
June 1944

Fourth International

Review of the Month *By The Editors*

The Case of the 18 and the Stalinists

Why English Trotskyists Are Jailed

The "New" Bonomi Regime In Italy

U.S. Capitalism Heads for Bankruptcy *By Wm. Simmons*

Social Role of Religion *By Felix Morrow*

A Brief Report on England *By J. B. Stuart*

Pucheu Case and "Free France" *By Jeanne Sorel*

It Is Time to Break with Stalinism *By Hakim Mizra*

The Arsenal of Marxism

Our Current Basic Military Tasks II

By LEON TROTSKY

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

Letters from our Los Angeles agent report increased newsstand sales of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL:

"We just received the 100 extra magazines in the nick of time. Due to the extra amount we have to place on the stands we always need more than our actual order would otherwise be.

"The March F. I. had a good sale on the newsstands—82 copies on three stands. I expect this to have its effect on the sales of the April issue as well. I have noticed that quite a few people come to the office for literature and discussion after having picked up our literature on these stands.

"As long as we are getting those extra F. I.'s you might as well increase San Pedro's order. I am hoping that we can get going on the newsstands out there. We now have someone to handle the Hollywood stands so I should have some results on that within the next few weeks.

"The May issue kept up the standard of the previous issues. It is getting so that when a real good issue comes in, it is only average.

"I am enclosing more money on our F. I. account. Our aim is to pay for the current issue and always be paid up for the forthcoming issue.

"Please send us a bound volume of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and THE MILITANT for 1943, as I think we have a better chance of selling them when we can show them to people."

* * *

A reader in Toledo praises the technical and theoretical level of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, according to the following letter from our agent:

"We received the May bundle of F. I.'s and want you to know that we are proud of the magazine. It is set up with very good type and easy to read. The black and white effect is attractive. A friend who reads it thinks the F. I. is a clean looking magazine as well as an excellent theoretical magazine. We intend to expand the F. I. here and hope to get it out to more people."

* * *

A subscriber in Dayton highly

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME V June 1944 No. 6 (Whole No. 45)

Published monthly by the

Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 15c 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

CONTENTS

<i>The Month in Review</i>	
The Case of the 18 and the Stalinists.....	163
Why English Trotskyists Are Persecuted.....	165
"New" Bonomi Regime in Italy.....	166
A Brief Report on England.....	By J. B. Stuart 168
U.S. Capitalism Heads for Bankruptcy	
	By William Simmons 171
Pucheu Case and "Free France".....	By Jeanne Sorel 174
Religion—Its Social Roots and Role	By Felix Morrow 177
It Is Time to Break with Stalinism....	By Hakim Mizra 180
Australian Working Class and the War (From the Manifesto of the Revolutionary Workers Party of Australia)	183
<i>From the Arsenal of Marxism</i>	
Our Current Basic Military Tasks II	
	By Leon Trotsky 186



commends the series of articles on Japan by Li Fu-jen, which appeared in the February, March and April issues of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

"I received the second copy of the April F. I. The series of articles on Japan is one of the finest pieces of scholarship I have read in a long while."

* * *

Seldom a month goes by without requests for back issues of the magazine. For instance, a subscriber in New Haven asks for "three additional copies of the April F. I."

A subscriber in Toledo asks: "Can you get me two copies of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for February, 1941? I want that issue for the article by the Old Man on 'Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay.'"

A subscriber in New York City requests "the issues of the F. I. dealing with the Harlem and Detroit riots (August 1-3). If the Harlem riot is dealt with in more than one issue of the F. I., send the other issues."

The Wisconsin State Historical Society of Madison placed

an order for all of Vol. 2 (1941) NEW INTERNATIONAL and the January, February, March and April issues of Vol. 3 (1942) NEW INTERNATIONAL.

Our agent in St. Paul states: "We do not have any January issues of the F. I. left. As you know, that is the one with Grace's article on race (*Myth of Racial Superiority* by Grace Carlson). It was used as a basis for discussion in a Negro group here so you can see how popular it is. We have suggested it be made into a pamphlet and are looking forward to this. We could sell many more copies of ical that F. I. here."

* * *

The following unions have asked that they be placed on the exchange mailing list of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL: Meat and Cannery Workers, Local Union 56, AFL and the CIO Political Action Committee whose letter is interesting: "Plans for a comprehensive nation-wide news service for political action are now complete. As part of this service, we have established a central news clearance desk here at the national headquarters. . . Your part in furthering the news service is to send us whatever material you feel should be given national distribution. But even before that, would you please see that we are placed on your mailing list. If possible, we would like to receive two copies of each issue—one for clipping and one for our permanent file."

* * *

Readers of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL will be interested to know the outcome of the 3-month *Militant Subscription Campaign* launched April 1, during which period an introductory subscription of 13 issues for 25c. was being offered. The goal was 3,000 new readers to THE MILITANT.

During the first eight weeks of the campaign over 3,000 new subscribers were obtained by agents and friends of THE MILITANT, the only weekly newspaper in the country that tells the truth about labor's struggle for a better world. By the time this issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL reaches our readers, the *Subscription Campaign* will have officially terminated with approximately 6,000 new subscribers reading THE MILITANT.

Ready for Delivery Now

Bound Volume

of

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

1943

Price \$4.50

Order Now From

BUSINESS MANAGER

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 5

JUNE 1944

NUMBER 6

The Month in Review

The Case of the 18 and the Red-Baiting Stalinist Campaign

GROWING SUPPORT FOR THE CASE OF THE 18

The national campaign directed by the Civil Rights Defense Committee to free the 18 Trotskyists railroaded to prison under the vicious Smith "Gag" Act is becoming more and more recognized within the American labor movement as the foremost labor defense struggle of the Second World War. Warren K. Billings, who was framed up together with Tom Mooney in 1916, has correctly emphasized the fact that the Minneapolis Labor Case is "the same kind of frameup as was perpetuated against Mooney and myself during the First World War."

The growing realization of the crucial importance of this case is expressed in the rapidly widening support and solidarity among labor and progressive organizations. Already organizations representing well over a million workers and members of Negro, fraternal, civil liberties and other progressive bodies have backed the fight to free the 18 and to wipe out the Smith "Gag" Act. In addition to almost 250 local, district and state trade union organizations, several Internationals of the CIO have officially endorsed the defense campaign: United Transport Service Employees of America; Textile Workers Union; and the United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees. At its June Convention in Boston, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union of the AFL unanimously passed a resolution demanding presidential pardon for the 18.

Support has likewise come from the leading national Negro organizations: the National Association For the Advancement of Colored People and the March-On-Washington movement. The largest labor fraternal bodies, the Workmen's Circle and the Workmen's Benefit Fund, have called upon their members to aid the 18.

The series of highly successful meetings held during the national tour of CRDC Secretary George Novack in the principal industrial cities from coast to coast provided another graphic demonstration of the rising tide of labor and liberal support.

Like every great labor defense struggle of the past, the Minneapolis Labor Case has become a touchstone to distinguish the progressive forces in American life from the reactionary and to expose before the very eyes of the workers just who are the servants of the class enemy within its ranks. Leading this treacherous pack are the Stalinists, who have recently capped their strikebreaking activities by a public proclamation of allegiance to Wall Street and its "free enterprise."

PREVIOUS CONDUCT OF THE STALINISTS

Having stabbed the miners in the back, having scabbed on the Montgomery-Ward strikers, the Stalinist finks are now intensifying their activities in the field of labor defense. When Roosevelt and Biddle at Tobin's behest moved to railroad the Trotskyists to

jail in 1941, the sole objection voiced at the time by the *Daily Worker* was that the Department of Justice did not go far enough in its frameup. The GPU's hirelings in this country demanded that Roosevelt stage in Minneapolis a replica of Stalin's own Moscow Trial frameups. Through the subsequent stages of the case leading up to the imprisonment of the 18, the Stalinists in their press participated in the official conspiracy of silence concerning the case while covertly sabotaging efforts to rally forces and resources for the defense fight within the union movement.

Now that the Minneapolis Case has become one of the major issues in labor's ranks and the most progressive elements are rallying resolutely behind the campaign, the enraged and panic-stricken Stalinists have moved into the open. They are conducting a nation-wide furious and rabid campaign against the Trotskyists, and especially against the 18 class war prisoners and their supporters.

FINK BRIDGES CALLS FOR RED-BAITING CAMPAIGN

In the very same June 2 issue of *The Dispatcher*, official organ of the Stalinist-dominated International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union—CIO, in which Harry Bridges announced that the Stalinists intend to continue their strikebreaking policies permanently—in peacetime as well as for the duration—he devoted his entire personal column on the editorial page to incitement of lynch attack upon the Trotskyists. Echoing California's Associated Farmers vigilante gangs, Bridges ended his attack with the cry: "Let's go get 'em!"

Simultaneously the Stalinist West Coast daily, *The People's World*, published a series of typical GPU articles, one emanating from Mexico City full of fantastic charges of a "Trotskyite conspiracy" to "wreck the transportation system of Mexico" and to "curb war shipments to the US," in particular, by fomenting "wildcat railway strikes." A second dispatch from London slanders the English Trotskyists and backs Churchill's persecution of the leaders of the Trotskyist Revolutionary Communist Party. The third, written by the GPU in this country, smears the imprisoned 18 and endorses the frameup engineered by Roosevelt and Tobin. (*People's World*, May 22 and 23.)

GPU BUYS SPACE FOR ITS VIGILANTE LIES

This opening phase of the carefully calculated campaign was climaxed in the same week by the insertion of a half-page advertisement in the *San Pedro Pilot* paid for and signed by the Communist Club of San Pedro. This paid advertisement reiterates the vicious falsehoods in the articles of the *People's World*; adds that the Trotskyist program is "the same program which Hitler and Tojo advise American workers to follow"; brazenly includes the infamous Moscow frameups as part of the "record of Trotskyite conspiracy"; and then concludes by raising the same vigilante lynch cry that Bridges uttered in his own paper: "They operate, like enemy spies in our midst . . . Show these

provocateurs the gate." (*San Pedro Pilot*, May 27. Emphasis in the original.)

Concurrently issue after issue of the *Daily Worker* has been making political preparations for the extension of this lynch and red-baiting campaign against the Trotskyists on a national scale. To inflame public opinion the Stalinists have of course resorted to the vilest chauvinist waving of the Stars and Stripes, trying to exploit the Allied invasion of Europe, and every other demagogic trick of the profiteers and Legionnaires. Their immediate aim is to counteract and break up in every way the growing labor support for the 18. Similar methods were pursued by the GPU and its agents in connection with the historical struggle against the Moscow trials when the International Commission of Inquiry headed by John Dewey investigated the Moscow Trials, branded them as frameups, and found the chief defendants, Leon Trotsky and his son, Leon Sedov, not guilty.

RED-BAITING TRICKS OF THE DAILY WORKER

Two days before the CRDC mass meeting in New York on June 8 the *Daily Worker* openly attempted to terrorize prominent labor figures and to prevent them from speaking. Similar attempts, as the CRDC Secretary reported, had been made at various other cities during his tour. In New York, as elsewhere, these methods were unavailing. The New York meeting proved not only to be the largest public demonstration to date in support of the imprisoned 18 but brought forth from the labor leaders present scathing denunciations of the Stalinist's role in this case. Thus the chairman of the meeting, George Baldanzi, executive vice-president of the United Textile Workers—CIO, stated:

"... Very frankly, the activities of the *Daily Worker* and the Communist Party and some of our 'left-wing' leaders of recent date, with their endorsement of the Baruch plan, with their reemphasis that they have always been for capitalism, with their pronouncements of a no-strike pledge after the war—as far as I am concerned, that group has forfeited the right to speak for the working class in America. And I should say that the sooner they get out of the labor movement and stop pouring opium on it which will deaden its militancy, the better it will be for American labor."

What are the main reasons behind this latest public resumption by the GPU apparatus of its international campaign against Trotskyism? In the first place, broad working class masses are beginning to understand the enormity of the Stalinist degeneration, crimes and betrayals. This is being driven home by the Kremlin's counter-revolutionary foreign policy (the endorsement of Allied war aims; Stalin's complot to aid Roosevelt and Churchill in the attempt to strangle the maturing European revolution; the dissolution of the Comintern; the recognition of Badoglio, etc.); by the intensification of reaction within the Soviet Union (the wiping out of the remaining cultural gains of the October revolution; the elimination of free public education, co-education and all progressive legislation for women; the inculcation of national chauvinist ideology in place of proletarian internationalism; the restoration, with state backing, of the Greek Orthodox Church and its Holy Synod; the fostering of a monstrous officer caste with privileges surpassing those of Czarist Russia and Kaiser's Prussia, etc.); and finally, by the corresponding submission of Stalinist parties to Anglo-American Big Business.

A CONTRAST THAT IS ANNIHILATING

The unwavering and irreconcilable struggle of the Trotskyists for the socialist program of Marx and Lenin stands out before the eyes of the advanced workers in the sharpest contrast to the abysmal perfidy of Stalin and his followers. In the United States and England the Stalinists are crawling before Wall Street and the City; they have underwritten the war policies of Roosevelt and Churchill, especially the drive against labor's rights and living standards bound up with the execution of that imperialist program. In these two strongholds of world capitalism the Trotskyists have been persecuted, framed up and railroaded to prison because of their revolutionary socialist ideas and activities in defense of the interests and rights of the laboring masses on the road to the establishment of workers' power throughout the world.

In order to try and check this political awakening of the militant workers and their gravitation toward the Trotskyists, the Kremlin has again stepped up the operations of its slander, terror and murder machinery. This anti-Trotskyist campaign is rendered all the more imperative by the visible disaffection within the ranks of the Stalinists themselves. The Kremlin's policies have already produced splits within the Communist Parties of Italy and Poland; Browder, Foster and Co., have had to resort to expulsions in this country in order to put over the new line; while in England more and more Stalinist-influenced workers are becoming disillusioned and turning toward the Trotskyist Revolutionary Communist Party.

The growing radicalization of the war-wearied masses throughout the world and their increasing opposition to the decayed capitalist system and all its apologists and upholders presents a mortal danger not only to the imperialists but also to the rule of the usurping Stalinist bureaucracy within the USSR. The GPU will stop at nothing in fulfilling Stalin's order to behead the rising world revolutionary movement by striking at its Trotskyist vanguard.

ON GUARD AGAINST GPU MACHINATIONS!

When in 1941 prior to the entry of the United States into the war Roosevelt and Biddle initiated their frameup against the leaders of the Socialist Workers Party and of the Minneapolis Truckdrivers Union Local 544-CIO, we warned the labor movement that this assault upon labor's rights and free speech was but the opening gun in an all-out offensive against the American working class. Today ever-greater sections of organized labor recognize the inseparable connection between the fight to free the 18 and their struggle to maintain their own organizations and rights in the face of the rabid anti-labor drive.

The current anti-Trotskyist campaign of the Stalinists—centered around the case of the 18—is likewise fundamentally directed against the interests of the labor movement as a whole, against its day-to-day struggles to safeguard gains already made, and above all against its great revolutionary communist future. The Stalinists are concentrating their fire upon the Trotskyists for the same purpose as Roosevelt did in 1941 and Churchill is doing at this very hour—to repress the most conscious and incorruptible anti-capitalist fighters and thus clear the way for the general assault upon the rest of the working class. The Stalinist attack is all the more insidious and dangerous because it issues from within the labor movement.

It is the elementary duty of every progressive element to expose and beat back this latest conspiracy of the Stalinist

agents of Big Business. The task of tasks for American labor is to crush Stalinism *politically* and to completely purge itself of what Trotsky called "the worst plague" of the world working class movement.

Why the English Trotskyists Are Being Persecuted

**TROTSKYIST LEADERS
JAILED IN ENGLAND** Early in April, following the huge coal strikes in Wales and Yorkshire, the strike struggles of dock, aircraft and engineering workers in Scotland and North Ireland, and the apprentices' strike in Tyneside, the English bourgeoisie, alarmed by the militancy of the workers and definitely shaken by prospects of bigger and fiercer strikes in the near future, geared its machinery in order to extricate itself from the crisis by means of one of its most favorite methods—raising the red scare, unleashing a rabid red-baiting campaign.

While the English press nationally began detecting everywhere "hidden hands," "sinister influences," etc., etc., the Gestapo squads of Scotland Yard raided Trotskyist headquarters, and even private homes from one end of the country to the other. Next came the arrests of four Trotskyist leaders: Jock Haston, Roy Tearse, Heaton Lee and Ann Keen, on the charge of having "incited and instigated" the Tyne strike. The Trade Disputes Act under which these revolutionists have been indicted is the notorious piece of Tory strikebreaking legislation, passed in 1927 after the defeat of the General Strike. This is the first instance in which the Tories have dared to invoke the provisions of the 1927 anti-union law, or more correctly, have empowered their lackey Bevin, Minister of Labor, to employ it against our English co-thinkers. For further details and for the general background of the case we refer our readers to the article of J. B. Stuart in this issue and to articles appearing in the weekly newspaper, *The Militant*.

We shall confine ourselves here to two points: (1) the primary motivations of the British ruling class and its agencies in engineering this frameup; and (2) the importance of this case not only to the workers in England but to those in the United States, as well as throughout the world.

**CLASS ALIGNMENTS
IN GREAT BRITAIN** The English capitalists, like their class colleagues in other countries, are now caught in the vise of the gravest crisis of their existence. Both the crisis and the war which engendered it flow from the decay of the capitalist system as a whole. The peculiarities of the development of English capitalism (its insular position, its early appearance on the world arena, the advantages resulting from its initial virtual monopoly of industrialization, its vast colonial empire, etc., etc.)—these peculiarities have hitherto enabled the ruling class to corrupt the English workers, buying off the top layers with sops from colonial super-profits, and imbuing the entire class with bourgeois ideas, habits and traditions. The English empire gave the semblance of immutability precisely because it rested on this bourgeoisified proletariat.

The conservatism of the English working class as a whole enabled the bourgeoisie to emerge from the crisis of the first imperialist World War, and to surmount, with relative ease, the post-war shocks and convulsions, especially the world-wide economic depression and crisis that erupted in 1929 and continued right up to the outbreak of the second World War.

Indeed, the passivity and docility of the English workers at the time came as a pleasant surprise to the rulers who had expected, feared—and prepared for—far greater conflicts than those which did actually take place. Throughout the first war and its aftermath only the advanced layers of the English proletariat moved forward, while its thickest and nethermost strata remained inert. The English capitalists owed this situation *externally* to the successive catastrophic defeats of the European working class; and *internally*, on the one hand, to the perfidious Labor leadership who helped quell and crush the isolated vanguard; and on the other, to the progressive degeneration of the Communist International under Stalin who further facilitated the task of the Tories by beheading the English vanguard.

