
May 1944

Fourth International

MAY DAY 1944

By Ralph Graham

Review of the Month *By The Editors*

Stalin and Badoglio

On the Eve of Invasion

The Montgomery Ward Case

The Great Minneapolis Strikes

By JAMES P. CANNON

The Arsenal of Marxism

Our Current Basic Military Tasks

By LEON TROTSKY

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

It is not only the sentiment expressed in letters from our readers and agents concerning the high standard of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL but the constant increase in monthly sales that attests to the growing popularity of our magazine. As usual a portion of the correspondence received this month requests increases in monthly bundle orders, as can be seen from the following excerpts:

Minneapolis: "Please increase our monthly bundle 10 copies. We have sold out almost all the last two months and expect to be able to continue. This is due, of course, to the unusual quality of the material in these issues."

Toledo: "Please increase the F.I. bundle order by 15 copies."

San Francisco: "We should like to have our monthly F.I. bundle order increased by 5 copies, beginning with April. By the way, if it is at all possible, we should like to have you send us 5 copies each of the January and February issues of the 1944 F.I. and we want at this time to order 2 bound volumes of the F.I. for 1943. As soon as they are ready, you can send them out and bill us for them."

Los Angeles: "Newsstands just sold 48 F.I.'s. More placed. You will get the final report when the May issue is placed. Please increase our F.I. bundle by 20."

"FOURTH INTERNATIONAL sold extremely well at the Los Angeles School of Social Science and was favorably commented on by several of the students. Especially liked was the series of articles on Marxism and the Military question by Leon Trotsky. Several students, being introduced to the magazine for the first time through the school, have indicated their intention of becoming steady readers. This, together with the continuous expansion of newsstand sales, should lead to another increase in our bundle order in the near future." * * *

The monthly delay in delivery of subscriber copies, caused by a "withhold-until-OK'd" order to the New York City post-office from Washington, is resulting in considerable and understandable irritation among our readers. For instance, our Minneapolis agent writes that he has "been having persistent and quite gen-

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME V May 1944 No. 5 (Whole No. 44)

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

The Month in Review

Stalin and Badoglio.....	131
On the Eve of Invasion.....	133
The Montgomery Ward Case.....	134
The May 1940 Assault Against Trotsky.....	135
May Day 1944.....	By Ralph Graham 136
The Great Minneapolis Strikes....	By James P. Cannon 140
English Resolution on War and Military Policy.....	148
A Defamer of Marxism (Book Review)	

Harry Frankel 149

From the Arsenal of Marxism

Our Current Basic Military Tasks...By Leon Trotsky	152
--	-----



eral complaints from the F.I. subscribers that their copies arrive late."

A reader in Long Beach also complains: "I have not received my April issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. Being 'unusual' times I don't expect everything delivered on the dot, but if it is possible, please send me my copy."

Another reader, knowing of the arbitrary action of the postal

authorities in delaying delivery of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL each month, asks: "Has any new development occurred in your case? I am very much interested in your magazine and inasmuch as it is unobtainable in Baltimore, I am wondering if you have ceased publication." (To all our friends who are constantly moving about from one place to another and cannot receive FOURTH INTERNA-

TIONAL regularly through a subscription, we suggest that you ask for our magazine at the public libraries.)

Again we ask our subscribers to bear with us and for our part we will continue the practice of prodding Washington each month in an attempt to get the current issue released promptly.

* * *

There have been many letters of general interest, excerpts from which we quote:

Cleveland: "Greetings from a subscriber and sympathizer. Am looking forward to the publication of Cannon's 'History of American Trotskyism.' Please send me a copy when available. Being somewhat new to the movement, the March F.I. article 'Dog Days of the Left Opposition' answered many of the questions troubling me. I find many of your F.I. articles excellent. I don't agree with all the articles and interpretations, but I do agree practically 100 percent with your program. Hence, good luck and keep it up!"

Plentywood: "I am sending a one dollar bill for April F.I. From the looks of it, all in all you are doing a good job."

Cuba: "These are hard times we are going through, but we hope to surmount the difficulties . . . Your publications are splendid in form and content. I have enjoyed its reading to the last bit."

England: "To hand is the December issue of the monthly . . . I would very much like a copy of the book 'In Defense of Marxism.' None has come my way up to now; all I know about it is the announcement in the magazine. One feels helpless nowadays with the restrictions preventing one buying those works which are important contributions to our ideas. "My grateful thanks for the papers and magazines. They mean much at the present time, in a world so topsy-turvy. My sympathy goes out to our friends in their enforced idleness and all that that means."

* * *

Bound Volumes of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for 1943 are now ready for delivery. The price is \$4.50. Send your order to:

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

Read these historic documents: SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

By JAMES P. CANNON

112 pages —:— Indexed —:— 10 cents

IN DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

95 pages —:— 10 cents

DEFENSE POLICY IN THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIAL

1—A Criticism by Grandizo Muniz
2—An Answer by James P. Cannon

64 pages —:— 20 cents

WHY WE ARE IN PRISON

Farewell speeches of the defendants

56 pages —:— 10 cents

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 5

MAY 1944

NUMBER 5

The Month in Review

Stalin and the "Democratization" of the Badoglio Regime

STALIN INTERVENES TO SAVE BADOGLIO Stalinism has completely unmasked its counter-revolutionary visage in Italy. Two closely linked moves mark the Kremlin's direct and forcible intervention against the Italian revolution. First came the recognition of Badoglio and the House of Savoy. This paved the way, under Stalinist auspices, for the "reconstitution" of Badoglio's utterly reactionary government through the inclusion of the representatives of the six parties comprising the so-called Committee of Liberation, otherwise known as the "democratic" bloc, or Junta. For the Kremlin, these are only preparatory steps in a general offensive against the revolutionary masses. An integral part of the plan is to clear the way for the untrammelled operations of the GPU murder squads on Italian soil. Stalin hopes to assassinate the Socialist revolution in Italy as he did in Spain.

These are desperate measures to meet a desperate situation. That there is apprehension in the Kremlin over the Italian developments is clearly evident from a long article which appeared in *Izvestia* on March 30. This article states flatly that: "It is well known by now that the moral and economic situation in southern Italy is disastrous." (*Daily Worker*, April 1.)

The situation is no doubt disastrous so far as the plight of the masses is concerned. But this is not what *Izvestia* has in mind.

By its entire record the Stalinist bureaucracy has long ago revealed that the only disasters to which it is sensitive are those that threaten its own interests and privileges.

WHAT IZVESTIA REALLY FEARS After pointing out that "matters in Italy have clearly run into a 'cul de sac,'" *Izvestia* goes on to conclude that the existing situation is leading "Italy to an exhaustion of forces and threatens to ruin her." Here we already come to the nature of the "disaster" that is alarming the Kremlin. On the lips of the Stalinists Italy's "ruin" means one thing and one thing only—the triumph of the proletarian revolution. It ought to be noted that *Izvestia's* words are an eloquent confirmation of the fact that the revolutionary crisis in Italy has yet to reach its peak.

No less noteworthy is the Kremlin's estimate of the effect of Allied policies. *Izvestia* attacks Churchill's plan of letting the "situation stew" and insists that this "only deepens the crisis instead of solving it." The same thing is true of the AMG. According to *Izvestia*: "The rule of the Allied Military Government . . . has done more harm than good."

What about the resources of the Italian ruling class? Here, too, *Izvestia* paints a dismal picture. There is no one to cope with the crisis. In its opinion: "Neither the Badoglio govern-

ment nor the Committee of Liberation by themselves can solve it."

The situation in Italy must indeed be critical—for capitalism—if the official organ of the Stalinist government becomes so outspoken about it. There can be no question about it: mortal fear of the revolution has spurred Stalin into action. He hopes to achieve the "solution" of the Italian crisis by amalgamating the two bankrupt combinations which represent the forces of capitalist reaction; and by utilizing the "united" cabinet, with Stalinists in government posts, to provide the GPU with a most convenient facade for its operations. Those who spread the slightest illusion about the role of Stalinism or the "reconstituted" Badoglio government are guilty of aiding the bitterest enemies of the Italian people.

CHURCHILL'S INTERVENTION IN FAVOR OF THE MONARCHY The Kremlin's actions came at a time when the opposition to Badoglio was reaching new

heights. On February 22, only a few weeks before Stalin's intervention in favor of the King, Churchill declared in the House of Commons that the monarchy constituted the "only legitimate government" of Italy. This declaration of the Tory chief provoked such anger and indignation that the parties of the "democratic" Junta were compelled to head the movement of protest. They first called for a general strike in Naples and then, after reducing it to a token demonstration of 10 minutes, called it off, under Allied pressure; but they did hold a public meeting.

On March 11, the day after the Naples protest demonstration and in the midst of the great general strikes against the Nazis in northern Italy, the Kremlin announced its recognition of Badoglio. This timing was deliberate. In order to intensify the surprise and the confusion, Moscow confined itself in the beginning to semi-official explanations, pretending that nothing more than a diplomatic technicality was involved. On March 24 the *New York Times* reported that what Stalin had in mind was "establishing direct contact with that (Badoglio) government rather than actually according it diplomatic recognition."

GPU'S HIRELINGS CAUGHT UNAWARES The hirelings of the Kremlin—who are never consulted or informed on really important shifts of policy—were everywhere caught completely unawares. While the negotiations with Badoglio were being consummated, the Stalinists in Italy, as well as in England and this country, continued to attack Badoglio and the King.

Even after the news of Stalin's recognition of Badoglio was released, the Stalinists denied they would therewith alter their policy. In this country, the *Daily Worker* swore on March 15 that Moscow's action "in no way affects the desire . . . to dispose of it (the Badoglio regime) fundamentally." Italian Stalin-

ist leaders went even further. According to dispatches from Naples:

"Eugenio Reale, secretary of Italian CP, said the action would have no effect on the party's opposition to Marshal Badoglio and its demand for the abdication of King Victor Emmanuel." (*New York Times*, March 14.)

C. L. Sulzberger cabled on the next day from Naples that:

"Communist Party leaders here announced that they would intensify their efforts to overthrow King Victor Emmanuel and Marshal Badoglio's government."

Sulzberger went on to specify that Paolo Tedeschi, leader of the Italian Communist Party, had publicly issued a pledge to "agitate more strongly" against the universally hated King and his Marshal.

Needless to say, these contemptible flunkies reversed themselves swiftly enough.

HOW THE "DEMOCRATS" ALL FOLLOWED SUIT
Moscow made doubly sure by rushing one of its most notorious GPU agents Palmieri Togliatti, alias Ercoli, to the scene. The flip-flop of the liberals, "democrats" and "socialists" in Italy was no less sudden and abject than that of the Stalinists. The colleagues of this shabby crew in this country forget to mention this trifle. By placing the entire blame on the Kremlin, they seek to exonerate the despicable role of *all* the six parties who have played the game of opposition to Badoglio and the King since the downfall of Mussolini. No, these gentlemen will not succeed in hiding their own crimes behind the crimes of the Kremlin. They will deceive very few, least of all in Italy.

Nothing could be more fraudulent than the claim that the Badoglio government has been "democratized." Its character has not been altered in any essential way by the inclusion of the Stalinists, the liberals and the Social Democrats. It has been reinforced in this way in order to enable it to continue to deprive the people of their elementary democratic rights and to prevent them from organizing a government of their own choosing. The caricature of a "People's Front" is nothing but a cloak for a regime which remains a police and military dictatorship, resting on Allied bayonets, and now to be propped up also by the pistols of the GPU.

The Badoglio regime emerged as it did after the downfall of Mussolini not out of choice but of necessity: the years of fascist rule had destroyed all the other traditional mechanisms and levers of capitalist rule.

THE ROLE OF "COALITIONS"
In the heyday of capitalism a shift of ministers or cabinets was of little moment to the bourgeoisie. As a matter of fact such shifts became the customary means of enabling the ruling class to extricate itself from untenable positions. By the middle of the nineteenth century, after the 1848 revolutions, the bourgeoisie elaborated a special technique of ministerial shifts as a means of duping, dividing and weakening the workers. This device is the so-called "coalition" government, that is, a cabinet consisting of members of the bourgeoisie and renegade working class leaders. For decades the "socialist" leaders of France, Germany and other European countries have provided in this way a convenient cover for the capitalists, enabling them to surmount one crisis after another. After the overthrow of Czarism, the Russian bourgeoisie tried to save itself through just such a trick—a coalition with the SR's and the Mensheviks. Kerensky's provisional government

was a "People's Front" in its classic form. Kerensky and the Mensheviks actually wielded the state power—in the interests of the Russian bourgeoisie. Stalin subsequently repeated this abysmal treachery of the "People's Fronts" in the period prior to the outbreak of the second World War (France, Spain).

The "People's Front" concocted in Italy is a miserable caricature of the classic form. Badoglio and the King remain in the saddle, the "coalition" members are impotent captives.

We see expressed here the progressive decay of the capitalist system which has been enormously speeded up by the war. The arena for political maneuvers, already greatly restricted in the pre-war period, has been still further narrowed down. The experience in Italy has already shown that in countries subjected to fascist rule ministerial shifts are in and of themselves pregnant with the gravest political consequences. Far from surmounting a crisis thereby, the capitalist class may find itself facing the abyss. The Italian capitalists hoped to stave off a catastrophe by sacrificing Mussolini and a few other figureheads; instead of subsiding the revolution thereupon sent its billows throughout the entire land. What would Badoglio's removal entail? Or the abolition of the monarchy?

A NAKEDNESS THAT MUST BE COVERED
The urgent need of maintaining the *status quo* politically, poses all the more urgently the need of a cover.

If any regime in history ever needed a cover it is that of Badoglio and Victor Emmanuel who because of their direct association for twenty years with Mussolini stand all too nakedly exposed before the masses. Virtually from the beginning, Badoglio has dangled cabinet posts before the parties of the "opposition" in order to secure at least a semblance of "coalition." It is no secret that such negotiations were in progress long before Stalin's intervention. Even *Izvestia* acknowledges that Badoglio and the King had "on more than one occasion stated their readiness to include new elements capable of uniting the progressive forces of Italy." (*Daily Worker*, April 1.) Hitherto these overtures have been rejected only because of the fear that individuals and parties accepting such posts would immediately lose all credit with the people. Today the "progressive forces" hope to escape the consequences of their actions by mutual support and mutual amnesty. Just the reverse will happen.

IT IS SUPPLIED BY THE KREMLIN
Stalin utilized the prestige of the Soviet Union and the victories of the Red Army to constitute the caricature coalition which now masks the reactionary and impotent regime of Badoglio. If the Italian events have demonstrated anything at all, it is the complete corruption and bankruptcy of bourgeois democracy. Nine months of AMG's rule in Italy have driven this lesson home to the masses in the country. The reactionary role of Churchill and Roosevelt, especially through their support of Badoglio and the King, is no longer a secret to them. They are now receiving their direct lessons about the true nature not only of Stalinism but also of the domestic brand of capitalist "democracy." At one stroke all the parties in the camp of capitalism have revealed their true nature. The road has been cleared for a rapid political education of the masses and the consolidation of the working class vanguard in a genuine revolutionary party.

ALL THE PROBLEMS REMAIN UNSOLVED The Badoglio regime is doomed. Italy has long been bankrupt. Inflation, the terms of the Allied armistice and the turning of the country into a major battlefield are completing its economic ruin. The Italian people want and need bread and peace. The "reconstituted" Badoglio regime can offer them only more starvation and further slaughter. Every one of the six parties capitulating to Badoglio is compromised by its open betrayal of the Italian people.

There is only one force in Italy and throughout the world that is really progressive and capable of solving the unpostponable problems confronting mankind. That force is the working class united under the banner of the Trotskyist party and its program of the socialist revolution. In the interval between the two world wars many favorable revolutionary situations were lost for lack of a revolutionary party and program. This cardinal lesson of the past has not been forgotten by millions of Italian workers who, we are confident, will build such a party in the days ahead.

On the Eve of the Allied Invasion of Europe

PREPARING FOR THE INVASION By the time these lines appear in print the Allied invasion of Europe may be under way. The capitalist press is devoting many columns of space each day to descriptions of the mammoth preparations for this climactic agony of the war. Eisenhower has announced with an air of finality that Germany will be defeated before the year is out. Another American general in England tells a group of field officers that some of them will never return—"but we shall win." There is a steely, inhuman quality about it all. Everything is cut and dried. Millions of human beings are being pushed around like chips in a great poker game. The Allied soldiers who are being shoved toward the bloody abyss know that a fearful ordeal awaits them. They have been schooled to fight and kill, to suffer and endure—to the end that Hitler may be defeated. And then? It is at this point that the official schooling ends. As every report on the subject plainly shows, the soldiers haven't the least idea what they are fighting for.

The Atlantic Charter, with the "four freedoms"? Its pale, flickering existence was snuffed out by its very authors. Churchill made haste to proclaim its non-applicability to India. He and Roosevelt have worked out plans for dismembering Germany and Balkanizing the whole European continent for the profit and security of Anglo-American Big Business.

The imperialists now sense the futility of trying to surround their predatory schemes with an aura of disinterested idealism. So they don't state any war aims. They just keep quiet. After all, there is North Africa. And there is Italy. The Moroccans and the Tunisians have been "liberated." Is it just accident that they find themselves under the heel of the same old gang of French capitalists who now have American and British bayonets to back them up? Was it just some queer twist of fate that brought the Italians under the police-military dictatorship of Badoglio and the King after they had got rid of Mussolini and his blackshirt thugs?

LIBERAL PRETENSES AND NAKED REALITY Only an obtuse liberal or a venal Stalinist could pretend to believe that. The Allied imperialists had planned it that way and want to keep it that way. They have planned the same sort of thing for "liberated" France on the morrow of the invasion. The dirty deals of Roosevelt and Churchill, always screened from public view in the preparatory stages, seem amazing and mystifying only if one accepts the premise that this is a war for liberty and democracy. Mystification gives way to true understanding if one accepts the Trotskyist thesis that this war, like the war of 1914-18, is simply a predatory war for imperialist aims.

The material interests involved in the war—the lust for colonies, for markets, for spheres of influence, for profits—are becoming more and more evident. Where in the fanciful picture of a "war for democracy" can one fit Standard Oil's grab of the oil of Saudi Arabia, the growing Anglo-American rivalry over air transportation, shipping, trade, colonies, or Britain's flat refusal to return Hong Kong to China when Japan has been defeated? All these things fit into a picture of imperialist war and no other.

In preparing the invasion of Europe, Roosevelt and Churchill are confronted by two sets of problems, one military, the other political. In the purely military sphere they seek the defeat of German imperialism. Politically they are concerned with insuring that vanquishment of their German rival is not followed by social revolution and the downfall of European capitalism.

