. 26, *Economic Power and Political Pressures*, p.172.)

The terms which big business dictates includes not only profits for itself but also means throwing the burden of the war on the workers by slashing their living standards through wage-freezing, price-rises and increased taxation. Price-rises are inevitable because the government can get the private owners of industry to shift from civilian to war production only by making war production more profitable through higher prices for war materials and goods. The resultant curtailment of consumers' goods, in turn, leads to price rises in that field too, cutting down the workers' standard of living more and more.

We have said that big business “dictates” this situation. More accurately, it is the result of the anarchy of capitalism. Planning is possible only where, as in the Soviet Union, the economy is nationalized property—a government can plan only that which it owns and controls. The United States is so rich in productive power that, with a planned economy, it would consequently be possible to wage war on the present scale and still allocate a sufficient sector of the economy for consumers' needs to keep the main item of workers' expenditures, food prices, near their 1939 level—especially if there had been no ploughing under during 1933-1940. But capitalism cannot plan.

Another way of keeping down the cost of living would be effective policing of prices. But that way, too, is impossible for a capitalist government. On April 29, 1942, while admitting the necessity to enforce price-fixing, the first OPA administrator, Henderson, in the same breath hastened to add that his organization had spent “little time” in “figuring out means for putting people in the hoosegow. The idea that we will have a whole army of people searching for violations will not be an important part of the picture.” Yet only a “whole army of people” could stop the violations which are being universally practiced by the capitalist class as a whole, irresistibly tempted by the possibilities for profiteering created by scarcity. As we predicted from the first, the so-called policing of prices by a government bureaucracy has proved worthless. The necessary “whole army of people” is easily available to do the job—the trade unions and housewives' groups could set up a network of mass committees on prices in every street and city. Their living standards are at stake and they would make the food and clothing corporations, the chain stores and the landlords toe the mark! But that of course would be the class war of the workers against the capitalists. Price committees manned by the unions and housewives would become proletarian forums voicing the class anger of the masses against the scarcity of food and clothing, rising prices and the black market. Roosevelt is no more capable of endorsing such a method than of proposing the abolition of capitalism.*

Nevertheless, Roosevelt wants to keep prices down as far as it possibly can be done by *capitalist* methods. He and the capitalist class have their own reasons for desiring it. Indeed, they are desperately determined to do so. Every increase in prices means the government has to pay more for its purchases for the armed forces. The meteoric rise of the national debt tends to endanger the stability of the currency. Without

* For a more expanded discussion of these aspects of the war economy, see my article, “Labor's Fight Against Inflation,” in the May 1942 *Fourth International*, and the editorials in the October and November 1942 numbers.

the stable measure of value that a sound currency provides, government purchase and organization of war production would become a hundred-fold more disorganized than it already is: inflation always means economic chaos. Though certain sectors of the capitalist class would gain through inflation, even they fear its consequences in wartime. In addition, of course, price rises are alienating from the government not only the workers but also the large sections of the middle classes which have relatively fixed incomes.

Barred by the very structure of capitalism from planning consumers' economy or really policing prices, Roosevelt is thus reduced to adopting the methods compatible with the anarchy of capitalism: wage-freezing and increased taxation, which siphon off mass purchasing power and thus, though only partially and ineffectively, reduce the pressure on prices. These anti-labor methods have been in use increasingly since Pearl Harbor. They were already embodied in written form as the government's aim in OPA Administrator Henderson's Price-Fixing order of April 29, 1942, which stated:

"Left to itself, the process [of rising prices] has no definite end. It can be stopped only by measures which will eliminate the occasion for increased income payments on the one hand, and narrow the gap by withdrawing excess purchasing power on the other."

To "eliminate the occasion for increased income payments" meant wage-freezing. "Withdrawing excess purchasing power" meant increased taxation.

Maybe the overworked war workers couldn't understand this language easily, but certainly the CIO and AFL leaders, with the help of their lawyers, understood just what was involved. Yet their main activity since Pearl Harbor has been to attempt to deceive the workers concerning the real meaning of the Roosevelt war policies. For a while Roosevelt was able to facilitate this deception by an occasional nod to the War Labor Board to grant a very minor concession here and there, although the inevitable course of the war economy gave Roosevelt less and less room to maneuver. But no matter what Roosevelt did, the AFL and CIO leadership continued their attempts to confuse and misinform their membership.

The Meaning of Roosevelt's Veto

The latest instance is the CIO and AFL statements on Roosevelt's veto of the Smith-Connally Act. It is instructive to note the lengths to which the union officialdom went in distorting the plain facts.

The facts are that Roosevelt made no effort to prevent the overriding of his veto. For ten days after its passage he gave no public hint of what he would do with the bill—scarcely a method of mobilizing public sentiment against it. What is more, the press has reported, and it has not been denied, that the President's chief lieutenant, Byrnes, told Congressmen to support the bill; and that several Senators declared, when the veto message arrived, that they had been assured by administration spokesmen the bill would be satisfactory to the President if certain changes were made, and these had been made in the final bill. Certainly a Congress in which several Senators are surprised when Roosevelt's veto message arrives is scarcely one which has been canvassed by the President to sustain his veto.

The margin by which the veto was overridden was very small—nine votes in the House, two in the Senate. Among the Senators who voted to override the veto were several who are very close to the White House: Caraway, Chavez, Hatch, Hayden, Hill, Maybank, Pepper, Russell and Thomas (Oklahoma). At least two of these, enough to sustain Roosevelt's veto, have never before been known to go against the wishes

of the President: Hill of Alabama and Pepper of Florida (that same week the latter announced in *Look* that he was living for the day when he could nominate Roosevelt for President of the United States of the World).

In the House, there was an even more amazing situation—amazing, that is, from the point of view of those who pretend that Roosevelt tried to get the nine additional votes required to sustain his veto. There were at least 10 Representatives from labor constituencies who could under no circumstances vote to override the veto and who were... absent when the vote took place! Eight of these were Democrats from New York City, six of whom (Heffernan and Delaney of Brooklyn; O'Leary of Richmond; Fay and Gavagan of Manhattan; Buckley of the Bronx) were elected in November with the endorsement of the American Labor Party; the two others (Pfeifer of Brooklyn and Burchill of Manhattan) were elected with trade union support. It is impossible to believe that these men, had they been called upon to do so by the White House, would not have voted to sustain the veto. Trying to cover up Roosevelt's responsibility for the conduct of these "absentees," Philip Murray's statement of June 25 on the overriding of the veto declares:

"It is a tragic fact that the absence of a number of members of Congress made it possible for a Congressional clique to engineer a sneak attack on the Commander in Chief by rushing through the overriding of the veto within minutes of its announcement."

Murray thus implies that the speed of the overriding vote caught the absentees unaware. But a Congressman who wishes to vote though he will be absent has a method available to him: it is called "pairing" whereby two Congressmen of opposing views agree to absent themselves together. Those in the minority (only one more than a third of the votes was necessary to sustain Roosevelt) can always find Congressmen to pair with. As a matter of fact there were 12 Representatives who did pair to sustain the veto. These elementary considerations should make it plain that the Congressmen who could not but vote against the bill and who failed to answer the roll call or pair themselves did so deliberately and with no pressure from the White House to do otherwise.

Why Roosevelt did not try to mobilize his supporters is made clear by the text of his veto message. The principal provision of the Act, embodied in the first seven of its nine sections, makes a criminal offense of strikes in "government-operated" plants or mines; this provision goes into effect in any industry as soon as a custodianship is set up like that of Ickes in coal. It was primarily with this provision in mind that the joint memorandum of the AFL, CIO and Railroad Brotherhoods, asking Roosevelt to veto the bill, stated:

"The 'War Labor Disputes Act' is a wicked, vicious bill. It is the worst anti-labor bill passed by Congress in the last hundred years... It is the very essence of fascism..."

"Compulsion, civil damage and criminal penalties are the unholy trinity by which this act accomplishes its evil purposes."

Did Roosevelt agree with this estimate of the principal provision of the bill? On the contrary, his message stated: "If the bill were limited to these seven sections, I would sign it." His objections to Section 8 were by no means pro-labor; conservative organs like the *New York Times* agree with him that its requirement of 30-day strike notices and secret strike ballots "might well become a boiling period instead of a cooling period." Only this Section 8 is cited by Roosevelt as his reason for vetoing the bill, because it "will produce strikes in vital war plants which otherwise would not occur." Even section 9, which has nothing to do with strikes, but brazenly outlaws use of trade union funds for political purposes, is not

cited by Roosevelt as a ground for his veto. He merely says that it "has no relevancy to a bill prohibiting strikes during the war," and he does not even condemn it as a general law: "If there be merit in the prohibition it should not be confined to wartime..." And in conclusion Roosevelt's message recommends a "work or fight" law providing for induction of all up to 65 years into non-combat military service: "This will enable us to induct into military service all persons who engage in strikes or stoppages or other interruptions of work in plants in the possession of the United States." Such was Roosevelt's "veto" message—no wonder the bill was passed.

As Arthur Krock noted in the June 27 *New York Times*, Roosevelt's message made "new and unusual concessions toward labor curbs." Yet this is the message which brought Roosevelt a letter from William Green praising the President's "courage" and "statesmanship" and one expressing gratitude for his "statesmanlike attitude" signed "Gratefully Philip Murray." At least the servile AFL leadership during the last war did not express praise and gratitude for a "work or fight" order issued by Wilson during a strike. The point has been reached where Gompers looks like a fighter in comparison to Green and Murray! And this, too, while they "lead" a labor movement triple in numbers and tenfold more powerful than the AFL of 1918. Truly, there is no limit to the fall of the bureaucrats.

Even if their picture of the Roosevelt veto were true, they would still have to answer the question: why did the bulk of Roosevelt's own party representatives in Congress vote to override it? The answer is that his party is an agency of the

capitalist class and that the trade unions must establish their own Independent Labor Party. But the AFL and CIO bureaucracy is still hunting for an answer acceptable to Roosevelt. The Stalinist *Daily Worker*, with its own foul logic, of which the major premise is support of Roosevelt no matter what he does, provides them with the only answer compatible with continued support of Roosevelt: "It is wrong to judge members of Congress only on the basis of the vote on the [Smith-Connelly] bill." There is certainly no limit to the fall of Stalinism.

The lies of Murray, Green and the Stalinists have been all too effective hitherto in shielding Roosevelt. Had their alibi of his veto message been launched in the climate preceding the miners' fight, it would probably have done the job.

Finally, however, the class struggle broke through. The miners' fight, month after month, pounded home the real meaning of Roosevelt's line. And, with the eyes of millions of CIO and AFL workers now opened to the real situation, Roosevelt's control over the labor movement is drawing to its close. The CIO and AFL leaders resist as long as possible. But the workers will finally drag them along out of the camp of Roosevelt. More precisely, a large section of these "labor statesmen" will remain with Roosevelt, but as individuals without their membership and finally without their official posts in the trade unions. Most of them are incapable of leading the unions in the coming stormy period when, breaking out of the coalition with Roosevelt, the unions march forward toward independent class action on both the economic and political fields.

The Detroit Pogrom

By DAVID RANSOM

The "race riots" which have flared up in Mobile, Beaumont, Los Angeles and, a dozen other cities are best described as anti-Negro pogroms. In each case a lynch mob has wrought violence upon an innocent colored minority. The Detroit "riot" fits into this same reactionary pattern.

On Sunday night, June 19, a scuffle between a Negro and white took place on the bridge leading to Belle Island park. Rumors spread like wildfire among the Sunday bathers on Belle Island. Among the whites the rumor circulated that a woman had been raped by a Negro; among the Negroes that a baby had been thrown into the Detroit river by a white marine. By ten o'clock fighting had broken out on Belle Island. At midnight gangs of white hoodlums were already roaming through Paradise Valley, the Negro slum area. 5 a. m. Monday morning the first victims of the anti-Negro pogrom lay dead in the streets of Detroit. Three Negroes had been shot by the police who claimed, as police will forever claim, that they killed in "self-defense." Hour by hour the fury and size of the white mobs multiplied. They roamed the streets unchecked by the police.

Acting in an organized fashion, the hoodlums set up a battlefield along Woodworth avenue, Detroit's main thoroughfare. From behind this battle they carried out their raids into the adjacent Negro area. Time and again they pushed into the Negro districts only to be repelled by courageous groups of Negroes. Meanwhile other gangs scoured the streets of Detroit dragging Negroes from streetcars and automobiles and beating them into bloody insensibility. Overturned cars to which the hoodlums had set fire littered the streets.

The role of the police is a matter of public record. Most

of the police were stationed in the Negro section. Of the 1,400 arrested, at least 1,000 were Negroes. Most of the 600 injured were Negroes. Of the 33 people killed, 26 were Negroes. And 16 of these 26 met their death at the hands of the police.

