

INTERNAL BULLETIN

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

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

Volume VIII—No. 11

OCTOBER, 1946



Price 35 Cents

Contents

Wages and Prices, by <i>Vincent Grey</i>	1
A Reply to Morrow and Shachtman on Wages and Prices, by <i>Milton Alvin</i>	5
For the Slogan "Wage Raises without Price Increases," by <i>Felix Morrow</i>	7
Statement of Bayonne Branch on Removal of Comrade Morrow from Party Payroll	9
Minority Statement on Removal of Comrade Morrow from Full-Time Party Work	10
PC Answer to Bayonne Branch on Morrow's Removal from the Payroll	10
Letter of the IS to Logan and Morrow	12
A Note on the Ideological Degeneration of Goldman, Morrow and Logan, by <i>Wm. F. Warde</i>	12
Plenum Resolution on the Unity Proposal of the Workers Party	14
Two Letters of the IS on Discussions with the WP	15
A "Discussion" to Prevent Unity	15
Resolution of WIL (Johannesburg) on the SWP and WP Unity Negotiations	17
An Open Letter to the SWP Minority, by <i>Niceto Andres</i>	17
How to Distort Democratic Centralism, by <i>Dan Shelton and Eugene Shays</i>	19
The Militant's Record on Stalinist Foreign Policy, by <i>E. Shays & D. Shelton</i>	20
Again on Nuremberg and the Church, by <i>John Fredericks</i>	25
Revolutionary Politics Versus Political Inertia, by <i>Dave Jeffries</i>	26
Proposals to the PC on Soldiers' Demonstrations	28
A Letter on the Jewish Question, by <i>Dave Jeffries</i>	29
A Revolutionary Program for the Jews, by <i>Leo Lyons</i>	30

Wages and Prices

By VINCENT GREY

Our slogan, "A sliding scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living" fully answers the requirements of a transitional slogan in the present period. "Wage increases without price increases," the Reuther slogan, does not. Nor did the old Murray-Reuther "Roll-back the prices" ballyhoo. Other slogans may of course enjoy a certain popularity. But such popularity cannot in and by itself elevate them to the status of transitional slogans.

What is a transitional slogan? Or for that matter — the Transitional Program? It is clearly a guide to action that will most effectively lead the day to day class struggle into a revolutionary onslaught. It must be practical in both mediums.

It must seem as sensible in the former as it is dynamic in the latter.

"The sliding scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living" is a slogan which fills the bill in these respects. It has a deep and defensive meaning for the worker. Each worker knows very well that the general cost of living is rising. All the thousand and one retail prices are going up for him. He knows little or nothing about the wholesale price of the commodity he himself produces. So ours is the "natural" slogan for him. It is becoming increasingly popular. Not so much as a finished slogan, but as an idea.

The Reuther slogan failed. And not because the Trotskyists

failed to make it a part of their Transitional Program. The Reuther slogan is based on keeping down the price of a particular product while those who produce it get a raise in wages. Our slogan turns on the whole world-wide price list of commodities.

The basic content of our slogan is to continue the demand for a decent standard of living under conditions of economic decline. It dramatizes the justice of this demand. At the same time, it leads at a certain point (of capitalist decline) to more revolutionary action in order to enforce it.

"The realizability or unrealizability" of our slogan is actually dependent on the relationship of forces as Trotsky says. But absolute price control is like money control. The force needed to enforce it is ALL the force, namely: state power, and even that might not be enough (e.g., the Soviet Union).

The essence of a transitional demand is not that of a carrot on a stick over the nose of a mule. Any mule driver will tell you that this device makes neither mules nor people go ahead for very long. The idea of a transitional demand is not to get the masses all excited over a slogan that some clever Marxists may know is meaningless without a revolution.

The essence is rather like the succeeding inches of ground an army wins in skirmishes with another army, but can only cultivate after demolishing its enemy in decisive battle.

"Wage increases without price increases" seems to refer to the general prices of commodities. But in action — GM — it referred, as it must refer in trade union action, to the specific price of the commodity the worker was making — in this case, automobiles. Granted that it was compromising to the GM capitalists, granted that it helped advance the idea of "open the books," can we nevertheless say that it has a general transitional character for our epoch?

Its fighting appeal to the workers is extremely limited. Comrade Morrow says the Reuther slogan was very popular. Yes, it was. But Murray and Lewis very easily got away with ignoring it. The price of steel did not seem fundamental to the steelworkers. The steelworkers did not feel that Murray was buying the raise by giving the OPA the green light. And their feeling — though not based on any particular knowledge — happens to coincide with fact.

The steelworkers and the mine workers didn't think they lived on steel, or coal. They thought and still think that they lived on butter, eggs, shoes, clothes, meat and potatoes. They need to buy more of these things. They want the money to do it. They got this money and to their simple minds that was a victory — not a "so-called victory."

It is realistic trade union policy to tell the strikers that the cost of living is rising (or has risen) and these particular strikers, in this particular plant, must get more money for making this particular product, regardless of the bosses' profits, in order to keep on buying milk, meat, potatoes and the thousand different products they and their families need. This regardless of whether the product they are making goes up in price or not. The worker is far more interested in the products he needs and uses than in the product he makes. (Incidentally, a tremendous percentage of all products are capital goods and raw materials).

For the worker it is realistic to ask for the rising scale of wages hitched to prices because it is asking for a greater share of the value of his labor power. It is the old conservative slogan of "a fair day's wages" in a new context which transforms into "a sliding scale" of more and more revolutionary content.

It can be put in contracts and it has been put into contracts. Employers will violate it, just as the shipyard owners did in 1942 through the agency of Roosevelt. But they will do so at a greater and greater risk to themselves.

The sliding scale of wages like other slogans in our transitional program, notably the falling scale of hours (for periods of great unemployment) is defensive and understandable. It asks "only" for a living wage under capitalism. At a certain point this is impossible of achieving under capitalism and that is what gives the slogan its transitional character.

Our slogan, however, contains no false impressions. "A sliding scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living." Here, things are right side up. It is clear that the cost of living is going up — and the workers must get more money to live. In this slogan it is clear that the prices have nothing to do with the wages of labor — scientifically. And it demands for that very reason that wages be pegged to certain commodity prices — namely, cost of living commodities.

Our slogan, like life itself, brings the workers into conflict with capital. Or rather, the transitional slogans are geared to the living process of the workers' struggle and make the meaning of the struggle clearer. And they do not promise to stop the capitalist juggernaut in its tracks, while it is still in high gear.

Now it may be that we are reading too much into the Reuther slogan. "Wage increases with no price increases" is after all, a valiant demand, is it not? Why not just say Reuther is barking up the wrong tree and let it go at that?

That would be all right. And that is what **The Militant** tried to do by not blaring out this slogan to the four winds. But unfortunately for Comrade Morrow, he reads the same thing into the Reuther slogan that we do. But instead of rejecting it for that reason, he clasps it to his bosom!

Comrade Morrow not only accepts the half-implication this slogan carries, namely that wages determine prices. He bases himself entirely on this anti-Marxist premise. He says: (Pre-Convention Bulletin No. 1, p. 9) "Everything in that issue (of **The Militant**) is written on the clever theory of separating the steel strike settlement from the price rise, on the basis of which the strike was settled!" (Emphasis and exclamation point in the original.) "Only by this artificial distinction could **The Militant** carry the headline of 'Fighting Steel-Workers Triumph'... 'This so-called victory...' , etc., etc.

Here is an astounding but revealing glimpse into Comrade Morrow's thought process. What a combination of sneering cynicism and formalism! Sneering cynicism because he brands it a "clever" theory, implying that it is nonsense, and does not bother to show where the theory is wrong. It is formalistic because he takes an act of a paper puppet of the capitalist class, the OPA, as a be-all and end-all that has equal weight with the four week struggle of three quarters of a million steelworkers.

Perhaps if the steel barons had put over the price increase a month after the strike or if they had got rid of OPA altogether a few months later, with or without Murray's cooperation, perhaps then Morrow might concede that the steelworkers had scored a triumph. But it would be unsafe to bet on this. Because apparently Morrow does not understand that prices are going up independently of wages.

It is true that the capitalists wanted a pretext for letting down the dikes, for dropping their own fraudulent rules. Politics was more directly involved here than economics. But if it hadn't been one pretext it would have been another. Murray gave them the best possible pretext. But if he had not given it they would have done the same thing at a later date.

Most people realize that prices are bound to rise far more than 18%. Many workers realize better than Comrade Morrow seems to, that if they had not got the raise, or if the companies had wrecked their unions and reduced their wages, prices would still have risen. These workers regard their strike victories as — victories.

Murray gave the capitalists a better chance to connect the price increase with the wage increase and thus fool most of the public and Felix Morrow. But without in the least defending Murray's attitude, we have this to say: The present labor weapons are economic weapons. The weapons of strike. Assuming that Murray secured an agreement that steel would not raise its price, and in a month's time say, the companies claimed that circumstances made them raise the price of raw steel, anyhow — could Murray then swing a nation-wide steel strike on that issue? And if a greater cost of raw materials, due to a shortage for instance, caused the increase, could such a strike stop it?

Murray gave them the chance to tout a phoney connection between the wage increase and the price increase. Murray didn't act much like a man, he didn't expose what he could have exposed, and he didn't fight down the line he himself had set. But those deplorable facts don't prove that wages determine prices or that Phillip Murray raised the price of steel on the long-suffering American public.

Murray himself may believe that prices went up because wages did — or worse still, he may think that wages went up because he "permitted" a price increase. But that's Murray. No Marxist believes it.

Comrade Morrow says that The Militant made an "artificial distinction" between the price rise and the wage increase. This is incorrect. There was and is a very real distinction. There are capitalistic laws that determine prices. The capitalists themselves may not understand them thoroughly but they do not permit themselves, like Morrow does, to fall for their own propaganda about the wage rise causing the price rise. No indeed! They fight like hell against the wage increases. And they do not stop fighting merely because prices go up. They know quite well that what goes up invariably comes down!

Price is the monetary expression of value. Value is determined only by the amount of necessary labor in the product. Supply, demand and other factors, make the prices oscillate above and below the values they distortedly represent. But, like the short shadows and the long shadows cast going to and from lamp posts, the prices ultimately average out to be a faithful reflection of the values themselves.

During the war prices rose throughout the world for three principal reasons:

1. Shortages of consumers goods (supply). Here the price of some commodities went above others because of the difference in relative supplies.

2. Credit and money inflation. The actual amount of gold or crystallized labor that a dollar (or yen) represented decreased, i.e., was decreased in order to finance the war. This varied in different countries but in any given country it led to the whole price list going up uniformly in proportion to the money inflation.

3. A decrease of labor productivity on a world scale, destruction of machinery, etc., thus increasing the actual amount of average labor in a product. Here the values themselves are artificially raised by the decline of capitalism.

These three main factors all combine to make a now even, now uneven price rise — but the general trend is upward. However, the trend can continue after the war with much greater unevenness than during the war. New changes in productivity, new demands for different types of products, neglect and stagnation of others, and many other things may produce this unevenness without necessarily leading to an immediate crash.

If cost-of-living commodities for the steelworker rise 50% by next February, and the steelworker demands a 50% raise, does Comrade Morrow believe that the steel corporations can

automatically compensate themselves by appealing to a non-existent OPA to "let" them raise the price of steel 50%? The price of steel might even be going down at that time (even though Murray might be glad to "give" the steel companies a raise) while the price of food and clothing still continues to rise.

The Militant was completely justified in "separating" the wage increase from the price increase in viewing the workers struggle. Just as it will be justified in the next period in separating the Reuther demand for a new OPA from the Reuther proposal for a fighting class action to get it.

ON THE CAPITALISTS' PROFITS

Marx's theory of the rate of profit also suffers somewhat at the hands of Comrade Morrow. Marx spent many years of his life elaborating and analyzing this important aspect of capitalism. Comrade Morrow contradicts and disposes of it in a few phrases. Morrow's argument has the hidden premise that the capitalist raises his prices to compensate himself for losses in paying higher wages. If this is so, what then is the rate of profit? Why it must be a percentage agreed upon by the bosses in the backroom! Being ethical and highly moral boys-of-the-back-room, they don't try to get anything above the agreed-upon "take," except when they have to pay out more for wages! Then, by God, the code has been violated. Then they see to it that justice is done and they command the public to give them back what they have lost!

Ah, how the capitalists wish they really had such a system.

On the surface, of course, this is what happened in the events Comrade Morrow describes. But only a vulgar economist would say that it is all that happened. And only an anti-Marxist would underline and repeat in various keys that "The price rise (was the) basis on which the strike was settled."

The rate of profit is the average of the surplus values produced by labor with different capitals; it is the average proportion of surplus value to the total capital. It is, in the long run, the ratio between the total surplus value and the total capital of the world. When the workers take a portion of that surplus for themselves, can the capitalists, by a stroke of the pen, increase the total surplus, thus maintaining their old rate of profit. "Yes!" says Morrow, "They do it by raising prices!" It would have been far more fruitful for Morrow to have concerned himself with the application of Marx's Value, Price and Profit in our epoch, or its possible lack of application under some conditions, rather than completely ignoring it and not giving the comrades credit for having studied it.

There are many tricks the capitalists can employ because of their control of state power, but they cannot for long raise the gold prices of any appreciable number of commodities. Even individual monopolies dealing in one product, can only do it for a time.

And here we come to the nub of the question: The recent price increases and the ones to come in the immediate future — do they represent a new trend of inflation or an already existing trend? By virtue of the very fact that OPA was a partial check, the potential market price of most things had risen above the legal price. The existence of black markets proves this.

It is undeniable that there will be a general upward trend for some time in the future. Continued scarcities and credit and money inflation will cause this. But we must understand clearly that it is not the subjective will of the individual capitalist that is involved here at all (despite his indubitable cooperation).

When the capitalists got OPA to raise the price of steel it was not because their OPA is a supra-economic body that has the power to raise prices. It is because the market will stand the increase, and buyers will pay it to get the steel. During a

price war, prices are very low. At its close they are raised to a new high. But economically, they do not rise; they rebound. During World War II, there were great shortages of some commodities. Their prices were artificially held down, although they were allowed to rise to some extent. The consumer paid for part of that "price control," through governmental subsidies, taxes, etc.; he is now going to pay for the rest of it.

Comrade Morrow says that "every worker who thinks at all knows that this time with far more pressure on prices than in 1917-18, there was no comparable rise in prices since OPA was established." We assume that Morrow is making his own, this alleged opinion of the worker.

The PC document has enumerated in detail the respects in which the cost of living has actually risen. And these points may cause any thinking worker to entertain at least mixed thoughts on the question.

What is even more to the point — granting that OPA had some effect — is the manner in which we as Marxists must pose the question. Comrade Morrow says the OPA is something new under capitalism and that there was far more pressure on prices in this World War than in the previous one. He should have said instead that **without** OPA there could not have been the tremendous war production and the consequent restriction of consumer production, causing high prices.

The executive committee of the capitalist class had to get more capitalists to produce war goods in order to run a first class war — more than ever before. War goods are not automatically more profitable to produce than peace goods especially if everybody starts making them for example, when the market for, say, automobiles is better than it's been for a decade.

The executive committee must guarantee the capitalists a price higher than they would ordinarily expect — a price far higher than value — and higher than a competitive market could stand. It must also guarantee them the same high price in the event of surpluses, unneeded goods, outdated models, end of war, etc.

This executive committee had to lure the capitalists into war production and they made it really attractive. At the same time, in order to cover their rear, in order to keep capital from drifting back into consumer production, as the **artificial shortages** would send prices soaring, they held consumers' prices temporarily at a "reasonable level."

As long as the decisive section of industry got their grossly inflated prices and the others were always compensated for "hardships," there weren't any serious squawks. If there had been, OPA would have been ended long ago.

"Who is master in the house? Not Labor which is chained to frozen wages. Not the government, which has chained Labor. The owners of the private property whom the government cajoles, they are master in the house. That is what is so glaringly revealed by Henderson's admission that war production could be expanded at the expense of consumer production only by **permitting SKYROCKETING PRICES IN WAR MATERIALS.**" (My emphasis).