**AN ALTERED
SITUATION** But the basic economic factors which formerly worked in favor of the bourgeoisie have in the meantime been operating, at first hidden and then more and more openly, to its gravest disadvantage. The country's economic structure—and it has remained virtually unaltered—which once fed the conservative tendencies within the proletariat is not only antiquated: it is decayed to the core. This gangrenous condition is inescapably the source of a development which is the polar opposite to that of the past. It cannot fail to lead to the rapid radicalization of the English workers who comprise the overwhelming majority of the population; seventy percent and more, according to official estimates. As a matter of fact, under the impact of a second World War within the lifetime of the same generations, the war-weary masses are already beginning to stir into motion not only among the topmost and advanced layers but also among their most backward and hitherto immobile sections. This is clear from the recent English strike statistics.

What will happen once this gigantic mass, seemingly so immutably fixed in the past, begins rolling? Prospects of such a social avalanche are precisely the stuff of which nightmares are now made in Downing Street and the City. This is what makes Churchill and his friends so acutely sensitive to the slightest disruption of the equilibrium on which they rest, and which must be maintained at all costs, if capitalism is to survive in England. The current name for this equilibrium is—"national unity" for the sake of the war effort. But what are strikes?

**WHY THEY MUST
EMPLOY FORCE** In war as in peace, strikes are one of the infallible indications of the disruption of equilibrium in capitalist society. Hence the rage and fear of the Tories. Hence their resolve to take the first steps in applying brute force against the proletariat as a whole—after these measures have been first successfully employed against the extreme left, the vanguard of the vanguard, today represented by the Trotskyists.

English capitalism is shaking. If the existing political set-up in the country still fails fully to reflect this, it is because political processes always tend to lag behind economic processes. Periods in history arrive, however, when such gaps are bridged swiftly and in giant strides. It took the far more politically backward masses in Czarist Russia only 8 months in 1917 to leap from conditions of Asiaticism and medievalism to the establishment of the first workers' state. The tempo in Britain may differ, but the process in its essential features is the same.

The ferment and the strikes constitute one expression of the

growing mass radicalization. No less significant is another aspect of the process—the moods now prevailing among the ruling summits, and especially the Labor Party flunkies.

TORY PRESS SPEAKS OUT The London *Times* and *Telegraph*, two of the most influential and authoritative capitalist dailies in close contact with government circles, have been publicly hinting of late that the rank and file in the unions is getting out of the control of the Labor bureaucrats; and they have been pressing for action—i.e. repressions—against the “irresponsible” elements. Prevalent among bourgeois circles is the conviction that now is the testing time for Labor leaders’ participation in the government. If, at one extreme, the awakening workers are demanding that an end be put to the perfidious Labor-Tory Coalition, then, from the other extreme, the most conscious leaders of the capitalists are likewise adumbrating the same step: For, after all, if Bevin and the TUC and the Labor Party Ministers in the government cannot restrain the workers, of what earthly use are they to the bourgeoisie? In such situations the labor lackeys are unceremoniously booted out.

That such is actually the trend among bourgeois tops is confirmed by the reactions and deeds of the Labor bureaucrats who are far more sympathetically sensitive to moods of their masters than to those of the rank and file. It is not for nothing that Bevin boasted that there has been far less industrial strife in England in 4½ years of this war than there had been in 3½ years of the last one. Bevin of course cites the record as an argument for retaining his ministerial post. But the fact that the Labor leaders have held the masses in check for 4½ years counts for exactly nothing in the face of the current, and, what is more important, impending developments. The bourgeoisie, unlike the purblind bureaucrats, looks ahead. It demands proof that their flunkies can continue to be of service.

BEVIN’S ANSWER What is Bevin’s answer? It is at one and the same time a tacit admission of bankruptcy and an open assumption of the role of jailor and, if need be, of executioner. The most reactionary section of the bourgeoisie and the labor lieutenants of capital are agreed that the only recourse left is—brute force. Bevin and his contemptible crew require and beg for help from the police and state apparatus of repression in the fight against the militants and their own rank and file. Nothing is too despicable for these traitors.

At the same time that Bevin applied the provisions of the Trade Disputes Act of 1927 against the Trotskyists, he also introduced Regulation IAA in Parliament. The chief aim of this “Defense Regulation”—which was adopted—is to bolster up the vanishing authority of the union bureaucrats by applying penal measures against those who “incite, instigate or act in furtherance of strikes” in any industry classified as “essential work.” This is a direct blow at the shop stewards. Regulation IAA like the Trade Disputes Act, states that “officially convened” union meetings do not come under a prohibition, that is, a union member may advocate strike in his own local union. But outside the local he would be liable. A shop stewards’ meeting in the shop gives no protection from the regulation.

Churchill—through Bevin—could hardly have made it clearer from the very outset that the persecution of the Trotskyists is an integral part of a general anti-labor drive.

WHAT OUR DUTY IS

American workers, who are in ever increasing numbers learning the lesson that Roosevelt’s railroading to jail of the 18 Trotskyist leaders was likewise part of Wall Street’s unfolding offensive against American labor, must now assimilate another, and no less important lesson, namely, the inseparable connection between the defense of their own interests and organizations and the struggle that is being waged in England to beat back the Churchill-Bevin onslaught on their English brothers.

If Big Business emerges triumphant in England, the effects will be felt not only throughout Europe, but here at home as well. Wall Street and all its agencies will become all the more emboldened thereby. Conversely, if the aroused English workers beat back the attack, it will lift the self-confidence of workers everywhere, in Italy as well as in Germany as well as in USA.

The interaction between events in various countries operates with even greater force in wartime when all processes are greatly speeded up. American workers have a great stake in the struggle now unfolding in England. In the last analysis—and this is what really counts—they can serve their own interests and promote their own welfare only through international solidarity.

It is the duty of every class-conscious militant to raise his voice in protest against the persecution of the English Trotskyists; to expose the abysmal treachery of Bevin and the Labor leaders; to help rescind the totalitarian Tory anti-labor laws, the like of which, otherwise, may be instituted here on the morrow. It is an elementary working class obligation to extend to the chief targets of this vile attack—the English Trotskyists—every possible moral and material aid.

We feel confident that the readers of *Fourth International* will support and help spread the appeal: **ALL AID TO THE TROTSKYIST CLASS-WAR VICTIMS IN ENGLAND!**

The Allies Handpick A “New” Regime for Italy

For the second time “THE MORE IT CHANGES, THE MORE IT REMAINS THE SAME” within the brief space of a few weeks the shadow government of “liberated” Italy has had its face lifted. Marshal Pietro Badoglio, the fascist butcher of Abyssinian ill-fame, has stepped down from the premiership and has been replaced by an aged “Liberal,” 71-year-old Ivanoe Bonomi, who once held the office of premier in pre-Mussolini days.

The little King, Victor Emmanuel, moved into the shadows after the Allied armies had occupied Rome and into his place has stepped the fascist bootlicker, Prince Humbert, whose task it is to make himself palatable to the outraged Italian masses—if he can—and thus preserve the royal prerogatives and immense privileges of the rotten House of Savoy.

If he can! When the fascist prince appeared on the balcony of the Quirinal Palace in Rome revolver shots flew forward from among the crowd of monarchist scum organized to give him greetings. The masses have long memories!

It was with these revolver shots ringing in their ears that the parties of the “Italian Committee of Liberation”—Stalinists, Social Democrats, Liberals, Catholics—went into a quick huddle to give their regime another “democratic” face-lifting. The Allied diplomats and the Stalinists pressed for the retention of Badoglio. But the others, acutely aware of the revo-

lutionary temper of the Romans, pushed Badoglio out and shoved Bonomi in. Cabinet posts were reshuffled a little to let in a few of the Romans.

But the character of the regime has not been changed in the slightest. It remains a police-military dictatorship, supported by Allied arms, and in no way subject to popular control. It will continue, like its predecessors, to rule by decree. It, too, is crowned by the hated monarchy.

The reason for the reshuffle, and the THE REASON FOR ouster of Badoglio, were revealed by THE RESHUFFLE the Rome correspondent of the *New York Times*, who told how Prince Humbert, together with Badoglio and his cabinet, arrived in the Eternal City after its fall to find "a hot situation, almost a threatening crisis, on their hands." The revolver shots increased the heat, and, as the correspondent discloses, "it was a day of great argumentation, which was resolved only because all concerned were determined to form a cabinet quickly."

Yes, the day was hot—hot with the breath of mass rebellion. A new attempt at deception of the masses became urgent. There emerged a "new" cabinet, a new governmental facade in which nothing essential was changed. Its policy is to preserve Italian capitalism, to hold the masses down, to repress, with the aid of the Allied imperialists, any attempt at revolution.

Quite characteristically, it was the Stalinist Palmiro Togliatti, who fought to the last for the retention of Badoglio as premier in the cabinet-making session. This was reported by the *New York Times* correspondent, who wrote: ". . . only the Communists here are supporting the Premier, under the orders of Signor Togliatti, who is also known as Ercole."

What was in the mind of this GPU agent and his master Stalin, who originally came to the rescue of the Badoglio regime when the Italian people seemed about to cast it into the garbage can? They fear that the slightest upset in the ruling junta may precipitate a revolutionary crisis in "liberated" Italy. They are acutely sensitive to the delicate balance of class relations. Any change at the top may precipitate an upheaval below.

But the pressure of popular anger was too great and so Badoglio had to go. His successor revealed the nature of the political trick when he "paid tribute to Marshal Badoglio" but added quickly that "anyone with the slightest tinge of fascism" would be banned from the new government. This "tribute" to the fascist butcher of Ethiopia, and the fact that the fascist bootlicker Humbert remains, are the measure of the "new" regime. It is certain that the masses will not tolerate Bonomi and his clique very long.

LENIN'S ANALYSIS OF CABINET SHIFTS The correct analysis of ministerial changes in periods of social crisis was made more than a quarter of a century ago by Lenin. Commenting on the constant shifts of cabinets that took place in Russia in 1917 after the downfall of Czarism, and in particular, with reference to the entry of Russian Populists and Mensheviks into the ministry, Lenin wrote:

"Let us suppose everything goes well. Even so there is not a shadow of doubt that those who have promised will not be able to carry out their promises. 'We shall help—in league with the capitalists—to bring the country out of its crisis, to save it from ruin, to rid it of war'—this is what the entrance into the ministry of the leaders of the petty bourgeoisie, the

Chernovs [leader of the Populists] and Tseretelis [leader of the Mensheviks], actually means. Our answer is: Your help is not sufficient. The crisis has advanced infinitely farther than you imagine. Only the revolutionary class, by taking revolutionary measures against capital, can save the country—and not our country alone. The crisis is so deep, so widely ramified, so world-wide in its scope, so closely bound up with capital, that class struggle against capital must inevitably take the form of political domination by the proletariat and semi-proletariat. There is no other escape." (Lenin's *Collected Works*. English Edition, vol. XX, book 2, p. 45.)

This correct Marxist analysis of the role and bankruptcy of bourgeois democracy was restated as follows in the resolution on the *Perspectives and Tasks of the Coming European Revolution* adopted, November 2, 1943, at the Fifteenth Anniversary Plenum of the Socialist Workers Party:

"The only alternative to the continued rule of monopoly capitalism is the Workers' and Farmers' Government based upon Workers, Soldiers and Peasants Councils. The decay of capitalism and the acuteness of class conflicts forbid another extended period of bourgeois democracy for war-torn Europe . . . The fact that the economic pre-conditions for an extended period of bourgeois democracy in Europe have disappeared does not, however, put an end to the role that bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats can play to stem the advance of proletarian revolution. With the collapse of fascism, capitalism will attempt to rule by means of naked military force, as already demonstrated in Italy. When this device proves powerless to control the insurgent masses, the native capitalists, allied with the invading imperialists, will push forward their treacherous democratic, social-reformist and Stalinist agents in an effort to strangle the revolution in a 'democratic' noose."

Lenin's prognosis of the cabinet shifts in Russia in 1917 applies with equal force to the cabinet shifts we are witnessing today in Italy.

Extracts From A Letter From Chile

For the information of our readers we reprint an extract from a letter dated May 22, 1944 recently arrived from Santiago, Chile. Our co-thinkers there write:

"Dear Comrades:

"We have been deeply affected by the prosecution and imprisonment of the Eighteen. Their example, their political courage, their fidelity to our ideas have been for us a stimulating source of revolutionary optimism. In protesting their imprisonment, we assure you we tell our friends here that the best way of showing our feelings is to redouble our work in Chile—something that we are doing without delay. The confidence and Socialist optimism of the Eighteen is one of the greatest proofs of the firmness of our program and of our forces in the United States and in the entire world.

"We acknowledge receipt of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and THE MILITANT. The theoretical level of the former and the correctness of its position are greatly appreciated in our ranks. There is no doubt whatever here about the correctness of your position on all major problems: the strategy and program of Europe; the position on the USSR; the position on China and India; your conception of the workers' state affirmed again and again — against the opportunist revisionism of the petty-bourgeois W.P.'ers . . .

"We here are very well satisfied. We have the same assurance and confidence which you possess."

N. N.

A Brief Report On England

By J. B. STUART

The fusion of the British Trotskyist groups into a single organization, the Revolutionary Communist Party, coincides with a mounting crisis of the British ruling class. This is not a mere coincidence. The most advanced representative of the rising working class grows and gains cohesion concurrently with the disintegration of the old stratum of rulers. To set this highly important unification and its attendant events into a proper perspective, at least a sketch of the general background is necessary.

England is today on the verge of great revolutionary events. Its economic system, long the pride of the capitalist world, is shot through with gangrene. War, which puts all economies to the supreme test, has proved British capitalism to be inefficient, wasteful and corroded.

England, the first capitalism to rise to ascendancy, has retained a large part of its antiquated structure and now finds herself in a condition bordering on collapse. Lacking the tremendous resources of the United States, the ruling class has not been able to cover up its bankruptcy by the same sort of forced marches in production.

A measure of England's economic crisis is the coal situation. Production fails to meet quotas set by war demands. The coal barons and their government even risk great miners strikes, which imply a further drop in production, rather than grant the *basic* demand of the miners: nationalization of the pits. The rulers are caught in this dilemma: endanger the military situation or open the sluices of nationalization—and thus threaten their whole system of private property. The issue is too "controversial" for Parliament to deal with, says Churchill . . .

For the miners, and for the rest of the workers as well, real improvement in their miserable, ever-falling standard of living is directly tied up—in this declining economy—with outright nationalization of the means of production.

The negligible wage "concessions" are inadequate to the needs. Strikes are bound to increase. The class struggle is bound to sharpen. Just as its uncertain international position has created rifts in the ruling stratum so the deteriorating domestic situation will create still further schisms at the top.

The Education Bill

The issue of "*mine nationalization*" was too "controversial" for the government to act on, said Churchill, postponing it to some future general election when, he hopes, its acuteness will not be so glaringly illumined for the masses as in the flames of war. Churchill preferred to have his labor lackies handle the issue by betraying the miners from within and by "nationalizing" labor from other industries for the coal pits (the "Bevin boys") — apparently only nationalization of mine property is "controversial."

However, the domestic crisis found another means of obtaining parliamentary expression. In March an apparently harmless *Education Bill* came before the House of Commons. It contained a provision to equalize the pay of women educational workers with that of the male teachers. The Government opposed the provision. But, a majority of the Commons, in-

cluding a sizable section of the Prime Minister's own Tory party, passed it.

No one paid much attention to this minor setback of the Cabinet. But Churchill made it a major issue. He demanded a reversal of the vote as a test of confidence in his government. The whole country rang with the controversy. Finally, the Prime Minister got what he wanted.

Equal pay for women—and only in a white-collar segment of the working class at that—became an issue on which the government of British imperialism demonstratively made its war leadership dependent! Not a single sluice of social progress must be left open, the British rulers announced thereby. So great is their fear of the threatening social avalanche.

Churchill got his vote, to be sure. But the result was such a surge of resentment among the masses that, for the first time since 1940, the Tory-Labor coalition was seriously shaken.

Crisis in the Labor Party

Under pressure from below, the Labor party executive announced in April that "it recognizes that the Coalition government cannot function for post-war reconstruction and will end it when divergencies with the Tories on social legislation become sharply clear" and further that while the Coalition continues to function for war purposes, it will contest by-elections on its "own social program."

The immediate cause for this step was the Education Bill incident. But a mass demand for labor to break the coalition has been sweeping the trade unions for the past two years.

The Labor party which, before 1939 was gaining by-elections steadily from the Tories, has seen by-election after by-election go to independents and to the newly formed, "radical" middle-class Commonwealth party. The labor leadership has so compromised itself that posters issued by petty-bourgeois outfits like the "Free Trade League" can nowadays appear with impunity in Labor strongholds in London, denouncing—"Labor Fascism." Nor has the fact that the hated Fascist Oswald Mosley gained his release from prison, through the instrumentality of the Labor minister Morrison, helped halt the decline of popularity of the Labor party among the masses. This reluctant first half-step to appease the mass demand that it break the coalition merely means that even the myopic traitors in the Labor Party leadership are beginning to see the handwriting on the wall. The crisis is rotten-ripe.

The Treachery of the Trade Union Officials

While the first indication of a break in the *political* coalition becomes apparent, the trade union fakers have intensified their craven subservience to the capitalists on the *economic* field—where the masses have *directly* burst through the shackles of "national unity." Not sham opposition is the task that the labor fakers have set themselves here, but a blindly fierce mending of the shackles. With hundreds of thousands of miners out on spontaneous strikes, with the strike fever growing, they resorted to desperate measures. Their pie-cards are directly at stake.

History will record to their ever-lasting shame that the trade union officialdom of Great Britain *begged* the ruling class to impose a new law against strikes and against the support of strikes. History will also record that the ruling class entrusted this task to Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor and erst-while "leader"—and betrayer—of the General Strike in 1926.

Under the new "Bevin Law," as it is called, the despotic outrage of outlawing sympathy strikes—the infamous Trades Dispute Act of 1927 which sealed the defeat of the General Strike—is multiplied over and over again. Imposing penalties of up to five years imprisonment, the law makes it a crime to *talk* in favor of a strike anywhere outside of an official union meeting in the industry or plant affected. A crime to *support* an "unofficial" strike in the press. A crime to send *financial* aid to such a strike. The papers openly gloat that the trade union officials called on the government for aid to hold in line the union members whom they can no longer control.

A few days after the promulgation of the "Bevin Law," thousands of members of Bevin's own union, the General Transport Workers Union, responded by going out and tying up all bus traffic in the busiest districts of London. The same week thousands of workers in the municipal gas plant walked out in Manchester, leaving that city without gas for seven days.

The "Communist" Party

In all these developments the Stalinist party invariably plays the auxiliary strike-breaking role. The main job is, of course, left to the trade union and Labor Party fakers. The appeals of the Stalinists against strikes are larded with pious references to the needs of supporting the military effort of the Soviet Union. They make a show of opposition to the crasser of the anti-labor acts which have aroused universal wrath among the workers. Thus, for instance, they advise Bevin that there are already adequate laws to deal with "Trotskyist strike instigators" without resorting to a new law such as the Labor minister espouses. Like all mass organizations in England and unlike its American counterpart, the "Communist" Party is still constrained to use socialist phraseology as a demagogic concession to the deep-rooted traditions in the working class.

