

We propose that the regular 1940 session of the Congress of the United States shall enact emergency legislation to put into immediate effect the following:

1. Appropriation of \$10,000,000,000 to provide, at once, jobs on housing and other public works projects for unemployed workers.
2. Amendment of the Wages and Hours Act to provide throughout private industry and public works a maximum work week of 30 hours and a minimum weekly pay of 30 dollars.
3. 30 dollar weekly old age and disability pensions.
4. Appropriation of \$3,000,000,000 to guarantee either maintenance at school or jobs for all youth.

Vol. IV, No. 16

NEW YORK, N. Y., APRIL 20, 1940

FIVE (5) CENTS

WORKERS! BEWARE THE CLAMOR FOR WAR!

West Coast Sailors Ask Increases

S.U.P. Demands New Adjustment to War Conditions

SAN FRANCISCO, April 12—The Sailors Union of the Pacific served a firm demand for wage increases on the Pacific-American Shipowners Association this week.

Of interest to all unions in the country are the reasons cited by this militant union for pressing its demands: the higher living costs resulting from the war and the war-time profits of the shipowners.

In its letter to the shipowners, published in the union's weekly, West Coast Sailors, out today, the S.U.P. says:

Meanwhile the rates for carrying freight by American ships have soared sky high. We know, by daily reports in the nation's press, and by following the Merchants' Exchange, that the shipowners are at the present time coining money hand-over-fist, due to the increased freight rates.

"We have also signed agreements with other American shipowners in the trans-Pacific and Australian run, paying 12.50 more per month and 15 cents more per hour overtime, than your Association pays our sailors.

"We have also several agreements with American shipowners, whose ships are engaged in an inter-coastal run, paying A. B. seamen \$85 per month and \$1.10 an hour overtime as against your ships paying A. B. seamen \$72.50 per month and 70 cents per hour overtime.

"These agreements are signed by the shipowners voluntarily over the negotiating table, without any strike action by our organization. We feel that what is good for one American ship operator should be good for another operating in the same trade.

In other words, we call upon you to raise the wages equal to American ship operators running ships in the same run in competition with your ships. We know that you can well afford to pay higher wages due to the fact that you are making large profits from increased freight rates and shortage of American tonnage.

"Our organization demands that you meet with us to negotiate the question of a raise in pay and overtime for sailors."

TWO-A-WEEK APPEAL ON WAY!

On April 7 the Socialist Workers Party convention instructed the National Committee to resume publication of the TWO-A-WEEK APPEAL within sixty days. That means the deadline for changing the APPEAL back to a twice-weekly is June 7.

The convention delegates did more than decree. They also pledged a healthy slice of the necessary money. Pledges taken at the convention amounted to \$4,130—with many delegates promising that the tentative quotas they set would be raised to a higher figure when they return to their branches. Some branches have not yet set any quota. In a word, the prospect is that we will get the amount needed over the \$4,130 already pledged.

Little money could be expected this week, for most of the delegates are still on the way home. Even so, however, we have received on the pledges a total of \$445. That's a fine beginning! Let's hear from every branch this coming week! And from our readers and sympathizers—you're expected to join in the launching of the new Two-a-Week APPEAL too!

Power Workers Win All-Union Shop

Twin Cities Electrical Locals Victors In Northern States Power Co. Poll

MINNEAPOLIS, April 12—The all-union shop, covering all employees of the Northern States Power Company, was won by the Twin Cities locals of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, in a ballot here Thursday.

Employees covered by the jurisdiction of Minneapolis Local 160 voted 865 for the union shop, and 174 against. Those covered by St. Paul Local 110 voted 623 in favor and 68 opposed.

The union had prepared to strike for the union shop. The strike was averted when the power company signed a stipulation providing that the union shop would become part of the contract if a majority of the employees voted for it.

Smother's Company Talk

The company has some time ago said it would sign a clause in the contract only if 75 per cent of its employees voted for it. The actual vote showed 83 per cent favoring it in the Minneapolis jurisdiction and 90 per cent in

St. Paul. All the union needed, however, according to the stipulation, was a majority.

In union circles, before the vote was taken, it was a sure thing that the union would win. The ballot was merely a face-saving device for the company to back down in face of the strike threat.

Union Strengthened

The balloting victory puts the union in a strong position in the negotiations now to take place for a blanket wage increase of 5 cents an hour and other issues. Under the stipulation the company must now sign a single contract covering the entire jurisdiction area of both locals, putting an end to any attempts to play one local against the other.

The victory of the union may be considered the latest step in cashing in on its successful strike of February, 1937, when in a militantly-conducted offensive it brought the company to its knees in five days. In the succeeding three years the locals have shown that they have retained the militant spirit of those stirring days.

Teamsters Help Akron Strikers

Rubber Strike Focus For CIO-AFL Unity Campaign

AKRON, Ohio, April 14—Two million pounds of crude rubber are jammed up in the warehouses here as General Drivers Union, Local 348, AFL, refuse to go through the picket line of 1,400 CIO rubber workers on strike at the General Tire and Rubber.

This is the first important strike in Akron's rubber factories since the militant strike struggles of two years ago. It was called by Local 9, United Rubber Workers of America, CIO, April 10, in answer to the employers' constant chiseling on pay rates, refusal to adjust grievances, in some cases for as long as eleven months, and attempt to introduce the 40 hour week (8-hour 5 day week) in place of the prevailing 36 hour week (6 hour - 6 day week), at a time when almost half of Akron's rubber workers are unemployed.

AFL, CIO United

Immediately after the strike vote was taken on late Wednesday, although no scabs were inside, the strikers began to picket in front of the factory's main gate in demonstration of their determination in this struggle. Only supervisory and maintenance forces, by permission of the union, are inside the plant.

