

AFL Council Rejects Application Of Miners

American Federation of Labor Executive Council Runs True To Form at Seven-Day Session in Swank Hotel in Chicago

By E. R. Frank

Thirteen well-heeled, well-fed and eminently respectable gentlemen concluded a seven day session of the American Federation of Labor Executive Council in Chicago's huge Drake Hotel, on August 16. All reports have been completed and are ready to be presented to the Boston convention of the AFL scheduled to open October 4.

Experience has taught progressive trade unionists not to expect any constructive policies or progressive labor leadership from this assortment of case-hardened bureaucrats. The AFL Executive Council ran true to form at this Chicago meeting.

But with the numerical growth of the unions and the increasing strength of organized labor, the AFL Executive Council has become an important and influential body. Its decisions play an important role in the trade union movement and deserve analysis. The resolution on wages and prices issued by the Council at its first session continued to call on the Roosevelt administration to put into effect the "rollback of prices." The resolution made clear that the AFL bureaucrats like their CIO brothers are determined to cling to the coat-tails of the Roosevelt administration and to resist all attempts on the part of the workers to begin a fight for wage increases to meet the rising cost of living. The very thought of such a struggle is completely foreign to these die-hard reactionaries.

AGAINST LABOR UNITY

These bureaucrats are determined to hold on to their personal privileges and power. They place their personal interests above the interests and needs of the labor movement as a whole. For over five years the bureaucracies of the AFL and CIO have been negotiating and talking about labor unity. The decisions of the Executive Council make it clear that labor unity is as distant today as it was in 1938. It is obvious that the problem of consolidating the two organizations is insuperable as far as the two bureaucracies are concerned.

The AFL bureaucrats each possess their separate sphere of influence at the present time. They fear any unity which does not absolutely guarantee them a continuation of their present power. William Green told reporters that prospects for labor unity were "not within the realm of possibility."

So fearful are the AFL bureaucrats of their privileges and prestige and so involved are they in hundreds of crooked deals with different capitalist politicians, that the Executive Council felt it necessary to reject the proposal of the CIO, made by Hillman, chairman of its political committee, for joint action in the political field during the coming national, state and local elections.

In the face of the unprecedented swing of reaction and the gigantic anti-labor drive of the big corporations and the government, the executive council non-

chalantly repeated the moth-eaten, treacherous Gompers policy of "rewarding our friends and punishing our enemies regardless of their political affiliations." William Green informed the press that "the council felt that we should follow our old non-partisan policy without becoming entangled with committees of other organizations."

THE UMW APPLICATION

The question on which most interest centered was the application of John L. Lewis for the reaffiliation of the United Mine Workers to the AFL. This question has evoked heated discussions among many AFL officials as among union men throughout the labor movement. When Lewis first announced in the midst of the coal crisis that the UMW had reapplied for membership in the AFL, it was commonly assumed that Lewis had reached a prior agreement with members of the executive council and received assurances that the application would be accepted.

Immediately after Lewis' announcement, the Roosevelt administration began to apply great pressure to prevent the AFL from accepting the UMW application.

The Roosevelt administration feared that Lewis would be able, once inside, to dominate federation policy and thus begin to influence the whole labor movement in an anti-Roosevelt direction.

The present policies of Lewis and the leadership of the UMW are anti-Roosevelt. The mine union is an opponent of the most important labor policies and practices of the Roosevelt administration and has announced that its no-strike pledge is no longer binding.

DECISIVE FACTOR

The main body of the AFL bureaucrats on the other hand are slavish adherents of the Roosevelt administration. They support the War Labor Board. They back Roosevelt's wage-freezing program and "price rollback" farce. They continue their no-strike policy.

In the first critical test, these major political considerations proved more important and decisive than private agreements and clique alliances. Of course, the UMW insisted that it be taken back into the AFL "as it is," that

(Continued on page 4)

India One Year After The Repressions Began

The following picture of conditions in India today is from a letter by an Indian worker just returned to Britain. It first appeared in the July issue of the British Socialist Appeal.—Ed.

The first noticeable feature is the completeness, not only of censorship on news going abroad, but also of internal news. The important centers of agrarian unrest are completely isolated, with regiments distributed in various parts of the country and a strict control of all news by the government. People in Bombay do not know what is taking place in Bihar, Orissa or the United Provinces.

Secondly, the extent of the atrocities committed in famine-stricken areas is just beginning to be realized. An example of this is the Chirur Incident, which is known in India as the "Lidice of India." After the disturbances a regiment was stationed in the village. They stay resulted in daily evictions and whippings. When the regiment was withdrawn, the anger of the survivors fell on the local police. A policeman was killed, which resulted in brutal reprisals in the form of eviction of scores of peasants, houses were burned down, and women and children maltreated.

In Midanepore, where a cyclone killed about 12,000 people, no relief was sent because of the revolutionary tradition of the area. The local bureaucrats did not send any information of the devastation to the Home member of the Bengal government. No news appeared in the Indian press. The first indication of the seriousness of the situation was given in articles published after days by Horace Alexander, a Quaker-Pacifist who is touring India.

In industrial areas it is practically impossible to obtain rice and wheat. The people are literally starving. Government grain shops, where wheat is sold at controlled prices, are shut for days at a time. Where food riots have taken place, a cordon is thrown around that area, and no more news is heard. As an example can be cited the Habli district in Bombay residency, where famine and riots were reported; this district was completely taken over by the police imported from other areas. No outsiders were allowed in this district.

An example of the prices of clothes is that a dhoti (loincloth) costing four shillings in 1939 costs now over a pound (a price rise of more than 400%). According to reports, out of four billion yds. of cloth produced last year nearly three billion yards have been exported abroad. It is a common sight to see even middle class men and women appearing in rags.

Along with this impoverishment, tremendous speculation and growth of mushroom companies is taking place. For the first time in the history of India, British financial interests are losing ground. Agents of American banks and industry are in every key center. They are buying up everything that will be of any value in the post-war period. Lands, mines and factories are daily passing into their hands. They have control over aircraft assembly plants, the iron and steel industry. Among the Indians there is a growing suspicion of America.

Quebec Conferees Perturbed By Victories Of Red Army

PRIMARY FIGHT WAS NO BENEFIT TO THE ALP

The Struggle Was Not Based On Issues Important to the Welfare of Workers

While the outcome of the primary elections held by the American Labor Party on August 10 is still in doubt, it appears from the silence of the Dubinsky-Rose group, that the Marcantonio-Connelly-Stalinist clique has won control of the New York City organization.

Whichever side comes out on top, it is certain that their primary election squabble did not enhance the prestige of the ALP among the militant workers or strengthen its influence in New York. While the contest for control of the organization engrossed the professional labor politicians who whipped themselves into a lather over the question, the majority of ALP voters manifested indifference to the fight.

SAME PROGRAM

This is not surprising. The entire struggle did not involve fundamental issues important to the welfare of the workers. Here was a struggle for control of the party by two rotten, reactionary bureaucratic gangs having no basic differences whatsoever in their programs.

Both the Dubinsky and the Stalinist-controlled factions are servile supporters of Roosevelt's war policies. Both factions are opposed to making a definitive break with the capitalist parties. They are even more opposed to breaking with the program of the capitalist parties. Both contend for the honor of insuring Roosevelt's re-election in 1944 and thus carrying a few favors for themselves from the White House.

What difference then can it make to the rank and file of the workers which clique won? The workers are in need of a fighting program to combat the high cost of living; to stop profiteering; to shift the tax load from the poor to the rich; to ensure a more equitable distribution of available commodities. They are in need of a party of their own, free of all ties with the utterly bankrupt Democratic gang which put over the Smith-Connelly Act, protects the profiteers and enforces wage-freezing.

Dubinsky-Rose and their Stalinist rivals offered the workers just the opposite of what their interest require. They urged the workers to get behind the President and give unconditional support to his program which has already disillusioned the ALP voters.

Many people who are becoming disillusioned with the war reason that if great liberals who are bitter critics of certain policies of the administration still insist that this is a people's war for democracy, then there must be some truth in this idea. Thus the liberals perform an invaluable service for the capitalist masters. In

This unprincipled brawl between the rival factions in the ALP has damaged the ALP and reduced its attractive power among the workers who had high hopes that it would become an effective instrument of independent political action against the capitalists and their agents. The four hun-

Why Churchill Praised Mussolini

Churchill's fear of revolution in Italy today and his readiness to deal with any reactionary government in an attempt to avert revolution is a continuation of the policy he has followed all his life. In a speech to the Italian fascist and foreign press in 1927, he praised Mussolini, asserting that if he were an Italian he would have been with him wholeheartedly "from start to finish," and then continued:

"Externally, your movement has rendered a service to the whole world. The great fear which has always beset every democratic leader or working class leader has been that of being undermined or overbid by someone more extreme than he. Italy has shown that there is a way of fighting the subversive forces which can rally the mass of the people, properly led, to value and wish to defend the honor and the stability of civilized society. She has provided the necessary antidote to the Russian poison. Hereafter no great nation will be unprovided with an ultimate means of protection against the cancerous growth of Bolshevism."