Among the trade union bureaucracy, particularly in the mining and engineering industry, a strong section inclines to the newer, more energetic and more polished methods of betrayal that the CP espouses. It is among them that the Stalinists have obtained weighty support for their projected entry into the Labor Party—which the leaders of the latter still oppose—as well as for their "Left Unity" campaign, designed to revive and form the basis of a more "solid" Popular Front project. The Stalinists strain every effort to help in the betrayal of the workers, but are not appreciated or trusted by the powers that be sufficiently to be given a leading place. Among the miners, where they once had their strongest base, their influence is steadily declining.

The Labor "Lefts"

The so-called Labor "Lefts"—Aneurin Bevan, Laski and Co.—call every shot in the treachery of the bureaucrats and in the nefarious plans of the bourgeoisie. But—their support of the war leads them to cowardly submission every time! Bevan goes to his miners district, speaks to strikers, agrees that all their demands are correct and just, castigates the coal barons and the government for their crimes, and winds up—by urging

the miners to go back to the pits because the strike hurts the war conducted by the very criminals he castigates. In spite of his old popularity with them, the miners wave him aside no less unceremoniously than the Stalinist Horner or the old-line bureaucrat Lawther.

Nevertheless, this very discreditment among his constituents pushes Bevan and his ilk into a more vigorous collision with the Labor Party heads. So much so and with such impetus that not only does the party bureaucracy want to "discipline" him but—finds that very difficult. In a recent parliamentary caucus such an attempt failed by a considerable margin.

It is safe to say that this group, despite all its gyrations, will remain what it intrinsically is—the "Left" face of the rascally bureaucracy.

The Independent Labor Party

As against all the other old and established working class organizations, only the ILP has held its prestige and even grown. The secret of its success is not hard to discover: it maintains an anti-war position, although with typical centrist trappings, and not too loudly or clearly.

However, it dissociates itself whenever it can from the Trotskyists. Its leaders hobnob politely with the parliamentary crowd. Half of them are really pacifists at heart. They are always ready for a jolly get-together with the bureaucrats. In short, no one in the ruling circles takes them seriously as a revolutionary threat. As a matter of fact, the ruling circles value them as parliamentary colleagues, perhaps with an eye to the future . . .

Such in brief outline is the political background against which, in the middle of March, the Workers International League and the Revolutionary Socialist League held a joint convention at which these two organizations fused and took the name of Revolutionary Communist Party.

The Fusion Conference

The fusion resolution, adopted by the conference, places the new Revolutionary Communist Party squarely on the granite foundation of the principles and program of the Fourth International.

The name Revolutionary Communist Party has turned out to be highly successful. The bulk of the party's new recruits comes from the Stalinized CP and its periphery. The Stalinists are trading on a name with which they have nothing in common politically, but one that is becoming ever more popular with the masses in Great Britain. The new party has thus seized the banner which is rightly theirs from the hands of the usurpers who besmirch it.

Needless to say, the Stalinists have reacted with wild fury to the new Trotskyist party name. They even have large posters in front of their headquarters calling attention to the situation, setting forth in huge letters that they are "*the Communist Party.*" This frenzied indignation is indirectly a good measure of the effectiveness of the RCP name. Of course, the RCP is no less anxious to distinguish its identity from that of the Stalinists, to whom they refer as "His Majesty's Communist Party."

Made frantic by the growing domestic crisis and impotent to deal with the rapid succession of sporadic strikes, the ruling class and its bureaucratic partners-in-crime take their revenge—by pouncing savagely on consistent revolutionists, the Trotsky-

ists. The Trotskyists spend their time, not in apologizing for anybody or anything in the twists of official politics. Nor in hobnobbing with traitors. They go sounding the tocsin around the country, exposing the fraud perpetrated by the imperialist war on the masses; denouncing the hypocritical treachery of the labor lackeys of capitalism; baring the manifold ways devised for the cheating of the workers; and aiding to the best of their ability every effort of the toiling masses to improve their lot and awaken to their historic destiny.

The basic motives for the attack on the Revolutionary Communist Party have already been indicated. Here we shall deal only with the immediate cause and developments ensuing.

The actual charges against the Trotskyist leaders, Jock Haston, general secretary of the RCP; Roy Tearse, national secretary of the Militant Workers Federation; Ann Keen, north-east (London) district secretary of the party and Heaton Lee are: violation of Trade Disputes Act (of 1926) in connection with the recent great strike of engineering apprentices in Scotland.

In the case of the apprentices, mass resentment grew against the Bevin order drafting these young men—many of whom had nearly completed their 4-year apprenticeship acquiring the mechanic's skill for a life-long trade—into coal pits, where they saw no future for themselves and only another obstacle to the miners' fight for nationalization, with which they sympathized.

"We refuse to carry the burden imposed on the industry by the lust for profit and inefficiency of the coal-owners. Since they are directly responsible for the coal crisis it is against them that compulsion must be directed," says the Statement of the Tyne Apprentices Guild, January 1944.

Open defiance swept the ranks of the apprentices. They were resolved not to become "Bevin Boys." When one of their number received the draft order, the Tyneside Apprentices Guild sent a letter to Bevin demanding exemption from compulsory mine labor for all apprentices in the "industrial engineering trades." The Minister of Labor failed to reply. Thereupon the Guild called its 5,000 members out on strike. A few days later they were joined by 20,000 others in Glasgow and elsewhere. (The various local machinists unions, expressed support; even the Executive of the national Amalgamated Engineers Union expressed sympathy with their cause; although organizational relations between the latter and the Apprentices Guild were strained.)

The strike was rather wide-spread and appeared well-organized and coordinated. It gave the ruling class a particularly bad scare, because it came from a new and unfamiliar quarter of the working class.

The RCP supported this strike, and the just grievances of the apprentices. The apprentices guild is a new organization. It grew up as a matter of fact in conflict with the established trade union machine which in its complacency refused to organize the young workers or take them under their wing—leaving them pretty much to their own devices.

The raids against the RCP conducted by Scotland Yard were to primarily obtain "proof" which dealt with the apprentices' strike, among other things. Theirs is the *first* case to be tried under the Trades Dispute Act of 1926 and this in itself is an indication of the unpopularity of that Act among the masses. Furthermore, the new implementing Bevin Act—openly proclaimed and directed against the Trotskyists—is, if anything, even more unpopular.

The Labor "lefts"—alleged friends—only see the "numerically insignificant" group. They treat the attacks, the raids, the arrests of the Trotskyists—against which they, to be sure, protest—as a farce. The bureaucrats, the Will Lawthers, the Bevins, in the wake of the bosses, are more circumspect. They see the powerful ideas of the Trotskyists. They see a serious menace in the prospect of a convergence of these ideas and the great stirring mass of miners, ship-builders, engineers. They can't see the joke. They are in deadly earnest.

The *British Tribune* of April 14 reports:

"Mr. Lawther, the leader of the miners, is said to have stated in a speech that the Trotskyist organization must be taken seriously and that the amendment of the law under consideration [the "Bevin Law"] is on the request of the miners leaders themselves."

The growth of the British Trotskyists and the unification of several groups into a single, centralized section of the Fourth International, is an event that this enemy cannot help but note. And, with apprehension.

Meanwhile, the RCP is having difficulties in obtaining the release of the arrested comrades on bail. Meeting halls for defense rallies—due to Stalinist interference mainly—have been barred to the RCP and it has had to hold its initial London meetings in the open, at Hyde Park.

Immediate Effects of Attack

The attack on the young party, fraught as it is with great danger to its existence, has other sides by way of compensation.

The new Revolutionary Communist Party has at once become a factor of first importance in the political consciousness of the country. The press, the radio, are teeming with news about it.

Great sympathy has been aroused for Trotskyism among masses of miners and other workers who for the first time have heard of this party and who have heard it identified with their own eruptive militant action.

In the organized labor movement, workers moving leftward now have a new, dramatic banner before their eyes as a rallying point.

Thousands of communist workers, betrayed and disillusioned with Stalinism, see the cherished communist ideal reborn in new form, awakening glorious memories.

In the ILP, among the Labor "Left," the rank and file evince immediately spontaneous solidarity with the persecuted Trotskyists. The leaders, forced to go along, make uneasy jests, and try to avoid mentioning the new party and its papers in their own meetings and in their own press.

A broad defense committee has already been organized with the participation of the ILP and Labor "Lefts". Those who have already joined the national committee of the "Anti-Labor Laws Victims Defense Committee" include:

James Maxton, M. P., John McGovern, M. P., Walter Padley, and Fenner Brockway of the ILP; Aneurin Bevan, M. P.; Rhys Davies, M. P.; S. Silverman, M. P.; Rev. Sorenson, M. P.; W. G. Grove, M. P., of the London Workers' Committee; V. Sastry, Federation of Indian Associations; Ted Grant, Revolutionary Communist Party; M. Kavanagh, Freedom Press; G. Pittock-Buss, Bob Turner, Arthur Ballard, D. Beech, D. Ballantine.

The assault of the ruling class on the new party cannot help but cement the unity and invest the membership with a strong sense of party loyalty and party patriotism from the very first. All reports indicate that the fusion is an accomplished fact and not merely a formal decision.

U.S. Capitalism Heads For Bankruptcy

By WILLIAM SIMMONS

To the American working masses all questions concerning the coming post-war period are summed up in the single and simple proposition of jobs. The problem of what kind of social system shall prevail does not so far appear to them as a problem of practical reality. And yet, these two questions—jobs for all, and the kind of social system—are insolubly linked together.

For continental Europe it is readily granted that such a posing of these questions is in order, because of the much more acute nature of its social conflicts. But the United States of America! Does it not represent the very heart and lifeblood of the capitalist system; nourished by seemingly unlimited resources?

This is true. But it is precisely because capitalism is here so highly developed and its productive powers so colossal that the question of jobs for all will under post-war conditions cut like a razor edge to the very roots of the social system itself. Because of the social relationship of capitalist ownership and control, this enormous capacity of production and jobs for all become utterly and entirely incompatible.

During the last six months of 1943, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce, this nation produced goods and services at the rate of \$188,000,000,000 a year. This is more than twice the previous high production peak reached in 1929. And it was accomplished at a time when about ten million young men were in the armed forces. Insofar as actual war production is concerned most figures are kept secret. But such figures as are available emphasize one thing above all—the enormous capacity of production.

The steel industry, for example, reached a total output in 1943 of 94,000,000 tons. This is about one third higher than any pre-war peak year. It is also more than the rest of the world can produce in one year.

The Maritime Commission reports that the last eight months of 1943 saw the launching of 12,000 merchant ships averaging 10,000 tons each. This means an output of five such ships every twenty-four hours. For the year the total tonnage reached twenty million, or ten times more than was launched in the United States during 1918 when the U-boat warfare was at its height in World War I. And all this is in addition to the building of a five-ocean navy which for the year 1943 alone, according to published figures, amounted to 1,600,000 tons of combat ships.

For the airplane industry the claimed annual capacity is now 125,000 planes. Conversion to war output stepped up the machine tool producing industry from an average annual rate of \$40,000,000 for the years after 1929 (and including 1937) to the imposing figures of \$1,320,000,000.

Naturally, such an increase in machinery and tools of production, together with what is popularly called more efficient methods, has brought about an increase of labor productivity. Since the beginning of war production this increase has taken place on a constantly rising scale from year to year. The output per man hour was 3.9 percent greater in 1940 than in 1935; 3 per cent greater in 1941 than in 1940; and in 1942 4.4 percent above 1941. The increase in output per man hour in 1943

over 1942 is estimated to be still greater, although final figures are not yet available. The Union Trust Co. of Cleveland asserts that labor productivity has risen from 100 in January 1943, to 136 by the end of that year.

One instance, typical of many others, of this same process has been widely publicized by one of the big automobile corporations now making an aircraft engine crankcase. The original daily output was met with a minimum of tooling and required 230 hours of work with the spoilage averaging 47.6 per cent. Through the addition of new machines the crankcase operations were mechanized and instead of 230 hours of manufacturing time the work was cut to 125 hours, while scrappage was reduced to 7 per cent. Tooling expansion, rationalization and efficiency methods kept pace. Machine time dropped to 40 hours, and finally to 32 hours. Such is the record: from 230 man hours of labor to 32 hours per crankcase.

What Will Happen If and When the War Ends?

Available figures of production do not cover a wide field and cannot therefore be considered as conclusive for industry as a whole. Nevertheless they do furnish a partial illustration of what present productive capacity amounts to. At the same time they serve as a portent of different things to come in the post-war period.

Summing it up in their minds, sensing the rhythmical, monotonous hum of machines everywhere, and aware of the flow of war materials that leave the factories, mills and yards in a steady and endless stream, Americans of all classes get an impression of a veritable ability to produce on a global scale. But the workman, who is the most important cog in this huge machine, also faces the question almost as ominous and catastrophic, as the war itself: What will happen when this war comes to an end? Simultaneously an additional query arises: If we can produce so magnificently for war, why can we not also do that for peace?

These are momentous questions. But outside the ranks of the Marxists nobody has dared, or wanted, to give a fundamental, realistic answer. Such attempts as have been made with regard to post-war planning have not set forebodings or uneasiness at rest. Nor can the American workers draw much comfort from plans advanced by official labor leaders. Because of their utter inadequacy these plans have been accorded only scant attention.

In fact, the elder statesmen of the AFL appear to view the coming post-war period as a matter of business as usual. They make no pretense of hiding their support of Big Business demands for speedy and complete restoration of "free enterprise." They warn against what they call the tendency to tax "free enterprise" out of existence. At the same time, however, their practical suggestions, for example, for a housing program and other job providing enterprises, propose joint labor, management and government planning together with extended government financing.

CIO leaders are not less contradictory in their plans; but they start out from the premise of a high level economy of

large governmental expenditures, extended government control, and then they wind up by accepting the Baruch-Hancock report which proposes a speedy restoration of "free enterprise." CIO leaders also want joint labor, business, agriculture and government planning. Such planning they say must be for

"large output at low prices and profits kept at reasonable levels and monopoly profits utterly prevented. To this end anti-trust laws must be enforced, patent laws must be improved, and new controls developed."

Philip Murray and his co-leaders proclaim that the nation "has the knowledge, the skills, the machines and the resources to produce a gold standard of living to every American." How? Very simple. They say that

"the only way to win the peace, when scarcities end, is to go on full rations for every man, woman and child in the United States. Then farmers, factories and stores will have good markets and prosperity can be general. High wages help the nation as well as the wage earner. With full production prices can be low and wages can be high."

This would be entirely true if Murray and his co-leaders visualized and proposed an organization of productive society which would make it possible. Such, however, is not the case at all. Perish the thought. It frightens them.

But the capitalist owners of the American productive system have already made it abundantly clear that they have no interest in low prices and high wages as such; nor will they countenance extended government control or extended government financing in order to create jobs. And serving people's needs has no place in actuality in their calculations. They will keep the factories running to produce commodities only to the extent that a profitable market is available. Moreover, capitalist production is governed by certain definite laws, not made in legislative halls, but engendered by the system itself and in turn submitting the system to the action of these laws.

Profits are the motivating force of all capitalist production. No other incentive is given any serious recognition. Production for profit and the people's needs therefore become opposite poles. So long as the profit motive prevails as the single dominant factor in production, to which all other factors are subordinated, the needs of the people will naturally be utterly disregarded. What proof could be more telling than the last great world depression? And proof equally as telling is contained right in this war.

Capitalist production is not only carried on for profit, it depends for its very survival upon profit—upon ever increasing profits. It depends upon the accumulation of capital and constantly increasing opportunities for profitable investments. Realization of profits in turn depends upon increasingly larger markets to absorb the rising output of consumers goods which is a necessary condition for the absorption of capital goods. Thus continued expansion is a prime necessity for capitalist survival.

It is a prime necessity not only for capitalism in general but for American capitalism as well. And today this is even more urgently so. During the past century U.S. capitalism encountered no great difficulty in solving this problem for it enjoyed exceptional opportunities, and its rise and growth took place on a new continent. It had before it a constantly and naturally expanding internal market, an enormous population growth, swelled by immigration. It had before it constantly new raw material sources which, with the application of new scientific discoveries, made possible constant industrialization of new regions and building of new industries. All of these favorable factors, together with some brazenly-executed con-

quests, accounted for the rapidity of its development and the tremendous wealth it accumulated. From the civil war to the first world war the *rate* of growth of American capitalism showed a constantly rising curve and it averaged over five percent annually. Since then the *rate* of growth has been declining. Not only that, but each new prosperity peak was lower than the preceeding one. For example, the percentage of growth for the period from 1902 to 1906 was 7.6; for the period from 1909 to 1913 it was 4.6 percent, and for the period of the great boom of 1922-29 it was only 3.8 percent. In other words the constantly upward movement came to an end in the period 1909-13. The same holds true for capitalism on a world scale. In the United States the favorable factors of capitalist expansion, mentioned above, which were of a long range nature are now no longer available. They have been exhausted.

War Production, a Hypodermic Injection

Naturally, the expanding capitalism of the past stimulated an upward economic movement. Industrialization of new regions and the growth of new industries were a source of high profits because they made possible the use of large amounts of capital goods and a more rapid accumulation of capital. But, as could be observed during this whole period, within capitalist society expansion of production develops at a more rapid pace than and always tends to outstrip the growth of consumption, or the growth of the market. The latter is governed by quite different laws which act much less energetically. This is easily understandable when one bears in mind the fact that among the forces of consumption is the ever growing proportion of wage workers, and their dependents, who receive as compensation for their work only a part of what they produce. Relatively, that is in comparison to the expansion of the productive forces, the purchasing power of the workers tends constantly to decline.

The present period is witnessing a new production peak towering above all previous similar experiences. It represents a gigantic expansion of production. It is not, however, in any sense of the word a production expansion for a stable and growing market, but wholly and exclusively for war purposes.

Almost from its inception this war became a terrific accelerator of American production expansion. It is a patent fact that this present war production served as the only means of getting this country, as well as the other capitalist nations, out of the great world depression. The generally downward spiral of the capitalist business cycle fluctuated and took a sudden feverish upward leap owing to the hypodermic injection of gigantic government war orders, which now amount to almost \$100,000,000,000 annually. Expansion in the means of production, in factories and in tooling, processes, i.e., constant capital, broke all records. Government building of new factories is alone estimated to have amounted to about \$16,000,000,000. Including machinery and tools, etc., the total sum is in excess of \$25,000,000,000. Fuller employment of every available worker and his family together with the extended workweek increased the volume of production. But labor productivity naturally went on a steeper upward curve due to this huge increase of constant capital. More work is performed more efficiently by machines. More raw materials are turned into finished commodities at a faster pace. At the same time, however, the most immediate result of this expansion is a higher organic composition of capital. This is a characteristic of all capitalist production. In the United States each prosperity peak has shown a growing disproportion bet-

ween constant capital (equipment and raw materials) and variable capital (labor as represented by wages). During the period 1923-29 constant capital in manufacture rose four times as much as did variable capital: 24.4 percent as against 5.7 percent. The changes that have taken place in the organic composition of capital during this war prosperity cannot yet be illustrated in similar comparable figures. We can rest assured, however, that while there has been a great increase in payrolls, this increase is by far overshadowed by the enormous additional investments in constant capital. Government outlays alone serve as eloquent testimony.