Supreme confidence in military victory marks all the pronouncements of the Allied camp. Like gangsters about to move into territory held by rival racketeers, they have made every possible preparation to guarantee success for their undertaking. Huge armies have been assembled and trained. Mighty air and sea forces are in readiness. Tremendous stocks of munitions and supplies have been gathered. Just as they display a reckless unconcern over monetary costs so, too, the imperialists are cynically indifferent to the great cost in human life of this tremendous military gamble. Their war juggernaut will have to cross rivers of blood and mountains of corpses to reach its objective. They know this. They have counted and discounted the cost. If in times of peace millions must toil, starve and die to sustain the system of capitalist robbery, of what account are more millions of lives in time of war?

WHAT THEY ALL DREAD THE MOST But what is to be the result of all this "blood, sweat and tears?" The arrogant confidence which the imperialists display in their military might is not matched by a corresponding spirit in the political domain. Here one discerns a feeling of unease and apprehension. War breeds revolution. They remember the Russian October and the revolutions that swept through Finland, Hungary and Germany after the last war when the workers rose up to put an end to capitalism. And now there is Italy, where a restless, rebellious people are striving to rid themselves of the rotten Badoglio regime.

Will the various underground movements in Europe fold up and disappear when the Allied armies march in? Will the dark cloud of civil war which now hangs loweringly over the Continent simply dissolve, or will it change to the red hue of the socialist revolution? Fear of such a development, amounting almost to certainty, haunts the dreams of the Allied imperialists

and gives them no rest, for socialist revolution in Europe will spell doom for world capitalism.

In their arrogance the imperialist gamblers may imagine that armies powerful enough to reduce Hitler's *festung-Europa* will be powerful enough to put down revolution and restore capitalist "order." But how will the workers back home regard the activities of a "liberating" army which becomes a counter-revolutionary police force employed to stamp upon the revolutionary masses? In Russia after the October overturn, American and British troops refused to fight against the Bolsheviks. French sailors mutinied in the Black Sea. British workers formed Councils of Action to prevent shipment of munitions and supplies to the counter-revolutionary forces in Russia. What ground is there for any assurance that these things cannot happen again?

D-Day is near. The invasion armies are poised to strike and the war in Europe moves toward its dramatic climax. Insofar as this is possible, the imperialists have perfected their plans for the military campaign and for suppressing revolution. They have found useful allies in the Stalinists, who are the most venomous betrayers of the revolutionary struggle for Socialism. But the tortured peoples of Europe have not yet spoken. Theirs will be the last word.

The Montgomery Ward Case

AN OBJECT LESSON FOR THE WORKERS The seizure by the government of the Montgomery Ward plant at Chicago on April 26 and its subsequent return to the company two weeks later, have provided the labor movement with another object lesson on the role of the capitalist government in disputes between the employers and the unions. The labor leaders who hailed Roosevelt's order directing the Department of Commerce to seize the plant as a "victory" for the union, are more than a little bewildered by the frenzied developments that occurred in this short period. It turns out that the union won a Pyrrhic victory! The strike which tied up the Chicago plant and was spreading to other Montgomery Ward units, was called off in compliance with Roosevelt's order. The basic issues in dispute are left dangling in mid-air. Sewell Avery, head of Montgomery Ward, adamant in his determination to maintain the open shop, persists in his refusal to extend the existing contract and reiterates his unyielding opposition to conceding the maintenance-of-membership clause—the real issue in dispute.

The only disputed question settled was that the union represents a majority of the employees as established by a National Labor Relations Board poll, taken while the government was in possession of the plant. But the union had established this point by its ability to tie up the Chicago plant by calling its members out on strike—a strike which received the sympathy and support of the entire labor movement, with the exception of the Stalinist finks, and gave every promise of being an effective means of forcing Avery to meet the demands of the union. Roosevelt and his henchmen pretended that the only issue involved in the dispute was whether or not the union represented a majority of the workers.

AVERY DENIES WHAT ROOSEVELT AFFIRMS "If the election shows that the union does not have a majority of the employees," Roosevelt told a press conference, "that will end the case. On the other hand, if the election shows that the union has a majority, then the management has declared that it is willing to continue its contract and that will end the case." The plant was seized, an NLRB election was held, and the establishment was turned back to Avery even before the polls were closed, on the aforementioned assumption that the results of the election would resolve the dispute. Avery quickly dispelled this mirage. Referring to Roosevelt's press statement Avery said: "We have never made such a statement and we never intend to. The only thing the election will settle is whether the union represents a majority of Ward's workers."

The NLRB election, in which the union won a substantial majority, decided exactly nothing. Avery's comment was that the election was of "no consequence." The company, "would sign no contract demanding a maintenance of membership or a closed shop clause," Avery declared, "nor would Montgomery Ward renew the former contract, containing a maintenance of membership provision." After being taken for a whirl on Roosevelt's merry-go-round, the union found itself back where it started from; a trifle dazed by the dizzy ride and trying to recover its bearings. "The seizure of the plant has been a farce," declared the union's attorney. The president of the Chicago local, H. B. Anderson, added: "We hope the old contract will be extended until our new contract demands are met. If the company refuses maintenance of membership, the whole thing will be back in the War Labor Board's lap." In other words, "hold on to your hats, here we go again!"

ROUTINE LEFT UNDISTURBED BY GOVERNMENT "SEIZURE" After his return Avery issued a statement in which he boasted: "During the thirteen days of the seizure no employe was disciplined for failure to maintain union membership, no dues were checked off and no grievances were arbitrated or even adjusted." In his statement accompanying the order for the return of the plant, Secretary Jones, Department of Commerce, observed that, "at no time during the period of Government possession have the normal, routine business procedures of Montgomery Ward and Co. been disturbed." In fact, nothing was disturbed throughout the whole theatrical seizure, except the breaking of the strike. After this purpose was successfully accomplished the plant was returned to the company posthaste.

The primary object of the government seizure was to head off the independent action of the workers in fighting for their rights. In referring the case to Roosevelt, the War Labor Board warned that "there is a real and present danger that the disturbance will spread to the plants and facilities of other companies, both in the Chicago area and elsewhere. . . . Local unions in Chicago in many of the important war plants have voted to support the Montgomery Ward employees who are on strike." A successful strike of the Ward employees, backed by the strength of the organized labor movement, would be an infectious example for the workers who have been smarting under the provocative acts of management and the run-around they have been getting from the WLB and other administration agencies. Roosevelt's strategy is designed to prevent the in-

dependent action of the workers by channelizing their grievances into the labyrinth of government bureaus and agencies which make up his labor relations machinery.

INESCAPABLE CONCLUSIONS

The lesson to be learned from the Ward case is that the workers cannot depend on a capitalist government to protect their interests. Such a government can function only as a strikebreaking agency for the bosses. Only the independent action of the workers, through their own union strength and solidarity, can bring the "recalcitrant" employers to terms. But today the entire organized labor movement is rendered impotent by the complete reliance of the leadership on the Roosevelt administration. Through the no-strike pledge labor has been deprived of its most effective weapon of defending its interests on the economic field. Once the Independent Labor Party is built and the American workers enter the path of struggle for the establishment of the Workers and Farmers Government—then, and only then, will the workers be able to depend on the government to defend the interests of the overwhelming majority of the people against the greed and arrogance of Avery and all his kind.

The May 1940 Assault Against Leon Trotsky

**STALIN ORDERS THE
MURDER OF TROTSKY** Four years ago, on May 24, 1940, the GPU murder machine, on orders from Stalin, struck to destroy Leon Trotsky and his wife Natalia.

A squad of more than a score of heavily armed men, masquerading in the uniforms of Mexican police and army, succeeded in penetrating into Trotsky's residence in Coyoacan, a suburb of Mexico City. The premises were riddled with machinegun fire, the attack being concentrated on the bedroom where the aged couple was sleeping. Convinced that their mission had been carried out, the assassins departed after setting off incendiary bombs in order to destroy Trotsky's archives, particularly the manuscript of his book on Stalin which was then in preparation. (The publication of this book in the United States has since then been suppressed by orders of the State Department.) But Trotsky and his wife miraculously escaped the attack. Stalin was to succeed a few weeks later, when in August the GPU agent Jacson struck Trotsky down from behind with a pickaxe.

The details of this May 1940 crime have long been a matter of public record. The role of the GPU and of the Stalinists in it was established beyond a shadow of a doubt. Many of the participants confessed. It was proved that the murder squad was comprised of former members of the Stalinist-dominated Loyalist brigades in Spain. The leader of the attack, David Alfaro Siqueiros, Mexican painter and notorious GPU agent, was caught red-handed. To this day he does not deny his part but tries brazenly to dismiss it as "an unfortunate bit of political sniping on my part." (Siqueiros is now back in Mexico City where he roams the streets with impunity and talks of making a tour in the United States, under the auspices of Nelson Rockefeller's "coordinators of inter-American affairs.") The trail led directly to the Central Committee of the Mexican Communist Party, one of whose members Serrano was implicated. Likewise indicated was the complicity of the Soviet

Embassy in Washington, then under Oumansky, now Stalin's ambassador to Mexico.

ROBERT SHELDON HARTE FALLS VICTIM OF GPU

In their May 1940 attack, the murderers failed to carry out their main assignment, but they did not leave the scene without exacting a toll. They kidnapped and killed Robert Sheldon Harte, one of Trotsky's American secretary-guards. They put two bullets through his head, one in the base of the skull, the other through the temple—and threw his body into a shallow lime-filled grave, near a cabin a few miles away from Trotsky's residence. After they killed Harte, the Stalinists tried to besmirch his name by intimating in the press that he had been connected with the gang of assassins. They hoped that the lime would disfigure his body beyond recognition, if it ever was found. But in this, too, they failed.

The memory of Robert Sheldon Harte remains unblemished. Bob was only 25 when he died for the ideas in which he believed. He came from a wealthy family, but he found it impossible to accept a society based on exploitation and greed, on lies and cruelty, on perpetual misery and perpetual wars. His hatred of the decaying capitalist system led him to search for a solution. He found it in the program of Trotskyism. From the day he joined the New York local of the Socialist Workers Party, he served with unbounded devotion. He sought for no personal satisfaction beyond the framework of the revolutionary movement and its tasks. His sole ambition was to be worthy of the banner under which he had enlisted. He was not the first co-worker of Leon Trotsky murdered by the GPU. His name must be enrolled among the members of Trotsky's secretariat against whom the GPU has from the first vented all its fury. Inside the Soviet Union, Stalin killed the following Russian secretaries of Trotsky: M. Glazman, G. Butov, Y. Blumkin, N. Sermuks and I. Poznansky. In addition to Robert Sheldon Harte, the list of Trotsky's secretaries murdered abroad includes: R. Clement, E. Wolfe, and Trotsky's own son, Leon Sedov.

TROTSKY'S PROGRAM IS UNCONQUERABLE

Today it ought to be clear even to the blind why Stalin had to silence at all costs the voice of Lenin's collaborator, the leader of the October insurrection in Petrograd and the organizer of the Red Army. It was to pave the way for the Kremlin's open betrayal of the world working class and the struggle for Socialism. By killing Trotsky, Stalin hoped to destroy the influence of Trotsky's ideas and his popularity with the masses in the Soviet Union and throughout the world. Stalin thought he was thereby dealing a death blow to Trotsky's supreme contribution to the world revolution—The Fourth International.

The power of ideas is beyond the grasp of Stalin and his hirelings. In the not too distant future the unconquerable force of the program of the Fourth International will demonstrate itself on the arena of history. For everyone of our fallen martyrs, thousands upon hundreds of thousands will rally to Trotsky's banner. In their wake, millions will follow to realize on earth the communist future of man.

May Day 1944

By RALPH GRAHAM

On the occasion of May Day, a day symbolic of socialist struggle and working class solidarity, it is fitting to review the primary tasks of the revolutionary vanguard in all countries with regard to the crucial problems and issues facing the toiling and exploited masses of mankind who are suffering the horrors of war and are seeking a way out.

The passivity and apathy of the masses during the first years of the second World War is dissipating rapidly in the fifth year of the slaughter, which has already lasted longer than the World War of 1914-1918. The shift in mood is becoming more and more marked. War-weariness, and a desire to find a way out of the bloody welter are being manifested by the workers in a number of countries. The tortured and deceived peoples are no longer prepared to leave their fate in the hands of the criminal capitalist war-makers, but are beginning an active and independent intervention in the war, with aims and purposes of their own.

With the revolutionary battle-cry of "Peace and Bread!" on their lips the Italian working class was the first to enter the revolutionary road, after the overthrow of the regime of Mussolini and his Black Shirt gangsters. Today, in northern Italy, the workers are battling the Nazi enslavers who have occupied their country. In the south, they are continuing the fight against the infamous regime of Badoglio and the King which survives solely by virtue of supporting Allied bayonets.

A World-Wide Trend

The overthrow of Italian fascism and the continuing battle against reaction by the Italian masses represent the first lightning flashes of the approaching revolutionary storm in Europe.

Throughout occupied Europe, in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, the movements of mass resistance are gaining in strength. Beginning under the Nazi jackboot, as a resistance to the oppressing invader, these movements are everywhere becoming fused with the class struggle. Opposition to the Nazi regime in Germany itself, and in Austria, becomes more and more manifest. The reactionary governments of Franco in Spain and Salazar in Portugal live precariously over a social volcano.

The movement of the resurgent masses is not confined to Nazi-dominated Europe. In England, in Australia and Canada, the working-class is moving into open opposition against the "democratic" capitalists and their vile imperialist schemes. The workers are coming more and more to disavow and violate the treacherous truce with their class enemy which was imposed upon them by the fake labor leaders at the beginning of the war. Despite all the frantic appeals and threats of the governments and the labor traitors, strikes of growing magnitude occur with increasing frequency. The class struggle breaks through the hardened crust of thinly veiled war dictatorships. In all the countries of "democratic" capitalism the workers are taking to the road of independent class action, both on the industrial and political fields.

In the countries of the Orient this vitalizing movement of mass resurgence is likewise taking place. From behind a heavy veil of censorship we learn of strikes and hunger riots in Japan.

The fearfully oppressed workers and peasants of that country, held down for years under an iron military-police dictatorship, are at long last defying the imperialist policies of their rulers which have brought them nothing but death and misery. Just across the Yellow Sea, the masses of China are manifesting opposition to Chiang Kai-shek's murderous regime. In India, the struggle of 400,000,000 colonial slaves for national independence, for freedom from imperialist oppression, has been temporarily quelled but far from crushed. The first victories of the revolution in Europe will inspire the Indian masses to intensify their battle for freedom. The whole colonial world will be set aflame.

The outstanding fact for revolutionary Socialists in the present situation is this world-wide manifestation of a break in the mood of the masses. From quiet submission to the war and to the war plans of the imperialists, in the Allied as in the Axis camp, the war-weary peoples are beginning to awaken. This awakening is unmistakable. But the masses have as yet no program, nor a responsible revolutionary leadership. They are discontented and rebellious, but they still do not understand the true cause of their terrible plight nor discern the road out of their miseries. It is necessary to imbue them with the realization that the present war is a continuation of the war of 1914-18 in which the imperialists set themselves the task of redividing the world. Now they seek to divide it again in accordance with the new relationship of forces, taking account, above all, of the dominant world role of American imperialism. The duration of the war will be determined, in the last analysis, by the willingness or unwillingness of the masses to permit themselves to be killed and maimed for the greater profit of their exploiters and oppressors.

Their Deeds and Their Lies

By their policies and deeds the "democratic" imperialists are confounding their own lying propaganda and unwittingly helping the workers to understand the true character of the war. Before the ink had dried on the so-called "Atlantic Charter" with its hypocritical promise to spread the "four freedoms" to the four corners of the world, Churchill made haste to announce that it did not apply to the millions of colonial slaves of British imperialism in India. Britain has refused to return Hong Kong to China even after the war, although this is Chinese territory and was seized by force a century ago. Puerto Rico remains a colony of the American imperialists despite a promise of independence made forty years ago. Occupation of North Africa by the Anglo-American armies has not brought freedom and independence to the peoples of that area, but renewed enslavement to French imperialism supported by Allied bayonets. The imperialists of Holland, France and Britain, deprived of their Far Eastern colonies by their Japanese adversaries, do not even promise independence to the millions in the Netherlands East Indies, French Indo-China, Burma and Malaya after the Japanese invaders have been driven out. On the contrary, they openly proclaim their intention to establish the *status quo ante*, to restore

their own imperialist rule and the exploitation of the inhabitants.

Crisscrossing the restorationist plans of the smaller empires are the sinister designs and aims of the big pirates of Britain and the United States. The British colonial despots harbor designs on the French African colonies. American monopoly capital eyes hungrily the lush "possessions" of France and Holland in the Far East, the larger and richer colonies of the British Empire and China. Wall Street tells the world that it aims at nothing less than world domination. Thus in the very midst of the present war the seeds of a new destructive conflict are sown.

The self-exposure of the imperialists is driving ever larger masses of the workers into opposition to the war. It is the task of the revolutionary vanguard to show the workers the way out of the morass. They must convince the masses that the only road to peace is the road to Socialism. They must convince the masses that so long as capitalism with its greedy rivalries remains, war with all its horrors, distress and privation will go on and new wars will be inevitable. They must convince the workers that only they, by their united action, can sweep the putrid capitalist system away and build a new world of peace and plenty.

Throughout history war and revolution have been intertwined. The Franco-Prussian war gave rise to the Paris Commune in 1871. The first Russian Revolution of 1905 erupted as a consequence of the Russo-Japanese War. The World War of 1914-18 set the stage for the great Bolshevik revolution which swept capitalism from one-sixth of the earth's surface. It produced revolutions in Germany, Hungary and Finland in the early post-war period, led up to the revolutionary general strike in England in 1926, and germinated the seeds of the Chinese Revolution in 1925-1927.

Allied Plans for Europe

The imperialists are beset with the fear, amounting to certainty, that the present slaughter will produce a new wave of revolutions to imperil and perhaps destroy their system. Events in Italy which accompanied and followed the overthrow of Mussolini confirmed their fears and the threat of revolution haunts them like a nightmare. To meet the threat of a European revolution they are conspiring with every reactionary element on the continent with a view to insuring the maintenance of capitalist "order" on the morrow of their invasion. Capitalist counter-revolution is mustering all its cohorts.

In southern Italy and Sicily the workers and peasants find themselves held down, ruled by decree, deprived of democratic liberties, kept on starvation rations by the police-military dictatorship of Badoglio and the King whose main support is the bayonets of the Allied imperialists. Do the Italian people wish to make a clean sweep of the last vestiges of the fascist regime, to free themselves of the rotted capitalist system which gave birth to both fascism and the war, to live under a system and a government of their own choosing? The "democratic" Allies are there with their troops to see that capitalism, together with the reactionary monarchial Badoglio regime, are preserved! Do the Italian masses desire an end to the imperialist slaughter? Again the "democratic" Allies are there to harness them to the Anglo-American war machine.

