
July 1944

Fourth International

Ten Years of Our Theoretical Organ

An Editorial

Financial Jugglery at Bretton Woods

By Sam Marcy

Significance of the Cuban Elections

By J. B. Stuart

Crisis in the British Labor Party

By Our London Correspondent

The Arsenal of Marxism

Our Current Basic Military Tasks -- III

By Leon Trotsky

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

One of the best ways of increasing sales of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL is the newsstand method. Realizing this, our agents are building up F.I. newsstand routes in their various localities, as will be seen from the following letters:

Los Angeles: "Due to San Pedro's having obtained two newsstands you'll have to boost their bundle up by ten. Los Angeles, which has been running pretty close to the margin, will also have to be raised by ten. I don't have the addresses of the Pedro newsstands and have asked them to send them directly to you so as not to lose any time. Our next step will be the stands in the Negro neighborhood where we got many of our 25c. subs to THE MILITANT.

"We ran out of copies of the June issue and for the first time actually had to turn people down who wanted to buy them at a meeting we held on England. Please rush us another ten copies of this issue."

Another letter from *Los Angeles*, airmail special delivery, followed closely upon the heels of the one quoted above:

"I was passing by one of our newsstands and noticed that he had run out of F.I.'s (he carries 15) and another stand nearby which carries 30 has only 7 left. This is after a period of two weeks. Rush us ten more copies of the F.I. in addition to the ten I asked for two days ago. I can't take any more chances on being caught short."

Minneapolis: "We have been able to place FOURTH INTERNATIONAL on one of the newsstands here—Shinder's located at 6th and Hennepin Ave."

Philadelphia: "The F.I. is on sale at one stand along with THE MILITANT and we hope to place it on some stand near the housing project here."

* * *

Our agent in Los Angeles is putting back issues of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and THE MILITANT to excellent use. Other agents will appreciate this suggestion:

"Please send complimentary copies of the F.I. and THE MILITANT to the L. A. Public Library. I have enclosed the sub blanks. I notice that they carry other magazines and papers.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME V July 1944 No. 7 (Whole No. 46)

Published monthly by the

Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 15c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles, 16c for 5 copies and up.

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

Editor: FELIX MORROW

CONTENTS

Ten Years of Our Theoretical Organ.....	195
<i>The Month in Review</i>	
One Year After the Fall of Italian Fascism.....	196
The Verdict Against the British Trotskyists.....	198
Stalin's Policy in Rumania.....	199
"For the Fourth International!".....	200
On the Anniversary of Klement's Murder.....	202
Financial Jugglery at Bretton Woods....By Sam Marcy	203
Significance of the Cuban Elections....By J. B. Stuart	205
Crisis in the British Labor Party	
By Our London Correspondent	208
Lessons of the 1934 Revolt in Austria....By P. Berger	211
Religion—Its Social Roots and Role II	
By Felix Morrow	213
Australian Working Class and the War (From the	
Manifesto of the Revolutionary Workers Party	
of Australia) II	217
From the Arsenal of Marxism	
Our Current Basic Military Tasks III	
By Leon Trotsky	219



This week I am going to try to sell them some books, and will give them the back issues of the magazine and paper. The sociology department is the place where they keep most of those on the labor movement."

* * *

Readers of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL comment about the magazine:

New York: "The June issue of

the F.I. is one of the best in a long time, maintaining a high theoretical level throughout. Particularly excellent is Simmons' article 'U.S. Capitalism Heads for Bankruptcy', an outstanding example of Marxist theory applied to current developments. Jeanne Sorel's analysis of the French political situation is also much appreciated, and the article by Felix Morrow on

religion is a gem. The issue is very well balanced."

Plentywood: "I am sending \$1 for the June F.I. Have not had a chance to look it over carefully yet, but it is always good."

Milwaukee: "I want to buy the 1940-41 bound volume of the F.I. I think it is a dandy magazine."

Cleveland: "I have not received the June issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL; it would be very much appreciated if you would forward this to me, as I do not like to miss any of them."

Kentucky: "I would appreciate it if you would start my subscription with the copy that contains the tribute to the American Trotskyists who went to jail last December. I mean the one that Macdonald wrote about in his *Politics*." (The article referred to, *How the Trotskyists Went to Jail* by Joseph Hansen, appears in the February 1944 issue.)

Readers abroad write:

Ireland: "We find FOURTH INTERNATIONAL invaluable, and I say without exaggeration that we could profitably dispose of many more copies. Cannon's 'Dog Days of the Left Opposition' in the March issue is superb. Simply written and yet profound in content, it is ideal for workers. Cannon is our best selling writer here, and his reputation second only to Trotsky's."

Ann Keen, London: "Thank you for your letter and the cutting of my article in the March issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. It was forwarded on to me in Durham prison and I felt extremely bucked up that it was considered good enough to go into the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

"I am sorry not to have replied sooner but since we have been allowed out on bail there has been a tremendous amount of work to get through.

"I can't at the moment recall if I wrote to thank you for one parcel of back files of FOURTH INTERNATIONALS. Did you send any more? Because it is quite possible that a parcel may have gone astray whilst I was in prison for four weeks."

(Ann Keen is one of the four members of the Revolutionary Communist Party involved in the recent Government case against the British Trotskyists, which is commented on elsewhere in this issue.)

Ready for Delivery Now

Bound Volume

of

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

1943

Price \$4.50

Order Now From

BUSINESS MANAGER

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

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

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 5

JULY 1944

NUMBER 7

Ten Years of Our Theoretical Organ

THE TWO HISTORIC EVENTS OF JULY 1934

Ten years ago this month the American Trotskyists launched the first issue of their theoretical journal. The appearance of the magazine coincided with the great July strike of the Minneapolis truckdrivers. These two historic events were symbolic of the whole future of the Trotskyist organization. It can be said that they served as twin guide posts of this movement, which has since become recognized as the bastion of revolutionary internationalism.

The Trotskyist leadership of the Minneapolis strike exploded forever the accusation of sectarianism with which its enemies sought to revile the movement. The strike was conducted in exemplary fashion and with the greatest tactical skill. The victory of the strike blazed the trail for the colossal class struggles that ensued in the United States. More than that, it provided the scattered and hounded forces of the revolutionary internationalists in all countries with the first living proof of the practical viability of Trotskyist ideas in the test of action and of their ability to conquer.

EXEMPLIFIED OUR DEVOTION TO THEORY

The other achievement of American Trotskyism in July 1934 was no less formidable. The launching of the magazine *The New International* was not a mere coincidence. From the first, the American Trotskyists were imbued with the deepest conviction that, in Lenin's words, "without revolutionary theory there is no revolutionary action." The theoretical magazine was launched with deliberation at the very time when our party was engaged in the most important mass activity in its history.

The American Trotskyists understood that a theoretical weapon was indispensable for the further growth and the correct orientation of the American and the international Trotskyist movement.

TROTSKY SET ITS AIM AND PURPOSE

Under the guidance of Leon Trotsky and with the direct and regular participation of our great teacher and leader, this magazine was to become a major instrument for the preservation of the Marxist fundament of ideas against all attacks.

It was to serve as the means for the elaboration of the program on which the Fourth International—then in its initial stages of formation—was to be built.

In the ensuing years our Marxist monthly took on the role of organizer and educator of the whole international movement.

FIRST EDITORIAL PROCLAIMED POLICY

In the leading editorial of that very first issue the character and the aims of the Trotskyist theoretical organ were firmly and unmistakably set.

To these aims the Trotskyists have remained unflinchingly loyal throughout the years. That ringing editorial fully describes the aims of our periodical **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** today, without the need of changing a comma or a colon. As indicated therein, the founders of the magazine fully realized the battle it faced.

TENACIOUS STRUGGLE AGAINST STREAM

Its job was one of fighting against the stream, at a period in our epoch when—inspired by the victories of reaction—a crusade of world-wide scope was being undertaken against Marxism on the field of theory. Even the would-be Marxist intellectuals joined in this assault under the guise of "critical" appraisals. Their "independent" thinking was of a negative and sterile character, the whole essence of which was scepticism. This scepticism soon turned into corroding cynicism, hypocrisy and submissive apologies for gangrenous capitalism.

It is against this background of a virtual siege on the theoretical front, that the Trotskyists established, maintained and expanded their Marxist monthly. The magazine analyzed and exposed the attacks of the bourgeois critics. It mercilessly flayed the retreating petty bourgeois intellectuals. And when the gangrene of intellectual reaction penetrated into the Trotskyist party itself—when the petty bourgeois opposition of Burnham and Shachtman made its appearance in the Socialist Workers Party—the party coped with these ideological renegades in no less decisive fashion. After a six months discussion in 1940 the party rejected this new revisionism and reaffirmed its Marxist position.

BATTLE AGAINST TREACHERY WITHIN

One casualty of the struggle against the petty bourgeois opposition was the original name of the theoretical magazine, *The New International*. Deserting the party, deserting the Marxist ideas for which the magazine had stood since its inception, Burnham and Shachtman, who had held formal property rights to the journal as trustees of the S.W.P., purloined the name and mailing rights like common thieves. They hastily published a counterfeit issue of *The New International*, in which they spread their whole claptrap of revisionism, anti-Marxism and anti-Trotskyism. The Trotskyists decided not to waste time in a legal contest for the name and to continue publication of our organ as the **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**.

"The once-glorious name of *The New International*," a statement appearing in the first issue under the new masthead declared, "has been irretrievably sullied by its appearance for one issue under the auspices of these betrayers of its tradition. The program of the Fourth International, the great theoretical contributions of Comrade Trotsky, the Marxist message of our party, cannot appear under its dirtied name. We want no deception, no confusion, no mixing of banners . . . They stole it. They have already identified its name with their own treachery. Let them keep it, and let the whole world know it is henceforth their magazine, not ours. Our magazine is *Fourth International*."

In an article written shortly after the theft, Leon Trotsky, whose brilliant articles set the line of the magazine from the beginning, declared himself no less sharply. He wrote:

"The very first 'programmatic' articles of the purloined organ already reveal completely the light-mindedness and hollowness of this new anti-Marxist grouping which appears under the label of the 'Third Camp' . . . Toward their new

magazine my attitude can only be the same as toward all other petty bourgeois counterfeits of Marxism."

Shachtman's "counterfeit of Marxism" has not improved with age nor with the departure of Burnham into the camp of outright reaction. It remains as it began, an organ of petty bourgeois opinion in which are "merely refurbished the well-riddled views of old revisionists."

AN HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENT The rich traditions of the Marxist organ founded ten years ago this month, its heritage of struggle against revisionism and against all the sterile "re-interpretations" of Marxism, its defense of the fundamental theories of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky are today embodied in our magazine, in *Fourth International*. That is why we are able to reprint else-

where in this issue, without any alteration whatsoever, the full programmatic editorial which appeared in Volume 1, Number 1 of July 1934. We stand by every word in that editorial.

The present issue rounds out ten years of the consistent publication of the Marxist theoretical magazine. In the annals of the revolutionary movement it would be difficult to point to a comparable achievement. The Trotskyists have been able to attain this magnificent record in a period of unprecedented reaction, of enormous working class defeats, of degeneration within the working class movement. This is a tribute to the unshakable strength of our ideas. It is another great augury of the invincible power which will carry our movement forward to the victory of world socialism in the stormy days ahead.

The Month in Review

One Year After the Fall of Italian Fascism

CAPITALISM FACES THE THREAT OF REVOLUTION This month marks a year of the downfall of the Mussolini regime and the unleashing of the forces of the Italian revolution.

The disintegration of the Italian army a year ago, the military catastrophes, the outburst of tremendous strikes throughout Italy's industrial north, brought the Mussolini regime, and with it, the rule of the capitalists and landlords, to the brink of disaster. The ruling class dumped Mussolini and hastened to surrender to the Allies. They knew that only by the aid of foreign bayonets could they hope to prop up their disintegrating rule. The hope of all military resistance had ceased. There remained nothing left but to attempt to salvage the system of capitalism itself.

The masses of Italy, who a year ago rose up in their majesty and might, who took to the streets and ran the Fascists into holes and hiding places, desired not the perpetuation but the destruction of the rotten system of capitalism. They desired not the continuation of the imperialist war, but peace. They desired not the retention of power on the part of the old upper class capitalist and landlord scum, who for 20 years locked them in the vise of the fascist dictatorship, but the complete destruction of the rule of the exploiters and tyrants.

ALLIED AIM IS SUBJUGATION But from the very first day of Allied occupation of Sicily, up to the establishment of Allied control over Naples and occupation of Rome, the Anglo-American capitalist powers have revealed, so that today even the blind can see, that their real aim is to subjugate the peoples of Italy. They come not as liberators but as conquerors. They intend to establish themselves as imperial overlords over Italy and exploit for the greater wealth and power of the Wall Street and the Lombard Street bankers. They intend to prop up with their bayonets the same upper class scum who formed the warp and woof of Mussolini's Fascist regime.

The Italian masses are learning today that the Allies are fighting the Nazis only to replace Nazi exploitation and tyranny with Anglo-American exploitation and tyranny.

The Italian masses demanded an end to the slaughter into which Mussolini had thrust them. Italy has been converted into an imperialist battleground.

PLIGHT OF MASSES WORSE THAN EVER The Italian masses wanted bread. Pietro Nenni, the Social-Democratic, pro-Allied leader of Rome, has just revealed what Allied rule has accomplished for Italy in this respect. "If eight or ten more Italian cities get into the state of Naples, where three-quarters of the citizens live by beggary, prostitution, peddling and black marketing, Italy will cease to exist," stated Nenni.

Allied occupation of Rome has immediately brought similar "blessings" to its people. The cost of living in Rome which rose 749 percent between November 1940 and June 1944, registered a further sharp rise since the city has been taken over by the Allies. The daily food allotment for Italians in Naples under Allied rule is reputed to be the lowest in Europe, lower even than the food allotment in Warsaw under Nazi rule. The Italian masses are starving.

OLD RASCALS ARE KEPT IN POWER The Italian masses determined to wipe out root and branch every vestige of the butcher Fascist regime. Under Allied rule, the self-same rascals, crooks and profiteers who tyrannized over the Italian people for twenty years have been returned to power. The Allies shield the black shirts from the wrath and vengeance of the people, while they disarm the anti-fascists. Such is the sum and substance of Allied "liberation" of Italy.

From their own bitter experience, the Italian masses are learning the stark reactionary aims of the Allied invaders. Their present disillusionment with the Allies will soon turn to hatred and then to ferocious opposition.

NAKED FORCE STILL RULES As for the native upper class landlord and capitalist cliques, the Italian masses were completely opposed to them even before the downfall of Mussolini. In its last years the Fascist regime was bereft of all mass support. Every institution associated with the Mussolini regime, the monarchy, etc., faced the hostile opposition of the popular masses. In its last period, the Mussolini regime could rule only as a naked military dictatorship. Since the downfall of the Mussolini regime, the Allies and their shadow governments are likewise forced to rule by naked force alone.

With the smashup of the Mussolini regime, Italy entered a revolutionary period. The revolution has by no means been smashed by the blows dealt it by the Allied and Nazi armies. Temporarily arrested, it is today again gaining strength, ready

to march forth with redoubled determination and militancy to achieve the aims for which the Italian masses demonstrated in Milan and Turin one year ago. On June 15th the *London Times* correspondent wired his paper from Rome that "Persons who were recently in northern Italy say that the whole country is solidly Communist—both the peasants and the workmen in the towns."

REVOLUTION HAS GATHERED NEW STRENGTH

The political atmosphere in Italy is white hot. The masses are rapidly learning. They have not simply turned away from the institutions, political parties and political representatives who were smeared with direct support of the Fascist dictatorship, but have in large measure turned away even from the traditional capitalist parties and capitalist politicians of the Sforza-Croce stamp.

Of the six parties that comprise the Bonomi coalition government and the "Committee of National Liberation," only the so-called working-class parties, the Stalinists and the Social-Democrats, have any significant mass following. The Sforzas and Croces continue to walk the political stage only by virtue of Allied support and because of the perfidy of the supposed representatives of the working class.

TREACHERY INSIDE LABOR'S RANKS

Italy, as the testing-ground of the unfoldment of revolutionary events in Europe, has already revealed in most unambiguous fashion the utter treachery and perfidy of the traditional parties of the working class—the Social-Democrats and the Stalinists. The Social-Democrats, in line with the policies of the "yellow" Socialist International, have added in Italy one more working class sell-out to their already long list of betrayals of the European proletariat. It is the Stalinists, however, who exercise the most extensive influence over the Italian working class today. They dominate the so-called working class representatives both in the government and in the six-party coalition, the "Committee of National Liberation."

From the very first days of the formation of the Badoglio government a year ago, the Committee of National Liberation, with the Stalinists playing the leading role, worked to deflect the working class revolutionary struggle, and used its influence and prestige to uphold the Badoglio government. They simply demanded that the Italian ruling clique change war partners and join the Allied camp.

STALINISTS IN VAN OF REACTION

When the Badoglio government finally exhausted itself, it was the Stalinists, under direct instructions from the Kremlin, who stepped in to break the deadlock for reaction and strengthen the Badoglio government under a facade of a six-party "coalition" government. Today the Stalinists are in the vanguard campaigning for acceptance of the Allied "armistice" terms, which are reported to be more onerous and draconic than those Hitler imposed on prostrate France in 1940. Following their international role of policemen for world capitalism, the Stalinists in Italy have emerged as the very spearhead of reaction inside the working class movement.

The Italian masses want to get out of the imperialist war. The six-party coalition, under Stalinist leadership, tells the masses to enlist again in the army under the leadership of monarchical and Fascist generals to fight under the banner of the Anglo-American imperialists.

The Italian masses want bread, jobs and security. The

six-party coalition under Stalinist leadership tells the masses to accept the Allied brigands' "armistice" terms which aim to convert Italy into a colony of the Anglo-American powers.

LEADERS AND MASSES CLASH IN AIMS

The Italian masses want to wipe out the rule of the Fascist scum, they want freedom and their democratic rights; they want to establish a new government genuinely representative of the people and one that will fight for their interests. The six-party coalition, under the leadership of the Stalinists, tells the masses to support the Bonomi shadow government which is nothing but a tool of the Allied powers, who are determined to re-establish the dictatorship of the rich.

The Italian masses want to wipe out the black market, to wipe out profiteering, they want bread. The six-party coalition under the leadership of the Stalinists confines itself to begging for a few crumbs from the Allies who are supporting and propping up the profiteers, the black market operations, the capitalist exploiters.

Masses learn quickly in revolutionary periods. In the white hot revolutionary Italy of today, the masses are sure to learn from their own experience that the Stalinist-dominated six-party coalition is an organization of treachery and betrayal. At the next stage, the wrath and anger of the people will turn against these traitors.