Conference Takes Up Problems Affecting Fate of All Europe

By William F. Ward

High on the agenda of the Roosevelt-Churchill conference now going on in Quebec is the question of Allied policy toward the Soviet Union. The latest victories of the Soviet Union and the developments in Italy and other parts of Axis-dominated Europe have not brought Washington-London and Moscow closer together but rather have sharpened the differences between them.

For weeks the capitalist press has been exhibiting grave concern over the future of Anglo-American and Soviet relations. Now that Soviet authorities have curtly announced that neither Stalin nor other representatives of the USSR would be present at Quebec because of the nature of the conferences held there, the capitalist press has renewed its clamor—as it always does after important Red Army gains—for commitments by

Stalin; a full and frank statement of Stalin's plans for Europe; a list of his territorial claims, etc.

Why do the Soviet victories and the rising spirit of revolt in Europe—both of which deal hammer blows at the Axis—bring apprehension rather than rejoicing in the Anglo-American councils?

ANGLO-AMERICAN AIMS

Roosevelt and Churchill are out to defeat their Axis rivals and are undoubtedly preparing plans together with their military staffs at Quebec for extensive military moves against them. But the defeat of the Axis would be empty for them if it led to the extension of Soviet influence and to the establishment of workers' governments in Europe, and especially in Germany.

The Anglo-American partners aim through this war to establish their military and political supremacy over the globe. But in order to advance the interests of their ruling classes they must see that the capitalist system of private property is maintained. Their struggle against the rulers of Germany, Italy and Japan takes place within the framework of capitalist relations. Wherever the working masses threaten to upset capitalist property relations and power, the capitalists subordinate their inner-class conflicts to subdue their common class enemy.

BASIC DIFFERENCES

The rift between Washington-London and the Kremlin is rooted in the basic differences between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union. The Stalinist gang which has usurped power is thoroughly nationalist and reactionary in spirit and places no confidence in revolutionary methods. It pursues the policy of making diplomatic deals with the imperialists and gaining territorial acquisitions and concessions from them.

Stalin is said to be demanding the Baltic states, Bessarabia, parts of Finland and maybe Norway, a passageway through Iran to the Persian Gulf, etc. If no more were involved than the extension of Stalin's regime over the Baltic and border states, the British at least might be disposed to bargain with the Kremlin on this basis. As Raymond Daniell cynically wires from London:

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued on page 3)

MINNESOTA PETITION ASKS PARDON FOR KELLY POSTAL

WDL Initiates Program to Mobilize Labor Forces in Drive to Free Union Leader

The quarterly bulletin of the Workers Defense League reports that its Twin Cities branch has started work to mobilize the labor and progressive forces of Minnesota behind the campaign to free Kelly Postal.

The Twin Cities WDL is circulating a petition for pardon to be presented to the Minnesota State Board of Pardons at its next session in October. The petition reads:

"We believe Kelly Postal was unjustly convicted of larceny for following the instructions of his union, at a regular membership meeting, in transferring its funds from an existing AFL union to a new CIO union. He did not personally appropriate any money. His motives were good. Imprisonment based on such circumstances is unjust. Therefore we, the undersigned, respectfully request that a pardon be granted to Kelly Postal."

The Civil Rights Defense Committee, which is directing the national campaign for Postal's pardon, this week released the

text of a letter to Governor Ed. Thye from Theodore Brameld, Regional Vice-President of the Progressive Education Association in the Northwest, stating:

"I believe that there is strong evidence to show that he has been unjustly convicted and imprisoned. In common with hundreds of other citizens who are fearful of undemocratic actions against labor leaders, especially in this tense period of conflict, I respectfully urge you to give every consideration to the plea that he be pardoned."

Both the Civil Rights Defense Committee and Workers Defense League urge all friends of civil liberties and defenders of union democracy to write similar letters on Postal's behalf to Governor Thye at St. Paul, Minnesota.

The CRDC also reports that Local 160 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL, in Bayonne, N. J., last week contributed \$35 to the Postal Pardon Fund.

The List Of Wartime Frauds And Scandals Grows Longer And Longer

Each week the list of Big Business wartime frauds and scandals grows bigger and bigger.

The latest involves that staunch New Dealer, Secretary of the Interior Ickes, sometimes referred to as "Honest Harold."

The Labor Policy Committee of the OPA charged on August 10 that Ickes was helping oil companies "to put over a \$1,250,000,000 steal" on consumers through a proposed rise of 35 cents a barrel in the price of crude oil.

The committee, made up of union representatives serving in an advisory capacity, declared:

ICKES RAISES ANTE

"Pressure has been exerted since early this year on the Office of Price Administration to grant this price gouge. As far back as February, the oil interests, through the petroleum industry war council, called for a 25 cents a barrel increase.

"To everyone's surprise, Secre-

tary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, as chief of the Petroleum Administration for War, raised the ante and in April wrote to the OPA recommending that a 35 cents a barrel advance be sanctioned. This was just before the President's 'hold-the-line' order was issued. We had hoped and expected that Secretary Ickes would thereupon withdraw his request, but to our disappointment he pressed it with new vigor and insistence."

Ickes' argument on behalf of the price steal was that the oil magnates needed increased profits as an "inducement" to increase oil production. The Labor Policy Committee's answer to this was to point out that oil profits were already at their highest peak in years and that:

"It is startling but true that if the 35-cent increase were allowed, most straight oil producing companies would be able to double their profits after taxes."

Despite these revelations Ickes stands firm in insisting that the price increase should be granted.

ELK HILLS DEAL

Other recent developments in the field of Big Business scandals include the following:

The Navy-Standard Oil deal, which gave the oil corporation the right to exploit the government-owned Elk Hills oil reserve in the world, is still on. Although the deal was strongly condemned in Congress and characterized as in many ways worse than the Teapot Dome scandal, the Navy contract is still in effect until a new contract is worked out. Whether the new contract will be any improvement on the old one remains yet to be seen. If Secretary Knox's repeated defense of the old contract is any indication, the new contract may be more carefully drawn up but it will still be highly satisfactory (and profitable) to Standard Oil.

A federal grand jury in Detroit indicted the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation on August 5 for conspiracy to defraud the government by violating specifications for airplane engine castings. The indictment said that the corporation "did knowingly, willfully, unlawfully and feloniously make and cause to be made, in a defective manner, certain war material."

The war material referred to was castings for the Packard Motor Car Company, prime contractor of Rolls-Royce airplane engines for the U. S. and Great Britain.

DEFECTIVE CASTINGS, REPAIRS AND EGGS

The corporation tried to defend itself with the statement that "there has never been a single engine failure due to an aluminum casting made by us" but it did not explain why it had tried to conceal its practices from both Packard and the government. On August 6 the Sullivan Dry

Dock and Repair Corporation of Brooklyn was fined \$5,000 and four of its officers and one employee were sentenced to prison for violating specifications for submarine chasers.

In Albany, N. Y., last week the government opened its case in court against Sonda Egg Products Corporation and Samuel Dunker and Company, who are charged with willfully selling the government 650,000 pounds of defective white dried egg powder used for lend-lease and faking its records in an attempt to cover up its crime.

Big corporation and little, they are all demonstrating that profits are their primary consideration. Everything else—the lives of the men in the armed forces of this country and its allies, the struggle against high prices and profiteering—is to them either secondary or totally unimportant.

TRADE UNION NOTES

By E. R. Frank

The August 1 issue of the *United Mine Workers Journal* denounces the federal prosecution of thirty officers and members of the United Mine Workers under the Smith-Connelly "slave labor" act. The *Journal* states: "It is the first hunting party and big kill under the design of the Smith-Connelly-Harness un-American prescription for shackling labor."

The *Journal* makes the accusation that "the entire trouble leads right up to the backdoor of the directing forces of U. S. Steel."

This federal prosecution represents the first indictment under the Smith-Connelly "slave labor" law. The 30 indicted officers and members of the U.M.W. are entitled to the unqualified support of the whole labor movement.

...the CIO (political) program is effectively heading off a dangerous third party movement (in Michigan.)—*Daily Worker*, August 15.

From an article, entitled "War and Why," in a recent issue of *The Searchlight*, voice of Flint Chevrolet Local 659, United Auto Workers:

"To speak of capitalism without war is like speaking of human beings without lungs. The fate of one is bound to the fate of the other. . . That my friends is why my boy and your boy is dying today."

The Knitgoods Workers Voice, official organ of Local 155, International Ladies Garment Workers, AFL, writes: "The major parties have been taken over by the reactionaries and profiteers. We must answer them with a nation-wide Farmer Labor Party, that will truly represent the interests of the American people. . . Independent Political action in 1944!"

Will Allen, Washington correspondent of *Justice*, official publication of the International Ladies Garment Workers, reports in the August 15 issue that he has managed to secure a copy of Volume 6 of the OPA's own series of "War Profits Studies." OPA Economic Adviser Gilbert told him: "These studies are not public documents. They are intended only for the use of OPA officials."

Allen writes: "Why the public should not know the facts in these war profits studies only Administrator Brown can say."

The study reveals that "one out of every ten of the big wholesalers in food reported profits up to 600%."

"Two out of every ten of the smaller food wholesalers reported profits up to 600%."

"Three out of every ten food wholesalers reported profits over 300% higher than in 1939."