Roosevelt's instructions to Gen. Eisenhower to deal with whatever French authorities he sees fit when Allied armies have landed in France indicates clearly the intention to establish in that country, too, a police-military dictatorship of the

Badoglio type. The Allies come, not to free France and restore democracy, but to guarantee "order" and preserve capitalism against the insurgent actions of the workers.

Nor do they plan to liberate Germany. There, as in Italy, they will endeavor to place a reactionary clique in power to hold the masses down and prevent them from making a clean sweep of the capitalist system which spawned the Nazi regime. They plan to tear Germany apart, Balkanize the entire European continent, establish puppet dictatorships, and place the inhabitants on hunger rations for the security and profit of Anglo-American imperialism. Plots and plans and schemes toward this end are being hatched in Washington and London at a time when Europe's crying need is for political and economic unification to banish national and race rivalries, to insure peace, and to make possible a regime of social progress.

Against the reactionary machinations of the "democracies" for the dismemberment and enslavement of the European continent, the revolutionary vanguard must propagate with increased vigor the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe as the rallying cry of the masses. Only the abolition of capitalism and the realization of workers' rule can save Europe from barbarism and slavery and make possible an era of peace and plenty under Socialism.

In the Far East as in Europe, the aims and plans of the imperialists run contrary to the deepest interests and desires of the peoples. The Anglo-American coalition is conducting war against Japan, not in order to liberate China and other countries from the grip of the Nipponese imperialists, but in order to replace the latter as the oppressors and exploiters of oriental peoples.

Roosevelt and Churchill, moreover, realize that Japan's defeat will surely touch off a revolutionary explosion in that country and that the resulting conflagration will spread to all of Asia to bring crashing to the ground their schemes for the enslavement and exploitation of the bulk of the world's population. Casting around for a likely Japanese puppet to head a new regime of reaction in Japan, they are eying the Emperor Hirohito as a likely candidate and as a preliminary have forbidden public criticism of this symbol of capitalist-feudal Japan.

Against the counter-revolutionary schemings of the imperialists, against the plot to head off the Japanese revolution, to stifle the will of the Japanese masses and to bring the Japanese and all other eastern peoples into a new system of imperialist enslavement, the revolutionary vanguard must raise the slogan of Freedom for the Colonies. All Support to the Oriental Peoples in Their Struggle for Liberation!

The Reaction at Home

The counter-revolutionary plans of London and Washington with regard to Europe and Asia are a continuation and extension of reactionary policies pursued at home. In Britain and America the living standards of the workers are being driven down while the capitalists gather in vast profits from the sweat and agony of their own and other nations. In both countries the labor movement is under constant attack by the capitalists and their governments. Democratic liberties, especially the right of free speech, are being more and more curtailed. In the midst of a war for "freedom" there is an increasing regimentation and Prussianization of daily life. The vile orgy of anti-Jewish pogroms in Hitler's Europe is matched by persecution and discrimination against Negroes in Roosevelt's "democratic" America and the extension of Jim Crow to American Negro

soldiers in Churchill's "democratic" British Isles. Failing the intervention of the workers, the end result of all these tendencies will be the wiping out of the labor movement, the abrogation of all democratic liberties and the erection of a totalitarian state.

At a time when the workers are coming to a realization of the meaning of these tendencies and taking more vigorously to the road of the class struggle, all the false friends and betrayers of labor stand on the side of the capitalists and their governments to deceive and disorient the workers and deliver them to their class enemies. The Labor Party and trade union bureaucracy in England have tied the British labor movement to Churchill's war plans, just as the leaders of the AFL and CIO have tied the American labor movement to the war plans of Roosevelt and Wall Street. They proclaim their support of the war machine and hamper, sabotage and betray every effort of the workers to maintain or better their living standards. These labor lieutenants of the capitalist class have become so transparently treacherous to the workers' movement they are supposed to serve that increasing numbers of class-conscious militants in labor's ranks are beginning to see the necessity for a break with these fakers. They are turning away from the policies of class collaboration.

The Role of Stalinism

Upon the revolutionary vanguard rests the duty of encouraging every tendency by the workers to break from the leading-strings of the capitalists and their labor lackeys. Every reactionary move and plan of the class enemy, both at home and abroad, must be exposed to the hilt. Every treacherous deed of the labor fakers must be dragged into the light of day and the true role of these servants of capitalism revealed to the broadest ranks of the workers' movement. Only in this way can the workers be led on to the wide battlefields of the class struggle, the struggle for a peaceful and prosperous life under socialism.

Even more perfidious in their betrayals of the workers' struggle are the so-called Communist Parties, which in the course of fifteen years have degenerated from vanguard parties in the revolutionary struggle for socialism into venal agencies of the counter-revolutionary Soviet bureaucracy and its imperialist allies. In every country the Stalinist leaders appear as the spearhead of reaction and counter-revolution, enemies of the working class, betrayers of socialism. In World War II they have taken the place which the treacherous social-democrats of the now defunct Second International occupied in World War I—that of the most ardent defenders of the capitalist "fatherland."

The fountain-head of the corruption and degeneration of the Communist parties is the counter-revolutionary Soviet bureaucracy of the Soviet Union, of which Stalin is the leading personifier and representative. It rose to power in the Soviet Union because the 1919-1923 post-war revolutionary wave in Europe was broken and left the first workers' state isolated in a hostile capitalist encirclement, amid the economic and cultural backwardness inherited from Czarism.

The political ideology of the ruling bureaucratic stratum was expressed in the theory that socialism could be built in one country. It was under this ideological cover that the Stalinist bureaucracy proceeded to entrench itself in the apparatus of the Soviet state, elevate itself above the masses, arrogate to

itself unheard-of powers and privileges. "Socialism in one country" meant assuring all the comforts and attributes of a bourgeois life for the new privileged stratum which rapidly grew into a hardened parasitic growth on the new Soviet society. Irked by the democratic controls which the October revolution had established, the bureaucracy reduced the Bolshevik Party, the Soviets and the trade unions to impotence and established its own unbridled rule. The old revolutionary guard of the Bolshevik Party, the comrades-in-arms of Lenin and Trotsky, were framed up and murdered. Trotsky himself was killed by a hired assassin of Stalin's secret police organization.

Hand in hand with this reactionary retrogression went the systematic destruction of most of the important social gains of the October revolution. Piece-work and the speed-up (Stakhanovism) were re-introduced. Wage differentials were established and economic inequality officially idealized. Factory committees were done away with. Free universal education and co-education have been abolished. The youth organization, the Young Communist League, was dissolved. The inequality of the sexes has been revived in law and in practice. Together with all these retrograde steps has gone the reintroduction of many of the most odious features of Czarist rule, including the internal passport system and a super-privileged caste of officers in the army.

The revolutionary internationalism of the days of Lenin and Trotsky has given way to the practice of unbridled chauvinism. The "Internationale," revolutionary battle song of the working class, has been replaced by a vulgar national anthem. All organizational ties between the Soviet working class and the workers in capitalist lands have been liquidated by the disbandment of the Communist (Third) International. In place of the old reliance upon the revolutionary working class abroad as the shield and armor of the Soviet Union, the Stalinist bureaucracy now depends upon pacts and alliances with the imperialists. And since revolution anywhere threatens to topple the rotten Soviet bureaucracy from power, the Stalin regime gives aid and support to every reactionary plot of its imperialist allies. The Kremlin is in league with world reaction against the proletarian revolution. Its instruments abroad are the so-called Communist parties.

Our Defense of the USSR

The Soviet bureaucracy is not an independent social formation, with independent roots in the productive process, but an evil parasitic growth on the body of Soviet society. It utilized the backwardness and isolation of the Soviet Union in order to usurp the powers of government of a rising class, the working class, which had only yesterday smashed capitalism and come to power by revolution. It has no progressive historic mission to perform, but lives off and undermines a new society established by the proletarian revolution.

In defending or leading the defense of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack the Stalinist bureaucracy is simply defending its own privileged position. On the other hand, by its bureaucratic misrule and counter-revolutionary policies this caste also undermines and weakens the foundations of the Soviet state and gives aid and comfort to all the elements of capitalist restoration which seek to destroy the remaining conquests of the October revolution.

One thing the parasitic Soviet bureaucracy has not yet done: It has not destroyed the economic foundations of the new society which was ushered in by the October revolution. Capital-

ism, private property in the means of production, distribution and exchange, remains banished from the territory of the former Czarist Empire. The socialized economy of the Soviet Union is preserved and reveals its vast superiority over the system of capitalist anarchy, above all today, when the Red Army is defending the Soviet Union against imperialist attack. This is why the Trotskyists define the Soviet Union as a degenerated workers' state which in spite of and against the rotten Stalinist bureaucracy must be defended by the world working class as a fortress of its own socialist future. Whereas in capitalist countries the workers must abolish capitalist rule and expropriate the factories and the land in order to proceed to the building of a new socialist order, in the Soviet Union the economic foundations of the socialist order already exist in the form of the nationalized property. The task for the Soviet working class is to overthrow the parasitic rule of the bureaucracy and restore all the institutions of Soviet democracy.

The Trotskyists, stand firm in their defense of the Soviet Union despite its degeneration under Stalin. The military vanquishment of the Soviet Union by imperialism, or the destruction of Soviet nationalized property by internal forces of counter-revolution, would signify the return of the former empire of the Czars to the world capitalist exploitation and reaction. The putrescent system of capitalism would gain a new lease on life. The Socialist movement of the working class would receive a setback from which it would take many years, perhaps decades, to recover. In order to win fresh victories, the revolutionary vanguard must recognize and know how to defend the conquests already made.

Churchill and Roosevelt, no less than Hitler, want to destroy what remains of the October revolution, for despite Stalin and his reactionary policies, the Soviet Union continues to be a thorn in the side of world capitalism. It continues to inspire and encourage the workers of all lands in their struggles to end capitalism and establish Socialism.

Defense of the Soviet Union does not mean defense of the counter-revolutionary Stalin regime, any more than the defense of a trade union under attack by the bosses means defense of the traitorous bureaucrats who dominate the union and sell out the workers. On the contrary, defense of the Soviet Union requires an unrelenting struggle against Stalinism both in the Soviet Union and abroad. Stalinism is the enemy and destroyer of the workers' state. It poisons and weakens the international labor movement and has become a prop and mainstay of capitalism and counter-revolution, as witness the action of the Stalinists in coming to the rescue of the Badoglio regime. If the workers do not purge their movement of this corrupting menace, the coming tidal wave of the Socialist revolution will end only in defeats of the working class and the destruction of the Soviet Union.

With all its might the revolutionary vanguard of the workers must fight this dangerous canker of Stalinism. It must be exposed before the workers in all its treachery as an agency of the class enemy. Without the fight against Stalinism there can be no real fight for Socialism.

Alone and against all other parties and political groupings the Trotskyist movement defends and fights for both the immediate and historic interests of the working class. The trade union bureaucracies, the Social Democrats and the Stalinists have all betrayed the workers' interests by supporting the imperialist war and are smeared beyond redemption with all the crimes of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The Trotskyists, on the

other hand, have opposed the imperialist war from the beginning. They saw the war approaching and warned the workers against its frightful consequences. Consistently they have exposed the lie that it is a war for "freedom and democracy" and have revealed its reactionary imperialist character.

The Trotskyists alone have continued the struggle for Socialism. That is why eighteen leading American Trotskyists are today confined to prison where they were railroaded by Roosevelt under the infamous Smith "Gag" Act. That is why the British Trotskyists are being hounded by Churchill. In every country where the banner of Trotskyism is planted, the ruling class recognize in the Trotskyists their implacable foe.

Our Spotless Banner

Long before the war the banner of the Fourth International was planted in nearly every important country. Today, under the increasing terror of the war and the blows of reaction, its ranks are growing and its sections becoming more numerous. In England, the Trotskyist forces long divided, have united firmly on the program and principles of Trotskyism to form the Revolutionary Communist Party, British section of the Fourth International. In France our heroic co-thinkers of the Parti Ouvrier Internationaliste (International Workers' Party) have maintained their organization in the teeth of the Nazi terror and continue to bring out their paper, *Le Soviet*. Even in Hitler's Germany a revolutionary vanguard is once more being assembled under the banner of international socialism.

In the coming period, with the growing radicalization of the masses, new revolutionary groupings will appear in many other countries. Many of them will move in our direction and claim to be Trotskyist. The Trotskyist movement welcomes and will continue to welcome every regroupment of the revolutionary vanguard elements and will accord them every possible assistance. It will, however, insist on the utmost programmatic clarity as a test of the political qualification of any group for adherence to our ranks.

The task of tasks confronting the revolutionary vanguard is to speed the consolidation and growth of the genuine revolutionary party in their respective countries.

In *The Manifesto on the Imperialist War and The Proletarian Revolution*, Leon Trotsky wrote:

"The capitalist world has no way out, unless a prolonged death agony is so considered. It is necessary to prepare for long years, if not decades, of war, uprisings, brief interludes of truce, new wars and new uprisings. A young revolutionary party must base itself on this perspective. History will provide it with enough opportunities and possibilities to test itself, to accumulate experience and to mature. The swifter the ranks of the vanguard are fused the more the epoch of bloody convulsions will be shortened, the less destruction will our planet suffer. But the great historical problem will not be solved in any case until a revolutionary party stands at the head of the proletariat. The question of tempos and time-intervals is of enormous importance; but it alters neither the general historical perspective nor the direction of our policy. The conclusion is a simple one: it is necessary to carry on the work of educating and organizing the proletarian vanguard with tenfold energy. Precisely in this lies the task of the Fourth International."

It is with this perspective that the Trotskyist movement confidently continues its forward march. The day is not far distant when decisive sections of the working class will find their place under its liberating banner.

The Great Minneapolis Strikes

By JAMES P. CANNON

EDITOR'S NOTE: THE GREAT MINNEAPOLIS STRIKES is the eighth chapter of James P. Cannon's, *The History of American Trotskyism* which Pioneer Publishers has scheduled for publication this spring.

* * *

The year 1933, the fourth year of the great American crisis, marked the beginning of the greatest awakening of the American workers and their movement towards union organization on a scale never seen before in American history. That was the background of all the developments within the various political parties, groups and tendencies. This movement of the American workers took the form of a tremendous drive to break out of their atomized state and to confront the employers with the organized force of unionism.

This great movement developed in waves. The first year of the Roosevelt administration saw the first strike wave of considerable magnitude yield but scanty results in the way of organization because it lacked sufficient drive and adequate leadership. In most cases the efforts of the workers were frustrated by governmental "mediation" on one side and brutal suppression on the other.

The second great wave of strikes and organization movements took place in 1934. This was followed by a still more powerful movement in 1936-37, of which the high points were the sit-down strikes in the auto and rubber factories and the tremendous upsurge of the CIO.

Our lecture tonight deals with the strike wave of 1934 as represented in the Minneapolis strikes. There, for the first time, the effective participation of a revolutionary Marxist group in actual strike organization and direction was demonstrated. The basis of these strike waves and organization movements was a **partial industrial revival**.

This has been mentioned before and must be repeated again and again. In the depths of the depression, when unemployment was so vast, the workers had lost their self-confidence and feared to make any move under the ominous threat of unemployment. But with the revival of industry, the workers gained new confidence in themselves and began a movement to wrest back some of those things which had been taken away from them in the depths of the depression. The ground for the mass activity of the Trotskyist movement in America was, of course, laid by the action of the masses themselves. In the Spring of 1934 the country had been electrified by the Auto-Lite strike in Toledo in which some new methods and new techniques of militant struggle had been introduced. A political, or at least semi-political grouping, represented by the Conference for Progressive Labor Action, which had set up the Provisional Committee for the formation of the American Workers Party, had led this tremendously significant strike in Toledo through the medium of their Unemployed League. There was shown for the first time what a great role can be played in the struggles of industrial workers by an unemployed organization led by militant elements. The unemployed organization in Toledo, which had been formed and was under the leadership of the Musteite group, practically took over the leadership of this Auto-Lite strike and raised it to a level of mass picketing and

militancy far beyond the bounds ever contemplated by the old line craft union bureaucrats.

The Minneapolis strikes raised the level even higher. If we measure by all standards, including the decisive criterion of political direction and the maximum exploitation of every possibility inherent in a strike, we must say that the high point of the 1934 wave was the strike of the Minneapolis drivers, helpers and inside-workers in May, and its repetition on a still higher scale in July-August 1934. These strikes put American Trotskyism to a crucial test.

For five years we had been a voice crying in the wilderness, confining ourselves to criticism of the Communist Party, to the elucidation of what appeared to be the most abstract theoretical questions. More than once we had been accused of being nothing but sectarians and hairsplitters. Now, with this opportunity presented in Minneapolis to participate in the mass movement, American Trotskyism was put squarely to the test. It had to demonstrate in action whether it was indeed a movement of good-for-nothing sectarian hairsplitters, or a dynamic political force capable of participating effectively in the mass movement of the workers.

Trotskyists Seize Opportunity

Our comrades in Minneapolis began their work first in the coal yards, and later extended their organizing campaign among the general drivers and helpers. That was not a preconceived plan worked out in the general staff of our movement. The drivers of Minneapolis were not by far the most decisive section of the American proletariat. We began our real activity in the labor movement in those places where the opportunity was open to us. It is not possible to select such occasions arbitrarily according to whim or preference. One must enter into the mass movement where a door is open. A chain of circumstances made Minneapolis the focal point of our first great endeavors and successes in the trade union field. We had in Minneapolis a group of old and tested Communists who were at the same time experienced trade unionists. They were well-known men, rooted in the locality. During the depression they worked together in the coal yards. When the opportunity opened up to organize the yards they seized it and quickly demonstrated their capacities in the successful three-day strike. Then the extension of the organizing work to the trucking industry generally followed as a matter of course.

Minneapolis wasn't the easiest nut to crack. In fact it was one of the hardest in the country; Minneapolis was a notorious open-shop town. For fifteen or twenty years the Citizens Alliance, an organization of hard-boiled employers, had ruled Minneapolis with an iron hand. Not a single strike of any consequence had been successful in those years. Even the building trades, perhaps the most stable and effective of all the craft unions, were kept on the run in Minneapolis and driven off the most important construction jobs. It was a town of lost strikes, open shops, miserably low wages, murderous hours, and a weak and ineffectual craft-union movement.