The higher organic composition of capital increases the rate of surplus value produced by the workers. While living labor incorporated in a commodity falls, the unpaid portion, representing surplus value, rises. Under conditions of war economy, with its extraordinary pressure, production of surplus values mounts to dizzying heights. In fact, the fortunes and the vicissitudes of present day warfare depend directly and entirely upon productive labor. The very financing of war expenditures comes in the final analysis out of the production of surplus values. Capitalism knows no other way of meeting expenses. Taxation levies on employers and government borrowing from banks for this extraordinary financing increases only after there has been a previous rise in profits as a result of increased surplus values produced by labor. But the workers carry the cost not only in this indirect form. They pay directly as well. Even the compensation received by them, their weekly pay check—that part representing paid labor which is necessary for them to reproduce their own labor power—is being mulcted by ever steeper taxes, war loans and miscellaneous contributions.

Insofar as workers' conditions are concerned it is perfectly clear that war restrictions have served to reduce the *real* wage. And nobody has dared deny that the deficit between the hourly wage rate and the steeply rising cost of living, and taxation, has been made up only through the lengthening of working hours and by the employment of greater numbers of the workman's family. At the last AFL convention the Executive Council reported the average wage in durable goods industries to be \$49.38, and estimated that the return to the 40-hour week would reduce this amount to \$38.64. In non-durable goods industries the slash would be from \$34 to \$30.32.

While a higher organic composition of capital is the most immediate result of the present expansion of the productive forces, the latter also promotes two opposite developments which act in direct antagonism to this advance. In the first place, the growing disproportion between the volume of equipment and materials, on the one hand, and labor wages on the other imposes limitations upon the purchasing power and the consumption of the workers. Wages always fall relatively to output and to profits and thereby limit the market. In the second place, this change in the organic composition of capital, with the decrease of variable capital in relation to constant capital limits the production and the realization of surplus value in proportion to the total capital invested. The rate of profit on this total invested capital therefore tends to fall. Seemingly these laws, or these processes, are all upset, or nullified, by conditions of war economy. Production everywhere continues on its steep upward climb. Profits mount; workers have money to buy. The war market seems unlimited. But the upset is only in appearance, not in reality. As soon as the huge war orders cease the economic laws of capitalist society will be found to have operated in full force and the effects will stand out in their disastrous magnitude. The pre-

ponderant growth of constant capital will then appear clearly and indisputably as the outstanding factor in the American productive system. It represents an overproduction of capital which has now reached terrific dimensions. But it is typical of the capitalist mode of production. Inherent in the economic war upswing are all the elements of the coming depression and crisis.

No fundamental change has taken place in the spiral of the capitalist business cycle. It remains on its downward curve. Moreover, it is the decline and the decay of the capitalist system which produced the war. Inevitably the feverish war expansion, the hypodermic injections, will react most violently upon the capitalist decline.

At the conclusion of the war and the return to a "peace" economy excess capacity of production—excess because of the artificial fetters of capitalist ownership and control—will be expressed not only directly in bullet and gun factories, but also indirectly in steel, aluminum and other metal alloy plants, as well as in rubber, truck, airplane factories, shipyards, etc. Resumption of production of civilian goods, even if given full sway to fill what are called the banked-up demands, could only result in the glutting in short order of a drastically reduced market. The large addition of equipment and tools will require relatively less labor power than heretofore to fill this demand. And according to the U.S. Department of Commerce the employers will have 57 million employable workers to choose from: 12 million more than were employed in 1939.

War Prosperity, Harbinger of Crisis

The capitalist owners of industry will, of course, hire no more men or women than are absolutely necessary to produce the commodities of which they can dispose profitably in the available market. Failing a market in which to dispose profitably of the goods produced, the owners of industry bring wheels to a standstill: factories close. And the termination of the huge war orders will automatically separate millions of workers from their payrolls, thus reducing their purchasing power, not only relatively but absolutely. Other millions will be released from the armed forces and face the same prospect.

Overproduction of the means of production can no longer be turned into capital—it can no longer serve to exploit wage labor. As Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific socialism pointed out: "The abundance of means of production becomes the source of wants and distress, the very thing that prevents the transformation of the means of production and subsistence into capital." Therefore, "the real barrier to capitalist production is capital itself." The conclusion is inevitable. It is the capitalist ownership and control, and it is this alone, which stands in the way of the highest standard of living for every American.

Organization of production has become thoroughly socialized, even to the smallest details of integration within each separate factory, as well as within industry as a whole. But appropriation of the goods produced still remains individual. This contradiction between socialized organization of production and the individual capitalist appropriation inevitably leads to a violent explosion—the arrival of depression and crisis. Millions of workers without jobs, on the one hand, while on the other, fierce competition among capitalists for a narrowing market. However, with centralization and monopoly growing apace it is the small concerns which suffer the most. Many of them will be wiped out. Many more of the middle class will

either be reduced to the ranks of the proletariat looking for jobs, or become declassed.

Inescapably the war prosperity will be transformed into its opposite. Like all things in society, and in nature, it is subject to change. But it is passing into its opposite not only as a result of changes in external circumstances—the change from a war to a “peace” economy. The forces of its own transfiguration were contained within it and developed within it. The overproduction of capital is a sure harbinger of depression and crisis.

Capitalism came into existence and rose to its zenith because of its ability to develop the material forces of production. Modern means of mass production, although an outcome of the insatiable lust for profit, nevertheless served as an aid to society. The higher composition of capital became an expression of economic progress; an expression of plenty. However, in terms of its social relationship, in terms of its capitalist ownership and control, it is also at the same time its exact opposite. It becomes the means of separating the wage workers from their jobs. It becomes the very means of condemning the wage workers to idleness, pauperization and starvation.

Capitalism has definitely reached its stage of decline and decay; it has become transformed into its opposite. It has become a deterrent to the further development of the productive forces, to the further development of society; and it has become a hinderance to the progress of mankind. This is the great contradiction of capitalist ownership and control. And it is so because the evolution of society has not kept abreast with the changing times. Or to put it more exactly: The change for which society has long ago matured has not yet taken place.

Only a socialist society can guarantee jobs for all. Only when the producers of hand and brain take over the means of production, can production be planned and coordinated for people's needs, for the well-being of the producers; for a standard of living undreamed of under capitalism. To paraphrase Engels: The social character of the organization of production, instead of being a source of periodic crisis, collapse and distress, will then be turned by the producers into a mighty lever for the further development of production itself. It will also be transformed into its —opposite.

The Pucheu Case And “Free France”

By JEANNE SOREL

Pucheu, former Minister of the Pétain Government, has been shot at Algiers in execution of a sentence pronounced by the French military tribunal sitting in that town. The working class will have but one regret, that Pucheu was not sent to the firing squad by proletarian justice. The trial has, however, a far wider meaning than that of the individual fate of a collaborator of the Germans who unavailingly attempted to change horses and back the Allies.

Pucheu's trial throws some light on some important aspects of the French situation. France has always been the country where political struggles were consistently fought out to the bitter end, and today the struggles in France are an inherent part of an entangled maze of struggles which are developing over the whole of Europe. We may therefore neglect nothing that can throw any light upon the present great European drama and its currents and tendencies.

Who Was Pucheu?

Pucheu had none of the usual characteristics of a French politician of the democratic period. He never appeared upon the political stage of the Third Republic. He was one of a number of young intellectuals bought by the Comité des Forges, the most powerful cartel of French heavy industry. After 1914-18, the Comité des Forges had endeavored to enlist the services of some brilliant young men (amongst them Pucheu) who, among other things, edited the “*Bulletin Quotidien*” de la Société d'Etudes Economiques, a roneographed publication of restricted circulation whose 60 or 80 and more daily pages brought extensive and reliable information on a wide range of subjects, with well-considered appreciations and views judiciously elaborated in the interests of big capital.

Pucheu played a leading role in the economic services of the Comité des Forges, but not till later did he enter politics, and even then he remained behind the scenes until the Bord-

eaux coup-d'état. He belonged to several small committees which aimed at maneuvering politicians and never attempted to exercise any direct influence upon the larger masses. In this respect there is much similarity between the circles frequented by Pucheu and the notorious Herrenklub of Berlin.

It is the policy of the Comité des Forges which Pucheu strived to enforce, first as Production Minister and then as Minister of the Interior in the Pétain government. Again and again during the trial Pucheu declared that he was “acting by order.”

The pleadings at Pucheu's trial did not give rise to the development of long dissertations on international policy, but the few words that were spoken are quite sufficient to show up the game of French capitalism. Giving evidence, General Giraud declared:

“If I am not mistaken, it was towards the end of 1942 that Pucheu requested an interview from me . . . He was of the opinion that the time of the ‘attentist’ [wait and see] policy of 1940 had come to an end. I told him I agreed with him on this point. Now that Germany's defeat was certain, there could be no question of remaining an accomplice of Germany.”

General Giraud thus corroborates what Pucheu had expressed more clearly still:

“In October 1942, I came back to Vichy and submitted a memorandum to Marshal Petain. I told him that, in my opinion, . . . the possibilities of the wait and see (‘attentist’) policy had been exhausted and that the time was ripe for an Allied intervention in North Africa. I suggested that, without Laval being informed, negotiations should be opened with Tuck, the American chargé d'affaires. I went to Lyons where I was received by General Giraud. He communicated his plans to me and I declared that I would take his orders.”

We can summarize as follows the international policy of the Comité des Forges, before and after Bordeaux, and then since 1942: French capitalism, fearing a proletarian revolution and lacking confidence in Great Britain's capabilities, seeks an

outlet in a policy of collaboration with Germany. But this overthrow of alliances could not be effected by normal parliamentary means. A period of cross-currents and confusion, the June 1940 collapse, had to come before such a reversal could be effected, and then it implied the necessity of bowing before Germany instead of following Great Britain. The French capitalists thought they might successfully play this card. German capitalism, then supreme in Europe, was very weak outside Europe and was compelled to seek an agreement with the United States which held the first place in the capitalist world. In the Spring of 1940, Laval, who then held no post within the Vichy State apparatus and could therefore express himself more freely, addressed himself to the United States in a broadcast speech. Several weeks before Hitler opened hostilities against the USSR, Laval was telling the Americans: Europe is behind Germany, the bulwark in the fight against Bolshevism, and you should come to an understanding with her. No country is better situated than France to serve as intermediary.

This policy of equilibrium was adopted by practically all the teams which took part in the game of Vichy and Paris from 1940 to 1942. At that time, doubts, and even more than doubts, began to arise as to the possibility of a German victory, and a part of French big capital began to turn with the wind. Pucheu expresses this by saying that "attentism is a policy whose possibilities have been exhausted," and Giraud declares: "I quite agree." "Exhausted," we may well mark the word.

As a result, the year 1942 is characterized by the wide-scale export of French capital into North Africa. The occupation of North Africa by the Allies is being prepared in France under the direction of the American diplomats, Leahy, Murphy and Tuck. The exploiters of the French workers and peasants no longer aim at being the intermediate agents between two gangster parties; they now long to become the flunkies of the victorious camp. In July 1940, Dakar opposes the Royal Navy with cannon-shots, in December 1942, she bows without resistance to His Majesty The Dollar.

From the above quotations it appears quite clearly that Giraud had entrusted Pucheu with the task of sounding Pétain in this matter and that this was directed against Laval whose intrigues and double-crossing they may have feared. Pétain refused to side with the United States or to enter their service—presumably because he had his doubts as to their ability of rapidly settling accounts with German imperialism. It is then that Washington regretfully severed its relations with Pétain.

As at the time of the assassination of Darlan, the minor incident of Pucheu's execution has once more revealed the rivalries existing between Britain and America in spite of their numerous declarations of friendship. Practically none of the London newspapers expressed any reservations on the subject of the disposal of Darlan and Pucheu. On the contrary, the State Department publicly expressed their regret at Darlan's assassination and now fail to conceal their displeasure at Pucheu's execution.

True, the American government simultaneously denies any acknowledged or concealed sympathy for Vichy... and undoubtedly, they feel no sympathy—either acknowledged or concealed—for de Gaulle's committee. This has been the case ever since 1940 and still remains true. In this connection, the instructions recently imparted to General Eisenhower whereby he is to deal, in France, with whatever local authorities he will deem fit, are more eloquent than all of Cordell Hull's general declarations. In the eyes of America, de Gaulle's original sin consists in having been the first chief of the

French Legion, created by the Foreign Office to take the opportunity of the French collapse in order to seize France's colonies. Washington, however, had its own designs in the matter of these colonies and preferred to deal with the men of Vichy who appeared to offer better guarantees of stability and social conservatism. Pétain might have become the American de Gaulle. As a result of Pétain's evasion, the Americans temporarily forfeited certain advantages and had to play a more complicated game, but they must reckon that their material supremacy will allow them, either at Algiers or later on in France, to suppress any elements likely to play into the hands of the Foreign Office or the Kremlin.

The Algiers tribunal sentenced Pucheu for "having incited men serving in the Army or the Navy to pass over to the service of a foreign power, i.e., Germany, at war with France" and for dealing with Germany in his capacity of Secretary of State for Industrial Production and of Minister of the Interior. The Algiers tribunal was composed of former "attentists" who agree with Giraud and Pucheu that "the possibilities of the attentist policy are exhausted."

Vichy's Measures against the Working Class

The working masses had one primary indelible reason to hate Pucheu: repression had been constantly on the increase under Daladier, Reynaud, and up to Pétain, but under Pucheu's Ministry it developed on an even larger scale. Exceptional jurisdiction was introduced; the courts pronounced death sentences against which there was no possible appeal. Pucheu caused heads to fall, and the masses clamored for his blood. It was also under Pucheu's Ministry that the German occupation authorities began to shoot militant workers who were detained as hostages by the French authorities and who had never been sentenced by any tribunal. At Algiers, Pucheu claimed to have resisted the Germans on this point and denied that he had any responsibility in picking out the militants who were shot by the German authorities. Pucheu's denials have no value whatsoever. We may believe him when he declared that he did not favor *too much* collaboration with the Germans, for it is obvious that French capitalism did not wish completely to bar the way to Germany's capitalist rivals, and this would have been the inevitable result, had French economy been subjected to a thorough reorganization along German lines. In the matter of the repression of working class movements there was, however, no difference between Pucheu's conceptions and those of German imperialism. No French worker can have the slightest doubt on this point. This aspect of the question has unfortunately been obscured by the ultra-chauvinist character of the evidence given by F. Grenier, the Stalinist Member of Parliament.

The Attorney-General declined to retain against Pucheu the accusation of complicity in the shooting of hostages and the tribunal declared Pucheu "not guilty of having caused the arrest of Frenchmen and thus having committed an arbitrary act or an act assailing the rights of one or more citizens." In plain English, this juridical jargon is tantamount to the approval of Pucheu's activities in the repression of working class movements. The Algiers tribunal thereby delivered a blank signature to Vichy and to the Gestapo for their anti-proletarian terror in France.

To the masses, Pucheu's trial could only appear as a trial of the Pétain régime. But this was not the view of the tribunal, in spite of their condemnation of Pucheu. One of Pucheu's

barristers argued that "the Vichy Government is juridically legal, though it is not legitimate." Pucheu himself stressed that at the time when he was a Minister, the United States and the USSR both recognized Vichy as the legal government of France. This question may be of interest to the various capitalist chancelleries, but from the workers' point of view and from a purely factual point of view, it is undeniable that Pétain forced himself upon France by a *coup d'état*. In its decision the Algiers tribunal nevertheless declares that "by participating in the institution called 'Etat Francais', . . . Pucheu did not commit an offence aiming at the destruction or the transformation of the government." Thus, the Algiers magistrates mark their approval of the Bordeaux coup d'état and of the authoritarian character of Pétain's régime. Their disavowal only concerns one point: they are of the opinion that Pétain played the wrong card in the imperialist game.

The significance of the sentence pronounced by the Algiers tribunal goes far beyond the personality of Pucheu and of his judges. The sentence reveals the *common nature* of the Pétain régime in France and the de Gaulle régime now established in North Africa which lays claim to the future government of France. At the same time, the sentence may serve to lay open some of the differences between these two régimes.

The Pétain régime is the dictatorship of the army and of the police in the service of big capital. This is Bonapartism, not fascism. It is Bonapartism propped up by the Gestapo and the German occupation troops.

The de Gaulle régime—especially since its establishment at Algiers—contains an ever increasing number of men from the army and the police who have deserted Vichy. This too is Bonapartism. It is Bonapartism propped up by the Allied troops and the crumbs of Lease-Lend.

The differences between these two Bonapartist régimes are in no way exhausted by the fact that some of these French patriots have a marked preference for Basic English as opposed to the jargon of the "Voelkischer Beobachter".

The Hotbed of a 'New' Fascism

In France, independent working class organisations are driven to illegality by Pétain; in Algeria, where reaction still reigned supreme at the time of the proletarian offensive of 1936, the de Gaulle régime cannot help tolerating the open expression of trade unions and working class parties and must even seek their collaboration.

In France, Pétain is constantly being spurred on by the agitation of the fascist organisations, in particular by Doriot's PPF. In Algeria, these same fascist organisations have been reduced to illegality and there actually appears to be no fascist movement in existence at Algiers. Obviously, one of these bonapartist régimes leans essentially on fascist reaction, whereas the other leans more towards the exploited masses. This is nowise to the credit of one or other of the leading cliques, it is simply the resultant of the class forces in operation; but it is a fact of great importance for the future development of the class struggle.

Fascism is not openly and officially present at Algiers, but the influence of the existing and latent counter-revolutionary forces in France is far from unimportant. Fascism is not represented solely by groups like the PPF which have linked up their fate with that of German fascism. Fascism finds many other possibilities of development and unfolds into various forms that are more refined and much more dangerous for the future of the working class movement.

The actions of the "resistance movement" and of the "maquis" are being praised high and low. These are formations essentially composed of young men who are leading an unceasing and extremely dangerous struggle against the occupation troops. But armed struggle does not in itself constitute a political program. Physical courage abounds nowadays, in all uniforms and under all flags, the sore point being that too often workers are displaying this courage in the cause of their masters. What is the program of the "maquis," of the "resistance movement"? The statement that their only aim is "the liberation of the national territory" does not suffice to define a program. We would like to probe a bit further into its social content, examine their aspirations and see what tendencies they are fostering. The official news handouts supply us with very sparse details, but even from them it is obvious that the "resistance movement" is composed of a number of diametrically opposed elements.