That Monday afternoon a stormy meeting took place between a committee of Negro and white citizens and the Mayor of Detroit. The June 26 *Pittsburgh Courier*, the leading Negro weekly, describes the meeting:

"At a noonday meeting in the Lucy Thurman branch of the YWCA, Negro and civil leaders complained to the mayor about the obvious partiality shown by members of the Detroit police department. They stated that police are confining their activities to shooting and clubbing Negroes. They said that Hastings, St. Antoine, and Brush streets are the scenes of police brutality, and that Negroes are being roughly handled and warned to 'get off the streets.' They claimed that whites are permitted to roam at will on Woodward avenue, a boulevard running parallel to the aforementioned streets and the police don't stop them from congregating."

The same newspaper gives an account of the police machine-gunning of an apartment house in the Negro area:

"According to information I have been able to gather, it seems that one colored occupant had fired out of one of the windows.

"Immediately, state troopers and police machine-gunned every window in the building, killing two occupants immediately and seriously wounding more than half a dozen others. They then invaded the building and brought out every occupant. Using Gestapo methods, they forced the occupants to stand on the Brush street sidewalk against the building, with hands up for more than an hour while the police searched the building. It is said the law enforcement officers

numbered at least 200, and that more than 1,000 shots and rounds of tear gas were fired into the building."

The Causes of the Pogrom

What incendiary had lit the fires of race violence in Detroit? The Stalinist *Daily Worker*, anxious to whitewash the Roosevelt regime and preserve "national unity," sees in the atrocities the handiwork of Axis agents. But every union militant, every Negro in Detroit, knows what happened: a lynch mob had been permitted to run wild. Even the capitalist press, which at first spoke of "fifth columnists," later retreated to safer ground; it referred to the indubitable facts about "economic antagonisms" in Detroit. But it did so only to place equal blame on Negro as well as white.

Detroit overflows with a population of two and a half million workers. Into this greatest of industrial centers has poured a continuous stream of southern migrants, Negro and white. The war boom swelled and quickened this migratory stream. The racial antagonisms of the South are thus reproduced against an industrial background. Competition for scarce housing, transportation, and recreational facilities creates new and sharpens old frictions.

The intolerable conditions created by the war drive the Negroes to try to break down the barriers of segregation. In housing segregation means higher rent. In industry segregation chains the Negro worker to unskilled jobs at low pay. To survive the Negro must burst from the overcrowded ghetto and win skilled jobs that bring higher wages. The rising cost of living is driving the Negro to demand, as never before, the equality of treatment without which economic survival begins to appear well-nigh impossible.

The native fascist gangs who have made Detroit their headquarters—Ku Klux Klan, Knights of the White Camelia, National Workers League, etc.—stand guard at the edge of the Jim Crow ghetto. They are prepared to kill and lynch to keep the Negro in the prison of economic and social segregation. And the tune of race hatred played by these reactionary pied-pipers is listened to by thousands of backward workers. To these dissatisfied workers they offer a scapegoat as the cause of their difficulties: "the Negro does not know his place." And a cure: the pogrom.

This, in brief, is the immediate background. This far in the description of the situation even the capitalist press has gone. But in and of itself this "economic" explanation is a half-truth as misleading as the Stalinist story of Axis agents and fifth columnists. The "economic" explanation fails to explain the boldness with which the native fascists operate. It fails to explain why the reactionary gangs killed with relative impunity. It covers up the central fact that the legions of reaction have on their side the ruling class and its agencies of "law and order." The fascist gangs brazenly stalk their prey in broad daylight because they feel armed with the moral authority of the Jim Crow system which the government itself enforces. The same capitalist press which today deplores "interracial riots" yesterday incited violence against Negroes and Mexicans, under the guise of an attack on non-existent "zoot suit" and "mugger" crime waves. The press and the government deplore the methods of the fascist gangs but share with them their hostility to the Negro's attempt to escape the ghetto.

Examine, first, the record of the Detroit police and Mayor Jeffries. We have already given the casualty figures which show their anti-Negro bias. But their hostility to the Negroes did not begin on June 19. The attack on Negroes at the Sojourner Truth Housing Project a year and a half ago seems now to have been a dress rehearsal for the later pogrom. Then as now Mayor Jeffries displayed his anti-Negro attitude. When this housing project for Negroes outside the Negro slum area

was announced, Jeffries asked Washington to build it inside the Negro ghetto. The police played the same part then as now—instead of repelling the white rioters they clubbed and arrested Negroes. In the face of the casualty figures, Mayor Jeffries has now had the effrontery to blame the Negroes for a large part of the June 19 explosion. If the Negroes didn't strive for better jobs, he says in effect, there would have been no "riots." According to Jeffries many manufacturers have been "forced to hire as high as ten per cent colored help where, in many instances, no colored help had ever been hired before." This, says Jeffries, "aggravated the situation." Jeffries adds this astounding admission: "It was taken by surprise only by the day it happened." Asked by a *PM* reporter what he had done to prevent the "riot," the Mayor replied: "I've had two luncheon conferences with the editors of Detroit papers..."

The Role of the Federal Government

Examine, next, the record of the Federal authorities, and you will find that the Detroit authorities are following in their footsteps. The Federal Housing Agency, in Detroit as elsewhere, Jim Crow's the Negroes in its housing projects. Two Jim Crow projects have just been finished in the suburbs of Inkster and Ypsilanti. The June 25 Negro weekly *Michigan Chronicle* makes this editorial comment:

"Outside the city limits of Detroit, two extra special housing projects have been designed and build to accomodate war workers who have dark skins, one at Ypsilanti and the other at Inkster. In these two modern asylums the colored war workers will be herded together in order not to 'contaminate' the white war workers with whom they work side by side every day. These projects are owned and operated by the United States Government..."

As in housing, so in industry the government yields to the pressure of the Jim Crow elements. Examine the record of the Fair Employment Practices Committee. Roosevelt created this committee only after a group of Negro leaders threatened to lead the Negro masses in a march on Washington. But he gave it no powers except that of holding hearings. And it even suspended hearings in the South when poll-taxers took offense at plans to air discriminatory practices of Southern railroads. Now the pressure of the poll-taxers has transformed this committee, ostensibly created to end discrimination in industry, into a means of furthering segregation. That is the tenor of the recent Mobile decision of the FEPC.

Toward the end of May a violent attack on Negro workers was staged by reactionary whites in the Mobile shipyards of the Alabama Drydock and Shipbuilding Company. They were resisting the upgrading of Negro workers to skilled jobs. Thereupon Father Haas, chairman of the FEPC, approved a plan for separating skilled Negro and white workers in the shipyard. The *Pittsburgh-Courier* writer, John B. Davies, reported the reaction of Negroes: "The point out that the Alabama decision threatens to establish a Jim Crow pattern of frightening proportions, that every industry all over the country will seize on the formula of a segregated section or plant for Negro workers, and that after the war the Negro will be driven out of industry completely."

Does the FEPC, which is scheduled to hold hearings in Detroit, intend to bring this Jim Crow formula there to "solve" the "riot" danger? It was after a similar riot that Father Haas brought it to Mobile. The government does not frown on Jim Crow in industry. Witness the statement of Lawrence Kramer, the executive secretary of the FEPC to the June 12 *Pittsburgh Courier*: "The FEPC has in the past refused to decide hypothetically that segregation of Negro from white workers was discrimination..."

Roosevelt sent in the army to restore law and order in Mobile, Beaumont and Detroit. But who is going to restore order inside the army? A permanent pogrom against Negroes rages inside the armed forces. Negro soldiers are beaten, killed and lynched for daring to protest against the Jim-Crow setup in the army and civilian life. In the south the struggle has taken on the character of a civil war. We cite only two instances. On January 11, 1942 in Alexandria, Louisiana, 700 Negroes, including 500 Negro soldiers, engaged in a battle with 300 town police; the fight was caused by the beating and shooting of 28 northern Negro soldiers two weeks before. The same week in which the army patrolled the blood-stained streets of Detroit, Negro soldiers stationed at Camp Stewart, Georgia, rebelled against the brutality of Jim Crow officers, MP's and local civilian authorities; one white MP was killed and four were wounded. These and hundreds of similar incidents are the inevitable consequences of the segregation of the Negroes in the armed forces.

Thus all forces of government, from the mayor's office in Detroit to the White House in Washington, seek to keep the Negro in the ghetto. It is this which explains the confidence with which the reactionary gangs are hurling themselves upon the Negroes. This all-important fact is being grasped by an increasing number of Negro people. Their views were reflected in the statement of A. Phillip Randolph in the July 2 Negro *Call*: "I consider that the official Jim Crow of the Negro by the Federal government itself in the armed forces, the government departments and defense industries is a major cause of the wave of race riots sweeping the country."

The Duty of the Trade Unions

The Negro people have the right and duty to defend themselves from these assaults. But the Negro people are a minority. They need allies. Their natural ally is the labor movement, for the enemies of the Negro people are also the enemies of the workers.

The Detroit pogrom struck a blow at the Negro people,—and the labor movement. Detroit unions—which means primarily the United Auto Workers—are composed of different racial, religious and national groupings. Without the solidarity of black and white, foreign and native born, Jew and gentile, the UAW is nothing. The pogromists have driven the dagger of race hate at the heart of the UAW. It is a life and death question.

Native fascist cells exist in the union. The KKK is reported to have more than 18,000 members in Detroit. The recent anti-Negro walkout at the Packard plant is a measure of the inroads the fascists have made into the union.

The auto companies, of course, have been stirring up race hatred among the workers. In the Packard incident, UAW President R. J. Thomas declares: "When the men entered the plant Sunday night and the Negro workers appeared to take their places at their machines, [three company officials] C. E. Weiss, Schwartz and Watts appeared and urged the white workers to ignore the position of the local union and the international officers. These company spokesmen, Weiss claiming to speak for George Christopher, president of Packard, said the white workers did not have to work with the upgraded Negroes if they did not choose to do so."

The union of course ordered the men back to work and upheld the right of the Negroes to upgraded jobs. But the UAW leadership failed to arouse the union to take decisive steps to eradicate this dangerous cancer. When the pogrom

came, the UAW leaders issued strong statements against it. But a thousand statements cannot cover the harsh truth. The UAW leadership failed the Negro people and the union in an hour of crisis. Individual acts of courage by union members during the pogrom were plentiful... but the union membership was not organized to defend the Negro people.

What Must Be Done

Why did the Thomas-Reuther leadership fail to call a meeting of the Executive Board of the International to take stock of the situation? Why did they fail to call a mobilization of shop stewards and bring out the veteran flying squadrons to defend the Negroes? The lynch mobs could have been stopped dead in their tracks by an organized and disciplined defense.

Had Thomas and Reuther rallied the men who built the union for a struggle against the fascist gangs, mass murder could have been prevented. By their failure to act, no small guilt for the blood that was shed rests with the top union leaders. Cowardice, stupidity, and lack of initiative characterised the behavior of the Reuther-Thomas leadership.

Nor has Thomas learned anything from the pogrom, for after it he issued an 8-point program, which follows the same policy of dependence on government officials, courts and agencies. Does Thomas have the illusion that an investigation will reform the police and rid them of their anti-Negro attitude?

To repel further assaults by the fascist gangs, union defense squads must be formed and held ready. Such action by the UAW will restore the shaken faith of the Negro people in the labor movement. The mere existence of such defense bodies will compel the fascists to think twice before they stir again.

Thomas calls for a grand jury and a mayor's interracial committee to probe the causes of the pogrom and make recommendations towards eliminating racial friction. But only the union can set in motion committees that will really expose the peddlers of race hate. What is necessary is a Labor Committee to hold public hearings, where the whole truth will be told. This dramatic step would begin the education of backward workers, who must be systematically taught the anti-labor consequences of race prejudice.

A Letter

EDITOR, *Fourth International*:

I am sure that when E. R. Frank referred to the Secretary of Labor as "Ma Perkins" (June *Fourth International*, Page 170), he did so in the same way that thousands of trade unionists do—without thinking.

But the origin of this term is to be found in the fact that Mrs. Perkins was the first woman to be selected as a member of the White House Cabinet. One need not in any way alter his opposition to the reactionary policies carried out by the Secretary of Labor to understand that this "Ma" is an expression of "male superiority," which is no less objectionable and has no more place in the press of the Trotskyist movement than expressions of national or racial "superiority."

In the interests of educating your readers and writers, I hope that the next issue of *Fourth International*, which firmly opposes discrimination against women and believes in full equality for all sexes, races and nationalities, will contain some reference to this question.

ALBERT PARKER
New York, N. Y.