The coal strike, mentioned in our discussion last week, was a preliminary skirmish before the great battles to come. The smashing victory of that strike, its militancy, its good organiza-

tion and its quick success, stimulated the general organization of the truck drivers and helpers, who up to that time and throughout the years of the depression, had been cruelly exploited and without benefit of organization. True, there was a union in the industry, but it was holding on to the ragged edge of nothing. There was only a small handful of members with some poor kind of contract with one or two transfer companies—no real organization of the mass of truck drivers and helpers in the town.

The success of the coal strike uplifted the workers in the trucking industry. They were tinder for the spark; their wages were too low and their hours too long. Freed for so many years from any union restraints, the profit-hungry bosses had gone too far—the bosses always go too far—and the ground-down workers heard the union message gladly.

Our trade union work in Minneapolis, from beginning to end, was a politically directed campaign. The tactics were guided by the general policy, hammered home persistently by *The Militant*, which called on the revolutionists to enter into the main stream of the labor movement represented by the American Federation of Labor.

The Revolutionary Course

It was our deliberate course to go along the organizational line the masses were travelling, not to set up any artificially constructed unions of our own in contradiction to the impulse of the masses to go into the established trade union movement. For five years we had waged a determined battle against the ultra-left dogma of "Red Unions," such unions set up artificially by the Communist Party were boycotted by the workers, thus isolating the vanguard elements. The mass of the workers, groping for organization, had a sound instinct. They sensed the need of help. They wanted to be in contact with other organized workers, not off on a sideline with some howling radicals. It is an unailing phenomenon: The helpless, unorganized mass in industry have an exaggerated respect for established unions, no matter how conservative, how reactionary, these unions may be. The workers fear isolation. In that respect they are wiser than all the sectarians and dogmatists who have tried to prescribe for them the exact detailed form of a perfect union. In Minneapolis, as elsewhere, they had a strong impulse to get in with the official movement, hoping for its assistance in the fight against the bosses who had made life pretty tough for them. Following the general trend of the workers, we also realized that if we were to make the best of our opportunities, we should not put unnecessary difficulties in our path. We should not waste time and energy trying to sell the workers a new scheme of organization they did not want. It was far better to adapt ourselves to their trend, and also to exploit the possibilities of getting assistance from the existing official labor movement.

It wasn't so easy for our people to enter the American Federation of Labor in Minneapolis. They were marked men who had been doubly expelled, doubly damned. In the course of their struggles they had been thrown not only out of the Communist Party, but also the American Federation of Labor. During the "Red Purge" of 1926-1927, at the height of the reaction in the American labor movement, practically all of our comrades who had been active in the trade unions in Minneapolis had been expelled. A year later, to make their isolation complete, they were expelled from the Communist Party.

But the pressure of the workers toward organization was

stronger than the decrees of trade union bureaucrats. It had been demonstrated that our comrades had the confidence of the workers and had the plans whereby they could be organized. The pitiful weakness of the union movement in Minneapolis, and the feeling of the members of the craft unions that some new life was needed—all this worked in favor of our people making their way back into the American Federation of Labor through the Teamsters Union. In addition, there was the fortuitous circumstance, a lucky accident, that at the head of Local 574 and the Teamsters Joint Council in Minneapolis was a militant unionist named Bill Brown. He had a sound class instinct, and he was strongly attracted by the idea of getting the cooperation of some people who knew how to organize the workers and give the bosses a real fight. That was a fortunate circumstance for us, but such things do happen now and then. Fortune favors the godly. If you live right and conduct yourself properly, you get a lucky break now and then. And when an accident comes your way—a good one—you should grab it and make the most of it.

We certainly made the most of this accident, the circumstance that the president of Teamsters' Local 574 was that wonderful character, Bill Brown, who held open the door of the union to the "new men" who knew how to organize the workers and lead them in battle. But our comrades were new members in this union. They weren't in there long enough to be officers; they were just members when the fight began to pop. So not a single one of our people—that is, members of the Trotskyist group—was an official of the union during the three strikes. But they organized and led the strikes just the same. They were constituted as an "Organizing Committee," a sort of extra-legal body set up for the purpose of directing the organization campaign and leading the strikes.

The 'Organizing Committee'

The organizing campaign and the strikes were carried on virtually over the head of the official leadership of the union. The only one of the regular officials who really participated in a direct way in the actual leadership of the strikes was Bill Brown, along with the Organizing Committee. This Organizing Committee had one merit which was demonstrated in the beginning—other merits were revealed later—they knew how to organize workers. This is one thing the ossified labor skates in Minneapolis did not know and apparently could not learn. They know how to disorganize them. This breed is the same everywhere. They know how, sometimes, to let the workers into the unions when they break the doors down. But to go out and really organize the workers, stir them up and inspire them with faith and confidence—the traditional craft-union bureaucrat cannot do that. That is not his field, his function. It is not even his ambition.

The Trotskyist Organizing Committee organized the workers in the trucking industry and then proceeded to line up the rest of the labor movement to support these workers. They did not lead them into an isolated action. They began working through the Central Labor Union, by conferences with the labor skates as well as by pressure from below, to put the whole labor movement in Minneapolis on record in support of these newly-organized truck drivers; worked tirelessly to involve the officials of the Central Labor Union in the campaign, to have resolutions passed endorsing their demands, to make them take official responsibility. When the time came for action, the labor movement of Minneapolis, as represented by the official

unions of the American Federation of Labor, found themselves in advance in a position of having endorsed the demands and being logically bound to support the strike.

In May the general strike burst into flames. The bosses, grown complacent from long unchallenged domination, were greatly surprised. The lesson of the coal strike had not yet convinced them that "something new" had been added to the trade union movement in Minneapolis. They still thought they could nip this thing in the bud. They tried stalling and maneuvering, and bogging our people down in the negotiations with the Labor Board where so many new unions had been cut to pieces. Right in the middle of the business, when they thought they had the union tangled in this web of negotiations for indefinite delay, our people just cut through it at one stroke. They hit them on the nose with a general strike. The trucks were tied up and the "negotiations" were taken to the streets.

Effect of the Strike

This May general strike shook Minneapolis as it had never been shaken before. It shook the whole country, because this was no tame strike. This was a strike that began with such a wallop that the whole country heard about it, and about the role of the Trotskyists in its leadership—the bosses advertised that widely, and also hysterically. Then we saw again the same response among the observing radical workers that had followed our resolute action in the case of Field and the New York hotel strike. When they saw the performances in the May strike in Minneapolis, that same sentiment was expressed again: "These Trotskyists mean business. When they undertake anything, they go through with it." The jokes about the Trotskyist "sectarians" began to turn sour.

There was no essential difference, in fact I don't think there was any serious difference at all between the strikers in Minneapolis and the workers involved in a hundred other strikes throughout the land in that period. Nearly all the strikes were fought with the greatest militancy by the workers. The difference was in the leadership and the policy. In practically all the other strikes the militancy of the rank and file workers was restrained from the top. The leaders were overawed by the government, the newspapers, the clergy and one thing or another. They tried to shift the conflict from the streets and the picket lines to the conference chambers. In Minneapolis the militancy of the rank and file was not restrained but organized and directed from the top.

All modern strikes require political direction. The strikes of that period brought the government, its agencies and its institutions into the very center of every situation. A strike leader without some conception of a political line was very much out of date already by 1934. The old-fashioned trade union movement, which used to deal with the bosses without governmental interference, belongs in the museum. The modern labor movement must be politically directed because it is confronted by the government at every turn. Our people were prepared for that since they were political people, inspired by political conceptions. The policy of the class struggle guided our comrades; they couldn't be deceived and outmaneuvered, as so many strike leaders of that period were, by this mechanism of sabotage and destruction known as the National Labor Board and all its auxiliary setups. They put no reliance whatever in Roosevelt's Labor Board; they weren't fooled by any idea that Roosevelt, the liberal "friend of labor" president, was going to help the truck drivers in Minneapolis win a few cents more an

hour. They weren't deluded even by the fact that there was at that time in Minnesota a Farmer-Labor Governor, presumed to be on the side of the workers.

Our people didn't believe in anybody or anything but the policy of the class struggle and the ability of the workers to prevail by their mass strength and solidarity. Consequently, they expected from the start that the union would have to fight for its right to exist; that the bosses would not yield any recognition to the union, would not yield any increase of wages or reduction of the scandalous hours without some pressure being brought to bear. Therefore they prepared everything from the point of view of class war. They knew that power, not diplomacy, would decide the issue. Bluffs don't work in fundamental things, only in incidental ones. In such things as the conflict of class interests one must be prepared to fight.

Proceeding from these general concepts, the Minneapolis Trotskyists, in the course of organizing the workers, planned a battle strategy. Something unique was seen in Minneapolis for the first time. That is, a strike that was thoroughly organized beforehand, a strike prepared with the meticulous detail which they used to attribute to the German army—down to the last button sewn on the uniform of the last individual soldier. When the hour of the deadline came, and the bosses thought they could still maneuver and bluff, our people were setting up a fortress for action. This was noted and reported by the *Minneapolis Tribune*, the mouthpiece of the bosses, only at the last moment, a day before the strike. The paper said:

"If the preparations made by their union for handling it are any indication, the strike of truck drivers in Minneapolis is going to be a far-reaching affair. . . . Even before the official start of the strike at 11:30 P.M. Tuesday, the 'General Headquarters' organization set up at 1900 Chicago Avenue was operating with all the precision of a military organization."

Thorough Preparations

Our people had a commissary all fixed up. They didn't wait until the strikers were hungry. They had it organized beforehand in preparation for the strike. They set up an emergency hospital in a garage—the strike headquarters was in a garage—with their own doctor and their own nurses before the strike even broke. Why? Because they knew that the bosses, their cops, and thugs and deputies would try in this case, as in every other, to beat the strike down. They were prepared to take care of their own people and not let them be sent, if injured, to a city hospital and then placed under arrest and put out of commission. When a fellow worker was injured on the picket line they brought him to their own headquarters and doctored him up there.

They took a leaf from the Progressive Miners of America and organized a Women's Auxiliary to help make trouble for the bosses. And I tell you, the women made lots of trouble, running around protesting and scandalizing the bosses and the city authorities, which is one of the most important political weapons. The strike leadership organized picketing on a mass basis. This business of appointing or hiring a few people, one or two, to watch and count and report how many scabs have been hired, doesn't work in a real struggle. They sent a squad to keep any scabs from going in. I mentioned that they had their strike headquarters in a garage. This was because the picketing was put on wheels. They not only organized the pickets, they mobilized a fleet of picketing cars. Every striker worker, sympathizer and trade unionist in town was called

upon to donate the use of his car or truck. The strike committee thus had a whole fleet at its disposal. Flying squads of pickets on wheels were stationed at strategic points throughout the town.

Whenever a report came in of a truck being operated or any attempt to move trucks, the "dispatcher" called through the loudspeaker in the garage for as many cars, loaded with pickets, as were needed to go out there and give the operators of the scab trucks an argument.

The "dispatcher" in the May strike was a young man named Farrell Dobbs. He came out of a coal yard in Minneapolis into the union and the strike, and then into the party. He first became known to us as a dispatcher who shot out the squad cars and the pickets. At first the pickets went out barehanded, but they came back with broken heads and injuries of various kinds. Then they equipped themselves with shillalabs for the next trips. A shillalah, as any Irishman can tell you, is a blackthorn stick you lean on in case you suddenly go lame. Of course, it is handy for other purposes too. The attempt of the bosses and the police to crush the strike by force culminated in the famous "Battle of the Market." Several thousand special deputies in addition to the whole police force were mobilized to make one supreme effort to open up a strategic part of the town, the wholesale market, for the operation of trucks.

Battle of 'Deputies Run'

Those deputies, recruited from the petty-bourgeois and the employing classes of the town, and the professions, came to the market in a sort of gala holiday spirit. They were going to have fun down there just beating up strikers. One of the special deputies wore his polo hat. He was going to have one hell of a time down there, knocking strikers' heads around like polo balls. The ill-advised sportsman was mistaken; it was no polo game this time. He and the whole mob of deputies and cops ran into a mass of determined, organized pickets of the union supplemented by sympathetic unionists from other trades and by members of the unemployed organizations. The attempt to drive the pickets from the market place ended in failure. The counter-attack of the workers put them to flight. The battle has gone down in Minneapolis history as "The Battle of Deputies Run." There were two casualties, and they were both on the other side. That was one of the features of the strike that lifted Minneapolis high in the estimation of the workers everywhere. In strike after strike of those days the same story had been monotonously repeated in the press: Two strikers killed; four strikers shot; twenty strikers arrested, etc. Here was a strike where it wasn't all one-sided. There was one universal burst of applause, from one end of the labor movement to the other, for the militancy and resoluteness of the Minneapolis fighters. They had reversed the trend of things, and worker militants everywhere praised their name.

As the organizing campaign developed, our National Committee in New York was informed of everything and collaborated as much as possible by mail. But when the strike broke out we were fully conscious that this was the time for us to do more, to do all that we possibly could to help. I was sent to Minneapolis by airplane to assist the comrades, especially in the negotiations for a settlement. This was the time, you will recall, when we were still so poor that we couldn't afford a telephone in the office. We had absolutely no financial basis for such extravagant expenses as airplane fares. But the consciousness of our movement was expressed very graphically in

the fact that in the moment of necessity we found the means to pay for an airplane trip to save a few hours time. This action, taken at an expense far beyond what our budget could normally carry, was designed to give the local comrades involved in the fight the benefit of all the advice and assistance we could offer, and to which, as members of the League, they were entitled. But there was another aspect, just as important. In sending a representative of the NC to Minneapolis our League meant to take responsibility for what they were doing. If things went wrong—and there is always the possibility that things will go wrong in a strike—we meant to take responsibility for it and not leave the local comrades to hold the sack. That has always been our procedure. When any section of our movement is involved in action, the local comrades are not left to their own resources. The national leadership must help and in the final analysis take the responsibility.

A Partial Victory

The May strike lasted only six days and a quick settlement was reached. The bosses were swept off their feet, the whole country was clamoring to get the thing settled. There was pressure from Washington and from Governor Olson. The settlement was severely attacked by the Stalinist press, which was very radical at that time, because it was not a sweeping victory, but a compromise; a partial victory that gave recognition to the union. We took full responsibility for the settlement our comrades had made, and took up the challenge of the Stalinists. Our press simply chased the Stalinists off the field in this controversy. We defended the settlement of the Minneapolis strike and frustrated their campaign to discredit it and thereby to discredit our work in the unions. The radical labor movement was given a complete picture of this strike. We published a special issue of *The Militant* which described in detail all the different aspects of the strike and the preparations leading up to it. This issue was written almost entirely by the leading comrades in the strike.

The main point around which we wove the explanation of the compromise settlement was: what are the aims of a new union in this period? We pointed out that the American working class is still unorganized, atomized. Only a part of the skilled workers are organized into craft unions, and these do not represent the great mass of American labor. The American workers are an unorganized mass and their first impulse and need is to take the first elementary step before they can do anything else; that is, to form a union and compel the bosses to recognize that union. Thus we formulated the problem.

We maintained—and I think with full justice—that a group of workers, who in their first battle gained the recognition of their union, and on that basis could build and strengthen their position, had accomplished the objectives of the occasion and should not overtax their strength and run the danger of demoralization and defeat. The settlement proved to be correct because it was enough to build on. The union remained stable. It was not a flash in the pan. The union began to forge ahead, began to recruit new members and educate a cadre of new leaders. As the weeks went by it became clear to the bosses that their scheme to trick the truck drivers out of the fruits of their struggle was not working so well.

Then the bosses came to the conclusion that they had made a mistake; that they should have fought longer and broken the union, so as to teach the workers of Minneapolis the lesson that unions could not exist there; that Minneapolis was an open-

shop slave town and should remain that way. Somebody gave them some bad advice. The Citizens Alliance, the general organization of the employers and labor haters, kept needling and inciting the bosses in the trucking industry to break the agreement, to chisel and stall on the concessions they had agreed to give, and whittle away the gains that had been made by the workers.

The leadership of the union understood the situation. The bosses had not been sufficiently convinced by the first test of strength with the union and needed another demonstration. They began to prepare another strike. Again the workers in the industry were prepared for action. Again the whole labor movement of Minneapolis was mobilized to support them, this time in the most impressive, the most dramatic fashion. The campaign for the adoption of resolutions in the Central Labor Union and its affiliated unions in support of Local 574 was pointed toward a great parade of organized labor. The members of the various unions turned out in force and marched in solid ranks to a huge mass meeting in the City Auditorium, to back up the truck drivers and pledge them support in the impending struggle. It was an imposing demonstration of labor solidarity and of the new militancy which had taken hold of the workers.

The bosses remained obdurate. They raised the "Red Scare" in a big way, denouncing the "Trotsky Communists" in screaming advertisements in the newspapers. On the union side, preparations went ahead as in the May strike, but on an even more highly organized plane. When it became clear that another strike could not be avoided without sacrificing the union, our National Committee decided that the whole Communist League of America would have to go all-out in its support. We knew that the real test was here, that we dared not dabble with the issue. We sensed that here was a battle that could make or break us for years to come; if we gave half-hearted support, or withheld this or that aid which we could give, it might tip the balance between victory and defeat. We knew that we had plenty to give to our Minneapolis comrades.

The Real Test

In our movement we never played with the absurd idea that only those directly connected with a union are capable of giving assistance. Modern strikes need political direction more than anything else. If our party, our League as we called it then, deserved to exist it would have to come to the aid of the local comrades. As is always the case with trade union leaders, especially in strike times, they were under the weight and stress of a thousand pressing details. A political party, on the other hand, rises above the details and generalizes from the main issues. A trade union leader who rejects the idea of political advice in the struggle against the bosses and their government, with its cunning devices, traps and methods of exerting pressure, is deaf, dumb and blind. Our Minneapolis comrades were not of this type. They turned to us for help.

We sent quite a few forces into the situation. I went there about two weeks before the outbreak of the second strike. After I had been there a few days, we agreed to call in more aid—a whole staff, in fact. Two additional people were brought from New York for journalistic work: Shachtman and Herbert Solow, an experienced and talented journalist who was a sort of sympathizer of our movement at that time. Borrowing an idea from the Toledo Auto-Lite strike, we called in another

comrade whose specific tack was to organize the unemployed to assist the strike. That was Hugo Oehler who was a very capable mass worker and trade unionist. His work in Minneapolis was the last bit of good he ever did for us. He caught the sectarian sickness soon afterwards. But up to then Oehler was all right, and he contributed something to the strike. On top of this, we imported a general attorney for the union, Albert Goldman. We knew from previous experience that a lawyer is very important in a strike, if you can get a good one. It is very important to have your own "mouthpiece" and legal front who gives you honest advice and protects your legal interests. There are all kinds of ups and downs in a hard-fought strike. Sometimes things get too hot for the "disreputable" strike leaders. Then you can always push a lawyer forward and he says calmly: "Let us reason together and see what the law says." Very handy, especially when you have such a brilliant lawyer and loyal man as Al Goldman.