NEED OF NEW PARTY BEING RECOGNIZED

Already advanced groups of workers have come to the realization that it is necessary to create a new revolutionary party in Italy which will work to organize the Italian proletariat for revolutionary struggle against all their enemies and oppressors. The revolutionary working class party of Italy which is sure to arise and grow strong will be organized around the tested program and methods of Lenin and Trotsky, the program and methods of the great Russian revolution of 1917.

The revolutionary workers' party of Italy will be a Trotskyist party, because Trotskyism is the only genuine Marxist Socialism today. The revolutionary workers' party of Italy will challenge the Stalinists and their allies of the six-party coalition in every sphere and on every front. They will expose the crimes and treachery of these misleaders and point the road to the Socialist revolution.

MASSES WILL RALLY TO TROTSKYIST BANNER

Against the Stalinist scheme to drag the Italian masses more deeply into the holocaust of the imperialist war, the Trotskyists will unfurl the banner of the struggle against imperialism and imperialist war, the struggle for peace through socialism.

Against the Stalinist proposal to kowtow before the Allied invaders, to accept their overlordship and become subservient tools of the Allied war camp, the Trotskyists will raise the cry to clear Italy of all imperialist invaders.

Against the Stalinist program of begging for crumbs from the Allies and the Italian capitalists, the Trotskyists will call the masses to struggle against the black market, against the profiteers and exploiters. They will urge the masses to organize their own working class consumers' committees and by their own class action to fight for jobs, for lowering of prices, for destruction of the black market, for food control.

Against the Stalinist program of begging the Allies and the Italian capitalists for jobs, of whining against unemployment, the Trotskyists will raise the demand of nationalization of all industry under workers control of production.

TROTSKYISTS WILL INSPIRE SELF-CONFIDENCE

Against the Stalinist program of relying on the Allies to give the Italian people a "free" government "after the war," the Trotskyists will teach the masses that only their own independent class organizations, only their workers', peasants' and soldiers' councils, only their own revolutionary struggle can win for the masses their democratic rights and provide them the opportunity to elect a government of their own choosing.

Against the Stalinist program of Italy remaining under the rule of the capitalists and landlords, under the imperial overlordship of the Allies, the Trotskyists will explain that only a Socialist Italy can truly give peace, bread, and freedom to the Italian masses, that the only road to avoid enslavement and destruction, is the road of struggle for a Socialist Italy.

WILL FIND TRUE ALLIES IN EUROPEAN MASSES

In this struggle the Italian masses will find allies, not in the Anglo-American rulers, who aim to convert Italy and its peoples into an exploited colony, not in the Italian capitalists and landlords, who have kneeled before the foreign invader in order to preserve their privileges and power, nor in the Sforzas, Bonomis, Social-Democrats and Stalinists who would deliver the Italian masses into the hands of their oppressors. The true allies of the Italian revolution are the insurgent masses of Europe, who like the Italians, aspire to drive out the old tyrants and exploiters, to destroy for all time imperialism and its wars, and to rebuild Europe on new socialist foundations. Arm in arm with *these* allies the Italian working class will fight for a Workers and Peasants Republic as an integral section of the Socialist United States of Europe.

The Verdict Against the British Trotskyists

THEIR "GUILT" AND THEIR SENTENCES

On June 19, after a trial lasting six days at the Newcastle assizes, four British Trotskyists, members of the Revolutionary Communist Party, were sentenced to prison terms when found guilty on charges of "furthering, aiding and abetting" a strike of engineering trades apprentices on the Tyneside last March.

Jock Haston, general secretary of the party, 32 years of age, was sent to prison for six months; Roy Tearse, 25, and Heaton Lee, 28, each received sentences of one year; Ann Keen, 29, got thirteen days. The convictions are being appealed.

The prosecution was the first ever brought under the Trade Disputes Act of 1927. That Act was passed by the Tory government after the great general strike of 1926 and was designed to prevent a repetition of the upheaval which shook capitalist England to its foundations.

Specifically, the Act outlaws sympathetic strikes of any kind, likewise any strike which is not immediately occasioned by a dispute between striking workers and their own employers, and makes it a criminal offense to "instigate" or give support to such strikes.

"CONSPIRACY" CHARGES COLLAPSE AT TRIAL

Into this latter category fell the Tyneside apprentices strike which was aimed at the Pit Ballot Scheme, introduced by Labor Minister Ernest Bevin, whereby apprentices and other workers were to be forcibly drafted for work in the coal mines. The Trotskyists were charged with "conspiring" to bring about

the strike and with supporting the action once it had begun. The prosecution made a point of proving that the strike was directed, not against the apprentices' employers, but against the enforcement of the Pit Ballot Scheme—in other words, against the government.

The "conspiracy" charge collapsed like a pricked bubble when the government's own witnesses, apprentices who took part in the strike, testified that they had acted on their own independent decision and had been "instigated" by no one. They denounced the enslaving Pit Ballot Scheme in the courtroom and declared that they knew of no instance in which the arrested Trotskyists had urged strike action.

There was nothing the jury could do but acquit the defendants on the "conspiracy" charge. But they found them guilty of "furthering, aiding and abetting" the strike. The Trotskyists proudly admitted their role in aiding the strikers, which was their elementary socialist duty. It was for this that they were sent to prison.

REAL CONSPIRATORS IN GOVERNMENT

Instead of being able to convict the Trotskyists of a "conspiracy," the Tory government of Churchill-Bevin found *itself* publicly convicted of this charge. The Tyne apprentices strike and the great strikes of coal miners which occurred about the same time, reflected the rebellion of the workers against intolerable conditions. Britain's coal industry under capitalist ownership and management has long been in a state of chronic chaos and decline, with productivity falling from month to month. The Churchill-Bevin "solution" was to draft men for work in the mines. But the apprentices, with their careers at stake, rebelled at this Hitlerian forced labor scheme. The miners, with grievances accumulated over the years, went on strike. Both want an end to capitalist mismanagement. The cry, "Nationalize the Mines!" was heard again. But that's something a capitalist government will never do.

Affrighted by the mounting wave of working-class militancy, and remembering the general strike of 1926, Churchill-Bevin looked around for scapegoats and for a means to hold back the tide of revolt. While Bevin promulgated his new Defense Regulation 1-A(a) in order to strengthen the Trade Disputes Act by making *any* strike in any war-essential industry illegal—the Tory press went sleuthing in a search for "sinister underground influences" behind the strike movement, for "secret funds from abroad," for a master revolutionary "conspiracy" directed against Britain's imperialist war.

Helped by the Stalinist traitors, the British ruling class did not require very long to "discover" that it was the Trotskyists who were back of all the trouble. And it was upon their shoulders that Churchill-Bevin sought to saddle responsibility for the wave of strikes caused by the mismanagement of the ruling class. This was the *real* conspiracy. It failed.

MASS SUPPORT FOR THE ARRESTED

The British workers, recognizing in the Trotskyists the advance guard of their movement, the consistent, never-flagging champions of their class interests, sprang to their aid. They condemned the prosecution and demanded the release of the prisoners. They assisted in setting up a defense committee. They contributed funds for its work. This movement of class solidarity even spread to sections of the army. Soldiers have passed resolutions protesting the persecution of the Trotskyists and defending the workers' right to strike.

The Tory-capitalist attack on the Trotskyists, the fact that

they were railroaded to prison under the Trade Disputes Act, is indicative of the sharpening of the class struggle in England. The Trade Disputes Act remained in desuetude for *seventeen* years. It was a weapon kept in reserve by the British ruling class for just such situations as that which developed last March—a rising wave of strikes threatening to develop into a general strike.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ATTACK

The fact that it has been used now, for the first time, is striking testimony to the growing militancy of the British workers and the revolutionary tendencies which that militancy reveals. It confirms, too, the progressive revolutionary role of the Trotskyists in the British labor movement. Selection of the Trotskyists as the first target of ruling-class counterattack was no accident. It was deliberate and calculated. "There is the enemy!" Churchill-Bevin must have said to themselves.

They are right. In the further unfolding of the class struggle in England, the workers in ever greater numbers will come to recognize in the Trotskyists the only real leaders of the fight against capitalism and its Tory-labor coalition government. They will march forward to their socialist victory under the revolutionary banner of the Fourth International.

Stalin's Rumanian Policy Bares His Plans to Strangle the European Revolution

PREMATURE FEARS OF STALIN'S "SOVIETIZATION"

When, at the beginning of last April, the Red Army crossed the river Pruth to enter Rumania—its first incursion into foreign territory in the present war—the capitalist world displayed symptoms of nervousness and apprehension. There were copious references in the bourgeois press to an alleged Stalinist plan to "sovietize" Europe.

Among other things, they overlooked, or simply forgot, the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin conferences at Teheran. The proceedings of those conferences, and the decisions reached, have never been published. But through the Forrest Davis and Demaree Bess articles in the *Saturday Evening Post*, obviously inspired by Roosevelt himself, the world has been vouchsafed an inkling of what took place—of the nature of the discussions, the decisions reached, and the pledges given and received. The most important of these pledges was undoubtedly given by Stalin to the heads of the two big imperialist states. He confirmed what had already been implicit in his policies for a long time, namely, his desire to live at peace with the capitalist world and to integrate the Soviet Union into the "family of nations."

STALIN FULFILLS REACTIONARY PLEDGE

He not only repudiated any intention of trying to "Sovietize" Europe, but pledged all his efforts to uphold capitalism and to sabotage and oppose every attempt by the workers to bring about a socialist revolution. This pledge was sincere. It was motivated by the same fear of revolution which haunts the "democratic" imperialists.

Rumania has been the first testing ground of the counter-revolutionary policy of the Kremlin in Europe since the outbreak of the imperialist war. When the Red Army crossed the Pruth, Molotov, Stalin's foreign commissar, reaffirmed Stalin's Teheran pledge with the statement: "The Soviet Government declares it does not pursue the aim of acquiring Rumanian territory or of altering the existing social structure of Rumania." Three months of occupation of the northern corner of Rumania

by the Red Army bears this out. Foreign newspaper correspondents were permitted to visit the territory early this month. Their findings were reported by Associated Press correspondent Henry C. Cassidy, who said it was "the unanimous opinion of American, British and Chinese observers that the Russians are not interfering in any way with the political, economic or social life of Rumania."

The details of the picture, filled in by Cassidy, were most illuminating. All the old reactionary officials of the semi-fascist regime have been confirmed in their offices, including prefectural heads and mayors of the towns. Capitalist private property and the estates of the landowners have not been disturbed and "order" is being maintained by the Red Army and the Rumanian officials. Stalin has thus assigned the Red Army, the great liberating army of Socialism founded by Lenin and Trotsky, the ignominious role of gendarme of bourgeois property rights.

OUT-HERODS ALLIES IN OPPRESSION

Nor is this all. Cassidy tells us that "local laws, including those with anti-Semitic provisions, are left unchanged. . . . This attitude is applied even to the Rumanian act outlawing the Communist Party, which remains on the books. In thus preserving the vilest of the totalitarian filth of the semi-fascist Rumanian regime, the Kremlin clique out-Herods the Allied imperialists, for one of the first acts of the Allied Military Government in Italy was to nullify the anti-Semitic laws imposed by Mussolini's Fascist government and legalize the opposition parties, including the Communist Party.

RUMANIAN POLICY SETS A PATTERN

It is not surprising, as Cassidy states, that the capitalists and landlords of northern Rumania are highly gratified by Stalin's protective policies. The Chamber of Commerce at Botosani expressed delighted appreciation of Stalin's "respect for our laws."

The correspondent apparently did not take the trouble to inquire what the poverty-stricken, war-weary masses of Rumania think of all this. Nevertheless, the workers and peasants *have* feelings and ideas. For many years they have struggled to free themselves from capitalist-landlord oppression. Stalin's alliance with their class enemies will surely open their eyes to the counter-revolutionary character of the ruling bureaucratic clique in the Soviet Union. But it will not halt their struggle for a socialist future.

Kremlin policy in Rumania sets a pattern for the practices to be pursued in every other country where the Red Army sets foot—unless the Soviet bureaucracy is overthrown. Under different circumstances, it has already unfolded in Italy, where the Stalinists, on orders from the Kremlin, have stepped forth as the principal supporters of the monarchy and its rotten police-military dictatorship.

AIMS UTOPIAN AND REACTIONARY

Stalin is pursuing a two-fold purpose. On the one hand, he is trying to erect dykes against the rising tide of socialist revolution, for such a revolution anywhere, but particularly in a country bordering the Soviet Union, would endanger the Stalin regime by encouraging the Soviet workers to struggle against it. On the other hand, he hopes to neutralize capitalist hostility to the Soviet Union by helping the capitalists to defend their property interests, by openly siding with the forces of reaction against the forces of revolution. Additionally, by befriending the capitalists in adjacent lands, he aims to create a circle of states "friendly" to the Soviet Union and thus erect a counter-weight to the great

(Continued on page 204)

For the Fourth International!

The following is the programmatic editorial which appeared in Volume I, Number 1 of the *New International*, July 1934. In our editorial "Ten Years of Our Theoretical Organ" on page 195, the reader will find comment on its historic significance.—Ed.

Our periodical appears at a most critical juncture in the life of the international labor movement. The mighty mechanism of capitalist society is crumbling in the sight of all. Once it tore whole nations out of the backwardness of feudalism and erected that colossal productive machine which is capable of keeping all mankind at a high level of comfort and culture. Having surmounted Alpine peaks of progress, it is now rolling at breakneck speed down a precipitous incline. In its ascension, it encountered obstacles, but it overcame them and mounted higher. As it hurtles into the abyss to which it is historically doomed, the tiniest impediment subjects it to the most convulsive shocks. It leaks at every joint and gives off suffocating fumes of decomposition like the gases of a gangrened body which empoison the atmosphere. All the retrogressive and parasitic abominations inherent in the very existence of capitalism, are pressed upward to the surface in a last effort to evade paying the final note on its overdue doom.

The lusty young bourgeoisie, which once dealt such crushing revolutionary blows at feudal and clerical reaction, has aged to a decrepit senility when life depends upon reviving and forming an alliance with all that is archaic and reactionary in the world's economy and politics. The once progressive capitalist class can no longer live without preserving feudalism and serfdom in more than half the world, and resorting to Fascist barbarism in the rest of the globe. Where it once relied for its victory upon the support of the working class and peasantry, which liberated it and society from their common foe, capitalism can now maintain itself only by reducing its former allies to a standard of life and culture no higher than the feudal.

Capitalism has outlived its usefulness! It cannot expand the productive forces of mankind—it contracts them. It cannot feed the masses—it starves them. It cannot bring peace to the people—it drives them to war. It can no longer justify its supremacy—it maintains it with the Fascist bayonet.

If we can write, as von Hutten said in his day, that this is a time for the joy of living, then only because we live in the period of revolution, the triumphant culmination of which will open up a new era to humanity. The forces of production of the things men live by are in rebellion against the anachronistic fetters which impede their fullest development. The proletariat is in rebellion, now blindly, now consciously, against its exploiters. The colonial slaves are in rebellion against their metropolitan oppressors. The class struggle, which no human or natural agency can suppress without suppressing society—at least not until classes themselves have been abolished—has reached an unprecedented degree of acuteness. Yet, outside the Soviet Union, capitalism still prevails. Instead of receiving its mortal blow, it has inflicted upon the proletariat some of the cruelest defeats in history.

On the one side, an outlived social order, revealing within itself the objective necessity and inevitability of a new society; on the other side, a proletariat socially developed to the point where it can inaugurate this new society which nevertheless has not yet summoned sufficient forces to overthrow the old. The unknown factor is only too well known, and can be established with the exactness of a mathematical equation:

The two parties of the proletariat, into whose hands history successively gave the imposing task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie and opening the road to socialism, have failed abysmally. Social democracy and Stalinism both collapsed at the first blow, like eggshells sucked dry, in Germany, then in Austria, then in Latvia, then in Bulgaria. (The social democracy, be it noted, died politically twenty years ago; it proved no less despicable in its second incarnation.)

The whole history of the modern proletarian movement has only served to underscore the all-importance and indispensability of that most highly perfected of all its instruments: the political party. Especially in our time has it become the master key to all problems. The class war is fought by class armies. The working class as a whole—to say nothing of its necessary allies in other sections of the population—is not characterized by firm homogeneity. It is stratified at different levels of consciousness, it is divided by conflicting ideologies, by separatist interests of caste, religion, nationality, sex, age. Emerging from its ranks—but transcending these differences and consequently able to overcome them—is its vanguard, the revolutionary political party. The party embodies the accumulated experiences of the proletariat distilled into its revolutionary theory. It is the repository of the consciousness of the class. It embraces the most advanced, the most militant, the most devoted, unites them firmly on the basis of tested principles and welds them together in rigorous discipline.

The proletariat as a class, as a whole, cannot directly plan and guide its battles, any more than each platoon in an army can elaborate the strategy and tactics of war. For that a staff, a vanguard is imperative—not imposed from above as in a capitalist army, without the possibility of control and verification from the ranks, but rising from the ranks by tested ability and common approval. It is all the more imperative in this epoch because of the extreme concentration of power in the enemy camp, its increased mobility, and because of the abruptness with which changes take place in the objective situation. These necessitate a trained, vigilant vanguard equipped with foresight and consequently capable of pre-arrangement. Foresight is made possible by the searchlight of Marxism, whose powerful batteries are merely the condensed experiences of history, illuminating the path ahead.

For lack of just such a party, the working class has suffered one defeat after another, until the dreadful climax in 1933-34 fully disclosed the bankruptcy of the existing organizations.

Neither of the two parties came to their miserable end because of some aberration, springing out of conditions peculiar to Germany, or Austria. Their demolition is rather to be traced to the fundamental theories and practices common to their respective Internationals. The generic name of these theories is nationalistic opportunism.

The modern social democratic parties were nurtured on the skimmed milk of the imperialist expansion of their respective national fatherlands. Grown mighty and fabulously wealthy on the vast profits of colonial exploitation, the imperialist powers found it necessary and possible to corrupt and thus enlist the support of a whole section of its own working class. The social democracy based itself upon the aristocracy of labor, upon the reforms which an indulgent imperialism vouchsafed it, and upon sections of the middle class. It was gradually absorbed into the machinery of the capitalist state and interlaced its

destiny with the fate of the bourgeois nation. Thence the unforgettable treason of the social democracy during the war, each party digging bloodsoaked fingers into the throat of the other for the greater glory of its own fatherland. Thence the rabid loyalty to the capitalist state when the spontaneous post-war revolutionary wave threatened to inundate the bourgeoisie. Thence the theory of gradually converting capitalism into socialism just as smoothly and miraculously as the transubstantiation of the wafer and the wine into the body and blood of Christ. Thence the repudiation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its replacement by the theory and practise of coalitions with the democratic bourgeoisie for the preservation of capitalism, as a necessary transition to socialism. Thence the theory of the lesser evil—capitalism is preferable to Bolshevism—the theory which facilitated the victory of Fascism.