Behind the Argentine Coup

By TERENCE PHELAN

Few recent events have been so badly misjudged by the U.S. government and press as the June 4th *cuartelazo*, or barracks-revolt, in Argentina. On the first day Navy Secretary Knox gleefully announced, "It looks as if the pro-Axis Administration there has been unhorsed," and other government spokesmen likewise publicly rubbed their hands at the prospect of pulling Argentina into belligerency. But within the fortnight, though the U.S. had recognized the new government, Secretary Hull was greeting with snappish replies of "No comment," reporters who pleaded to know whether he thought it a Nazi regime. The authoritative *New York Times* was forced to write a fresh editorial, with a new line, practically every day; and finally its editors were reduced to what they themselves called "reasonable guesses." Even Argentine pro-U.S. elements similarly leaped before they looked: the Radical Party announced its support of the new regime—and had its headquarters padlocked for its pains. One Horacio B. Oynaharte popped up in Chicago to hail the coup and announce that he had accepted the Radical Party's nomination to run for President in the September elections—which the new regime a few days later postponed to the Greek kalends. Nor was Berlin any more perspicacious: the first day of the revolt its radio howled that it was nothing more than a U.S. plot to drag Argentina into the war.

The most ridiculous spectacle of all was provided by the Stalinists. The Moscow press and radio hailed the *coup*; the humbling functionaries of the *Daily Worker* within four days had run the entire gamut from its first-day headline "Anti-Axis Army Takes Control in Argentina" to denouncing the *coup* as "Nazi fascist." Its June 7 editorial stated:

"The change in government is already a blow to the pro-Axis forces. Independent of the objectives of the forces now in control we may expect the speedier unfolding of democratic developments in Argentine."

That same morning's *New York Times* was reporting the seizure of the Stalinist daily *La Hora* and the arrest of its editors. This is, of course, precisely the sort of political analysis to be expected from people who abandon Marxist criteria for the treacherous deception of classifying all regimes as "democratic" or "fascist" according as they are in the Anglo-U.S. or Axis bloc.

In the fliplop of both bourgeois and Stalinist press from warm welcome to indignant denunciation one fact stands out sharply. From the very first moment it was abundantly plain that the new regime was one of extreme military reaction, with nothing democratic about it. Yet the press was ready to welcome this reactionary gang and indeed to whitewash it as long as it assumed it was unconditionally pro-U.S., and exploded into righteous indignation only when it began to appear that it retained considerable independence vis-a-vis Yankee imperialism.

Why They Guessed Wrong

In one sense, the mistaken assumption that the Ramirez-Rawson coup was pro-U.S. was understandable. When you telephone for a messengerboy and five minutes later the doorbell rings, it is not unreasonable to suppose that it is the messenger. The U.S. had long been "expecting" a pro-U.S. revolt in Argentina. As long ago as May 1941, *Fortune*, the organ of Big Business' managerial technicians, in a remarkably

frank reportage, "Report from Argentina," revealed that Latin Americans were fearing a new kind of intervention on the part of the U.S. The article noted ironically:

"Marines are a dated method, *tres vieux jeu*. Much neater are internal 'democratic' revolutions, turning the rascals out and replacing them by upstanding statesmen who, quite accidentally, are pro-U.S."

And it went on to point out that General Justo was Yanquilandia's man. In May 1942, we ourselves warned in these pages:

"The pro-Anglo-U.S. sector, despairing of the internally split and collapsing Radical Party, is preparing to get behind the ex-President-Dictator General Augustin P. Justo. If the Castillo regime continues to resist U.S. pressure, there is far from excluded a coup, backed by Yankee imperialism, to put Justo in power and swing Argentina into the U.S. war orbit."

Indeed, the plans of U.S. imperialism were a secret to nobody. In the Spring of 1942 it was a matter of public knowledge in Argentina that not only had the Radical Party failed to interest Washington in backing an overturn which would reestablish electoral sovereignty, but the negotiator had been given to understand in diplomatic but unmistakable language that, though the U.S. was indeed interested in backing an anti-neutrality revolt, the horse it was backing was ex-dictator General Justo who, while swinging Argentina into the U.S. war camp, would maintain "a firm hand" internally.

Although Justo himself died in the interim, delaying matters, it was nevertheless not surprising, when the cables brought word of a revolt, that everyone assumed that This was It—delayed a little by the necessity of rearranging matters with Justo's political heirs, but in essence the same revolt that had been so long awaited.

An even more basic reason for the assumption that no Argentine revolt could be other than pro-yanqui was the U.S. bourgeoisie's incorrect evaluation of its Argentine counterpart. Arrogant U.S. capital had long assumed that Argentina was just another banana-republic, differing in size but not in essence. Argentina's dogged independence at the Rio de Janeiro Conference of Foreign Ministers in January 1942 was a considerable jolt; but was frivolously attributed to "Latin pride," "jealousy of Mexico," and similar nonsense. Irritated, U.S. capitalism turned on the heat by means of a strangling embargo on Argentina, and continued to underestimate the powers of resistance of the strong though badly divided Argentine bourgeoisie. It was that persistent error of evaluation which made Washington find so incomprehensible a series of Argentine attitudes and actions which were, on the contrary, perfectly logical on the part of the national bourgeoisie of a strong semi-colonial country.

Just how strong has been exemplified by the success of the long and not yet ended struggle of Argentina to keep from being dragged into the war. It has not yielded as yet even to the extent of severing normal diplomatic relations with one imperialist bloc at the behest of the other. Indeed, if Argentina is compared with the only other remaining countries of similar importance which have kept out of the war—Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal, Spain, and Turkey—it will be found that it has maintained a more independent position than any of them. Despite a considerable rise in the cost of living, the war has probably caused less suffering in Argentina than in any other country. The latest Banco Central report shows that industrial

production more than doubled between 1935 and 1942—from \$800,000,000 to \$1,750,000,000. Never was employment so high. It was basically this situation which enabled the Castillo government to count at least on negative popular tolerance, despite strong resentment of its reactionary internal policy.

But the war has had indisputable effects on Argentina's economy. It produced neither an over-all boom, as in 1914-18; nor has it shattered it, as was momentarily feared after the closing-off of the continent and the apparently imminent collapse of Britain in 1940. Instead, it has—literally—*dislocated* it. Stock-raising, after the mid-war scare, has again become flourishing and profitable; but grain-crops are in a catastrophic situation for lack of markets, involving dangerously both the bond-structure erected on capitalized land-values and the government's own finances, heavily burdened by the policy of buying grain at a guaranteed price. Some industries are booming; but others are collapsing through inability to obtain the necessary machinery replacements, raw materials, etc. Here, as we pointed out in "The Real Situation in Argentina" in the August 1942 Fourth International, is the weak joint in Argentina's armor.

The Causes of the Revolt

Yankee imperialism has ruthlessly attacked at that point, attempting to strangle Argentina into submission by refusal to send the steel, heavy machinery, and other special equipment which Argentina must have to maintain and expand its industries. As long as the scales of war appeared to the Argentine bourgeoisie to be nicely balanced, they stubbornly held out. Now the turn in the war has not been sharp or overwhelming as yet; but Tunisia and Pantelleria visibly tipped the scales in the Allies' favor. The Argentine revolt was the distorted reflection of that shift in the correlation of imperialist forces.

Furthermore, parallel with the growth of Allied successes, Argentina has seen itself threatened by increasingly menacing military encirclement. Free Lend-Lease arms, especially planes, have been pouring into the bordering countries, particularly into Brazil. And with them, again particularly into Brazil, were pouring U.S. planes, guns, and troops. Meanwhile the U.S., now the only possible source, refused to sell Argentina any arms whatsoever. Argentina manufactures its own light arms and planes, largely trainers. But it has not in the past manufactured heavy artillery, tanks, and big planes; and even if it now attempted to do so, could not obtain the necessary aluminium and special steels.

Until a year ago, the Army was Castillo's stronghold, and its nationalist-minded leaders heartily supported his policy. But with every plane that arrived in Brazil, they began to get more nervous, and to put pressure on Castillo to relax his policy just sufficiently to enable the Army to buy some arms in the U.S. Castillo, presumably better informed than they of the political price demanded, refused.

The final incident was, curiously, one affecting Argentina's *imperialist* interests. For Argentina, though standing in a semi-colonial relation toward the major imperialisms, in its turn imperialistically exploits a smaller nation, Paraguay. Of late, Brazil, acting purely as an agent for U.S. imperialism, has been poaching on Argentina's preserves: some eighteen months ago, for example, the Banco do Brasil opened in Asuncion an agency which offered easier credit terms to Paraguayans than the long-established branch of the Argentine Banco Central there.

Such was the situation when, on the morning of May 24th, Minister of War Pedro Paulo Ramirez received a report that President Morinigo of Paraguay, during his recent "good-will" visit to Brazil, had signed a treaty of military alliance. This was the

last straw: Ramirez imperatively demanded of Foreign Minister Enrique Ruiz Guinazu that foreign policy be swung round sufficiently to enable the Army to buy equipment. On the refusal of this request, the Army generals, backed especially by the hot-headed nationalist cadres of colonels, decided at a secret meeting to put an ultimatum before Castillo at the July 6th annual Army-Navy "Comradeship" Dinner. Though they proposed to hold their troops in readiness in barracks on the night of the dinner, they conceived this merely as a powerful argument, and did not doubt that Castillo would concede just the necessary amount. But Castillo, if he lacks imagination, does not lack courage; getting wind of the plans, he countered by demanding Ramirez's resignation as Minister of War. A public statement by Ramirez that he had no designs on the presidency, either by election or by coup, failed to appease Castillo. At another meeting of the top Army officers, General Arturo Rawson persuaded the majority that they had gone too far to back down. On the night of June 3rd, the Army marched on the Federal Capital.

Thus the revolt was not made by principled political opponents of the Castillo regime, but by its own men trying to force its hand. Furthermore, their own hand forced in turn, they went off at half-cock. They did not have time, as nearly as can be ascertained, to consult at the necessary length with key capitalists and political leaders. It was thus a movement without either responsible bourgeois, or broadly popular, support: a mere *cuartelazo*. Hence it did not so much end a struggle as open it; and it is safe to assume that the June 4th *coup* was only the first act in an Argentine drama that will prove long and complicated.

That it was a mere palace revolution without fundamental political changes was demonstrated by the events of the *coup*. The entire action was carried out by a mere 8,000 men, some of them, according to the radiophotos, not even helmeted. There was almost no resistance—only 82 dead, and some of those civilians shot accidentally. The high-seas fleet maintained a benevolent neutrality. Most striking and significant of all, the politically conscious masses of the Federal Capital took no part in the action, regarding it with apathy. Between the Castillo government and the generals, they saw no good reason to die for either. On the one hand, Castillo's policy of non-belligerency was extremely popular, but his barbarously repressive internal policy was justly hated. On the other, the generals might perhaps promise a restoration of full internal democracy, but, the masses shrewdly guessed, only at the cost of dragging Argentina into the war. So, though a handful (blown up by the U.S. press into a big demonstration) hopefully shouted: "*Viva la democracia!*," the only genuine popular demonstration was unconnected with the *coup*. Crowds in the Plaza de Mayo seized the occasion to tip over and burn a dozen *colectivos*—Buenos Aires' small fast buses—to express their indignation toward a particularly resented dirty deal whereby the government had forced their driver-owners to sell them—on the pretext of "rationalization of the transport system"—to the predominantly British-owned Corporacion de Transporte. They also stoned the offices of a few Nazi newspapers and chased into his home the leader of one of Argentina's national-fascist groups, Manuel Fresco. Cops dispersed all demonstrators with tear-gas, put Fresco in protective custody overnight, arrested eighty newsmen and photographers. And the popular "intervention" in the revolt was at an end.

Far from being democratic, as it was first hailed, the new regime is rightist-reactionary and nationalist-military in nature. It furthermore has strong overtones of the Vargas brand of totalitarianism. It is, incidentally, not without interest that Ramirez in April fulsomely praised Vargas's *Estado Novo* in

a public address. The second statement issued by the junta abounds in typically clerical-fascist demagoguery:

"Usurious capital imposes its interests to the detriment of the financial interests of the country, protected by the powerful influence of high Argentine politicians who prevent our economic resurgence.

"Communism threatens to set up its rule in the country, which is made possible by the absence of social precautions . . .

"The armed institutions are despised and national defense is neglected.

"Education is leading the children away from the Christian doctrine and the youth is being raised without respect for God or love for country.

"It is inconceivable to plan the future government of the nation and to remedy such grave evils when the very men who participate and take part in the government are, and will be, the very ones responsible for the present situation, and are tied down by political agreements with the financial and land-owning interests.

"The high-ranking leaders of the Army and Navy who today decided to assume the enormous responsibility of creating, in the name of the armed institutions, a strong government devoid of the attitude of indifference which was masked by legality, but of the highest patriotism as in the Praetorian epoch . . ."

This could have been written by Vargas or Salazar or Franco.