We gave all we could to the strike from our center in New York, on the same principle as I mentioned before, which should serve as the guiding line for every kind of activity of a serious party, or a serious person for that matter. This is the principle: If you are going to do anything, for heavens' sake do it properly, do it right. Never dabble, never do anything halfway. Woe to the lukewarm! "Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth."

The July-August Strike

The strike began July 16, 1934, and lasted five weeks. I think I can say without the slightest exaggeration, without fear of any contradiction, that the July-August strike of the Minneapolis truck drivers and helpers has entered into the annals of the history of the American labor movement as one of its greatest, most heroic and best organized struggles. Moreover: the strike and the union forged in its fires are identified forever in the labor movement, not only here but all over the world, with Trotskyism in action in the mass movement of the workers. Trotskyism made a number of specific contributions to this strike which made all the difference between the Minneapolis strike and a hundred others of the period, some of which involved more workers in more socially important localities and industries. Trotskyism made the contribution of organization and preparations down to the last detail. That is something new, that is something specifically Trotskyist. Second, Trotskyism introduced into all the plans and preparations of the union and the strike, from beginning to end, the class line of militancy; not as a subjective reaction—that is seen in every strike—but as a deliberate policy based on the theory of the class struggle, that you can't win anything from the bosses unless you have the will to fight for it and the strength to take it.

The third contribution of Trotskyism to the Minneapolis strike—the most interesting and perhaps the most decisive—was that we met the government mediators on their own ground. I tell you, one of the most pathetic things observable in that period was to see how in one strike after another the workers were outmaneuvered and cut to pieces, and their strike broken by the "friends of labor" in the guise of federal mediators.

These slick rascals would come in, take advantage of the ignorance and inexperience and political inadequacy of local leaders, and assure them that they were there as friends. Their assignment was to "settle the trouble" by extorting concessions from the weaker side. Inexperienced and politically unschooled strike leaders were their prey. They had a routine, a formula

to catch the unwary. "I am not asking you to give any concession to the bosses, but give me a concession so that I can help you." Then, after something had been given away through gullibility: "I tried to get a corresponding concession from the bosses but they refused. I think you had better make more concessions; public sentiment is turning against you." And then pressure and threats: "Roosevelt will issue a statement." Or, "We will feel obligated to publish something in the papers against you if you aren't more reasonable and responsible." Then get the poor greenhorns into conference rooms, keep them there hours and hours on end and terrorize them. This was the common routine these cynical scoundrels employed.

They came into Minneapolis all greased up for another standard performance. We were sitting there waiting for them. We said, "Come on. You want to negotiate, do you? All right. That is fine." Of course our comrades put it in the more diplomatic language of the negotiations "protocol," but that was the gist of our attitude. Well, they never negotiated two cents out of the Trotskyist leaders of Local 574. They got a dose of negotiations and diplomacy which they are still gagging from. We wore out three of them before the strike was finally settled.

Federal Confidence Men

A favorite trick of the confidence men known as federal mediators in those days was to assemble green strike leaders in a room, play upon their vanity and induce them to commit themselves to some kind of compromise which they were not authorized to make. The federal mediators would convince the strike leaders that they were "big shots" who must take a "responsible" attitude. The mediators knew that concessions yielded by leaders in negotiations can very rarely be recalled. No matter how much the workers may oppose it, the fact that the leaders have already committed themselves in public compromises the position of the union and creates demoralization in the ranks.

This routine cut many a strike to pieces in that period. It didn't work in Minneapolis. Our people weren't "big shots" in the negotiations at all. They made it clear that their authority was extremely limited, that they were in fact the more moderate and reasonable wing of the union, and that if they took a step out of line they would be replaced on the negotiations committee by other types. This was quite a poser for the strike-butchers who had come to Minneapolis with their knives out for unsuspecting sheep. Every once in a while Grant Dunne would be added to the Committee. He would just sit in a corner saying nothing, but scowling every time there was any talk of concessions. The strike was a hard and bitter fight but we had plenty of fun in planning the sessions of the union negotiations committee with the mediators. We despised them and all their wily artifices and tricks, and their hypocritical pretenses of good fellowship and friendship for the strikers. They were nothing but the agents of the government in Washington, which in turn is the agent of the employing class as a whole. That was perfectly clear to a Marxist, and we took it as rather an insult for them to assume that we could be taken in by the methods they employed with novices. They tried it though. Apparently they didn't know any other methods. But they didn't make an inch of headway until they got down to cases, put pressure on the bosses and made concessions to the union. The collective political experience of our movement was very useful in dealing with the federal mediators. Unlike

stupid sectarians, we didn't ignore them. Sometimes we would initiate discussions. But we didn't let them use us, and we didn't trust them for one moment. Our general strategy in the strike was to fight it out, not give anything away to anybody; to hold on and fight it out. That was Trotskyist contribution number four. It may appear to be a very simple and obvious prescription, but that is not the case. It was obvious to the great majority of strike leaders of the time.

The 'Daily Organizer'

The fifth and crowning contribution that Trotskyism made to the Minneapolis strike was the publication of the daily strike newspaper, the *Daily Organizer*. For the first time in the history of the American labor movement, strikers were not left dependent on the capitalist press; were not befuddled and terrorized by it; did not see public sentiment disoriented by the capitalist monopoly of the press. The Minneapolis strikers published their own daily newspaper. This was done not by half-million coal miners, a hundred thousand auto or steel workers, but by a single local union of 5,000 truck drivers, a new union in Minneapolis which had Trotskyist leadership. This leadership understood that publicity and propaganda are highly important, and that is something very few trade union leaders know. It is almost impossible to convey the tremendous effect of this daily newspaper. It wasn't a big one—just a two-page tabloid. But it completely counteracted the capitalist press. After a day or two we didn't care what the daily papers of the bosses said. They printed all kinds of things but it didn't make that much difference in the ranks of the strikers. They had their own paper and took its reports as gospel. The *Daily Organizer* covered the town like a blanket. Strikers at the headquarters all used to get it straight from the press. The women's auxiliary sold it in every tavern in town that had working class customers. In many saloons in working class neighborhoods they would leave a bundle of papers on the bar with a slotted collection can beside them for contributions. Many a dollar was collected that way and carefully watched by the friendly bartenders.

Union men used to come from the shops and railroad yards every night to get bundles of the *Organizer* for distribution among the men on their shifts. The power of that little paper, its hold on the workers, is indescribable. They believed the *Organizer* and no other paper. Occasionally a story would appear in the capitalist press about some new development in the strike. The workers wouldn't believe it. They would wait for the *Organizer* to see what the truth was. Press distortions of strike incidents and outright fabrications—which have destroyed the morale of many a strike—didn't work in Minneapolis. More than once, among a crowd that always surged around strike headquarters when the latest issue of the *Organizer* was delivered, one could hear remarks such as this: "You see what the *Organizer* says. I told you that story in the *Tribune* was a damned lie." That was the general sentiment of the workers toward the voice of labor in the strike, the *Daily Organizer*. This powerful instrument didn't cost the union a penny. On the contrary, the *Daily Organizer* made a profit from the first day and carried through when there was no money in the treasury. The profits of the *Organizer* paid the daily expenses of the commissary. The paper was distributed free to anyone who wanted it, but nearly every sympathetic worker gave from a nickel to a dollar for a copy. The morale of the strikers was kept up by it, but above all, the role of the

Organizer was that of an educator. Every day the paper had the news of the strike, some jokes about the bosses, some information about what went on in the labor movement. There was even a daily cartoon drawn by a local comrade. Then there would be an editorial drawing the lessons of the past 24 hours, day after day, and pointing the way ahead. "This is what has happened. This is what is coming next. This is our position." The striking workers were armed and prepared in advance for every move of the mediators or Governor Olson. We would be poor Marxists if we couldn't see 24 hours in advance. We called the turn so many times that the strikers began to take our forecasts as news and to rely upon them as such. The *Daily Organizer* was the greatest of all the weapons in the arsenal of the Minneapolis strike. I can say without any qualification that of all the contributions we made, the most decisive, the one that tipped the scale to victory, was the publication of the daily paper. Without the *Organizer* the strike would not have been won.

All these contributions which I have mentioned were integrated and carried out in the greatest harmony between the staff sent by the National Committee and the local comrades in the leadership of the strike. The lessons of the hotel strike, the lamentable experiences with swell-headed and disloyal people, were fully assimilated in Minneapolis. There was the closest collaboration from beginning to end.

Olson's Dilemma

The strike presented Floyd Olson, Farmer-Labor governor, with a hard nut to crack. We understood the contradictions he was in. He was, on the one hand, supposedly a representative of the workers; on the other hand, he was governor of a bourgeois state, afraid of public opinion and afraid of the employers. He was caught in a squeeze between his obligation to do something, or appear to do something, for the workers and his fear of letting the strike get out of bounds. Our policy was to exploit these contradictions, to demand things of him because he was labor's governor, to take everything we could get and holler every day for more. On the other hand, we criticized and attacked him for every false move and never made the slightest concession to the theory that the strikers should rely on his advice.

Floyd Olson was undoubtedly the leader of the official labor movement in Minnesota, but we did not recognize his leadership. The labor bureaucrats in Minneapolis were under his leadership, just as the present bureaucrats of the CIO and AFL are under the leadership of Roosevelt. Roosevelt is the boss, and Floyd Olson was the boss of the whole labor movement in Minneapolis except Local 574. But he wasn't our boss; we didn't hesitate to attack him in the most ruthless manner. Under these attacks he would flinch a little bit and make a concession or two which the strike leadership would grab on the fly. We had no sentiment for him at all. The local labor bureaucrats were weeping and wailing in fear that his political career would be ruined. We didn't care. That was his affair, not ours. What we wanted was more concessions from him, and we hollered for them day after day. The labor skates were scared to death. "Don't do this; don't push him into this calamity; remember the difficulties of his position." We paid them no mind and went our own way. Pushed and pounded from both sides, afraid to help the strikers and afraid not to, Floyd Olson declared martial law. This is really one of the most fantastic things that ever happened in the history of

American labor. A Farmer-Labor governor proclaimed martial law and stopped the trucks from running. That was supposed to be one on the side of labor. But then he allowed the trucks to run again under special permits. That was one for the bosses. Naturally the pickets undertook to stop the trucks, permit or no permit. Then, a few days later, the Farmer-Labor governor's militia raided the headquarters of the strike and arrested the leaders.

Martial Law

I am jumping a little ahead of the story. Upon the declaration of martial law, the first casualties, the first military prisoners of Olson and his militia became myself and Max Shachtman. I don't know how they found out we were there, as we were not very conspicuous in public. But Shachtman was wearing a great big ten-gallon cowboy hat—where he got it, or why in God's name he wore it, I never knew—and that made him conspicuous. I suppose that is how they located us. One evening Shachtman and I came away from the strike headquarters, walked downtown and, being in need of diversion, looked around to see what shows were playing. Toward the lower end of Hennepin Avenue we were confronted with two alternatives: in one place a burlesque show, next door a movie. Which to go to? Well, naturally, I said the movie. A couple of detectives, who had been on our trail, followed us in and arrested us there. What a narrow escape from being arrested in a burlesque show. What a scandal it would have been. I would never have lived it down, I am sure.

They kept us in jail for about 48 hours; then took us into court. I never saw so many bayonets in one place in my life as there were in and around the courtroom. All these young, up-state "apple-knockers" and white collar squirts in the militia seemed to be quite eager to get a little bayonet practice. Some of our friends were in the court watching the proceedings. Finally the judge turned us over to the military, and Shachtman and I were marched down the corridors and down the stairs between two rows of bayonet-clutching militiamen. As they were marching us out of the courthouse, we heard a shout overhead. Bill Brown and Mick Dunne were sitting comfortably up in a third-floor window watching the procession, laughing and waving at us. "Look out for those bayonets," Bill shouted. Anything for a laugh in Minneapolis. When a few days later Bill and Mick were arrested by the militia, they took it just as light-heartedly.

They threw us into the guardhouse and kept two or three of these nervous rookies watching us with their hands on their bayonets all the time. Albert Goldman came down, threatening legal action. The militia chiefs seemed to be anxious to get us off their hands and avoid any trouble with this lawyer from Chicago. On our side, we did not care to make a test case of our detention. We wanted, above all, to get out so that we could be of some help to the steering committee of the union. We decided to accept the offer they made. They said, if you agree to leave town you can go. So we said, all right. We moved across the river to St. Paul. There every night we had meetings of the steering committee as long as any of the leading comrades were out of jail. The steering committee of the strike, sometimes with Bill Brown, sometimes without him, would get into a car, drive over there, talk over the day's experiences and plan the next day. There was never a serious move made during the whole strike that was not planned and prepared for in advance.

Then came the raid on the strike headquarters. One morning the troops of the militia surrounded the headquarters at 4:00 A.M. and arrested hundreds of pickets and all of the strike leaders they could lay their hands on. They arrested Mick Dunne, Vincent Dunne, Bill Brown. They "missed" some of the leaders in their hurry. Farrell Dobbs, Grant Dunne and some others slipped through their fingers. These simply set up another committee, and substitute headquarters in several friendly garages; the picketing, organized underground, went on with great vigor. The fight continued and the mediators continued their finagling.

A man named Dunnigan was the first one sent into the situation. He was an impressive looking fellow who wore pince-nez glasses suspended on a black ribbon and smoked expensive cigars, but he didn't know very much. After trying vainly for a while to push the strike leaders around, he worked out a proposal for a compromise providing for substantial wage increases for the workers without granting their full demands. In the meantime, one of Washington's ace negotiators, a Catholic priest named Father Haas, was sent in. He associated himself with Dunnigan's proposal and it became known as the "Haas-Dunnigan Plan." The strikers immediately accepted it. The bosses stalled, and were put in the position of opposing a government proposal, but that didn't seem to bother them. The strikers exploited the situation effectively in mobilizing public opinion in their favor. Then, after a few weeks had gone by, Father Haas found out that he couldn't put any pressure on the bosses, so he decided to put the pressure on the strikers. He put the issue baldly to the union's negotiating committee: "The bosses won't give in so you must give in. The strike must be settled; Washington insists."

The strike leaders answered: "No, you can't do that. A bargain's a bargain. We accepted the Haas-Dunnigan plan. We are fighting for your plan. Your honor is involved here." Whereupon Father Haas said—this is another threat they always hold over strike leaders: "We will appeal to the rank and file of the union in the name of the United States government." That threat usually scares the pants off inexperienced labor leaders.

But the Minneapolis strike leaders were not scared. They said: "All right, come on." So they arranged a meeting for him. Oh, he got a meeting that he never bargained for. That meeting, like every other important action taken in the strike, was planned and prepared in advance. Father Haas had no sooner ended his speech than the storm broke over his head. One by one, the rank and file strikers got up and showed how well they had memorized the speeches that had been outlined in caucus. They almost drove him out of the meeting. They made him physically sick. He threw up his hands and left town. The strikers voted unanimously to condemn his treacherous attempt to wreck their strike and thereby their union.

Dunnigan was finished, Father Haas was finished. Then they sent in a third federal mediator. He had obviously learned from the sad experiences of the others not to try any shenanigans. Mr. Donaghue, I think that was his name, got right down to business and in a few days worked out a settlement which was a substantial victory for the union.

The names of a new galaxy of labor leaders flashed in the northwestern sky: William S. Brown; the Dunne brothers—Vincent, Miles and Grant; Karl Skoglund; Farrell Dobbs; Kelley Postal; Harry De Boer; Ray Rainbolt; George Frosig.

The great strike came to an end after five weeks of bitter struggle during which there hadn't been an hour free from tension and danger. Two workers were killed in that strike, scores injured, shot, beaten on the picket line in the battle to keep the trucks from running without union drivers. A great deal of hardship, a great deal of pressure of every kind was endured, but the union finally came out victorious, firmly established, built on solid rock as a result of those fights. We thought, and we wrote later, that it was a glorious vindication of Trotskyism in the mass movement.

Significance of the Victory

Minneapolis was the highest point of the second strike wave under the NRA. The second wave surged higher than the first, as the third wave was destined to transcend the second and reach the peak of the CIO sit-down strikes. The giant of the American proletariat was beginning to feel its power in those years, was beginning to show what tremendous potentialities, what resources of strength, ingenuity and courage reside in the American working class.

In July of that year, 1934, I wrote an article about these strikes and the strike waves for the first issue of our magazine, the *New International*. I said:

"The second strike wave under the NRA rises higher than the first and marks a big forward stride of the American working class. The enormous potentialities of future developments are clearly written in this advance. . . .

"In these great struggles the American workers in all parts of the country are displaying the unrestrained militancy of a class that is just beginning to awaken. This is a new generation of a class that has not been defeated. On the contrary, it is only now beginning to find itself and to feel its strength, and in these first tentative conflicts the proletarian giant gives a glorious promise for the future. The present generation remains true to the tradition of American labor; it is boldly aggressive and violent from the start. The American worker is no Quaker. Further developments of the class struggle will bring plenty of fighting in the USA."

The third wave, culminating in the sit-down strikes, confirmed that prediction and gave us ground to look forward with the greatest optimism to still greater, more grandiose demonstrations of the power and militancy of the American workers. In Minneapolis we saw the native militancy of the workers fused with a politically conscious leadership. Minneapolis showed how great can be the role of such leadership. It gave great promise for the party founded on correct political principles and fused and united with the mass of American workers. In that combination one can see the power that will conquer the whole world.

* * *

During that strike, tied up as we were from day to day with innumerable details and under the constant pressure of daily events, we didn't forget the political side of the movement. In the steering committee, on occasion, we discussed not only the day's immediate problem of the strike; as best we could, we kept alive and alert to what was going on in the world outside Minneapolis. At that time Trotsky was elaborating one of his boldest tactical moves. He proposed that the Trotskyists of France should make their way into the revived left-wing section of the French Social Democracy and work there as a Bolshevik faction. This was the famous "French turn." We discussed this proposal in the heat of the strike at Minneapolis. We translated it for America as an injunction to hasten the amalgamation with the American Workers Party. The AWP was obviously the political group closest to us and

moving toward the left. We decided to recommend to the national leadership of our League that it take decisive steps to speed up the unification and to accomplish it before the end of the year. The Musteites had led a great strike in Toledo. The Trotskyists had distinguished themselves in Minneapolis. Toledo and Minneapolis had become linked as twin symbols of the two highest points of proletarian militancy and conscious leadership. These two strikes tended to bring the mili-

tants in each battle closer together; to make them more sympathetic to each other, more desirous of close collaboration. It was obvious, by all the circumstances, that it was time to give the signal for the unification of these two forces. We returned from Minneapolis with this goal in view and moved decisively to the fusion of the Trotskyists and the American Workers Party, to the launching of a new party—the American section of the Fourth International.