What distinguishes the Stalinist parties from the social democratic is not so much the outcome of their policy—the effects have been equally calamitous in both cases—as it is the different origin of their nationalism. The Stalinist parties were not poisoned at the well of imperialist nationalism, but at the well once fed exclusively by the springs of a proletarian revolution. The theory of “socialism in one country” is an expression of the nationalist degeneration of the Soviet Union. There is not, nor can there be, an inherent conflict between the interests of the Soviet Union and the interests of the world revolution. The interests of a parasitic Soviet bureaucracy, however, can and do conflict with the interests of the world revolution. The generalized formulation of this conflict is implicit in the theory of “socialism in one country.”

The Soviet bureaucracy, myopically attributing longevity to phenomena of a temporary character, does not believe in the possibilities of a world revolution for several decades to come. With this conviction pervading all their thoughts, the bureaucrats want above all else the safeguarding of Russia's territorial integrity in order to construct a nationally walled-off utopia. This course has led inexorably to the transformation of the Third International from the general staff of the world revolution into a Soviet border patrol. Internationalism requires the subordination of each country to the interests of the world revolution. Nationalism means the subordination of the world movement to the interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union.

Their nationalist degeneration, however much it differs in origin and complexion, led both the social democracy and Stalinism to their Waterloo in Germany. *Fundamentally*, there is no other explanation for the collapse of the existing Internationals. All the blunders and crimes, the big ones as well as the little and less dramatic ones, flowed from a central fountain-head.

History and the events that compose it, do not occur for nothing. They afford the possibility of theoretical generalization, of learning from them. The great strength of the Communist International in its early years lay in the fact that it learned from the collapse of the Second International.

The lesson of the collapse of the *two* Internationals is not the renunciation of internationalism but its revival. And not on paper, but in deeds. Revolutionary internationalism must be active and concrete. At the present time that can mean only one thing: *unfurl the banner of the Fourth International and work unremittingly to rally the vanguard elements throughout the world around it!*

* * *

—We too are internationalists, but will it not be a better and stronger International if we first build up solid revolution.

ary parties in each country and then unite them throughout the world?

—Dear friend, so many stupendous events have been experienced in the last twenty years that it would appear as if everybody must have learned something. But it seems that one cannot judge by appearances.

How will you build up “solid revolutionary parties” nationally without unceasing activity for the reconstruction of the International at the same time? The day of *national* revolutionary parties ended long ago, as did the day of national party programs. In the period when world politics and world economy exist as distinct entities there can be only one revolutionary party—the International, with sections in every country. The International cannot be a mere arithmetical sum of various national parties, that is, it must not be. What you will have, if ever you reach the stage of forming your International, will be a somewhat less repulsive edition of the Second, composed of disparate parties, which have developed by themselves in divergent directions, which are jealous of their “national independence,” which resent “interference by outsiders.” You propose to turn back to twenty-five years ago. We prefer to go forward.

—But must the International be formed this very moment when there is so much confusion in the ranks of the working class?

—Just because of that. Hide and seek is no game to be played with the masses. The revolutionary vanguard needs a new Communist International. The masses are confused, it is true. They are being confused by the social democrats of all shades and disguises, who tell them that the Second International is good enough, that it can be reformed, if not today then tomorrow, if not tomorrow then . . . after Fascism triumphs in a few more countries. They are being confused by the Stalinists who tell them that the Third International was right yesterday, today, tomorrow and forever. They are being confused by the vacillators and opportunists who deceive them with stories about uniting the Second and the Third, or about forming some other International—not a “sectarian” one, God forbid! but one in which all “good revolutionary parties outside the Second and the Third” will find shelter for the night. The Fourth International will not bring confusion into the ranks of the working class. It will bring a flaming sword whose edge cuts through the web of lies and deceit and hypocrisy, and whose light brings clarity.

—But who wants a Fourth International now? You are too weak, it is a period of defeats, and even Lenin formed the International only a year and a half after the triumphant revolution.

—Your arguments do not improve with age, dear friend. Lenin proclaimed the need for the new, the Third International, not after the Russian victory, but in the darkest days of reaction, in August 1914. At Zimmerwald in 1915 he fought bitterly against those who, like you, argued that “now is not the time” because “we are too few.” A year later at Kienthal his persistence had brought to his side new and greater forces. The basis for the Comintern was not laid in Moscow in March 1919, but four years before. The struggle for the building of the new International can no more be postponed than the struggle for the rebuilding of the new parties in each country. It is just as unpostponable as the class struggle itself. For us the International is not, as Kautsky said, merely an instrument in peace times which does not function in war. That is all his International was. The International is the general staff of the world proletariat, and consequently it is indispensable *at all times*.

The general staff, like the army, is demobilized or has its functions drastically curtailed only at the end of a war. But our class war is far from ended.

— But already some of those who were for the new International have begun to vacillate, haven't they?

— Indeed, indeed. So much the worse for them; so much the worse for those who take the same course. Not all those who began with the Zimmerwald Left wing of Lenin, stayed with it. Some developed reservations, some quit, others even deserted to the enemy. But do not judge by superficial phenomena. Today the vacillators murmur softly or not at all about the Fourth International to which they firmly pledged themselves before. They want to "win the masses" of Tranmael's Norwegian Labor Party and Brockway's Independent Labour Party. How? By keeping still. Tomorrow, when Tranmael and Co. have gone the way of the Austro-Marxists, it will not be thanks to the vacillators that Tranmael's present followers will have learned necessary lessons. But when they do, and they will, they will join hands all the more firmly with those who fought persistently for the Fourth International.

— But why must it be the Fourth, and not just the new International?

— Words have a meaning, or they should have. The Fourth International—that means new *Communist* parties and a new *Communist* International. The Second means all the varieties of social reformism. The Third means Stalinism, bureaucratic centrism. But in addition there are those who want to bridge the gap between reformism and Communism, those who want the unity of the two, those who want a Two-and-a-Half International, a home for the politically homeless, a night's lodging until the storm in the ranks blows over and they can resume their peaceful journey back to the Second International, as they did in 1923 at Hamburg.

On the Anniversary of Rudolf Klement's Assassination

It was on the eve of a great historic event. The World Congress which was to found the new hope of the revolutionary working class, the Fourth International, was in the final stages of preparation. Suddenly the labor movement was startled with the news of the mysterious murder of the Secretary of the Bureau of the Fourth International.

On July 12, 1938, Comrade Rudolf Klement disappeared. A few days later, the carbon copy of a letter allegedly sent by Klement to Leon Trotsky made its appearance in Paris. The letter purported to be a statement breaking with the Fourth International because of its "objective collaboration with the Fascists." It was signed "Rudolf Klement" in the typewritten text and countersigned with his "illegal" pen-name! An odd procedure! The crudeness of the forgery pointed to the cause of the disappearance: The valiant young International Secretary had been kidnapped by agents of Stalin's G.P.U. For many weeks it was believed, because the letter had been postmarked from Perpignan on the French border in the Pyrenees, that Comrade Rudolf had been carried off into the Stalinist terror dungeons of Loyalist Spain. Then, in September, his mutilated body was dragged up from the River Seine.

Six years have passed since the brutal murder of Klement by the Stalinist gangsters. By his assassination, the usurpers in the Kremlin sought to paralyze the work for the rebuilding of the revolutionary International which they had deserted and betrayed. It was a cruel blow.

But the assassins only served to emphasize by their foul

The Fourth International? This is no meaningless phrase. *It is a fighting program!* It means a fight to the death against Fascism, imperialism, war. It means an intransigent struggle against treacherous social reformism, bureaucratic Stalinism, cowardly compromising centrism of all species. It means the unconditional struggle to defend the Soviet Union which social democrats and Stalinists left in the lurch in Germany when they permitted the arch-anti-Sovietist Hitler to come to power without a battle. It means the militant struggle for revolutionary Marxism, for the final victory of the working class.

For the Fourth International! For revolutionary Marxism!

That is the unsullied banner our periodical will defend. In periods such as the one we are passing through now, it becomes fashionable in certain quarters to seek the reasons for defeat and reaction in all corners except where they are to be found, to trace the causes everywhere except to their roots. Not the traducers of internationalism are at fault; perhaps it is internationalism itself. Not the traducers of Marxism; perhaps it is Marxism itself which requires revision or "re-interpretation." As yesterday, so today, we shall continue to work with all our strength for all the fundamental theories of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, which have been tested through and through and confirmed a thousand times over and from every angle. With its modest resources, *The New International* will defend the revolutionary teachings of Marxism in every domain, taking up every challenge and refuting all over again those "new" anti-Marxists who have merely refurbished the well-riddled views of old revisionists. Our banner is hoisted and unfurled. The class-conscious militants will rally to it and plant it on the citadels of capitalism.

For the Fourth International! For revolutionary Marxism!

deed the dread in which the rising Fourth International was held by all the forces of reaction the world over. The founding World Congress was held despite all the machinations and plots of its enemies. The newly organized Fourth International continued to grow and to thrive as a living memorial to its martyred young secretary, who at the age of twenty-eight had already devoted most of his lifetime—beginning with his boyhood in Hamburg, Germany—in the service of the proletarian revolution.

Shortly before his own murder at the hands of a Stalinist killer, Trotsky wrote:

"The assassination of Klement, because he was Secretary of the Fourth International, is of profound symbolic significance. Through its Stalinist gangsters, imperialism indicates beforehand from what side mortal danger will threaten it in time of war. At present, sections of the Fourth International exist in thirty countries. True, they are only the vanguard of the vanguard. But if today, prior to the war, we had mass organizations, then revolution and not war would be on the order of the day."

The frenzied fear of the Fourth International, expressed so symbolically by the forces of reaction before 1938 in the murder not only of Rudolf Klement, but of his martyred co-workers Hans Freund, Erwin Wolf, Ignace Reiss and Leon Sedoff, reached its highest pitch in 1940 with the pick-axe blow that felled Leon Trotsky, the leader in whom revolutionary internationalism in our epoch found its truest personification.

But even this cruelest of all blows could not crush the spirit of struggle which our great martyrs imparted to the organization for which they laid down their lives. With redoubled determination, the Trotskyists of the world carried on, expanded and accelerated the work of the fallen heroes.

Today, international reaction spends its impotent wrath in new persecutions. In America and in England it has singled out the Trotskyist leaders for frame-up and imprisonment. But they cannot stop the relentless march of the forces of the

Fourth International on the road to mass organization, when, in the words of Trotsky, revolution and not war will be on the order of the day.

We bow our heads today in homage to the martyred young International Secretary. On this sixth anniversary of his death we feel more confident than ever that he did not die in vain. That the cause in which he fell, the cause of international socialism, will conquer the earth.

Financial Jugglery at Bretton Woods

By SAM MARCY

At Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, there are now assembled delegations from forty-four so-called "United Nations" for a monetary and financial conference. The announced purpose of this conference is: 1. to devise a plan for stabilizing the world currency system through the establishment of an *International Stabilization Fund*, and 2. to establish a *Bank for Economic Reconstruction and Development*. The realization of these objectives, according to the sponsors of the proposed plan, will "promote world trade, production, and employment in the post-war world."

Elaborate plans for this conference have been in preparation for many months and have acutely engaged the attention of Allied monetary and financial experts ever since the outbreak of the second imperialist war. In order to camouflage their real aims and hide their respective imperialist appetites, the experts have clothed this plan in the most ambiguous language and made it cumbersome by a host of complicated technical details.

One illuminating detail, however, which was apparently "overlooked" by the monetary experts, was the designation of the *country* where the Stabilization Fund would deposit its gold holdings! A most remarkable manifestation of the trust and confidence which the "United" Nations repose in each other! Even the currency contributions which each member must make are not to be deposited in some central place designated by the Stabilization Fund, but each participating member is supposed to allocate its share of its own currency and deposit it *in its own Central Bank* and—"hold it in trust" for the Fund. This is indeed the very extreme of unorthodox capitalist banking procedure.

The Specter of Past Failures

The significance of the Conference, foreshadowed in the preliminary addresses by Roosevelt, Keynes and Morgenthau, was most dramatically emphasized by Republican Senator Tobey, one of the American delegates, in these words: "We must not, we cannot, we dare not fail."

Apparently no one at the Conference reminded Senator Tobey of the fact that international monetary conferences beginning with the Paris Conference of 1867 and the following conferences held in 1878, 1881, 1892 and all the way up to and including the London Economic Conference of 1933—have consistently—without a single exception—failed to achieve their purpose. And the reason has invariably been the same: the utter impossibility of reconciling the basic antagonisms inherent in the capitalist system of production.

As a matter of fact, during the eighteen months in which the capitalist experts worked on the stabilization scheme, a very sharp and increasingly widening cleavage developed between Roosevelt and his financial experts headed by Morgenthau

and White on the one hand, and the bulk of American high finance on the other. This rift, after a series of acrimonious attacks upon the plan in the financial press, culminated on the very eve of the conference in a so-called "Bankers' Committee" headed by Winthrop Aldrich, Chairman of the Chase National Bank, whose purpose it is to serve notice on the conferees (especially Great Britain) that Roosevelt and his experts do not, at least in this particular instance, represent "their point of view." The banking magnate Aldrich made it clear that his committee is not just anybody, but bluntly stated that it represented the top notch banking, business and trade associations of America. In the press release announcing the formation of his committee, no attack was made on the conference, but in January of this year Aldrich made an address before his board of directors in which he severely attacked both the British (Keynes) plan and the Morgenthau plan on the ground that either of these schemes, if tried, "would lead us (American finance capital) to a worse condition."

The difference between Roosevelt and the bankers revolves around the *degree* of imperialist independence to be manifested by U. S. capitalism in relation to its allies, especially Britain. The Bankers' Committee will not however attempt to torpedo the Conference as Roosevelt did at the 1933 London Conference. They will bring pressure upon the Conference, so that it may more completely adopt the viewpoint of the American bankers. But they too cannot afford to have the Conference completely fail. They will "only" try to more completely dominate it.

Let us then proceed to analyze each of the specific problems under consideration at Bretton Woods, and expose the illusion they carefully cultivate, that a capitalist quack medicine in the form of a Stabilization Fund or Bank is capable of staving off the impending economic and political collapse that is sure to follow upon the heels of World War II. We must begin with the first objective of the Bretton Woods Conference: the creation of an International Fund to stabilize world currencies and thereby to restore "normal" commerce and trade which, as Morgenthau warned the delegates, is the "life blood" of capitalist society.

This fund is planned to have a paid-in capital of eight billion dollars. The subscription of each nation would be according to a system of quotas based in part on the amount of its normal foreign trade and partly on the size of its gold holdings. Under the latest revised plan, the quota for the U. S. will be about 2.75 billion dollars, Great Britain about 1.25 billions, the Soviet Union about 1 billion, China 600 million and Canada 300 million.

A great deal of material has lately appeared in the capitalist press, dealing with the relative advantages and disadvantages that would accrue under the mechanism of this plan, either to

Great Britain or the U. S.—such as the degree of dependability of the Fund upon gold, the management of the Fund, the distribution of the voting powers and the size of the subscription of each of the participating nations. All this is, however, of secondary importance, and is within the realm of an imperialist solution. The *key problem*—the *problem of deciding what the currencies of the nations at the Conference are actually worth (their exchange value) in terms of the dollar* and the stabilization of those currencies at an *agreed level*—has not even been publicly discussed and is so shrouded in secrecy that no press release of its status on the agenda of the Conference has been issued! But that, precisely, is the foundation upon which all the plans of the Conference are to be erected.

A glance at some of the world's currencies and their approximate exchange value in terms of the dollar will help to make the problem plainer:

Canadian Dollar90
British Pound	\$4.04
African Pound	3.98
Australian Pound	3.23
Cuban Peso	1.00
Mexican Peso20

Before *any* so-called "Fund" (which is more than a mere camouflaged loan transaction granted by the creditor nations to the debtors) can become effectively operative and on a sustained basis, the conferees must first fix a rate of exchange for each of the currencies represented at the Conference. In other words, it must be agreed, let us say, that the British Pound shall be assigned a par value of \$4.04; that the Mexican Peso shall be assigned a par value of 20c.; the Cuban, a value of \$1.00, etc., etc.

Why Fixed Currency Is Impossible

Why is such an agreement necessary? Is it not a fact that by the automatic operation of the law of supply and demand, currencies find their own price levels?

In the days of normal capitalist international relationships, no such agreements as are presently contemplated at Bretton Woods were necessary. The exchange rate for a specific currency was arrived at by the free (automatic) operation of the world money market. But since the crisis of 1930 and the severe economic dislocation that followed in its wake, the so-called "free" capitalist money markets gradually began to disappear and various "managed" or "doctored" currencies arose, ranging from those that deteriorated to mere scraps of paper, and some of dubious value, to those that are still strong and directly exchangeable such as the dollar and the pound.

So that today, about 90 per cent of the world's currencies are inconvertible, i.e., they cannot be freely sold on the regularly organized money exchanges, because of their uncertain value. It is therefore plain that if the Conference is to set an *actual value* on each of the national currencies represented at Bretton Woods, some of them would have to be declared bankrupt and still others far below their nominal value. The chaotic state of the world's currencies is merely a reflection in the field of foreign exchange of the anarchy that prevails in the sphere of capitalist production and distribution on a world scale.

If we assume that the United States, and Britain to a lesser extent, are to lend (or to subscribe, as is contemplated by the Stabilization Fund) gold-supported money to all participating countries of the Conference so that each would commence anew with a currency that is internationally valid and convertible, the experts would still be faced with the second and more

significant problem of maintaining the *stability of a fixed* relationship among the currencies of the world.

To maintain the stability of a fixed currency means, however, to freeze its exchange value. To freeze it from a legal (external) standpoint is quite a simple matter, but to freeze the actual (internal) value of a currency can only be done by freezing the total value of the commodities of a country. *And that is quite impossible.*

The reason for this was explained many years ago by Marx in his monumental book *Capital*.

"Values," says Marx, "are only definite masses of congealed labor time. The value of a commodity can only remain constant (i.e., frozen—S.M.) if the labor time required for its production remains constant" (or frozen). But, he continues, "the latter changes with every variation in the productiveness of labor."

Thus, in order to freeze the exchange value of a currency, it would also be necessary to freeze the commodities which are represented by the currency and thereby freeze the productiveness of labor. To do that, according to Marx, means to freeze the "average skill of the worker, the state of science, its practical application, the social organization of production, and the extent and capabilities of the means of production." In other words, it means, to put the economic relationships in each of the various countries in an iron vise, where no change whatsoever is permissible.

And does not this very tendency, in a somewhat different form, resemble the regimented and totalitarian economy which has been so roundly condemned as Nazism and Fascism at this very Conference? Try hard as the capitalist planners may under the rule of monopoly capitalism, all their schemes, if ultimately carried out, lead inevitably to the most ruthless economic and political regimentation. They can plan the most ingenious system of "blocked marks" in one part of the territory under imperialist domination and Stabilization Funds and Reconstruction Banks in another, but beneath it all is brutal and unrestrained finance capitalism in a blind alley. Only the proletarian world revolution can adequately solve the economic problem of our day on the basis of a free, socialist world.