The author of the above quotation from the May 1942 F.I. knew how to pose the question right. Who was he? The author was. . . Felix Morrow.

A shortage of consumers goods — an abundance, more than an abundance of war goods. On one side, an inflated but controlled price on the consumers' goods. On the other, a grossly inflated and only weakly controlled price on the finished goods of war (tanks, planes, guns, etc.).

Had OPA failed to do its job, war production would have slowed down and failed to that extent. Had the war capitalists not gotten the juicy negotiated contract plums, capital would have shifted to more profitable consumers' items. Then these

items would have fallen in price as they were produced in quantity. The "pressure on prices" might have been less than 1917-18 because productivity was greater.

But now war production has stopped. The capitalists have pulled the plug on price controls. The auto barons in particular are stalling production until OPA is gone and the prices go up. And as long as there is a shortage, they will go up. The capitalists know quite well that if they produce at full capacity and sell at OPA prices now, they may not be able to get even that much later on. So the "master in the house" issues new orders.

The "pressure on prices" Comrade Morrow speaks about, is only now really asserting itself. The artificial balance between war goods and peace goods is gone — and with it, the CPA will-o-the-wisp that was perched on top of the precarious balance. The one-sided market of government war orders is gone. Prices are rebounding. The fraudulent OPA, even if it is reborn, will sit as lightly on a fast-rising price list as it did on a slowly rising one.

A whole economy devoted to consumers' goods should, of course, bring low prices. But that is just the point. The capitalists know this and are determined to get their pound of flesh right now, while they can, before the market is saturated. The ironic part of it all is that the NAM argument about low prices when production is high again will eventually come true, even if they hope it doesn't. Even a machineless world cannot buy the products of the machine in its present poverty-stricken state. Eventually a crash will come.

But even in the crash, things may be different from the last depression. Gold prices could go down and currency prices up for instance (because of government bankruptcy, etc.) and the sliding scale of wages would still retain its full meaning; while the sliding scale of hours would go to the forefront because of the consequent unemployment.

CONSUMERS' COMMITTEES

After saying (p. 7) that "the only answer (the transitional program) offers to the problem of high prices is the sliding scale of wages," — and motivating his whole document, presumably, on this deficiency of the program, Morrow corrects himself in a postscript where he quotes the Transitional Program as follows:

"To the capitalists' lamentations about costs of production, of transport and trade, the consumers answer 'show us your books; we demand control over the fixing of prices' The organs of this control should be the **committees on prices** made up of delegates from the factories, trade unions, cooperatives, farmers organizations and the 'little men' of the city, housewives, etc. By this means the workers will be able to prove to the farmers that the real reason for high prices is not high wages but the exorbitant profits of the capitalists and the over-head expenses of capitalist anarchy."

All of Morrow's pompous criticism of the Transitional Program for not saying anything about price control, falls to the ground in the light of this paragraph which Morrow had to insert in the postscript to cover up his brazen mis-statement of fact. But that is only by the way.

We wish to involve the workers directly in exposing the capitalist "business secrets" rebates, monopolies, etc., to scandalize big business (and we carried out this idea energetically during the GM strike). But this is all an **auxiliary** to the basis of the daily class struggle which is to get enough to live on from our masters. The struggle, carried to its logical conclusion, will make them lose their masterdom.

And we wish to control prices. Of course — with "**committees on prices** made up of delegates from the factories,

trade unions, cooperatives, farmers organizations etc." — in a word, working class price control. Not by capitalist fraud. And here again, what is referred to is the whole price list of workers commodities. What is demanded is a political act. A price rise caused by monetary inflation, for instance, can only be stopped by working class control of the treasury, and not only the treasury but the whole economy. That is the transitional content of the quote from Trotsky.

True, Comrade Morrow opposes class price control to Reuther's slogan "No Price Increases." But he falsely implies that one equals the other — and also that the latter will grow into the former. But at the present stage "No Price Increase" is fast becoming a substitute for "Raise Wages." The union leaders are playing on the backwardness of workers who believe that the wage raise caused the price rise, and telling them to stop their struggles for further increases.

"We demand control over the fixing of prices," said Trotsky. At the risk of being called "doctrinaire" I would say that this is an infinitely better formulation than the "remarkable" — "No Price Increases." Trotsky's formulation does not guarantee to keep the prices static. It does not give false hopes.

In the same paragraph it is explained that capitalist anarchy and high profits are responsible for the prices. The high profits may be cut down by the workers' struggle for wage increases. But neither these nor the anarchy can be eliminated without socialism. The capitalist anarchy in fact increases as the system falls apart. Naturally the exposure of these things leads to more revolutionary methods of struggle

and organization. The workers will set up committees of various kinds. This will greatly sharpen the class struggle.

The demand for a new OPA "with teeth in it" a la Reuther, although it may temporarily strike a responsive chord among the masses, is not along the line of the transitional program. It is, in fact, opposed to the transitional program and a blind alley for the workers.

"Hold the line against prices through the medium of OPA" can take real shape in the masses' mind for a time, that is true. The present popularity of the new Reuther action proves that. A great many workers are anxious to do something. And this seems like something.

Naturally we support this militant action because of its implications and try to breathe our own slogans into it. Already, and inevitably, the words "re-open the contracts" are tossed about. As the worker sees prices continue to go up regardless of new laws, strikes and demonstrations, the wage increase is the answer he instinctively turns to. If the whole business does not lead to a new OPA and a wage freeze, it is ten to one it will prove the prelude to a fight for the sliding scale — or strikes to re-open contracts immediately.

We supported and fought in the GM strike. We will support and fight in the action planned in the recent Detroit conference. And we will fight the best.

We can hardly be called "doctrinaire" for jumping into a struggle some of whose leading slogans are actually false. If people say we are not supporting such a struggle because we do not water down our program with false slogans on our masthead, we can only shrug our shoulders.

A Reply to Morrow and Shachtman on Wages and Prices

By MILTON ALVIN

It is obvious from his article, "The Political Committee's Principal Mistake in Trade Union Policy During the Strike Wave," that Comrade Morrow does not understand what happened during the course of the General Motors strike. Morrow's principal mistake is his failure to "catch" the moods of the workers during this period plus a general misunderstanding of the Transitional Program. Flowing from his arbitrary conception of the mood of the workers is his erroneous conclusion on what slogan should be advanced by the party at a particular stage of the struggle.

The Transitional Program is designed "to help the masses in the process of the daily struggle to find the bridge between present demands and the socialist program of the revolution. This bridge should include a system of transitional demands, stemming from today's conditions and from today's consciousness of wide layers of the working class and unalterably leading to one final conclusion: the conquest of power by the proletariat." (*Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International*, page 9.)

From this clear cut definition of the Transitional Program we can only draw the conclusion that it is imperative for the party to base its slogans upon the moods and understanding of the masses at every particular stage in the development of the struggle.

Therefore, before drawing conclusions from our policy and slogans during the General Motors strike, we must understand what happened during the strike, what the mood of the workers was. In other words, we must analyze "today's conditions and today's consciousness" and see if our policy conformed to it within the broad framework of our Transitional Program. Above all, we must not be misled by what did not take place

during the upsurge and try to fit arbitrarily assumed conceptions into the real, the actual situation.

The GM strikers through their leader Walter Reuther put forward the idea of Wage Increases Without Price Increases. This idea was advanced in the early stages of the negotiations and the strike as an answer to corporation propaganda that General Motors could not give a wage increase of such an unprecedented amount (30%) without getting an increase in prices. The corporation representatives claimed they would go broke, if they gave any such wage increase. On the other hand, Reuther claimed that the corporation could afford the wage increase and that it could be paid out of current income, that is, absorbed by the corporation without any increase in the prices of automobiles. The debate between the union and the corporation over this point, whether such an increase in wages could be paid out of current income, led to Reuther's demand for opening the books.

The publicity around this question led to an exposure of the tremendous profits piled up by the corporations during the war. The stand of the GM workers, that the corporation could pay the wage increase, that it was stuffed with war profits, exposed the profit-hungry aims of the corporation, was progressive and supported by us. However, even the Reuther leadership of the strike later retreated from this position when they stated that they would scale down their demands, if it could be shown that the corporation could not pay.

From this development Morrow has drawn entirely false and unwarranted conclusions. He states, "Walter P. Reuther... proclaims a slogan which means to control prices by class struggle methods..." This is entirely the product of Morrow's imagination. At no time during the strike did the GM workers

or anyone else, propose that the unions control prices. The union never adopted the slogan of Wage Increases Without Price Increases in the sense that Morrow claims. It was a propagandist slogan calculated to show that the wage increase would not be responsible for any subsequent price increase, that it could be absorbed by the corporation out of its current earnings. Even Reuther proclaimed after the strike that the main purpose of the slogan was "to get the corporation over a barrel."

Morrow says the union was on strike for Wage Increases Without Price Increases. This is untrue. The union struck for wage increases only. No effort to control prices by the union was involved. The price question was brought into the picture by Reuther only for the purpose stated above.

What Morrow pretends to see in the GM strike the Shachtmanites have worked up into a finished system of falsification of the issues in the strike. In the June 24 issue of Labor Action writing on "How Labor Can Act Now to Stop Price Jumps," they say, "They had the right idea in their GM STRIKE PROGRAM. It was this: the workers in each industry must, through their own unions and stewards committees and special price committees, control the prices of THEIR OWN industry." (their emphasis). This completely falsified version of the demands of the GM strikers will come as a surprise to anyone familiar with what went on during the strike.

The trouble with Morrow and the Shachtmanites is that they do not understand what the workers wanted during the first strike wave nor how they proposed to get it. The prevailing mood of the workers at the time of the GM strike was to obtain wage increases to make up for the cuts in take-home pay which resulted from the shortened hours of work. The entire attention of the workers was focused upon striking for higher wages; the wage question had the center of the stage. At the same time there was comparatively little interest in the question of prices on a broad, nation-wide scale. The issue of prices entered the GM strike only in the sense that the union said a price increase was unnecessary to allow a wage increase in General Motors. Other unions that took part in the first strike wave did not take up the question of prices. Our effort to introduce the slogan of a Sliding Scale of Wages did not succeed at that time; it was not taken up.

The idea that the GM strikers were fighting for workers control of prices is completely false. No such fight took place, either explicitly or by implication. In fact, a struggle for workers control of prices pre-supposes a struggle for Workers' Control of Production, an entirely worthy slogan but somewhat premature at this time and, needless to say, premature during the GM strike from the standpoint of the present consciousness of the workers.

The workers fought in the first strike wave for higher wages to meet the cuts in take home pay and at the same time to meet the already inflated prices up to that time. They were not yet ready to fight on the price front. They were willing to wait and see what the future would bring so far as prices were concerned. We were the only party to warn of the coming inflation, showing how the capitalist class would stop at nothing to maintain the record-breaking profit grab of the war days.

Our prediction of a runaway inflation has been quickly confirmed. The workers, after obtaining unprecedented wage increases, have seen them wiped out to a large extent by rising prices. This has focused unprecedented attention on the price question. Many union militants are asking themselves how labor can protect its standard of living under the present conditions. They are coming to the conclusion that frequent strikes for higher wages to meet higher prices is an insufficient program. Many workers are losing whatever illusions they had about the role of the OPA. In this changing situation, where

the spotlight is now playing on the price question, our program for a Sliding Scale of Wages fits right in with the admonition of the Transitional Program to fit our slogans to "Today's consciousness of wide layers of the working class."

On the other hand, Morrow and the Shachtmanites are beating the drums for tightening up the OPA. Morrow says, "it will be necessary . . . to consider additional ways and means of calling for workers' struggles to implement and tighten up OPA." Not on your life. We have no intention of spreading any illusions on the OPA, even the best OPA that the capitalist government can put together. We have described the OPA as the agency through which prices are not kept down but on the contrary steadily allowed to rise. The OPA has been used as a screen behind which the capitalist class has accumulated huge profits at the expense of wages. To call for implementing and tightening up this agency as Morrow does and for depending upon it as the Shachtmanites do is to sow reformist illusions and tail behind the Stalinists, Murray and Green. We have no intention of bolstering up the OPA. Our job is to expose its role to the workers and to counterpose to the OPA our slogan for a Sliding Scale of Wages with a guaranteed minimum. Parallel to the struggle for the Sliding Scale of Wages we fight for the formation of broad committees of the unions plus the small farmers and merchants and housewives to fight on the price front.

The Morrow-Shachtmanite program flows from a propagandistic-journalistic approach to a living problem. They approach this question from the outside of the labor movement without considering the factors that are developing in the course of the actual struggle. On the other hand, our program flows from our direct participation in events and our responsibility to propose a solution. The difference is one between a petty bourgeois and a proletarian approach to the living issues in the class struggle.

Morrow's proposal that the unions can fight for both slogans, for the Sliding Scale of Wages and for Wage Increases Without Price Increases is completely unrealistic. He writes: "And at that time (during contract negotiations) why should we limit ourselves to the sliding scale of wages? That slogan does not exclude the slogan of wage raises without price rises. We can then demand both slogans." (his emphasis) This proposal testifies to Morrow's lack of understanding of the most elementary factors in union-company struggles. If the union is going to demand both a Sliding Scale of Wages to meet price increases and at the same time a wage increase without price increases it would most assuredly place itself in a ridiculous position. The company representatives would most likely reply to this that the union negotiators should retire and decide what they want before they continue.

In reality the two slogans are mutually exclusive, if we approach them not from the journalistic and propagandistic point of view but from the point of view of a program for the union. The unions need a program of clear cut demands to meet inflation and not a hodge podge plucked from every direction. Either the unions will fight for a contract containing a stipulation that the prices cannot be increased in that industry, the Morrow proposal, or a stipulation that every price increase must be followed by a corresponding wage increase, our proposal. Obviously, they cannot fight for both. The Morrow proposal does not meet the test of reality.

The GM slogan of Wage Increases Without Price Increases had a propagandistic value at a certain stage of the strike. It was not meant to be a program upon which the strike was based. This was understood by everyone familiar with the issues in the strike at the time. No one put the emphasis equally on the two factors, wages and prices, in this slogan.

It was understood that the wage increase was the aim of the union and that its aim was not to control prices at that time but merely to point out that price increases would not be necessary in order to grant the wage increase. As a propaganda slogan it played a progressive role. But to try to elaborate it into a program as Morrow and the Shachtmanites have done, to try to make it into an aim in the strike, is incorrect. That is not what happened.

Morrow's idea that the slogan of a Sliding Scale of Wages is good only when contract negotiations are taking place and does not give an answer to the rise in prices now is based upon his preoccupation with the GM situation to the exclusion of everything else. How about the rest of the working class? Many contract negotiations are taking place all the time

throughout the country. In rubber, for example, negotiations are taking place at this writing. The slogan of a Sliding Scale of Wages is taking hold among leading militants in this union. Undoubtedly other unions will take hold of this slogan and attempt to write its provision into their contracts in the near future. At any rate, we should push for this slogan all the time, both in our press and in our day to day work in the unions. Just as soon as some unions take it up concretely and especially if the slogan gets national publicity, we can expect it to spread to many sections of the union movement.

For the present period of runaway inflation the slogan of a Sliding Scale of Wages gives the only practical answer so far as the workers are concerned. We must keep it in the central position of our propaganda and agitation.

For the Slogan, "Wage Raises Without Price Increases"

By FELIX MORROW

(Speech to N. Y. Membership, June 24, 1946)

I shall not repeat what I wrote in my article and resolution in the pre-convention bulletin No. 1. I shall stress tonight what is most important at this point in the crisis over price control.

THE MAIN ISSUE: Shall our party support or not support the slogan "Wage Raises Without Price Increases." The PC majority raises many smokescreens to divert you from centering your attention on the one proposition: shall we or shall we not support the slogan made famous by the GM strikers, "Wage raises without price increases." Keep your eye on the main thing. Maybe you don't agree with one or another argument which I offer for the slogan, but that does not discredit the slogan itself. That's what you have to decide; whether you are for or against the slogan.