Resolution on War and Military Policy

Adopted by the Revolutionary Communist Party of England

On March 11-12, 1944, the hitherto separated Trotskyist forces and groupings in England met in a joint conference in London and took a great forward step in founding a unified party, The Revolutionary Communist Party. For the information of the readers of *Fourth International* we reprint below one of the important resolutions adopted by this founding conference.

* * *

The Second World War into which capitalism has plunged mankind in the course of a generation, and which has been raging for more than four years is the inevitable outcome of the crisis of capitalist methods of production, long predicted by the revolutionary Marxists, and is a sign of the impasse out of which capitalism cannot lead the mass of humanity.

The war of the British ruling class is not an ideological war fought in the interests of democracy against fascism. This has been demonstrated clearly by their support of Hitler against the German working class; their acquiescence to the seizure of Austria and Czechoslovakia; by their cynical policy of non-intervention in Spain which enabled Franco to massacre hundreds of thousands of Spanish anti-fascist proletarians; and by their support of Darlan in North Africa and Badoglio and Victor Emmanuel in Italy. The British ruling class is waging the war to maintain its colonial plunder, its sources of raw material and cheap labor, its spheres of influence and markets, and to extend wherever possible, its domination over wider territories. It is the duty of revolutionary Socialists to patiently explain the imperialistic policy of the ruling class and expose its false and lying slogans of the "War against Fascism" and the "War for Democracy."

The victory of German fascism and Japanese militarism would be a disaster for the working class of the world and for the colonial peoples. But no less disastrous would be a victory for Anglo-American imperialism. Such a victory would perpetuate and intensify the imperialist contradictions which gave rise to fascism and the present world war and will inevitably lead to new fascist and reactionary regimes and a third World War.

The British working class, therefore, cannot support the war conducted by the ruling class without at the same time opposing its own class interests on a national and international scale. Our party is opposed to the war and calls upon the working class to oppose it. Only by overthrowing the capitalist state and taking power into its own hands under the leadership of the Fourth International, can the British working class wage a truly revolutionary war and aid the German and European working class to destroy fascism and capitalist reaction.

By their support of the war the trade unions, the Labor Party and the Communist Party, with their satellite organizations, have betrayed the historic interests of the working class and the interests of the colonial masses oppressed by British imperialism. It is the duty of revolutionary Socialists to mercilessly expose the leadership of these organizations as agents of the ruling class in the ranks of the workers and to win over the broad mass of the workers from the leadership of these organizations to the party of the Fourth International.

The outbreak of the war created a new objective situation in which the revolutionaries had to conduct their political activity. Millions of workers—men and women—the most youthful and virile section of the population, are conscripted into the armed forces. The war not only changed the way in which millions of workers are forced to live, but also their level of political consciousness. War and militarism has penetrated every phase of, and become the basis of their lives.

It would be a mistake on the part of the revolutionary Socialists to lump the defensist feeling of the broad mass of the workers together with the chauvinism of the Labor and Stalinist leadership. This defensism of the masses stems largely from entirely progressive motives of preserving their own class organizations and democratic rights from destruction at the hands of fascism and from a foreign invader. The mass chauvinistic enthusiasm of the last war is entirely absent in the present period. Only a deep-seated suspicion of the aims and slogans of the ruling class is evident. To separate the workers from the capitalists and their lackeys, is the principal task of the revolutionary party.

The policy of our party must be based upon the objective conditions in which we live, including the level of consciousness of the masses, and must help the masses in the process of their daily struggles along the road to the seizure of power.

In the present period all great social changes will be made by military means. Our party takes the capitalists militarization of the millions not merely as the basis for the restatement of our fundamental principles and aims, but for the purpose of propagating positive political ideas and policies in the ranks of the working class as an alternative to the class program of the bourgeoisie. This necessitates the *supplementing of our transitional program* with a policy adapted to the needs of the working class in a period of militarization and war. Our attitude towards war is not based merely on the rejection of the defense of the capitalist "fatherland" but on the conquest of power by the working class and the defense of the proletarian fatherland. From this conception flows the proletarian military policy of the Fourth International.

In the last war socialist pacifism and conscientious objection were progressive and even revolutionary in opposition to the policy of national unity and support for capitalist militarism which was advocated by the chauvinists. But thirty years of class struggle have clearly and decisively demonstrated that such policies act as a brake on the socialist revolution and serve only to separate the conscious revolutionaries from the mass of the working class caught up in the military machine. To this negative policy must be counterposed a positive policy which separates the workers from their exploiters in the military organizations.

The working class and the revolutionary socialists are compelled to participate in the military organizations controlled by the capitalist state. But to the capitalist militarism for capitalist ends, the revolutionary socialists must counterpose the necessity of proletarian militarism for proletarian ends. Our military policy defends the rights and interests of the working class against its class enemy; at every point we place our class program against the class program of the bourgeoisie.

The Labor Party, the Communist Party, the ILP and the sectarians have also policies for the workers in arms. But these policies are reformist, based upon the perspective of the continued control of the state in the hands of the bourgeoisie. These policies contain only a series of minor democratic and financial reforms which do not lead to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the conquest of power by the working class.

Our party is for the arming of the working class under the control of workers' organizations, the trade unions, workers' committees and political parties.

We are against the special schools controlled by the capitalists for the training of their sons and agents for the highest posts of command and technicians of the military arts.

We are for state-financed schools, controlled by the trade unions and workers' organizations for the purpose of training worker-officers, who will know how to defend the interests of the working class.

We are against the selection of the officers in the armed forces, including the Home Guard, by the bourgeoisie and its state machine. This selection takes place on the basis of class loyalty to the capitalists and hatred of the working class. We are for the election of officers in the armed forces by the men in the ranks.

These are the positive steps which our party advocates in its proletarian military policy, and which supplements our general transitional programme in the struggle for power. Such a policy, not only caters for the needs of the workers in uniform in their day-to-day struggle against the reactionary officer caste, but by its thoroughly anti-pacifist character, prepares the working class for the inevitable military attacks which will be launched against it by the exploiters at home, and for the defense of the proletarian fatherland against reactionary war of intervention.

A Defamer of Marxism

THE NEW COURSE, by Leon Trotsky;

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE NEW COURSE, by Max Shachtman.
New International Publishing Co., New York. 1944. Cloth \$2.00,
paper \$1.50.

* * *

The collection of articles entitled *The New Course* was Trotsky's opening gun in the struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy. In 1923, the year of the writing of these articles, the Russian Bolshevik Party was passing through a profound internal crisis. It was not the first struggle inside the Bolshevik Party which had grown and developed through many previous internal disputes over questions of program, strategy, and tactics. The 1923 conflict, however, differed from all the previous ones in culminating in the triumph, not of the proletarian-Leninist tendency, but the Stalinist tendency of capitulation to alien class influences that were pressing heavily upon the party. After 1923 the European revolutionary wave began to recede, leaving as a deposit moods of pessimism, exhaustion and despair which enveloped the proletarian vanguard and which found their expression through the weakest section of the party. It was in this atmosphere that the Stalinist vise began to close upon the Bolshevik Party, squeezing out its democratic life and transforming it into an instrument of the narrow, opportunist, and eventually counter-revolutionary clique of Stalin.

It was this growing bureaucratization of the party against which Trotsky took up the cudgels in 1923. With *The New Course*, he began his fight, lasting almost two decades, against the degeneration of the first workers' state.

A new edition of this famous series of articles has been put on sale by Max Shachtman who deserted Trotskyism and broke with the Trotskyist movement in 1940. Attached to Trotsky's 112 page classic, there is a 128 page "explanatory"

document by Shachtman. We have here another instance of that common, current black-market device, the tie-in sale, which compels a buyer to purchase inferior, shoddy or worthless goods in order to obtain the articles he really desires. In order to get beef these days a working class housewife is often obliged to buy tripe as well. Trotsky's essays supply Marxist insight and are a matchless example of consistent and principled polemic; Shachtman's essay is the antipode: **it is tripe.**

One reads occasionally in the Stalinist, or Social Democratic press that there are "two Trotskyist papers" or "two wings" of the Trotskyist movement in this country. This deliberate misrepresentation is akin to references often made in the bourgeois press to "two kinds of communism." In reality, of course, there is only one "kind of communism" just as there is only one party in this country which teaches and applies the program of Trotskyism. Trotsky himself made sure in his lifetime that there would be no confusion on this point.

Trotsky's Own Estimate

On more than one occasion he took the opportunity to explain what he thought of Shachtman's politics and program. "Our old Mensheviks were real heroes in comparison with them," he wrote of the Shachtmanites. After the split with the petty bourgeois opposition led by Burnham and Shachtman, Trotsky took particular pains to clarify his attitude toward these people. He wrote: "Only the other day Shachtman referred to himself in the press as a 'Trotskyist!' If *this* be Trotskyism, then I, at least am no Trotskyist . . . Had conscious agents of the class enemy operated through Shachtman, they could not have advised him to do anything different from what he himself has perpetrated."

No one can deny Shachtman the right to abandon Trotsky's ideas, any more than ex-colleague Burnham could be denied the right to abandon the Socialist movement, after he together with Shachtman split with American Trotskyism. The "right" of betrayal and renegacy has always been freely exercised by petty bourgeois intellectuals, particularly in periods of reaction. But then, they should not masquerade, like Shachtman, in the trappings of Trotskyism while propagating the polar opposite of the program of Trotskyism.

Lenin pointed out that the enemies and opponents of the great Marxist teachers have invariably sought after their death to "emasculate and vulgarize the *real essence* of their revolutionary theories and to blunt their revolutionary edge." Shachtman is merely another recruit to this legion of emasculators, vulgarizers and falsifiers.

With typical impudence, Shachtman, pretends that Trotsky's class analysis of the Soviet Union as a degenerated workers' state "is not even a decisively important part" of Trotskyism. This is like saying that a man could function without a heart.

In addition, Shachtman states:

"Our criticism of Trotsky's later theory of the 'workers state' introduces into it an indispensable correction. Far from 'demolishing' Trotskyism, it eliminates from it a distorting element of contradiction and restores its essential harmony and continuity." (*Op. cit.* p. 244.)

A Crucial Issue

Every word here is false. The truth is that Trotsky devoted the main energies of the last period of his life to analyzing the various stages of the development of the Soviet Union. His study of the degeneration of the Stalin regime ranks among his greatest theoretical contributions to Marxist thought. Even a conscientious opponent will admit that it is an integral part of Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution and of the Trotskyist program. He affirmed and reaffirmed this literally in scores of articles and books. Thus, in the programmatic document *The Soviet Union and the Fourth International* it is flatly stated:

"The condition for further successes is the correct evaluation of the world situation, including the class character of the Soviet Union. Along this line, the new [Fourth] International will be subjected to tests from the very first days of its existence."

Leon Trotsky properly attached crucial importance to the class nature of the Soviet Union. It is only necessary to recall that the entire struggle against the Burnham-Shachtman faction as well as their break with the Trotskyist movement revolved in the main around the question of the USSR.

Answering at that time the attempts of Burnham (supported by Shachtman) to smuggle into the program of the Fourth International the anti-Marxist motion that the regime of Stalinism represented the rule of a new exploiting class, Trotsky wrote that "the perspective of a non-worker and non-bourgeois society of exploitation, or 'bureaucratic collectivism,' is the perspective of complete defeat and the decline of the international proletariat, the perspective of the most profound historical pessimism." (*Leon Trotsky, In Defense of Marxism*, p. 31.)

The revisionist theory that a new social formation can come to replace capitalism, concerns not only the USSR. Trotsky made this quite clear. He wrote: "It concerns the whole fate of the world proletariat and mankind." And he asked:

"Have we the slightest right to induce ourselves by purely

terminological experiments in a new historic conception which occurs to be in an absolute contradiction with our program, strategy and tactics?" (*Loc. cit.* pp. 1-2.)

Burnham's theory of "bureaucratic collectivism" (borrowed from Bruno) is now coolly offered as an "indispensable correction" to Trotskyism. Shachtman tries to palm off as a *restoration* of the "essential harmony and continuity (of Trotskyism)" what was flung back in Shachtman's face by Trotsky himself as an *absolute contradiction* of "our program, strategy and tactics," or, if you prefer, the "whole of Trotskyism."

Small wonder that in 1940 Trotsky characterized Shachtman and his tendency as that of "ideological charlatanism," "petty-bourgeois counterfeits of Marxism," "outright theoretical betrayal."

Let us review briefly the ABC of Marxism. Marxists view classes as the product of historical development, in other words, all classes have a *past* and a *future*, as well as the *present*. Shachtman's "new exploitive class" is, in Shachtman's own words "without a past and without a future." (*Max Shachtman, The Struggle for the New Course*, p. 247.)

Lenin insisted that the roots of all class rule are to be found in the productive foundations of society. He said: "The rule of the class is determined *only* by the relationship to *property*." To explain the rule of his "new class" Shachtman points not to the foundation but to the political superstructure. It thus turns out that Shachtman's "indispensable correction" applies not only to Trotsky but to Lenin and Marx as well. But Shachtman simply forgets to mention such trifles.

"Wherein does the rule of the class (the proletariat) express itself?" asked Lenin. And he answered: "The rule of the proletariat expresses itself in the abolition of landed and capitalist property." Not the introduction of nationalized property and planning but the *abolition* of the old property forms sufficed for Lenin.

How does Shachtman get around this? Very simply. He denies that his new class needs either to abolish previous property forms or institute new ones of its own.

Shachtman's class that has no past and no future possesses for its "fundament" not property relations but the "ownership" of "political power." Needless to add, this "ownership" in its turn has neither a past nor a future. Such tripe is, according to Shachtman, "the veriest commonplace of Marxism."

A Petty Bourgeois Counterfeit

According to Marxists the historical justification for every ruling class is the ability under its particular system of exploitation to raise the development of productive forces of society as a whole to a new level. Does Shachtman grant this ability to Stalinism, i.e., his own "new exploitive class"?

What then remains of the Marxist conception of class?

The gist of Shachtman's 128-page argument boils down to a representation of the crimes of Stalinism as the birthpangs that marked the rise of a new class to power. No more, no less. It is an elementary principle of Marxism that ruling classes rise in society through the operation of forces beyond the control of men's consciousness, reason or will. The rise of new ruling classes can be retarded or facilitated but never prevented—until and unless these classes have exhausted their historic mission. In the light of this, what is Shachtman's version of the evolution of the Soviet Union if not an attempt to supply an historical justification not for the ascendancy of a new class but actually for the abominations of the Kremlin?

It is not for nothing that Trotsky told Shachtman in 1940 that an attempt to revise the principled position of the Fourth International on the class nature of the USSR was a mockery of Marxism. In fact, according to Trotsky, to say that the Stalinist bureaucracy was a new exploitive class is to declare that the class struggle for socialism was only a utopian dream. Here is what Trotsky wrote:

"The historic alternative carried to the end, is as follows: either the Stalin regime is an abhorrent relapse in the process of transforming bourgeois society into a socialist society, or the Stalin regime is the first stage of a new exploiting society. If the second prognosis proves correct, then, of course, the bureaucracy will become a new exploiting class. However onerous the second perspective may be . . . nothing else would remain except only to recognize that the Socialist program, based on the internal contradictions of capitalist society, ended as a utopia." (*Loc. cit.* p. 9.)

A Typical Evasion

Shachtman's choice of the 1923 writings of Trotsky as the springboard for his polemic against Trotsky's position on the USSR is deliberate. The very date of the writing of these essays and the circumstances surrounding their publication precluded the possibility of their containing a fundamental analysis of the Stalinist degeneration in the Soviet Union. In 1923 Thermidor was still in the year of its birth. Lenin was still alive. The fate of the German revolution still hung in the balance. Moreover, the major political differences between the Stalinists and the Left Opposition had not yet ripened. Stalin had not yet promulgated the theory of socialism in one country, which was to form the crux of the epic struggle. The events of the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27 and the Anglo-Russian Committee were still in the future.

It is no slur upon the value of Trotsky's 1923 writings to say that they do not contain a finished analysis of events which had not yet occurred at the time. Shachtman, however, finds *The New Course* indispensable for his purposes not for what it does say, but primarily for what it does not and could not of necessity say. Could Shachtman have published *The Revolution Betrayed* and attempted to refute it? Or perhaps the *Soviet Union and the Fourth International*, and attempted to refute that? He might at least have attempted to review *In Defense of Marxism* which contains the most finished and the most recent analysis of the Soviet Union made by Trotsky, and is, in addition, addressed in person to Shachtman and Co. Shachtman's perspicacity, lamentably limited though it may be, extends at least far enough for him to foresee the consequences of such foolhardy enterprises. Discretion is indeed the better part of valor, for Shachtman.

The Trotskyist movement holds that the Soviet Union remains a degenerated workers state, basing that analysis upon the property forms of the Soviet Union: the existence of nationalized property and monopoly of foreign trade. This position is a line of demarcation between Trotskyism and all hostile and alien tendencies in the labor movement.

In order to give a picture of the Soviet Union to advanced workers, Trotskyists have often drawn an analogy between the first workers state and a trade union. Just as trade unions have become corrupted and degenerated, losing their internal democracy and giving up militant struggle in defense of the interests of the membership, just so, the Soviet Union, subject to far more enormous pressures, has been altered. But the degenerated workers state, and the degenerated trade union

remain class organizations and a struggle must be conducted to reform them and to defend them against the capitalists. Shachtman discusses the trade union analogy only to abandon this time the Marxist position on trade unions. We quote Shachtman verbatim:

"The trade unions remain trade unions, no matter how bureaucratized they become, so long as they fight (ineptly or skillfully, reformistically or militantly) in the defense of the workers' share of the national income, or at least against its diminution. Once they give up that fight, they may call themselves what they will, they may have ever so many workers in their ranks (as many company unions have), but they are no longer class organizations. John L. Lewis' organization is still a trade union; Robert Ley's is not."

This point of view is clear, it is consistent, it is harmonious with the Shachtmanite point of view on the Soviet Union. It likewise happens to be the traditional position of the ultra-leftists. Lenin polemicized against it in *The Infantile Disease of Left Wing Communism*. It is precisely on this theory that the Stalinists constructed their thesis of "social fascism," and their designation of the AFL as a "fascist" organization.