Stalin's Policy in Rumania

(Continued from page 199)

Anglo-American imperialist coalition, which, after the defeat of Germany, will be in a position to exercise enormous pressure on the land of the Soviets.

The plan is both utopian and reactionary. The capitalists may and do accept Stalin's vile services. With his methods they have much in common. But this does not in any way lessen their basic hostility toward the Soviet Union. The capitalist world and the new socialist world whose beginnings are represented by the Soviet nationalized economy will remain in irreconcilable antagonism to one another. This antagonism can be resolved only by the restoration of capitalist private property in the Soviet Union, or by the defeat and liquidation of world capitalism. Meanwhile, Stalin betrays both the Soviet Union and the world working-class by his reactionary policies. The only real defense of the Soviet Union is the extension of the socialist revolution. In betraying the socialist struggle of the workers, Stalin deprives the Soviet Union of its greatest shield and armor.

Let us repeat again: Defense of the Soviet Union and the fight for a socialist world demands a never-flagging struggle against Stalin and the Kremlin clique, and their agents and supporters throughout the world.

Cuba's Elections: Background & Analysis

By J. B. STUART

The outcome of the Cuban elections of June 1, 1944 can be understood only as another, highly important manifestation of the reawakening anti-imperialist struggle that has recently been sweeping Central America and the Spanish speaking countries of the Western hemisphere. The victory of Ramon Grau San Martin and his "Autentico" Party (Partido Revolucionario Cubano) over the Government coalition of Batista and the Stalinists shows that the masses of the island Republic are as eager to rid themselves of the rule of Wall Street's puppets as the masses in other Latin American countries.

This does not, naturally, mean that by the election of Grau as president they have made positive headway in the direction they actually desire. For, Grau is formally pledged to support the war of the "democratic" imperialists and his old reputation as an anti-Wall Street warrior—already suspect by that very fact—has still to stand the practical test of a term in office.

The election result must be taken, rather, as an indication of the growing revolutionary *anger* against the redoubled exploitation which colonial and semi-colonial peoples are forced to suffer under the war-time conditions of the imperialist world.

Immediate Economic Causes

As in most Latin American countries, the war has entailed an increase in the cost of living and a corresponding downward sweep of living standards far more severe than similar phenomena in the United States. Curtailed imports of necessities, and an ever stricter confinement to the one-crop (in Cuba: sugar) system foisted by imperialism on most Anglo-Saxon colonies in the Caribbean, have raised prices of primary commodities beyond the reach of most of the population. The increase in nominal wages during the early war years—for which the Stalinist leaders of Cuban Confederation of Labor (*Confederacion de Trabajadores Cubanos*) like to take the credit—has long since been outraced by living costs and now, as in the United States, wages have been frozen—something which the Stalinists do not like to, but unquestionably can also take "credit" for.

Added to their economic misery, which the masses correctly ascribe to Yankee imperialism and its war—a war they cannot find any tangible reason to be enthusiastic over—are the burdens imposed by graft, corruption and political oppression under the eleven year old "democratic" dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista.

The Stalinists have the dominant position in the Confederacion de Trabajadores Cubanos, organized a few years ago, which embraces most of the working population of the island. Their present position is due primarily to their *former* anti-imperialist and militant role. They organized the trade union movement in their radical past. Since "people's front" days (1935) they had been flirting with Batista. Since June 21, 1941 they have actually become a government prop. In turn the Batista government has done all it could to integrate the Stalinist trade union leadership as part of its quasi-totalitarian machine.

With the C.T.C. membership getting out of their control as the Stalinist march toward reactionary politics accelerated, General Secretary Lazaro Peno and his henchmen found new means

of maintaining and entrenching themselves. Assisted by Batista's Ministry of Labor machinery, they have not only been able to flaunt a few fake concessions to cover up their miserable strike-breaking role (such as the government seizure of the Bacardi firm, a stunt on the style of Roosevelt's Montgomery Ward "seizure") but more ominously, to gag and purge internal trade union oppositions. For their part, the Stalinists have rigidly enforced the no-strike rule and virtually transformed the trade union apparatus into a veritable auxiliary police force of the government.

Composition of the Two Electoral "Blocs"

Sweeping resentment made itself felt in many unauthorized strikes as well as in mass demonstrations. The Batista regime felt compelled to hold an election which, considering its past record of terror and intimidation, was relatively free.

Arrayed in the election struggle were two blocs. One, the government bloc, called itself the Democratic Socialist Coalition. It was composed of the Liberals and the Democrats, parties long associated with Batista's dictatorship, and the Stalinists, who recently changed their name to "Popular Socialist Party."

The other, the opposition bloc, rallied around the Cuban Revolutionary Party, known popularly as the "Autenticos." This party played a leading role in overthrowing the regime of General Gerardo Machado in the anti-imperialist revolt of 1933. Its leader, Grau, was one of the provisional presidents in the interregnum that followed the revolt. His few months in office during 1934 were marked by several anti-Wall Street acts, the best known of which was a decree requiring all business enterprises to employ at least 50 per cent native Cubans.

In order to understand the evaluation made by the Cuban masses of these two blocs it is necessary to go beyond the surface issues and platforms. According to the press reports, Grau declared for "Cubanidad," (Cubanism), asserted the need for "collaboration of all classes," proclaimed "fair treatment of foreign capital" and hailed "collaboration in international relations rather than blind nationalism." All these vague and ambiguous aims could equally be found in the platform of the Government coalition in somewhat different language.

He also accused the Batista regime of "mismanagement of the war economy," of causing inflation and food shortages and of tolerating the black market. While these latter issues undoubtedly struck closer to home among the masses, in themselves they could not have been decisive as long as both contestants approved of the war, which has been used to justify their hardships.

The decisive factors in the Cuban masses' election verdict can be found only in the experiences of the past eleven years. The wartime conditions only served to accentuate and dramatize these experiences for them. A brief review of this past is therefore in order.

Review of the Political Background

In 1933, under the impact of the world economic crisis the proletariat and the students, the agrarian masses and the petty functionaries overthrew by a popular revolt the dictatorship of General Machado, whose regime applied in Cuba the gen-

eral line of Wall Street: to shift the burden of the crisis—through wage cuts and reduction of the budget—on the lower classes of the population under its control.

Labor organization, political life, national and anti-imperialist sentiment swept the country under the provisional regime of Grau San Martin, a university professor at Havana who led the uprising of the students.

American imperialism was alarmed. The Roosevelt New Deal started out on its vaunted "Good Neighbor" policy... by refusing recognition to the revolutionary Cuban government early in 1934.

The Army, in which the uprising was reflected by a "sergeants' revolt," remained a doubtful factor. Through Ambassador Sumner Welles—yes, the self-same the latter-day liberal saint—Yankee capitalism negotiated with the leader of the military insurgents, Sergeant Fulgencio Batista and won the army over against the revolution. Batista became Wall Street's "strong man," who upheld the hand of the successive puppet presidents to whom Washington deigned to grant recognition.

The Cuban army, 18,000 strong in peace time, could not but play a first rank role in the life of a country with a population of approximately 4,000,000. Together with the political police and the rural constabulary, all tightly controlled by the General Staff, this disproportionately large armed force could not be supported financially by an impoverished colonial people. From the first, the Washington powers had grasped this situation and, by manifold manipulations, they have fostered it as a reactionary tool to serve their interests. Even in the midst of an economic depression loans were found with which to maintain and even expand the Cuban army. Batista became entrenched.

Rule by decree became the law of the land. Strikes were prohibited, trade unions persecuted, political propaganda suppressed. The revolutionary masses, frustrated in their aims, seethed. The working class party which might then have welded them together for another successful assault, the young Communist Party of Cuba, was engaged in the ultra-leftism and divisive tactics characteristic of the "Third Period."

The Trotskyists, expelled from the C.P. only a year or so previously, did all they could to contribute political cohesion to the movement but with their meager forces could not overcome the preponderance of the adventurist petty bourgeois politics that dominated it.

The General Strike of 1935

In March 1935, the Autentico Party of Grau San Martin called a General Strike for which a united front "Committee of Proletarian Defense" was set up. The Stalinists called a General Strike under their own auspices and denounced the former as "social fascists." With the insurgent forces thus split, preparations inadequate and action premature, the strike was foredoomed to failure.

Batista declared a state of war. In three days of terror and bloodshed, the army crushed the strike. A curfew was proclaimed for nine at night. Not more than three persons were permitted to gather in the streets at any time. The trade union headquarters were raided and padlocked. The government admitted taking a toll of 30 dead among the strikers, among them the Trotskyist Crescencio Freire, and 900 prisoners. Six to ten year sentences were imposed upon trade union leaders, among them over a score of Trotskyists. The very carrying of a trade union card was made subject to imprisonment.

As an aftermath of the strike, Antonio Guiteras, the Autentico leader of *Joven Cuba*, the Left Wing youth organization

which had been in the vanguard of all the revolutionary developments, was assassinated by Batista's thugs as he was about to embark for a trip to Central America. Guiteras had come out of the upheaval with tremendous prestige. A brilliant and courageous leader, he had grown politically from the experience and was at the time of his assassination moving close to Trotskyism.

The brutal suppression of the General Strike and the assassination and imprisonment of its outstanding leaders concluded the revolutionary period and opened up the period of reactionary "stabilization" under the Batista dictatorship. For five years the country was ruled by dictatorial decree. With "stabilization" assured, Washington gave the signal for a "democratization" of the regime. A war was coming and democratic illusions were on the order of the day for imperialist policy.

In 1940 Batista promulgated a constitution and began to restore civil rights in piecemeal fashion. During the elections held that year under the new constitution, Batista succeeded in getting himself elected over Grau for the presidency. The masses had not yet had much of an opportunity for political life and Batista's new turn undoubtedly gained him a certain popularity among the masses after the years of dictatorial rule.

Political Revival After 1940

Labor organization flourished under the new conditions. For the first time a single centralized trade union federation was organized in Cuba. Subsidized by the Comintern, the C.P. naturally had more powerful means of maintaining an illegal existence than the other opposition parties suppressed in 1935. It was therefore not surprising that when trade unions and political organizations were once more legalized, the Stalinists emerged with the greatest organized strength and were able to capture control of the new Cuban Confederation of Labor, the C.T.C. Control of the trade unions, the base for expansion in many other fields of mass organization, made the Stalinists a powerful political factor in the country. With the entry of the Soviet Union into the war in June 1941, it became evident that collaboration between Batista and the Stalinists was inevitable. Stalin's war policy denoted support of Wall Street's puppets. Batista needed a mass base. At the same time, a sharp cleavage between the masses of trade union workers, particularly those under Autentico influence, and the Stalinists became just as inevitable.

Soon after the Stalinist Juan Marinello entered the Batista government, following its declaration of war on the side of the "United Nations," the C.T.C. was given "official status" by presidential decree. That signified the incorporation of the C.T.C. leadership and its policies into the Ministry of Labor. A government lottery to subsidize the new, \$200,000 headquarters of the C.T.C. was another payment made by Batista for Stalinist support.

The Stalinists, for their part, proclaimed their "no strike" policy and proceeded with characteristic thuggery to apply it against the recalcitrant workers. Among other things, they engineered the assassination of the popular Autentico trade union leader Sandalio Junco. Where their terrorist methods didn't work out so well for them, the strong arm of Batista was always there to lend aid.

Thus, in May 1943, a strike of Autentico railroad workers in Guantanamo, in which Trotskyists played a leading role, proved to be too stubborn for the Stalinists to break by the usual means. The workers stood firm in their demand for a 50 per cent increase in wages to meet a 300 per cent rise in

living costs. The strike even began to spread and threatened to take on the form of an area-wide general strike. At this point Batista rushed in troops to man the trains. The strike was finally broken, the leading militants—among them the Trotskyists Juan Medina and Luciano Garcia—were victimized, but the government felt itself compelled nevertheless to grant increases of from 15 to 20 per cent.

Preliminary Clashes

In numerous other struggles of a similar nature, the lineup for the election contest was similarly foreshadowed. While the Stalinists were still able to maintain their sway over a considerable section of the workers and the population as a whole—in part through their bureaucratic job control and in part because of the prestige of the Soviet Union with which they tend to be identified in the popular mind—the most militant sections of the working class had turned decisively against them, against Batista and, of course, against the policy of supporting American imperialism common to both. Opposition to the Stalinists and to Batista was naturally associated with the great struggles of 1933, 1934 and 1935. Out of those struggles against imperialism and for national and social liberation, the political figure of Grau San Martin arose with the least blemish and with the greatest prestige. It was not for the miserable “platform” of Grau, but for the revolutionary banner of 1933-1935 and against “continuismo”—the tendency of the Batista regime to perpetuate itself—that the Cuban masses cast their decisive majority in the presidential elections.

This analysis is substantiated by the result of the elections for the two houses of the Cuban legislature. There, with nondescript political groupings and personages aligned with both blocs, the so-called Democratic Socialist Coalition elected a majority of Senators in four out of the six provinces and obtained a majority in the lower house over the Autentico-Republican coalition. There the Stalinists also obtained a slight increase in votes.

Grau's main base of support, as already indicated, lay in the masses of Autentico workers who have been in continual conflict with the Batista regime and the Stalinist leaders of the C.T.C. It is therefore not surprising that one of the first declarations of policy by the President-elect has dealt with the trade unions. In it he openly proclaims his intention of intervening by state means in the C.T.C. against Stalinist control. The latter have opened a campaign on this subject, hypocritically protesting today against government intervention in the unions, which they invited and welcomed only yesterday. They make a big show of being for trade union democracy now, with “fullest rights for every political tendency”—yesterday they were carrying on a violent drive (unsuccessful to be sure) to run the Trotskyists out of the labor movement.

Grau Adopts a Batista Policy

Grau's announced “trade union policy” provides grave cause for apprehension—but only because it follows in the well-trodden footsteps of Batista. A struggle against it, which is vital to the task of reestablishing the independence of the unions, is unthinkable, however, without a concomitant fight against the Stalinist originators of this reactionary policy.

What the new president intends to do to live up to his anti-imperialist past record is not known. If he has anything in mind, he has kept it secret. But it has been rumored that “American interests” are discouraging plots for coups d'Etat hatched by Batista's military camarilla. (One such plot was quickly exposed and its sponsor, a Batista-made general, fled

by plane to... Miami). Apparently Big Business has a little scheme to housebreak Grau—if not as yet an understanding with him.

For the Stalinists, the election has undoubtedly been a heavy blow. If the Autentico leader goes through with his declared plans, they stand to lose many government posts as well as their strangle-hold on the trade union apparatus. Their whole powerful machine (it is more ramified, richer relative to the size of the country, and far more influential than the U.S. Stalinist machine) stands in danger of cracking up. Although they accuse Grau of being a tool of the *Falangists* (what is true is that he did receive editorial support from such organs as the *Diario de la Marina*, the reactionary Havana daily which has been known to espouse the cause of the Franco-inspired Fascists) that should not deter them from doing all they can to make a deal with him. Indeed, in the *Daily Worker* (July 14), a report informs us that the Stalinist leader Blas Roca, secretary of the “Popular Socialist Party” can see “no obstacle to united work with Grau should he show himself willing to accept unity.”

Both the interests of the Cuban Stalinist bureaucracy and that in the Kremlin dictate such a line. Only a falling out between Grau and Washington could seriously change it.

The future of the anti-imperialist trend indicated by the elections and the strike struggle preceding it will not, however, be decided by the actions of Grau or of the Stalinists—though their capacity to impede it cannot and must not be underestimated. The masses are on the move and their voice will, it can be expected, be heard in ever greater volume in the coming political life of the Island republic. The success of their aspirations is tied up with the ability of the conscious vanguard of the working class—the Trotskyists—to place themselves at the head of the struggle and to pursue the tested policies of the Fourth International in the course of its development.

The Trotskyist Movement in Cuba

The Trotskyists in Cuba are known as the Partido Revolucionario Obrero or Revolutionary Workers Party. First appearing on the scene as an independent political grouping in 1932, they grew rapidly in the stirring days of 1933-1935. But they were completely outlawed and decimated in the terror that followed the defeat of the Autentico-sponsored General Strike. Since then the organization has slowly recuperated, working illegally and semi-legally, and only recently regained its place as a factor in the political life of the country. After years of a stifled sectarian existence underground, these valiant comrades have with great hardship and many sacrifices, established a firm mass base, particularly in the Oriente and Guantanamo provinces, where the Trotskyists enjoy considerable trade union influence, primarily among workers, the majority of whom still follow the Autentico leadership politically.

Trotskyists came as delegates to last year's national congress of the C.T.C. and there defeated decisively the Stalinists' attempts to oust them from the unions. Aside from their successful self-defense, they played a great and prominent role in the deliberations of the Congress as a whole. They put forward resolutions embodying the *Transitional Program* of the Fourth International which received wide minority support. They took the leading part in preventing a split of the trade union movement proposed by the Autentico leaders on provocation from the Stalinists, who mismanaged credentials and used their other well-known machine tricks to impose their line on the Congress. The Autentico workers upheld the Trotskyists against their own leaders in the caucuses and to-

gether with them formed an organized Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition to combat Stalinism within the *united* Confederation. (A full account of the events centering around the Congress can be found in the August, 1943 issue of the *Fourth International*).

As a result, the prestige of the Trotskyist trade unionists was greatly increased, and their influence has been growing steadily.

In the current elections, the P.R.O. attempted to get on the ballot at least for the municipal contests. The Supreme Court, after a legal struggle, denied them the right. The party then held a *write-in* campaign for Mayor and Alderman in Guantanamo. As its candidates, it ran comrades Juan Medina and Luciano Garcia, the two militants victimized for their part in the railroad workers' strike the year before. In spite of the wide-spread illiteracy of the workers in that provincial city, *the party's standard bearers received over 1,000 officially counted votes!*

Criticism of P.R.O. Election Policy

Unfortunately, the P.R.O. could not participate in the presidential or the national legislative elections with candidates of its own. The central committee, therefore, decided to give *critical support* to Grau San Martin. Indeed, the support was much more *critical* than "support." Nevertheless, the mere act of endorsing the candidacy of Grau deviated from Bolshevik policy in election tactics. Trotskyists have supported candidates of other political organizations 1) when they represented another working class party against capitalist party candidates; 2) when support of such candidates would further the objective of independent labor political action or 3), in the case of colonial countries, when the candidates ran on an unambiguous and uncompromising anti-imperialist platform.

Grau's candidacy did not fall into any of these categories. On the contrary, in his "platform," he declared for collaboration with the imperialists of the "United Nations." His electoral bloc, moreover, included bourgeois nationalists hostile to labor. Under such conditions, support of the Autentico leader was impermissible.