"Four out of every seven food wholesalers reported profits over 200% higher than in 1939 etc., etc."

Summing up the whole thing, the OPA study states: "Wholesale food grocers realized twice as much on every dollar of sales in 1942 as in 1939."

Allen writes: "The OPA report points up the hollow mockery of the cynical report on August 10 by War Labor Board Chairman William H. Davis that the Ad-

ministration's Economic Stabilization program has been remarkably successful, with the single exception of the cost of food."

The noisily advertised price "rollback" campaign of the Murays and Greens sounds pretty foolish in the light of these facts.

This past week saw a number of large strikes break out in both the United States and Canada. Canada's biggest walkout of the war occurred when 20,000 workers in Montreal's three largest aircraft plants—Fairchild, Noorduyn and Canadian Vickers—laid down tools in protest over a 10 month runaround they have been receiving on a cost-of-living bonus demand.

The issue is the payment of a back cost-of-living bonus due the workers from June 30, 1942 to March 23, 1943. The Canadian War Labor Board awarded the bonus but failed to make it retroactive to the time the cost of living increased. Both the Board and the Labor Minister disclaimed that they had no authority to make such a decision. So, the workers made their decision—they walked out.

Two months ago the Fair Employment Practices Committee and other government agencies took the initiative in enforcing the segregation of Negro workers employed in a Mobile shipyard. Immediately a great protest against this policy was raised by every important Negro organization in the country and many unions, who correctly pointed out that it would serve as an impetus to the segregation of Negro workers in other parts of the country. This protest was so loud that the FEPC had to stage a retreat. It did so with the assertion that while it stood by its Mobile policy, this policy was not intended to serve as a model for industrial race relations elsewhere.

But now there comes evidence that the FEPC reassurances aren't worth the paper they are written on. The Washington commentator of the *New Leader* reveals that the Employers Association of Chicago, has informed the employers of that city that "segregation of Negro workers from white workers is not necessarily a violation of the anti-discrimination Executive Order 8802 so long as the FEPC recently approved such a solution of a racial controversy at the yards of the Alabama Drydock and Shipping Co. . ."

Roosevelt's executive order establishing the FEPC was once hailed by some foolish people as "another Emancipation Proclamation." Actually it has shown itself to be a pro-Jim Crow outfit that would warm the cockles of Jefferson Davis' heart.

The Roosevelt Administration gave its blessing this week to using the army draft as a weapon to crack down on strikers. The War Manpower Commission has created a special category of "idleness" and declared this category to be a non-deferrable activity. Strikers will thus be in "the status of idleness" and can be immediately inducted into the army if their local boards choose to do so.

C. P. Helped Badoglio To Weather Initial Crisis

By Felix Morrow

The Communist Party of Italy and its allies gave their support to the Badoglio regime during the first week following the dismissal of Mussolini. This fact must be understood by every militant worker: if the Badoglio regime was not overthrown by the rising masses during that crucial week, it is in part due to the backing which Badoglio received from the Stalinist-led five-party coalition.

We write from afar, but the main outlines of what happened in Italy that week are clear enough. Far from considering the dismissal of Mussolini as a sign of repentance by the ruling class—the monarchy, the church, the army generals and the big capitalists—on whose behalf Mussolini had ruled, the industrial workers took it as a sign of the regime's weakness, and pressed forward for a decisive victory over the forces of reaction.

The workers indicated their attitude toward the Badoglio regime by violating its orders outlawing demonstrations and strikes and political activity in general. In a number of instances the workers stood their ground successfully against orders of officers to soldiers to fire into the crowds; in the face of the workers' determination, the soldiers refused to fire.

When those two phenomena come together—workers refusing to retreat under leveled rifles, and soldiers refusing to fire—they are the sure sign of a revolutionary situation. They indicate that the Italian proletariat was ready to go to any lengths to smash their oppressors and set up their own governmental power to strive for peace and freedom.

Instead of leading the workers in this direction, the Stalinists and their allies pulled the workers in the opposite direction. The proof of this is to be found indelibly recorded in the Stalinist press of those days.

Original Stalinist Policy
Let us examine the Stalinist line, as it unfolded in the *Daily Worker*.

The actual Stalinist line in Italy turned out to be far to the right of what even the *Daily Worker* editors thought it was going to be. Speaking for themselves and as yet without news from abroad, the *Daily Worker* editors on July 27 condemned the Badoglio regime and any peace it might make:

"The new [Badoglio] regime set up by the palace coup is a maneuver by those responsible for fascism and for subjection of the country to the war aims of Hitler Germany."

"By this maneuver, the fascist ruling classes aim to [get] . . . a type of peace which will perpetuate those very forces responsible for imposing fascism upon the country and dragging Italy into the war."

"That was the line on Tuesday, July 27, two days after Mussolini's dismissal. By Wednesday, however, Badoglio had undergone a remarkable transformation, and not only he, but all the forces responsible for imposing fascism." Responsible on Tuesday; but no longer on Wednesday.

For by Wednesday, July 28, the *Daily Worker* had the line, in the form of a Berne wireless from "Intercontinent News," Moscow's "news" service. The dispatch was ostensibly the text of a radio broadcast by "Milano Libertà," an underground radio station speaking for the five-party coalition led by the Stalinists.

Praised King and Badoglio

This dispatch praises the King and Badoglio for removing Mussolini! It does so in the following words:

"We greet all those who, understanding the will of the nation, helped ban the tyrant by action from the top."

In order to justify this praise of the Italian ruling class, the dispatch—in language borrowed from Churchill's reference to Mussolini as "the one man responsible"—attributes everything that happened previously to Mussolini alone. It does so in the following words:

"The man responsible for all the misfortunes of our country and for all our calamities, the man who drew us into the war and who is responsible for the defeat, hunger and ruination of our country, has now been removed from the government."

It then goes on to assign the task of peace, not to the masses, but to "their government," the Badoglio regime. The day before, as we have seen, the *Daily Worker* had correctly said that any peace made by Badoglio would "perpetuate those very forces responsible for imposing fascism." Now, however, the dispatch to the *Daily Worker* asks Badoglio:

"To save Italy it is not enough to ban Mussolini. It is necessary at once to break the enslaving treaty which binds us with the Germans, to immediately ask the Allies for an armistice and to begin peace negotiations. This is the people's first demand of their government." (My italics.)

Having thus gotten the line from abroad, the *Daily Worker* editors were ready to defend Bado-

glio. In the July 31 *Daily Worker* James S. Allen rebukes liberals for fearing a deal with Badoglio:

Want Badoglio Deal

"Badoglio is a new phenomenon. He is not Petain. He is not Darlan. He is not only the Badoglio of the Ethiopian campaigns. . ."

"He is the man who in this transitory but swift and decisive moment of national resurgence is confronted with the imperative national will for peace. . ."

"At the present moment civil war threatens only if the Badoglio regime rejects the Allies peace offers. . . Civil war can be avoided if Badoglio makes peace. . ."

"Thus, to raise the slogan of 'No deals with Badoglio,' under any circumstances, even if this would mean knocking Italy out of the Axis immediately, is to befuddle the whole issue."

This Stalinist line was completely in obedience to the Churchill-Roosevelt warnings that they wanted no "anarchy" in Italy. The Italian press under Badoglio's control picked this up and warned the masses of Italy that disorders would mean immediate military occupation: Badoglio used Churchill-Roosevelt's statements to threaten the Italian workers with the idea that if they made a revolution it would be crushed by the Allies. Thus, that first crucial week, there was an unholy united front of Badoglio, the "democracies" and the Stalinists against the revolutionary overthrow of the Italian ruling class.

Another Shift in Line
Not until Roosevelt and Churchill decided Badoglio was not their man, and announced renewal of bombings—not until then did the Stalinists shift their line. The August 2 *Daily Worker* reported:

"The five anti-fascist parties. . . have called on the workers of northern Italy to refuse further collaboration with the Badoglio government." To refuse "further collaboration" meant that they had collaborated with it, that is, helped it to maintain itself.

This is openly admitted by James S. Allen in the August 5 *Daily Worker*, when he writes: "During the first five days the five-party coalition directed all its efforts toward forcing the Badoglio government to accept the Allied terms. . ."

"When it became clear that Badoglio simply was playing for time. . . the approach towards the Badoglio government of both the Allied governments and the anti-fascist front in Italy changed."

"The five-party coalition first increased direct pressure upon the regime and when this failed to produce results called for its overthrow."

It is clear, then, that the Stalinists and their allies helped the Badoglio regime to weather the revolutionary wave of the first week. Nor does the Stalinist change of line toward Badoglio constitute a fundamental change of policy. Like Churchill and Roosevelt, whose line they are following, the Stalinists are ready to support any Prime Minister named by the King who will make peace with the Allies.

The Churchill-Roosevelt policy is not merely one of "military expediency." As they have made plain, they want no revolution in Italy, even though a workers' government would try to take Italy out of the war. Churchill and Roosevelt are guided not by military expediency but by political "principle": the principle that at all costs the capitalist system must be maintained in Italy. And this is the line which the Stalinists also are following, in the service of "democratic" imperialism.