The new regime immediately established martial law (later reduced back to the state of siege imposed by Castillo since December 1941); it dissolved Congress; it closed *La Hora* and arrested 14 of its editors and contributors—including even a Chilean Stalinist senator who was traveling through to Uruguay and was released only on strong diplomatic representations by the Chilean Embassy; it closed the headquarters of all political parties, including those of the Radicals who had offered it their support. It freed Castillo, naturally—this was only a family quarrel. It sent Interventors—Federal appointees replacing elected provincial governors—not only into the Castillo-controlled provinces where electoral frauds had put governors in power, but, even more promptly, into those provinces where legally elected Radical governors were in office. It was hailed, nevertheless, as anti-Nazi by the "democracies" when it abolished the privilege of embassies to send code messages; then obligingly lifted the ban long enough for the Axis embassies to make—in code—other arrangements. It forbade more than three persons to meet together in any trade union headquarters. It replaced the Radical mayor of the Federal Capital by General Basilio Pertine, member of the highest coordinating committee of the Argentine fascist groups, the Junta del Gobierno del Nacionalismo Argentino. It suspended the pro-Allied afternoon newspaper *Critica*, permanently suppressed the Stalinist weekly *Orientacion*, and barred from the mails the Socialist morning daily *Vanguardia*, which nevertheless offered its support. Two days after announcing that it was only a temporary government and would return the power as quickly as possible to really "worthy" politicians, it called off the presidential elections scheduled for September 5th and formally ordered the word "provisional" dropped in referring to itself. It replaced the strongly nationalist heads of the "YPF," Yacimientos Petroliferos Fiscales, the government oil corporation, and the Marina Mercante de la Nacion, the government steamship corporation, by unknown young Army officers. By the 20th, the German-financed pseudo-nationalist rag *El Pampero* was boasting in an editorial passed by the government censorship that Ramirez proposed to set up a corporate state based on guilds similar to that established by Mussolini. In repeated statements couched in a sort of diplomatic double-talk, the

Ramirez *junta* assured that it would fulfil all its "Pan-American obligations," but would remain "truly neutral" toward the rest of the world, and issued a sharp warning that it proposed to maintain complete sovereignty against no matter what pressure.

The Real Struggle Is Now On

With these measures, then, the Argentine situation is momentarily frozen. The fog of censorship established by the new regime is impenetrable, but behind it the real struggle for power is now going on. It was significant that the military *junta*, once it had state power, didn't quite know what to do with it. The only two civilians General Rawson could get to become ministers were two "illustrious zeros," obscure fascists from those circles which army officers habitually frequent. Rawson's "Cabinet" fell in 28 hours. For the moment Ramirez has cobbled together another which the Argentines promptly nicknamed "the cabinet of colonels." One serious representative of the Argentine bourgeoisie, however, sits in it as Minister of Finance: Jorge Santamarina, president of the Banco Central, most powerful single financial force in the country. It is safe to assume that he is there to see that the Bonapartist stop-gaps do nothing financially silly while the Argentine bourgeoisie is making up its collective mind what to do, and the various sectors are struggling for power.

The determining factor underlying that struggle is that the growing Allied victories confront the Argentine bourgeoisie with the necessity of carefully reexamining its foreign policy. In the process, it is determined to make the least possible concessions, political or economic, touching Argentina's sovereignty. Given its extreme complexity, the struggle may be long drawn out. First there is the struggle between the majority of the bourgeoisie which is truly national and—according to its limited bourgeois lights—anti-imperialist, and the minority bourgeois agents of imperialism. Among these agents themselves there is a secret and bitter rivalry between British and Yankee factions. Britain's role in the *coup* is far from clear: on the first day, stocks of the almost bankrupt British railways in Argentina spurted upward in London; when Rawson gave way to Ramirez, they climbed down again. Also to be noted is the friendship toward the British evidenced by Patron Costas, Castillo's chosen successor. There are also struggles among the representatives of the various economic sectors: the almost ruined grain interests clamoring for a change while the live-stock industry is by and large satisfied with the status quo; the industrial sub-sectors to whom the present situation means boom against those to whom it means crisis. There are struggles between those bourgeois nationalists who want a Vargas-type totalitarian state, and those who want the reestablishment of the Constitution. These struggles are numerous, complex, and cut across one another at all angles. It may take considerable time to iron them out. Meanwhile, it is the most probable variant though not at all the only one, that the Ramirez *junta* will be kept in power as a stop-gap. This was the pattern of the very similar 1930 *coup*, when a military government was maintained for six months until all the necessary deals had been made.

To the Argentine masses no intelligent lead has been given by either of the two mass working class parties. The Socialists, for long pro-Allied and pro-war, apparently see signs that the Ramirez regime will ultimately yield to U. S. pressure and support it. The Stalinists embarked on violent unprincipled zigzags. On the third day the Argentine Communist Party called for a revolutionary general strike against

the new régime, summoning the workers "to the streets!". This adventuristic appeal meeting with the same apathy which the proletariat had shown toward the *coup* itself, the Stalinists, six days later began humbly whining to the new government to "keep its democratic promises."

To the small but vigorous Fourth Internationalist movement there opens the opportunity of growth. As against the Popular Front demagoguery of the Socialists and Stalinists—the Fourth Internationalists advance a program of democratic demands and a proletarian united front. They have an excellent opportunity of rapid increase of influence in a proletariat angered by the continuance of reaction in Argentina. The censorship now allows almost no news to filter through concerning the Argentine labor movement; but one five-line UP dispatch of June 22, reporting that police shot down five of the striking workers in the sugar center of Esperanza, is indicative of both the workers' anger and the government's reaction.

The new government is reported ready at last to sign the long argued oil accord with the U. S. Argentina badly needs drilling equipment for the further development of her oil

reserves, now her only source of petroleum products. The U. S. offered a three-cornered deal whereby, in return for Argentina's supplying oil to the neighboring countries, especially Brazil, the U. S. would deliver some oil-drilling equipment. But the offer contained a catch. The government petroleum corporation, "YPF," has long successfully combated the Standard octopus. But now a disproportionately high part of this drilling equipment would go to Standard and another U. S. company operating in Argentina. Against this provision Castillo and the YPF directors stubbornly held out. The new government's willingness to accept this accord may well be the opening wedge to far greater concessions.

Nevertheless, the Argentine bourgeoisie may decide for a while longer to continue resistance to stepped-up Yankee pressure. If that should come to pass, there would soon arise again in sharpened form the danger of intervention, disguised under the nauseous hypocrisy of "Pan-American joint action." North American workers, knowing that the class-conscious Argentine proletariat, a million strong, looks to its class brothers in the United States as its only sure allies, must in such a case be quick to raise the cry of protest: "Hands off Argentina!"

Sidney Hook's Attack on Trotskyism

By M. MORRISON

When Sidney Hook attributes failure of nerve to all those who, overwhelmed by the unexpectedness and hideousness of the war, retreat into the realm of religion and mysticism, he is on solid ground and makes out a very good case. (See his articles in the last three numbers of *Partisan Review*.) In every period of great upheaval and violence many persons in the general progressive movement give up the struggle for a better world as utterly hopeless and find solace in the abstractions of religion and metaphysics. Insofar as Hook attacks all forms of religious belief and insists on the use of reason and scientific method no thinking person can have any quarrel with him. But Hook then goes on, in the same articles, to create an amalgam by including the Trotskyists among those who have lost their nerve when confronted by the problems of the war. In doing so he has not only done violence to common sense but, one is tempted to say, he is actually attempting to forestall the accusation that he himself has lost his nerve. He has not taken refuge in religion, but he has found peace and safety in supporting the war.

It is difficult to conceive how, even in the remotest sense, failure of nerve can be ascribed to the Trotskyists, who worked out a basic theory before the war, anticipating all the arguments presented by the supporters of the war, and remained firm in their convictions after the outbreak of the war. Failure of nerve is a term appropriate to those who, because of the unexpected, change their ideas, but is hardly applicable to those who predict an event and, when it occurs, follow the theory which they had formulated beforehand. Whatever the Trotskyists and their theory could be accused of, they can hardly be accused of a failure of nerve.

Three things (among many others) can be said about those whose nerve failed them when the war came. They changed their ideas about the war; they support it; they face no possible prosecution at the hands of the government. All three are applicable to both Hook and the religionists and not one is applicable to the Trotskyists.

But let us dispense with this terminological argument and proceed to the main issue—whether Hook or the Trotskyists are correct in their respective positions on the war.

Hook's False Description of Our Stand

To help him in his argument Hook presents a completely incorrect picture of the Trotskyist position. According to him the Trotskyists consider the war of "no concern to socialists"; believe that Roosevelt and Hitler "should be fought at the same time"; "that Roosevelt should be fought first because Lenin taught that the main enemy of the working class is its own government." What Hook does is to take some isolated phrases found in revolutionary socialist literature and present them as the systematic position of the Trotskyists on the war.

The real position of the Trotskyists can be summarized as follows: no support to any power fighting the war for imperialist purposes; continuation of the struggle for socialism during the war. Essentially that was Lenin and Trotsky's position during the First World War. It is true that in addition, other ideas and slogans were advanced and discussed during the First World War which leftist sectarians still insist upon placing at the center of a revolutionary program. These leftists do not understand that certain ideas and phrases were valuable during the First World War because they served the purpose of sharpening the cleavage between reformist and revolutionary socialists and of educating revolutionary cadres in intransigence after the unexpected political collapse of the Second International. But these ideas were not and could not be part of the essential position of the revolutionary Marxists towards imperialist war. For example, there is no justification for giving the phrase "revolutionary defeatism" a meaning separate and apart from the general Marxist attitude towards the war. Since revolutionary socialists never believed in helping an enemy government defeat their own government, the expression

“revolutionary defeatism” can be correctly understood only in the sense of continuing the revolutionary struggle for socialism during the war. Likewise the slogan “the main enemy is at home” is only another way of saying that so long as the proletariat does not possess state power it has no chance to struggle for its own interests against any foreign oppressor and must necessarily confine its efforts against the capitalist enemy at home. The basic idea of the revolutionary Marxist position towards an imperialist war is: no class peace during a reactionary war.

Hook is distorting our position when he says that the war is of no concern to the Trotskyists. Nor is it correct to say that the Trotskyists are “neutral.” They do not stand aside and view the war with indifference. They conceive their duty to be to educate the masses to the real nature of the war, to help them in their struggles against the capitalists during the war and to prepare them to take governmental power in order to abolish war and fascism. This is neither indifference nor neutrality.

Correctly understood, the position of the Trotskyists on the war makes completely irrelevant such a question, raised by Hook, as whether the Trotskyists are willing to permit Hitler to invade England without lifting a finger to oppose him. Non-support does not mean that the Trotskyists, any more than others, can refrain from working or fighting. So long as we Trotskyists are supported only by a minority of the population there is nothing for us to do except to submit in action to the position accepted by the majority of the population. Nor can our position of non-support directly affect the military outcome of the struggle. Either the working class comes to power under the leadership of the Trotskyists, in which case the war against Hitler is immediately transformed into a war for socialism against capitalism, or the working class remains subject to the capitalists and then the Trotskyists have no alternative other than to work and fight as other workers have to do.

The Dilemma Which Faces Hook

The attitude of the Trotskyists may have an indirect effect on the military struggle only in the sense that they defend the right of the workers to strike against the employers for higher wages and better conditions. Hook does not say whether he supports or condemns strikes. If he carries his support of the war to a logical conclusion he should do what the Stalinists and other reformists supporting the war do: condemn the strike of the miners.

If, on the other hand, he does not permit his logic to interfere with his sympathies for the workers, and he supports the strike of the miners, then he is doing just as much to “hamper the war effort” as the Trotskyists who do not support the war. It may be said that John L. Lewis supports the war but still calls the miners out on strike. But John L. Lewis is not a logician. Logic demands that he who supports the war should oppose any continuation of the class struggle because it may affect the military outcome of the struggle.

The central question is whether one believes in continuing the struggle for socialism during the war. Hook may claim that, although he supports the war, he still believes in continuing the struggle for socialism. He favors an independent Labor party and certain economic demands for the workers. But he does not treat the question of how the workers shall fight for their demands. The strike weapon remains the primary means of achieving the economic demands of the workers, and Hook evades this crucial question.

Perhaps Hook will claim that, if the opportunity is afforded during the war, he will favor the taking of power

by the working masses. But, if the majority of the people want to establish a socialist government during the war, Hook must reckon with the overwhelming probability that the capitalists will resist the attempt of the workers to take power. A conflict will ensue which cannot fail to affect the outcome of the military struggle.

It is only by posing the questions of one's attitude toward strikes or to an attempt by the workers to take power that we can discuss intelligently the question of how far we are willing to permit the military front to determine our attitude in the struggle on the home front. Either Hook believes in giving to the military struggle precedence over all other considerations, in which case his attitude of fighting for socialism during the war is a mere pose. Or he really believes in supporting the workers in their struggles during the war, in which case his support of the war is just as bad for the military front as the non-support of the Trotskyists.

Obviously one cannot avoid assuming certain risks. The victory of a foreign oppressor is certainly an evil. To cease the struggle for socialism is also an evil. Revolutionary socialists consider the latter the greater of the two evils. For to cease the struggle for socialism during a reactionary war is to cease to struggle for it at any time. Hook may prove to be an exception, but the verdict of history upholds this general principle.