In their declaration on the elections which appeared in the official organ *Revolucion Proletaria* (May 1, 1944) the P.R.O. comrades correctly evaluate Grau as follows:

"Grau's turn to the right and to conservatism, which is most clearly expressed in the vice-presidential candidacy of

Raul de Cardenas, figures prominently in the domestic reaction, the unconditional abandonment by the Autentico leader of the anti-imperialist struggle in favor of "democratic" imperialism and finally, the presentation by the Partido Revolucionario Cubano of confessed Machada followers as its candidates—such as Aquilino Lombardi and Deldo Nunez Mesa—are proof of the Autentico leadership's liquidation of all revolutionary manifestations of the party; they indicate how the leadership has broken with the aims and interests of the masses which continue to remember the glorious events of 1933."

However, from this correct appraisal, they drew the following erroneous and confusing conclusion: "We do not propose support of Grau San Martin as a 'lesser evil'; we give him critical support in conformity with the Leninist theory, as a tactic in fighting the immediate enemy of the working class: that is, the military police dictatorship of Batista, disguised under the trappings of the Socialist Democratic Coalition."

Unquestionably the masses' first desire was to get rid of the self-perpetuating Batista regime. And unquestionably, that is why they rushed pell mell to the illusory hope represented by Grau's Autentico banner. But, that is precisely why it was the task of the revolutionists to clearly dissociate themselves from that treacherous banner and, in the best way possible to make heard the voice of genuine anti-imperialist struggle.

Under the circumstances, that was a most difficult task. The masses, in the heat of the election contest, would not perhaps have paid much heed to the party voice. But, in the stormy days to come, such a stand would undoubtedly have redounded to the greater prestige and strength of the party which alone refused to join in upholding the treacherous politicians of either camp, and which traced the clear and correct course while all the others vied to confuse and deceive the masses.

The P.R.O. is now engaged in a discussion and reevaluation of its electoral policy, in which co-thinkers in other countries are participating. By virtue of mutual and comradely criticism and aid, the young P.R.O. will gain in theoretical strength, solidify its already important progress in mass influence and learn to overcome the manifold and complicated obstacles that confront it on the road toward establishing itself as the party of the Cuban proletariat. Its responsibility is enormous. For, only with a party grounded in Marxist theory and Bolshevik tactics can the Cuban revolution hope to conquer.

Britain's Labor Party Faces a Crisis

By OUR LONDON CORRESPONDENT

The Labor Party has a dual structure of political and trade union wings. The political wing comprises the local branches, Divisional Labor Parties and Constituency Labor Parties. All of these local parties are organized in accordance with Local Government or Parliamentary Electoral Areas. For example, in any city, the smallest Labor Party branch will be the Ward Committee, which is the Party Committee in any local government electoral area. Delegates go from the Ward Committees to the City, Divisional and Constituency Labor Party, which latter is the Labor Party local, comprising all members in the Parliamentary constituency concerned. This form of organization, in times of elections, constitutes a highly efficient

and formidable electoral machine and indeed it was designed for that very purpose.

The trade union wing of the Labor Party, on the other hand, is entirely different in structure. Each union, at the Annual Conference of the Party, is represented by a delegate or a delegation. These delegates represent all the votes of those affiliated to the Labor Party by virtue of paying the political levy. Members of any union who sign the form contracting to pay one penny per month to the Union political funds, are thus represented as a bloc at the Labor Party conferences. There is, however, no prior discussion on political questions in the union which has any binding power over the delegate who is usually

a leader appointed by the Executive. He is simply at the conference to represent Union policy—that is, the policy of the bureaucracy—but he wields the vote of the entire affiliated membership of his Union.

Slump in Party Life

At the Annual Conferences of the Labor Party, voting is by total numbers of members affiliated, either by direct individual membership, i.e. "political" membership, or by trade union affiliated membership. The figures for 1944 disclosed 235,501 individual members of the Labor Party compared with 2,237,307 affiliated through trade unions. The overwhelming vote wielded by the trade union delegates at the Party Conferences thus becomes apparent. It is necessary to bear the above in mind when considering events in the Labor Party.

During the course of the war, and certainly since the entry of Labor representatives into the Churchill Coalition in 1940, the internal life of the Party has dropped to a very low level. Ward Committees very often meet only every three months. Individual membership has slumped badly. Very few public meetings are held. In general, as an organized party, the Labor Party may be said to be moribund. In most localities, the Labor Party takes no lead at all on any questions. Where an active functioning Labor Party exists, it becomes a battleground of opposing, usually Stalinist and Left wing, political tendencies. Insofar as such a local party operates, its main work is restricted to "educational" meetings, or the convening of a May Day Committee, etc.

The leaders of the Labor Party, those who are now Ministers, or in Government posts, have become completely divorced from the party base. It is not necessary here to outline the reactionary legislation and activities of Morrison, Bevin, Alexander and a host of others. But the direction in which they are driving, it is important to note, is more and more to the Right. The recent pronouncement of Labor Party foreign policy is more reactionary than any they have made in the past. The Government White Paper on Employment is typical bourgeois reaction, and the Labor Party Ministers still remain in the Government and thus give tacit consent to it. And, of course, the recent promulgation of Regulation 1AA, and the arrest of the Trotskyists mark a new level of collaboration with the worst Tory reaction.

Two Antagonistic Trends

Parallel with the apathy of the party organization and the leadership's swing to the Right, proceeds the ever greater integration of the trade union apparatus in the state. The influence of the bureaucratic executive councils of the unions is consistently thrown behind the most reactionary current Labor Party figures in the Government at any particular time. Further, the union bureaucrats in return are guaranteed powerful aid from the government circles against the leftward pressure from the masses.

However, this over-boiling, leftward pressure of the masses is the factor which complicates and threatens to destroy the whole bureaucratic reactionary set-up. Particularly in the armed forces, a great spirit of questioning and discussion pervades the atmosphere. The events in the Eighth Army, such as the recent poll, which showed an overwhelming majority of the soldiers in favor of the right to strike in wartime, give poignant evidence of this spirit.

The transition to new production forms, curtailing war production and the preparation for peacetime production with its concomitant redundancy of labor and reduction of wages, are

having a far-reaching effect upon the political orientation of the workers. It thus becomes more and more difficult for the union bureaucrats and the labor leaders to effectively keep the workers in check. The rising crescendo of strikes, culminating in the great miners' strikes this year, was a sufficient warning and indication to the bureaucrats that their whole policy was in danger.

In terms of political allegiance, however, the entire process has led to the undoubted fact that if a general election were to be held now, the Labor Party would get an overwhelming majority. At the moment, the workers and soldiers believe, in the main, that everything would be better if the Tory influence were to be completely crushed, and the Labor leaders given a free hand. Meanwhile, amongst certain sections of the workers, such as the miners and factory workers in some of the key engineering centers, a deep distrust of Bevin, Morrison and the Labor Party tops has set in.

It is the contradiction between the reactionary activities of the Labor Party tops and the militant temper of the workers which determines the whole course of the struggles in the Labor Party today. The mass pressure has resulted in a crystallization of what are called the "Labor Lefts" in the House of Commons, who attempt to give vent to the frustrated feeling of sections of the workers, and at the same time lead these feelings into "safe" channels.

Crystallization of the "Labor Left"

The "Labor Left" consists of such Members of Parliament as Aneurin Bevan, Silverman, Sorenson, Cove, Alex Sloan, S. O. Davies, R. R. Stokes and Rhys Davies. The recognized leader of this group is Aneurin Bevan, a miner's M.P. representing Ebbw Vale, in South Wales.

Other Left groupings exist in the Labor Party in more or less varying strength in the rank and file; the "Victory for Socialism" group, for example, is one small group of centrists. The "Socialist Vanguard" and "Clarity" groups are similar left reformist tendencies and the *Tribune*, a weekly labor paper, provides a kind of common platform for the airing of Left Labor views. There is also the Militant group, which fights on a revolutionary Marxist position, but, like the other groups just mentioned, has as yet no mass support.

But far and away the most important Left critic of the present Labor leaders is Aneurin Bevan and his loose grouping in the House of Commons. Bevan has great mass support among the miners of South Wales as a result of his opposition to 1AA, and his speeches against the government over a long period. Some of his speeches in South Wales to miners' audiences have been so "Left" that it would be difficult to distinguish them from those of a revolutionist—at least on issues dealing with the mining industry—and except for the fact that in the background, there is always evidence of his pro-war position.

Aneurin Bevan has placed himself at the head of the agitation against Regulation 1AA, in the Labor Party. In Parliament, on April 28, he moved a prayer for the annulment of the regulation. In his speech in the House, Bevan made a trenchant attack on Minister of Labor Ernest Bevin and the trade union bureaucrats. The following are some quotations from his speech.

"If the Right Honorable Gentleman (Bevin) thinks that he has the support of the armed forces, then he does not know the mood of the armed forces. The men who will shortly go to France are not soldiers. They are civilians in uniform. They are miners, busmen, farm laborers, shop assistants and the like. . . . Now, after putting them in uniform and handing them the orders, the government stabs them in the back . . ."

"Many trade union officials do not like the shop stewards because the shop stewards are nearer the men than they are, and therefore challenge the supremacy of the trade union officials. One way of becoming a Member of Parliament is to become a shop steward or to lead a strike and then to be sent to gaol for so doing. That is a certain lever for getting into Parliament. But these shop stewards are all alarmed and I have had telegrams from shop stewards all over the country expressing alarm about this . . .

"It is an astonishing spectacle to see conservative members giving special legal protection not to trade unions but to trade union officials, because it is the trade union officials who are invoking the law against their own members. Do not let anybody on this side of the House think that he is defending the trade unions; he is defending the trade union official, who has arteriosclerosis, and who cannot readjust himself to his membership. He is defending an official who has become so unpopular among his own membership that the only way he can keep them in order is to threaten them with five years in gaol. Wherever you get the rank and file at trade union meetings, this regulation will be opposed. The General Council of the Trade Union Congress, at the top, supports it, but the worker at the bottom opposes it. The further you get away from the trade union official to the rank and file, the less support the regulation gets. The more you move away from reality, from the robust, dignified, normal worker, to the jaded, cynical, irresponsible trade union official, the more support the regulation gets."

Bevan and the New Anti-Labor Laws

The quotations give a good indication of the acerbity which the differences between the political Lefts of the Labor Party and the trade union bureaucrats have reached.

By placing himself at the head of the protests against IAA, Aneurin Bevan has scored a decisive personal victory. Greenwood, the leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party, supported by Bevan, Attlee, and the rest of the Labor Party leaders, attempted to expel Bevan from the Party, but were completely unsuccessful. The rank and file Labor M.P.'s refused to stand for it. They have constituents to face and they know what is and what is not healthy for them.

The Executive Board of the Welsh Miners Federation had already unanimously demanded the repeal of the regulation, and in the course of a few weeks a majority of the union executives were forced by the rank and file to register opposition to it.

The net result of the whole affair has been to strengthen the Labor Party Lefts at the expense of the reactionary bureaucracy.

Aneurin Bevan nailed his colors to the masthead in a very important article in the *Tribune* of May 26. In this article, Bevan affirms the necessity of a mass Labor Party based upon the unions. The identification of a political Labor Party and the unions is and has been the Party's main source of strength and stability. "Strength from the unions and social purpose from the Party; those are still the twin merits which justify the trade union basis of the British Labor Party."

He goes on to point to the masses of youth who have been "enormously stimulated by the existing conditions of public affairs" (the swing to the Left) and italicizes "*It is absolutely vital that we should devise the means for them to express themselves through the medium of the labor movement both in industry and politics.*"

He points out the danger of fascism if the youth are not given a fighting way out. It is precisely in this that the unions

are failing us, says Bevan. He refers to the great volume of correspondence he gets expressing "deep indignation with the fact that decisions are being taken in their name affecting their lives most intimately and yet with no attempt made to consult their opinions." The trouble is that "as things are, the trade union affiliates as a single unit, with the result that only on rare occasions can the trade union as a whole form a view on a political question. The practical effect of this is that the executives and officials of the unions at the top make the real decisions on policy, while the rank and file fumes at the bottom, condemned to frustration."

The Demand for Party Reform

Bevan suggests that union branches should affiliate to their local labor parties, not, as now, affiliating as a union to the Labor Party nationally. Without this reform, and a new turn in the Party, the danger of a split and break-up of the Party is very real.

The article by Bevan voices a demand for a reform which has long been advocated, and which would undoubtedly have a vitalizing effect on the Labor Party. On their own behalf, the union tops strike back by jeering impotently at the "intellectuals." Ernest Bevin himself the other day protested against any domination of the party by intellectuals. Harold J. Laski, the President of the Party and one of the "intellectuals" published a reply in the *Tribune*.

One of the standard bones of contention between the two factions is the question of the electoral truce and the coalition. At several bye-elections, the Government candidates have been defeated. In those constituencies where the Tory and Labor Parties have supported notorious reactionary candidates, Commonwealth or Left Independent candidates have won victories. This fact, and the restiveness of the rank and file, have produced their reaction. At the last Labor Party conference, which was postponed ostensibly due to the Second Front, 40 M.P.'s had resolutions demanding the ending of the truce, although not necessarily the coalition. The *Tribune* has begun recently to doubt the value of national unity abroad, and has taken a stand which implies that it is only a matter of time before that "Left" organ demands the ending of the coalition.

To sum up, the effect of the increasingly reactionary trend of the Labor Party leaders at a period when there is a rapid swing to the left, is to produce the beginning of a serious split in the Labor Party.

In the past, all Left movements and groupings in the Labor Party have been initiated or have fallen into the hands of the Communist Party of Great Britain. Since 1935 all of these groupings, under Stalinist direction, have borne a Popular Front character. In fact, Aneurin Bevan and the Labor Lefts are tending in the direction of a "Left coalition" even now. However, there is a difference between 1944 and the past.

New Signposts in the Situation

For one thing, the Stalinists are today among the staunchest supporters of Churchill and his Tory-Labor cabinet. Any flirtations that they may undertake with the Labor Lefts in the C.P.'s so-called "Left Unity" campaign will have as their object to revert the whole movement to allegiance to Churchill and Co. This is known far and wide and it runs counter to the whole line of Aneurin Bevan and his friends, who base themselves on the radicalization of the masses.

For another, there exists today in Great Britain a growing Trotskyist party, the Revolutionary Communist Party. This party has already established contact with the masses and poses

an alternative before them which Bevan and the Labor Lefts can hardly ignore. The case of the Four Trotskyists has aroused nation-wide publicity. The trade union masses are responding to the persecution with great warmth. In defense of the arrested Trotskyists and with the objective of repealing the infamous IAA regulation, a genuine working class united front movement has been initiated. Its further political development is bound to pose the question of Proletarian Front versus Popular Front as the practical answer to the needs of the masses.

Aneurin Bevan and several Labor Lefts were invited to join the new united front organization, the Anti-Labor Laws Victims' Defense Committee. The fact that they have joined the Committee shows not only that they are aware of the trend but

that, under the pressure from below, they have to recognize it as a political factor with which they will have to count in the future.

The invasion of Europe has brought a pause in the industrial struggle. But there is no shadow of a doubt that the struggle will reopen on a far higher plane. In the period of temporary industrial quiet, the regroupments in the class struggle are taking place in the political sphere, within the framework of the Labor Party. Meanwhile the Aneurin Bevan group in the House of Commons, with its mass support in the mining areas, appears to be the immediate focus around which the Left wing of British labor is crystallizing.

London, June 1944.

Lessons of the 1934 Revolt in Austria

An Account of a Participant

By P. BERGER

It was ten o'clock in the morning, on February 14th, 1934, when the power in our little workshop in Vienna stopped. Our noisy machinery turned unusually quiet.

"What's that?" I asked my foreman. "General strike!"

Already, a neighbor was in to ask if our power had stopped as well. There was no argument. Everybody had expected some action of the Austrian working class, long famous for its militancy.

When the three of us, my boss who was a little Polish Jew as poor as any worker, my foreman, a Hungarian engineer, and myself, the errand boy, walked through the town, the trams were dragged by army lorries to the depot to prevent the workers from using them as barricades. All the bridges across the Danube Canal which divided the working class suburbs from the city, were in the hands of the army. Nobody could enter or leave the city without identification. Machine guns and barbed wire were placed in front of important buildings in the main roads. Soldiers in battledress were patrolling the streets. Great activity was manifested at the entrance of the war office. Everything was ready to smash capitalist democracy, under which the workers possessed some rights, and to establish a fascist dictatorship. This was the final moment for twenty years of Social Democratic "constitutional leadership."

Twenty Years of "Austro-Marxism"

What was the starting point of this leadership?

In 1914, the Austro-Marxists placed their services at the disposal of the Habsburg Monarchy. Although they claimed to be Republicans, this made no difference to them. "Our country was in danger!" So Republicans and Monarchists, exploiter and exploited, parasites and Social Democrats, chauvinists and Second Internationalists, all were supposed to join hands to save "our country."

The war imposed terrible burdens on the working class. Trouble in the Balkans, conscription of farm labor, revolting national minorities; all this caused the breakdown of Austro-Hungarian national economy.

In the towns, people started to stand in line at four o'clock in the morning to obtain a half pint of milk for a family. . . . Tremendous losses in men and material at the fighting front, insufficient food supply for the army; all these taken to-

gether resulted in a revolutionary upsurge of the masses against the ruling class and the war.

The February Revolution in Russia threw some light on the events to come. A permanent revolutionary wave was approaching. It did not pass its climax until the greater part of the European proletariat had participated in the revolutionary fight. The October Revolution demonstrated to the world working class what had to be done to seize power. The capitalist state machinery had to be destroyed, a dictatorship of the proletariat to be established.

After a year of reorganization of the revolutionary movement inside Germany, the Kiel sailors mutinied, Hamburg went "red," Soviets were set up, dual power developed. The Kaiser abdicated on the 11th of November 1918, but left the Generals behind. The Austrian Emperor immediately followed suit. On November 12th, 1918, the Austrian Republic was proclaimed—the workers took possession of the factories. In Hungary the regime of the ruling class was overthrown and a Soviet Republic set up. In Milan and Turin, Italian Socialists were in power. The European revolution was in full swing. But a revolutionary party was necessary for its successful conclusion.

Social Democracy in "Power"

The Social Democrats formed the new government in Austria. What was their political line? "No bloodshed!—Nothing against the law!—Keep quiet and leave everything to us, as we are now in the Government!" The popular slogan of Otto Bauer (Left wing Austro-Marxist) was: "What is the good of taking a disrupted economy from the capitalists? Let the capitalists pump life into their own system, and let us take it over afterwards."

The Social-democratic Party Government suppressed the young Communist Party by every means, but they did not declare it illegal. However, in order to remain in power, the S.P. had to do better than merely betray the worker's cause. They were confronted with the urgent problems of housing, starvation, tuberculosis, unemployment etc.