Let's try to understand why the slogan has had such a powerful appeal not only to the workers but also to the middle class. How powerful that appeal is was shown recently by a poll taken by the National Opinion Research Center. The interviewers asked a cross-section of people the following question which obviously is based upon the GM slogan: "Some people say that most of the really BIG industries could raise their wages without increasing the prices of things they sell. Do you agree with this or not?" A majority of the wealthy, of course, answered no. But 63% of the workers answered yes. Also a majority of middle class elements answered yes, so that the polltakers had to report that 56 out of every 100 people in the U.S. say wage increases in big industries could be made without price increases.

This means that the GM workers' demand for wage increases without price increases rallied the support not only of the industrial workers but of a majority of the whole population.

LABOR AS THE LEADER OF THE NATION

Here was a demand in which a great trade union showed that Labor can represent the interests not only of the organized workers but of all workers and of the middle class. Organized labor, in the person of the GM workers, stood out as fighting on behalf of the overwhelming majority of the people against price increases and thereby won the support of that majority of the people for organized labor's demand for wage increases. Labor appeared as the leader of the whole people, as the fighting force to which the unorganized workers, the white collar worker, the "little man," should look for leadership. This was

the profound significance of the slogan, "Wage increases without price increases."

The "little man," the non-proletarian toiler, feels his own impotence. He knows he must lean on others. But which way he leans determines the history of a given period. Most of the time, as we know, he has ended up in the camp of the big bourgeoisie and that's what makes possible war, fascism and reaction generally. The problem of the revolutionary vanguard is to persuade the working class to understand this and to show the working class how it can become the leader of the other toiling classes — the farmers, white collar and small business men.

This was what the GM workers did. They showed the other toiling classes that organized labor is capable of representing the interests of all. This is the profound significance of the GM demand for "wage raises without price increases." In this, the slogan is superior to the sliding scale of wages in union contracts which represents the interests only of organized workers.

OTHER SLOGANS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR PRICE CONTROL

This doesn't mean that we cease to call for the escalator clause in union contracts. But it does mean that the escalator clause is no substitute for the broader slogan which wins for the working class the support of the middle class.

Nor are consumers' committees a substitute for the trade unions' struggle for price-control. It is simply ridiculous for the PC majority to reject trade union struggles for price control in the face of the example of the GM strike and to propose instead that struggles for price-control be relegated to consumers' committees.

It is double-talk for the PC majority to say on the one hand that we want the trade unions to become organs of political struggle and on the other hand to say that the "broad political fight for price control" cannot be fought for by trade unions in negotiations and strikes. Since when are we Trotskyists opposed to trade unions striking for political demands? Yet such opposition is clearly indicated when the majority resolution declares that "The erroneousness of this formula (wage raises without price increases) consists in the fact that it directly links together the struggle for higher wages with the fight against high prices. But . . . these struggles are parallel

struggles, conducted on different grounds and in different ways." In plain English this comes down to saying that the GM workers should not have made price-control one of their strike demands, but should have relegated it to the non-existent consumers' committees.

OUR FAILURE TO CRITICIZE MURRAY

So the Trotskyists end up with essentially the same attitude as the scissorbills in the UAW on the GM strike. Those scissorbills thought that the demand for no price increases should never have been made in the GM strike. They had no quarrel with Phillip Murray who, in the midst of the GM strike, pointedly declared "Prices are none of my damn business now" and agreed to the rise in the price of steel as part of the steel strike settlement.

And you of the majority, you also have no quarrel with Murray about that. You hailed his steel settlement as a great victory for labor and had nothing to say about the fact that that settlement broke the back of the GM workers' fight against price increases.

Reuther, for opportunistic reasons, failed to publicly criticize Murray's agreement to a steel price-rise. But the importance of this issue continues and, at long last, has forced Reuther to make his first public criticism of Murray's policy. At the Reuther caucus meeting at the Michigan CIO convention two weeks ago, following his address to the delegates in which he again raised the slogan of wage-raises without price-increases, Reuther declared: "The torch we lit during the GM strike was not picked up by the steel workers." That should have been page 1 news in *The Militant*. Instead, *The Militant* story of the convention (June 22) mentions neither Reuther's wage-prices speech nor his criticism of Murray's steel policy!!

Why this silence in the party press? If you don't agree with Reuther's policy, then attack him for it. Attack the slogan wage-raises without price increases — certainly it is an important enough issue on which the party leadership should speak out publicly. If it's such a bad slogan, urge the workers to resist it. Instead you are silent; you describe the Michigan CIO convention as a faction fight without a word about what the contending factions stand for! It was double-talk when you of the PC majority hailed the GM workers' fight against price increases and yet reject the slogan under which that fight was carried on.

Those who are really and wholeheartedly for the kind of fight against price increases which was conducted by the GM workers must, in all logic, adopt the GM strike slogan, "Wage Raises Without Price Increases."

WHY THE WORKERS WANT PRICE CONTROL

So much for the slogan. Now let's see where it came from. Was it, as Warde says, something dreamed up by Reuther? No. We must ask ourselves where the workers and the middle class got the idea that wage raises could be granted without price increases. For us — the tiny minority of revolutionists — that idea is very obvious. We know industry could produce everything the people need at very cheap prices. But we know that because we are socialists. The great masses, however, still accept capitalism in this country. They still yield to the idea that industry must make profits.

Before the war no union ever raised the demand for wage raises without price increases. The workers tended to accept the idea that their wage raises would be passed on to the consumer. But during the war something new happened. The capitalist class, for its own purposes, tried to learn from its mistakes in World War I when prices were uncontrolled. Not only to prevent labor unrest, but also to conduct its war more

efficiently, the capitalist government established price controls in the Spring of 1942.

The capitalists did it for their own purposes, but the result was a relative stability of prices during the war once OPA was established. Please note that I say **once OPA was established** and **during the war**. I say this in my resolution and my article. But the majority resolution, ostensibly quoting me, has me speaking of relative stability of prices "since OPA was established." Having falsely attributed this to me, it is then child's play for the majority to slaughter me by pointing to the bounding prices in the last period of OPA, i.e., after the war was over.

From the Spring of 1942 until V-J Day, three and one-half years later the workers saw price control work to their benefit, certainly compared to the sharp rise in prices prior to that. The workers know that for most of them their standard of living actually rose during the war, and that for three and one-half years or more OPA price-control tended to preserve that standard of living. It was from this experience during the war with price control that the workers got the idea of the slogan "Wage raises without price increases." They saw the big corporations make gigantic profits during the war while prices remained relatively stable. They therefore feel that wage raises can be paid out of profits without increasing prices. This is a new idea in the minds of American workers — workers who still accept the profit system — an idea they got out of the war period. And we should certainly be encouraging it instead of pouring cold water on it as the PC majority wants to do.

HOW WE COULD FIGHT FOR PRICE LEGISLATION

Had our party adopted the slogan "wage raises without price increases", and had we advocated the GM strike's adoption of this slogan as an example to be followed by all unions, we would today be in an excellent position to intervene in the struggle which is taking place for or against ending OPA.

Now that the OPA's role of facilitating the waging of the war is over, a large part of the capitalist class is out to end it. But the mass of the workers want to save OPA. No one can deny that they are in favor of the CIO and AFL fight to save OPA.

What is the position of our party on this question? The truth is our party has no position, thanks to its theory that price control is impossible because, says the majority resolution, "inflation is inherent in capitalism in its period of death agony." This is one of those broad generalizations which provides no answer for the actual situation. It becomes, in the hands of the PC majority, an excuse for abstaining from intervening in the fight which the trade union movement is waging to save OPA.

This kind of abstentionism is possible only for a tiny sect which is without real influence in the labor movement. Despite all the boasts of the PC majority, that is what the SWP is — a tiny sect, and the PC majority's abstentionism will keep us so. Imagine if we had a Congressman or two, how impossible it would be to follow the majority line. Those Congressmen would have to take a position. The workers who elected them would demand some leadership from them. They couldn't duck, as *The Militant* does.

The same thing would be true in the unions, if we played the role there that the PC majority pretends we do.

If our party had Congressmen and big trade union fractions, they would have to support the fight to save price control legislation because there is a progressive side to that fight. Yes, we would have to be in favor of saving OPA, i.e., saving price-control legislation. But we would proceed to our own radical

interpretation of what is necessary in order to save and extend price control. We would point to the GM fight as the road to real price control, enforced by the trade unions in negotiations and strikes. We would explain that the demand for no price increases must be backed up by class struggle methods, the way the GM strike did it.

Just this is the Leninist method: to take hold of the progressive side of a demand raised by the masses and propose that it be fought for by class-struggle means.

WHY THE WORKERS WANT TO SAVE OPA

When the PC majority denies the progressive side of this demand, it makes the workers out to be idiots. According to the majority, the workers have been fleeced from beginning to end by OPA. Why, then, do the workers want to save OPA? They must be idiots to want to save the instrument that has been fleecing them. But the workers are not idiots. They know that rent control means something; they know they still pay the same for electricity and cooking gas as before; and they want a return to the wartime controls of other prices. They want price-control legislation and we should be the first to offer them leadership in the fight for it.

What leadership did the party offer to the UAW workers' demand for price control? Now, answering my proposal, the PC majority sternly declares that the central slogan for fighting high prices is the sliding scale of wages. But how little they believe that is indicated by one murderous fact: the sliding scale of wages was not part of the three-point program of the UAW fraction for the UAW convention. Nothing in that three-point program had anything to say about price-control. All the hullabaloo about the sliding scale of wages as the central slogan is a belated alibi for the fact that the party leadership muffed the ball — didn't call for adoption of the GM program by other unions — didn't say a word when Murray scuttled the fight for wage raises without price increases.

The PC majority muffed the ball because it failed to recognize a new transitional slogan when one arose out of the class struggle. It failed to recognize the new transitional slogan raised by the GM workers because the PC majority is not on the lookout for new transitional slogans arising out of the class struggle.

A FALSE CONCEPT OF THE TRANSITION PROGRAM

Its attitude is glaringly revealed by the first sentence in its resolution: "The transitional program of the Fourth Interna-

tional, reaffirmed by the 1942 and 1944 conventions of the SWP, has set forth the main generalized slogans and methods of struggle necessary. . ." All they know how to do is to keep on reaffirming the slogans of 1938, adding nothing and subtracting nothing no matter what the class struggle brings that is new. This ritual of reaffirming and reaffirming is done in the name of Trotsky. But it is alien to Trotsky's whole method.

What did he say about that 1938 program which the PC majority keeps reaffirming? Trotsky said it was only a first hint, a first approximation. Trotsky demanded that it be applied, concretized and changed in accordance with each country and even with each locality — not to speak of changes over the coming years.

The PC majority has embalmed Trotsky's transitional slogans, turned them into unchangeable Holy Writ. That's not the way Trotsky worked and tried to teach us to work.

Where did he get his transitional slogans? He got them out of the class struggle. He recognized new transitional slogans even when he first saw them used by class-collaborationists and capitalist demagogues.

Where did he get the transitional slogan for a popular referendum on war? He got it from the pacifists and Republican Congressman Ludlow, who introduced the idea as a constitutional amendment in 1938.

Where did he get the slogan of an Independent Labor Party? From the reformists who advocated it for years before we adopted it in 1938.

Where did he get the sliding scale of wages? He got it first from the class-collaborationist AFL building trades unions, which made widespread use of the escalator clause in the early 1920's, when Trotsky was writing his "Europe and America."

To take from wherever it may appear a demand which arouses or is capable of arousing the workers, to give it a radical interpretation, and propose that it be fought for by class struggle methods: that is the method which Trotsky used to write the transitional program of 1938. Just as he was the first to see how other slogans advanced by others — by reformists and capitalist demagogues — could be turned to our own use, so Trotsky would have been the first to take the ball away from Reuther in the case of "Wage raises without price increases."

It is sheer stupidity to muff the ball. Let's stop giving so much lip-service to Trotsky's 1938 program of transitional demands and start trying to use the method by which Trotsky gathered together those slogans as a first approximation of what we should do thereafter.

Statement of Bayonne Branch on Removal of Comrade Morrow from Party Payroll

Comrade Morrow's removal from party full time work prior to the pre-convention discussion is a bureaucratic act, designed to stifle discussion and criticism and to force the minority out of the party, without resorting to formal expulsions.

The official excuse of "retrenchment, and Morrow hasn't done any work" is exploded when one discovers the fact that Morrow has offered to do any work assigned him. If he hasn't done any work it is because he has been removed from the FI editorship and not given any other party assignments such as classes, forums, translations, etc.

The removal of Morrow from full time work hinders the presentation of the minority view point, in speeches, documents,

etc., inasmuch as Comrade Morrow was the only minority comrade on full time. (He has been a professional revolutionist for 15 years in our movement.)

The majority comrades have a whole host of comrades, ostensibly doing **only** party work while on the payroll, but it is common knowledge that many of these functionaries use general party funds and time in order to further the cause of their majority faction.

The majority comrades have an obligation to see that the minority has the actual right and not only the formal democratic right of presenting its views to the party.

This latest action of the majority is another example of

how the majority maintains the purely formal aspects of democracy while robbing it of any real content.

Formally Morrow can speak anywhere, but how can one work and maintain a job, and be in the main centers of the party at the same time? It is obviously impossible, so in essence, Morrow has been deprived of much of the right to speak and write.

Morrow, while being told of his bureaucratic removal, was also told that the party does not have to support a minority. Let your minority comrades support the minority faction, said E. R. Frank at a PC meeting.

Yet E. R. Frank and many others after him use part of the general party funds, made up of minority and majority contributions, solely for the benefit of their majority factions, while cutting off all legitimate party use of these funds to the minority.

We feel in the light of the removal of Comrade Morrow from the payroll that we are under no obligations to support

what is in essence a majority faction, at the expense of our own minority faction, which will now need all the funds it can get, in order to counter the effect of the majority's "gag" maneuver.

We feel we must now attempt to further the pre-convention discussion which the majority has attempted to stifle, by contributing our present Sustaining Fund to the minority faction. We will however, continue to pay dues and support legitimate party activities such as the New Jersey election campaign where a Bayonne comrade, Arlene Phillips, is running for Congresswoman, together with comrades from Newark.

We will and we must support legitimate party work, but no distortion of the real meaning of party "loyalty" will make us support a majority faction, at the expense of the operating efficiency of our own minority faction which considers it has the vital tasks of the political rearmament of the party.

We hope that by this statement we have dragged out into the open this "office" maneuver so that the whole party can see and condemn this latest action of its present leadership.

On the Removal of Comrade Morrow from Full-Time Party Work

Statement of the Minority to the Political Committee

At the closing of the May 19-22 Plenum, Comrade Cannon stated that he welcomed the fact that Comrade Morrow and his associates were remaining in the party; that it is important that the ideas they stand for be discussed thoroughly in the party; that immediately following the Plenum the pre-convention discussion is already opened.

Within the week, however, the Secretariat called in Comrade Morrow and informed him that he is removed from full-time party work. The reason is allegedly the need for financial retrenchment.

By what criterion, however, is financial retrenchment achieved by removing from the party payroll the leader of the Minority and the only Minority comrade who is on the party payroll?

The Minority has yet to prepare its principal documents for the pre-convention discussion. These documents were to be written by the Minority leader, Comrade Morrow. The Minority hoped to present a spokesman as Minority reporter not only at New York membership meetings but also in the other principal party centers. Again, this was to be Comrade Morrow.

The effect of the removal of Comrade Morrow is to make well-nigh impossible the effective participation of the Minority in the pre-convention discussion. Quite apart from all other limitations on the pre-convention discussion, the removal of Comrade Morrow compels us to declare to all Trotskyists that the pre-convention discussion has been seriously interfered with at its very beginning.

June 4, 1946

An Answer to the Bayonne Branch on Morrow's Removal from the Payroll

Statement by the Political Committee

The Statement of the Bayonne Branch on the removal of Comrade Morrow from the party payroll must be considered in its proper setting, namely, as one more step in the anti-party fight begun under the leadership of Goldman-Morrow and now continued under Morrow's leadership.