In the towns they are more linked up with the working class movement, and in particular with the Stalinist formations. This is the older part of the "resistance movement", and dates back to 1941, i.e., to the beginning of the war against the USSR. Pucheu, attempting to justify his measures of repression against the communists, recalled during his trial that, at that time, "even the Gaullist broadcasts declared that the guerrillas had no military value." This part of the resistance movement is still looked upon with very little favor by the reactionary elements in the Algiers apparatus. On the other hand, the resistance movement contains formations which were not constituted till 1943, *after the dissolution of the French army*, which freed a number of ex-officers and N.C.O.'s who now serve as cadres for the young "labor-escapees" in the resistance movement. This part of the resistance movement is generally more linked up with the agricultural regions of the country, and it undoubtedly constitutes a favorable hotbed for the development of a "new Fascism." There, are to be found the same type of discontented ex-servicemen, of ex-officers seeking to score a victory over the enemy at home, as in Mussolini's fascios of 1919 or in the memorable Baltikum troops. The resistance movement deems itself superior to all and everyone and recognizes none but its own laws. And this state of mind is being assiduously fostered. Some within the resistance movement are already stating that they aim at transforming it into a party, and others propose to do so immediately the country has been freed of German troops. Here then we have the germ of a new fascism. We do not mean to say that the resistance movement is fascism or that it is led by fascists. There probably are within the movement some fascist elements, conscious of the revolutionary danger that may arise in the near future, who aim to work at the formation of counter-revolutionary troops. But the bulk of the men in the resistance movement—at least those who do give thought to the problems of the future and are not content with fighting only—are still seeking a way out of the situation into which the war has precipitated them. They are not ipso facto fascists in embryo. On the contrary, the next stage in Europe will most probably be marked by a huge revolutionary upsurge of the masses, and declassed elements of the "resistance movement" will participate in this. If, however, this revolutionary wave were to break up, a new fascism would arise from the midst of these elements trained to violence and discipline. There is only one counter-measure: a class policy denouncing the lie of all groups pretending to remain above classes, and of all programs of national liberation without class content.

Why was Pucheu judged and executed by the Algiers

flunkeys? Serving Wall Street and the City, they have the same dominant fear as their masters—that of the masses and the European revolution, especially as far as France is concerned, for the experiences of June 1936 are still extremely vivid. The Attorney-General, General Weiss, openly admitted this:

"We wish with all our heart to avoid the threat of what might increase the danger of a civil war, which our dear allies, in spite of their watchful affection might be unable to dam."

Pucheu also warns:

"If the provisional government of France enters the country behind the troops with methods and ideas identical with those they hold today, not one year will pass before they will have let loose the worst internal strife."

Pucheu's barrister declares that the danger already exists in North Africa now:

"The trial is a mistake from the political point of view in that it may well disconcert Moslem public opinion in North Africa and thus arouse unrest."

The leaders at Algiers have thought that, by sacrificing a few lives, they may succeed in calming the rage of the masses and save the capitalist régime. How mistaken they are! No subterfuge can shackle the working class masses of Europe in their struggle. AMG and its servants will not succeed tomorrow, where the Gestapo with its accomplices has failed today. However many Pucheus they may sacrifice, they will not save their régime!

March 1944.

Religion—Its Social Roots And Role

By FELIX MORROW

EDITOR'S NOTE: The article which appears below was originally delivered in 1932 as a lecture before the League of Professional Groups. It was among the papers that Felix Morrow planned for publication, in particular against the trend of the Kremlin and the Stalinists openly to embrace religion and the Church—and this, in the name of Marxism! The projected publication of this essay was prevented at the time by Morrow's being railroaded to jail together with the other Trotskyist leaders.

* * *

Definitions of religion, like definitions of the state, generally tell us more about the social and political allegiances of the author of a given definition than about the true nature of religion or the state. Loyalties—that is, class interests and class outlook—are transferred into definitions; especially is this true of religion. Typical of such definitions is a theologian's formula for Christianity as "the synthesis of the highest aspirations of man." The fact that definitions are declarations of class allegiance and class programs does not at all mean—as empiricists and pragmatists pretend—that all definitions are therefore of equal validity. On the contrary. Just as Marxists, in controverting "classless" and other fraudulent theories of the state can point to historical and contemporary class-functions of the state as a class organ used by the dominant class; so, too, Marxists are able to confront all apologetic definitions of religion with the actual *social* function of religion.

What are the roots of religion? The most favorite trick of the obscurantists and their allies is to pretend that religion is rooted in the mind. That is how the perpetuation of religious prejudices, creeds, etc., is usually explained. Exposing this falsehood Lenin wrote

"Why does religion retain its hold in the backward layers of the urban proletariat, in the broad layers of semi-proletarians and also in the mass peasantry? Because of the ignorance of the people—replies a bourgeois progressive, a radical, or a bourgeois materialist . . . The Marxist says: Not true! Such a view is superficial; it is narrow-bourgeois 'culture-spreading.' Such a view does not probe deeply enough into the roots of religion. In modern capitalist countries these roots are primarily *social*." (*Lenin's Collected Works*, First Russian Edition, vol. XI, Book 1, pp. 253-254.)

It is precisely because of this social role of religion—teaching submissiveness, summoning all to suffer in silence in return for rewards in the "hereafter" etc., and in this way seeking to dampen the class struggle of workers against capitalists,

of peasants against landlords—it is precisely for this reason that Marx designated religion as the "opium of the people," and Lenin branded it is a "a kind of spiritual corn-whiskey."

To lay bare the social roots and social function of religion is to expose it for what it really is. Which is precisely what the apologists of capitalism and *all* its institutions seek in every way to avoid. It is hardly surprizing therefore that one of the most significant gaps in apologetic definitions of religion is the omission of the fact that religion is an institution; the fact that a religion, if it plays any role in a given society is an *organized* religion. One scarcely need point out, as against this omission of the fact of institutionalization, that a religion which remains unorganized would not perpetuate itself.

What would an unorganized religion be? It might be enunciated by some individuals and communicated to others. But if these did not organize together, acquire property and funds, endow churches and subsidiary institutions, carry on extensive propaganda, raise up a professional paid class of ministers and administrators, how would the religion be communicated to great numbers? The blood of the martyrs may be the seed of the church, but that the seed sprouts and is perpetuated, is due to union with Rome, to the riches garnered by the church, to its position as the greatest of feudal landholder. This is indeed a commonplace, except that it has been so obscured by the English Dissenting tradition which is the main source of American religious thinking.

This tradition of a lower class, once so suspicious of established church and state, and therefore appealing to the direct inspiration of the Word of God, with a lay ministry and tiny meeting-houses, is still reiterated by the descendants of the Dissenters, who are now the ruling class of America, with powerful, enormously wealthy churches, with a clergy whose administrative duties make them as much businessmen as priests, with the fusion of different sects, and the centralization of church control growing every day more pronounced. The hypocrisy of John D. Rockefeller's Reverend Harry Emerson Fosdick sermonizing that the church is not so important as the pure heart, is only too transparent—provided one is not wearing blinkers.

This institutional character of religion, glossed over by religious apologists as somehow irrelevant to the religious core of the church, is highly relevant to any serious description and analysis of the function of religion.

In every epoch of history, the existing institutions are bound

up with the social relations of production. As the Catholic Church was the bulwark of feudalism, so today all churches are part of the arsenal of capitalism, share in its privileges and fortunes. In the class struggles which arise from the antagonisms implicit in the mode of production, the dominant institutions, including the churches, support the ruling classes.

In the epochs before the triumph of the bourgeoisie, the differences between classes were expressed also in different religions; that is, the new classes struggling against the ruling class, have also given birth to new religions which wage parallel struggles with the dominant religion. The struggles against feudalism became struggles also against the then greatest feudal landowner, the Catholic Church. The peasant wars against the clergy and nobility, in the 15th and 16th centuries, took the form of the Anabaptist, Albigensian, Hussite, Lollard, heresies: In defense of its domains and privileges, the Church demands submission to it as the only channel of grace; the peasants counter by proclaiming the central authority of the Gospels.

So, too, the revolt of the middle classes of Germany under Luther, which, as Engels has pointed out, takes the form of a demand for a cheap church similar to the later bourgeois and petty bourgeois demand for cheap government, is also a religious heresy. In the same way, the revolt of the rising bourgeoisie of England against irresponsible monarchy and feudal landowners, takes the form of a Puritan and Sectarian struggle against the Established Church.

Bourgeois Anti-Clericalism

It is interesting to note that, as the meaning of the bourgeois revolutions grows clearer to the plebian revolutionists, the fight against the church grows less and less a fight of one religion against another. Thus, the French Revolution and the revolutions of 1848 no longer obscure their tasks with religious ideology; the class fighting its way upward has no need of seeing its struggle as a religious one. The mists of religion, obscuring the real contending forces, become a hindrance to the class fighting an uphill fight. If this is true of the later bourgeois revolutions, revolutions which serve only to transfer power from one minority ruling class to another, how much more true must this be of the proletarian revolution, which is to do away with all classes, and whose success, whose very program of action, is based on the scientific analysis of the nature of social life free of all fetishisms.

Since the Puritan revolt there has been no important example of a class struggle also taking the form of religion. All later religious movements have been reactionary in character. The religious movements among the lower classes, such as the evangelistic sects, like the Baptists and Methodists, were a substitute for secular protest, combining with their wails of anguish explicit submission to the powers that be. The other religious substitute for secular protest, the religious communist colonies, belongs to the history of utopian socialism and comes at a time when the role of utopian socialism has become a reactionary one.

What happened to bourgeois anti-clericalism? Once the bourgeoisie triumphed, they, too, find like the ruling class which preceded them, that religion is useful to the state, and freethinking and atheism become in their eyes identified with "immorality," etc., i.e., hatred of the established order. The realistic rationalism of the epoch of bourgeois revolution passes; no American politician who announced the beliefs of Jefferson and Patrick Henry, or even the indifferent church-going of Washington, would be run nowadays for office.

Tom Paine, the propagandist of the American revolution,

became, for Theodore Roosevelt, "that filthy little atheist." In France, its classic home, anti-clericalism remained longest, owing to the political usefulness of the traditions of the Revolution, and continual conflicts over property with the Catholic Church. But despite any manifest unfriendliness, the Church of Rome labored to find favor in the eyes of French capital, and at long last, it has not labored in vain. When a flare-up between the Church and the Chamber of Deputies occurred in 1924, the *Journal des Debats*, organ of the most important French imperialists, sharply warned the government against breaking with the Holy See, "because of the large number of French Catholic institutions abroad. French influence", the Journal said, "in Asia Minor and North Africa is largely maintained through these [Catholic] institutions." The rush of the formerly anti-clerical bourgeoisie into the arms of the Church became so precipitous and for such obvious reasons, that the Church itself felt embarrassed. Here is how Abbe Ernest Dimnet commented on this sudden influx of converts:

"Today it is remarkable that the French upper middle classes are the main support of religion and go to great expense in order to support the schools in which their children are educated in a religious atmosphere totally different from that in which the previous generations grew up. The majority in the French Chamber may still be Masonic... French governments in consequence cannot but feel the influence of the lodges and might be expected to be anti-clerical. Yet they are not. Monks and nuns have returned to their schools and teach in their costumes. The Archbishop of Paris is on the best terms with the Prime Minister and a recent legal case has shown that the government regards the Papal Nuncio as a valuable ally."

"What does this mean?" asks the reverend father. It is true, he sadly goes on:

"That the bourgeoisie and the politicians representing it have opened their eyes to the social utility of religion. A mean notion of religion, this utilitarianism in the land of Saint Louis and Joan of Arc!... But in France as in the rest of the world there is, working for a return to religion, something higher than opportunism." And so forth and so on.

Sanctifying Wealth

Thus passed the last stronghold of anti-clericalism. The Catholic Church has adjusted itself to its capitalistic successors, and serves them as loyally as she once served feudalism. Once she completes the process of adjusting herself, with some necessary losses of estates, to the new capitalist regime of Spain, the Catholic Church will have finally completed her transition from feudalism to capitalism. Her losses will be little enough in the process, if she can help herself. On the same day that the Pope by radio condemned "men for fixing their eyes on earthly goods," he demanded cash reparations of thirty million dollars from the Spanish government for church property destroyed by the revolution.

In America, once the Civil War decided that capitalism was to be master of the continent, the churches proceeded to become capitalist with a brazenness which no established church has ever outdone. The example of the Baptist Church is a good one, since it had always been known as a poor man's church. As I have said, these evangelical movements were once substitutes for social protest; however, as they prospered, they ceased to be substitutes for social protest and became glorifiers of the social order. Baptist ministers indignantly repudiated the idea that the Baptist churches are composed of the poor of the world. A prominent Baptist divine has declared:

"God has so blessed (us), temporally, as well as spiritually,

that we could demonstrate that the aggregate of wealth among (us) is far greater than of some ecclesiastical fraternities whose members not infrequently put on lordly airs and affect to despise the Baptists for their poverty."

The concept of the sanctification of wealth became a creed of the churches. Dollars and godliness were pronounced to go together. Capitalists were "God's stewards." Baptist conventions passed resolutions saying that they "thankfully recognized the rich blessing of the Great Head of the Church, in the recent gift of Brother John D. Rockefeller" (or other millionaire Brothers Vassar, Bishop, Colgate, Deane, etc. etc.). The *Christian Standard* urged businessmen to take over the administration of church affairs, for who, it asked, was "so qualified to do business as a businessman, and who to spend God's money as his legitimate stewards?"

It ought to be noted that the developing control of the churches by capitalism was more than an obviously direct control. While the Protestant churches have been directly controlled by the businessmen—who generally control property, funds and ministers—this kind of control is not at all indispensable to the general support of capitalism by the churches. As a matter of fact, the most effective supporters of capitalism are not the obvious hirelings but the apparent volunteers. The shortsighted businessmen who directly control the Protestant churches may prevent at crucial moments a flexibility which is much more valuable to capitalism. In this, the Catholic Church has proved superior to Protestant. In Spain the ally of the feudal nobles, in Italy of Fascism, in Germany of the Social Democracy, all at the same time. Thus, the Catholic Church has been the savior of capitalism in ways impossible for the less flexible Protestants. Her union with German socialists helped bring forth the Weimar constitution, saving capitalism, while the Protestant churches, in the hands of Junkers and industrialists, were unable to maneuver. The Catholic church knows how to yield the husk to save the kernel. Today* she is unwilling, in America, officially to recognize the principle of trade unionism (though she exercises considerable influence in the AFL.) Tomorrow, if it is necessary to hold the masses from rushing forward, the Catholic Church will organize trade unions. This flexibility, plus the fact that so far as the working masses in large numbers go to church, they are Catholics, bids fair to give the Catholic Church an increasingly important role in American capitalist struggle against the workers.

In general, when the underdog struggles, it is high time for the topdog to call down to him in the name of brotherhood. In particular, this has been the role of the Social Gospel. To bring the worker into the church or at least to persuade him that the Church is not his enemy; offering either religious techniques for solving the social problems or paper programs, which mean nothing and which, even on paper, go no further than the mildest of liberalism. This, and an occasional gesture. The high water mark of the Social Gospel in this country was the Interchurch World Movement's report on the Steel Strike after it failed; the result was the collapse of the Interchurch organization. I once asked a secretary of the Federated Council of Churches why his organization did not do things like the Steel Strike report. He looked hurt. Why, he said, "that steel strike report put us in a fix which we have just about dragged ourselves out of now. Do you want to ruin us?"

* This was written in 1932.—Ed.

The measure of direct control of the churches, therefore, is not a sufficient index to their capitalist loyalty. Nor is their relation to the state. The political privileges of the churches, their freedom from taxation, their right to conduct religious schools or teach religion in the public schools, blasphemy and Sunday laws, religious propaganda in the armed forces and legislatures, etc., are also not the most significant revelations of the capitalist role of the churches. The fact is that formal separation of church and state, like the formal appearance of impartiality assumed by capitalist "democracy," is the most efficient form under which the churches can function in the interests of capitalism. An established church is suspect even by scarcely class-conscious workers. Under the slogan of freedom from state domination, the church performs its best work for capitalism.

The Mechanics of Deception

The ministers and administrators of the churches are, by income or social status part of the capitalist class, move in it and have their being in it. They simply express the capitalist ideology of their class. The principles of capitalism become, as by a process of osmosis, the principles of religion under capitalism. When the pillar of the Baptist Church, John D. Rockefeller, declared, as he fought the Ludlow strikers, that the great principle at stake was that American workmen should not be deprived of their "right" to work for whom they please, the Baptist pulpits echoed him. The clergy howled for the blood of the Haymarket martyrs as did the capitalists. When Theodore Roosevelt pronounced Debs an "undesirable citizen" he was but repeating the gist of thousands of sermons. The history of the development of the American working class is mirrored in the capitalist propaganda of the churches, their calling the workers to submission, their outright strikebreaking, their regimentation of the workers for the capitalist parties, etc., etc.

As a matter of fact, the churches, in their inculcation of the standards which are also inculcated by school, press, radio and state, have an immeasurable advantage over other institutions. What the others teach to be correct as a matter of expediency, advisability or judiciousness, the church teaches as the word of God or connects with religious significance or translates into archaic, sonorous language far more effective than the language of school and press and state. The world war of 1914-1918 proved this to the hilt. They turned the war of capitalism into a holy war, and God's habitations became the most effective recruiting stations. In this capacity of the churches to make religious principles out of practical politics lies their greatest service to capitalism.

Bourgeois thinkers occasionally blurt out this fact. I quote, as an example, the following unguarded soliloquy of James Bryce. That Philistine becomes thoughtful as, in his survey of the American Commonwealth, he is struck by the important role of the churches:

"No one is so thoughtless as not sometimes to ask himself what would befall mankind if the solid fabric of (religious) belief on which their morality has hitherto rested, or at least been deemed by them to rest, were suddenly to break up and vanish . . . Morality with religion for its sanction has hitherto been the basis of social polity, except under military despotisms . . . So sometimes, standing in the midst of a great American city, and watching the throngs of eager figures streaming hither and thither, marking the sharp contrasts of poverty and

wealth, an increasing mass of wretchedness and an increasing display of luxury . . . one is startled by the thought of what might befall this huge yet delicate fabric of laws and commerce and social institutions were the foundation it has rested on to crumble away . . . History cannot answer this question. The most she can tell us is that hitherto civilized society has rested on religion, and that free government has prospered best among religious people." (*Op. cit.* vol. II, p. 794.)

No wonder, then, that no Commencement address in schools and universities is complete without a tribute to religion; and no Chamber of Commerce banquet ended without someone sounding the religious note. No wonder that in dedicating a statue of Francis Asbury, that Methodist pioneer, Coolidge should have declared:

"Our government rests upon religion. It is from that source that we derive our reverence for truth and justice for equality and liberty, and for the rights of mankind."

In the midst of the imperialist war of 1914-1918, Lenin wrote:

"Feuerbach was right when in reply to those who defended religion on the ground that it consoles the people, he pointed out the reactionary meaning of consolation: 'Whoever consoles the slave instead of arousing him to revolt against slavery, aids the slaveholder.' All oppressing classes of every description need two social functions to safeguard their domination: the function of a hangman, and the function of a priest. The hangman is to quell the protest and rebellion of the oppressed, the priest is to paint before them a perspective of mitigated sufferings and sacrifice under the same class rule (which it is particularly easy to do without guaranteeing the 'possibility of their realization' . . .). Thereby he reconciles them to class domination, weans them away from revolutionary actions, undermines their revolutionary spirit, destroys their revolutionary determination." (Lenin's *Collected Works*, English Edition, vol. XVIII, pp. 295-296.)

Whoever grasps and assimilates this Leninist-Marxist analysis of religion has learned the truth about the social function of religion. He who denies it, in the words of Feuerbach—"aids the slaveholder."