The Revolutionary Program

At the opposite pole to this is the revolutionary program for the Italian working class. The revolutionary party would, first of all, warn the workers that if the Badoglio or a similar regime surrenders to the Allies, that regime in return would be recognized as the permanent authority for Italy and would be propped up by Allied bayonets against the will of the Italian masses. The revolutionary party would tell the workers the truth: that peace under such conditions is the peace of slavery. The revolutionist is not only against capitalist war, he is also against capitalist peace.

The revolutionary situation in Italy must not be permitted to drift, for the opportunity may well be lost for a long time if it is not seized upon. Workers' councils must be formed in the factories, peasant committees in the villages, and soldiers' councils in the regiments, and only these should be recognized as having authority to speak for the Italian people. Only a Workers' and Peasants' Government based on such councils can struggle for a progressive peace and a real future for the Italian people.

Such is the basic program which we can be sure, our Trotskyist comrades are advancing, as they escape from the prisons or make their way back into Italy, and begin building the Bolshevik-Leninist party which will lead the Italian revolution to victory.

Italian Workers Played Leading Part In Downfall Of Mussolini

By George Breitman

The events of the last month in Italy have already shown that the real anti-fascists are the masses, and particularly the industrial workers. General Eisenhower has tried to pass off Victor Emmanuel and Co. as anti-fascists. But it wasn't till after three days of mass demonstrations, strikes and parades following the fall of Mussolini that Italy's rulers finally moved to abolish the fascist party. And while the Italian masses were fighting to drive the fascists from all posts on the Italian mainland, the Allied leaders were ordering all but the most notorious and hated fascist officials to remain at their posts in Sicily. Even if they hadn't lifted a hand in resistance to fascism before the fall of Mussolini, the Italian workers have amply demonstrated since then that the masses alone can be depended on to root out and destroy all vestiges of fascism.

But despite the censorship there is already plenty of evidence at hand to show that the workers played a leading role in the downfall of Mussolini as well as in the shattering of fascism after his removal. Their resistance to fascism began many years ago—in fact, before Victor Emmanuel called Mussolini to power. Before he could assume his office and after, Mussolini had to wage a long fight to destroy the workers' organizations because they were the chief opposition to fascism. More recently, all the world has recognized that the workers in the factories and the army did not support Mussolini's war and that it was their resistance which spelled his doom.

IMPETUS TO ACTION

Was their resistance purely passive—manifested only in refusal to fight, mass desertions, low morale, lack of confidence in the regime—or did it take on more active forms? We understand how difficult it is normally for the masses to conduct open oppositional activity under a fascist dictatorship, but the war and the reverses of Mussolini's armies opened up new possibilities. Five years ago, in the resolution "The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International," Leon Trotsky pointed out what developments could be expected to swing the masses into motion in the fascist countries. "It is very likely," he wrote, "that a genuine proletarian success in one of the 'democratic' countries will be necessary to give impetus to the revolutionary movement on fascist territory. A similar effect is possible by means of a financial or military catastrophe." Mussolini's military catastrophe began not with the invasion of Sicily but with the defeat in North Africa.

It will probably be some time before we get the whole picture, but we have enough indications now to be able to draw the conclusion that it was the defeat in North Africa which began the transformation of passive into active resistance by the masses in Italy.

But, someone may say, if a significant number of the masses were already in action—and the ruling class must have known about it if they were—why didn't they make bigger political capital out of Mussolini's ouster than they did? Why didn't they put on a "democratic" mask and thus try to "satisfy" and check the masses? Doesn't that indicate perhaps that there was no serious mass action before July 25?

Not at all. The events that took place before July 25, about which we are getting more and more incontrovertible evidence, are not determined by what the ruling class did thereafter, but rather the other way around. The ruling class acted the way it did in removing Mussolini because it failed to estimate the situation correctly.

On May 27 the *Daily Telegraph* of London reported: "Italy is also racked by labor strife. The gravity of the situation can be judged by the fact that THE ITALIAN GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN FORCED TO ISSUE PUBLICLY A DECREE ORDERING STRIKERS TO RETURN TO WORK. Hitherto the existence of strikes has been kept secret. The decree makes it clear that the fascist legislation is failing to function." What it certainly made clear was that strikes were beginning to take place on such a scale that no pretense could cover them up.

OPENLY STATED FEARS
On May 21, Carlo Scorza, secretary of the fascist party, found it necessary to announce publicly: "Italy has followed a too-elastic and tolerant and good-natured policy toward all internal questions for long enough, and the time has come for a firmer line." On June 13 the Pope warned a meeting of 26,000 in Rome against the "false prophets" preaching revolution. He was certainly not addressing himself to Victor Emmanuel or Badoglio in this way. As *The Militant* pointed out on

June 26: "This speech, taken in connection with the latest reports of conditions in Italy, makes clear that revolutionary agitation is very widespread and open, that it has penetrated into wide ranks of the population and that the working class is seriously preparing for the overthrow of Mussolini's fascist regime."

MUSSOLINI'S ADMISSION
On June 24 Mussolini himself spoke to the Fascist Directorate on problems raised by the threatened invasion of Italy. On July 4 Stefani, the Italian news agency, released the text of this address, which was his last public speech. The *N. Y. Times* report on the text (July 5) says: "Examining the situation in Italy, the Premier in his message not only noted the existence of a 'negligible' opposition but also referred to labor unrest in some industries." Mussolini could still attempt to minimize this "unrest" but he could no longer ignore it.

Two days after the overthrow of Mussolini the Stalinist-controlled radio, *Milano Libertà*, issued a proclamation saying in part: "We greet the masses of brave men who by their demonstrations against the fascist government for peace, by their work stoppages, strikes, sabotage in war industry and resistance to the fascist executioners have forced the tyrant to be banned." (*Daily Worker*, July 28.) While it is correct to be suspicious of all reports made by the Stalinists, it is not logical to believe that they would make such a statement to workers in Italy unless the workers themselves were already aware of strikes, sabotage, etc.

In their July 25 announcement on the removal of Mussolini, by which the Italian people were first informed of what had happened, Victor Emmanuel and Badoglio stated: "In this solemn hour for the destiny of the fatherland, let each one return to his post of duty, faith and battle." As the *British Tribune* correctly asks: "Why call on everybody to return to his post unless people were deserting their posts—striking, demonstrating, voting against the war with their feet?"

TWO DECISIVE FACTORS

Thus it is reasonable to assume that Italy's rulers, who probably had been considering the dumping of Mussolini for some time, took the action when they did not only because of the worsening of the military situation but also because of the rise in protests, strikes, etc. Which factor played the greater part we cannot say, but we dare not ignore either if we want to understand the mechanics of Mussolini's downfall and of the events that rapidly followed. (The military situation itself, by the way, was due in large measure to the resistance of the masses; it would have been a different military situation if the masses had supported the war.)

Whatever democratic rights the masses get in Italy, they will have to take. Any other estimate is based on a misconception about the nature of capitalism in its imperialist stage. The failure of the capitalists to make even a pretense of returning to democracy on July 25 proves a lot about the nature of fascism as a tool of capitalism, but it proves absolutely nothing, one way or the other, about how active a role the masses played in the removal of Mussolini.

It is perhaps too early to write the conclusive analysis of the fall of Mussolini. But already we are able to see that such an analysis cannot be written at all unless it takes into consideration the active revolutionary role of the Italian masses in the period leading up to July 25.

The ruling class had become convinced that Mussolini was used up and that they would have to get rid of him—if not on July 25, then soon after—or be dragged down with him. Only for this reason would they risk upsetting the whole apparatus. We must remember that while the action of the masses prior to July 25 had already begun to manifest itself in the open, it had not yet taken on the greater scope it was to assume in a few short days. As a result some of the ruling class probably hoped the mere removal of Mussolini would satisfy the masses; others, not sharing this hope, may have felt it was worth the risk if it gave them some time to strengthen their position against the masses.

RULERS MISCALCULATED

But events and the masses moved much more rapidly than they had expected. The open anti-fascist and anti-war demonstrations of the masses before July 25 helped to precipitate the fall of Mussolini; in turn the fall of Mussolini encouraged and strengthened and speeded up the action of the masses. Within three days they forced the government to abolish the fascist party, free some political prisoners, etc.

The ruling class's failure to foresee the rapidity with which the masses moved after July 25 is not proof that the masses were not demonstrating and striking and leaving their posts before that date. Rather it is proof that the masses regarded the ousting of Mussolini as their own achievement, that they did not give any credit for it to the ruling class. And they could have this feeling only if they had already begun their mass struggles before the ruling class dismissed Mussolini.

WHY NO "DEMOCRACY"?

Why, if they saw the masses already in action, didn't the Italian ruling class go "democratic" after the removal of Mussolini? Why don't they do it now? One reason is that they failed to understand what was happening. Another reason—and this is the most important one—is that they don't intend to return to democratic capitalism unless it is absolutely necessary, unless they can see no other way to avert a workers' revolution. They know how quickly the masses pass through and beyond the "democratic" stage in a revolutionary situation and they intend to prevent the masses from entering that stage for as long a period as possible.

It must also be borne in mind that in the period of capitalist decline and decay the trend is not for the capitalists to restore but to destroy democratic rights wherever they exist. The events of the past few weeks have shown that their aim was and is to institute a military-monarchist-clerical-police dictatorship, shorn of a few of the fascist leaders.