Up to the May 1946 Plenum of the National Committee, Comrade Morrow marched shoulder to shoulder with Goldman towards a split from the Socialist Workers Party. It would even be correct to say that Morrow was often a step ahead of Goldman in his tireless efforts to split the SWP.

In his letters to Albert Goldman, Max Shachtman urged the minority faction to split without delay. He spoke not only in his own name but also in the name of Felix Morrow. It is evident from these letters (Internal Bulletin, Vol. VIII, No. 6) that the split strategy had been worked out in closest day-to-day collaboration between Shachtman and Morrow. To break down Goldman's resistance Shachtman writes: "More and more comrades, at least here in New York, want out (of the SWP) and want out badly. This group now includes Felix,

and that is most significant and important." Shachtman then continues his pleas to Goldman for an immediate split and winds up as follows: "Felix agrees and, I repeat, agrees firmly. We are as convinced of its correctness and so much aware of the importance of your agreement, that we have decided to have Felix leave for Chicago immediately to consult with you and the others."

It is thus undeniable that (1) Morrow was with Shachtman in the van of the drive to split the SWP; and that (2) he worked in collusion with the Shachtmanites and under their direction ("... we have decided to have Felix leave for Chicago immediately...").

When the Plenum in its May 22 session received the Control Commission's report of the disloyalty and flagrant disciplinary violations committed by the Goldman-Morrow faction it resolved as follows:

"1. To censure Comrades Goldman and Morrow and warn them that any further violations of the party rules will be met by further disciplinary action.

"2. To instruct the Political Committee and the local and branch executive committees to take careful note of this resolution and see to it that it is promptly and rigorously enforced in case of any more violations of party discipline on the part of the above-named party members."

The Plenum decision is unambiguous; it means that the minority faction could remain in the party only on one condition, namely: strict and loyal adherence to party discipline.

Immediately following the Plenum, Goldman and his followers consummated the split. Morrow and nine of his followers made their decision known in a statement entitled "We Remain in the Party." In this statement they said: "For our part we renounce without reservation independent activity. We shall function fully in the SWP and seek to win the majority of the party to our political views."

At the time of the Plenum we did not know whether the above quoted statement represented a sincere effort at reintegration in the party or whether it was merely a diplomatic document designed to conceal a maneuver for a more advantageous split at a later date. But we had reason to suspect that just as Oscar Williams represented only the advance guard in the minority faction when he joined the Workers Party several weeks ahead of Goldman, just so Morrow might be remaining behind in order to bring up the rear. In his letter to Goldman, Shachtman argued as follows: "Hold back in order to win Archie? [the reference here is to A. Winters of Bayonne]. A fine comrade, I'd like to have him. But you can't base a policy on him."

The bulk of the Goldman-Morrow faction decided not to base their policy on Archie — they joined the Workers Party. But it is certainly not excluded that Morrow decided to "hold back in order to win Archie."

The statement of the Bayonne Branch on the removal of Comrade Morrow from full time party work certainly indicates that Morrow has not been without success in maneuvering these comrades on the road of "independent" work, which is the road of split.

If we leave aside for a moment the faked indignation at the alleged mistreatment of Morrow at the hands of the PC, the statement of the Bayonne branch boils down to a "declaration of independence" from the party and its democratically constituted bodies. The Bayonne branch takes it upon itself to decide whether or not it will give or withhold financial support to the party and its institutions. Since this statement implies that previously its financial support had been regular and prompt, it is worth while first to examine briefly the record on this score.

At the request of the Bayonne branch the Political Committee cancelled in November 1945 Bayonne's debt of \$155.65 on the Sustaining Fund and a debt of \$165.21 to The Militant. Thereafter the branch reduced its Sustaining Fund pledge from \$48.50 a month to \$20.00 a month. This amount they paid until May 1946, but they have made no payments at all since May 13, a full month before Morrow was removed from the payroll. Although the Bayonne branch has continued to receive a small bundle of The Militant each week, they have made no payments on the paper since April 4. Likewise they have received a small bundle of magazines each month but have made no payments for the F.I. since November 1945. The Bayonne branch owes \$72.46 to Pioneer Publishers but has made no payment on this obligation since April 11, 1946. Finally, the Bayonne branch is the only branch which failed to meet its quota on the \$15,000 Militant Fund (it sent in 58% of a \$75.00 quota).

Thus we see that financial support from the Bayonne branch had dwindled away quite a while before Morrow's re-

moval from the payroll. While the financial delinquencies of the Bayonne branch were heretofore explained as owing to the branch's weakness, we are now confronted with a political motivation for their non-payment of financial obligations.

The record makes it clear that the Bayonne branch is not and has never been one of the financial mainstays of the party. The financial threat implied in the statement is therefore of no great consequence. What is quite important, however, is the question of correct organizational procedure, of the relationship between the branches and the party as a whole. What is important is the fact that the statement comes on the heels of the National Committee Plenum which censured Morrow and Goldman and their faction for their disloyalty and disciplinary violations. What is ominous is that the statement of the Bayonne branch indicates that these comrades intend to continue on the same course.

Morrow and his faction are being closely watched by the entire party. It is for them to demonstrate before the party whether they have taken the censure seriously and whether they really intend to integrate themselves as loyal members. Everything they have done since the Plenum demonstrates that they are once more maneuvering with the party. The Bayonne statement is only one indication of it. The impudence of the Bayonne statement is matched only by its hypocrisy when it protests at this late date Morrow's removal from the editorship of the F.I., and that Morrow hasn't been assigned any work. It is an established fact that for many months Morrow has been subsidized by our party. To all intents and purposes he has been all this time doing full time work for a rival party, in collusion with it and under its direction. He was supposed to be working for the party even when Shachtman sent him to Chicago to prevail on Goldman to split the SWP without delay.

The party has been extremely patient with the splitting course of Comrade Morrow and his pitiful faction. The party continued to pay him while he was carrying on his anti-party activities. It was only when the financial situation required that we retrench in all our institutions that we had to deprive Morrow of the privilege of working for the Workers Party at the expense of our party. But even then, we first cut expenses of the Secretariat staff and of The Militant business office; we reduced the editorial staff of The Militant, cut down on the maintenance department, cut off subsidies to 11 party organizers in the field, and so on.

The argument of the Bayonne comrades that our removal of Morrow from full time work is a move to "gag" the minority is irresponsible and falls to the ground in the face of the above-mentioned facts. It must also be borne in mind that the discussion has been going on for over two years, that Morrow has been given full expression during this period inside the Party, that he has been given an opportunity to devote himself during the last year and a half to full time factional activity.

If we desired to "gag" Morrow we had ample grounds and evidence to expel him outright as an agent of an opponent party, as an enemy of the SWP who sought to split it and wreck it. We didn't do this precisely because we welcomed the opportunity afforded us by the pre-convention discussion to expose Morrow not only on organizational grounds but also to lay bare his whole political line, his break with our program and method, his cynical opportunism, his capitulation to Shachtmanism and its "Three Theses" ideology. But even though we welcome the political discussion, we have specific instructions from the Plenum not to tolerate any more disciplinary violations. The Bayonne comrades and other members of the minority who might follow their example in refusing to meet their party obligations, in refusing to abide by party decisions and

loyally participate in all the party activities are continuing the course of "independence" for which they were censured by the Plenum, and will have to face the consequences of their actions in the light of this Plenum decision.

What is involved, furthermore, is the spirit in which these comrades have signed their statement entitled, "We Remain in the Party." The party as a whole has been watching the conduct of these comrades and will pass judgment on the sincerity of their statement. So far we have the following evidence of their intentions:

1. Immediately after the Plenum the members of the Morrow faction, including Morrow himself, saw fit to attend the convention of the Workers Party where they were apparently received as welcome guests.

2. The minority faction sent Dave Jeffries on a national faction tour without even taking the trouble to ask his branch for a leave of absence.

3. The minority faction has openly withdrawn financial support from the party.

4. The minority has engaged in a systematic sabotage of the party's public activities. A recent instance was the Antoinette Konikow Memorial Meeting in New York, at which Morrow and all but one of his faction were conspicuous by their absence. Ten days later the New York Local held a public rally to mobilize support for the New York election campaign which is the biggest and most difficult task the party has ever undertaken in this field; again, Morrow and all but one of his faction were conspicuous by their absence.

The Bayonne comrades have in the past fought inside the minority faction against the splitting course of Goldman and Morrow. Their statement reveals that they have now embarked on this dangerous course themselves. We warn them to return to a party-loyal attitude while there is still time.

July 30, 1946

Letter of the IS to Logan and Morrow

To Comrades Logan and Morrow
(Copies to the PC of the SWP and the PB of the PCI)

Dear Comrades:

It has come to the attention of the International Secretariat that you, together with another person whose identity is not clear here, recently sent a cablegram to the minority faction of the Parti Communiste Internationale (France), advising them, in case their party should decide for abstentionism in the referendum of May 5 to dissociate themselves publicly from their party's position.

The IS naturally does not deny the right of any member of any section of the International to communicate directly by personal letter or other means with any member of any other section, despite its conviction that such methods, if made a regular practice, can lead to deplorable organizational degeneration, tending to bureaucratic cliquism in the case of majorities,

to anarchistic indiscipline in the case of minorities. But it does certainly call into question the propriety of calling of anyone whatsoever in any section to break the discipline of his party.

The IS, by direct warning, and the ES before it by fraternal counsel, have repeatedly indicated, by their interventions in the tense and embittered atmosphere of the SWP faction struggle, that they are no mere formalists about discipline and wish to protect minorities from any brusque or formalistic application thereof. But the action in question is no mere hot-headed carelessness about formal discipline, particularly when committed by comrades so experienced as yourselves. The IS takes this occasion to warn you that repetitions of such conduct can only call for direct and inevitable sanction.

With Communist-Internationalist greetings,
The IS of the FI

May 19, 1946

A Note on the Ideological Degeneration of Goldman, Morrow and Logan

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

Some comrades have expressed astonishment at the fact that Goldman, Morrow and Logan who, during the struggle of 1939-1940 participated on the side of the proletarian majority of the SWP against the petty-bourgeois minority, are today allied with the Workers Party in bitter struggle against the SWP. How did this reversal of positions come about? Why have these particular comrades gone over to Shachtman's camp and themselves succumbed to the disease of revisionism and opportunism?

To answer these questions it is necessary to go back to the struggle of 1939-1940. Trotsky remarked at that time that: "Not all comrades possibly are content with the fact that I give the predominant place in the discussion to the matter of dialectics." (In Defense of Marxism, p. 95). This happened to be the case, not only with the minority leaders of that time, but also with two of the leading figures in the majority caucus: Goldman and Morrow.

Both opposed and fought Shachtman's political positions, including his unprincipled bloc with Burnham. But at the same time they believed with Shachtman that Trotsky had arbitrarily

and unjustifiedly injected the question of philosophic method into what should have remained a purely political dispute. They shared Shachtman's view from somewhat different standpoints. Goldman was more or less indifferent toward the philosophic foundations of Marxism; Morrow was at odds with them. In the spirit of Hook, his former associate in politics and philosophy, Morrow had long nursed doubts and differences regarding important aspects of dialectical materialism: its organic relations with natural processes, its theory of knowledge, etc. But he had never dared to develop these differences publicly.

Thus Goldman and Morrow combatted Shachtman and Burnham in 1939-1940 without fully understanding or accepting the real theoretical foundations of the political positions they then held in common with Trotsky and the SWP majority. In their disregard for the dialectic they retained an attachment with the ideas of the Shachtmanites even after the split. This inner contradiction in their position provided the theoretical starting point for their subsequent rift with the SWP majority and passage over into Shachtman's camp.

In an article published in the Internal Bulletin Vol. VII,

No. 10 on "The New Opposition in the SWP: Its 'Theory' and Its Methods," I undertook to trace the unfolding of this contradiction and to mark certain milestones along the road.

The divergences in our respective interpretations of the fundamental issues and lessons in the 1939-1940 fight first manifested themselves in 1942 over the writing of a preface to Trotsky's *In Defense of Marxism*. There were then three main points of disagreement between us. Morrow presented the struggle as centering around the Russian question. We pointed out that, although the fight began over the Russian question it quickly developed into a class battle in defense of Marxism and the very life of our party and the Fourth International against the petty bourgeois revisionists. This was the central issue in the struggle.

Whereas Morrow made Shachtman the principal leader of the opposition, we singled out Burnham as its most representative figure because his anti-Marxist ideas inspired the tendency. Shachtman had simply served as Burnham's attorney. Finally, Morrow omitted entirely any treatment of the philosophical question. We, following Trotsky, accorded it "the predominant place in the discussion." Goldman sided with Morrow on these questions.

These emerging disagreements over Marxist method were further accentuated in the dispute in 1942-43 with Logan over basic conceptions of the Marxist dialectic. There Logan revealed a disposition to nibble in a light-minded manner at the materialist roots of dialectical thought and to tack on to Marxist theory ideas borrowed from petty bourgeois schools of philosophy. In this attempt at philosophic revisionism Logan received support and sympathy from Morrow and Goldman.

Along with the growing pressure of petty-bourgeois public opinion upon them, it was this objective alliance on the theoretical front with the Shachtmanites, we pointed out, that kept pulling the new opposition in the SWP away from revolutionary proletarian positions and toward conciliation with Shachtman's ideas and organization. We predicted that unless they radically changed their course, the objective logic of their ideas would lead them still further away from Marxism.

It is a year since this analysis and prognosis was published. Let us first observe that, despite their voluminous writings on a score of incidental and episodic issues, not one of these minority leaders has bothered to reply to it. This fact is especially noteworthy since the minority leaders plume themselves upon their superior ability as Marxist theoreticians. Morrow has constantly complained that the majority leaders are unwilling — or incapable — of dealing with the fundamental questions in dispute.

Yet when these vaunted specialists in theory were confronted point-blank with a discussion on the decisive question of scientific method in politics, did they seize the occasion to expound their ideas and teach the party in the process? Not at all. Here too they imitate the pattern set by the original petty bourgeois opposition who in turn continued, "the tradition of revisionism in theory and opportunism in politics." They simply maintained a stubborn silence.

The minority leaders thereby express their real attitudes: their lack of conscientiousness toward Marxist doctrine, their scorn for the dialectical method in living politics, and their disregard for the theoretical training of the workers in the party.

As in 1939-1940 Goldman and Morrow have somewhat different reasons for their reticence. Goldman remains skeptical about the practical validity of the dialectic and is in general not much concerned with questions of scientific method. Morrow has so far persistently refrained from divulging his views on the materialistic dialectic because he fears to face squarely either his own conscience or the public opinion of the party.

It is not accidental that Morrow reacted toward our challenge much as Burnham reacted toward Trotsky's famous open letter in 1939: "You have expressed as your reaction to my article on the petty-bourgeois opposition . . . that you do not intend to argue over the dialectic with me and that you will discuss only the concrete questions." (Page 71.) Any comrade who studies the development of that dispute in those invaluable documents will be immediately struck by the deadly parallel, not only in this, but in other respects.

No less significant from the theoretical standpoint has been the rapid political evolution of the opposition leaders in the past year. Last September we pointed out that the same unmistakable signs of the petty-bourgeois character of this faction which were negatively indicated by their disdainful attitude toward theory, were more positively expressed in their eclectic political positions.

"Logan abetted by Morrow attempts to combine dialectics with ideas taken from petty-bourgeois philosophical schools: positivists, agnostics, empiricists. Morrow tries to reconcile the liquidationist outlook of the 'Three Theses' revisionists with the revolutionary program of the Fourth International. This later became more explicit in his feverish insistence upon the 'method of democratic demands' as the master key to the present stage of the revolutionary struggle in Europe — a position shared by both Shachtman and the 'Three Theses' group. Goldman seeks to yoke together those who defend the Soviet Union in the revolutionary way with those who advocate Soviet defeatism. All three unite in seeking to reconcile the theory and program of our revolutionary proletarian party with the positions of the petty-bourgeois revisionists in the Shachtmanite camp."