It Is Time To Break With Stalinism

By HAKIM MIZRA

Hakim Mizra, the author of the following article, is an Indian revolutionist who participated in the founding of the Communist International at its first World Congress. His article originally appeared in *Workers International News*, February 1944, theoretical organ of the WIL, one of the British Trotskyist groups that have recently merged to form the Revolutionary Communist Party—Ed.

* * *

On March 15, 1919, the Communist International was established by Comrade Lenin and the Bolshevik Party with the object of helping and developing international Socialism. At its inception, Lenin declared that the fulfillment of the cause of the International would only be realized when capitalism was overthrown and Socialism established throughout the world. Thus, to the colonial and oppressed people, the Soviet Union, as the citadel of the October revolution and the Communist International, was an object, not only of admiration, but of hope and guidance for their own struggle for independence.

The people of India are inherently anti-fascist and anti-imperialist. When Spain was attacked by the fascists, the Indian people's sympathy was with the workers and peasants of Spain. They gave all the material and moral help possible. When China was attacked by Japan, the Indian people declared their solidarity with the Chinese Republic and gave every possible help. During Mussolini's rape of Abyssinia, Indian sympathy with our Negro comrades was pronounced and unequivocal. During the period of Hitler's accession to power, Indian leaders were the first to condemn it in no uncertain terms.

During the last 25 years, the struggles and successes of the Soviet Union have fired the imagination and revolutionary zeal of Indian youth, workers and peasants. Right from the beginning, hundreds of Indians tried to get into direct touch with the Soviet Union and its leaders. The Indian Communist Party had to work through the British Party. In spite of many hitches, the Indian comrades always put their faith in the Communist International and accepted its guidance and help.

There had been many misunderstandings between the British Communist Party and the Indian comrades and there has been much disillusionment; but in spite of all this, the Indian comrades stood by their loyalty to the Communist International and the Soviet Union.

Purpose of Article

When the Communist International was suddenly dissolved, it confused and shocked most of the genuine revolutionaries. We then did not subscribe to the line put forward by the Trotskyists who declared that the CI had already been dead and the declaration of May 22, 1943 was only its final burial. After overcoming the initial shock and watching the subsequent events, we were anxious to find out the causes for these developments. *The purpose of this article is to clarify the situation and to place before Indian and colonial Communists a series of facts, in order to help them to review their ideas and views on the basis of current events.*

On May 22, 1943, the ECCI recommended the dissolution of the Communist International. The ECCI gave several reasons. Let us discuss some of them. Firstly that the fundamental aims of the Third International have now been achieved. According to the Constitution and Rules of the Communist International, Section 1—Names and Objects—Clause 1:

"The Communist International—The International Workers Association—is a union of Communist parties in various countries; it is a World Communist Party. As the leader and organizer of the world revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the upholder of the principles and aims of Communism, the Communist International strives to win over the majority of the working class and the broad strata of the propertyless peasantry, and fights for the establishment of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of a World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, for the complete abolition of classes and for the achievement of socialism—the first stage of Communist society."

Again, to quote Section II—The World Congress of the Communist International—Clause 8:—

“The supreme body of the Communist International is the World Congress of representatives of all Parties (Sections) and organizations affiliated to the Communist International. The World Congress discusses and decides the program, and tactical and organizational questions connected with the activities of the Communist International and of its various Sections. Power to alter the program and rules of the Communist International lies exclusively with the World Congress of the Communist International. The World Congress shall be convened once every two years.”

It must be evident to everybody that the power of dissolution must also exclusively lie with the *World Congress* and not the ECCI who in fact dissolved it.

Stalin's Vow

Here we also quote Stalin's vow on Comrade Lenin's death:

“Lenin never regarded the Republic of Soviets as an end in itself. He always regarded it as a necessary link for strengthening the revolutionary movements in the lands of the West and the East, as a necessary link for facilitating the victory of the toilers of the whole world over Capital. Lenin knew that only such an interpretation is the correct one, *not only from the International point of view, but also from the point of view of preserving the Republic of Soviets itself.* Lenin knew that only in this way is it possible to inflame the hearts of the toilers of all countries for the decisive battles of emancipation. That is why this genius among the great leaders of the proletariat, on the very morrow of the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship, laid the foundation of the Workers International. That is why he never tired of expanding and strengthening the league of the toilers of the whole world, the Communist International. In departing from us, Comrade Lenin bequeathed to us the duty of remaining loyal to the principles of the Communist International. We vow to you, Comrade Lenin, that we will not spare our lives to strengthen and expand the league of the toilers of the whole world—the Communist International.” (Stalin, writing on the death of Lenin in *Pravda*, No. 23, January 30, 1924.)

We ask ourselves, had the Comintern become “the necessary link for strengthening the revolutionary movements in the lands of the west and the east?” If so, the other reason given by Stalin, that it is difficult to call congresses in war time is incorrect. The International was started in March, 1919, when the Soviet Union was in the throes of civil war and attacked by 13 invading armies, and only a few hundred square miles around Moscow were left in the hands of the Bolsheviks. The Soviet Union was a backward country, hardly at all industrially developed. The situation was far more critical even than when Hitler's forces had advanced as far as Stalingrad. The workers of the world were just beginning to understand the value of international solidarity. In spite of far more adverse circumstances between 1919 and 1924, five international congresses were held, and these built up the Communist parties in various countries, thus strengthening the position of the Soviet Union. Comrade Lenin and the Bolsheviks, at that period, had full confidence in the class instinct of the working class of the world. They rather put their faith in the workers and peasants of all lands than in the Churchills, Roosevelts and other class enemies. Hence, we saw incidents like the stopping of the “Jolly George” and other ships; mutiny in the French ships in the Black Sea, fraternization of invading soldiers with

the Bolsheviks, etc., which saved the Soviet Union. If under the war conditions it is difficult to call an international congress, then why during the period between 1924-1939, which was a *peace* period, only two International Congresses were called—which was against the constitution of the CI? The Fifth Congress of 1924 did not instruct the ECCI to wait for four years before calling the Sixth Congress in 1928.

We are told that the various Communist parties are now matured. From our association with the British party, we can say that this is definitely not so. We know the events in India—also various sectarian lines taken by some of the British members re Indian organizations—the starting of sectarian Trade Unions, the sectarian Workers' and Peasants' Parties, the attitude towards the national movements—there are many such examples of the British party misleading the Indian revolutionary movement, which have been admitted by Ben Bradley and others in their books. Also, the British party's history up to the present period shows one blunder after another—at one time, a sectarian deviation to the right, at another, a left-wing deviation. No wonder that, apart from a few thousand workers, the British party is not trusted by the militant section of the working class. Moreover, it is a fact that at least twice the number of members have left the British party than the total membership of the party, at the present time. If the British party had become matured, the situation would have been different. The British party would have been a mass party and would have led the struggle—perhaps the war would have been avoided, and humanity would have been well on the path to Socialism, peace and plenty. The American party would not find itself in a position of dissolving itself and advocating cooperation between “labor, farmer and capital.” Surely that is not the fulfillment of the aims of the Communist International!

Lies and Facts

While the CI has been dissolved, capital still reigns supreme and the toilers of the world are far more under the bondage of imperialism and Fascism. According to the pronouncements of Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, there is full understanding for cooperation for at least 20 years. The American Communist Party dissolves itself in order to avoid “civil war” in the post-war period, supports free enterprise, i.e. the exploitation of man by man, accepts capitalist democracy as an end in itself. (Lenin stood for workers' democracy—Lenin believed in class war and partisan interest, i.e. the interest of the working class at the expense of the capitalist class.) All these are accepted by a so-called “mature” party, as a result of the Moscow, Cairo and Teheran conferences! Lenin and the other Bolshevik leaders pointed out that the attempts by the capitalists to forcibly repress the working class and its rights in any movement they would take to overthrow capitalism would inevitably lead to civil war. The task of genuine leaders of the working class was to explain this to the workers and prepare them for the inevitable struggle; not sow illusions in the possibilities of achieving their aims peacefully, as did the reformist renegades such as MacDonald and Kautsky, while the capitalist reaction prepared a bloody trap for them. The British party, in its [London] *Daily Worker* editorial, fully supports the policy of the American party.

The dissolution of the Communist International is concurrent with other fundamental changes in the Soviet Union, such as:

1. Reorganising the Red Army on capitalist lines, creating an officer caste. The difference between the pay of an ordinary soldier and officer is much greater than in capitalist countries such as Great Britain and the USA. Revival of Czarist uniform and creation of orders and decorations in the names of old Czarist soldiers, rather than revolutionary leaders who gave their lives for the revolution. Introduction of Prussian discipline; "*Nowadays, privates and N.C.O.'s travelling in a bus, tube or tram, must give up their seats to men of senior ranks, should they be standing.*" (London Daily Worker, July 9, 1943.)

Even in capitalist countries, an ordinary soldier has not to undergo such insults. This is just as bad as the worst type of caste distinction. Perhaps such measures and changes were necessary to counter the discontent of the Red Army men!

2. We find in the [London] Daily Worker, as well as in a special pamphlet by Reg. Bishop, the support of "*Soviet Millionaires.*" This is the result of acute differences in wages and privileges between various sections of the workers in a "socialist country"!

3. Recognition by the state of the Greek Orthodox Church—the excuse is that now "Religion" is a friend of Socialism! The opium of the people has now become its balm. Marxists always recognised the right of religious freedom, and under Lenin this was certainly so in the Soviet Union. But the new attitude represents a definite departure from the militant and uncompromising stand taken up by Bolshevism towards religion.

4. Abolition of co-education and introduction of paid higher education in place of free education and opportunities for all.

5. Replacement of the "Internationale"—which was the anthem of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party by a national anthem, such as "*Sing to our Motherland, Glory Undying*" in the same vein as "*Land of Hope and Glory.*"

Those of us who have up to now, supported the line of "socialism in one country" will no doubt get a shock, and be forced to review the situation on Marxian lines. Instead of regarding it "not as an end in itself, but as a necessary link for facilitating the victory of the toilers of the world over Capital," the present rulers consider the Soviet Union as a specific country (not as part of the world struggle for Socialism and the citadel of the world revolution) and, following a nationalist line, are prepared to subordinate the cause of Socialism for their immediate gain; are prepared to overturn the whole ideology of the October revolution.

The series of changes mentioned above, force one to conclude that it is the present policy of the Russian Government which had deviated from the ideology of the October revolution, which has led the Communist parties to such a sorry pass. The attitude of the Soviet government towards the colonial struggles has undergone simultaneous changes with its foreign policy. As a result of the Soviet Union deciding to join the League of Nations and forming peace alliances with France, England and other capitalist states (dabbling in power politics), the colonial struggles all over the world were watered down and subordinated to the interest of the Stalinist bureaucracy. A few examples will suffice.

"It was in 1927 that the Indian National Congress took part in the foundation of, and affiliated to, the International League of oppressed people against Imperialism." (R. P. Dutt, *India Today*, p. 488.)

Again: "*The National Congress affiliated to the LAI in*

1928." All these steps were endorsed by the ECCI, the British Party and R. P. Dutt personally. In the middle of the thirties, the League against Imperialism was dissolved and simultaneously the anti-imperialist struggles were watered down. The anti-war movement, which gained a footing in India and other colonies, was simultaneously wound up. The workers of India manifested their anti-war attitude at the beginning of the second world war—for example, 80,000 workers of Bombay took part in a political anti-war strike.

Effects on Colonial Struggle

In his speech on India, Wang Ming, at the Seventh World Congress (August 7, 1935) said:

"The Indian Communists are able to lead these masses to victorious anti-Imperialist and agrarian revolution in India," and that the Communists are really the vanguard of the people of India in the struggle for national emancipation—"this is now the main task of the Indian comrades." He ended up: "*Raise high the banner of the Communist International—Forward to the victory of the world Socialist Revolution.*"

R. P. Dutt ends up his *India Today* (Page 536):

"The decisive battles of India for freedom are in the near future. Whether the transition to freedom will be stormy and achieved at the cost of heavy sacrifices, or whether it will be relatively smooth and rapid, depends, not only on the strength of the Indian National Movements, but also on the cooperation of the British working class and of the British Democratic movement. The war only accelerated the issues which are already maturing in India—the issues of the decisive struggle for national liberation, and eventually of the struggle for social liberation."

To contrast the above—in the *World News and Views*, April 25, 1942, Ben Bradley writes:

"The Congress proposal, that a National Government be set up which commands the confidence of the people, was rejected by the British Government, but is receiving widespread support in India, even from such British semi-official newspapers as the *Calcutta Statesman*. All sections are agreed on the postponement of major issues until after the war."

What are the major issues? No doubt the struggle for national independence and the overthrow of British imperialism's bloody rule, which was the line laid down by the last world congress and put forward by his immediate leader, R. P. Dutt. "All sections," of course, includes the CPI members who support the policy of a so-called "National Government" (not Constituent Assembly on the basis of universal franchise—which was the line laid down by the Leninist Bolshevik Party), no doubt a popular front policy including semi-official imperialist organs! Moreover, they do not state that such a coalition Government of Princes, Congress, Moslem League, Liberal, Hindu, Mahasabha, Communists and others has been put forward to deceive the masses and cover up the continued rule of the oppressors. *Even if such a Government is formed, it will not achieve national independence, as, due to conflicting class interests within it, it is bound to remain dependent on the foreign imperialist power.* Perhaps it is intended to be the same policy as now being followed by the American CP—i.e. unity of labor, capital and farmers, and free enterprise.

The change of line promulgated by the British "Communist" Party (no longer CPGB) for India, their protege—is supposed to help Russia against the Nazis. Even from that angle this policy is futile and treacherous—first, it has not alleviated the

discontent of the masses, hence Britain and USA have been forced to keep a large army of occupation in India—secondly, it is the deliberate policy of Great Britain to isolate the Indian national emancipation struggles from the progressive forces of the outside world, they would rather allow the whole of India to fall under the temporary subjugation of the Axis powers (as in Burma, Siam and occupied Europe) than relax their grip over the masses of India.

The British CP knows that it was this stranglehold, and the policy of British imperialism, which prevented the Indian people from taking part in the common struggle for Socialism, peace and plenty. By enforcing the policy of a "People's War" on the CPI, they are but serving their new master, British imperialism. This notorious thesis of R. P. Dutt, which demands unity with the Moslem League and a "National Government" of all classes, is nothing but a deliberately dishonest and treacherous sell-out. Dutt has scores of times mentioned in *India Today*, that the Moslem League is nothing but an organisation set up at the instigation and with the blessing of British imperialism in order to divide the National Front. Such a policy only leads some of the Indian CP'ers to form so-called "People's Volunteers" with the Moslem Leaguers. In order to sabotage the struggle for independence and act as the S.S. of local Moslem League ministries, as in Dacca. When this double-crossing policy was first put forward by Dutt & Co., our comrades thought that it was a genuine mistake. But subsequent events show that they are only echoing Stalin, who has adopted full cooperation with capital in order to prevent "disorder" and civil war after this war. Thus, the policy of a "People's War" in India is the precursor of the policies laid down in the three conferences at Moscow, Cairo and Teheran (and Harry Pollit praises these conferences in the *World News & Views* for being a greater event than the October revolution.) This is the outcome of the right-wing nationalist line adopted by the present rulers of the Soviet Union.

Stalin has deliberately broken his vow on Lenin's death that "*Lenin never regarded the Republic of Soviets as an end in itself,*" and is prepared to sacrifice future social revolutions and civil wars to please his present friends, Churchill and Roosevelt. No wonder the American party dissolves itself and is wholeheartedly prepared to support the policy of coalition between labor, farmer and capital, and free enterprise—no doubt other Communist parties will follow suit and return to the fold of capital as prodigal sons.

To a genuine Marxist and revolutionist there are only two tests by which to judge all political ideas and personalities namely: (1) loyalty to the interests of the working class; and (2) belief in the continuance of the class struggle until the whole world is Socialist. The party which advocates cooperation in making capitalism work effectively in the post-war period and subscribing to the idea that "*capitalism and Socialism have begun to find the way to peaceful coexistence and collaboration in the same world*"—such a party is acting as a traitor to the working class and betraying the world revolution.

Stalin may cling to the illusion of 20 years of uninterrupted peace relations with capital to serve his purpose. He may refuse to respond to the appeal of the Indian national movement against his newly made friends, Churchill and Co., but the workers of the world, who have seen the success of the October revolution under the leadership of the Bolsheviks will not forget anything, nor will they forgive anything. The masses of the Soviet Union, who made the Soviet Republic, will never forget this betrayal. The time of reckoning and judgment will come, and the class enemies will be justly dealt with by the workers of the world under the banner of the "International Workers Association," which lives and fights, though the Communist International is dissolved. The true Communist International created by Comrade Lenin under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, lives and fights for world Socialism, peace and the happiness of mankind—The Fourth International.

Australian Working Class And The War

From the Manifesto of the Revolutionary Workers Party, Australian Section of the Fourth International

Australia is a fully developed capitalist state whose ruling class has hitherto relied on English imperialism for protection against its working class. The situation in Europe and the entry of Japan into the war left the local ruling class without a protector, and so a hasty alliance was made with the USA. While the capitalist press has built up a story that America is defending the Australian people from the Japanese hordes, the converse is, in fact, correct—Australia is fighting for the "right" of America to control the Pacific ocean.

The sudden attack on Pearl Harbor and the unexpected success of the Japanese in the East Indies gave a false picture of the strength of Japanese imperialism. It suited Australian capitalism to play up the "danger" in order to militarize and conscript the people of this country and to filch from the workers many hard won industrial conditions. Reactionary legislation, introduced under the guise of "National Security," has given the ruling class powers as great as those of Hitler.

The basic fear of the Australian capitalist class was not Japanese invasion but the possibility of the development of a revolutionary situation. At the time of the entry of Japan into the war, the ruling class in Australia was in a condition of semi-collapse. Unable to rule, it had called on its Labor hirelings, the Curtin government, to take over the task of controlling and disciplining the workers. Owing to their efficiency in this task the ruling class has regained much of its strength and the influence of American troops has given added confidence. Reactionaries like Theodore and de Groot hold important positions in industry and the armed forces. Semi-fascist and fascist parties appear daily. The total militarization of the workers through the Civil Construction Corps and the Army is all part of a gigantic offensive launched by capitalism against the workers.

There has been established in this country an internal police system similar to the Gestapo. A percentage of all civilian mail

is opened to provide a check on morale, quite apart from the "listed" mail that is always censored. Every man suspected of left sympathies has a dossier and his views and actions are recorded. All the incidentals of a police state such as passport system and domiciliary visits are in full operation. The inability of the Labor Party (Social Democrats) to resist reaction has been demonstrated over and over again. France, 1936-39; Germany, 1930-33; Italy, 1920-22 are convincing examples. Only a revolutionary party of the working class can offer serious resistance because such a party recognizes the class war and its implications.