Suppose the British Labor Party were to change its character and attempt to lead the workers to power during the war. It must certainly be assumed that the British capitalists will offer resistance and in the ensuing struggle the military front might be endangered. But then one must consider the tremendous gains which would come from a victory of the British working class. It would immeasurably increase the chances for victory over Hitler. Not only because the English people would throw their hearts and souls into a war for socialism, but because of the repercussions within Germany of a socialist victory in Britain. Hitler could not possibly stand up against it for long. The risk that British labor runs with its policy of supporting the war and of class peace is infinitely greater than the risk it would assume with a policy of non-support and making a serious effort to establish a socialist government.

The Character of the War

Our refusal to support the war is based on the fundamental premise that it is a war for imperialist purposes. Almost daily new evidence piles up to prove that assertion.

Upon what does Hook base his support of the war? In his articles in the *Partisan Review* he does not expressly say either that this war is imperialist in character or that it is one for democracy against fascism. Twice he uses the expression of a “war against Hitlerism,” leaving the impression that he considers the war to be against Hitlerism as a system; in other words, that it is a war against fascism.

If Hook could prove that this is a war for democracy against fascism, he would convert the Trotskyists to material support of the war. By our attitude to the Civil War in Spain we showed that, if we consider a conflict to be one between bourgeois democracy and fascism, we give material aid to the forces representing bourgeois democracy. Hook has not, as far as I know, undertaken to prove the impossible, namely, that this is a war for democracy against fascism.

Although he does not state flatly that he considers the war to be imperialist in nature, his articles can be explained only on the assumption that he is of that opinion but considers its imperialist character unimportant in comparison with other factors. Those liberals and Social Democrats who claim

this is a war for democracy are in constant difficulty. The conduct of the war is such that it is impossible to reconcile it with the idea that the war is being fought for anything else but imperialist interests. Many liberals have decided to recognize the war in its true colors and yet to support it on the simple proposition that the working class has greater rights in England and America than in Germany, and that it is better to live in democratic imperialist countries than in fascist imperialist countries. Hook is in that group.

It is of course undeniable that the workers still have greater rights in democratic imperialist countries than in fascist countries. The question is whether this furnishes any kind of an adequate criterion upon which to base a policy of supporting the war.

Acceptance of this criterion reduces itself to the proposition that those workers should support the war who have greater rights. On this basis the Southern Negroes should not support the war, for it would be difficult to contend that their rights are any greater than those of the German, Italian or Japanese workers. On this basis, furthermore, Hook should have urged the workers of Greece, the government of which was as brutal a dictatorship as that of Hitler or Mussolini, not to support the war. He should give the same advice to all workers in countries allied with the United States and England that are under dictatorial regimes. I am certain that Hook can name a few countries both in South America and in Europe that are allied with the United States and are far from democratic.

The Trotskyists support the war of the Soviet Union and of China; in the case of the Soviet Union, on the ground that it is a workers' state although a degenerated one; in the case of China on the ground that its struggle against Japan is a struggle of a colonial nation against an imperialist nation. The fact is, and will undoubtedly be admitted by Hook, that the totalitarian regimes in the Soviet Union and in China are just as bad as those in Germany, Italy and Japan from the point of view of lack of democracy. On the basis of Hook's criterion, then, there is no reason why the Chinese workers should support the war.

Hook does not deal with the question of the support of the war by the Chinese, Soviet and other workers living under a dictatorship. If he flatly stated that these workers should not support the war, I would be compelled to admit that he is at least logical. To be logical and still maintain that the workers of the dictatorship countries allied with the United States and England should support the war, it would be necessary for him to contend that the victory of the United States and England will, in some mysterious way, bring democracy to all dictatorships now allied with the democratic capitalist countries. This is a proposition that Hook will hardly advance.

The Consequences of the War

In supporting the war Hook relies mainly on his central proposition: "If Hitler wins, democratic socialism has no future. If Hitler is defeated . . . it at least has a chance." The consequences of a war, says Hook, are relevant in deciding what attitude a socialist should take towards it. It is quite true that the consequences to which a war leads is a factor of vital importance in determining the attitude of a socialist towards it. But the important question is what consequences a socialist must consider germane in determining his attitude towards a war.

The criterion of consequences is used by Marxists in a very precise and restricted sense. By the term "consequences of the war," insofar as it is a relevant factor in determining

support or non-support of a war, Marxists understand not all possible or probable consequences, but such as inevitably flow from the victory or defeat of one side or the other.

The consequences of a victory of the North in the American Civil War could have been nothing but a shift of power from the slaveocracy of the South to the capitalists of the North. Marxists therefore supported the North because the capitalist system of the North was progressive in comparison with the outmoded form of production prevailing in the South. The consequences of a victory of a colonial country over an imperialist country would inevitably be the weakening of imperialism. Marxists therefore support a colonial country as against an imperialist country.

The consequences of a victory of German and Japanese imperialism would be that the markets, raw materials, and spheres of influence now under control of English and American imperialism would be transferred to German and Japanese imperialism. The consequences of a victory for American and English imperialism would be the elimination of rival imperialisms.

Lenin thought that the consequences of a defeat for Russia in the First World War would be revolution. And so it turned out. But Lenin did not for that reason support the imperialist enemies of Russia. Marxists have always said that social upheavals will follow this war. They did not, for that reason, favor the war.

One can make out a plausible argument for the proposition that defeat of the United States by Japanese imperialism is very likely to lead to a great strengthening of the American revolutionary movement. It would be such a blow to American capitalism that it would place the sharp alternative of fascism or socialism on the order of the day. But no revolutionary Marxist would use that speculative possibility as a basis for supporting Japanese imperialism.

It is my personal opinion that the defeat of Hitler is more likely to lead to revolutionary upheavals in Germany and the rest of Europe than the victory of Hitler. That may be a reason for my wanting to see Hitler defeated, but it is no reason whatever for me to support any imperialist power which fights and can only fight for imperialist objectives. As a Marxist I base my position on the motive forces which brought the war into existence and the consequences of the war which are directly related to these motive forces.

Hook, on the other hand, uses the term "consequences of the war" in a much broader sense than that given to it by Marxists when they refer to consequences of the war as a factor in determining their attitude towards it. He would have us determine our attitude towards a war not by an analysis of the objective factors but by speculating on possible and probable results.

In addition to this basic factor of the character of the war, there are other factors that weigh heavily against the one selected by Hook. The Trotskyists, by refusing to give support to a war waged for imperialist purposes, thereby indicate their solidarity with the millions of enslaved colonial peoples. They indicate also their solidarity with the masses of Germany, Italy and Japan who will be worse off if their countries are defeated. I am afraid that many German workers argue like Hook: it is terrible to be under the yoke of Hitler but it will be worse to be under the yoke of our foreign enemies. They therefore conclude they must support German imperialism. Hook's support of the imperialists will scarcely help those German workers to free themselves from their identically false position.

It is highly significant that the Trotskyists, under the most adverse conditions, are building a revolutionary party

without which no successful socialist revolution can come, even if Hitler is defeated. Are they doing that because they do not support the war? Perhaps it would be too difficult theoretically to make out a cause-and-effect relationship between non-support of the war and building a revolutionary party. History, however, has proved at least once that they who

did not support an imperialist war and continued the struggle for socialism during the war were the ones who led workers to power. And it stands to reason that those who believe in continuing the struggle for socialism during the war are certain to be building a party for that struggle; the others are too busy supporting the war to build a revolutionary party.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

EDITOR'S NOTE: The official dissolution of the Communist International comes almost ten years after the proclamation by Leon Trotsky that the Third International was dead as the world instrument for the socialist revolution. It was on July 15, 1933 that Trotsky wrote his theses, reprinted below, in justification of this conclusion and the need of building the Fourth International.

In his summary speech before the International Commission of Inquiry into the Moscow Trials, on April 17, 1937, Leon Trotsky reviewed his position as follows:

"In the course of the years from 1923 to 1933, with respect to the Soviet state, its leading party and the Communist International, I held the view expressed in those chiselled words: *Reform, but not revolution*. This position was fed by the hope that

with favorable developments in Europe, the Left Opposition could regenerate the Bolshevik Party by pacific means, democratically reform the Soviet state, and set the Communist International back on the path of Marxism. It was only the victory of Hitler, prepared by the fatal policy of the Kremlin, and the complete inability of the Comintern to draw any lessons from the tragic experience of Germany, which convinced me and my ideological companions that the old Bolshevik Party and the Third International were forever dead, as far as the cause of Socialism was concerned." (*The Case of Leon Trotsky*, p. 475.)

Trotsky's 1933 theses were submitted for discussion to the various sections of the International Communist League (the original name of the Trotskyist organization) and were adopted by an overwhelming ma-

majority. Within a few weeks of their adoption a resolution "On the Need of a New International And Its Principles" was issued under the signatures of the following four organizations: The International Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninist); Socialist Labor Party of Germany (SAP); Independent Socialist Party of Holland (OSP); Revolutionary Socialist Party of Holland (RSP). Of the original signatories to this resolution only the Trotskyists—including a left wing in the Dutch parties—continued the work of building the Fourth International.

The Russian text of Trotsky's 1933 theses was first published under the signature G. Gurow in the *Bulletin of the Russian Opposition*, Nos. 36-37, October, 1933. The translation by John G. Wright is a new one from the original.

It Is Necessary to Build the Communist Parties and the International Anew

By LEON TROTSKY

The Orientation Toward Reforming the Comintern

From the day it was founded the Left Opposition has set itself the task of reforming the Comintern and regenerating the latter through Marxist criticism and internal faction work. In a whole number of countries, especially in Germany, the events of recent years have revealed with overwhelming force the fatal character of the policies of bureaucratic centrism. But the Stalinist bureaucracy, armed with extraordinary resources, has managed not unsuccessfully to counterpose its caste interests and prejudices to the demands of historical development. As a result, the evolution of the Comintern has unfolded not along the line of regeneration but along that of corrosion and disintegration.

But the orientation toward "reform," taken as a whole, was not a mistake: it represented a necessary stage in the development of the Marxist wing of the Comintern; it provided an opportunity for training cadres of Bolshevik-Leninists; and it did not pass without leaving its mark on the working class movement as a whole. The policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy throughout this period remained under the

pressure of the Left Opposition. The progressive measures adopted by the government of the USSR, which acted to check the offensive of Thermidor, were only partial and belated borrowings from the Left Opposition. Analogous manifestations, but on a smaller scale, could be observed in the life of all the sections of the Comintern.

It should be added that the degree of degeneration of a revolutionary party cannot, as a rule, be established *a priori*, on the basis of symptoms alone. The living verification of events is indispensable. Theoretically it was still impermissible last year to have considered as absolutely excluded that the Bolshevik-Leninists, basing themselves on the sharpening of the class struggle, could succeed in impelling the Comintern to take the road of actual struggle against fascism. The simultaneous attempt of the SAP* in Germany to assume an independent position did not exert any influence on the course of events precisely because the masses were waiting in the critical moment for the political leadership of their old organizations. In conducting the policy of a faction and educating its cadres on the experience

* Socialist Labor Party (Sozialistische Arbeiter Partei), a centrist organization — Ed.

of this policy, the Left Opposition, however, did not hide from itself nor from others that a new defeat of the proletariat, resulting from the policy of centrism, would inevitably acquire a decisive character and would demand a drastic review of our position on the question: faction or party?

The Change of Orientation

The most dangerous thing in politics is to fall captive to one's own formula which yesterday was appropriate, but is bereft of all content today.

Theoretically the collapse of the German Communist Party still left two courses open to the Stalinist bureaucracy: either a complete review of the politics and the regime; or, on the contrary, a complete strangulation of all signs of life in the sections of the Comintern. The Left Opposition was guided by this theoretical possibility when, after advancing the slogan of a new party for Germany, it still left open the question of the fate of the Comintern. It was, however, clear that the next few weeks would bring an answer and there was far too little hope that the answer would be a favorable one.

Everything that has taken place since March 5 (the resolution of the Presidium of the ECCI on the situation in Germany; the silent submission of all the sections to this shameful resolution; the anti-fascist congress in Paris; the official line of the emigre Central Committee of the German C.P.; the fate of the Austrian Communist Party; the fate of the Bulgarian Communist Party, etc.)—all this testifies incontestably that not only the fate of the German Communist Party but of the entire Comintern was decided in Germany.

The Moscow leadership not only has proclaimed as infallible the policy which guaranteed victory to Hitler, but has prohibited all discussion of what had occurred. And this shameful interdiction was not violated, nor overthrown. No national congresses; no international congress; no discussions at party meetings; no discussion in the press! An organization which was not roused by the thunder of fascism and which submits docilely to such outrageous acts of the bureaucracy demonstrates thereby that it is dead and that nothing can ever revive it. To say this openly and publicly is our direct duty toward the proletariat and its future. In all our subsequent work it is necessary to take as our point of departure the historical collapse of the official Communist International.

Realism Vs. Pessimism!