"The trade unions remain trade unions, no matter how bureaucratized they become, so long as they fight (ineptly or skillfully, reformistically or militantly) in the defense of the workers share of the national income or at least against its diminution." But what of those unions that have abandoned the fight? What of those bureaucratized leaderships which have offered their cooperation to the war administration and fight for the diminution of the workers share of the national income? What of the Stalinist controlled unions? Shachtman's answer is clear: "They are no longer class organizations." By this criterion, the trade union movement of the United States (and not only the United States) has all but disappeared!

Notice the examples given: "John L. Lewis' organization is still a trade union: Robert Ley's is not." A typical Shachtmanite evasion! In order to find an example of a union that is "still a union" Shachtman cites the one union which has conducted four general coal strikes in the midst of the war! Shachtman is willing to admit it is still a union. This generous fellow would give ice away at the North Pole. Somebody should inform him that any schoolchild would readily agree that the United Mine Workers is "still" a union, while the Nazi Labor Front is not. But the question remains: what is the Hod Carriers Union, which holds conventions every 99 years? Or the Stalinist-run UE, which fights for incentive pay, not against it? Or anyone of a dozen others.

When a union is involved in a strike against the bosses, all labor must rally to the defense, even though a bureaucracy dominates the particular union. People who advocate defeatism for the striking union are traitors to the labor movement. That is the role of Shachtman, who denies defense to the Soviet Union in its struggle against Nazi imperialism.

Among the primary results of the Nazi-Soviet war has been the elucidation of the attitude of the Soviet masses towards the state which emerged from the October revolution. Of the attitude of the Soviet workers and peasants to the Stalinist bureaucracy there can be no doubt. Stalin has betrayed their democratic hopes by making a prison house of the Soviet Union.

He has betrayed their revolutionary aspirations by his continual abasement before world imperialism. The hatred of the masses for the Stalinist caste, so long expressed through the struggle of the advanced workers under the banner of the Trotskyist Left Opposition will break out into the open at the first decisive turn in the European situation.

But what of the attitude of the masses towards the Soviet state? The remarkable spirit and fighting energy, not only of the Red Army, but of the whole people, demonstrate their conviction that something important remains in the Soviet Union which must be defended; something which they feel belongs to them. The morale of the Red Army is the envy of the putrefying bourgeois military staffs everywhere. None of them can duplicate it because its secret lies in that event which they all hate so thoroughly; the October revolution of 1917.

Shachtman attempts to dismiss the morale of the Soviet peoples as of little significance. In 1940, during the Soviet-Finnish war, he was quite concerned about it. At that time, the Soviet workers, repelled by Stalin's counter-revolutionary policy, by the spectacle of the friendship and collaboration between Stalin and Hitler, and more important, not yet actually feeling the pressure of the bourgeois military intervention against the first workers state, prosecuted the war with indifference. At that time, Shachtman, like any shyster lawyer, considered testimony relating to the morale of the Red Army to be perfectly admissible evidence as to the "character of the war." He and his followers quoted derisively Trotsky's prediction as to the morale of the Soviet people in the event of war.

That forecast is well worth repeating now.

"Within the USSR war against imperialist intervention will undoubtedly provoke a veritable outburst of genuine fighting enthusiasm. All the contradictions and antagonisms will seem overcome, at any rate relegated to the background. The young generations of workers and peasants that emerged from the revolution will reveal on the field of battle a colossal dynamic power. Centralized industry, despite all its lacks and shortcomings, will reveal great superiority in serving war needs. The government of the USSR has undoubtedly created great stores of food supplies sufficient for the first period of war. The general staffs of the imperialist states clearly realize, of course, that in the *Red Army they will*

meet a powerful adversary, the struggle with whom will require long intervals of time and a terrific straining of forces."

These are the words at which Shachtman scoffed during the Finnish events. Where is the "genuine fighting enthusiasm?" he then taunted. Have you seen that spirit yet? The Soviet masses have given their answer.

During the factional struggle in the SWP in 1939-1940 Shachtman's petty-bourgeois opposition insisted that its sole political point of difference with the majority of the party was over the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union. The class nature of the Soviet Union, they explained, was no concern of theirs "at the moment", and was only dragged into the dispute by Trotsky for "factional, demagogic purposes." "Is it not demagoguery for Trotsky to direct polemics against Eastman and Hook, or Bruno instead of against our ideas?" claimed Burnham and Shachtman. Today, Burnham writes from the standpoint of an avowed enemy of Marxism, while Shachtman espouses the former position of Burnham, who in turn borrowed it from Bruno. Today Shachtman even adduces as his main "proof" of the existence of a new class the argument adduced originally by Bruno, namely, Stalin's purges and frame-up trials of 1936-38. A modest disciple never fails gratefully to acknowledge his teacher. Shachtman ungraciously ignores his true preceptors: Burnham and Bruno.

Equipped with the compass of Marxism, Trotsky charted in the struggle of 1939-40 not only our own course, but the future course of the Shachtmanites. That is why he was able to write an annihilating answer to Shachtman's "theoretical" document long before Shachtman set it down on paper! Trotsky's writings *In Defense of Marxism* require no "corrections." Trotsky's characterizations of Shachtman as a "charlatan" and a "betrayers" are as true today as when Trotsky wrote them in 1940.

Reviewed by HARRY FRANKEL

From the Arsenal of Marxism

Our Current Basic Military Tasks

By LEON TROTSKY

EDITOR'S NOTE: With the publication of Trotsky's report and summary speech delivered at the conference of military delegates to the Eleventh Party Congress on April 1, 1922, we complete the section on theoretical-military questions originally published in 1925 by the Supreme Military Council of the USSR in its three volume edition of *How the Revolution Armed Itself* by Leon Trotsky. The 1922 speeches were first published in Russian in a pamphlet entitled, "The Current Basic Military Tasks." The English translation is by John G. Wright. The publication of Trotsky's writings on military subjects was begun in the December 1943 issue of *Fourth International* and continued through all the subsequent issues to date.

* * *

TROTSKY'S REPORT

I

What Are We Discussing?

First, a few preliminary remarks relating to the history of the question before us. A critical and impatient movement in favor of a new military doctrine manifested itself even before the Tenth Party Convention. The Ukraine was the chief breeding ground of this movement. More than a year ago Comrades Frunze and Gussev formulated theses devoted to a unified military doctrine, and tried to get them adopted by the Convention. In my capacity as reporter on the Red Army question I declared at the time that these theses were in my opinion false from the standpoint of theory and fruit-

less from the standpoint of practice. Comrades Frunze and Gussev then withdrew their theses which, of course, does not at all mean that my arguments had convinced them. Among those engaged in military work there has continued to exist a certain grouping under the banner of a "proletarian military doctrine." It is only necessary for you to recall the article of Comrade Solomin, certain speeches of Comrade Gussev, and so on. I felt myself obliged to relinquish my previous position of watchful waiting inasmuch as the articles by Solomin and others might, if permitted to pass unchallenged, sow the greatest confusion in the minds of the army's leading elements. There has been no answer as yet to my article, *Military Doctrine or Pseudo-Military Doctrinairism*. Nevertheless differences of opinion and prejudices on this question have not been outlived, although there is no longer any room for doubt that on this subject the public opinion of the overwhelming majority of the party has already become fixed.

The task of the present discussion which has been initiated by Comrades Frunze and Voroshilov is to clarify this same question of military doctrine. The external impulsion for the discussion came from the programmatic theses on training and educating the Red Army, defended by Comrade Frunze at the recent conference of the Ukrainian commanders. I must begin by saying bluntly that these theses are in my opinion more dangerous and harmful than the articles by Comrade Gussev and others on the same subject. Comrade Solomin's article runs far too obviously counter to the logic of things, counter to common sense and counter to our own experience. It was obviously written in a moment of doctrinaire occultation. I am sorry that the author is not here and unable to defend his viewpoint personally. But his article is a political fact and I am constrained to deal with it lest it exert further harmful influence. As regards the Ukrainian theses, they are far more cautiously worded, and so combed and cleaned that at first glance everything appears to be in good order; more than that—and here I must render to the author of the theses what is due him for his artistry in maneuvering—certain points are accompanied with a notation in parentheses: Trotsky, Trotsky, Trotsky . . . An impression is created that these might almost be actual quotations from my articles. The terminology has likewise been renovated. The word "doctrine" has been supplanted by the expression "unified military world-outlook," which is, in my opinion, 100 times worse. And here we already pass from the history of the issue to its essence.

A unified military doctrine obviously presupposes that we likewise have a unified industrial doctrine, a unified commercial doctrine, etc., so that from the sum-total of these there arises a unified doctrine of Soviet activity. This is a pompous and an affected terminology, but still tolerable. But by writing "unified military world-outlook," the point is driven home far more strongly. It now turns out that there exist some sort of "military" *outlook upon the entire world*. Up to now we have proceeded on the assumption that we have a Marxist world-outlook. And we suddenly hear that it is also necessary to have a unified military world-outlook. No, Comrades, get rid of this terminology as quickly as possible!

In polemicizing against the term "doctrine," I disclaimed any intention of starting a fight over a word. But, in my opinion, the totality of views and moods for which this term serves as a cover, is very dangerous.

Let us get down to cases. The theses tell us that a unified military world-outlook represents a totality of views, raised to a system with the aid of the *Marxist method* of analyzing social events. Here is how point 1 reads verbatim:

"This education and training permeating all the stratifications of the army must be carried out on the basis of unified views on the fundamental questions relating to the tasks of the Red Army, the elementary principles of building it, and the methods of conducting combat operations. It is precisely the totality of these views raised to a system with the aid of the Marxist method of analyzing social events and inculcated in the Red Army through statutes, orders and regulations that provides the army with the necessary unity of will and thought."

The Trade of War and—Marxism

Does this include strategy, tactics, military technology and our military statutes? Are these included in the "totality of views raised to a system with the aid of the Marxist method"? Yes or no? It is necessary to answer this question. In my opinion, they must be included. How can it be otherwise? After all, statutes—not in the sense of our statute booklets but in the sense of their principles—must enter into this "unified world-outlook," mustn't they? For once they are thrown out, nothing military remains. In that case one is simply left with a "world-outlook." What determines its military character are precisely the statutes which sum up military experience and which determine our military usages. But have our statutes then been created by means of the Marxist method? This is the first time I hear of it. Statutes sum up military experience. Our statutes may perhaps limp, and we shall continue to perfect them on the basis of our military experience. But how can they be unified by means of the Marxist method?

What is the Marxist method? It is a method of thinking scientifically. It is the method of historical social science. True enough, our army magazine bears the name: *Military Science*. But our magazine still contains many incongruities left over from the past, and most incongruous of all is its name. There is not and there never has been a military "science." There does exist a whole number of sciences upon which military affairs rest. Included among them essentially are all the sciences from geography to psychology: An outstanding army leader must possess the knowledge of the elementary principles of many sciences—although, to be sure, there are self-taught army leaders who act on the basis of probing empirically, but who are assisted by a certain innate sense. War rests on many sciences, but war itself is not a science—it is a practical art, a skill. The Prussian strategist, King Frederick II was fond of saying that war is a trade for an ignoramus, an art for a man of talent and a science for a genius. But he told a lie. This is false. For an ignoramus war is not a trade because ignorant soldiers are the cannon fodder of war and not at all its "tradesmen." As is well known, each trade requires a certain schooling; and for those who are correctly schooled in military affairs war is therefore a "trade." It is a cruel, sanguinary trade, but a trade nonetheless, that is, a skill with certain habits which are elaborated by experience and correctly assimilated. For gifted people and those of genius, this skill becomes transformed into a high art.

War cannot be turned into a science because of its very nature, no more than it is possible to turn architecture, commerce or a veterinarian's occupation into a science. What is commonly called the theory of war or military science represents not a totality of scientific laws explaining objective events but an aggregate of practical usages, methods of adaptation and proficiencies corresponding to a specific task: the task of crushing the enemy. Whoever masters these usages to

a high degree and on a broad scale and is able to attain great results by means of combinations—such an individual raises military affairs to the level of a cruel and sanguinary *art*. But there is no ground whatever to talk of science here. Our statutes are just a compilation of the practical rules derived from experience.

The Quagmire of Scholasticism and Utopianism

Marxism on the other hand is a method of science, that is, the science of apprehending objective events in their objective connections. Just how is it possible to construct the usages of a military trade or art by means of the Marxist method? This is the same thing as trying to construct a theory of architecture or a text book on veterinary medicine with the aid of the Marxist method. A history of war, like a history of architecture can be written from the Marxist viewpoint, because history is a science. But a so-called theory of war, i.e., practical [military] leadership is something else again. These must not be mixed up, otherwise the result is not a unified world-outlook but the greatest muddle.

With the aid of the Marxist method, social-political and international orientation is facilitated in the extreme. This is incontestable. Only with the aid of Marxism is it possible to analyze the world situation, especially in our modern and exceptional epoch.

But it is impossible to construct a field statute with the aid of Marxism. The blunder here lies in interpreting military doctrine or, what is worse, “unified military world-outlook” to include our general state orientation, both international and internal, as well as practical military usages, statute regulations and precepts—with the expressed desire of seemingly rebuilding all this anew with the aid of the Marxist method. But our state orientation has long been built and is still being built by means of the Marxist method and there is no need whatever of starting to build it anew within the womb of the war department. With regard to the purely military methods—as they are set down in our statutes—it is hardly expedient to apply the Marxist method here. It is of course necessary to introduce the maximum of unity into the statutes and check them against experience, but it is sheer absurdity to talk about the unified military world outlook in this connection.

Such are the first and second points of Comrade Frunze's theses.

I now come to point 3:

“The elaboration of this unified world-outlook of the workers' and peasants' army was started at the very first stages of its existence.”

This almost seems a polemic against Comrade Gussev who has given us to understand that we never had and still haven't got any principles of construction.

“In the course of further practical work were crystallized and delineated all the basic elements of the military system of the proletarian state, which flow from its specific class nature.”

This takes in far too much territory. It turns out that our military system derives wholly from the specific class nature of the proletarian state. Presumably the task is first to determine this nature, next deduce from it a unified military doctrine, and then obtain from the latter all the necessary partial, practical conclusions. This method is scholastic and hopeless. The class nature of the proletarian state determines the social composition of the Red Army and particularly of its leading

apparatus; it determines its political world-outlook, its aims and its moods. Naturally, all this exerts a certain indirect influence upon strategy and tactics alike, and yet strategy and tactics are not derived from a proletarian world-outlook but from the conditions of technology, in particular military technology, from the available facilities of providing supplies, from the geographical milieu, the character of the enemy, etc., etc.

Do we possess a unified industrial or a unified commercial world-outlook? Is it possible for us to deduce from the “specific nature of the proletarian state” the best textbook of foreign trade, or the best method of administrative or commercial organization for our trusts? An attempt to do this would be ludicrous and hopeless. To think that by arming oneself with the Marxist method it is possible to solve the question of how best to organize production in a candle factory, is to understand nothing either about the Marxist method or about a candle factory. Meanwhile, an army regiment from the standpoint of its own specific tasks is a factory that must be correctly organized, that is, in harmony with its purposes. I assert that an attempt to derive from the system of the proletarian state by means of deduction, i.e. logically, the organization, structure, and tactical usages of an infantry or cavalry regiment is absolutely utopian and nonsensical.

The authors of the criticized theses themselves sense this because they keep wavering between the “unified proletarian doctrine” and the French field statutes for the year 1921. I shall deal with this later on.

No Abstractions—Only Concretizations!

The premises for the existence of an army are of course wholly political in character. The state must have an answer to the question: What kind of army are we preparing and for what tasks? But inasmuch as our army is revolutionary and class-conscious it must itself also have a clear and correct answer to this question. Point 4 of the Ukrainian theses sets this as its aim. I consider it to be politically one of the most dangerous passages. In it we read the following:

“The profound principled contradiction between the system of proletarian state-ism on the one hand and the surrounding bourgeois capitalist world on the other renders inevitable both conflicts and a struggle between these two hostile worlds. In correspondence with this, the task of educating the Red Army politically consists in reinforcing and strengthening its constant readiness to engage in a struggle with world capitalism. This combat mood must be riveted by means of planful political work, carried out on the basis of proletarian class ideology, in forms that are viable and accessible to all.”

Such an approach to the question is patently non-political, abstract, wrong and dangerous in its essence. The struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is being waged throughout the whole world. In the course of this struggle either our country will be attacked or we shall do the attacking. The army must be held in readiness, educated on the basis of proletarian class ideology—“in forms that are viable and accessible to all.” But all this is the most abstract communist doctrinairism against which all of us made speeches during the previous session when we discussed military propaganda! A beautiful program is offered us: in the first part of the year convert one-quarter of the peasant Red soldiers into communists; in the second part add another quarter, and then still another, and in this way, that is by means of barracks propaganda, alter the reciprocal relations of classes within the country and create an army which would proceed in its political consciousness from the international proletarian class ideol-

ogy as its motive force. But such an approach is false to the core, patently utopian.

Yesterday we were all seemingly saying: Don't forget that our army in its overwhelming majority consists of young peasants. It represents a bloc between the directing worker minority and the peasant majority led by it. The basis of the bloc is the need of *defending* the Soviet Republic. It must be defended because it is being attacked by the bourgeoisie and the landlords—foreign and domestic enemies.

The entire strength of the workers' and peasants' bloc rests upon the conscious recognition of this fact. Naturally, we reserve the programmatic right of dealing blows to the class enemy on our own initiative. But our revolutionary right is one thing, the realities of today's situation and of tomorrow's perspectives are something else again. Some may take this to be a secondary distinction, but I assert that the life and death of our army depends on this. Those who do not understand this, understand nothing about our entire epoch and, in particular, they do not understand what the NEP is. It is as if we said: On the basis of proletarian ideology—"in forms that are viable and accessible to all"—the entire people must be educated in the spirit of the socialist organization of economy. This is easily said! But in that case what need is there for a new economic policy [the NEP] with its decentralization, its market, etc.? This, it will be said, is a concession to the moujik. Yes, it is just that. Failing this concession, the Soviet Republic would be overthrown. How many years will this economic zone endure? We don't know—it may be two years, three years, five or ten before the revolution comes in Europe. How do you want to get around this with your "military world-outlook"? You want the peasant, on the basis of proletarian doctrine, to be prepared at any moment to wage war on the international fronts for the cause of the working class. It is our direct duty to educate communists, advanced workers in this spirit. But to think that an army, an armed bloc of workers and peasants, can be built on this basis—is to be a doctrinaire and a political metaphysician, because the peasantry becomes imbued with the idea of the necessity of maintaining the Red Army only to the extent that it becomes convinced that despite our intense efforts to preserve peace and despite our greatest concessions, the enemies continue to threaten our existence.