Whatever democratic rights the masses get in Italy, they will have to take. Any other estimate is based on a misconception about the nature of capitalism in its imperialist stage.

The failure of the capitalists to make even a pretense of returning to democracy on July 25 proves a lot about the nature of fascism as a tool of capitalism, but it proves absolutely nothing, one way or the other, about how active a role the masses played in the removal of Mussolini.

It is perhaps too early to write the conclusive analysis of the fall of Mussolini. But already we are able to see that such an analysis cannot be written at all unless it takes into consideration the active revolutionary role of the Italian masses in the period leading up to July 25.

LEON TROTSKY'S

LAST WRITINGS:

IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM

(Against the Petty-Bourgeois Opposition)

Introduction by William F. Warde and Joseph Hansen
240 pages

Paperbound \$1.50 Clothbound \$2.00

SEND YOUR ORDER TO

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK CITY

SUBSCRIBE NOW

THE MILITANT

Six Months \$1.00
One Year \$2.00

Combination offer:
1 year of *The Militant* and 1 year of the monthly magazine, *Fourth International* . \$3.00

(Clip and Mail This Coupon)

THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
116 University Place, New York, 3, N. Y.

I enclose \$1.00 for a 6-month sub to THE MILITANT
 \$2.00 for a 1-year sub to THE MILITANT
 \$3.00 for a 1-year combination sub to

THE MILITANT and FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Please send my subscription to:

Name

Address

City State

CHICAGO MEMORIAL MEETING

To commemorate the life of

LEON TROTSKY

and to celebrate the events which today confirm the teachings of the great revolutionist

Speaker: Lydia Bennett

SUNDAY, AUGUST 22, 2:30 P. M.

Room 421 - 160 North Wells Street

Also: Exhibition of documents of the period of the Russian Revolution and of the works of Leon Trotsky.

Admission free All invited
Auspices: Socialist Workers Party, Chicago Branch

The Negro Struggle

By Albert Parker

Still More Anti-Negro Slanders

The Militant's very first article on the recent anti-Negro rioting in Detroit warned against "a possible attempt to pin the blame for the whole tragic affair on the Negro people." This possibility, which seemed so remote less than two months ago, is now an ugly reality. The agencies of "law and order," both state and federal, have opened up with all their light and heavy artillery against the victims of mob violence which they are supposed to prevent and punish.

Prominent among these agencies is the Michigan governor's fact-finding committee, which was set up to investigate and report on the causes of the anti-Negro terror and which has sternly opposed all demands for a grand jury investigation.

The committee issued a very long report last week. It expressed many noble sentiments, advocating that the situation must be examined without bias or prejudice. It was filled with charts and graphs and statistics and maps and documents. It recommended that a study of the situation be made by "the proper social agencies" so that "there can be a frank, straightforward approach to this problem."

The committee's own approach to the problem has been well summarized by the August 13 Press Service of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

"Fully one-third of the digested text as reported in the Detroit dailies, August 11, concerns itself with minutely detailed descriptions of what the report describes as 'disconnected incidents provoked by a group of Negroes.'"

"Violence of whites against Negroes is dismissed summarily in a short paragraph, despite the fact it is asserted this violence extended over a period of twenty hours, from 4 A. M., June 21, until 11 P. M. that same day. During this period 1,500 persons were arrested of whom 85% were Negroes. Seventeen of the 25 slain Negroes were killed by police."

Of the behavior by the police, who laughed when they saw white hoodlums beating up Negroes and who shot to kill when they saw Negroes successfully resisting these attacks, the committee's report had nothing to find but praise.

The third part of the committee report is devoted to an attack on the Negro press, Negro leaders and Negro organizations like the NAACP and the March-On-Washington Movement for "inspiring" the riot. The governor's committee pretends that they are to blame because they urged the Negro people to seek equal rights. As the NAACP puts it, "Negroes have asked nothing but simple justice and the report to the governor calls them agitators."

I have read the long digest of the committee's report printed in the Detroit press. While I myself could not read it in the "unbiased" manner which the committee recommends, I did try to picture the reaction to the report by the average man or woman who was not very well acquainted with the situation. The result would be, I am sure, that this average man or woman would put down the paper and say, "Well, it's too bad the whole thing

happened, but it looks as though those Negroes got what they deserved." Thus the committee added provocation and insult to manifold injury.

Two members of the governor's committee were the county prosecuting attorney and the city police commissioner. The other two were the state district attorney and the state police commissioner. All of these men were heads of departments which were responsible in more ways than one for the heavy casualties in Detroit. So it would have been foolish to expect anything else of them.

But what about Francis J. Biddle? He refers to himself as a liberal and in recent months has even been posing as a friend of the Negro people. As Attorney General he is the chief law enforcement officer in the country. Yet his contribution to the discussion last week was no less contemptible and reactionary than the report of the Michigan governor's committee.

Biddle sent an FBI agent to Detroit and when he got his findings wrote a confidential letter to Roosevelt, parts of which were made public last week. The chief emphasis in his letter was placed on the need for more police to handle future "race riots." The Workers Defense League's comment on this aspect of the letter is worth reprinting: "Shooting rioters in Detroit and New York is certainly no solution. Your report does not reveal any sign that a more fundamental solution is to be sought for."

Then Biddle went on to pay lip-service to the need for better housing and recreational facilities, the lack of which he understands to be one of the causes of the anti-Negro attacks. But since he knows that the government is not going to do anything fundamental about housing, etc., he feels that the movement of Negroes to certain war production centers should be limited or stopped. Not the movement of white and Negro workers, but of Negro workers only.

What is this but a cowardly way of saying that Negro migration to war centers is the cause of violence against Negroes and that the way to avert this violence is to keep Negroes out? Furthermore, the NAACP points out, "Those employers who are reluctant to hire Negroes discover an unexpected ally when the Attorney General suggests that Negroes not even be permitted to move into those centers where Negroes are needed."

Later in the week Biddle backedtracked on this proposal, asserting that it was not a recommendation to Roosevelt but a suggestion, that careful study should be given to the matter and that he knew of "no present plan to prohibit migration."

All these slanders against the Negro people are committed in the name of preserving "law and order." Actually what they create is justified contempt and hostility for the officials trying to cover up their own criminal responsibility and to divert attention from the Jim Crow system which breeds anti-Negro violence. To the extent that they show Negro and white workers that they can rely only on themselves for the solution of their pressing problems, even these slanders perform a useful function.

Pioneer Paragraphs

THE SOVIET UNION IN WAR

By Leon Trotsky

Social regimes like all other phenomena must be estimated comparatively. Notwithstanding all its contradictions, the Soviet regime in the matter of stability still has immense advantages over the regimes of its probable enemies. The very possibility of a rule of the Nazis over the German people was created by the unbearable tenseness of social antagonisms in Germany. These antagonisms have not been removed, and not even weakened, but only suppressed, by the lid of fascism. A war will bring them to the surface. Hitler has far less chances than had Wilhelm II of carrying a war to victory. Only a timely revolution, by saving Germany from war, could save her from a new defeat.

The danger of war and a defeat of the Soviet Union is a reality, but the revolution is also a reality. If the revolution does not prevent war, then war will help the revolution. Second births are commonly easier than first. In the new war, it will not be necessary to wait a whole two years and half for the first insurrection. Once it is begun, moreover, the revolution

will not this time stop half way. The fate of the Soviet Union will be decided in the long run not on the maps of the general staffs, but on the map of the class struggle. Only the European proletariat, implacably opposing its bourgeoisie and in the same camp with them the "friends of peace," can protect the Soviet Union from destruction, or from an "allied" stab in the back. Even a military defeat of the Soviet Union would be only a short episode, in case of a victory of the proletariat in other countries. And on the other hand, no military victory can save the inheritance of the October revolution, if imperialism holds out in the rest of the world.

From Pp. 38-39, "In Defense of the Soviet Union," 1937, 40 pages, 10 cents. Order from Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Place, N. Y. 3, N. Y.

Liberals Whine But Remain 'Loyal Opposition' On Italy

(Continued from page 1)

Leon Trotsky



Portrait of Leon Trotsky by a well-known contemporary sculptor. This over-life-sized bust of the leader of the October Revolution is cast in plaster, colored to resemble bronze. Copies of the sculpture are for sale. Inquire at the headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

the same time that the Italian people were warned that no political activity would be tolerated. It was obvious that Roosevelt and Churchill were planning to continue virtually the same policy in Italy that they had pursued in North Africa. The starkly reactionary character of this policy stands out in more glaring form in Italy, because there its application takes place against the background of workers' demonstrations and strikes against the war.

MORE WAILING

The liberals, stunned and alarmed at the turn of events, forgot for the moment their heroic campaign for "unconditional surrender" and set up a great howl about the new "blunders." Max Lerner demanded to know in PM: "What happens when the Badoglio government or some other like it surrenders? What sort of temporary political order will be encouraged in Italy? Will we, from fear of disorder and revolution, freeze the situation and entrench Badoglio in power? It would seem so, judging from Churchill's warning."