The fact that two parties, the Social Democratic and the Communist, which arose half-a-century apart and both of which proceeded from the theory of Marxism and the class interests of the proletariat, could have come to such a sad end: the one through base treachery; the other through bankruptcy, can engender pessimistic moods even among the advanced workers. "Where is the guarantee that a new revolutionary selection will not suffer the same fate?" Those who demand guarantees in advance should in general renounce revolutionary politics. The causes for the downfall of the Social Democracy and of official Communism must be sought not in Marxist theory and not in the bad qualities of those people who applied it but in the concrete conditions of the historical process. It is not a question of counterposing abstract principles, but rather of the struggle of living social forces, with its inevitable ups and downs, with the degeneration of organizations, with the passing of entire generations into discard, and with the necessity which there-

fore arises of mobilizing fresh forces on a new historical stage. No one has bothered to pave in advance the road of revolutionary upsurge for the proletariat. With inevitable halts and partial retreats it is necessary to move forward on the road criss-crossed by countless obstacles and covered with the debris of the past. Those who are frightened by this had better step aside.

But how explain the fact that our grouping, whose analysis and prognosis has been verified by the entire course of events, is growing so slowly? The cause must be looked for in the general course of the class struggle. The victory of fascism seizes tens of millions. Political prognoses are accessible only to thousands or tens of thousands who, moreover, feel the pressure of millions. A revolutionary tendency cannot score stormy victories at a time when the proletariat as a whole is suffering the greatest defeats. But this is no justification for letting one's hands hang. Precisely in the periods of revolutionary ebb-tide are cadres formed and tempered which will later be called upon to lead the masses in the new assault.

New Reverses

Those attempts which were made more than once in the past to create a "second party" or the "Fourth International" emanated from the sectarian experience of isolated groups and circles "disillusioned" with Bolshevism and, in consequence, led each time to failure. We take as the point of departure not our own subjective "dissatisfaction" and "disillusionment" but the objective march of the class struggle. All the conditions of the development of the proletarian revolution imperiously demand a new organization of the vanguard and provide the necessary pre-requisites for it.

The disintegration of the Social Democracy now proceeds parallel with the collapse of the Comintern. However profound the reaction within the proletariat itself, hundreds of thousands of workers in the whole world cannot fail already today to pose to themselves the question of the further paths of struggle and of a new organization of forces. Other hundreds of thousands will join them in the near future. To demand of these workers, a section of whom left the Comintern with indignation, while the majority did not belong to the Comintern even in its best years, that they formally accept the leadership of the Stalinist bureaucracy, which is incapable of forgetting or learning anything, is to occupy oneself with Quixotism and only to hinder the formation of the proletarian vanguard.

Undoubtedly, in the ranks of the Stalinist organizations, will be found sincere communists, who will greet with fear and even with indignation our new orientation. Some of them might perhaps temporarily replace a feeling of sympathy with one of hostility. But it is necessary to be guided not by sentimental and personal considerations but by mass criteria.

At a time when hundreds of thousands and millions of workers, especially in Germany, are departing from communism, in part to fascism and in the main into the camp of indifferentism, thousands and tens of thousands of Social-Democratic workers, under the impact of the selfsame defeat, are evolving to the left, to the side of communism. There cannot, however, even be talk of their accepting the hopelessly discredited Stalinist leadership.

Up till now these left socialist organizations have held against us our refusal to break with the Comintern and to build independent parties. This sharp disagreement has now been removed by the march of development. Thereby the discussion of formal-organizational questions is shifted over

to the programmatic-political plane.. The new party will rise higher than the old one only if by taking its stand firmly on the grounds of the decisions of the first four Congresses of the Comintern, it is capable in its program, strategy, tactic and organization to take into account the terrible lessons of the last ten years.

The Bolshevik-Leninists must enter into open discussions with the revolutionary socialist organizations. As the basis for discussion we shall propose the 11 points adopted by our Pre-Conference (after changing the point on "faction and party" in the spirit of the present theses). We are, of course, prepared to discuss attentively and in a comradely manner all other programmatic proposals. We must and shall demonstrate that principled irreconcilability has nothing in common with sectarian snobbishness. We shall show that Marxist politics consists in attracting reformist workers into the camp of revolution and not in repelling revolutionary workers into the camp of fascism.

The formation in several countries of strong revolutionary organizations, free of any responsibility for the crimes and mistakes of the reformist and centrist bureaucracies, armed with the Marxist program and a clear revolutionary perspective, will open a new era in the development of the world proletariat. These organizations will attract all the genuine communist elements who still cannot bring themselves today to break with the Stalinist bureaucracy and, what is more important, they will gradually attract under their banner the young generation of workers.

The USSR and the CPSU

The existence of the Soviet Union, despite the far-advanced degeneration of the workers' state, remains even now a fact of immeasurable revolutionary significance. The collapse of the Soviet Union would lead to terrible reaction in the whole world, perhaps for decades to come. The struggle for the preservation, rehabilitation and strengthening of the first workers' state is indissolubly bound up with the struggle of the world proletariat for the socialist revolution.

The dictatorship of the Stalinist bureaucracy arose as a result of the backwardness of the USSR (the predominance of the peasantry) and the tardiness of the proletarian revolution in the West (the absence of independent revolutionary parties of the proletariat). In its turn, the rule of the Stalinist bureaucracy has led not only to the degeneration of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union, but also to the terrible weakening of the proletarian vanguard in the whole world. The contradiction between the progressive role of the Soviet state and the reactionary role of the Stalinist bureaucracy is one of the manifestations of "the law of uneven development." In our revolutionary politics we must take this historically given contradiction as our point of departure.

The so-called "friends" of the Soviet Union (left democrats, pacifists, Brandlerites, and the like) repeat after the Comintern functionaries that the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy, i. e., first of all criticism of its false policies, "helps the counter-revolution." This is the standpoint of the political lackeys of the bureaucracy, but never that of revolutionists. The Soviet Union both internally and externally can be defended only by means of a correct policy. All other considerations are either secondary or simply lying phrases.

The present CPSU is not a party but an apparatus of domination in the hands of an uncontrolled bureaucracy. Within the framework of the CPSU and outside of it takes place the grouping of the scattered elements of the two basic parties: the proletarian and the Thermidorian-Bonapartist. Rising above both of them, the centrist bureaucracy wages a

war of annihilation against the Bolshevik-Leninists. While coming into sharp clashes from time to time with their Thermidorian half-allies, the Stalinists, nevertheless, clear the road for the latter by crushing, strangling and corrupting the Bolshevik party.

If without the proletarian revolution in the West, the USSR cannot come to socialism, then without the regeneration of a genuine proletarian International, the Russian-Bolshevik-Leninists will not be able, with their own forces alone to regenerate the Bolshevik party and to save the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The USSR and the Comintern

The defense of the Soviet Union against the threat of military intervention has now become a task more acute than ever before. The official sections of the Comintern are as impotent in this field as in all others. On their lips, the defense of the Soviet Union has become a ritualistic phrase, bereft of all content. The inadequacy of the Comintern is being covered up by such undignified comedies as the anti-war congress in Amsterdam and the anti-fascist congress in Paris. The actual resistance of the Comintern to the military intervention of the imperialists will prove even more insignificant than its resistance to Hitler. To nourish any illusions on this score is to head blindfolded toward a new catastrophe. For the active defense of the Soviet Union are needed genuine revolutionary organizations, independent of the Stalinist bureaucracy, standing on their own feet and enjoying support among the masses.

The establishment and growth of these revolutionary organizations, their struggle for the Soviet Union, their constant readiness for a united front with the Stalinists against intervention and counter-revolution—all this will have an enormous importance for the internal development of the Soviet Republic. The Stalinists, insofar as they remain in power, will have all the less opportunity to evade the united front as the dangers, both domestic and foreign, become more acute, and as the independent organization of the world proletarian vanguard becomes a greater force. The new relationship of forces will act to weaken the dictatorship of the bureaucracy; to strengthen the Bolshevik-Leninists inside the USSR and to open up before the workers' republic as a whole far more favorable perspectives.

Only the creation of the Marxist International, completely independent of the Stalinist bureaucracy and counterposed politically to the latter, can save the USSR from collapse by binding its destiny with the destiny of the world proletarian revolution.

"Liquidationism"

Bureaucratic charlatans (and their lackeys, like the Brandlerites) talk about our "liquidationism." They repeat senselessly and unconscionably words torn out of the old vocabulary of Bolshevism. Liquidationism was the designation given to that tendency which, under "constitutional" Czarism, rejected the need for an illegal party, for it sought to replace revolutionary struggle by an adaptation to counter-revolutionary "legality." What have we in common with the liquidators? It is far more appropriate to recall in this connection the ultimatists (Bogdanov and others) who fully recognized the need of an illegal organization but turned it into an instrument of hopelessly false policies: after the crushing of the revolution they posed as the immediate task the preparation of an armed uprising. Lenin did not hesitate to break with them, although there were not a few impeccable revolutionists among them

(the best of them later returned to the ranks of Bolshevism).

Equally false in character are the assertions of Stalinists and their Brandlerite lackeys to the effect that the Left Opposition is creating an "August Conference" against "Bolshevism." Referred to here is the attempt of 1912, one of the innumerable attempts to unite Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. (Let us recall that Stalin made such an attempt not in August, 1912 but in March, 1917!) For this analogy to have even a shadow of meaning, it would be necessary in the first place to acknowledge the Stalinist bureaucracy as the bearer of Bolshevism; and secondly, it would be necessary for us to pose the question of uniting the Second and Third Internationals. There cannot even be talk of either proposition! The charlatanistic analogy is designed to cover up the fact that the Brandlerite opportunists are trying to curry favor with the Stalinist centrists on the basis of a mutual amnesty, whereas the Bolshevik-Leninists are posing the task of building the proletarian party on a principled foundation, tested in the greatest battles, victories and defeats of the imperialist epoch.

On the New Road

The task of these theses is to summon the comrades to cross off the completed historical stage and to sketch out new perspectives for work. But what has been said above does not at all predetermine the immediate practical steps, the concrete changes in policy, the tempos and method of shifting to the new road. Only after a principled unanimity has been secured with regard to the new orientation—and our previous ex-

perience permits me to think that such a unanimity will be achieved by us—will there be placed on the order of the day the concrete tactical questions applicable to the conditions in each separate country.

In any case, under discussion now is not the immediate *proclamation* of new parties and of an independent International, but of *preparing* for them. The new perspective signifies first of all that talk of "reform" and demands to restore oppositionists in the official parties must be put aside as utopian and reactionary. The day-to-day work must assume an independent character, determined by our own possibilities and forces, and not by the formal criterion of "faction." The Left Opposition ceases completely to feel and act as an "opposition." It becomes an independent organization, clearing its own road. It not only builds its own fractions in the Social-Democratic and Stalinist parties but conducts independent work among non-party and unorganized workers. It creates its own bases of support in the trade unions, independently of the trade union policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy. It participates in elections under its own banner, whenever favorable conditions for this obtain. In relation to reformist and centrist labor organizations (including the Stalinists) it is guided by the general principles of the united front policy. In particular and especially it applies the policy of the united front in order to defend the USSR against external intervention and internal counter-revolution.

July 15, 1933.

A Marxist Book on Maritime

By C. THOMAS

MARITIME: A Historical Sketch and A Workers' Program. By Frederick J. Lang. Published for the Socialist Workers Party by Pioneer Publishers, New York, 1943. 171 pages. Paper \$1.

In the short space of time since this book went to press, its major conclusions have received new confirmation by the revelations in the U.S. Senate of some of the facts concerning the shipowners' and shipbuilders' feeding at the public trough in World War II. Although this Senatorial debate took place after the publication of this book, the superiority of the Marxist method of the author is shown by the fact that this book anticipates in all essentials the facts since revealed and, indeed, provides the background and analysis for understanding them.

Packed within the 171 pages of this book is a wealth of documented material on the class relation of the government to labor and capital in one important industry in the United States. The fusion of monopoly capitalism with the state has gone further in the maritime industry than it has in other fields, but the same development is being tremendously accelerated in all the "key" industries. The worker no longer confronts the individual employer in a dispute, nor even an association of employers in a particular industry. What he faces in addition is the "state," that "apparatus of repression of one class by another" which guarantees the continued existence of the profit system.

This role of "government" is carefully sketched by Lang from the early days of the maritime industry until today. Long after the operators of the shipping industry had demonstrated their complete inability to develop a merchant marine worthy of the name, the government kept pouring millions of dollars of public funds into the coffers of the "shipowners" in order to keep up the pretense of "private initiative." Following the

last war, a Senate investigation of the shipping industry revealed so monstrous a plundering of the public treasury that the more "respectable" of the robber barons were "shocked." This financial scandal completely discredited the U.S. Shipping Board, forerunner of the present Maritime Commission, and hastened its demise.

The root of the evil was held to be the indirect, or mail subsidy. In 1936 a Merchant Marine Act was adopted, which substituted the "direct" for the "indirect" subsidy. Those who framed the law declared that they did so with an eye toward preventing a repetition of the Shipping Board scandal. The Maritime Commission was the agency created to administer the law.