After the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Peace Treaty of Saint Germain), Austria was left with only six million inhabitants, one third of which lived in the capital, Vienna. Under these circumstances, the Social Democrats saw no chance of reviving the national economy and so came forward

with the slogan of unification with Germany. But how could the western imperialists agree to this? Their motto was: divide and rule!

The Anglo-American stranglehold on the bankrupt Central Powers, made the Social Democracy dependent entirely on material help from the West. Since they could not satisfy their masters, the S. P. Government had to resign. Cardinal Seipel became head of a reactionary government with the line of an independent Austria.

It must be stated here, the slogan of unification with Germany was correct. But it could only be carried into practice by linking up with the Hungarian revolution on the one hand and the German revolution on the other. By so doing, a tremendous revolutionary bloc would have been created which no power on earth could have challenged. But how could the Social Democrats think of forming such a revolutionary bloc when they betrayed the revolution in their own country? Of course, the Austro-Marxists were prepared to unite with the Weimar Social Democrats, with leaders like Noske, Ebert and Scheidemann, the murderers of Luxemburg and Liebknecht and thousands of other Spartakists and Socialists who tried to establish a Soviet Germany. But never with revolutionists!

Municipal Reformism's Magic Formula

By 1923 the revolutionary wave had passed its climax. The S.P. had control of the Viennese City Council. The big chance for the Social Democrats to prove their "theory" of reformism had come. What was their plan? "Tax the rich! Put these taxes into the building industry! Thereby we solve the housing problem and get industry running." "Tax the rich!" was the Austro-Marxists' magic formula. They did their job very well, taking into account the limitations of the capitalist system. Many good working class apartment houses were built. Efficient management of social insurance made possible the reduction of T. B. cases to a very small number. Babies' outfits were given to every expectant mother. But all these measures depended on the money taken in taxes from the rich. A poor security!

The capitalist class did not like the "terror" of taxation. They schemed to organize a fascist guard and prepared to attack at the right moment. So they did. The "Heimwehr", (Home Guard, not officially connected with the State) mostly recruited from the peasantry and petty bourgeoisie, was organized. Their main task was strike-breaking and terrorizing the workers.

The S.P. had no better reply to this challenge than to make comical sketches and songs about the "Heimwehr." As always when the working class retreats, reaction advances. The Heimwehr started killing and assaulting S.P. "Defense Guards." The fascist murderers were always released without a sentence. That happened time and time again. The workers watched this development with growing anxiety. Their tempers rose. One time, when it became known that four Fascist murderers of two S.P. "Defense Guards" were released without punishment, the Viennese workers left their factories, marched down to the Fascist press, set it on fire. Then the excited workers went down to the Courthouse, where the Fascists were tried, to set it on fire as well. Practically a General Strike developed. All the workers were out in the streets. A real battle started in the center of Vienna between the workers and the Police.

These were the events of July 15th, 1927. The workers fought practically with their bare fists and without organization. But despite this, Vienna was in their hands.

Where was the S.P. leadership? They came down to the

scenes of the struggle on Fire Brigade cars, to order the challenged workers to go home and leave the whole dispute to them. The S.P. leadership had built up a great deal of respect through their work in the Viennese city council. The workers followed their leaders obediently, if reluctantly.

A debate came up in Parliament, and the July uprising was "settled"—at least for the S.P. leadership and the workers who were betrayed. The capitalist class, however, had learned a decisive lesson. The police were reinforced, and equipped with armoured cars etc.

The Social Democrats saw in the July uprising "just an accident" and not the last link in a chain of events. As dissension within their own party ranks grew, they tried to overcome all critics with appeals for unity. There was no other real working class party in Austria. The C.P. had only about a thousand members. Unity of all Social Democrats meant in reality unity of the working class. But of what use was this unity behind traitors to the working class cause?

The world economic crisis put an end to the reformist tax policy. As the factories stood idle, there were no profits and consequently no taxes. A radicalization of the working masses set in as a result of the crisis. The big chance for the C.P. to increase their influence had come. How did the C.P. begin their campaign? By denouncing the S.P. leadership as "Social Fascists." This was, however, not the way of winning the confidence of the rank and file Social Democrats. The workers felt offended when their leaders, having introduced quite a few good reforms, were called Social Fascists. So it happened that on the event of the second revolutionary crisis in Europe, the working class was again left without a revolutionary party.

The "IF" Policy of Fighting Reaction

In Austria it was obvious to everybody that a decisive fight between the working class and the capitalists was inevitable. The rebellious spirit of the youth against the S.P. bureaucracy intensified. But they were too confused and too weak politically to form an independent group immediately. When in 1933, Hitler came to power through the betrayal of the German S.P. and C.P., the situation in Austria went from bad to worse. The Austrian Fascists gained strength. The workers asked themselves: "Are we, too, going to capitulate without a fight?" "Oh no!" the S. P. leadership answered, "we are going to fight IF—

1. If Parliament is dissolved,
2. If the Social Democratic Party is dissolved,
3. If the Trade Unions are illegalized,
4. If the Social Democratic 'Defense Guards' (Schutzbund) is banned."

Thus the Social Democrats stated their terms before the fight had even started. So that it was left to the Fascists to organize their forces and open the offensive when it suited them best. The "IF" program had only one effect on the working class: it demoralized them when they should have gone over to the offensive. The reaction took the best advantage of the Four Point Program of the S.P. They discovered a constitutional right to run the country without Parliament, but through Emergency Laws. The S.P. took no action when these laws were enforced, as this case was not included in their four points. The C.P. was declared illegal—again no action on the part of the S.P.! Demonstrations were banned. "Alright!" the S.P. said, "if we are not allowed to march in the streets, we shall walk on the sidewalks." And so they did. But then the S.P. had a splendid idea. "Send protest telegrams, signatures, deputations down to

Ballhaus Platz (the government center), let the Premier bear the whole weight of public opinion!"

The police started searching for the arms of the S.P. "Defense Guards." But again: was the S.P. leadership going to fight if the workers' arms were taken away? Oh NO! The terms for the "fight" were already stated. Thousands of rifles, machine guns, hand grenades, etc. were confiscated. The mood of the workers rose to fighting pitch. When the police and the Heimwehr (which had meantime been given the status of auxiliary police) knocked at the door of the S.P. headquarters to search for more arms, they were received with bullets. That was the beginning of the February fighting.

The news spread immediately all over the country. Workers left their factories. Some groups of S.P. "Defense Guards" took possession of the Karl-Marx-House and other buildings in Vienna on their own initiative. Other crowds of workers were standing about in the streets, waiting for arms and instructions. The Fire Brigade, which was completely Socialist, was standing ready. Every worker was prepared to fight. The only body that still wavered was the S.P. leadership.

The reactionaries, however, were determined for a show-down. All the armed forces, army, police and Heimwehr brought their artillery, etc., into position and working class resistance was smashed in four days. The social democratic workers fought heroically for a cause lost only because of the betrayal of their leadership.

The S.P. leaders were ready in their own way: most of them got over the border and went to Prague to write about the glorious struggle of the Austrian Social Democrats...

Let it be stated here once and for all: The Austrian working class was not defeated by the class enemy. It was betrayed by its own leaders. Otto Bauer and other S.P. leaders admitted, that had the S.P. leadership made up their mind to fight even after all the blunders they had committed in the last 20 years, the working class would have won.

That is the most important lesson the world working class must learn. *The readiness of the working class to fight is not enough.* A revolutionary leadership prepared to lead the revolting masses is the necessary precondition for a working class victory.

The Austrian working class was, as a matter of fact, completely united behind its leaders. The whole outcome of 20 years' unity makes it clear to every worker that *unity is not enough.*

Unity on the basis of a *revolutionary program*, unity on the basis of the Program of the Fourth International—that is the unity the working class needs for final victory.

After the February fighting the S. P. changed their name to "Revolutionary Socialists." This did not prevent the S.P. youth from leaving the Second International and entering the Third International on an erroneous assumption that the Third International was still a revolutionary International. What did the Austrian C.P. do with these young revolutionary elements? All they did was organize futile demonstrations which resulted in the imprisonment of hundreds of these young revolutionists. What was necessary after the defeat of 1934 was to train the young revolutionists into cadres of the working class, and to come out in the open when the working class had started to recover. Instead of this policy the Austrian C.P. gave the impression that the fall of Austrian Fascism was not far off.

When the German imperialists had fulfilled their rearmament program, Germany's first step on the road to world domination was the occupation of Austria. What was the situation immediately before the occupation? The "Revolutionary Socialists" and Trade Unions came out of their illegality to negotiate with Schuschnigg (the bourgeois premier who "stood" for national independence) the terms on which they would fight Hitler's occupation army. The terms were simple. The R. S., the T. U. and the S. P. would have to be declared legal and the S. P. "Defense Guards" rearmed to fight Hitler. But Schuschnigg did not accept the terms. No wonder: "What if the workers turn their arms not only against Hitler but against us as well?" he must have thought. Of course, the Austrian capitalists preferred the rule of the German imperialists to the rule of the proletariat. It was just another example of how the national bourgeoisie "fights" for national independence.

Today again, the slogan for Austrian independence has been put forward by the western imperialists and the old betrayers of the Austrian working class. Thus they aim to confuse the Austrian working class, to set up a reactionary fortress in the midst of a revolutionary Europe, to separate the revolutionary Balkans from the rest of the continent. But all these manoeuvres won't work. The twenty years of Austrian "independence," with their unemployment and starvation will not be forgotten. Nor will the years of unification under German Fascism be forgotten. The way out for the Austrian working class is very clear: Independent working class struggle of the Austrian and German masses against their oppressors, the capitalist class; independent working class struggle under the leadership of the Fourth International.

Only a Socialist United States of Europe will free Austria and all the rest of the continent of social and national oppression.
London, February 1944.

Religion: Its Social Roots and Role II

By FELIX MORROW

In the June issue of *Fourth International* we published the first of Felix Morrow's essays on religion which were originally delivered in lecture form before the League of Professional Groups in 1932. This is a second essay in the same series.—*Ed.*

* * *

Why are people religious? The glaring fault of bourgeois atheism is that its analysis of religion gives no hint as a rule of the social roots and function of modern religion. Abstract analyses of religion, even from an atheistic standpoint, thus in effect *embellish* religion—through omission. One might even

say therefore that most bourgeois atheistic writing on religion creates even a greater mystery.

If bourgeois atheists cannot give us insight into why people are religious, still less will we receive our answer from religious people, particularly the professional peddlers of religion, the minister, preacher, priest, or rabbi whose task it is to embellish religion in every conceivable way. In a letter to Gorki, written in December 1913, Lenin pointed out that those who embellish, under any pretext, the idea of God or religion are thereby:

"embellishing the chains which shackle the benighted workers

and moujiks . . . God is (historically and in day-to-day life) first of all a complex of ideas arising from the torpid condition of man under the oppression of external nature and class domination; ideas which *reinforce* this oppression, ideas which *lull* the class struggle." (*Leninski Sbornik*, vol. I, pp. 157-158.)

In a document, "On the Attitude of a Workers' Party to Religion," written in 1909, Lenin expounded the Marxist viewpoint as follows:

"The social oppression of the toiling masses, their seemingly complete impotence in the face of the blind forces of capitalism, which afflicts the rank-and-file toiling people daily and hourly with far more terrible sufferings and far more savage tortures than such uncommon events as wars, earthquakes and so on—this is where the most profound, modern root of religion is to be found. 'Fear created the Gods.' Fear before the blind force of capitalism—a blind force because it cannot be foreseen by the masses of the people—a force which at every step in the life of a proletarian and a petty proprietor threatens to bring and does bring him 'sudden,' 'unexpected,' 'accidental,' bankruptcy, ruination, transformation into a pauper or into a prostitute, or leads to hungry death—there is the root of modern religion." (Lenin's *Collected Works*, First Russian Edition, vol. XI, book 1, pp. 253-254.)

Let us now analyze some of the favorite "techniques"—or tricks—of the religionists in order to lay bare what they seek to paint up.

The place of God in religion is emphasized and reemphasized. Yet no really religious person is religious because, on occasion, he or she can offer "arguments" proving the existence of God. For the common run of believers, which is to say, the overwhelming majority of religious people, God is simply "there." Professional spokesmen of religion have good and sufficient reasons for putting undue emphasis on God.

Theologians and "God"

The theologian who must reduce to some order the vague feelings and behavior of believers finds the most palatable solution in making God the organizing principle; the minister, embarrassed by any scrutiny of the efficacy of prayer or the magical elements in ritual, draws attention away from these by emphasizing God. In this way the actual relation of means and ends in religion is obscured and dislocated. We are told God is the goal of religion rather than God's being one of the religious means. In consonance with this tendency, the newer prayerbooks list fewer and fewer prayers for specific needs and occasions; the Catholic Church does not publicize the long roll of specialized saints who cater to specific needs. (Such as Breton saints of healing: St. Lubin for all afflictions, Mamert for intestinal disorders, Meen for insanity, Hubert for dog bites, Livertin for headaches and Houarniaule to dispel fear, and so on.) The professional spokesmen for religion would have us ignore the occasion for prayer, the need or desire expressed, and throw the emphasis on the fact that the religionist prays to God.

Any acquaintance with religious people, however, soon teaches one that God is not the object as distinguished from the apparatus of religion, but that God is just as much part of the apparatus of religion as is church, prayer or ritual. The religionist does not pray to God merely in order to pray for God, no more than he prays merely in order to pray. The occasion for prayer need not, of course, be specific: religion is employed not only for specific needs or anxieties, but for the general reinforcement of the believer's peace of mind, assurance and security. But whether religion is employed for specific or

general purposes, in either case, God is part of the religious "technique," not the purpose for which it is employed.

We may grant that there are some men for whom God is apparently not a religious "technique" for expressing or securing needs. God, the religionist claims, is at least for some men, not a technique, but an object of contemplation. God is such an object in Spinoza's intellectual love of God; he is such an object to some mystics and theologians. Even in this type of religious situation, however, the significant factor is not the contemplation of God but the motivation of such contemplation. As Dewey has illustrated in his *Quest for Certainty*, God is sought, even in Spinoza's case, because he is changeless and certain, as contrasted with our daily life of uncertainty. In other words, the intellectual love of God is only a sophisticated form of the so-called religious technique to ward off the confusion and peril of everyday life.

For the great masses of believers, this sophisticated form of religious "technique" is unsatisfactory. They do not separate God from the rest of the complex of religious "techniques" and institutions which constitute a church. The few for whom God is an object of contemplation might perhaps view with equanimity the role of the church as a bulwark of capitalism and take for granted the illusory efficacy of religion; but it is certain the masses do not take such a view. The main road to atheism for the masses is the discovery of the reactionary role of the churches and the social inefficacy of religion. A God who is believed to exist and cannot help them is not a God the masses continue to worship. The church may have been founded by Christ himself, but once the masses discover the role of the church, they break with it. The most effective propaganda against religion, as the Soviet Union* demonstrates, is to reinforce the arguments against religion from science, proving that God does not exist, by the exposure of the church's reactionary functions, the venality of the clergy, the fraudulence of relics, etc. Unlike a bourgeois atheist, the Marxist does not confine his systematic attack on religion merely to its "truth value," but probes into its social roots. For the great masses of believers, with whom we are concerned, it is the exposure of the social function of religion that is conclusive.

Ethics and Religion

In the same way that religious apologists emphasize the place of God in religion, so they also exaggerate the place of honorific ideals and values. Religion as the defender or conservator of ideals and values is also the position adopted by those so-called humanists who agree that God does not exist but who nevertheless wish to save religion. So the humanistic theologians of the University of Chicago define religion variously as "the conservation of human values" (Ames), "a quest for the good life" (Haydon) or the like. In the same way, but with a franker recognition of the actual role that religion has played, Harry F. Ward appeals to the ethics of Jesus as the true essence of religion. The arguments against any such attempted identifications of religion with ethics are conclusive.

Any ideal or value proposed as religious contains nothing in it which is *per se* religious. Security, harmony, happiness, the good life, love, peace,—what is religious about these? They are the goals of all human effort. They can only be called

* This was written in 1932, when Stalin and his usurping bureaucracy still did not dare embrace religion as they now do.—Ed.

religious if we falsely define life as a whole as religious. Some humanists do not shrink from this *reducto ad absurdum*. Professor Haydon, for instance, who defines religion as "a quest for the good life" then goes on to speak indiscriminately of every quest as religious. Such attempts to save religion by relinquishing its identity must, however, be set down as the latest and most cynical defense of a vested interest. The identity of religion will not be found in ethics, though, of course, any ethical ideal may be spuriously expressed or sought for in religion. How efficacious is religion for the realization of any such ideal? As we have seen, no ideals inimical to capitalism are furthered by religion. The realization of ideals involves a belief in a kind of supernatural efficacy to which even the Catholic Church does not assent publicly too often. I may add that when she does assert her belief in such a degree of supernatural efficacy, the Catholic Church does so in support of the capitalist ideals which she furthers as an institution. An example is the Pope ordering prayers for Russia, prayers which, declared the Catholic *Commonweal*:

"may affect the future much more profoundly than the success or failure of the Soviet Government's Five Year Plan."

The best commentary on the relation of ethics to religion is the way in which the equalitarian doctrines of Jesus and His immediate followers is employed. These have their uses. "Christianity a capitalist religion?" cries the preacher, "Why Jesus Himself was a poor man!" Or the rise of the church from its humble beginnings makes a Horatio Alger story edifying to the bourgeoisie and reinforcing the democratic illusions of the churchgoing masses. From Jesus' cry for charity for the poor the medieval church drew the comforting and highly sophistical conclusion that if charity is a religious duty, we must always have the poor to give it to. The symbolical tendency of religious ritual serves to turn equalitarianism into a ceremonial which only serves to show the masses how good their rulers are. An example is Maundy Thursday. I quote a *New York Times* story of the last time King Alfonso of Spain was able to perform this pleasant ceremony.

Madrid, April 2, [1932] King Alfonso today got down on his knees in the royal palace to wash the feet of twelve poor men. Queen Victoria, in a gold and white court dress, with a white lace mantilla and elaborate jewels, washed the feet of twelve poor women, and the monarchs afterward served food to the group with their own hands.

Nobles, high church dignitaries, including the Papal Nuncio, resplendent Generals and members of the royal family in magnificent court regalia watched their Catholic Majesties observe the age-old custom of Maundy Thursday in thus administering to the poor in rags and tatters.

No, one cannot find the identity of religion in ethics.

"Religious Experience"

To the apologist's attempt to cover up the fact that religion, including God, is a class institution employing a class technique, and the similar attempt to identify religion with ethics, one may add the attempt, for equally apologetic reasons, to discover and single out a unique experience to be called *the* religious experience. This is a game which was very popular with psychologists a few years ago, and a perennial source of employment for bourgeois philosophers. To controvert this hunt for the "numinous" one has but to think of the innumerable range of human experiences which have been the occasion for prayer. As Professor Schneider once put it wittily: "Any good mystic can get more varieties of religious experience than a 'numinous' psychologist can talk about."