Naturally, the situation may change: Great events in Europe can create entirely different conditions for military initiative on our part. This is in complete harmony with our program. But, after all, you are not engaged in writing a program. We have to elaborate methods of educational work for the present day and not for eternity. And the basic decisive slogan which corresponds to the entire situation and to our entire policy is *defense*. In the era when the army is being demobilized on a vast scale and when it is being constantly reduced, in the era of the NEP, in the era of the preparatory organizational and educational work in the European proletarian movement—after the already executed retreats—in the era of the working class united front, that is at the same time when joint practical action with the Second and 2½ Internationals is being attempted—in this era it is ludicrous and absurd to say to the army; "It may be that the bourgeoisie will assail us tomorrow or it may be that on the morrow we will attack the bourgeoisie."

To do so is to distort the perspectives, to befuddle the minds of the Red soldiers so as to make it impossible for them to grasp the educational significance of our international spirit of conciliatoriness, and to paralyze the great educational, revolutionary force of this conciliatory policy which will manifest itself in the event that we are attacked despite all our efforts.

The "Concession" to the Red Soldier-Peasant

It might seem that all these considerations have been amply clarified both within our party and on an international scale; the Third World Congress and the recent party conferences were largely devoted to these questions. But no sooner do we set ourselves the task of creating some sort of unified military world-outlook, than all the established political premises for our internal and international work are flung to the winds and we take naked abstractions as our starting point: "The international class struggle . . . we are being attacked . . . we shall do the attacking, etc. . . . we must be prepared to take the offensive . . ."

It is impossible to carry out with impunity an experiment of this sort with the consciousness of the Red Army mass. The army mass wants to know and, together with all the toilers of our country, has the right to know: What kind of army we are preparing and for what tasks? Not for the year 1930, but today. Why must we remain [in the army] under the banner of 1899, and for how long? Our answers to these questions will be clear and convincing, only if we do not begin by mixing ourselves up.

But Point 5 multiplies this doctrinaire blunder. It states flatly that "*the army will henceforth fulfill its combat tasks under the conditions of revolutionary war, either defending itself against the onslaught of imperialism or advancing shoulder to shoulder with the toilers of other countries in a joint struggle.*" These two eventualities are juxtaposed as if they were equally applicable to today: it is a case of either the one or the other. Well, just how will you tell a Saratov peasant: We shall either lead you to Belgium to overthrow the bourgeoisie, or on the other hand, you will have to defend Saratov *gubernia* [province] against an Anglo-French expeditionary force in Odessa or Archangel? Could one pose the question in this way without biting his tongue? Of course not! In speaking before a regiment or before a meeting of workers and peasants, each of us would invariably draw close to reality and say: We are prepared, under such and such terms, to pay Czarist debts because we wish to avoid war; but our very powerful enemies are engaged in machinations. We are still compelled to retain the status of the year 1899 within our army . . .

The more factually, the more concretely we present to our audience the difficulties of our international position, the magnitude of our concessions, all the more clearly will they be able to grasp the need of preserving the Red Army, and, at the same time, all the more will our words correspond to the truth of today. But if we advance a "doctrine" of either being ourselves attacked, or ourselves doing the attacking—then we can only introduce confusion into the minds of our commissars, political directors and commanders, for we shall have given them a false picture of reality, and invested the entire agitation with a false tone. With such abstract speeches we can never reach the moujik's heart. It is the surest way of ruining our military propaganda and our political agitation.

An Attempt at Philosophy

I now come to the sixth point of the theses. Here we pass from politics to strategy, that is, into the sphere of purely military questions. The theses, as you know, were formulated by Comrade Frunze. I must avoid any possible misunderstandings, I must say that I esteem Comrade Frunze as one of the most gifted of our military workers, and I would never

undertake myself the practical strategical work with which I would entrust him. But under discussion now is not Comrade Frunze's work as an outstanding army leader but his attempt to create a military philosophy. The late Plekhanov who towards the end of his life committed many sins in politics was, as is well known, extremely exacting in questions of philosophy. Plekhanov used to say that a Marxist has the right not to study philosophy—but if you are the kind of person who does take it up, and even out loud, then don't muddle. This was his favorite precept. Wherever he caught anyone in philosophical deviations he would attack like a wolfhound. Sometimes he was told: "George Valentinovich, why do you attack so cruelly? Perhaps the poor fellow hasn't even had the time to study philosophy." And Plekhanov would answer: "Then let him hold his peace and not spout 'independent' notions of his own because the most harmful political consequences can result from this." Plekhanov caught up Peter Struve on his muddling in philosophy long before Struve began to stray from Marxism politically.

We have before us here not philosophy in the strict sense of the word but rather an attempt at military philosophy. We are not at all obliged to take up such studies now. We have a general orientation. In military affairs one can be an empiricist, correcting and setting things straight on the basis of experience. In the sphere of military-organizational work I have taken the liberty of proceeding empirically and would take no exceptions whatever if Comrade Frunze chose to remain an empiricist in the strategical field. But he has occupied himself with generalizations and has passed over into the field of the philosophy of strategy, and in my opinion he has muddled up things. His own strategic roots are very strong, but he can cause others to stray from the correct road.

Here is how point 6 reads:

"Up to now our revolution has had to wage its struggle by employing the same basic methods of military tactics and strategy as those which have been also employed in the armies of bourgeois countries."

Please take particular note of this. Now let us read on:

"But the change in character and in the living forces of the Red Army produced by the revolution through the transfer of the leading role to the proletarian elements within the army, has found its reflection in the character of applying the general usages of tactics and strategy."

This language is ponderous and vague. But let us go on. In point 7 it is stated:

"Our civil war was primarily maneuverist in character. This came as a result not only of purely objective conditions (the vastness of the theatre of military operations, the relative numerical strength of the troops, etc.), but also of the internal traits of the Red Army, its revolutionary spirit, its military zeal, which are the manifestations of the class nature of its leading proletarian element, etc., etc."

We have just been told that up to now we based ourselves on "bourgeois" strategy; but in the next breath it is asserted that our civil war was maneuverist in character owing to the class nature of the proletariat. This discrepancy is not accidental. To say that the maneuverist character of the war was determined not only by material conditions (vast spaces, sparsity of troops) but also by "internal" traits of the Red Army as such is to make an assertion that is false from beginning to end. There is no basis for it, nor can a basis be supplied for it, and it reeks of bragadoccio.

The Traits of Our Maneuverability

We must begin by analyzing our maneuverability. It evolved first among our enemies and not among us—after all, it is an historical fact that our enemies taught us maneuverability. I have already proved this in my article on military doctrine.* Infatuation with maneuverability dates back in particular to cavalry raids and, once again, these were initiated by the Whites who executed them in the beginning better than we did. They taught us maneuverability. This is the first and foremost fact. No one can deny it. It flowed from the fact that their troops were more highly skilled, with an officer cadre personnel far larger than ours. In the beginning they had more cavalry (Cossacks!). For this reason they were better adapted to maneuverability. At the same time they had less of the peasant mass, and whatever they did have was for political reasons far less stable than our peasant mass. This made maneuvering indispensable for them. They tried to make up in speed (mobility) what they lacked in mass. We learned from them. This is an incontrovertible fact. Therefore if you say that maneuverability flows from the revolutionary nature of the proletariat then how will you be able to account for the strategy of the Whites? Your contention is glaringly false!

There is one thing that can be said: Maneuverability in the precise sense of the term is inaccessible to the peasantry both in its revolutionary and counter-revolutionary movements. Because when the peasantry is left to its own resources, the truly peasant form of war is guerrilla warfare (similarly in religion the peasantry is unable to go beyond the sect—it cannot create the church). The peasantry is incapable of creating a state with its own forces—we have seen a particularly graphic illustration of this in the case of the Ukrainian Makhnovist movement. In order to lift the peasantry to the level of a state and of an army, the hand of some one else over them is needed. Among the Whites it is the nobility, the landlords and the bourgeois officers who have managed to learn a few things from the landlord-officers. They take the peasants by the throat, place over them a centralized apparatus of coercion, teeming with officers and—proceed to maneuver. Among us the directing role is played by the workers who attract the peasantry, organize it and lead it forward. To the extent that maneuverability (not guerrilla warfare!) presupposes a centralized military organization during the civil war, to that extent maneuverability was peculiar to both camps. Please do not tell us that maneuverability flows from the revolutionary traits of the proletariat. This is not true. It flows from the size of the country, from the numerical strength of the troops, from the objective tasks posed before an army as such and not at all from the revolutionary nature of the proletariat.

And just what have been hitherto the traits of our maneuverability? The basic trait is, alas, formlessness . . . We have many reasons, Comrades, for being proud of our past but we have no right to idealize it uncritically. We must study, we must keep going forward. And for this, it is necessary to know how to appraise critically, but not how to sing hymns.

We Need Not a "Doctrine," but Cadres!

There has been virtually no critical analysis of the maneuverability of the civil war, nor a critical evaluation of it undertaken as yet, and failing this we shall be unable to take a step forward. There were admirable individual plans, there were

* See *Fourth International* for February, March and April 1944.—Ed.

operations, brilliant in the maneuverist sense, which secured us many victories, but on the whole our strategical line was characterized by formlessness. We attacked stormily and resolutely, we maneuvered audaciously, but not infrequently our maneuver resulted in our having to leap back hundreds of versts. To find an explanation for our maneuvers in the revolutionary character of the proletariat, combat spirit, etc.,—is to be thinking in a fog. The revolutionary character of the advanced workers and class-conscious peasants finds its expression in their self-abnegation, in their heroism—during all kinds of operations, under all kinds of strategy. Whereas the explanation for the instability and formlessness of our maneuverist strategy lies time and again in the inadequate organization of our zeal for combat: we still lacked real, serious cadres. Herein is the key to the question: our lower commanding staff was too weak, our intermediate commanding staff inadequately trained. That is why our plans, sometimes superb ones, broke down and were atomized in the course of execution and resulted in gigantic leaps backwards. On almost all the fronts we had to fight the war twice, sometimes three times. Why? Because of the quantitative and qualitative deficiencies of the cadres.

War is always an equation with many unknowns. It cannot be otherwise. If all the elements of war were known in advance, then there would be no wars: able to foresee the results in advance one side would simply surrender without battle to the other. But the task of military art does consist in reducing to a minimum the quantity of unknowns in the war equation, and it is possible to achieve this only by assuring the maximum of harmony between a plan and its execution. What does this mean? It means having such military formations and such a leading personnel as would assure the attainment of the goal set through overcoming the obstacles of space and time by means of combined methods. In other words, it is necessary to have commanding apparatus that is stable and at the same time flexible, that is centralized and at the same time elastic, that has mastered all the necessary habits and is able to pass them on to the ranks. Good cadres are necessary. This question cannot be solved by singing paeans to revolutionary maneuverability. There has been no lack of maneuverability; and still less do we or did we feel any lack of idealization of maneuverability. You could say that if our commanding staff did ail from anything toward the end of the civil war, it was precisely from an excess of maneuverability—from a sort of *maneuverist intoxication*. All the talk was about maneuvers. Cavalry raids were seen in dreams. But what do we actually lack? Stability in the maneuver itself, stability that can be secured only by a good commanding staff of a maneuvering army. This is where our center of attention must be shifted during the coming period of training. The schematic idealization of maneuverability which allegedly flows from the class nature of the proletariat does not lead us forward but keeps us back and even drags us back.

The Danger of the Abstraction of a "Civil War in General"

The idea contained in point 8, as it is expressed here, secretes a danger not only, and not so much, for us as for the revolutionary parties of other countries. It is impermissible to forget that others are now learning from us; and when we occupy themselves with revolutionary generalizations, including revolutionary-military generalization, we must not only always bear in mind Moscow and Kharkov, but also watch out

lest we sow misunderstandings in the West. Point 8 of the theses states:

"The conditions of the future revolutionary wars will present a number of peculiarities which will bring these wars closer to the civil war type. In connection with this the character of these wars will unquestionably be maneuverist. Therefore our commanding staff must be educated primarily in the ideas of maneuverability and mobility, while the entire Red Army must be prepared and trained in the art of quickly and planfully carrying our march-maneuvers."

By revolutionary wars are meant here the wars of the workers state against bourgeois states, as distinct from a pure civil war, that is, a war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie of one and the same state. Point 8 expresses the idea that future revolutionary wars will approximate civil wars in type, and for this reason will be maneuverist in character. But just which civil war is being referred to here? The reference is obviously to our civil war which took place under the specific conditions of our immense spaces, sparse population and poor means of communication. But the misfortune lies in this, that the theses posit some sort of abstract type of civil war, taking as their starting point the alleged fact that maneuverability flows from the class nature of the proletariat and not from the reciprocal relations between the theater of war and the density of troops. But, after all, in addition to our civil war, we know of still another and sufficiently large-scale example in France—the Paris Commune! In this instance the immediate task consisted in defending the fortified Parisian place of arms, from where alone any future offensive could have unfolded. What was the Commune in a military respect? It was the defense of the fortified Parisian region. Defense could and should have been active and flexible, but Paris had to be defended at all costs. To sacrifice Paris for the sake of a maneuver would have meant to cut down the revolution at its roots. The Communards were unable to defend Paris; the counter-revolution conquered Paris and slaughtered tens of thousands of workers. How then can I, proceeding from the experience of the steppes of the Don, the Kuban and Siberia, tell the Parisian worker: From your class nature there flows maneuverability. A generalization of this sort, hastily made, is no joking matter!

In the highly developed industrial countries with their dense populations, with their huge living centers, with their White Guard cadres prepared in advance, the civil war may assume—and in many cases will undoubtedly assume—a far less mobile, a far more compact character, that is, one approximating positional warfare. Generally speaking, there cannot even be talk of some sort of absolute positionalism, all the more so in a civil war. In question here is the reciprocal relation between the elements of maneuverability and of positionalism. And here it is possible to state with certainty that even in our super-maneuverist strategy during the civil war the element of positionalism did exist and, in certain instances played an important role. There is no room whatever for doubt that *in the civil war in the West the element of positionalism will occupy a far more prominent place than in our civil war*. Let some one try to dispute this. In the civil war in the West the proletariat, owing to its greater numerical strength will play a far greater and more decisive role than in our country. From this alone it is clear how false it is to tie up maneuverability with proletarian class nature. Hungary, during its Soviet days, didn't have sufficient territory to be able to create an army by retreating and maneuvering; for this reason the revolution had to be surrendered to the enemy (interjection by Voroshilov: "They can maneuver in a different way"). Naturally, it is a

wonderful idea that it is possible to maneuver "in a different way," that is, to include maneuvers within the framework of defending a given place of arms. But in such a case positionalism would already dominate over maneuverability. Up to a certain point maneuvers will play an auxiliary role during the defense of a given region which is the proletarian hearth of the civil war itself. But when we speak of the maneuverist strategy of civil war what we have in mind is the Russian example wherein we manipulated enormous distances and cities with a view to preserving our living forces and preparing a blow at the living forces of the enemy. During the days of the Commune the situation in France was such that the loss of Paris meant the doom of the revolution. In Soviet Hungary the arena of struggle was larger but it still remained very restricted. But even our arena of maneuverability is not unlimited. We deceive ourselves, not infrequently forgetting that the counter-revolution moved up on us from the border regions which are without any really viable hearths of the revolution. Hence derived the wild sweep of operations and monstrous retreats without mortal danger and without mortal consequences to the Soviet Republic. To the extent that the Whites drew closer to Petrograd, on the one hand, and to Tula,

on the other, our place of arms acquired for us an unconditionally vital significance. We cannot surrender Petrograd or Tula or Moscow in order later to "maneuver" on the Volga or the northern Caucasus. Of course, even the defense of the Moscow place of arms (had our enemies in 1919 scored further success) would not have necessarily brought us to the immobility of trench warfare. But the need of hanging on to territory and of defending every square verst would have confronted us far more imperiously. And this means that the elements of positionalism would have grown enormously at the expense of the maneuverist elements.

Point 10 of the theses recognizes positionalism—but immediately adds, in holy alarm, that it would be extremely dangerous for us to "permit ourselves to be carried away by positional methods as the basic form of struggle." Why so? Where did our comrades discover any danger of our being carried away by positionalism? There is intoxication among us, but it is maneuverist and not at all positional . . . Is the reference perhaps to our military engineering department which has recently been building far too many fortresses? Otherwise this reservation makes no sense at all.

(To be continued.)

LABOR AND THE IMPERIAL STATE

Excerpts from the Theses of the Irish Trotskyists on the National Question

Within limits the class struggle in Northern Ireland has its own internal rhythm of development, which may lag behind or race ahead of the British. However, in the last analysis, the balance of political power existing between the workers and capitalists of Britain exercises a decisive influence in determining the nature of the regime.

A fascist dictatorship in England would inevitably produce its Ulster equivalent . . . Similarly, a triumphant socialist revolution in Britain would be followed in quick succession—if not automatically—by the assumption of state power by the Irish proletariat.

A reformist Labor Government at Stormont would be unable to maintain itself for long in the face of an entrenched Tory regime at Westminster; for if, despite its minority position in Parliament, the Tory Party in past years proved sufficiently powerful in the work of sabotage, and resourceful enough in the invention of calumnies, to bring about the untimely downfall of two MacDonald Labor regimes; and if at a later stage, operating through the machinery of the Federation of British Industries, they conspired to close the New Zealand Government's channels of trade—notwithstanding New Zealand's relative independence of Britain as compared to Ulster, it may be accepted without discussion that the British Tory Government would move into action against a Stormont Labor regime with ruthlessness, effrontery and ruinous effect.

The choice confronting the unfortunate labor ministers would be reduced to one of running a risk of provoking a state overturn by the workers should they postpone the introduction of radical social changes or, alternatively, of being crushed in the vise of an economic boycott imposed by the Imperial State should they prove themselves lax in the defense of property rights and the maintenance of order. Caught in the midst of a withering cross-fire from three directions—from the workers, the Republicans and the Imperialists—the Labor regime would

inevitably succumb to mortal wounds. However, during its brief tenure of office the commands of the imperial dispenser of gold and food would be hearkened to like the voice of God. The labor reformists could not implement to the full the dictates of their imperialist overlords without, in doing so, eternally disgracing themselves in the eyes of the nationalist population and the working class in general. They would equivocate and temporize, squirming round in a vicious circle of half measures. Confronted with the imperative necessity of taking sides on an issue, certainly the labor lackeys would always choose the bourgeois state. But they would take sides weakly. Therefore, imperialism would not be tempted gratefully to forbear from wrecking their regime; for it would feel the pressing need of restoring a strong, authoritarian government in Ulster. British "good-will" is not a free commodity on the market. Its price to Ulster is the maintenance of sufficient internal calm to ensure a peaceful occupation . . .

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
 - 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