The Latest Revelations

How successful they were in their avowed purpose is revealed by the recent debate in the Senate—in March—over the question of confirming the renomination by President Roosevelt of Admiral Land as chairman of the Maritime Commission. Opposition developed in the Senate led by Senator Aiken of Vermont.

Senator Aiken's opposition expressed the fear that repetition of the Shipping Board scandals, multiplied and extended to other industries, would tend to discredit the entire capitalist ruling class. This is indicated when in the course of his speech in the Senate he says:

"Government spending to promote United States shipping, I regret to say, undoubtedly comprises some of the most unsavory pages in our history of Government expenditures. Many of the present members of the Senate are conversant with the

nauseating revelations brought forth by the Black senatorial committee a few years ago. *I fear that the conditions which exist at this time are even worse than those which prevailed at the time when the Senate created the Black committee.*"

Senator Aiken submitted charges against the Maritime Commission which were supported by voluminous evidence supplied by the office of the Comptroller General. Substantially, the evidence proved that the Maritime Commission was emulating its predecessor. With this important difference—while Shipping Board expenditures during World War I totalled a mere three billions of dollars, appropriations for expenditure by the Maritime Commission already total over nineteen billions of dollars. Not a bad banquet in these days of rationing!

And who would be sitting in dispensing the choice cuts? We'll let Senator Aiken tell us:

"I am informed by the Comptroller General that a number of officials of various steamship companies and of a large steel company have been or are now employed by the War Shipping Administration in rate-making and policy-making positions. Is it any wonder that the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration functions appear to be operating as much, if not more, for the benefit of private interests as they are in the interests of the public?"

Senator Aiken then expresses "alarm" at the probable reaction of the people when they learn the truth about the fraudulent "equality of sacrifice" hoax. "If this policy of the Maritime Commission," remarked Aiken, "so patently designed to relieve a single group from payment of taxes and moneys due the United States Government, were the only instance of its kind, I should not be so alarmed for the future of my country; but what I have stated applies to only a single factor of a single department of the government. *Probably it could be multiplied many times.*"

The *Pacific Shipper* (April 12, 1943) multiplied it at least once in an editorial protesting publicity given the "modest" profits of the shipowners, and saying, "future historians should note how much fuss has been raised over shipping profits in the Red Sea trade, running into millions, and how little over the wartime profits of the railroads, running into billions."

The attitude of the majority of the Senate was best expressed by Senator Bailey, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, the committee which acts on all important matters concerning the merchant marine.

In reply to the charges brought by Aiken, he said:

"I believe there still remains in the constitution the fifth amendment which says a man's property cannot be taken without paying him just compensation. I sometimes think we forget that that amendment is in the constitution, but when I say my prayers at night, if I am feeling very blue, I sometimes thank God for the fifth amendment, and remind myself that it is still in effect. We can take it away in a moment by action based on foolish thinking, and by appeals against profits, and by an attitude of envy of men who do well. I will have no part in it. I am in favor of just compensation because—well, because it is God's justice to begin with, and it is provided for in the constitution, which I would support even if I were not sworn to support it."

In the same debate, Senator Clark (Missouri) made the following comment referring to vessels subsidized by the government: "The government put up the money to build the ships. The government put up the money to operate the ships." The question arises: Just who is being compensated for whose property? Shipyards are constructed at government expense. In these shipyards, ships are built with public funds. The completed ships are turned over to private operators and the government pays for their operation. The government insures the vessels with public funds. The operators are then guaranteed a fat profit for the operation of the vessels and the govern-

ment further provides that a major part of this profit can be set aside in tax free reserve fund, to be divided up at a more opportune moment, or to be used to "purchase" the government-owned ships at bargain prices after the war. Such has been the attitude of "government" toward the shipowners for many years. It is not surprising that the author of *Maritime* uses quotation marks around the word "shipowners" when he refers to this class of parasites. And what is true of maritime can, as Senator Aiken remarks, "be multiplied many times." The Senate voted 70 to 5 to approve the policy of the Maritime Commission and refused to sanction an investigation of Aiken's serious charges.

The Story of Maritime Labor

In sharp contrast to the government's paternal attitude toward the profit system, is its attitude toward maritime labor. This book traces in detail the rich experience of the seamen with government "paternalism." Whenever the seamen were atomized, as they were after the U.S. Shipping Board had smashed their unions in 1921, the government maintained a hands-off policy. But when the seamen had regrouped their ranks and organized into strong unions, the government became very much concerned about their "welfare." With the termination of the 1936-37 strike it became apparent that the private operators were no longer able to "discipline" the organized seamen. Government then intensified its active intervention on behalf of the shipowners. With the outbreak of World War II, and particularly with the entry of the United States after Pearl Harbor, the seamen were confronted with the apparatus of government in every aspect of their activity. The shipowners left their "private" desks and flocked to Washington to occupy "government" desks in the offices of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration. Nineteen billion dollars makes plenty of fat and while putting it on in thick layers they found time to strip some from the bones of the seamen.

A considerable section of this book deals with the question of union leadership. Two main divergent tendencies developed in the maritime unions—the "anti-politicals" and the Stalinists. Functioning as agents of the foreign office of the Kremlin, the Stalinists adapted their policies to the exigencies of Stalin's line. With slight variations, they followed every zig-zag along with their compatriots in other sections of the trade union movement. Lang describes this process in great detail. The "anti-politicals" abjured "politics" for pure and simple trade unionism tempered with a healthy distrust of government intervention.

With the outbreak of war, fighting the government became unpopular. Along with other sections of the labor movement the maritime leaders gave up the right to strike "for the duration." It would be difficult to get an adequate definition of the phrase "for the duration" from those who entered into such agreements with the government. Does it mean until the present phase of the war is terminated? Does it mean until the government officially declares the war at an end? Or does it mean as long as the "emergency" lasts? In view of the fact that the phrase is always used in the most general sense, it might be profitable to probe the matter a little more deeply.

The "anti-politicals"—leading the Seafarers International Union and its West Coast affiliate, the Sailors Union of the Pacific—hope to maintain the independence of their unions throughout the war by giving political support to the government and by maneuvering with the government apparatus. They believe that they can thereby preserve the integrity of their unions during the war so that "after the war" the struggle with the shipowners can be resumed where they left off when war

began. This policy has led to a continuous series of retreats that have weakened the union, and strengthened the government apparatus of repression. The government knows what it wants and is determined to achieve its goal. That goal is the elimination of the independence of the unions, i.e., their integration into the government apparatus or the destruction of all union organization in the industry. Because of the existence of a number of factors which makes it almost impossible to achieve a central leadership of the seamen, the latter is the more likely variant. Considering its future perspective in world affairs, American imperialism cannot tolerate the existence of independent unions in the maritime industry.

American imperialism has set for itself the task of dominating the world market. Only the markets of the world can provide an outlet for the tremendous productive capacity of American industry. Of equal importance is the necessity of making every nook and cranny of the entire world available for the export of American capital. With the termination of the present phase of the war, the rivalry between the erstwhile "partners" in the United Nations bloc will develop into major conflicts. Already, with just a hint of a victorious conclusion to the present phase of the military struggle, ominous disagreements develop beneath the surface of a fictitious unanimity. Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, announces that the United States is building a "seven ocean navy" and is seeking bases all over the world. Military administrators are being trained to rule in territories occupied by the armed forces. The existence of world capitalism literally rests upon the armed might of American imperialism. There will be no "peace" for the peoples of the world under a social system in the last stages of disintegration and decay. Two world wars in one generation is eloquent testimony to the permanent crisis of world capitalism.

If World War II is but the continuation of World War I, then the "post-war" world under capitalism will be an armed camp between battles. With this vista before us, giving up the right to strike "for the duration" can only mean the surrender

of that right for as long as American imperialism endures. We can be sure that is the definition the ruling class applies to the phrase "for the duration." The seamen have an historical example to go by. In World War I, the British seamen gave up their right to strike "for the duration of the war." They never regained that right. For, after the termination of armed hostilities on the European continent, British imperialism was compelled to carry the war to a far-flung colonial empire. Armed intervention against the Soviet Union protracted the "period of emergency." In the U.S. the "period of emergency" terminated with the smashing of the seamen's unions by the government. With the colossal task that confronts American imperialism of trying to keep an entire planet in subjection the "period of emergency" can only terminate with either the crushing of the working class or the elimination of the system that breeds wars.

It is sheer folly for the anti-politicals to imagine that "after the war" the weapons which they now surrender will be returned. Nor is it any the less foolish to fail to utilize other weapons that are available. What some of these are is presented in the form of a program of action in the concluding chapter of *Maritime*. The methods of pure and simple trade unionism are hopelessly outdated. Every struggle, even for the most elementary demands, finds the workers confronted with the government sitting as the executive committee of the ruling class. Every struggle is immediately transformed into a political struggle. To refuse to recognize this fact and draw the proper conclusions is to invite disaster.

Frederick Lang's *Maritime* will serve as a model of the practical application of Marxist theory to the problems of the day. As such it is required reading for all students of the labor movement as well as for all seamen, who will find in it a veritable mine of material on the maritime industry. Pioneer Publishers is to be congratulated for having added *Maritime* to its list of publications.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

India

News from the Bolshevik-Leninist Party

Good news from India—the Bolshevik-Leninist Party, Indian section of the Fourth International, lives and fights on despite the bestial repressions of British imperialism.

The totalitarian censorship and blockade seeks to cut off the Indian fighters for independence from communicating from one province to another, not to speak of reaching the outside world. Nevertheless, we have received the most precious kind of news from our Indian comrades—ten leaflets and a pamphlet published by them during the past year. The latest of them issued appears to be the leaflet issued for the January 26, 1943 Indian Independence Day celebration. From this it is clear that the organization was still able to function after six months of the worst white terror of British imperialism, during which tens

of thousands of Indian revolutionists have been herded in prisons and concentration camps.

The leaflets and pamphlet are printed, and excellently so, which in itself is a testimonial to the efficiency of the Trotskyists of India, for nothing is more difficult under such conditions of illegality and military dictatorship than to maintain a good printing press establishment underground.

The pamphlet is a substantial 64-page publication of the Program of the party, dated 1942. Received here in an earlier draft in manuscript form, its main sections were published in the March, April and October 1942 numbers of *Fourth International*. It is a document of which the whole Fourth International may well be proud and testifies to the political maturity of the leadership of the Indian party.

Their View of the Struggle

Through the leaflets one can follow the response of the party to the revolutionary

developments in India. One is a rounded political statement issued August 9, 1942, when the All-India Congress Committee ratified the resolution of its Working Committee to launch a mass civil-disobedience struggle. Several paragraphs from it will indicate the Trotskyist policy, on the one hand completely free from sectarianism, on the other hand firm and precise on principles:

"The decision of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress to embark on a programme of struggle will be welcomed by the Indian masses . . .

"Only the flunkeys of 'democratic' British Imperialism, like the Royists, or the agents of Stalin, the so-called Communists—Stalinists—can oppose mass struggle against imperialism . . .

"The Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India welcomes the decision of the Congress to embark on some form of mass struggle, but deems it necessary to point out that nearly three years of fruitless vacillations and gestures were required before

this decision . . . In the coming struggle there must be no vacillation, no compromise. Gandhiji has said that the struggle will be 'short and swift.' We do not wish the life of Imperialism to be prolonged by a single day. But we do not underestimate the forces of imperialism. In order to overthrow imperialism it is necessary to prepare for an exceedingly bitter and even protracted struggle.

“ . . . But if British Imperialism is to be overthrown, the masses in their millions must be drawn into the struggle . . . Swaraj means little to the peasants if it does not mean the abolition of the curse of landlordism. For not only are the landlords among the most solid supporters of British rule in India, but their criminal record of oppression, extortion, and unbridled gangsterism over the unarmed peasantry has made them the most hated exploiters of India. The slogans of 'Abolition of Landlordism without Compensation' and 'Cancellation of Peasant Debt' must be leading slogans of the struggle. Not only no-tax campaigns against the government, but also no-rent campaigns against all landlords, must be commenced on the widest possible scale, leading to the seizure of land by the peasants through Peasants Committees.

“Manning the nerve centers of the economy, the workers are in the position to deal the most devastating blows against imperialism . . . A mass general political strike against British imperialism will paralyse and bring to a stop the whole carefully built up machinery of imperialist administration. The imperialists have been fully alive to the danger presented to them by the movement of the workers, and the heaviest and most savage blows of the repression have fallen on the workers and their leaders . . .

“With the mobilization of a majority of the nation in this way, the position within the Army, which imperialism depends on as a last resort, will change in a matter of days. The Indian soldiers, who are peasants in uniform, cannot fail to be affected by the agrarian struggle against landlordism and imperialism . . .