How Modern "Technique" Arose

I now reformulate the question, with which I began, why are people religious? in this form: Under what conditions are modern religious "techniques" employed?

Let us return to the example of the French Revolution. Through the thought of the plebian ideologues of the French Revolution streams the clear bright light of a new dawn in which humanity, bursting at last the fetters of feudal church and state, seems free to work out its own destiny. Confidence in humanity, assurance in the full capacity of men to evolve purely secular ways of fulfilling their potentialities, is the motif of all their writings. The theory of progress, progress without peril, is the dominant philosophy of the bourgeoisie itself on the eve of the Revolution. Hatred of the Catholic Church as the bulwark of feudalism is united with hatred of religion because it attributes impotence to man. Destroy the existing forms of oppression and man will be free to pursue a glorious destiny.

But then comes the French Revolution and victory for the bourgeoisie. And behind them looms the menacing proletariat. Fear of the proletariat drives the bourgeoisie into a union with the remnants of feudalism, into relinquishing their power to Bonapartism; the inevitable contradictions of capitalist economy appear: individual failures, economic crises, war. The bright new dawn of the plebian revolutionary ideologues is followed by the cold light of a day of new forms of oppression, bloodshed, suffering, anxiety. Few are able to understand how these must necessarily follow from the antagonistic mode of production of feudalism. Man's omnipotence seems an illusory dream. Perhaps man is doomed to defeat? It is precisely the most sensitive sons of the new bourgeoisie who in the cold light of day start a Catholic revival. The economic rehabilitation of the Church, its role in keeping the masses in subjection, combine with the loss of self-confidence by the bourgeoisie; anticlericalism shows signs of old age and finally disappears.

Source of Fetishism

What we see so clearly in comparing the dawn and day of bourgeois revolution is a dominant characteristic of the everyday life of all classes in the capitalist era. The basic process was analyzed by Marx who laid bare the fetishism of commodities.

The process of production is not mastered by man but is his master; man's labors appear to him as elemental natural forces beyond his control. Forces so independent of his own control appear to him inevitably as non-social forces. Failure, crises, war, appear as though by the inexorable hand of fate. Neither will, nor foresight, nor effort are in any case commensurate with results: the worker toils and yet starves, and is thrown out of work to suffer still more, by forces which cannot but seem mysterious and evil to him; the bourgeois is equally in the hands of fate; there is no relation between his efforts and rewards; he is superstitious when he plays a hunch on the stock-market and wins, equally superstitious when business prospers or fails. Commodities, the products of man's own efforts, rear up like monsters to overwhelm their makers; the social relations, which should be merely the way in which men are organized to produce the necessities of life, these social relations of employer-employee, state-people, appear to be the mysterious and eternal dictates of inexorable law. Men are frustrated at every turn by their own social relations. They desire security, but whatever they may have, this they cannot have. They desire peace and prosperity and work for it, only

to find themselves fighting devastating wars which bring in their wake economic catastrophes. The potentialities of most men are never realized. Their intellectual, esthetic, social faculties are warped at every turn, no matter what class they belong to. There is a basic dualism between social ethics and practical activity. Attempts to satisfy human needs or potentialities fail or are frustrated under capitalism. It is inevitable under these circumstances that so many fall victims to the religious "techniques."

It is precisely for the sake of what they hold dearest that the believers go down on their knees. For life and love, for food and shelter, for the innumerable needs and desires and hopes and dreams. Often they pray for no specific reason, but it is precisely then that they are praying for all their reasons, for the whole complex of hurt and pain and anxiety left by their crushed social status as Lenin so correctly pointed out.

"The Quest for Certainty"

One of the most familiar religious techniques—i.e. fraudulent embellishments—is to contrast the hazards of change with the sureties of the changeless. In the religious revivals that have accompanied every business depression, the churches have pointed out the "lesson." As the *Christian Times* once phrased it: "*the sad experience of the uncertainty of worldly riches . . . disposed the hearts of many to sigh for the durable riches.*" Another Baptist paper, a few weeks after the panic of 1873 declared that "*the suffering incident to the present state of affairs*" would "*lead thousands to turn from the fleeting things of time to the realities of eternity.*" Essentially, this is what John Dewey has sought to generalize as—"the religious character of the philosopher's quest for certainty."

The religiosity accompanying depressions is a very clear illustration of the fetishism induced by the capitalist mode of production. The fleetingness of the things of time and the uncertainty of worldly riches are put down, quite automatically, as proof of the impotence of man and the necessity of fortifying himself—by religious "techniques." As suspicions of the real causes of depressions have permeated society, especially today when the crass contradiction of starvation and overproduction lies bare, there is a growing tendency to say little about the rise in religiosity during crises, which has been so regular that it is called the evangelistic index; the obvious causes of the evangelistic index must seem to churchmen an embarrassing commentary on the functions of religion at all times.

The fetishism of commodities, resulting from the contradictions of capitalism, this phenomenon of men's own labors overwhelming them, stultifying them and frustrating their best potentialities, causing them to fall prey to superstitions, rituals and the entire mumbo-jumbo of religion, this cannot be done away with by those in power, the bourgeoisie, without destroying themselves as a class. Faced by the contradictions of capitalism the bourgeoisie, as in the case of the Catholic revival of the French bourgeoisie, can only turn to religion to help them survive the necessary evils of their own economy. At the same time, however, from the proletariat ranks there arises the beginnings of a scientific economic system—Socialism. Here the bourgeoisie and the workers confront each other, as irreconcilable enemies.

For the proletariat the socialist way out is irreconcilable with the religious way out. To take the religious way out, the road of consolation and reconciliation, is possible only as long as the proletariat shares with the bourgeoisie the illusions bred

by capitalism in its ascendancy. Once, however, the proletarian vanguard has cut to the source of these illusions, has learned that the contradictions of capitalism are not given by fate, are not necessary evils, the main basis of religion becomes impossible for the proletarian movement—and for society as a whole.

Communism and Religion

Will religion disappear under Communism? Speaking of the fetishism of commodities, Marx says:

"Such religious reflections of the real world will not disappear until the relations between human beings in their practical everyday life have assumed the aspect of perfectly intelligible and reasonable relations as between man and man, and as between man and nature. The life process of society, this meaning the material process of production, will not lose its veil of mystery until it becomes a process carried on by a free association of producers, under their conscious and purposive control."

But those religionists, like Reinhold Niebuhr, for example, who tacitly recognize that it is the fetishism of the evils, frustrations and perversions of capitalism which are at the root of modern religion, insist, nevertheless, that Communism will not do away with religion. There will still be, they say, the problems of our relation to the universe and the personal problems which no social system can solve.

It is least likely that "our relation to the universe" will be a problem for religious solution. This phrase is generally a professional subterfuge of ministers. Moreover, those who point to the influence of nature on the religion of peasants and farmers, ignore the conditions under which such religion flourishes. As Marx points out, it was not the direct relation to nature which made agricultural peoples religious. The process by which agricultural peoples produced the material necessities of life was an immature one; their interaction with nature, that is, their tilling of the soil, was immature in their ignorance of the sciences of fertilizing, irrigating, accurate planting, and intensive agriculture, they were at the mercy of the elements. It is for this reason that their relations to nature were correspondingly immature, and led to fetishism of nature. A mature process of agricultural production leads to a mature attitude toward nature. Under capitalism, the farmers' attitude toward nature is inextricably involved with the fetishism of commodities. The mysteries of nature are to the farmer nothing so puzzling as the mysteries of the market which holds him in subjection. His fear for his crops is a fear driven by need. I have seen a community of farmers come together in a time of drought to pray; they know all about the natural causes of rain, but still they are apparently praying for rain. Actually, however, they are praying not for rain, but to be saved from the consequences which will befall them if their crops fail. Suppose, now, that no serious economic consequences would follow upon the failure of the crops, would the farmers be praying for rain? Under Communism, that part of the community which will raise the foodstuffs will feel no terror when faced by crop failures; a purposive and systematic organization of production will provide for such contingencies; surpluses from other years will always be on hand. Under Communism, the individual farmer will not be penalized for drought or plague of crops, as he is under capitalism. Will he then pray for rain? or need to fortify himself by religion under continual anxiety and fear of failure? It scarcely seems likely. As for the rest of us, including the religious masses, our relation to nature is not a religious

problem today. Only a Niebuhr could envisage man's relation to nature becoming a "religious problem" under Communism.

So far as the "personal problems" or "the personal equation" is concerned, the trick of connecting these questions with religiosity is quite as threadbare as all the other "techniques." It consists in transferring the individual as he or she exists today—warped, twisted, undeveloped, enslaved—into the free Communist future where such "egos" and all their problems, frustrations, fixations, neuroses, etc., etc., might perhaps be for a brief while subjects for nursery rhymes but certainly never

topics of serious discussion among adults. To take such problems seriously is to forget the ABC of Marxism which is materialist to the core and which affirms that man's consciousness is determined by the material environment and not vice versa.

We Trotskyists are firmly convinced that capitalism is the last refuge of religion; and once capitalism is abolished this opium of the people as Marx called it, this "kind of spiritual corn-whisky" as Lenin aptly branded it will be cast into the garbage heap of history, where it belongs.

Australian Working Class And The War

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

EDITOR'S NOTE: In the June issue of *Fourth International* we published the first section of this interesting document of the Australian Trotskyists. The following is a second installment. It will be concluded in a subsequent issue.

Australian Labor Party

Until the most recent times the Australian working class has been satisfied to devote its organizing energies to gain a greater share of the profits of expanding Australian capitalism. Through the trade unions and the Labor Party, both essentially reformist organizations, the workers won a relatively high level of wages and secured social legislation famous throughout the world. These gains were possible because of the rapid expansion of Australian capitalism.

After the great strike defeats of 1890-91, the workers believed that the struggle in the industrial field would have to be accompanied by an attempt to gain representation in Parliament; the unions sponsored the formation of the Australian Labor Party. In its ideology the Labor Party has never progressed beyond a vague gradualism, rather akin to English Fabianism, but lacking any clear-cut political theory. The social theories that have been so important elsewhere, Owenite-Socialism, anarchism, syndicalism, Marxism, failed to take root in the insular soil of the Australian Labor movement. Comparatively good wages and plentiful jobs made the workers unresponsive to the idea of any radical change in the ownership of the means of production, a change from capitalism to Socialism.

There were experiments in state capitalism, such as the railways and other forms of transport, banking and insurance, shipbuilding, brickworks, etc., designed to fill in gaps in the capitalist economy. These, however, either languished in an atmosphere of capitalist hostility or were incorporated in the general structure of Australian capitalism. They in no sense represented a movement towards a working class control of the economy.

Speaking in economic terms the role of the Labor Party has been to assist in the development, along purely capitalist lines, of Australian secondary industries upon whose prosperity the high standards of the workers depended. It endeavored to prevent the influx of cheap labor by vigorously supporting the *White Australia Policy*, a policy which has an economic basis that is quite justifiable but which fosters an inter-racial animosity that is entirely opposed to all the international traditions of the working class. No attempt has been made at any

time to meet the problem that does exist by action designed to raise the living standards, on an international basis, of the workers of the Pacific and the East. In conformity with its function the Labor Party adopted an extreme protectionist tariff policy and, in general, it has sought, whilst advancing the interests of the workers within the limits of capitalism, to foster national capitalist industry and to protect it against its world rivals.

Thus until the permanent crisis of world capitalism commenced in 1928, the Labor Party tended to reflect the reformist ambitions of the workers. Nevertheless, the Labor Party instilled an elementary sense of class unity and of the antagonism between capital and labor.

The Labor Party in the Depression— A New Role

The world depression found the Labor Party unable to understand what was happening or to point a way to the abolition of capitalism. It capitulated to the "recovery" plans of the government, to the wage cuts, currency depreciation, and miserly doles of the Premiers Plan. In Australia, as in every other country, the reformist labor movement revealed that it had in its armory neither the ideological nor the organizational weapons to attack the tottering structure of capitalism. But the setting up of the Socialization Committees, though they were rapidly liquidated by the bureaucracy, showed that among the rank and file of the [Labor] Party the sparks of revolutionary thought were appearing.

The world crisis, culminating in the present imperialist war, has brought about radical changes in the roles of the various political groups. Basically these changes flow out of the new organizational form of capitalism, the totalitarian state. For the purpose of waging war, which is the sole remaining avenue for capitalist expansion, the capitalist groups are forced to introduce some measure of planning into the economy, and to regiment every section of the community. The Labor Party is being used by capitalism to subject the working class to the rigid discipline of the totalitarian state. This is the prevailing tendency, though it has not yet reached full fruition. Hence, whether in or out of office, the Laborite leaders find themselves, willy-nilly, servants of the real controllers of the country, the great capitalist combinations. They are, in an undeveloped, embryonic fashion, performing the function of the Hitlerian Labor Front.

Since even the most immediate needs of the workers cannot be met under declining capitalism, least of all in its semi-fascist form, a split has developed between the Labor Party apparatus and the rank and file members, who are rebelling against the treachery of the bureaucrats. And power seekers such as J. T. Lang seek to capitalize this discontent.

The Trade Unions

The organization of workers in trade unions has been carried further in Australia than in any other country; in general, all workers capable of organization in unions have been organized, a position that has not been approached in any other capitalist country. Inheriting the traditions of Great Britain, unionism in this country began on a craft basis. In a series of strikes, notably by the shearers and seamen, the workers established the right to bargain collectively with their employers. In the course of time the inadequacy of the craft basis became obvious and industrial unions, covering all workers in an industry, have come into existence. Under the pressure of the need for united action a general tendency exists for amalgamation and liquidation among the craft bodies, a tendency that must be assisted by all revolutionary workers.

Reformist methods having proved so successful during the continued expansion of the economy, the workers accepted state sanction for their procedure of collective bargaining and the guarantee—by the law—of the basic wage and the conditions of the awards. The arbitration system was adopted in all industries, thereby creating the illusion that the class struggle was, and should be, fought out in the courts. Inevitably the organization of the unions became more bureaucratic and the workers have become accustomed to compromises with the employers. So far has the process of legalization been carried that it is at the present time being suggested that, in return for the abandonment of the right to strike, compulsory legal unionism be introduced, a measure that could easily be used to enthrone the bureaucrats permanently and turn the unions from organs of working class struggle into integral parts of the apparatus of capitalist oppression.

An important revolutionary task is the education of the union members in an understanding of the real nature of the Arbitration System. Compulsory Arbitration represents an attempt to reconcile the interests of the capitalists and the workers within the capitalist system. As this is an impossibility the Arbitration System operates increasingly in the interests of the capitalists, whose spokesmen are becoming its keenest supporters just as the workers are becoming increasingly suspicious of it. The Arbitration Judges have the job of preserving peace in industry, which means they must constantly force the workers to make concessions, since the capitalists are unable and unwilling to do so.

All that has been said about the new role of the Labor Party machine, its functions within the capitalist totalitarian order, applies to the union movement. The bureaucracy collaborates with the capitalists on innumerable boards and commissions, deciding the fate of the workers without consulting their wishes. If the worker still supports his union, it is because he recognizes it as the only medium available for the defense of his wages and conditions. At the same time the rank and file are pressing always for a genuine working class struggle, and mass revolts are occurring against the class collaborationist policy of the officialdom. In particular, struggles are now occurring in the Miners, Waterside Workers, and Ironworkers Unions, whose

officials (so-called "Communists"), have openly announced a policy of collaboration with the capitalists in the interests of the "war against fascism." Such a policy, if persisted in, will raise the menace of Australian fascism to a new height, and the bulk of the workers instinctively realize this.

In Australia, the workers have developed the shop committee as a method of bridging over the gaps between the various craft unions and of coordinating the forces of the workers on the job against the boss. This form of organization presents the best opportunities for countering the bureaucracies of the unions and of transforming them into mass revolutionary organs. Machinery must be devised to coordinate the work of the shop committees, giving them contact with each other, arranging for the raising of strike funds, sympathetic strikes, propaganda, etc., generally increasing the influence of this type of rank-and-file organization among the workers.

While we sympathize with workers disgusted with some act of betrayal by the union officials, we are strongly opposed to workers leaving their unions or even giving the bureaucracies grounds for expulsion, as this leaves them unorganized, at the mercy of the highly organized employers. We also oppose the building of breakaway unions, on the lines of the "Red" trade unions set up at one stage by the Comintern. To do this is to split the ranks of the workers, to remove all opportunities to strengthen the hands of the rank and file, and to isolate the militants and lay them open to attack. The bulk of the workers will remain in the old unions which alone are recognized by the courts. To try to form pure "left wing" unions is to admit that the militants are unable to gain the leadership of the broad masses, without whose active participation there will be no Socialist revolution. It is a tactic of despair, not of militancy. The only method to beat treachery is to stay in the union, to intensify job organization, and to forge links with the workers in other shops, so that the union functionaries are forced to abide by the will of the membership.

The policy of the Revolutionary Workers Party towards the unions may be summarized: *Strengthen all along the line the power of the rank and file against the bureaucracy!* The unions remain the basic mass organs of the workers, and they must be transformed into revolutionary weapons of the class struggle.

Within the labor movement as a whole, the Labor Party as well as the unions, the revolutionist should not cease in his activity, but should always attempt to stem the rising tide of reaction, calling for resistance to the growing subordination of the officialdom to the capitalist state. He should also cooperate with any section of the movement that adopts a sound working class policy on some particular issue. The aim must be always to steer these limited demands towards the wider goal, the attainment of state power by the workers. There will be no difficulty in showing the rank and file that the attainment of the most limited demands calls, in this epoch of capitalist decay, for the abolition of the capitalist system of exploitation.

Fascism in Australia

During the depression a fascist movement first showed its teeth in Australia. The "New Guard" was formed to solve the crisis of capitalism by the violent suppression of all working class activities and the reduction of the workers to the level of the dole. It represented the reaction of the most ruthless section of the ruling class to the hand to mouth policy of J. R. Lang. Financed by the biggest monopoly capitalists, led by every type of political careerist, it found its mass basis in the ruined middle class and farmers. During the worst years of the

depression the capitalists were ready to call on these elements to preserve their rule.

Nothing is more certain than that Australian capitalism, faced by the ever intensifying crisis, will turn again for salvation to the fascist gangs. Already marked fascist tendencies appear in the services, particularly among the officer groups; and the capitalist press encourages this tendency by incessant propaganda aimed at sowing antagonism between the workers and the soldiers. Ruined petty-bourgeois elements such as small farmers and shopkeepers will swell the fascist ranks as the crisis grows. We must expect anti-capitalist demagoguery from the spokesmen of fascism on the lines of the Nazi slogans, but their objective role in the defense of the capitalist system will be revealed by their hostility of the workers organizations, their opposition to the workers class struggle, their claim to represent the whole nation, irrespective of class, and above all by their opposition to the demand for the abolition of private property in the means of production.