Today it is easier to see what these straddling positions really concealed and in what direction their proponents were moving. In his article on "The Explosion of Bureaucratic Imperialism" Logan has broken with the program of the Fourth International on the Russian question and adopted Shachtman's transitional position of 1940. While he still retains shreds of the old formulas, Logan is steadily heading for Shachtman's present anti-Marxist theory of "bureaucratic collectivism."

Morrow has stopped trying to reconcile the incompatible positions of the Fourth International and the "Three Theses" revisionists on the tasks and perspectives of the European revolution and has now ardently embraced all the political conclusions of the "Three Theses." The more sluggish Goldman has proceeded, as is his habit, more cautiously on these and other questions. But he has shown his true political affinity by breaking with the SWP and joining the petty-bourgeois defeatists of the WP.

An extremely instructive lesson can be drawn by our entire movement from this ideological degeneration and political backsliding of the present opposition leaders. That lesson is the same Trotsky aimed to teach the party in his last great battle: the decisive importance of a correct philosophical doctrine to the revolutionary party and the dangers of trifling or tampering with the theoretical foundations of Marxist method. Like Hook, Eastman, Burnham and Shachtman, the present opposition leaders started by differing with Marxism on the philosophic plane and thereafter developed fundamental political and organizational differences.

Goldman, Morrow and Logan are now repeating with the Shachtmanites the theoretical betrayal of Marxism that Shachtman, Abern and their associates committed with Burnham. Having replaced Marxism with eclecticism as their guide in practice, they entered into an unprincipled bloc with the WP revisionists against the Marxist SWP. At this stage of their

departure from Marxism, Goldman, Morrow and Logan still have a number of political differences with Shachtman. But these have not prevented them from joining the WP in warfare against us and the program of the Fourth International any more than they deterred Shachtman from uniting with Burnham in 1939-1940.

That is because the same fundamental forces lie behind both these unprincipled alliances against the orthodox Marxists. Underneath their special and episodic political differences, these elements and individuals have two main things in common which draw them together and throw them into violent opposition to the SWP. First, from the standpoint of theory they all reject in practice dialectical materialism and employ instead methods and ideas proper to petty-bourgeois thought. Second, in social composition and character they are radical intellectuals under the sway of petty-bourgeois moods and pressures. That is what is really at the bottom of our deepening differences with Goldman, Morrow and Logan and their rupture with us.

The social source of this new petty-bourgeois deviation in our ranks is the new wave of disappointment and despair in the prospects of the proletarian revolution which has swept over the radical intellectuals at the close of World War II. These members and fellow-travellers of the Fourth International pinned all their hopes upon a proletarian victory on the model of the October 1917 revolution emerging from the war. This expectation has not been realized. Notwithstanding the tremendous upsurge and efforts of the European working class, the first post-war wave of European revolutions nowhere culminated in the establishment of workers' power.

Both as cause and consequence of these setbacks for the proletarian revolution, European capitalism has been temporarily rescued from destruction, the power and influence of Stalinism has been enhanced, the Social Democracy has experienced a resurrection, and U. S. imperialism has apparently entrenched itself in impregnable positions throughout the world. This loss of confidence in the power of the revolutionary proletariat reflects itself in a rejection of the program of the Fourth International which most consistently and clearly expresses the revolutionary role and prospects of the world working class. This negative attitude toward the proletarian revolution has been most crassly formulated by the writers of the "Three Theses," who have advised the Fourth International to cease talking about the proletarian revolution for at least two years!

Impatience is often the mother of opportunism. Disappointment with the rate of growth of the Fourth International has impelled a number of unstable individuals into a frantic search for new formulas by which they expect to extricate the movement from its isolation in jig time. Upon examination all these "novel" formulas turn out to be borrowed from the old-clothes shops of revisionism and centrism. This was the case,

for example, with the supporters of the referendum on the tripartite bourgeois constitution in France.

Unable or unwilling to adjust themselves to the enforced slow rhythm of development of the Fourth International, these comrades try to leap over their own heads as well as over the heads of the party. As a result, they land in the camp of opportunism.

Capitulation to bourgeois pressure also accounts for their venomous hostility toward the proletarian majority of the SWP and the FI and their ferocious fight and unprincipled combinations against us. These intellectuals are incensed because we will not go along with them in yielding to alien class pressures but firmly adhere to the program of the Fourth International. By counterposing Marxism to their opportunism, we expose their real nature and pretensions. Their hostility toward us reflects the social hatred of the panicky petty-bourgeois for representatives of the revolutionary proletariat. Thus at bottom the struggle between us is a life-and-death combat between two opposing class tendencies.

* * *

We have attempted briefly to analyze the evolution of the new opposition by means of the Marxist method. Its dialectical character flowed from the antithesis between their political position in 1940 which united them with us and their underlying theoretical standpoint which linked them with Shachtman. This contradiction was the motive force behind the subsequent conflict with their own past. It has led to their break with us and a complete reversal of their former positions.

Here too theory has proved to be decisive. The fate of the new opposition has provided additional empirical proof of the primacy of theory in revolutionary political practice.

The materialist basis for this dialectical development comes from the buckling of the opposition leaders to alien class pressures. The same general political factors which brought about the defections of Burnham, Shachtman and their associates in 1939-1940 — the successes and strengthening of capitalist reaction and the reverses of the proletariat — are in the last analysis also responsible for the backsliding of Goldman, Morrow and Logan in 1945-46.

It should be clear that their refusal to engage in a debate over Marxist philosophy has not enabled either the indifferent Goldman or the evasive Morrow to elude the net of the materialist dialectic. The laws of this logic govern all forms of development from natural processes to political ones. That is why they flee in vain from them.

In the words of the poet Emerson:

They reckon ill who leave me out;
When me they fly, I am the wings.

September 1, 1946

Resolution on the Unity Proposal of the Workers Party

Adopted by the NC Plenum, May 19-22, 1946

The May Plenum of the National Committee of the SWP, having heard and discussed the report on the developments in connection with the question of the proposed unification with the WP, resolves as follows:

1. To endorse the report of the PC.
2. To reaffirm the basic position set forth in the resolu-

tion of the October Plenum and endorse the course followed by the PC in applying this resolution.

3. To instruct the PC to carry through the discussion with the WP provided for in its four motions adopted at its meeting of April 9th and submit its report and recommendations prior to the forthcoming National Convention which will decide the question.

Two Letters of the IS on Discussions with the WP

To the PC of the SWP

Dear Comrades,

We have taken note of the four motions passed by your PC on April 9, 1946 concerning the organization of the discussion with the WP. We are completely in agreement with these motions.

We believe that the SWP should now continue along the path outlined by these motions, that is, to open and conduct the discussion until the points of view of the two organizations on all questions submitted to discussion are clearly established.

At that time the question of unification should be re-examined and a decision taken either that unification is possible in the near future, or that unification has proved to be impossible for a certain time and that all organized discussion with this aim in view should cease.

The IS and the IEC will take a position one way or another as soon as they are in possession of the results of the discussion which you have decided to organize.

It would be desirable, in our opinion, for the discussion to begin immediately after your May Plenum, and to close at the latest in September.

On the eve of your October Convention you will undoubtedly hold a National Committee meeting to express a definitive opinion on the results of the discussion which will be submitted to the Convention.

We, on our part, and the IEC which will meet again in September, shall give our opinion on the basis of the results of the discussion. It would be well for our IEC meeting to precede your pre-convention Plenum.

In case the WP rejects the discussion proposals outlined in your motions of April 9, 1946, we are of the opinion that the SWP should maintain these proposals and demonstrate that this rejection constitutes proof of the maneuverist character of the WP campaign for unification.

We request you to make the contents of this letter known to your May Plenum.

May 9, 1946

With revolutionary salutations,
For the IS

PILAR

To the PC of the SWP

Dear Comrades:

Upon re-reading our resolution addressed to you dated May 9, we find that the eighth paragraph (English) can be open to misinterpretation. The section reads:

"In case the WP rejects the discussion proposals outlined in your motions of April 9, 1946, we are of the opinion that the SWP should maintain these proposals and demonstrate that this rejection constitutes proof of the maneuverist character of the WP campaign for unification."

This section should now read:

"In case the WP rejects the discussion proposals outlined in your motions of April 9, 1946, we are of the opinion that the SWP should maintain these proposals and demonstrate that this rejection constitutes proof that the WP campaign for unification had been of a maneuverist character."

The corrected section in French should read:

"Il serait indiqué que votre Plenum se tienne après la réunion du C.E.I. Dans le cas où le WP rejette les propositions de discussion contenues dans vos motions du 9. 4. 46., nous considérons que le SWP doit maintenir ces propositions et démontrer que ce refus constituerait la preuve que la campagne d'unification du WP aurait un caractère manoeuvrier."

This correction is necessary because in its original form it could be understood to imply that the IS already believes that the WP campaign is of a maneuverist character. This of course is not the intended meaning or impression.

With revolutionary salutations,
For the IS
PILAR

May 18, 1946

A "Discussion" to Prevent Unity

Statement of the National Committee Minority on the list of questions submitted for "discussion" by the Majority of the PC to the WP

The Political Committee has finally formulated a list of questions for a "discussion" with the Workers Party, as a "necessary precondition for a definitive decision by the next party convention on the question of unification of the two organizations."

It is more than six months since the National Committee voted in favor of "a party-to-party" discussion. By that is meant, so it was explained, a discussion where an article appears in **Fourth International**, to be answered, if the WP so desires, in **New International**.

But progress is inevitable. The majority of the PC advanced to the point of asking the WP for a statement of its position on the various questions listed by the PC, and promised to publish the statement in the SWP Internal Bulletin so that the members of the party will have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the position of the WP. Some months ago, Comrade Morrow made a motion that the WP part of the discussion be made available to our members. The crushing reply to the motion was: the Plenum resolution did not provide for

such a procedure; it provided only for a party-to-party discussion.

However, Plenum resolutions are permitted to interfere with a specific procedure only when the majority does not want that particular procedure. After the arrival of the resolution of the European Secretariat, which urged a joint elaboration with the leadership of the WP of the question to be discussed and after the letter of the International Secretariat, which asked that "the members of both organizations have the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the documents and opposing arguments," the Plenum resolution was forgotten and it was found possible to publish the WP statement in the Internal Bulletin.

Will There Be Any Party-to-Party Discussion?

In reality the Political Committee seems to have dropped the idea of a "thorough-going discussion and probing of all differences to the bottom."

There are fifteen subjects for discussion on the list pro-

posed by the PC. It is elementary that a discussion consists not only of a statement of position but of articles containing an elaboration of the position and arguments on its behalf. In one of the letters of the IS there is a statement that it expects the arguments to be made available to the membership. One can deduce from that that the IS wants a real discussion with the purpose, at least, of clarification, if not of winning over the members of the WP.

At the same time that the PC lists the subjects for discussion it states its intention of having the coming convention, which is scheduled to take place in October, definitively decide the question of unification. But how can fifteen subjects of the nature of those listed by the PC be discussed in a period of less than five months? Among the questions are several which, by themselves, could easily take six months of discussion — especially in “a party-to-party discussion.”

It is true that the PC continues to speak of a discussion but now it is a pre-convention discussion in the ranks of the SWP. The whole emphasis is on an exchange of statements rather than on a “party-to-party discussion.”

Purpose of Listing Such Questions

The questions listed by the PC for discussion include all subjects upon which there is or there may possibly be some differences with the WP. From the point of view of a discussion on unity they are absurd; but from the point of view of confusing an inexperienced membership and killing the possibility of unity the questions listed for “discussion” were formulated by “clever” people who see in “clever” maneuvering a solution for the problem of preventing unity without giving their real reasons for opposition to unity.

The real reason for the opposition of the majority leadership to unity is the fear of getting into the party some hundreds of independent and experienced revolutionists. This Cannon does not want to state. He will therefore come to the convention with a list of differences and everyone dutifully will get up and say that there are too many differences to justify unity.

Undoubtedly the dialecticians of the PC will prove that unity is impossible by citing the law of quantity changing into quality. One or two differences, we shall be told, may not be a bar to unity, but fifteen differences create a qualitative change.

What other purpose than the one mentioned above can a list of questions have that would fight the battle of 1940 all over again (question one); that asks for a discussion on the methods, principles and philosophy of Marxism; that raises such a silly subject for discussion as the attitude of the WP to the YPSL; that wants to discuss subjects that are part of history (India and China during the war); and wants to revive a discussion on Russia when everyone has said everything that can be said about that question (except for those who are reconsidering the subject — and they are not in the WP).

Honest and serious revolutionists confronted with the question of unity with another organization would take the trouble, once the question was raised, to find out the basic program of the opponent party with which unity was proposed; would follow the agitational press of that party to see what its position is on the basic questions of the day; to decide whether the differences that exist are or are not compatible with membership in one party; they would find out whether the members of the opponent party are willing to abide by the decisions of the majority; honest and serious revolutionists would propose a period of cooperation to decide whether unity will be followed by harmony in action.

It is more than ten months since the question of unity with the WP was raised and the leaders of our party, assuming that they did not know the position of the WP on the various ques-

tions listed, should have found it out a long time ago. But their interest was only in stalling; and now they list questions for discussion which, from the point of view of unity, have no meaning at all.

From the point of view of unity the attitude of the Workers Party to the war waged by the United States is of infinitely greater importance than its attitude to China. But the former question is not raised in the list of questions. From the point of view of unity the position of the Workers Party on the no-strike pledge is a thousand times more important than its attitude to the YPSL but that is not mentioned in the list of questions.

The sophists will say: “But we are listing only our differences.” That is correct and it is in listing all those differences which have no direct relationship to unity that the PC reveals its purpose.

What demands unity is the fact that both parties have the same fundamental anti-capitalist program; that both parties are agitating in favor of a labor party and for such transitional demands as nationalization of industry under workers’ control and for a rising scale of wages. What demands unity is that both parties defend the European revolution against Stalin and against the democratic imperialists.

As against the above questions upon which there is substantial agreement, the differences listed by the PC are secondary. In a healthy party there would always be enough differences among the membership so that, if listed by demagogues, they could fool the inexperienced into believing that no unity is possible.

Dishonesty and Monolithic Tendency

An honest opposition to a particular proposal for unity, no matter how wrong, would not be a crime. However, the attitude of the leadership of the majority to the question of unity is a thoroughly dishonest one.

There was a period when Cannon was perfectly honest on the question of unity. He was honest when he said “we must deepen the split.” He was honest when he said that there was nothing to discuss; that the press of the WP gave us all the information we need to see that unity is undesirable.

But when the majority leaders retreated from their position of open opposition to unity, they shifted to a completely dishonest position. When they began the farce of insisting on a discussion to probe all the differences, it was evident to the minority that the struggle for unity with the WP meant a struggle against a dishonest majority leadership.

It is tragic enough to see that leaders of a revolutionary party insist on continuing a split which necessarily is detrimental to the movement. The publication of two weekly agitational papers and of two monthly theoretical magazines; the duplication of effort, the confusion that two parties with similar positions on the main questions of the day creates in the minds of the advanced workers — all this is tragic enough.

But what is doubly tragic is that in a movement founded by a genius who is the very incarnation of integrity, a leadership relies not on an honest presentation of a position but on petty, dishonest maneuvers calculated only to fool the membership.

It is clear that a desire to build a monolithic party goes hand in hand with political dishonesty.

The minority recognizes that unity is out of the question in the coming period. A dishonest leadership plus an inexperienced membership constitute an insurmountable obstacle.

Unity is dead for the time being. The struggle for unity, for a revolutionary party — a living, thinking party — must go on.

May, 1946.

Albert Goldman Lydia Bennett Felix Morrow

Resolution of WIL (Johannesburg) on the SWP and WP Unity Negotiations.