I. F. Stone, writing in the August 7 issue of The Nation, cries aloud: "I am beginning to feel that while we are ready to make deals with any crooks at the top except the full-fledged, fully labeled Nazis and Fascists, we are out to demand 'unconditional surrender' of the peoples of Europe to what must begin to seem to them Anglo-American imperialism. The Europe that AMGOT would restore is not a Europe in which the Four Freedoms could be achieved."

PLAIN IGNORANCE?

In the same vein, J. Alvarez Del Vayo, foreign minister in Caballero's cabinet, bitterly complains in The Nation that "ordinary Europeans, suffering under a combination of war and tyranny, must think sometimes that in higher spheres of the United Nations are men who don't know what they want. Constantly the people are asked by Allied leaders to rebel against their Nazi and Fascist oppressors. But when the hour for revolt strikes, they find those same leaders busy offering terms to the men they have learned to hate and distrust, while they, the people, are urged to keep order at all costs."

Alexander H. Uhl, foreign editor of PM, sums it all up on August 11: "The shocking fact is that in a war for democracy the State Department is afraid of the ordinary people, who are our friends, and is building on a foundation of vested interests which use fascism when it suits them and ditch it when it doesn't."

What conclusions do the liberals draw from these facts? Obviously the liberals are well informed. They see what is going on. The picture is all too transparent and unambiguously revealing: The Anglo-American capitalists are not fighting to bring democracy to the peoples of Europe. Instead, they are determined to stamp out every vestige of democracy, to crush all revolts on the part of the peoples of Europe. Anglo-American capitalists have shown that like their Axis opponents they are not fighting for high ideals, for a better world, but simply to destroy business rivals and to establish their own hegemony over the world.

NO CHANGES

In the light of these irrefutable facts, do the liberals now say: We were wrong, we were mistaken about this war. We admit we were confused, we were dupes of the

war propaganda. We now see the light, we now realize the truth that the war is a reactionary war for markets, for colonies, for exploitation of the people.

No, they do not say anything of the kind. They continue to hedge and dodge and quibble. They continue to voice pious hopes. They continue the farce of separating Roosevelt from his State Department. They continue to divide the State Department

into "good" and "bad" men. They continue to split hairs. They continue to write sophistries. They continue to mouth phrases and slogans about the "war of freedom," the "people's war," etc.

Despite all their whining and complaining, they continue to cover up the crime of Roosevelt and Churchill and to whoop it up for the war. Thus they demonstrate the emptiness and lack of seriousness of their criticism.

Thus they demonstrate the spurious nature of their opposition. They are merely the traditional King's loyal opposition, which by its criticism acts as the safety valve for the regime and helps to stabilize it.

(The second and concluding section of this article on the American liberals and Italy will be printed in next week's issue of The Militant.—Ed.)

Soviet Gains Perturb Conferes In Quebec

(Continued from page 1)

"Nobody here is prepared to die for dear old Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia." (N. Y. Times, August 14.)

Washington, the senior partner in the coalition, is far more intransigent on this point. The N. Y. Times, which often reflects the State Department opinion, published an editorial on August 11 entitled "Finland: A Test Case," which warns the Soviet Union to keep hands off "poor little Finland" even though Mannerheim's Finland is presumably an antagonist and the Soviet an ally of Washington. The government of the American capitalists wants to leave the way open to building a ring of satellite states around the Soviet Union which can shut the workers' state off from Europe and be used, if necessary, as operating bases for intervention.

CAUSE OF FOREBODING

But much more is involved than the question of the Baltic and border states. The Soviet Union is a workers' state which, despite its degeneration under the reactionary Stalin regime, is based not upon capitalist property relations but upon nationalized property. Although Stalin fears the consequences of revolutionary convulsions in Europe as much as Roosevelt and Churchill, the social-economic nature of the Soviet regime impels him to make inroads upon capitalist property. Thus in 1939 the Stalinists were forced to nationalize property in Eastern Poland, the Baltic states, etc.

Stalinism is the deadly enemy of socialist revolution. Nevertheless, because of the social nature of the Soviet Union the victories of the Red Army feed the fires of revolt in Europe and endanger European capitalism. That is why the capitalists are filled with fore-

boding at the news of the Soviet successes.

The downfall of Mussolini, the successes of the Red Armies, the resurgence of the European masses, the worsening of Germany's position, the prospective invasion of the continent, the recognition of De Gaulle-Giraud's Provisional Committee — all these problems which are being discussed at Quebec compose parts of one all-embracing question: After Hitler, what?

WHAT WASHINGTON WANTS

Washington's plans for Europe, it is evident, will follow the pattern already laid down in North Africa and Sicily. AMGOT is to take over and rule the occupied countries in collaboration with the established officialdom, police, etc., no matter what their previous political affiliations and crimes against the people. Washington shrinks at the prospect of democratic regimes in Europe even on capitalist foundations because these would provide too much opportunity for agitation and organization among the workers and poor peasants and afford too broad and free an arena for the development of the class struggle. Roosevelt dreams of setting up clerical-monarchist regimes which shall rule with the aid of American troops, tanks, planes, guns and food.

The Soviet Union remains the great unknown factor in the calculations of Roosevelt and Churchill. Stalin has already formed his own Committee of Free Germans whose offer of peace terms to

Germany is extremely generous compared with the Allied demand for unconditional surrender, dismemberment and enslavement of the German people. Similar committees for Poland and other European countries have either already been organized or are being prepared in Moscow.

The Stalinist bureaucracy by its reactionary policies has done everything to deter and discourage the European revolution. Nevertheless revolution is rearing its head in Europe despite the Kremlin.

MASSES WILL DECIDE

The decisive word however will be spoken not by Washington, London, or even the Kremlin, but by the European masses themselves, above all by the German workers. The actions of the Italian workers, peasants and soldiers have scattered sparks of revolt throughout Europe. The suppressed masses are beginning to move toward the final assault upon capitalism. Their strivings for peace, bread, land and security can be realized only through the establishment of their own Workers' and Peasants' Republics and the formation of the Socialist United States of Europe.

Significance Of The Red Army's Morale

By M. Morrison

It could be no other than Max Shachtman who would make a superficial wisecrack to the effect that if the morale of the Red Army shows that the Soviet Union is a workers' state, the morale of the German army must also be taken to mean that fascist Germany is some kind of workers' state. (See Shachtman's article in the July New Internationalist.)

The morale of the Red Army does not of course prove that the Soviet Union is a workers' state. The suggestion that someone said something to this effect is one of Shachtman's debating tricks, to make the opponent look ridiculous. The contention that the Soviet Union is a workers' state rests on the basic Marxist conception that the nature of a state is determined fundamentally by the kind of property relations the state defends. If capitalist property relations prevail, the state that defends those relations is a capitalist one no matter what its political form may be—fascist or democratic. If capitalism has been overthrown by a working class revolution and the means of production nationalized, the state is a workers' state regardless of the fact that the workers have been expropriated politically of all their rights. Because of this expropriation it is a degenerated workers' state.

The morale of the Red Army proves only that the masses of the people in the Soviet Union, in spite of the brutal Stalinist dictatorship, feel that there is something in the Soviet Union worth fighting and dying for. Surely it can not be that the masses feel that the Stalinist government that oppresses them is worth defending. What explanation can there be for the morale of the Red Army and the masses other than that they consider the nationalized property an institution they must defend at all costs and that they must prevent a return to capitalism?

A Marxist must above all examine everything in its concreteness. While it is possible to discuss morale in general and enumerate all factors that go to determine the existence or non-existence of morale, it is necessary, in the case of a given situation to analyze all the factors of that particular situation. In considering the morale of the German army or the lack of morale in the Italian army, it is essential to take into account all the factors involving the particular army and come to a conclusion on the basis of such an examination.

When Shachtman confronts us with the wisecrack that if we attribute the morale of the Red Army to the existence of nationalized property we must therefore conclude that Germany is some kind of a workers' state, because the German army also has morale, it is an indication that he is thinking in the most abstract and formal manner. Assuming that the Nazi army has the same morale as the Red Army, it would be necessary to analyze the particular factors explaining the morale of both armies and see whether these factors are the same or different. The existence of morale in the Red Army can be attributed to the existence of nationalized property whereas the morale of the German army may be — in fact, must be — due to other factors.

It is obvious of course that Shachtman misses the point completely when he places the morale of the German army on the same plane as the morale of the Red Army. Because in the case of the latter we are dealing with an army that has suffered terrible defeats and has had to yield enormous territory while in the case of the former we are dealing with an army whose victories far outweigh its defeats. Assuming that the German masses possess as much morale as the Soviet masses — an assumption that I am not at all ready to grant — there can be no comparison between the two peoples because it is the Russian masses whose country has been invaded, whose army

has suffered grave defeats and from whom large slices of territory have been seized.

It has been proved that the morale of the Soviet masses has stood up under defeat; it has been proved that the morale of the French and Italian masses has failed to stand up under conditions of invasion and defeat; it has not yet been proved that the morale of the German army and masses can stand up under conditions of defeat and invasion.

The Russians have always fought well against a foreign invader, Shachtman informs us. We must conclude from this profound observation that there is something about the Russians which makes them fight well against a foreign invader and that the French and Italians are not endowed by nature with that peculiar characteristic. We can expect this kind of nonsense from a superficial bourgeois journalist.