* * *

The Australian Economy

Some years ago the Australian Section of the Fourth International characterized Australia as "a junior partner of English imperialism," recognizing that, in the period 1925-35, this country had ceased to be a colony but nevertheless could not stand on its own right as an independent imperialism. Under the drive of war, industrial development has increased in tempo; but England herself has lost her independent status. Australia is now a dependent imperialism looking for a master. Its capitalism is fully developed. The perspectives are now the Socialist revolution or Fascism.

Australia commenced as a prison—passed through a stage of industrial pastoralism based on convict labor which ended with the gold discoveries of the 1850's, then through a stage of colonial development based on mining and the wool industry; there was a mass inrush of proletarian elements with a high degree of class consciousness: the Irish rebels and the Chartists mixed with the descendants of the convicts to form the Australian proletariat. The basic industries, grazing and mining, were monopolistic in type, required a relatively small number of highly skilled laborers and had a rate of profit much higher than the world average. The distance from the world markets and the competition of richer virgin countries made industries based on cheap imported labor unprofitable. By 1900 the colonial economy was fully developed. From 1900 until the 1930's Australia was a rapidly developing capitalism, a development forced on by the war of 1914-18 and the depression of 1928-35. During the whole of this period the proletariat engaged in a reformist struggle with a highly integrated capitalist class which depended, in the last resort, for its state apparatus of repression upon English imperialism.

The Present Structure

As this war has dragged along the economy has reached its full capitalist development. With imports cut to the bone and under the drive of industrial war requirements we are making every article that can be made here.

In primary production Australia is organized upon an industrial basis. The great majority of holdings (158,000 out of 233,000—*Commonwealth Year Book 1939*, p. 98) are over 500 acres, and machinery is regularly used. The industry is based upon the export trade (66 percent of all primary produce by value is exported) and its control lies in the hands of the processing and exporting companies, and, in the last analysis, of the financial institutions.

Our economy has long ceased to be organized mainly for primary production: only 20 percent of persons in occupations in 1933 were engaged in primary industries (in the USA in 1920, 25 percent were so engaged). The great bulk of production consists of manufactured goods. These industries have been

developed not by cheap labor but on the basis of machine technique and the bulk of local capital has been accumulated from the pastoral and mining industries with their peculiar capital set-up. This, together with the limited home market, has meant that in the major industries the only units technologically efficient have been monopolistic in the sense that the needs of the entire economy have been supplied by one organization (iron and steel, chemicals, sugar, tobacco, glass, land transport, rubber, etc.) or by very closely interlocked groups (mining, sea transport, banking and finance, insurance, beer and spirits, news, meat, wheat and wool exports, textiles, etc.), all of which are themselves welded into a coherent whole by the financial houses. Maclaurin in his *Economic Planning in Australia* gives a curious example of the closeness of the integration in connection with the Premiers' Plan.

"Outside the Conference there was very strong opposition in financial quarters in Melbourne to the Conference proposals. When compulsory conversion was being considered, a private meeting of 400 leaders of Australian thought was convened in Melbourne to discuss the financial proposals of the Premiers' Conference. At the meeting Mr. R. G. Menzies declared... 'Report of a private meeting convened by Sir W. Harrison Moore, Melbourne, June 3rd, 1937. The meeting was kept private, and the report of the proceedings was not published because it was not believed to be desirable in the national interests. THE REPORT HAS NEVER BEEN MADE PUBLIC.'"
(Author's emphasis).

The result of this large scale organization has been a highly integrated, flexible economy with a high rate of surplus value. Profits have been poured into every available avenue of investment until further internal development is impossible. Investment henceforth must be in oversea lands, and in the present state of world imperialism such investment is only possible if backed by military force.

The Accumulation of Capital

TABLE I
Yearly Rates of Surplus Values in Factories
(in Thousand of Pounds)

(From COMMONWEALTH YEAR BOOKS)

YEAR	SALARIES AND WAGES	INTEREST, PROFITS, Etc.
1930-31	Pounds 56,930	Pounds 55,050
1931-32	62,450	55,860
1932-33	59,416	59,655
1933-34	64,445	64,647
1934-35	72,825	70,703
1935-36	82,098	80,339
1936-37	90,123	87,561
1937-38	102,079	94,409
1938-39	106,743	96,673

(It must be assumed in view of the averaging of the rate of profit and the known uniformity of the wage levels that these figures are sufficiently generalized to give a general rate for the whole Australian economy.)

These figures establish, taking into consideration the natural faking tendency of the keepers of the books, that the division of the added value as a result of manufacture is approximately even as between capital and labor.

To view the matter from another angle, we have the following position with regard to the number of persons producing the goods upon which the present standard of living is based:

TABLE II

Total available for work, including unemployed, 1939	2,700,000	
Persons recruited since	300,000	
		(Total)
		3,000,000
Persons engaged in socially useless work:		
Military forces, etc.	800,000	
Munition workers, and section of normal industry devoted to war	400,000	
Domestics, luxury workers, etc.	400,000	1,600,000
		(Balance)
		1,400,000

So we have 1,400,000 producing socially useful goods in the community at the present time. In other words, under capitalism, one half of the working population is, without further investment and development, not required. The problem for our ruling class is whether in the circumstances of a post-war world, there will be room for Australian imperialist development.

Considering both the division of value (Table I) and the activity of the workers (Table II) the rate of surplus value is at least 100 percent. On a national income of 1,000 million Pounds there is available for capitalist consumption and investment some 500 million Pounds. We are in a period of acute capital crisis and the higher the value of production the more there is for investment, the more acute the crisis.

The Panacea of Public Works

Such situations as will face the Australian economy after the war have been met in the past in other countries by a lavish program of public works. In Scandinavia there was a policy of planned public spending, and in the USA we saw the spectacular instance of the "New Deal," a method by which the ruling class bought a respite from a revolutionary situation. But the countries that have used these expedients have had low public debts and stable credit. Australia at the end of the war will have a public debt of crippling dimensions and will be in an intensified inflationary spiral. Public works based on borrowing will be impossible. Even now it is difficult to find loan money for the prosecution of the war; how much more difficult will it be to borrow when the capitalist is assessing his losses.

There are other nostrums. Single Tax, Douglas Credit, Central Bank Credit, but there is no solution for the present capitalist economic impasse, *except investment overseas*; and investment overseas is a function of military power. It is no longer possible to sell to the wide world; the only salesmanship that is effective at the moment is that backed by military force. Unfortunately for our ruling class they are not in a position to participate as principals in the imperialist struggle; they have to play the role of jackal to the USA and England. The difficulties of these leading members of the "democratic" Alliance are so great that the scavenger's share of the feast must be small; so small, in fact, that it will provide no relief for the problems of the economy. Thus, within the limits of a stable and efficient economy, capitalism cannot continue in this country, consequently it must make way for another system or rely on the techniques of force and improvisation that are called Fascism.

Such is the long term, post-war view of the Australian economy. We are, however, faced by a period of some three or four years of war. In this, Australian capitalism is the rather despised lackey of Anglo-American imperialism. The leaders of the self-styled democracies are not concerned with saving

Australia, but with screwing every ounce that fear and cupidity can extract from the Australian community for the purposes of "victory."

This means that the manpower of Australia will be forced into the armed forces to do the dying. If necessary, labor will be brought from the USA and cheap labor countries of the East, to free the healthy Australian fighting men for the battle front. It also means that the Australian capitalist will have to take manpower from the forces of production until we live under the threat of famine. He will have to screw the rate of surplus value (which means depress the amount of consumption) to a maximum. There will be malnutrition in the midst of plenty, crops will rot on the ground, fields will be left untilled, while the people face starvation.

The recompense the local ruling class expects to receive after the war is illusory. However, we must recognize that the overseas troops of allied though competing capitalists, e.g. the USA are available to keep the workers of this country in order. Under capitalism, the workers of Australia must for the period of the war, work and die; after it, they must starve and die.

The Class Structure

During the rapid development of the economy, the colonial class structure is ceasing to exist. The middle class is being liquidated into the proletariat; the aristocracy of labor are learning their common interest lies with the proletariat; the distinction between capital and labor becomes sharper.

Economically the capitalist class is being organized more closely than ever but as a result of the break in the tradition of servility to England, the loss of the coercive force that England represented, and the rapid growth of new production relations within the economy, it is politically disoriented. In its fear of working class revolt it prefers, with some loss of profits and prestige, to leave the Labor Parliamentary lackeys to carry out measures the capitalists would not dare impose. However, the process of integration is proceeding and in the face of a common danger, such as an attack by the workers, the capitalists would unite.

The middle class, on the other hand, has been broken up and dissolved in the course of the war. Many have entered the armed forces; others have sunk into the ranks of the workers. For the period of the war, they are impotent in the class struggle. The armed forces, in a large measure, occupy their place in the social system. At the moment the Forces are not allied politically to either side in the class struggle. Mainly they are unquestioning servants of the government, engaging in strikebreaking activities and accepting the propaganda of a press that represents the workers' struggles as a betrayal of the soldier in the line: however, they are also oppressed and, insofar as this oppression drives them, they are on the side of the workers. Their final line-up depends on the progress of the war and the pressures brought upon them. Divorced as they are from the process of production they cannot be relied on by either side.

The working class is also in the process of reorientation and economic reorganization. New recruits with alien ideologies are coming in from the female domestic workers and the middle class; there is a breaking of craft traditions consequent on reorganization and dilution. This has increased the natural confusion arising from the unprecedented position of security of employment and wages coupled with the demands of traditional patriotism. It must be admitted that, at the moment, the workers of Australia are, in the mass, desirous of the defeat of the Axis, especially Japan, and desire not Socialism but the

prosperous capitalism of 1928. Only patient explanation of the nature of the imperialist struggle and the dangers of local fascism can assist their development. It is to the intensification of the class struggle, which the war makes inevitable, that we must look for their education and realization of their true role.

Against this background of defined classes, a dubious army and intensified economic and class pressures, the struggle proceeds. The roles of the Communist and Labor politicians are demonstrated from day to day; even the trade union officials

appear as props of the capitalist system. The workers are spontaneously reorganizing their class for the purpose of struggle; the capitalists hurriedly prepare to face any attempt to challenge their rule. In the meantime, the pressure of the war economy increases and the influence of the American armed forces becomes more obvious.

The lines of development of the economy can be envisaged. The course of the class struggle depends on the development of local fighting organs of the working class and the creation of a revolutionary political organization.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

Our Current Basic Military Tasks II

By LEON TROTSKY

We continue in this issue the publication of Leon Trotsky's report and summary speech, delivered at the conference of military delegates to the Eleventh Party Congress in Moscow on April 1, 1922. The first section appeared in May issue of *Fourth International*. Other writings of Trotsky on theoretical-military questions connected with the organization, building and modernizing the Red Army will be found in issues of our magazine from December 1943 to April 1944.—Ed.

* * *

The Proletarian Strategy of . . . Marshal Foch

Point 11 reads:

"Red Army tactics have been and will remain permeated with activity in the spirit of offensive operations executed boldly and energetically. This flows from the class nature of the workers' and peasants' army (what, again!) and at the same time this coincides with the requirements of military art."

"This coincides!" What a superb construction! Maneuverability, which flows from the class nature of the proletariat happens to coincide exactly with the requirements of military art which had been created by other classes!

"All other conditions being equal, the attack is always more advantageous than the defense." If all other conditions are equal, then this is correct; there is no gainsaying it. But this is not all. Further on we read: "Because he who attacks first exercises an effect upon the psychology of the opponent by revealing a will much stronger than the will of the latter" (*French field statutes of 1921*). So, as you see: our strategy must be offensive, in the first place, because this flows from the class nature of the proletariat and, secondly, because this coincides with the French field statutes of the year 1921. (*Laughter. Voroshilov interjects: "There is nothing funny about it."*) No, there is. This reminds me, esteemed Comrade Voroshilov, a little, of the Wuerttemberg democrats of 1848 who used to say: We want a Republic, but with our good Duke at its head . . . So, too, here—we want a genuine proletarian strategy, but one that meets with the approval of Marshal Foch. It seems to be more reliable this way. A Republic, and more-

over one headed by a Duke—that is already the best! (*Laughter.*) According to Comrade Voroshilov, there is of course nothing funny about it—but the sooner you delete this, the better it will be for the theoretical merit of our Army.

And besides, it happens to be essentially false. In the first place, this thesis of Foch or somebody else—I do not know who edited the new French field statutes—is now being subjected to a merciless crossfire precisely in French military literature. The offensive is, of course, superior to the defensive. Without the offensive, victory cannot be gained. But to say that he who attacks *first exercises* an effect upon the psychology of the opponent is to fall into offensive formalism. Without the offensive, victory cannot be gained. The offensive is in the last analysis superior to the defensive. But it is not necessary to be invariably the first to attack; the offensive should be launched when it is indicated by the situation.

Were We to Think Concretely . . .

A booklet, *On the Principles of Military Art*, signed with initial X.Y. has recently been published by a French author. German military literature has acclaimed this book as the most remarkable military work in France since the war. The author of this book comes out most emphatically against the thesis of the new French field statutes which has been cited by Comrade Frunze. The author adduces as an illustration the attempt of the French to be the "first" to attack on the Lorraine theater of war in 1914, where the Germans, in their fortified positions, sat calmly awaiting the enemy's offensive. Therewith the moral preponderance was wholly on the side of a calculated and well prepared defense, which happened to be an outright trap for the attacking force. During the last period of the war the Germans assumed the initiative in the summer offensive of 1918. The Anglo-French army, after withstanding the offensive and draining the enemy forces, passed over in its turn from flexible defense to a counter-offensive which proved fatal to the army of Hohenzollern. Without the offensive, victory cannot be gained. But victory is gained by him who attacks when it is necessary to attack and not by him who attacks *first*.

Isn't it time to stop talking about the "offensive in general"? Many people proceed by mentally tearing out of the operations of the civil war some segment wherein we attacked successfully and victoriously; and taking this experience as a starting point, they depict to themselves, along this model, a picture of our future offensives. It is necessary to learn to think more concretely. Those states which may drag us into war are known to us. The possible theater of war is consequently open to scrutiny. War begins with mobilization, concentration and deployment of forces. In our strategic forecasts it is therefore necessary to proceed from the preparatory operations—first of all, mobilization. Who, then, will begin to attack *first*? Obviously, that opponent who is able to gather sufficient forces for it. Does mobilization give us the necessary preponderance? Sad to say, it does not. With the technical aid of imperialist countries our possible opponents may possess a certain preponderance with regard to technology—not only military, but also transport. As a result, they thereby gain superiority with regard to mobilization. What conclusion, then, follows from this? It is this, that our strategic plan—not an abstract plan, but one calculated for a concrete situation and concrete conditions—must envisage during the first period of the war not an offensive but the defensive. Its aim—to gain time for the unfolding of mobilization. Consequently we consciously leave it to our enemy to be the first to attack, not at all considering that he will thereby gain some "moral" preponderance. On the contrary, having space and numbers in our favor, we calmly and confidently fix the limit where our mobilization, secured by our flexible defense, shall have prepared a sufficient fist to enable us to go over to the counter-offensive.

The formulation of the French field statutes is obviously false. It speaks of the need of being the first to attack, evidently from the standpoint of the need of gaining tempo. It is incontestable that tempo is a very important thing in the bloody game of war. Chess players know how important tempo is on a field of 64 squares; but only an ardent young chess player believes that tempo will be won by him who begins to check-mate first. On the contrary, this is infrequently the surest way of losing tempo. Should I be the first to pass over to attack while my attack is not sustained by adequate mobilization and if I find myself compelled to retreat and therewith to disrupt my own mobilization, then of course I shall have lost tempo and, perhaps, irretrievably so. On the contrary, if a preparatory retreat enters into my plan; if this plan is clearly understood by the senior commanding personnel, which is confident of what tomorrow will bring, and if this confidence is transmitted from the top to the ranks below, without running up against the prejudice of an alleged necessity of invariably being the first to attack, then I have all the chances of retrieving the tempo and of winning.

Point 14 which states that our most urgent task is to review our statutes, propositions and instructions from the standpoint of the experience of the civil war is absolutely correct. But this has been said by us three years ago and it has been sealed by the decision of the Party Congress; corresponding orders have been issued and agencies to review the statutes have been set up. Sad to say, the work is progressing rather slowly. It must be speeded up. But to inform us, under the guise of a new "military doctrine," that we must review the statutes when all the corresponding agencies for this review have long since been created, is truly to break needlessly into long open doors.

The practical conclusions at the end of the theses are by

and large correct. But they do not at all flow from the premises and, in addition, they are inadequate; and they do not specify the central task—the securing of the army's stability and qualification through the education of the lower commanding personnel. What we need are individual platoon commanders! No matter what strategy may be imposed upon us by the march of events—whether it be maneuverist or positional, or a combination of both—the fundamental moment of combat operations remains the military section whose basic cell is the platoon, with the platoon commander at the head. This is the brick out of which, if it is properly baked, any edifice may be constructed.

What Is Old in the "Novelty"

Having read the theses of Comrade Frunze, I skimmed through Suvorov's "Science of Victory." The designation, "science" is of course incorrect; but Suvorov understood it in its most simplified form, that is, in the sense of that which must be assimilated. Precisely in this sense the soldier, when made to run the gauntlet, was admonished: "Here is science for you." Under Suvorov's dictation Lieutenant-General Prevost de Lumian wrote down seven laws of war. Here they are:

1. *Act not otherwise than on the offensive.*
2. *When marching—speed is paramount; in attack—impetuosity, cold steel.*
3. *What we need is not methodism, but a correct military outlook.*
4. *All power to the commander-in-chief.*
5. *The enemy must be attacked and beaten in the field, that is, don't remain sitting in fortified regions but keep after the enemy.*
6. *Don't waste time on sieges. An open frontal assault is best of all.*
7. *Never divide forces for the sake of occupying points. If the enemy outflanks you, so much the better; the enemy is himself heading for defeat.*

What is this if not a proletarian doctrine?! This is almost word for word a strategy that "flows from the class nature of the proletariat" and out of the civil war—only somewhat more succinctly and better stated! . . . Suvorov was of course in favor of the offensive. But he also said that we need not methodism but a correct military outlook . . . However, Suvorov, after all, led into battle a feudal army under the command of officer-nobles. It thus turns out that the principles of "the offensive doctrine of the proletariat" coincide not only with the field statutes of bourgeois-imperialist France, but also with the military "science" of the Suvorovist landlord-feudal Russia!

From this it does not at all follow that "the laws of war are eternal," as certain pedants say. Under discussion here are not at all laws in the scientific sense, but rather practical usages. Some of the simplest generalizations (as for example the advise—"attack, and do so impetuously") apply to all forms of struggle between living creatures. Rule of thumb, speed, aggressiveness are necessary not only during clashes between two organized and armed forces, but also during a fist fight between two little boys and even when a hunting dog chases a rabbit. But if the seven Suvorovist commandments are not eternal laws of war, then it is even less possible to pass them off as the most modern principles of proletarian strategy.