Although the WIL is not yet officially a section of the Fourth International, we are however vitally interested in the discussions now proceeding in the SWP on unification with the WP and after examination of all available documents and material, the EC has taken the following stand:

1. That the SWP minority in 1940 was completely unjustified in splitting from the SWP and its action dealt a cruel blow to the Fourth International in a time of world crisis. In the principal ideological dispute of the Russian question we agree with Comrade Trotsky's characterization of Soviet Russia as a degenerated workers' state, yet worthy of unconditional defense against imperialist aggression. We reject the WP theory of the Russian state as being one of bureaucratic collectivism.

2. Although pointing out the petty bourgeois nature of the opposition in 1940 Trotsky sought to maintain the unity of the SWP and affirmed that the ideas of the minority were compatible with remaining inside the FI.

3. Six years after the split the minority organized in the WP has expressed its desire to reunite with the SWP and to take its place in the ranks of the only world party of socialist revolution — the Fourth International. During these six years of its independent existence, the WP has maintained a Leninist attitude to its own ruling class — calling for the continuation of the class struggle against American capitalism and its reactionary war. Burnham, the chief representative of the petty-bourgeois tendency, left the WP, and other petty-bourgeois members rubbed off their petty-bourgeois dusting by coming into close contact with the working class in the factories and army. This can give new impetus to the fusion of the two organizations and aid the building up of the mass Bolshevik revolutionary party for America.

4. The chief obstacle towards unity was the refusal of

the WP membership to subordinate themselves to the majority decision inside the SWP and to abide by the principles of democratic centralism. The move towards unity indicates a change of attitude and readiness to accept the principle of democratic centralism and to work as disciplined members in the carrying out of the programme and the policies of the SWP.

5. The unity of the two organizations is a progressive step in the development of the FI in America, a pooling of revolutionary resources which we fully support. It would also influence the International towards cohesion and give new strength to the struggling Trotskyist groups elsewhere and serve to discourage splits and fruitless division in the other Trotskyist groups.

6. We firmly believe that the ideas of the WP are compatible with membership in one organization with the SWP. The SWP has grown significantly during the war years and has brought the ideas of Trotskyism to increasing sections of the workers. Unity with the WP would remove a rival organization and clear up the confusion that the present co-existence of two Trotskyist parties with similar programmes must necessarily have created in the minds of the advanced workers of America.

7. In order to facilitate the fusion of the two parties we support the holding of joint membership meetings, the issuing of joint bulletins and the engaging in common action in trade unions, elections, etc. So that a firm and lasting unity can be achieved.

8. We strongly urge the SWP majority to bring about unity with the WP and in this way prevent any further split in the Trotskyist ranks. We also urge its minority not to split but to continue to work for the consolidation of all the revolutionary forces in America.

An Open Letter to the SWP Minority

By NICETO ANDRES, Argentina

In the present conditions of our movement, the more defeatist tendencies express themselves through the channel of your position. As we wrote in *El Militante* No. 18, the heritage of the past proletarian defeats has not been thoroughly liquidated in the Fourth International. This heritage manifests itself by defeatism in the practical ground, and revisionism in the theoretical.

Trotsky forecast it very sharply. In the Emergency Manifesto of 1940 he wrote: "If the bourgeois regime is allowed to escape freely from the war, all revolutionary parties will degenerate. If the proletarian revolution triumphs, the conditions which produce degeneration will disappear."

But the worst mistake in order to crush revisionist tendencies like yours would be a sectarian approach. We must not only expose the social roots of this revisionism, but also its political deviations, and mainly its underestimation of the true character of the revolutionary upsurge of the masses in Europe and elsewhere, in relation with the state of world capitalism today.

Petty bourgeois are always the same: they have no memory. A proletarian party could not win the battle against them by simply recalling similar deviations in 1905, 1917, 1923 and so

forth. They will always answer that the situation is not the same, that it is worse, that in 1917 the existence of a Bolshevik party made all the difference, etc. Because the petty bourgeoisie, as a social stratum, is disintegrating, and all its political conceptions are tinged with the idea — linked to this process of disintegration — that the situation is always "worse than ever." That is why the defeatist tendencies are always so strong in the petty bourgeois layers of a revolutionary movement.

This defeatism fights to express itself not only in the practical ground, as I said, but in the socio-political as well. If it is true that the revolutionary potential of the masses is nearly exhausted, that without an external "stimulating" factor like the Red October the proletariat is unable to give birth to mass revolutionary parties, then the logical consequence is that the revolutionary movement needs another pillar to stand on its feet. This pillar could be no other than the petty bourgeoisie. But the petty bourgeoisie is not looking for some changes or reforms which would check its disintegration, that is, which would save the bourgeois regime and the position of the petty bourgeoisie in it. Therefore, in order to gain the petty bourgeoisie, you have to make, concessions, "programmatic" conces-

sions, you have to stress the importance of "democratic" slogans, to emphasize that the proletariat is deeply demoralized and frustrated, that it is plagued with "parliamentary illusions," that an undetermined period of bourgeois democracy is opening in Europe, that the absence of a mass revolutionary party changes the character of the situation. You have to enter — right now! — in the Social Democratic parties.

It is no wonder that Morrow found himself in the close neighborhood of Shachtman and Johre. As a matter of fact, the theory of "bureaucratic collectivism" and the theory of "involution" are but twin sisters to the theory of Morrow that our whole strategy is false considering the absence of mass revolutionary parties.

* * *

One of the main characteristics of the petty bourgeoisie is its day-to-day life, without hope, without future. But in quotidian life only facts, strong realities, are important. In this light a tree is more important than a seed. Now, in the capitalist system we have that tree; in the socialist revolution we have that seed. The tree, with all its roots, branches and leaves, represents only the past. The seed represents the future. And in the light of History, which is tridimensional, this seed is all important.

But the petty bourgeoisie is "realistic," even if reality, as old Hegel said, has ceased to be rational. "You have no party? — you will say. Then have no hope. If you do not think so, you are children in politics, you have the infantile sickness. You are ultra-leftists."

Because the petty bourgeois consents to be called a revolutionist, but in the depth of his heart he does not believe in revolution, and he laughs at those who take it seriously. Revolutionary in words, counter-revolutionary in facts.

We do not need in the revolutionary movement such kind of realism, which is similar to the realism of Vandervelde, Kautsky & Co. That "realism" leads directly to frustration and capitulation. It does not weigh exactly the actual correlation of forces in the class struggle. It takes the facade of the building for the building itself. The "democratic" program of Morrow, his mature for "revision" consideration of the class nature of the USSR, are only the old Menshevik model, repaired and rebuilt for 1946 usage.

We do not need such "realistic" people in our movement. What we do need are "popular tribunes," even if they are a bit "fanatic." We need mass leaders, who believe in the people and know the language of the people. We need revolutionists who are not following the mood of the masses, but leading them. We need, in a word, true Bolshevik-Leninists.

* * *

In 1914-1916 Lenin and a handful of revolutionists found themselves isolated in the war-ravaged Europe. But they did not fall into despair. Lenin undertook to read Hegel and his dialectics. And it was not casual. Dialectics is the science of growth, of internal and external reciprocal action, of tension between the old forms and the new contents, of transformations, of jumps. Dialectics is the science of revolution. Lenin did not confer on the social-patriots more importance than they really had. He was the right stuff of a realistic leader. He fought them to the bitter end, because he knew that a deeper current was under way (See the comments on Hegel's Logic by Lenin: Guterman et Lefebvre, "Qu'est-ce la dialectique"). Lenin foresaw March 1917; he foresaw the possibility of repeating, on a higher historical level, the unique deeds of the Commune.

This handful of revolutionists was isolated. But they had

something. They had a true revolutionary seed. They had a program. And this program was something real, something that History proved to be more real than the vociferations of the Social-Democratic leaders. It was the program of Bolshevism, the program of the proletarian dictatorship.

* * *

We are also a handful of revolutionists. But we are in a far better position than the Bolsheviks were in 1914-1916. The crisis of the capitalist regime has reached its maximum. We have a far greater revolutionary upsurge ahead of us. We have all the invaluable theoretical traditions of Marxism to throw complete light into our most difficult problems. We have the program of the Fourth International. Really, it is difficult to be wronged. You can't fool us! We know what to do, and we do it. There is no room for pessimism and pessimists.

And just in this moment you, comrades of the Minority, repeat, under a new cover, the arguments of our modern Martov, Shachtman, against the Fourth International in Europe. But now it is impossible to deny the existence and strength of our European parties. Then the tune has had to be changed. Of course, there are some Trotskyists in the Old Continent, but they are extremists, they know nothing about the masses, they do not know how to establish close contact with them. Such monstrosity is being circulated by the Minority! Indeed, the revisionists hate the revolution and those who believe in it, "who foresee it in advance," who prepare themselves for it!

However, a rounded Marxist analysis of the world capitalism carries with it the inescapable conviction that the objective situation is mature for the socialist revolution. The problem of revolution is now a problem of building a revolutionary party. But in order to build this kind of a party we must expose and crush all defeatist tendencies which try to infiltrate into our own ranks. The crisis of mankind, which is the crisis of the proletarian leadership, has exploded in a crisis in our own International.

To organize the revolution — our main historical task — means to gather all revolutionary elements the situation actually contains. We do not need to create revolutionists. We only need to arm the proletariat, which is already revolutionary, with the program of Socialism. That is the core of our whole strategy.

Our tactics must be twofold: we have to combine the mobilization of the great masses, which, owing to the intensity and scope of their class action, are "objectively attacking capitalism," with the mobilization of the revolutionary vanguard, the class-conscious workers. But the possibility of this twofold mobilization determines a new disposition of forces, historically equivalent to the disposition we found in a minor scale in 1917. That is why such an abyss has suddenly opened between your position and ours. The Fourth International is now entering into the political arena, armed with its full-fledged, unbroken revolutionary program. And, as always in the critical moment, the ideologies of the petty bourgeoisie in our movement hesitate, tremble, and menace us with a split. The Plejanovs, Martinovs, Gorkis, Kautskys "c tutti quanti" reappear on the eleventh hour, in order to instill their own fears, their own defeatism, their own cowardice, into the cadres of the World Party of the Socialist Revolution.

These master tacticians will shout to us unceasingly: "The best strategy may be ruined by the lack of correct tactics!" As always, the revisionists misunderstand the Marxist analysis of the relationships between strategy and tactics. Because in order to act as true revolutionary leaders, you have first of all to grasp, and never let loose!, the fundamental strategy. And

afterwards, only afterwards, you will be able to draw the correct tactic slogans. To alter the order of these operations, to speak of tactics without permanently linking them to the program, is in practice to betray the program.

* * *

"It is not worthwhile to repeat every day fundamental programmatics!" you say. As a matter of fact, however, a real, ideological, professional leader of the proletariat has to repeat, in a thousand ways, under a thousand different angles, for a thousand different applications to the daily struggle, the fundamentals of our program. "The theoretic tradition of a revolutionary party cannot be maintained without a periodic reiteration of the fundamentals" (L. Trotsky, in the letter accompanying the Emergency Manifesto.).

Our new revisionists should read again Lenin's articles and pamphlets in 1917! They are nothing more than untiring, energetic, systematic reiterations of the programmatic fundamentals, in the conditions of the Russian revolution.

And now, when our main task is the expansion of the cadres, the building of mass parties, every political resolution must be written in such a language as to propel the party cadres to broaden and to intensify their activity, to convert themselves into mass agitators, on the steel basis of our program. We are not ultra-leftists because we repeat in our political resolutions that the objective conditions for the socialist revolution exist, and that the bell is ringing. That is sound, revolutionary party politics. Those who are unable to understand it, those who are not willing to surpass the propaganda epoch, are of scarce value in a Bolshevik organization like ours.

* * *

The starting point for Morrow's criticism was the role of the Allied imperialism in Europe, which should have provoked a vigorous revival of the bourgeois-democratic illusions of the masses. Just a few dollars and some pounds of bread, and the masses will enter blindly into the channels of parliamentarism, forgetting the program of the Socialist Revolution, at least for some time! Thus spoke Felix Morrow.

Indeed, our English Party is right when asserting that a partial recovery has begun in Europe. But did this economic recovery run counter to the revolutionary upsurge of the European masses? Not at all. Not for the devil. This partial recovery, which must be sketched "within the general framework of decline," "does not contradict general revolutionary perspective" (RCP), making it only more organic. The dynamics of social struggles is far more complex than the mechanistic

scheme drawn by Felix Morrow. We must read Trotsky again, comrades of the Minority! Certain historical facts cannot be explained by a simple appeal to economic factors (See "The Great Organizer"). There is a certain inertia of the political events in relation to economics, so that in acute crisis only, in a general way can we resort to economics, and the concrete explanation must be sought in the direct inter-relations of the political superstructures. Marxism has nothing in common with the reduction of politics to economics. As always, the revisionist tendencies, which begin by stressing the importance of the subjective factor, end in the roughest kind of economic determinism. And this is not strange, as it simply reflects the essentially "mixed" characteristic of the philosophy of the middle class, its irrealism combined with its servile attitude towards facts which overwhelm it, and which it does not understand.

The comrades of the Majority are true when they say that a question of method is underlying all this discussion. You, comrades of the Minority, are not using the method of dialectic materialism. Your method is a combination of political hysteria and profound distrust in the masses. All our movement must understand that. As Comrade E. R. Frank says: "What is involved is actually not a dispute over this or that tactical or secondary question, but a struggle over the very fundamentals of our program and tradition."

We maintain the perspective of Trotsky, when he said in 1938 that within 10 years the Fourth International would lead the millions. This was not an empty phrase. Leon Trotsky was a Marxist, a scientific revolutionist; he was not trying to fool us. We maintain that his perspective is still correct, that nothing could authorize us to revise it. We made errors, no doubt. But, as the International Conference clearly pointed it, they were not errors in the fundamental perspective. But your errors, comrades of the Minority, have been of a completely different nature. You have yielded to the pressure of petty bourgeois moods. You have tried to incite our instrument of analysis, our main weapon in the struggle! You have tried to revise the program of the Fourth International.

Now, I must finish. The tasks in the Argentine movement are very great, and I have not very much time left. But you will hear from us again. We will wage a merciless war against all revisionists, here, there and everywhere. This is the indispensable prerequisite for the building of a healthy, strong world revolutionary party.

Long live the Fourth International!

Buenos Aires, July 15, 1946.

(For the PC: This letter represents only the personal views of the writer. N. A.)

How to Distort Democratic Centralism

By DAN SHELTON and EUGENE SHAYS

The SWP majority continuously parades as the guardian of democratic centralism as against an undisciplined, disloyal minority. The following incident, small as it may seem in itself, is highly symptomatic and grossly revealing of the majority's real and sordid attitude toward the very concept of democratic centralism.

Informed by WP comrades that their May 1946 National Convention was open to SWP comrades, the undersigned went to see Comrade Thomas in his capacity of City Organizer to discover if there were any objections to our attending the convention. We informed Comrade Thomas that although we wanted to take advantage of the opportunity to learn more about the political life of the WP, we would see to it that our attending some of the sessions would not interfere with our

branch or other SWP activities. We also told Comrade Thomas that having always disagreed with Comrade Goldman's concept of "independent activity" we wanted to go through regular party channels and not act on our own. We were told by Comrade Thomas that he himself could not pass on the issue but that we should call him up Monday morning (the day the convention opened) at which time he would let us know if there were any objections. Having agreed to this seemingly innocuous procedure, we called Comrade Thomas Monday morning and got the startling, if still innocent-sounding reply, that "in view of the importance of the question," the matter would have to be taken up at the next PC meeting. The following conversation then ensued:

I: "Well, if you insist on taking it up at the next PC

meeting, that's O.K. with us. When will the next meeting be held?"

Thomas: "The next PC meeting will take place Tuesday a week."

After this, of necessity, a pause occurred, as one had to "recover from the shock." The call took place on Monday, May 27. The Convention was to last from May 27 to Thursday, May 30. The PC meeting was to take place Tuesday a week, i.e., on June 4th, 5 days after the close of the convention.

I: "You mean to say you will pass on the question whether or not we can attend the convention, five days after its close?"

Thomas: "There is nothing else we can do. We cannot change the date of the meeting."

I: "If that is so, would we be violating any party decision if we attended the convention anyway?"