Naturally all people fight harder when their native soil is invaded. And the vast spaces of Russia have enabled the Russians in the past to retreat and continue the struggle. In the present war also, the vast spaces of the Soviet Union is an important factor explaining the continued struggle of the Red Army and the turning of the tide against the German army.

But it is not true that the Russian masses are endowed with something which makes them continue to fight regardless of invasion, defeat and misery. The Russian army, in 1917, was completely demoralized and did not want to continue the war under any conditions. Even the Bolsheviks had to make peace with the Kaiser and yield tremendous territory because the army could not and would not fight. Demoralization of the army had reached a point where it was absolutely necessary for the Bolsheviks to make peace at any price. Only the romantic ultra-lefts were in favor of continuing a revolutionary war under conditions of complete collapse and demoralization.

The Red Army suffered defeats in 1941 and 1942 that were just as disastrous, if not more so, than those experienced by the Russian Army in the First World War. And yet the morale of the Soviet army and the Soviet masses stood up in the present war whereas it collapsed in the war of 1914. In 1917 the Russian masses refused to continue the war while in 1942 they are obviously continuing the war with great determination.

What is the factor that explains this difference? Not because the Russian masses know that they own the factories and the state. They know too well that this is a fiction of the bureaucracy. But they do know that the October Revolution took the means of production away from the capitalists and placed them in the hands of the state created by the October Revolution. They also know that the Stalinist bureaucracy has usurped the privilege of controlling the state and the factories.

At the right moment they will undoubtedly settle with the bureaucracy, but meanwhile they understand that a capitalist state is attacking the Soviet Union and the consequences of a victory of the capitalist state must inevitably be the restoration of the means of production to capitalists and of the land to the landlords. It is this danger which makes them fight now whereas they refused to fight in 1917 when a victory of Germany would mean the continuation of the capitalist system.

I repeat. In explaining the morale or lack of morale of the masses of any particular country, due consideration must be given to many factors. In explaining the morale of the Soviet masses after invasion and defeat, the most important single factor remains the nationalization of the means of production, the conquest that still remains as a result of the October Revolution.

The Struggle For A Proletarian Party

By JAMES P. CANNON

Price: Paper Cover, \$1.50
Clothbound, \$2.00

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

IN HARLEM
The Militant
is on sale at the
southeast corner
of 125th Street
and Lenox Avenue

The Answer to
Jim Crow's

The Struggle for Negro Equality

a new pamphlet by
John Saunders and
Albert Parker

32 pages Five cents

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the Working People

VOL. VII—No. 34 Saturday, August 21, 1943

Published Weekly by

THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 116 University Place, New York, 3, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8647
Editor: GEORGE BREITMAN

THE MILITANT follows the policy of permitting its contributors to present their own views in signed articles. These views therefore do not necessarily represent the policies of THE MILITANT which are expressed in its editorials.

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for 6 months. Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for 6 months. Bundle orders: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.



To defend the USSR as the main fortress of the world proletariat, against all assaults of world imperialism and of internal counter-revolution, is the most important duty of every class-conscious worker.

— LEON TROTSKY

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

1. Military training of workers, financed by the government, but under control of the trade unions. Special officers' training camps, financed by the government but controlled by the trade unions, to train workers to become officers.
2. Trade union wages for all workers drafted into the army.
3. Full equality for Negroes in the armed forces and the war industries—Down with Jim Crowism everywhere.
4. Confiscation of all war profits. Expropriation of all war industries and their operation under workers' control.
5. A rising scale of wages to meet the rising cost of living.
6. Workers Defense Guards against vigilante and fascist attacks.
7. An Independent Labor Party based on the Trade Unions.
8. A Workers' and Farmers' Government.
9. The defense of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack.

The Answer To Rising Prices

The Roosevelt administration is launching another sham offensive against inflation. The OWI has begun to publish a monthly box-score on the progress of inflation. One hundred life-insurance companies have been mobilized to acquaint their policy-holders with the dangers of inflation. OWM Director Byrnes takes to the air and promises "a substantial reduction" in the cost of living.

Byrnes optimistically announced on August 16 that "definite progress is being made" in stabilizing food costs. And in line with Roosevelt's call for "stiffer taxes" he came out for a program of increased taxation and enforced savings which will take an additional twenty billion dollars worth of purchasing power away from the masses.

The administration has been promising the peo-

ple for almost two years that it was going to stabilize prices. The OPA was ostensibly set up for that purpose. Today the OPA wobbles about on its last legs. It has already exposed its utter inability to hold down the rising costs of living. Now the enfeebled OPA is being staffed with business men from the very same profiteering food corporations whose operations the OPA is supposed to supervise and curb. James Brownlee of General Foods Corporation, for example, has just been appointed OPA deputy administrator in charge of prices!

Byrnes proposes to roll back prices by extending the food subsidy scheme. This scheme is supposed to be in operation now. Have the workers noticed any appreciable cut in the prices of the subsidized commodities, such as beef and butter, or in the general costs of living? What has been cut down is not the prices of these commodities but their quantity and quality. Even William Green has confessed that food costs have risen in most cities from 50 to 200%.

How long are the CIO-AFL bureaucrats going to cover up Roosevelt's false promises and roll-back labor. No matter what Roosevelt, Byrnes and their labor lackeys say, higher prices and heavier taxes are ahead. The workers can combat this continual slashing of their living standards only by breaking with the Little Steel formula and demanding a rising scale of wages to meet mounting living costs and stiffer taxes.

Effect Of The War On World Politics

Under the impact of the war great changes are beginning to take place in the world political situation on both sides of the battlelines. The masses, and especially the industrial workers, are moving to the left. This radicalization of the masses is undermining capitalism and preparing the political conditions for its abolition.

The uprising of the Italian workers has been the most violent manifestation of this process in the Axis camp. But all the governments in this camp, from Hitler to his Rumanian, Bulgarian and Hungarian satellites, have been shaken by the rising discontent of their own peoples with the war.

The same trends are observable in the Allied camp. A Gallup poll taken last June indicated that a general election at this time would give the British Labor Party more votes than the other two major parties combined.

The fact that the British imperialists have found it necessary to keep Nehru, Gandhi and thousands of worker and peasant leaders of the Indian masses imprisoned for a year testifies that the Indian struggle for national independence and social liberation may be suppressed, but not extinguished.

Another straw in the wind is the result of the August 4 elections in Ontario, Canada. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Canadian equivalent of the Labor Party) won 34 seats in the 90-seat Ontario provincial legislature. The Progressive-Conservative party (Canadian equivalent of the Republicans) won 38 seats. The Liberal Party, which had been in office since last April and is a pillar of Prime Minister Mackenzie King's national administration won only 14 seats.

The crushing defeat inflicted upon this government party was directly attributable to the dissatisfaction of the masses with the war and its consequences. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation was backed by the Canadian affiliates of the AFL and CIO.

While in the U. S. no independent party of labor exists on a national scale, the growing disillusionment of the working class with Roosevelt, the increasing hostility to the labor bureaucracy, the sentiment for the formation of an independent labor party, as well as the sharp rise in strike struggles, led off by the three strikes in coal, all point to the beginning of the radicalization of the American working class.

The fundamental cause of this radicalization of the masses is the growing disillusionment with the effects of the war. The tempo differs very sharply in the various countries. But the tendency is the same throughout the world and everywhere it is paving the way for drastic changes in the political situation.

The Kind Of Party That Can Abolish Capitalism

An Estimation of the New Book by James P. Cannon

By William F. Warde

The American people have created revolutionary parties in the past. In the first American revolution they formed the Patriot Party which organized and led to victory the struggle for independence against England. In the middle of the nineteenth century they formed the Republican Party which, thanks to its more radical and plebeian elements, crushed the slaveholder's rebellion in the Civil War, preserved national unity, and placed the capitalist class in supreme power.

Now the American masses are called upon to build another revolutionary party to organize and lead them to victory in a third revolution, the socialist revolution against reactionary capitalism. This new revolutionary party must necessarily be of a totally different type than its predecessors. These parties of the bourgeois-democratic revolution were based upon various class forces with divergent interests. They were loose and sprawling aggregations of contending factions which at critical junctures paralyzed and threatened to split with one another. Their programs and professed aims were not only unclearly defined but often violated by their actions. Far more bourgeois than democratic, these parties were bureaucratically controlled by oligarchs of the possessing classes.

KIND OF PARTY NEEDED

The party of the coming American revolution must be modeled along Leninist lines. That means it must be a Bolshevik party with a homogeneous class character and a decisively proletarian composition. It must be guided by the scientific method of Marxism and armed with the revolutionary program of international socialism. It must be a centralized and disciplined combat organization democratically controlled by its rank and file. Its actions must conform to its principles.

For the past 15 years the American Trotskyists have been engaged in building such a party in the United States. James P. Cannon's "The Struggle For A Proletarian Party" deals with the most critical conflict in the development of the Socialist Workers Party. This was the factional warfare which flared up in 1939 upon the signing of the Soviet-Nazi pact and the outbreak of the second world war when a combination of petty-bourgeois revisionists, stamped by bourgeois-democratic public opinion, attempted to overthrow the theoretical foundations, political principles and organizational methods of the Trotskyist movement.