Is there a difference between the Red Army and the army of Suvorov? There is. An enormous one. Incalculable. In

the one case you have a feudal army, kept in darkness. Here you have an army that is revolutionary, and whose consciousness is growing. The aims are diametrically opposite. We are undermining everything that Suvorov defended. But this difference involves not a military doctrine but a class political world-outlook. In this little book, in his aphorisms, Suvorov also expounds a social world-outlook. Lacking it, Suvorov would not have been an army leader. Suvorov's entire psychologic art consisted in extracting the most out of the instrument represented by a feudal soldier. In his social doctrine Suvorov rested on two poles: gauntlets and "God is with us." In their place we have the Communist program and the Soviet constitution.

Here we have made a certain step forward. And not a small one. On this score the Kharkov theses can hardly offer us something new. And besides, we do not feel any need of renovating our social world-outlook. So far as the questions of strategy are concerned, then here, as we see, the matter came down to this, that those who began by promising us a new proletarian doctrine, ended by copying out the rules of Suvorov, and made mistakes in copying.

II

SUMMARY SPEECH

Doctrine, Outlook, A Monistic Viewpoint

It is first of all necessary to occupy positions which are cleared by the opponent in his "maneuverist" retreat. This is the first thing . . .

Comrade Frunze admits that here and there his formulations are inexact, ambiguous, inconclusive. If it were a question of a draft of an article, then it is quite self-evident that such shortcomings would be perfectly natural. But when it is said that "you have no doctrine, whereas I do have a doctrine"—as Comrade Frunze poses (or used to pose?) the question—then you are dealing with something of an entirely different order. After all, at the Tenth Party Congress, Comrades Frunze and Gussev took me very severely to task for lacking interest in the question of military doctrine, wherein, according to them, lay the whole crux of the matter. At the time they thumped my head lightly with a volume of Engels (without sufficient grounds, but I leave this for another occasion). What, then, to do? Engels came out as a theoretician of military affairs, whereas we still continue to fight empirically. Well, show us your "doctrine," Comrade Critics. But take care; it is possible to fight with an oven-fork, for lack of a different weapon—but it is impossible to write theory with an oven-fork; different instruments are here needed. But after all, is anyone forcing us to rush ahead with this question? There is no fire. True, Comrade Frunze very delicately hints that, as you know, after the Russo-Japanese war, there was an occasion when, by august order, all discussions concerning military doctrine had to be terminated and the study of statutes had to be undertaken. One thus seems to arrive at a certain not very pleasant analogy: Comrade Frunze proposes to take up the question of doctrine while I "order" that unpleasant discussions be terminated and a study of the statutes be undertaken.

But in reality, this juxtaposition is extremely arbitrary and its barb can be turned against Comrade Frunze himself. For what was the content of the task and aim of those Russian

officers who, after the Russo-Japanese war, began talking about military doctrine? They represented the critical elements in the army. They were dissatisfied with its structure and wanted changes introduced. This was the progressive section of the officerdom, the very same ones who later united around Guchkov and Miliukov and whom the Black Hundred men called "Young Turks." Consequently, the banner of military doctrine was for them the banner of criticism of the past and the program of military reform. Insofar as it was possible they wanted to Europeanize our army and in this connection sought support even in the State Duma. They were ordered to shut up, not to criticize, not to undermine autocratic Asiaticism. And how do matters stand with us? What is the content of Comrade Frunze's military doctrine? It consists of an uncritical idealization of the past. Our heralds of military doctrine seek to deduce from the class nature of the proletariat, and to render eternal that which characterized a certain period of the war. What did Comrade Frunze accuse me of in his speech? Of denying to the past the reverence it merits. He considers the idealization of the past an indispensable element in the army's moral education. But this was precisely the standpoint of those who inspired Czar Nicholas to issue his august order—to terminate discussion on doctrine, not to undermine the reverence of the past. But we say to you: Please stop threatening to annihilate the enemy by throwing hats at him; let us instead learn the ABC of military affairs from the enemy. This is where the basic disagreement lies and this is what Comrade Frunze refuses to assimilate.

By way of compensation Comrade Minin has enriched us with a new term: if we reject a unified military doctrine, if Comrade Frunze is ready to reject also a military world-outlook, then Comrade Minin offers us a "monistic viewpoint" on military affairs. This has a proud ring: a monistic viewpoint is hardly inferior to your term, doctrine. But what do you mean to say by it? That a unity of views, usages and methods is needed within the framework of an army? Why, of course. It is needless to waste eloquence in order to prove that an army is incompatible with such an order—or disorder—as one pulling one way while the other pulls the other way. Have we got agreement then? A unity of methods is necessary; let us call this unity "doctrine"—and that is all! Such a proposal was virtually made by Comrade Kashirin: it is necessary for the state to define its views on war in a single doctrine. Is the whole dispute then seemingly over words? Oh, no. The gist of the dispute goes much deeper—it lies in the confusion of concepts. What do you mean in the last analysis by military doctrine? Do you mean the answer to the question of *what* we are fighting for? or the answer to the question *how to fight*? or finally the answer to both these questions together? (*Kashirin interjects: "Both questions."*) That's it precisely—you need a military doctrine in the sense of some sort of answer to "the meaning and aims of the war." Here you are wholly captives of the bourgeois state. Inasmuch as the bourgeois state conducted and continues to conduct wars for the sake of plunder and enslavement, it was compelled to motivate the genuine aims of the war by a special and ostentatious "national military doctrine." The task of this doctrine is to deceive the popular masses, hypnotize them, render them blind.

The English doctrine is: the civilizing role of the Anglo-Saxons throughout the entire world and especially in the colonies; the highest interests of culture demand that Great Britain rule the seas; hence—the English fleet must be stronger

than the next two most powerful fleets. Behind this military doctrine lurk the class interests of the bourgeoisie. Is there any need for us to create a special doctrine in order to explain why and for what we have to wage wars! Not the slightest. We have the Communist program; we have the Soviet constitution; we have the land law—there's our answer. What more do you need? Is there another country with an answer which in any way approximates in power the answer given by our revolution? Our revolution has destroyed the ruling, possessing classes; it has handed the power over to the toilers and said: Defend this power, defend yourselves—here are your war aims.

Captives of Bourgeois Ideology

You are demanding that the Red Army pose itself a goal in the shape of some kind of doctrine—meanwhile the revolution in order to serve its own needs has created out of us an army and has ordered us to study military affairs as they must be studied; to fight as it is necessary to fight. And we did fight for more than three years. But when things eased up a little we began pondering over a profound question: where can we find a doctrine that would explain to us *for what* we shall go on fighting? This is ludicrous pedantry! There is a second question: *how to fight*. Here we are told that it is necessary to have a unity of methods. Yes, of course! Why else did we conduct the struggle against guerrillaism, parochialism and superficial "independent" notions? Why else did we create a centralized apparatus headed by the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic? For the sake of what did we write statutes and regulations and establish tribunals? On numberless occasions it was necessary for us (including myself) to explain and to prove that a unity of poor methods is superior to a diversity even of the best methods. I had to prove this in the struggle against guerrillaism in Tsaritsin, too, which is the home town of Comrade Minin who now *objects to having one pull one way while another pulls another way*. In those days some of the present adherents of military doctrine used to declare that they would carry out good orders at the front but would refuse to carry out orders they deemed incorrect. In those days it was necessary to deal severely with self-opinionated commanders of divisions and of brigades who grew up in the atmosphere of guerrillaism and who refused to grasp the meaning of the unity of organization and the unity of methods. All our efforts throughout the existence of the Red Army came down precisely to guaranteeing the maximum planfulness, the highest unity, the closest harmony. After all, this was the end which was served, and continues to be served by all our statutes, formations, regulations, orders, circulars, instructions, inspection commissions and tribunals. And even at the present time a considerable part of the interrelations between the Supreme Military Council of the Republic and the military districts and fronts consists in the *struggle against deviations from those formations and norms* which have been established by the center. Naturally, our statutes and formations are not absolute. We shall review them in the light of our experience. In reviewing and improving our methods we thereby defend their unity. By transferring the question to the plane of elementary discussions concerning the usefulness of the unity of methods, you are actually throwing us back three years—back to the period of our struggle against guerrillaism and parochialism; and this is being passed off by you as some kind of new military doctrine.

Comrade Kuzmin has dealt with the question of offensive and defensive warfare. And it turns out that there are no difficulties here at all. Comrade Kuzmin is able to dispel all the trouble by a mere wave of the hand. Trotsky, you see, argues against offensive revolutionary war and is in favor of the defensive. But now, I, Kuzmin, will say to the Red Army soldiers, to the workers and peasants: "Russia is today a beleaguered fortress; you are her garrison, but tomorrow it will perhaps be necessary for you to go from the stronghold into the field in order to break the blockade!" And that's all; it is as simple as that. But after all, Comrades, this is not a serious political attitude to the question, but completely that of a writer of feuilletons. The issue is presented as if it were enough to find a suitable simile, a military image, in order to dispel all difficulties with a gesture . . . No, this is not the crux of the matter at all. It is only necessary to clearly separate the political question from the strategic. Politically we are firmly maintaining a defensive position. We do not want war, and the entire population of our country must know and understand this. We are taking all possible measures in order to avoid war. We proclaim our readiness under certain conditions to pay the Czarist debts.

Attack and Defense

I recall that one comrade said to me, "Why do you say openly that we are ready to acknowledge *Czarist debts*?" This comrade seemed to be embarrassed by our being forced to agree to such a concession, and he sought to profer it to the workers and peasants in a masked form. This is a crude blunder. One must speak clearly, simply and frankly. And in the long run this will be only to our advantage. We say to the workers and peasants: "Payment of Czarist debts is being demanded of us. The Czar took money from the stock-market in order to strangle you, workers and peasants; and now it is demanded of you, workers and peasants, that you pay for being strangled by the Czar. And we, the Soviet power, are prepared, under certain conditions, to agree even to the payment of these abysmally dishonest, bloody debts. Why? Because we wish to spare our country the ravages of a new war."

In this way we clarify to the peasants the peaceful and defensive character of our policy. Armed bands have been thrown against us. We destroyed these bands, but did not go over to the offensive. We have truly revealed and continue to reveal an incredible forbearance. Why? Because we want to secure peace to the people. And this is now the foundation of our political-educational work in the army and in the country. And what if peace is denied us? What if we are compelled to wage war? In that case the most backward peasant will understand that the blame falls wholly on our enemies, that there is no other way out; he will then take his hunting spear and march into battle. Then, too, it will be possible for us to unfold an offensive war in the strategic sense. Then the Red Army soldier, the worker and the peasant will say: "Our entire policy was directed toward defense and toward peaceful relations. But if these neighbors, these governments refuse us peace, despite all our efforts, then for the sake of defense, nothing remains for us except to beat them down . . ."

Such will be the extreme conclusion of the entire country in the event that our defensive and peace-loving policy is disrupted by our enemies. Herein is the essence of the question. He who understands this will find the correct line for political work in the army. But allegories about a beleaguered fortress

will avail little here. It is only a metaphor, an image for a leading editorial or a feuilleton. A Samara moujik on reading this, or hearing someone else read it aloud, will scratch the back of his head and say, "A clever writer is Comrade Kuzmin; he writes fine." But for the sake of this metaphor, I assure you, he will not go to fight.

Comrade Voroshilov cited here my words to the effect that under certain conditions the road from Petrograd to Helsingfors may prove to be shorter than the road from Helsingfors to Petrograd. Yes, it is true I said this; and under certain conditions I am ready to repeat it again. But, after all, this is precisely what I have just been explaining. This does not at all mean that we are actually preparing to attack any of the neighboring countries. This is excellently understood by you. True enough, in the frontier regions where our warriors have had the occasion to observe very closely the banditism of Polish, or Roumanian, or Finnish origin, the moods in favor of a blow across the frontiers are at times quite strong among our troops. "Let's have war!" These words are often to be heard there, especially among cavalry men. Our military students are likewise not averse to verifying in practice what they are learning in theory. Moreover, throughout our whole army there fortunately prevails the mood of readiness for battle.

But, after all, this does not exhaust the question. War is a big, serious and lengthy business. It presupposes new mobilizations of several draft-ages, the mobilization of horses, the redoubling of land-carried levies, etc., etc. It is absolutely self-evident that we cannot start a war with the propaganda of the correct, abstract idea that the interests of all toilers in the world are identical, and so forth and so on. This idea is correct and it must occupy the most prominent place in our propaganda, above all within our own party. But there is an enormous difference between the propaganda of the idea of the world revolution and the political preparation of the toiling masses of the country for military events which may possibly occur in the immediate future. This difference is the difference between propaganda and agitation, between a theoretical forecast and current policy. The more clearly, persistently and concretely, the more unquestionably we are able to show and clarify to the entire population of the country the genuinely defensive character of our international policy, all the better prepared will be the entire population to provide the forces and resources for an offensive strategy on a broad scale, in the event that war is nevertheless foisted upon us. Comrade Frunze does not argue against this. On the contrary, he has even declared that it would be the most stupid project to talk today of an offensive war on our part. This is correct. But you have only to read some of the most recent articles of Comrade Frunze's closest co-thinkers to find stated there that up to now we have been "sitting" on the defensive, but that now we are preparing for the offensive. It is very good that Comrade Frunze has definitively and even sharply differentiated himself from this false *political* point of view which cannot bring us anything except difficulties, confusion and harm.

But isn't it impermissible to renounce the idea of political offensive in general? Why, of course! We are not in the slightest preparing to renounce the world proletarian revolution and the victory over the bourgeoisie on a world scale. We would be traitors and betrayers, like the gentlemen of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals if we renounced the revolutionary offensive. But, after all, the reciprocal relations between the preparatory, defensive work and the offensive have

been sufficiently fully and clearly elaborated on an international political scale at the Third World Congress of the Communist International. The adherents of the doctrine of the offensive were present there, too. They also said: "The offensive corresponds to the revolutionary nature of the working class or the character of the present revolutionary epoch." And when we set siege to them and set about to curb them, these "leftists" began to cry out: "Ah! So you renounce the offensive?" We renounce nothing at all, dear Comrades. But all in good time. Without the offensive, victory is impossible; but only a simpleton believes that the entire political tactic comes down to the slogan: "Rush Ahead!"

In the Grip of "Sad Necessity"

The idea of a revolutionary offensive can be tied up only with the idea of an international proletarian offensive. But is this the current slogan of the Comintern? No, we have advanced and we are defending the idea of a working class united front, of joint actions even with the parties of the Second International who do not want the revolution—and this, on the basis of defending today's vital interests of the proletariat which are being threatened from all sides by the aggressive bourgeoisie. Our task is to conquer the masses. How is it, Comrades, that you have overlooked this tactic, failed to assimilate its meaning, failed to clarify its connection with the new economic policy within our country? It is quite self-evident that at present it is a question of major preparatory work, at the given moment defensive in character and of the broadest mass sweep. From this work there will inevitably grow at a certain stage the mass offensive led by the Communists; but today this is not the task. You ought to bring our military propaganda in harmony with the general course of the policies of the world working class. It is stupid to talk to the Red Army about a revolutionary offensive at a time when we are summoning the European Communist parties to make careful preparations on an ever wider mass basis. When a change occurs in the world situation, the slogan of our educational work will change with it.

(To be Concluded)

SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK 3, N.Y.

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

for

() 6 months.....\$1.00

() 1 year.....\$2.00

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

PIONEER LIST

Documents of the Fourth International

- Founding Conference of the Fourth International* 127 p., paper .25
- Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution* 48 p., paper .05
- Manifesto of the Fourth International to the Workers and Peasants of India* 24 p., paper .05

Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

- War and the Fourth International* 36 p., paper .10
- In Defense of the Soviet Union* 40 p., paper .10
- Stalinism and Bolshevism* 40 p., paper .10
- Leon Sedoff* 32 p., paper .10
- Their Morals and Ours* 48 p., paper .20
- In Defense of Marxism (Against the Petty-Bourgeois Opposition)* 240 p., cloth 2.00
- Lessons of October* 125 p., paper .50
cloth 1.50
- The Third International After Lenin* 327 p., cloth 2.00
- Whither France?* 160 p., cloth .75
paper .50

George Breitman

- Wartime Crimes of Big Business* 16 p., paper .05

James P. Cannon

- The End of the Comintern, with The Manifesto of the 4th International* 36 p., paper .10
- Memorial Address "To the Memory of the Old Man"* 16 p., paper .05
- The Struggle for a Proletarian Party* 320 p., cloth 2.00
paper 1.50
- Socialism on Trial* 112 p., paper .10
- The Workers and the Second World War* 48 p., paper .10

James P. Cannon & Grandizo Munis

- Defense Policy in the Minneapolis Trial* 64 p., paper .20

C. Charles

- Your Standard of Living—What's Happening to It?* 32 p., paper .05

Dewey Commission

- The Case of Leon Trotsky* 640 p., paper 1.00

Albert Goldman

- In Defense of Socialism* 95 p., paper .10
- What Is Socialism?* 48 p., paper .10

Daniel Guerin

- Fascism and Big Business* 376 p., paper Special sale price .75

Felix Morrow

- Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Spain* 208 p., paper .50

Albert Parker

- Negroes in the Post-War World* 16 p., paper .05

Albert Parker and John Saunders

- The Struggle for Negro Equality* 48 p., paper .10

Victor Serge

- From Lenin to Stalin* 112 p., paper Special sale price .25
- Russia 20 Years After* 319 p., cloth Special sale price 2.00

* * *

- Why We Are in Prison* 56 p., paper .10

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

Warren K. Billings Urges Labor to Aid the Eighteen Class-War Prisoners And Their Families

AT A MEETING IN SAN FRANCISCO ON MAY 3, 1944, IN BEHALF OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE, WARREN K. BILLINGS, WHO WAS FRAMED WITH TOM MOONEY IN 1916 AND SPENT 23 YEARS IN JAIL, MADE THE FOLLOWING APPEAL TO LABOR:

"The best fighters for the working class have been subjected to frameups by the capitalist class and its agents. This is certainly true of the 18 in the Minneapolis Case. We can see clearly through that frameup.

"All these frameups follow a similar pattern. Just as in the case of Mooney and Billings, just as in the case of Sacco and Vanzetti and just as in the case of the seamen, King, Connor and Ramsay here on the West Coast, these men were not prosecuted for any crimes they have committed nor for any acts against the government but for their militant trade union activities. These men were leaders and members of militant trade unions. That is the real reason why they were framed. The prosecution of these 18 was a part of the drive by the enemies of organized labor to get rid of the most militant trade union elements in preparation for the war. Just as in the first World War the forces of organized capital were determined to frame up the most militant unionists like Mooney and myself here in California, so with the approach of the second World War they set out to frame up the Minneapolis Truckdriver leaders.

"This is an attack upon the entire labor movement and it must be met with the united action of all labor. That is why it is so important for every class-conscious worker to fight for the freedom of the 18 and for the repeal of the Smith 'Gag' Act."

THE CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE NEEDS FUNDS TO PROVIDE RELIEF FOR THE 18 PRISONERS, THEIR WIVES AND CHILDREN WHILE THEY ARE BEHIND BARS. WILL YOU HELP THEM?

JAMES T. FARRELL, Chairman
CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE
160 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY 10, N. Y.

Here is my contribution of \$..... to
the Minneapolis Prisoners Pardon and Relief Fund.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY and STATE