Thomas: "I am sorry, I can't tell you that. You will have to wait for the next PC meeting."

Let those who wish, laugh at the "cleverness" of this maneuver on the part of the majority. Serious comrades both in the majority as well as in the International will realize the vicious, bureaucratic, dishonest distortion of democratic centralism implicit in this sordid affair.

Everyone realizes that had there been the will, the way would have been found to inform us before the close of the convention of the SWP's attitude. Comrade Thomas himself could have made a decision; and if not, any three leading majority comrades could have made a decision on this so secondary matter. Referring the matter to a PC meeting to be held almost a week later is simply another "clever maneuver" on the part of the majority.

We are now told, subsequently, of the majority's discovery that the WP invitation was meant only for the SWP minority, and that, therefore, they could not act on it. If this was the WP's attitude, we did not know about it. But apart from Thomas's complete silence on any such aspect of the question at the time, this "argument" is not only an obvious and subsequent attempt to cover up a previously committed crime, but is also irrelevant to the issue involved. For even if true, it was still the majority's responsibility to act on this matter. Neither before, nor at the PC meeting in question nor at any PC meeting since, has the party taken a stand on the question. We still do not know, if we could have attended the WP convention. (!) This alone shows the spuriousness of the majority's "new" argument.

The majority's failure to make a decision until after the convention and its reliance on the minority's observing a non-

existent party line, have nothing in common with democratic centralism. They represent a distortion of the very concept.

Democratic centralism not only implies the observance by a minority of the party lines, rules, etc. however odious to them, as laid down by the majority for the party — it also imposes the obligation on the majority to use the democratic processes, to set rules and to determine party line. It must not sabotage the democratic process. It must not "rule" by failure to rule; it must not "decide" by failure to make a decision; nor by postponing a decision until after the event.

The majority is fond of reminding the minority of its duties in relation to democratic centralism. It is high time that it be reminded of its own duties in relation to the workings of the democratic process in the party. In this instance, by having failed in its responsibilities in relation to democratic centralism, the majority — by failing to act — has acted in a disloyal, non-Bolshevik manner.

The conclusion is unavoidable that the majority leadership's righteous indignation concerning Goldman's violations of discipline must be taken with a grain of salt. Apparently the majority is not so much a guardian over democratic centralism and its inviolability as it is a guardian over its factional interests, in the service of which democratic centralism is then used or misused. For in this case, the majority dealt with comrades who had broken with Goldman on this very question and now proceeded to get the party's "permission," instead of engaging in "independent" activity. The majority's answer to these comrades is clear: "We are unwilling to use democratic processes if it is not in our interests. We prefer not to act at all."

It is this failure to act which prompts us to say that democratic centralism has been violated. Had there been adverse action taken on our request, the majority would have exposed itself to the ridicule of serious and political comrades everywhere (rivalling the CP's infamous concept of "You must not talk to Trotskyists") but it would have committed no crime against the concept on which the party is built — democratic centralism. In failing to act at all, the majority once again revealed its true attitude for all those who have eyes to see: Democratic centralism is to be manipulated with and tampered with in the interest of their faction. It is the faction, and not democratic centralism which is supreme. All their "righteous wrath" over the minority cannot hide this unpleasant fact. Given a few more of these "clever maneuvers" on the part of the majority, we may be certain that comrades also in other countries will understand what we mean when we talk about bureaucratism and monolithism inside the SWP.

The Militant's Record on Stalinist Foreign Policy

By EUGENE SHAYS and DAN SHELTON

"It is indispensable to warn the masses tirelessly of the generally reactionary character of the Kremlin's policy, and of those dangers it bears for the occupied countries." (Trotsky, In Defense of Marxism, p. 133.)

The purpose of this article is to demonstrate the complete deformation and distortion which the concept of the "Defense of the Soviet Union" has undergone at the hands of the present SWP leadership.

We have made a detailed and systematic study of The Militant, from the end of the European war (May 1945) until the present moment (June 1946). By direct references to each article dealing in whatever form with the Kremlin's role and policies, we shall prove by the Militant's own record that:

1. Except in formal resolutions, the defense of the S.U. in the party press has turned into a capitulation to Stalinism.

2. The Militant has consistently and bureaucratically violated our 1944 convention resolution which relegates the defense of the S. U. into the background and pushes to the fore the defense of the European revolution against all its enemies including the Stalinists.

The method used to establish these two key criticisms, will simply consist of (a) an enumeration of the main crimes committed against the socialist revolution by Stalin in the course of the year since the end of the European war (as reported in the world press), and (b) the record of The Militant on each of these crimes.

1. THE USSR AND THE DISMANTLING OF FACTORIES

A large part of the industries in countries occupied by the USSR have been stripped, dismantled and shipped to Russia. In Czechoslovakia, the official figure is over 20% of all industry; in Poland, over 30%. These are "allied" countries. In Austria and German (now Polish) Silesia, the figures are correspondingly higher. In Manchuria (containing 70% of China's heavy industries), heavy industry in the Mukden area is almost 100% stripped; the Fushun mining area is stripped of all its electrical and modern mining equipment. In Germany more than 50% of all productive capacity in the USSR zone has been removed. The same policy was followed in Rumania, Hungary and Korea.

The objective resultant has been the de-proletarianization of large parts of the working class, the lowering of the standard of living of the masses, the condemnation of the country to social and political stagnation and, thus, the creation of grave obstacles in the path of the coming socialist revolution.

The bourgeois press, for its own reasons has carried literally thousands of documented items of reporting on this question. What has *The Militant* carried?

With the exception of three articles by the SWP minority (one by Goldman, two by Morrow) in 56 issues of *The Militant*, there appeared only the following:

July 14, 1946: Allied Looting of Germany (unsigned) deals with both US and USSR; very brief, factual only, a re-write job from bourgeois newspapers, no interpretation.

Aug. 25, 1945: NC Statement on "USSR in China" has not a single reference to the USSR's looting of China and Manchuria!

Aug. 18, 1945: International News; Austrian factories looted by USSR; brief, factual only, no interpretation.

Dec. 8, 1945: Austrian Elections (unsigned) correctly relates losses of CP at polls to Stalin's policy which includes looting of factories. Reference is thus nothing more than incidental to the main argument of the article on losses of CP at elections.

There is not a single reference to any looting of factories in the 1946 *Militant*; no reference in either 1945 or 1946 to looting of factories in Manchuria, Hungary, Rumania, Korea, etc.

2. USSR AND FORCED LABOR

Millions of physically fit men and women, war prisoners and nationals of "defeated enemy nations" have been deported to the USSR and put to forced labor in concentration camps. Among them are tens of thousands of political opponents of the Stalin regime.

Inside the USSR, whole peoples have been declared "collaborators" and shipped to Siberia (Tartars, Volga-Germans, etc.) Torture and malnutrition has resulted in the death of literally hundreds of thousands of these modern slaves.

In addition to impeding the revolutionary upsurge by removing, demoralizing and killing off millions of workers and peasants, and alienating the rest of the working class, this Stalinist crime must be opposed by socialists as the most cruel and brutalized type of human slavery yet perfected. The enslavement of man, and socialism, the freeing of man, are mutually exclusive.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, except for two of the above mentioned articles by Goldman and Morrow, there is not a single reference to forced labor. There is no reference ever to forced labor of war prisoners and political opponents in all the countries occupied by the USSR.

3. USSR AND THE SEIZURE OF TERRITORY

The following countries were occupied and were incorporated into the USSR: Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Eastern Poland, Bessarabia, Bukovina, Moldavia, Carpatho-Ukraine, Eastern Prussia, Karelo-Finland, Petsamo, Tanno-Tuva, Southern Sakhalin, Kuerlies.

In addition, thru occupation troops and police rule, the following areas have been occupied: Rumania, Hungary, parts of Austria and Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Poland, and half of Korea.

As Marxists, we must oppose this violation of the right of self-determination of the countries involved.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, the following references appeared:

June 2, 1945: Relations between US and USSR (Li Fu-je) in passing calls Stalin's aims "counter-revolutionary" but there is no condemnation whatsoever of Stalin's seizures of territories!

Aug. 25, 1945: NC Statement on USSR and China "explains" Stalin's "defensive expansionism" (!), opposes it only (!) because of — "bad results"!

Sept. 1, 1945: Editorial condemnation of Stalin's seizures in the Far East. But the "expansionism" is explained solely as a "defensive" one.

May 11, 1946: Carsten states that "the extension of USSR domination prevents the stabilization of capitalist relations and powers." This unqualified statement leads the reader to think that these seizures are to be welcomed. Further, Stalin wants spheres of influence only as a defensive measure, but, (according to Carsten) no effective defense can thus be built. Presumably, this is Stalin's crime — a crime in military logistics!

May 18, 1946: "Korean Labor Pleads for Aid Against Brutal U. S. Rule" (unsigned) — but presumably not against brutal USSR rule, for the USSR is not even mentioned! Whoever relies exclusively on *The Militant* for his news does not even know up to the present moment that the USSR occupied half of Korea.

This is the entire record of *The Militant* on Stalin's seizures of territories.

4. USSR AND REPARATIONS:

The USSR has demanded and was granted by the Allied imperialists reparations from Germany in the form of machinery. Entire industries have been made inoperative by the loss. The SU has demanded \$100,000,000 in reparations from Italy and has just been granted payments out of current Italian production. Crushing reparations have been imposed on Rumania, Hungary and Finland.

Marxists are opposed to the very concept of reparations which holds the people of a country responsible for the crimes of the capitalist class. Reparations are a blow at internationalism. Our slogan must be the Bolshevik slogan of "No annexations, no reparations!"

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, there has appeared nothing whatsoever on this question.

5. USSR AND ECONOMIC AGGRANDIZEMENT

In the spring of 1944, a secret treaty was concluded by the USSR with Churchill, assigning special spheres of influence in Southeastern Europe to Russia and to England.

Thruout the Nuremberg trials there have been constant references to secret economic treaties between the USSR and Hitler Germany, assigning spheres of influence in Eastern Europe and Asia Minor, agreements concerning machinery to be delivered by the USSR and other help to be extended to Ger-

many. These references have been diligently suppressed by the Russian prosecutor.

Joint stock companies have been and are being created in Manchuria, Rumania, Austria, Hungary, etc. under the pressure of the USSR, giving the latter control over the wealth falling under these agreements.

Marxists are opposed to such imperialist acts as the establishment of spheres of influence, exploiting the peoples, deciding the fate of peoples without their consent. These are characteristic methods of the imperialist division of the world.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, there appeared **nothing** on this topic.

6. THE USSR'S TERROR-RULE IN THE OCCUPIED COUNTRIES

The USSR enforces its rule everywhere thru the agency of the NKVD; thru fraudulent elections; by imposing CP-dominated governments upon people whose vote was overwhelmingly opposed to CP rule (Hungary, Rumania, Germany); by the re-opening of concentration camps (Buchenwald, Sachsenhausen); by deportation and arrests; by suppressing and demoralizing opponents; by postponing elections (Bulgaria, Rumania); by lawless evictions; by torture, murder and the third-degree; by the ever-present threat of the "Red" Army; by the threat of loss of ration cards etc.

Such police dictatorships are but a reflection of the internal regime in the USSR and must be mercilessly exposed before the working class.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, except for the above mentioned article on Poland by Goldman, *The Militant* carried this single reference:

July 28, 1945: International News: Tito — a police dictatorship, no freedom.

There was nothing further in either 1945 or 1946.

7. USSR AND FORCED MIGRATIONS

The Kremlin has mercilessly carried thru forced migrations in various European countries. These migrations have caused millions upon millions, mostly peasants and workers, unspeakable sufferings and degradations. Involved were and are: Germans who within 24 hours had to evacuate Poland; Poles who had to move into German territories, annexed to Poland; Sudeten Germans who had to leave Bohemia; Hungarians who had to leave Czecho-Slovakia and Transylvania; peoples within the USSR; and innumerable "minor" migrations, involving other nationalities, especially those of the Baltic states.

This brutal violation of the right of self-determination of these peoples must be opposed and denounced by the socialist movement.

In 56 issues of *The Militant* there appeared the following:

Oct. 6, 1495: 4 million Germans expelled from Eastern Germany by — (says *The Militant*) — Poles!!! (not by order of the Kremlin, by any chance!); even this is one paragraph only, buried in an article on a different topic, facts only, **no comment or condemnation!**

No other references, either in 1945 or 1946!

8. THE USSR'S ROLE IN PREPARING THE NEXT WAR

By its policy of armed aggression, intimidation and suppression of small nations; by its nationalist-chauvinistic terror-rule in occupied countries; by its police-state methods and dictatorial acts in its vassal states and the labor movement, the

Kremlin, as much as the imperialists, is laying the foundations for the next world war.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, the following appeared:

June 2, 1945: Relations between US and USSR (Li Fu-je) denounces US at length; then makes passing references to Stalin's "counter-revolutionary" aims in Europe.

Dec. 15, 1945: Sen. Wheeler attacks the USSR (Hansen); a re-write job on Wheeler's speech, written to defend the USSR. — Not a single reference or mention of any of Stalin's crimes!

March 9, 1946: Hansen explains that (a) Workers must oppose US imperialism (b) Workers must oppose the Stalinists — "in the labor movement." (c) The workers must defend the USSR in case of war. A big sub-head reads: "Defend the SU." **Not a word of condemnation!**

March 16, 1946: U.S. prepares war (Hansen) correctly exposes U.S. Then "In the face of this unbridled assault on the SU, the Kremlin is at an extreme disadvantage." Why? — because it always denied the danger of a third war, thereby disorienting the workers. Presumably Stalin's alarms now have corrected this previous omission.

March 23, 1946: "Wall St. Hurls Reactionary Barrage at USSR" (Carsten). In a long and detailed article, there is a single paragraph on Stalin, buried in the text.

March 29, 1946: Preparations for anti-Soviet war (Carsten); 25 paragraphs directed against the U.S., one paragraph against Stalin's "brutal policy of aggression." Except for this generality, not a single detailed charge or condemnation is made.

April 6, 1946: Iran used to further war on USSR (Wright), First page, lead article. Exposes U. S. Stalin not mentioned, except for his "crime" — what crime? "Painting up the UNO as peace instrument." Nothing further.

April 13, 1946: Long article on War danger; (unsigned); no reference to Stalin's role or crimes.

April 20, 1946: U.S. prepares war (Carsten), not a single word on Stalin.

May 4th, 1946: Carsten refers to U.S.'s building a ring of steel around the USSR. Exposes U.S. Not a single word against Stalin.

May 11, 1946: Paris Foreign Minister Conference (Carsten) sub-head: "Imperialists Blame USSR." "Imperialists are attempting to lay the entire blame for deadlock on USSR." No attempt made to show Kremlin shares the blame.

May 18, 1946: Carsten finds U. S. "blaming" USSR for breakdown of peace negotiations. Except for one abstract statement — Stalin's engaging in "power politics" — there is nothing else on Stalinist policy.

In none of the articles mentioned is there so much as a hint that Stalin may carry at least part of the responsibility of bringing on the next war: On the contrary, the entire onus for World War III is placed on the imperialists. To clinch this charge, one need only mention Gray's cartoon (March 16, 1946) on "Preparing for World War III" showing Truman, Churchill and Bevin playing with the Atom Bomb. Stalin is absent. Apparently he is to be the innocent victim of that bomb.

9 USSR AND IRAN

The Big Three forced a treaty on Iran in 1942 permitting their troops to be stationed there until 6 months after the end of the war. After this date, Russian troops remained giving a vague pretext ("elucidation of the situation"). They also charged that Iran was threatening war on the USSR (!). Stalin

manufactured a carefully planned "revolt" against the Teheran government, put pressure on it with the help of troop movements and reinforcements, and finally compelled it to grant important economic concessions, spheres of influence, monopoly on its northern oil resources.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, there appeared the following:

March 23, 1946: Wall St. Hurls Reactionary Barrage at SU (Carsten). The entire article is devoted to Iran: headline thus suggests that whatever may be said against Stalin is reactionary nonvoodoo. This impression is heightened by the absence of any reference to Stalin's crimes in Iran except for a small paragraph, buried in the text.