This prolonged struggle in defense of Marxism brought forth the documents collected in Cannon's book. It would however be wrong to regard these writings as simply a record of that historical faction fight or a review of its organizational lessons. These are extremely important aspects of its content. But there is far more in this book.

LENIN'S CONTRIBUTIONS

Marxism provided a scientific foundation for the practice of

proletarian politics. Lenin, the disciple of Marx and Engels, developed Marxist theory and practice by his system of party organization. Thanks to Lenin's organizational methods the Russian working class became the first to bring forth from its ranks a mass party of communist workers capable of taking power, expropriating the capitalists, and reconstructing the social order. The Russian Bolsheviks taught the workers of the world how to build a revolutionary party how to conduct the revolutionary struggle against capitalism, and how to win it.

The revolutionary proletarian party is the indispensable instrument for leading the working class from capitalism to socialism. The entire experience of the working class since Lenin's day has served to underscore this cardinal principle of Bolshevism. Although all the objective prerequisites for successful revolutions have matured, the working class during the last 25 years has sustained a series of devastating defeats for lack of Leninist leadership. In the program of the Founding Congress of the Fourth International Leon Trotsky wrote that the world proletariat suffers above all from this crisis of the revolutionary leadership. All the work of the Trotskyist movement culminating in the creation of the Fourth International, World Party of the Socialist Revolution, has been designed to overcome this crisis by providing the necessary leadership.

WHAT CANNON EXPOUNDS

"The body of doctrine and methods known as 'Trotskyism,'" writes Cannon, "is indubitably the genuine Marxism of our time, the heir and continuer of the Bolshevism of Lenin and the Russian revolution and the early Comintern." Cannon's work and writings carry on these traditions. His book is an exposition of the science and art of Bolshevik politics applied to the specific conditions of the class struggle in the United States. Into these pages he has poured the lessons learned in over 30 years of participation in the mass movements and revolutionary tendencies of the American working class: the IWW, the left wing of the old

Socialist Party, the early Communist movement, and the Trotskyist movement since 1928. Cannon expounds the method of Marxism and the principles of Bolshevism not in abstract or doctrinaire fashion but in integral connection with the most important battle in the development of American Trotskyism and in the history of the Fourth International.

Here the reader can see how revolutionary theory is translated into revolutionary practice, not only in the broad arena of the class struggle but within the more concentrated framework of the proletarian party itself, in the midst of a life and death struggle between the proletarian and petty-bourgeois forces and their representatives. Here is living testimony that all questions of revolutionary theory and practice in the present epoch of the death agony of capitalism can only be resolved in and through the action of the proletarian party. Before Marxist ideas, and Bolshevik practices can become the possession of the masses they must prevail within the revolutionary party which constitutes the vanguard of the class.

REVOLUTIONARY POLITICS

Cannon not only teaches what Bolshevik politics must be; he also lays bare the opposite of proletarian politics. With the precision of an expert political scientist he analyzes the anatomy and physiology of clique formations, unprincipled combinations, the subordination of political principles to factional ends and other evils which flow from the practices of petty-bourgeois politics. He clarifies the relations between workers and intellectuals, leaders and members, majority and minority in the proletarian party and many other vital questions of revolutionary politics.

"The Struggle For A Proletarian Party" is the greatest contribution to Marxist literature by an American revolutionist. The ideas it sets forth have universal application and should be valuable to workers not only in this country but everywhere that the new revolutionary parties of the proletariat are in process of formation.

AFL Council Rejects Application Of Miners

(Continued from page 1)

is, along with the miscellaneous local unions that make up District 50 of the UMW. Undoubtedly, this factor, as well as other jurisdictional and constitutional problems, played a role in determining the executive council action in rejecting the UMW application and referring the matter to the AFL convention with no recommendations. The major considerations that dictated the council decision, however, were political.

Once again Lewis is taught that in big problems political program is more important and

binding than personal allegiance and clique combinations or horse trades.

A new force is arising in the American labor movement — a force with a program of breaking with Roosevelt, repudiating his anti-labor boards and policies, regaining labor's independence on the economic field and building an independent party of labor. But this progressive force will be built only in struggle and through an alliance of all those who support this program. It will not and cannot be built by clique combinations with the Hutchesons and Wolls which disregard and ignore questions of program.

Duty of Unions Toward The Low Income Groups

The rising cost of living, which lines the pockets of the profit-mad capitalists, has struck hardest at the 4,000,000 American workers who, according to Secretary of Labor Perkins, earn less than 40 cents an hour. These people—"white collar" workers, retail clerks, food workers, etc.—work in industries that in the main have no union organizations.

Price rises, both open and hidden, have also drastically lowered the living standards of 20,000,000 other people in this country, according to a survey made public last week by the Office of War Information.

Included among these 20,000,000 with low incomes are 9,000,000 dependents of men in the armed forces; 6,000,000 employees of the local, state and federal governments; and over 5,000,000 recipients of local relief, old age and veterans pensions, widow and dependent children's aid, etc.

War inflation is bringing ruin to these millions of people. They are already beginning to lose faith in the Roosevelt administration. In the next period they will lose faith in the capitalist system. These people are anxiously seeking a way out.

The capitalist class, responsible for the plight of these millions of people, is already attempting to take advantage of the situation to drive a deep wedge between the white collar and the industrial workers in order to better exploit both. The N. Y. Times writes editorials which imply that labor unions are to blame for the ruin of the white collar workers and the lower middle classes.

The labor movement is the natural ally of the white collar workers and also of the lower middle classes. All of these groups are exploited by Big Business. All these groups stand to benefit by uniting and conducting a joint struggle against the capitalist masters.

The labor movement can win the leadership of these millions of white collar people only if it adopts a comprehensive and bold program of action which shows these people that labor has both the program and the will to solve the crisis. That is the only way labor can repulse the reactionary aim of the capitalists to split the white collar workers from the industrial workers.

Italian Labor Council Split Over Pope Issue

The Italian-American Labor Council, representing 300,000 trade unionists in this country, suffered a split last week. The issue over which the split took place was the association by President Luigi Antonini with Generoso Pope and other former supporters of Mussolini in the formation of the newly-formed American Committee for Italian Democracy.

The anti-Antonini faction, which is headed by some Amalgamated Clothing Workers leaders and includes a number of Stalinists, claims to speak for 200,000 members and asserts that Antonini is no longer president of the Council. This group has absolutely no differences with the program of the Pecora-Antonini-Pope committee, but is squeamish about uniting with people like Pope.

Antonini, who says he has the support of 90% of the Council's membership, defends his collaboration with Pope by saying: "Either you concede to Italians and Italo-Americans who had been poisoned by fascism for 20 years the right to repent and redeem themselves or there is no hope at all." With this approach Antonini would also be ready to unite with those fascist forces in Italy who have now found it expedient to "repent."

As for the Stalinists, who have also been denouncing Antonini, their main complaint against him is not his program and not even his collaboration with Pope—but his refusal to permit the Stalinists to join together with Antonini and Pope. As the editors of the Daily Worker explained on August 16:

"It would be too bad for our struggle against the Axis if we permitted only those who were considered anti-fascists for the last eight years to participate, and if we were to turn over to the Axis as its allies all who were not such anti-fascists. Of course those who were leaders in the fascist camp should be justly regarded with reserve and suspicion. They can prove themselves only on the basis of their actions and their merging with democratic anti-fascist forces."

Refugees Again Attacked By Mexican Stalinists

The murderous Stalinist attacks on anti-Stalinist refugees from fascism continues with full force in Mexico, according to an article by Victor Serge in the August 14 issue of the New Leader.

The Stalinists have denounced Serge, Julian Gorkin and Marceau Pivert as "the leaders of the Goebbels Fifth Column," thus creating the atmosphere for future "spontaneous" assaults organized by the GPU against them. El Popular has issued "undisguised threats of death" against Serge.

Finally, Serge reports, on August 1, during a private meeting of Catalan Socialists, Spanish Stalinists burst in and attacked the group. "The writer Jordi Arquer, author of a work on the Catalan problem which has just appeared here, was seriously wounded in the head. Professor Henrique Gironella, editor of Mundo, who had been seriously injured during the Communist attack on the Erlich and Alter meeting on April 1, was wounded in the arms and legs. Dr. Tusso, formerly director of the hospitals of Barcelona, assistant to the Mayor of the city and well known for his social services, was struck down."

None of the Stalinist gangsters has yet been arrested or punished.

NEW YORK

TROTSKY MEMORIAL MEETING

Speaker:

V. R. DUNNE

National Labor Secretary, SWP

SUNDAY, AUGUST 22, 8 P. M.

AT IRVING PLAZA

15th Street and Irving Place

Auspices: Local New York, Socialist Workers Party

Special Offer to Readers of

THE MILITANT

Good Only Until Saturday, September 4

A Year's Subscription to the Monthly Magazine, **Fourth International** \$2.00

A Copy of Daniel Guerin's 339-page book, "Fascism and Big Business", the best Marxist book on the subject \$1.00

TOGETHER FOR ONLY \$2.50

Order from Business Manager, **Fourth International**

116 University Place, New York 3, New York