The Workers Must Lead

“We cannot, however, expect the Congress to lead a struggle of this nature. With regard to the peasantry in the 1930-33 movement Gandhiji openly stated that he had no intention of endangering Indian landlord interests. With regard to the workers, the Congress has studiously avoided the use of the strike weapon as a method of struggle against imperialism. Tied to the doctrine of non-violence, the Congress will never call upon the Indian Army to turn their arms against the imperialist exploiters. For the Congress, which is dominated by Indian bourgeois interests, in all critical situations acts as the instrument of the Indian bourgeoisie. And the Indian bourgeoisie—even the most nationalist sections of it, because they fear their interests will be in danger when

the mass led by the workers take to revolutionary action—will strongly oppose the methods of struggle outlined above.”

The leaflet concludes with a section which warns the masses to be on guard against compromise, pledges support to “any mass action that the Congress may take against British imperialism,” and confidently predicts:

“The movement started under the leadership of the Congress is bound to develop into channels other than those laid down for it. The revolutionary masses who are the main victims of imperialism are also its most virulent and uncompromising opponents, and will intervene to wage the struggle on the widest scale.”

A Balance Sheet

Six months later, in its Independence Day leaflet, the Bolshevik-Leninist Party draws a balance sheet of the struggle, which says in part:

“The party supports the present mass struggle against British Imperialism although it is led by Congress. But the party points out that the Congress did not prepare for the struggle, did not give the masses a program, and did not make the meaning of independence clear in terms of the live problems of the workers, peasants and middle classes. Last but not least Congress did not adopt revolutionary methods of struggle.

“These failures are not accidental. They unmistakably point to the inherent nature of the Congress. Dominated as it is by the propertied classes, it cannot but serve their interests . . . Revolutionary struggle of the masses cannot develop without the struggle for the demands of the masses. But such a struggle will be directly against the interests of the capitalists. Hence it is that compromise with imperialism is the very anchor of the Indian capitalist class . . . Nevertheless the struggle launched by the Congress against British rule has the potentiality of rousing the long pent up revolutionary energies of the masses. Hence the party supports the struggle. In order to raise the struggle to a full-fledged revolution, the working class must participate in and lead the struggle, with its own program, banner and methods.”

This leaflet, like practically all, emphasizes over and over again the central task of rousing the great masses of the peasantry by calling upon them to seize the land: “Independence can mean nothing to the peasantry if it does not mean land to the peasantry and the liquidation of their indebtedness.”

Summarising the results of six months of struggle it records that the bestial repressions, “far from leading to demoralization, increases the volume of desperate discontent. The masses are reaching out for new methods of struggle. Ahimsa [non-violence] and the negative concept of paralyzing the government is giving way to mass violence and the concept of direct

overthrow of the government.” And it warns: “In the face of this situation the bourgeoisie are openly revealing their compromiser tendencies. They find in the mass movement merely an excellent counter to drive a bargain with British imperialism.”

For Defense of the USSR

Almost all the leaflets deal with the Soviet Union and Stalinism, for the advanced workers and peasants in this predominantly agrarian country understand their kindship with the agrarian country where the first successful proletarian revolution was achieved. This intense sympathy with and interest in the Soviet Union has enabled the Stalinists, masquerading as followers of Lenin, to be of considerable aid to British imperialism in opposing the struggle for independence.

One leaflet, headed “Defend the Soviet Union,” explains why the only way to defend it is by revolutionary struggle against all the capitalists. Another, “25th Anniversary of the October Revolution,” explains how the Stalinist bureaucracy rose to power on the ebb of the revolutionary wave, but that “Despite the distortions the main social conquests of October remain” and must be defended. Other leaflets—“Peoples War”—Charlatanism or Stupidity,” “Stalinist Traitors Unmasked”—expose the counter-revolutionary and chauvinist line of the Communist Party of India as “pimps and procurers” for British imperialism.”

Appeals to Troops

Three of the leaflets are written for distribution to American and British soldiers in India. One of these, “The Real Nature of the Anti-Fascist Peoples' War,” in explaining the imperialist character of the war on both sides, points out the significance of the events in Burma:

“The hide-bound conservative British were prepared to lose Burma to the fascists rather than give arms to the people. The British imperialist masters were more afraid of the independent action of colonial people than of the prospect of defeat at the hands of the imperialist rivals. What is more the Chinese soldiers, who offered their services for defending Burma, were not allowed to enter the country. It was only at the fag end of the battle of Burma that only one Chinese division was allowed to fight on Burmese soil and that too under an American General, Stillwell, who was foisted upon the Chinese army by the British imperialists. The obtuse British slave-owners could not brook the idea of the Asiatic peoples fighting under their own staff, side by side with the British, thus setting an example before the Burmese, who might emulate them and rise up and take advantage of the opportunity to gain their independence.”

The same leaflet, and another, bring to the American and British soldiers the news of the Nazi-U.S. patent pools of Standard

Oil, du Pont, General Motors, etc. They "are still doing business with Hitler" while "trying to place the full burden of the war upon the masses both in America and in Britain," the leaflets explain.

Understanding how the anti-fascist sentiments of British and American workers are being perverted to serve the imperialists, one leaflet to American and British soldiers is headed: "What is to be Done? Revolution the Only Way of Defeating Fascism."

Another leaflet, "An Appeal to the Fighting Forces," tells the American and British soldiers why the Indian masses are revolting and urges them: "Do not be party to wholesale flogging and large scale lynching . . . Join hands with the Indian comrades in their struggle against the common enemy—the imperialist exploiters."

Apparently referring to events well-known to the soldiers themselves, one of these leaflets refers to the fact that "The American soldiers are already fraternizing with the Indian revolutionaries in Behar and Bombay."

Uruguay

The Liga Obrera Revolucionaria Asks Entry Into the Fourth International

When Shachtman and Burnham, alleging that Russia was no longer a workers' state and hence was undeserving of unconditional defense, led a group out of the Socialist Workers Party, they naturally attempted to make inroads into other national sections of the Fourth International. The solidity of the International's theoretical and organizational foundations was triumphantly demonstrated by the fact that not a single national section followed the petty-bourgeois splitters, despite such extraordinary efforts as an elaborate South American tour made by an important Shachtmanite leader.

In May 1941, however, a small group of Uruguayans formed the Liga Socialista Internacionalista, which adopted an anti-defensist position on the Soviet Union. It was often featured in the Shachtman Workers Party press.

Last month, grown in size and experience, and renamed the Liga Obrera Revolucionaria, it wrote to announce a reconsideration of its position. After "long studies and discussion," and "with greater understanding of the matter," it has decided that the existence of the nationalized economy determines the character of the USSR as a workers' state, which therefore "must be unconditionally defended, as long as the economic foundation preserves the structure of socialized economy." Of those who refuse to defend the USSR it says:

"The task of the revolutionary on the Marxist basis cannot consist in aiding the class enemies (the imperialists of no matter what flag) to destroy the first workers' state, in order to defeat its counter-revolutionary leadership (Stalinism), but in defending it by all accessible

means against its enemies, both exterior and interior. It seems to us stupid to show oneself indifferent to the fate of the conquests of October because a counter-revolutionary camarilla has usurped the leadership.

"The danger of capitalist restoration in the USSR is not yet that restoration itself. In view of the immediate danger, the revolutionary does not abandon the field of battle to save the USSR, as the bridgehead of the world revolution."

Drawing the necessary organizational conclusion from its present theoretical premises, the Liga Obrera Revolucionaria last month severed its official connection with the Shachtmanites and applied for membership in the Fourth International. In view of the existence in Uruguay of the Liga Bolchevique-Leninista, official section of the International, it is expected that fusion negotiations will be initiated in the near future.

Argentina

Spurred by a rise in living-costs of 20 to 40 per cent whereas wage increases have rarely exceeded 10 per cent, the Argentine proletariat has been engaging in determined strikes for higher pay. As elsewhere, the class-collaborationist Stalinists have followed a strike-breaking policy. Now an April issue of the Fourth International fortnightly *Frente Obrero*, just arrived in New York, exposes a fantastic Stalinist attempt to find "theoretical" justification for their scab tactics in Lenin's writings!

Against honest Communist Party rank-and-filers who refused to desert their union brothers, the Stalinist bureaucrat Victorio Codovilla launched a campaign accusing them of "economism." "Economism" was a reformist deviation in Russia which tried to limit the revolutionary struggle to the "spontaneous" demands of workers for economic betterment, and fought the Leninist policy of political intervention into every field of struggle against Czarism and centralized organization on the basis of a principled program. Lenin attacked "economism" sharply in his *What Is To Be Done?* of 1902 and other writings of the period.

To the tail-ending trade unionism of "economism" Lenin counterposed the broad

political struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of Czarism; the Stalinist falsifiers counterpose "national union," i.e. a new name for Popular Frontism and its subordination of the proletariat to the "liberal bourgeoisie." Lenin wanted to integrate trade union struggles into the broader political struggle; the Argentine epigones utilize his arguments for political struggle as a pretext for sabotaging the union struggle.

Since many new Stalinist policies have their try-out performance in Latin American countries, Fourth Internationalists must be on the alert in all countries to unmask and scotch this latest Stalinist falsification as our Argentine comrades have done.

* * *

Repudiating an Adventurer

There has just arrived from Buenos Aires a copy of a mimeographed *Boletín Latino-Americano*, the first publication after a long period of silence by the adventurer Quebracho. We publish below a statement on this adventurer made last September by the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International:

"The person named Quebracho has himself broken off all relations with the Fourth International. He has thereby demonstrated his inability to find his place in our movement. Like any one of us, Quebracho had complete freedom to defend his political concepts within our organization. But he was so lacking in any sense of revolutionary discipline that he did not even undertake to set forth his political ideas—if he had any—but chose rather to turn his back on our movement. His petty-bourgeois irritation against proletarian discipline then made Quebracho lose all equilibrium, and to his desertion he added acts endangering members of our organization. The Executive Committee has demonstrated the greatest patience in trying to save Quebracho from himself, that is to say, from his bourgeois past. But today we must note that Quebracho has shown himself to be incapable of living and working in the revolutionary movement, and has revealed himself as an adventurer who has nothing in common with our ideas and our methods.

"The E.C. of the F.I."

SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK, N.Y.

I am enclosing \$..... Send me
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

() 6 months.....\$1.00
() 1 year.....\$2.00

Name.....

Address.....

City.....



J U S T O F F P R E S S !



JAMES P. CANNON'S THE STRUGGLE FOR A PROLETARIAN PARTY

THIS LATEST PIONEER BOOK is a companion volume to Leon Trotsky's "In Defense of Marxism." These two books supply the essential documentation of the struggle against modern revisionism which took place in the Socialist Workers Party three years ago. In the book by James P. Cannon the principles of party organization are set forth more comprehensively than this subject has ever been treated before.

FOUR MAJOR SECTIONS make up the book:

- 1) J. P. Cannon's pamphlet, "The Struggle for a Proletarian Party."
- 2) Letters to Comrades. Letters from Cannon to Trotsky and other leaders and members of the majority group in the Party.
- 3) Documents of the Struggle. Resolutions on party unity, on discipline, convention resolutions, etc.
- 4) Appendix: "The War and Bureaucratic Conservatism." This document of the petty-bourgeois opposition is printed to enable readers to contrast the organizational principles and methods of the opposition to those of the Trotskyists.

Paperbound \$1.50

Clothbound \$2.00

P I O N E E R P U B L I S H E R S

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK, 3, N. Y.

TIMELY PIONEER PUBLICATIONS

A New Topical Pioneer Pamphlet!—

THE STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO EQUALITY

by

ALBERT PARKER *and* JOHN SAUNDERS

Negroes and whites are asking what can be done about Jim Crow. This pamphlet contains the answer of the S.W.P., clearly and simply set forth.

32 pages

5 cents each

3½c in bundle orders

The Definitive Work on Seamen's Problems!—

M A R I T I M E

*A HISTORICAL SKETCH
A WORKERS' PROGRAM*

by

FREDERICK J. LANG

Written especially for seamen, it is, however, of absorbing interest to all workers who want to know what is happening to American economy and politics.

181 pages

Paper bound

One dollar

An Indispensable Part of Any Marxist Library!—

LEON TROTSKY'S

Great Marxist Classic

IN DEFENSE OF M A R X I S M

(Against the Petty-Bourgeois Opposition)

Written in the last year of Trotsky's life, this book contains articles and letters dealing with: dialectical materialism, the class nature of the Soviet Union, defense of the Soviet Union and many other problems of revolutionary politics and Marxist theory.

240 pages

Paperbound \$1.50

Clothbound \$2.00

*THE ANNIHILATING ANSWERS TO
THE FRAME-UP FILM —*

“Mission to Moscow”
are to be found in

NOT GUILTY: REPORT OF
THE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY
INTO THE MOSCOW TRIALS!—
JOHN DEWEY, Chairman

440 pages

Paperbound \$1.00

Clothbound \$3.00

The CASE of LEON TROTSKY:
THE HEARINGS HELD IN MEXICO CITY
by the COMMISSION of INQUIRY INTO
THE MOSCOW TRIALS—JOHN DEWEY,
Chairman

600 pages

Harpers (1938)

Clothbound \$2.75

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE •

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

• NEW YORK, 3, N. Y.