March 30, 1946: Iran (Carsten) 25 paragraphs against the U.S., one against Stalin.

April 6, 1946: Wright, on the first page, lead article — Iran used for war preparations against the USSR. Exposes U.S.; refers ironically to the "pitiful plight of 'Poor Little Iran'" (!) This reference to "Poor Little Iran" is in quotation marks in Wright's text to show that he is making fun of the imagined complaints of Iran. What, then, is Stalin's crime in this connection? "To paint up the UNO as a peace instrument." (!!) Not a single word more!

April 13, 1946: (unsigned) one line; "Stalin exerts pressure on Iranian government" in a long article. No condemnation. Nothing further.

May 4th, 1946: (Carsten) once again refers to "Poor Little Iran" (quotation marks his!) Not a single word against Stalin.

The above is the complete record of *The Militant* on the Iranian issue.

10. THE USSR'S RULE IN GERMANY

The USSR, as much as its imperialist accomplices, has brought misery and starvation to its zone in Germany. It has looted machinery, dismantled entire factories. It dragged off millions to slave labor. It kept the country at starvation levels and rules by brute dictatorial force. These undeniable crimes of the Kremlin must be exposed in our press.

In 56 issues of *The Militant* there appeared the following:

May 26, 1945: (Hansen) "Allies Impose Barbarous Rule on Germany" contains 1) one passing reference to Allies' "Kremlin accomplices," 2) all of long article devoted to denunciation of US and England. Not a single word more on Stalin!

July 7, 1945: CP opposes Soviets in Germany (Abbott) but not a single reference to Stalin's policies in Germany.

Oct. 6, 1945: "Allied Rule in Germany" — generalities only.

Nov. 10, 1945: "Allied Rule in Germany" (Varlin) exposes US, not a single reference to the USSR!

April 6, 1946: Starvation in Germany (unsigned) eloquent about US and England, completely silent about the USSR!:

April 27, 1946: an especially odious example of an almost explicit capitulation to Stalinism: Two articles on the same page.

1) "Kremlin Policy in Germany" — under this comprehensive title, the "Kremlin's policy" is outlined as: a) bringing soviets (incidentally contradicting Abbott's July 7th article: "CP opposes Soviets in Germany"!) b) creating factory democracy c) worker's seizures of factories. Nothing further.

2) "US Imperialism Brings Starvation to Germany" (Varlin). The juxtaposition of such two articles on one page is tendentious in the extreme. Apparently one of the occupying powers brings factory democracy, while the other powers bring starvation!

This is the complete record of *The Militant* on this topic.

11. USSR AND THE MERGER OF THE GERMAN CP AND SDP

As in Eastern Europe and Korea, so in its zone in Germany, the SU has compelled the merger of the Social-Democratic parties with the CP, resulting in the dominance of the CP. The merger in Germany was attended by an overwhelming vote of the SDP members against the merger (7:1) and by the last-minute prevention of the balloting in the Soviet sector of Berlin, in which half the Berlin SDP membership reside. It was further attended by the reactivation of the concentration camps of Buchenwald and Sachsenhausen where actual and potential opponents of the merger were imprisoned, as well as by the terror of the NKVD and police.

Imposed by brute force, the merger strengthens the hands of the Stalinists, puts a party based on totalitarian principles at the head of the masses, and thereby adds to the difficulties of the German workers in creating the preconditions for a struggle.

We must oppose such a merger.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, there appeared nothing on this issue.

12. USSR AND POLITICAL ASYLUM

The USSR has taken a definite stand against the granting of political asylum in the post-war period. In the UNO, the SU demanded that persons not wanting to return to their countries of origin should receive international assistance only with that country's consent; that "no propaganda" be allowed against the idea of returning home (a limitation of political freedom) and that no aid should be given to any refugee hostile to any of the United Nations. The SU has advocated forced repatriation of its political opponents who come from Eastern Europe. (The Czech government was forced to return 50,000 refugees from the Carpatho-Ukraine.)

The SU's shameful betrayal of this elementary human right of asylum — ever defended by Marxists — must be exposed in our press.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, there was not a single reference to this problem.

13. THE CONDUCT OF THE RED ARMY

Twenty years of life under Stalinist barbarism have left their mark on the "Red" Army soldiers. Fed on the reactionary ideology of chauvinism and revenge, they entered into new territories as rapacious conquerors. Brutalities against the population, plunder, rape and widespread looting are on the order of the day. Living off the countryside like locusts, confiscating the peasant's produce and land, and thereby further depleting already catastrophically low food supplies, the Soviet soldier incurs to an ever greater degree the wrath of the population. As a policing agent of the Stalinist bureaucracy — by crushing opposition, suppressing workers uprisings, etc. — the "Red" Army's ideology is chauvinistic and reactionary; its tasks are counter-revolutionary and anti-internationalist.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, there was not a single reference to this topic.

14. USSR AND THE FOOD PROBLEM

With food being the first and last issue confronting the peoples of Europe and Asia, the SU has its occupation troops live off the land. The SU has offered no plan by which even a minimum ration of food can be guaranteed to these people. In Austria, the Kremlin exacted first a levy of 60,000 tons of

wheat. It then confiscated vast areas in the richest agricultural section for the cultivation of the Army's food supply. While the masses in all Soviet-occupied countries starve, the SU shipped cereals to France amidst great publicity purely to strengthen its agents there. It bribes potential political adherents with food and allows extra rations to CP members. By dismantling industries vital to the production of agricultural machinery and machine parts, it forces the peasants of Eastern Europe into virtual idleness, further aggravating both present and future food shortages.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, there is, except for one article by Morrow, not a single reference whatsoever, to the problem.

15. USSR AND TURKEY

In an even more brazen and undisguised manner than in Iran, the USSR demanded from Turkey the cession of large parts of territory (Kars and Ardahan) and the establishment of spheres of influence in Northern Turkey. The pretext given was the preparations by Turkey for an "anti-Soviet" war. As in Iran, such policies must be opposed.

In 56 issues of *The Militant*, there was not a single reference to the topic.

CONCLUSIONS

An objective perusal of the above record of *The Militant* from May 1945 to June 1946 constitutes the most damning indictment of our party policy at the present moment. The Kremlin has entered upon the European scene as a ruthless conqueror, a bloody oppressor, a grandiose looter and a robber par excellence. It rules by terror and assassination. By its criminal policies, its rapacious conduct and its Ghengis Khan-like demeanor, it has dealt and is dealing terrible blows to the European and ultimately, the world revolution. It denied the right to self-determination to all its conquered peoples. It demanded and extracted spheres of influences, "bilateral" trade agreements, raw material concessions in the best imperialist style. It drowned the independent working class movements in blood and "convinced" its political opponents by means of the NKVD and the hangman's noose. It added untold millions of war prisoners, workers and peasants, political opponents of all nationalities, to its own vast reservoir of forced labor. It looted the countryside bringing starvation to the masses as much as it looted the factories in the cities, undermining the economic foundations of the very class destined to lead mankind out of chaos — the proletariat. It trampled democratic and political freedom underfoot. It denied the most fundamental rights to political refugees and demanded their forcible return to their home countries. In short—it brought the reality of Soviet Russian life today to the masses of Europe and the Far East.

In the face of this almost unending list of crimes against the socialist revolution, the record of *The Militant* is both pitiful and criminal indeed. *The Militant* has failed in its revolutionary task to tell the truth.

The attacks on the Kremlin in whatever few manifestos or resolutions which appeared in *The Militant* were purely perfunctory and hence, meaningless, since the line was not carried out in the party's propaganda and press.

The objective resultant of the party press's failure to in any way adequately deal with the Kremlin's crimes thus becomes, at least implicitly or by omission, a capitulation to Stalinism on the part of the Trotskyist movement.

What remains is to uncover the roots of this terrible record

of the party press. There is probably no comrade in the party, be he majorityite or minorityite, who is not aware of the fact that — without a resolution to signal a change of line — the majority leadership in its dealings with Stalinism is proceeding from the fundamental premise that an Anglo-American war against the USSR is imminent. Hence, the defense of the USSR is placed again in the foreground of our propaganda. Further proof of this contention is to be found in the fact that *The Militant's* record on the SU is slightly better for 1945, and gets progressively worse in 1946 when the SWP majority began to be convinced of the "imminence" of war. The Convention resolution on the SU (October 1944) —accepted only under the pressure of Comrade Natalia and the SWP minority, and proclaiming the receding into the background of the slogan of defense of the SU—has now been buried quietly in the backyard. Bureaucratically, without consent or knowledge of the party, the line was changed. Given the "imminence" of a new war, the slogan of defense of the SU is suddenly back in the foreground; the slogan of the defense of the European revolution against all its enemies has receded into the background. Presumably, as far as the majorityites are concerned, the European revolution is off the agenda for the moment and is to be preceded by the war against the USSR. For if it was not, how could the "imminence" of a war against a trustworthy accomplice in putting down the revolution be otherwise explained?

We shall not enter here into a discussion of the SWP majority's ludicrous position on the "imminence" of war, for such discussion is irrelevant to the subject: **Regardless** of the majority's position on the present world situation, their concept of a defense of the SU still has nothing in common with Trotsky's concept of the defense of the SU. Let us recall certain key formulations of his interpretation of defense of the SU and counterpose to them *The Militant's* role during the past year.

1. However progressive the statification of industry in Soviet-occupied territory, "this does not alter the generally reactionary character of the Kremlin's policy," which it is "indispensable to tirelessly warn the masses against." (In *Defense of Marxism*, p. 133.)

When has *The Militant* ever "tirelessly" pointed this out?

2. "The defense of the USSR coincides for us with the preparation of world revolution. Only those methods are permissible which do not conflict with the interests of the revolution. The defense of the USSR is related to the world socialist revolution as a tactical task is related to a strategic one. A tactic is subordinated to a strategic goal and in no case can be in contradiction to the latter." (In *Defense of Marxism*, pp. 17, 18.)

When did *The Militant* point out to the masses that the Kremlin's occupation of Eastern Europe, Germany, and the Far East is "in contradiction" to the strategic goal of world revolution?

3. "The primary political criterion for us is not the transformation of property relations in this or another area, however important these may be in themselves, but rather the change in the consciousness and organization of the world proletariat, the raising of their capacity for defending former conquests and accomplishing new ones. From this one — and the only decisive standpoint — the policies of Moscow, taken as a whole, completely retain their reactionary character and remain the chief obstacle on the road to the world revolution." (In *Defense of Marxism*, p. 19.)

When did *The Militant* point this out??

4. "The statification of the means of production is a progressive measure, but its progressiveness is relative; its specific weight depends on the sum total of all the other factors.

Thus, we must first and foremost establish that the extension of the territory dominated by bureaucratic autocracy and parasitism, cloaked by 'socialist' measures, can augment the prestige of the Kremlin, engender illusions concerning the possibility of replacing the proletarian revolution by bureaucratic maneuvers, and so on. This evil by far outweighs the progressive content of Stalinist reforms." (In *Defense of Marxism*, p. 19.)

When did *The Militant* "first and foremost" point this out??

5. "We were and remain against seizures of new territory by the Kremlin." (In *Defense of Marxism*, p. 20.)

Again on Nuremberg and the Church

By JOHN FREDERICKS

On April 8, 1946, I submitted a document to the Political Committee of the party for publication in the *Internal Bulletin* and for discussion in the party. To date, June 25, that document has not been published and no discussion has taken place around it. Since history does not stand still, and events in this epoch occur with lightning-like rapidity, it now becomes necessary to restate my position on two of the topics contained in my "New Issues for Discussion". This is necessitated by the non-publication of my document.

The fact that the Political Committee did not publish my article sooner makes it now read like a distortion of the facts. Its publication now, after a lapse of 3 months, constitutes a gross misrepresentation of the condition I described at the time. This period has been used by the leadership to change the line that I have criticized.

Events and criticisms lose all meaning if published out of the period for which they were written. I can find no valid excuse for this delay other than the desire of the leadership to correct themselves before publishing my document.

I can only hope that future discussion articles will find more prompt publication and discussion in the party ranks. If a 3-month pre-convention discussion period is to be anything but a farce, then prompt publication of articles becomes a prerequisite for any healthy discussion.

I ask therefore, that the party read my article with the date, April 8, in mind.

THE NUREMBERG TRIALS

The question of utilizing the Nuremberg Trials for the purpose of further exposing the slanders of the Stalinists against our party and Leon Trotsky was first raised by our British Section in a letter to the SWP dated December 23, 1945. The first public notice given the world that the SWP had a position on the matter came in the May 18 issue of *The Militant*, 5 months late! In the meantime a number of other Trotskyist Parties in Europe, notably the French, Belgian and Dutch Sections of the Fourth International, took up the campaign and secured the signatures of prominent literary and political people to petitions addressed to the Nuremberg court. In this country a long list of over 100 prominent signers sent a petition to the court. Until May 18, in spite of the invitation to participate in this petition, in spite of the fact that we should have initiated such a petition, the leadership did absolutely nothing!

Now we have a position. Now the party is told about the issue. If my article provoked the leadership into doing something then it has had an effect. Let us see what the statement contains.

First let me ask a few pertinent questions. Why do we label the American Petition the "Thomas-Woll" Statement? The petition was the work of Jack Weber, former member of the

When did *The Militant* point this out?

For more than one entire year, the party press, under the compulsion of a completely distorted concept of the defense of the SU, has objectively, both by what it said and what it omitted, defended Russian foreign policy. It has done so, furthermore, in violation of the party's own 1944 resolution on the SU. It is high time that the party press began to espouse a Trotskyist interpretation of the USSR's role in Europe and the Far East instead of objectively capitulating to a Stalinist interpretation.

NC of the SWP, James T. Farrell, Meyer Schapiro, Sidney Hook and Max Shachtman. Do you think that either Thomas or Matthew Woll would either initiate such a petition or collect the necessary signatures? Why did we refuse to participate? Why did we not draw up a petition of our own? We find the clue in Stein's statement that he does not believe the former Dewey Committee's intervention is realistic. In other words he felt that the party was unable, because of its isolation, to attract any number of signers to such a petition. Here we have a confession that the SWP has isolated itself from all the intellectuals of the country. What a confession!

Who stopped the party from demanding that a representative of Natalia Trotsky be sent to the trial? Apparently no one.

In a letter from M. Stein to Al Goldman dated Feb. 18, 1946, he stated, "The approach of the English Comrades appears to be one of an attempt to vindicate Trotsky. This we believe, is false. It is particularly bad to call on officials of the Nuremberg Trials to intervene in order to prove the truth of the Moscow Trials." Yet the May 18 Statement in *The Militant* says, "The Nuremberg Trials and the campaign around them initiated by the British Trotskyists, have served to expose the Moscow Trials as Frame-Ups once again."

Why does the American leadership attack the British Party internally in order to cover their own incorrect position, and then pretend in the press that they think the idea was a good one? The truth of the matter is simple. The British Section, and the majority of the Fourth International for that matter, were more correct than our American leadership in this matter. They gained from this activity while the SWP was forced to issue an apologetic statement to explain its 5 months of abstentionism. Then they launch into a series of articles extolling the qualities of the Old Bolsheviks.

Bolshevik history is fine, comrades, but it is no substitute for correct action when action is on the order of the day. Our entire historical series did not do 1/10 of the good that our participation in a petition campaign would have accomplished. The "Thomas-Woll" statement received country-wide publicity. Our historical studies reached only *Militant* readers but I fear that they missed the real point of the petition campaign. The fact remains that the future Stalinist attempt to frame up Trotsky has been scotched. No credit for this goes to the SWP leadership. Our abstentionism remains part of the record. No amount of explanations can erase it.

There was a real reason why we abstained in this matter. Its roots are political. How could we give the contradictory line of the party during that period in the pages of the press?

On the one hand we were telling the world that war between the United States and the Soviet Union was on the order of the day. Internally, the party was told that the issues of the Nuremberg Trials presented a great danger. "These judges are just as capable of perpetrating another frame-up as were