The answer of the Socialist movement to the onslaught of fascism is not to be found in reliance upon the protection of the law, or an appeal to the state apparatus to restrain the violence of the Storm Troops. European experience proves that the capitalist state machine, the police, courts, army, etc., is always thoroughly infected with the virus of fascism. Nor does protection lie in the "Popular Front" movements in which the working class surrenders leadership in the struggle to a motley collection of petty-bourgeois elements, many of whom, in the final crisis, will find more in common with the capitalist regime than with the workers. Of course, this does not prevent the

workers from finding allies among the other classes, but always the leadership of the anti-fascist struggle must lie with the workers, under the direction of the workers' revolutionary organizations.

The workers' answer to fascist thug tactics lies in building organizations designed for the actual process of fighting—physical fighting in the last analysis. Force must be met by force. In the course of the actual class struggle such bodies as strike committees, strike pickets, defense guards, will be set up. These must be placed on a permanent, disciplined basis, forming the nucleus of a workers' anti-fascist militia.

So long as there is no slackening in the building of this fighting organization, and so long as the revolutionary groups preserve their organizational independence, it is correct to call for a united front of all the working class organizations against the fascists. Never again must the workers commit the mistake of the German Communist Party in 1932, which split the ranks of the German workers by proclaiming that the Social Democrats were a greater enemy than the fascists; the notorious theory of "Social Fascism," with its slogan of "*After Hitler Our Turn!*" which resulted in an alliance between the Communists and the Nazis on the basic issue of the Prussian Referendum and the consequential victory of fascism.

Once it is made clear that the workers intend to fight fascism and not capitulate before it, large sections of the petty bourgeoisie will be attracted to the workers just as the slogans of the Bolsheviks and their determination to seize power in 1917 attracted the vast masses of the peasantry to their leadership.

(To be continued)

From the Arsenal of Marxism

Our Current Basic Military Tasks -- III

By LEON TROTSKY

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

This is how matters stand today with regard to the question of the offensive in a political sense. But there still remains the strategic and tactical side of the question. And here, after all of Comrade Frunze's explanations, I remain wholly on the standpoint that the formula of the French field staff is wrong: it suffers from formalism with respect to the offensive. The idea of the offensive is expressed far more correctly in our own field statutes. "The best method of gaining a goal is to act aggressively." Nothing is said here to the effect that he who attacks *first* allegedly "reveals a much stronger will." The task of war is to annihilate the enemy. Annihilation is impossible without the offensive. The stronger will is revealed by him who

creates the most favorable conditions for the offensive and utilizes them to the very end. But this does not at all mean that in order to reveal his will one must attack first. This is nonsense. If the material conditions of mobilization militate against it, then I would be a hopeless formalist and a dunderhead to build my plan on the notion that I must be the first to take the offensive. No, I shall reveal the superiority of my will by creating favorable conditions for my offensive—as the second one; by wresting the initiative at a certain limit fixed in advance; and by gaining victory even though I am the second to attack. (*Frunze interjects: "This is less advantageous"*)

This may be less advantageous in relation to an *abstract* country with different railways and a different apparatus of mobilization from ours; but, after all, we are engaged not in solving a geometrical problem but in outlining a concrete plan of action, depending upon the material and spiritual conditions of our country and its reciprocal relations with other countries. On the one hand, Comrade Frunze in every way emphasizes that we will enter into combat, equipped with a lower technology than our enemies; and he seemingly even introduces this lower

technology into our military "doctrine." We must of course do everything in our power to raise our technology to the level of our enemies. But it is quite understandable that they will have the preponderance with respect to, say, aviation. Comrade Frunze takes this into account, emphasizes this in every way, and as a means of counteracting it recommends, for example, that our troops be trained for night operations. Why then does he forget about the condition of transport which happens to be under the existing conditions the most important part of military technology? It is impermissible to forget about mobilization, concentration and deployment of forces. Serious strategy must take precisely this as its starting point. The necessity to attack is beyond dispute. This is stated not only by our statutes but also by the old Czarist ones, and almost in the same words. We have heard this from the lips of Suvorov. How is it possible to vanquish the enemy except by dealing him a blow over the head? And for this it is necessary to attack him, to spring upon him. This was known to army leaders in biblical times. But it is your desire to communicate something new to us, you talk to us about a proletarian strategy flowing from the revolutionary nature of the proletariat. You are apparently not satisfied with the formula in our field statutes. You create a formula of your own which—surprise of surprises!—happens to be borrowed from the French field statutes. But this allegedly new formula is false and it obviously does not correspond to our conditions. If we hammer into the minds of our commanding personnel that revolutionary nature and "strong will" demand that you be the *first* to attack then the very first period of our operations in the West can lead our commanding staff astray because conditions may impose upon us, and in all likelihood will impose upon us an initial period of flexible defense and maneuverist retreat. (*Frunze: "Sad necessity!"*) Yes, Comrade Frunze, war in its entirety is a sad necessity.

Within the framework of this sad necessity it is necessary to build one's plans, taking into account other "sad necessities," if they are of cardinal importance. And the condition of transport, in the broadest sense of the word, is one of the cardinal conditions of war. In consequence, the nature of our country, its distances, the distribution of its population, its railways, its macadam and country roads make it quite probable that the starting point of our offensive will be a line at a considerable remove from our state frontiers. If our commanding staff grasps the inner logic of such a strategic plan which begins with screening operations, defense and even retreat in order to consolidate the troops along a border-line fixed in advance and then to pass over to a decisive offensive without which victory is, naturally, impossible; if our commanding staff becomes imbued with this genuinely maneuverist idea and not with a formalistic attitude toward the offensive, then they will not be disorganized nor led astray nor lose their heads but transmit their calm assurance to the entire army.

Our Agitation as a "Kind of Weapon"

Revolutionary agitation as a new kind of weapon introduced by us has been adduced here in support of the contention that we have our own "military doctrine." But this, too, is false. We are deceiving ourselves here as well. As a matter of fact, propaganda in bourgeois armies is arranged on a far broader scale, much more richly and diversifiedly than is the case with us. During the first two years of the [last] war I lived in France and had the opportunity to observe there the mechanics of imperialist agitation. How can we possibly compete with it

in the face of our poverty of forces and resources? Our newspapers are tiny, the paper is poor, the print extremely illegible, and, most important, their circulation, insignificant. Whereas in France such an obscenely mendacious, brazen bourgeois newspaper like *Petit Parisien* used to come out during the war in printings of almost three million copies. The circulation of several other imperialist newspapers was over a million. Every soldier received a newspaper, not infrequently two. Here was poetry and prose; feuilletons and cartoons. And the newspapers played in all the colors of the rainbow: Monarchist as well as Republican as well as Socialist. And they all kept hammering at a single point: war to the end. Right there was the Catholic priest walking through the trenches and functioning as a very skillful agitator, patting the soldier on the back and telling him: Only two good things are left in this world—wine and the Lord Almighty. A Socialist deputy arriving at the front would talk about the struggle for freedom, equality, and so forth and so on. Also there was the theater, the ballet, the chorus girls. And all of it, first-rate. And all of this hammering away at a single point. What a monstrous machine of deception, hypnosis, catalepsy and degeneration! Wherein then does our strength lie? In the *Communist* program. In the *revolutionary* idea. When our enemies talk about the monstrous power of our propaganda, it applies not to our organization or technique of propaganda in the army but to the *inner* strength of our revolutionary program which expresses the genuine interests of the toiling masses and therefore touches them to the quick. It was not we who invented politics. It was not we who invented agitation and propaganda. In this respect likewise, our enemies are materially and organizationally stronger than we are, just as Czarism was far stronger than our party when it was underground and had to function through circulars and proclamations. But the whole gist of the matter is this, that with all its apparatus and all its technology, the bourgeoisie cannot maintain its hold on the masses. But we are conquering and shall conquer them throughout the whole world. There is no need therefore of discovering a new kind of weapon, entering into the military doctrine of the proletariat. For the Communist program was discovered before the Red Army arose, and the features. Something similar, I repeat, may be observed in the Red Army itself is only a weapon for assuring the possibility of realizing the Communist program in life.

Fewer Sweeping Generalizations

The connection between strategic and tactical methods and the class nature of the proletariat is not at all so intimate, so unconditional and so immediate as many comrades here have expounded. On the basis of my personal and admittedly modest knowledge of the history of military affairs I would undertake to prove that the Red Army from the outset of its existence has passed through those stages which have marked the evolution of modern European armies, say, since the seventeenth century. Naturally, the transition from one stage to the next was accomplished very rapidly, as if in a telescoped form. A child in its mother's womb, as it develops from the embryo repeats the stages of the evolution of the human species in its fundamental development of the Red Army. It did not at all begin with maneuverability. Its initial combat attempts give us a picture of an angular, crude positionalism of a cordon type. Its organizational and strategical methods underwent change in the process of the struggle, under the blows of the enemy. In this way there unfolded the maneuverability of the last period of the

civil war. But this is not the last word of the Red Army's strategy. Into this amorphous, chaotic maneuverability we must introduce the elements of stability: firm, flexible cadres. Will this more highly qualified army arrive at positional methods? This depends on the conditions of future wars; this depends on where these wars will take place, the size of the masses that will be simultaneously drawn into war operations, and the territories on which the latter will unfold.

Comrade Budenny found the explanation for the positionalism of the imperialist war in an absence of great initiative, in the indecisiveness of the leadership. "A genius army leader was lacking! . . ." In my opinion this explanation is erroneous. The crux of the matter lies in this, that the imperialist war was a war not of armies but of nations, and therewith, the richest nations, huge in numbers and with huge material resources. It was a war to the death. To every blow the opposing side found an answer; every hole was plugged up. The front was constantly reinforced by both sides; artillery, munitions, men were piled up both here and there. The task thus went beyond the bounds of strategy. The war became transformed into the most profound measuring of reciprocal forces in every direction. Neither aviation, submarines, tanks nor cavalry could in and by themselves produce the decisive result; they served only as the means of gradually exhausting the enemy's forces and of constantly verifying the enemy's condition: is he still able to maintain himself or is he ready to collapse? This was in the full sense of the word a war of attrition in which strategy is not of decisive but of auxiliary significance. It is quite indisputable that a repetition of such a war in the immediate future is impossible. But just as impossible is a repetition on European territory of the methods and usages of our civil war: the conditions and environment are much too different there. Instead of making sweeping generalizations we ought to start thinking more definitely about concrete conditions.

"Unified Doctrine" in a Future Civil War

For the sake of illustration let us take England and let us try to imagine what will be, or more correctly, may be the character of a civil war in the British Isles. Naturally, we cannot prophesy. Naturally, events may unfold in an altogether different way, but it is nevertheless profitable to try to imagine the march of revolutionary events under the peculiar conditions of a highly developed capitalist country in an insular position.

The proletariat constitutes the overwhelming majority of the population in England. It has many conservative tendencies. It is hard to budge. But in return, once it starts moving and after it overcomes the first organized opposition of internal enemies its ascendancy on the islands will prove to be overwhelming owing to its overwhelming numbers. Does this mean that the bourgeoisie of Great Britain will not make the attempt with the assistance of Australia, Canada, the United States and others to overthrow the English proletariat? Of course it will. For this, it will attempt to retain the navy in its hands. The bourgeoisie will require the navy not only to institute a famine blockade but also for purposes of invasion raids. The French bourgeoisie will not refuse black regiments. The same fleet that now serves for the defense of the British Isles and for keeping them supplied uninterruptedly with necessities will become the instrument of attack upon these islands. Proletarian Great Britain will thus turn out to be a beleaguered naval fortress. There is no way of retreat from it, unless into the ocean.

And we have presupposed that the ocean will remain in enemy hands. The civil war will consequently assume the character of the defense of an island against warships and invasion raids. I repeat this is no prophecy: events may unfold in a different way. But who will be so bold as to insist that the scheme of civil war outlined by me is impossible? It is quite possible and even probable. It would be a good thing for our strategists to ponder over this. They would then become completely convinced how unfounded it is to deduce maneuverability from the revolutionary nature of the proletariat. For all anyone knows, the English proletariat may find itself compelled to cover the shores of its islands with trenches, deep ribbons of barbed wire defences and positional artillery.

Models of civil war approximating our recent past, we ought to seek not in Europe of the future but in the past of the United States. It is unquestionable that the civil war in the United States in the 'sixties of the last century discloses many features in common with our civil war. Why? Because there, too, you had enormous spaces, a sparse population, inadequate means of communication. Cavalry raids played an enormous role there, too. It is a remarkable thing that there the initiative likewise came from the "Whites," that is from the Southern slaveowners who waged war against the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats of the North. The Southerners possessed prairies, plantations, prairie pasture lands, good horses and were accustomed to riding horseback. The initial raids, thousands of versts in depth, were executed by them. Following their example, the Northerners created their own cavalry. The war was of a diffused, maneuverist character and terminated in the victory of the Northerners who defended the progressive tendencies of economic development against the Southern plantation slaveowners.

En Route to Proletarian Strategy

Comrade Tukhachevsky expressed himself in basic agreement with me, but made certain reservations the meaning of which is not clear to me. "That Comrade Trotsky," says Tukhachevsky, "keeps pulling back by the coattails is a useful thing." But this is useful, insofar as I am able to gather, only up to a certain point; for the very urge to create something new, in the sense of proletarian strategy and tactics, seems to Tukhachevsky an urge that is fruitful and progressive. Comrade Frunze, marching along the same line but going much further, cites Engels who wrote in the 'fifties that the conquest of power by the proletariat and the evolution of socialist society will create the premises for a new strategy. I also have no doubts that if a country with developed socialist economy were compelled to wage war against a bourgeois country (as Engels visualized the situation in his mind) the picture of the socialist country's strategy would be one that is entirely different. But this provides no grounds whatever for attempts to suck out of one's thumb a "proletarian strategy" for the USSR today. A new strategic word grows out of the urge to improve and fructify the practice of war and not at all out of the mere urge to say "something new." This is similar to someone who values original people setting himself the task of becoming original himself—naturally, he would not attain anything except the most wretched monkeyshines. By developing socialist economy, by raising the cultural level and fusing the ranks of the toiling masses, by raising the qualifications of the Red Army, by improving its technique and cadres, we shall un-

doubtedly enrich military affairs with new usages and new methods—precisely because our entire country will grow and evolve on new foundations. But to set oneself the task of deducing through speculation a new strategy from the revolutionary nature of the proletariat is to occupy oneself with patching up dubious propositions of the French field statutes and inevitably to lose one's bearings.

Forward to the Accumulation of Culture!

In conclusion I want to dwell on the question of the individual platoon commander. Everybody of course recognizes the importance and meaning of a platoon commander but not everybody is willing to see in him the central point of our military program in the period immediately ahead. Some comrades even express themselves somewhat condescendingly on this question: "Of course, who would deny . . . Yes, of course . . . Yes, obviously . . . But the world is large enough to contain more people than just the platoon commander . . ." And so forth and so on. The remarks of our charming Comrade Muralov smacked a little of this spirit. He said: "Naturally, it is necessary to grease boots, sew on buttons and educate good platoon commanders, but this is far from everything." For some unknown reason, the platoon commander is here lumped together with buttons and boots. In vain! Buttons, boots and the like pertain to those "trifles" which in their totality are of enormous importance. But the platoon commander is in no case a trifle. No, this is the most important lever of our military mechanics.

But in passing, allow me first to say a few words on buttons, boots, the war on lice, etc. Comrade Minin accused me of falling into cultural-uplift spirit. It is too bad he failed at the same time to indict also Comrade Lenin for his report to the Party Congress, for Lenin's main idea was that we lack sufficient culture for our work of construction and that we must persistently, stubbornly and systematically accumulate this culture, raising it through education and self-education. The term "cultural-uplifter" does not apply here because we used it against and even branded with it those curmudgeons who under the rule of Czarism and of the bourgeoisie hoped to regenerate the country through trifling and petty educational, cooperative, sanitary and similar measures. We counterposed to this the program of the revolution and the conquest of power by the working class. But today this has been achieved, power has been conquered by the working class: this means that political conditions have been created for cultural work on a scale hitherto unprecedented in history. This cultural work comprises exclusively of details and trifles. The victorious revolution gives us the opportunity to draw into cultural work the thickest nethermost layers of the people. This is now the main task. It is necessary to teach how to read and write; it is necessary to teach precision and thriftiness—and do all this on the basis of the experience of our state and economic construction, day by day, hour by hour. And exactly the same thing in the army.

Today's Military Slogan

But the *platoon commander*—that is still a special item. This is by no means a trifle; this is the commander, the leader, the head of the basic military group—the platoon. It is impossible to build an edifice with loose sand. One must have good building material, one must have a good platoon, and this

means—a good, reliable, class-conscious, confident platoon commander.

"But," some object, "aren't you forgetting about the senior commanding staff?" No, I am not forgetting it and it is precisely to the senior commanding staff that I set the task of educating the platoon commander. There can be no better school for a commander of a regiment, or a brigade, or a division than the work of educating the platoon commander. Our post-graduate courses, our academies and academical courses are very important and useful, but the best training of all is received by a teacher in teaching his pupils; best trained of all will be the commander of a regiment, the commander of a brigade and the commander of a division who centers his attention in the immediate future on the training and education of platoon commanders. For this cannot be done without clarifying more and more in one's mind all the questions of Red Army organization and tactics without a single exception.

One must think out clearly for himself all the questions, think them out to the end, without any self-deception in order to be able clearly and precisely to tell the platoon commander what he must be and what is demanded of him. The platoon commander—this is now the central task. General phrases about educating the commanding personnel in the spirit of maneuverability offer very little in essence, distracting attention away from the most important task of the present period. There was a time when it was necessary to smash our primitive immobility and our cordonism; there was a time when the slogan of maneuverability was salutary; at that time the cry: "Worker on Horseback!" expressed a basic need. Of course, at that time not only the cavalry but also the infantry, the artillery, etc., were of importance. However, had we not at that time created the Red cavalry we would have probably perished. For this reason the summons "Worker on Horseback!" summed up the central, basic need of that particular period in our Army's development. The new epoch advances to the fore a new task: to set in order the basic cell of the army—the platoon; to sum up our military experience for the individual platoon commander, raise his knowledge, his self-esteem. Everything now centers about this point. It is necessary to understand this, and to get firmly to work.

SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

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

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

for

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

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

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

PIONEER LIST

Documents of the Fourth International

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

Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

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

George Breitman

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

James P. Cannon

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

James P. Cannon & Grandizo Munis

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

C. Charles

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

Dewey Commission

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

Albert Goldman

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

Daniel Guerin

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

Felix Morrow

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

Albert Parker

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

Albert Parker and John Saunders

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

Victor Serge

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

* * *

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

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY and STATE