Many progressive AFL locals in the area have already come to the assistance of the striking CIO rubber workers. They are aiding with the technical facilities of their unions, the setting up of a strike commissary, and providing pickets.

Herbert D. Dawson, URWA international representative, stated that the International Executive Board will approve the strike at once.

Not a single production worker remains in the plant, as the company with war orders recently received finds its production at a complete standstill.

The leadership of the strike has expressed its intention to stay out until a complete settlement is accomplished, all grievances settled and the company's violations of the contract halted.

Extension of Conflict Sharpens Danger; War Mongers Grow Bolder

Behind the Lines

ISSUE OF DUTCH EAST INDIES WILL SOON BECOME SOURCE OF WAR DANGER

By GEORGE STERN

The German occupation of Denmark brought the question of Greenland forward as a factor of no small importance making for the involvement of the U. S. in the European war.

Now the threatened extension of the war to Holland is raising—even before the event—the issue of the fabulously wealthy Dutch East Indies, the great oil and rubber producing archipelago which abuts the southeastern end of the Asiatic continent, lying close to British Malaya, French Indo-China, and the U. S. possession, the Philippines.

On April 15 Japanese Foreign Minister Hachiro Arita announced in effect that Japan would tolerate no change in the status of the Dutch East Indies except their conversion into the Japanese East Indies. In veiled but unmistakable language he warned Japan's rivals to keep "hands off" these islands, and the whole Japanese press took up the chorus.

When Germany took Denmark, Great Britain simply seized the North Atlantic and announced a "protectorate" over Iceland. The knottier question of Greenland has been left in abeyance because of the ticklish question of U. S. intervention in the matter. (President Roosevelt wasted no time in suddenly getting worried about the food supplies of Greenland's inhabitants.)

But the case of the Dutch East Indies is a little different. There is no naval force at present in Far Eastern waters which can, at the present moment, prevent Japanese seizure of the archipelago. Last year the British and French Far Eastern fleets held extensive maneuvers in those waters.

At that time the significant presence on the scene of an American cruiser was made the occasion for widespread reports that the U. S. Navy was actually expected to play the role of policeman in this vital sector of inter-imperialist strategy when the other Powers became involved in war in Europe. This

was hotly denied at the time but the time is drawing near when hands are going to be called.

Neither Britain nor United States imperialism can easily allow the Japanese to gain possession of these islands. In the one case, it would place British India directly under Japanese guns. In the other case it would provide Japan with vast resources in oil, rubber, etc. which would tremendously enhance Japan's military and naval strength.

Britain, certainly, is not going to be able to enforce any "protectorate" over the Indies in case Holland is swallowed by Germany unless the U. S. Navy—right now maneuvering over thousands of miles of the Pacific—is ready to play a major role in making it effective. The degree of this readiness of the U. S. will determine the Japanese strategy. Japan used the last war of the powers to make a grab for sections of China. It will do likewise this time, except that now Wall Street imperialism stands far readier to resist the further expansion of its Nipponese rival.

In this situation, involving the fates of millions of people on the other side of the world, the threat of American imperialist intervention into the war comes dangerously close.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

All mail and payments for subscriptions, bundle orders or other accounts for the New International or Socialist Appeal must be sent to the following address only:

GEORGE CLARKE

NEW INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST APPEAL
116 University Place
New York City

We cannot guarantee that mail or money sent to any other address will be received by our publications.

Government, Press, Movies, Radio, Are Attempting to Work Up War Hysteria; New Armaments Ordered

One by one helpless small states caught between rival colossal powers are being sucked into the slaughter of the Second Imperialist World War.

One by one the remaining powerful non-belligerents are being drawn closer to the point of direct armed intervention on one side or the other.

This goes especially for the United States, where the spread of the war to Scandinavia has given a tremendous impulse to the campaign of propaganda favoring American intervention. All the danger signals are up! Movies, press, radio are hammering away day after day at the resistance of the American people to any involvement in the bloody holocaust.

The New York Herald Tribune on April 14 made no bones about it:

"The United States obviously must face the possibility that it may find itself forced to join in the fray as the only way in which it can protect its own interests."

As Raymond Clapper pointed out in the New York World Telegram two days later, it is only a step from this to saying: "The United States must join in the fray in order to protect its own interests."

Clapper predicts that the fresh start made by the American war-makers following the Scandinavian developments "will grow bold and come out full force in a cry for going to war in Europe." Of course, Clapper, the "isolationist," deplors this—but only because he favors the U.S. going to war, not in Europe, but in the Far East!

War In Year, Says Roosevelt Spokesman

Jay Franklin, columnist for the New York Post, who often functions as an unofficial journalistic spokesman for the Roosevelt administration, wrote on April 15:

"Irrespective of which party wins the election, it is the view of American military experts that this country will enter the war within a year. . . (They) are more convinced than ever that U.S. participation is inevitable."

President Roosevelt came out on April 13 with a statement denouncing the invasion of Norway and Denmark in a manner which left the whole press free to point out that of course he meant only Germany. He followed up a few days later with a speech before the governing board of the Pan-American Union in which he bluntly declared that this hemisphere must be made ready "to meet force with force."

"Order" in the Western hemisphere, Roosevelt said, "was not won by hysterical outcries or violent movement of troops. We did not stamp out nations, capture governments or uproot innocent people. . ."

How American Bosses Got "Order"

The "order" Roosevelt is speaking about is the "order" of U.S. imperialist domination of the two continents. It has been built, such as it is, through more than a quarter century of "hysterical outcries" and "violent movement of troops" accompanying the unhysterical but no less deadly penetration of the U.S. dollar. Cuba, Mexico, Haiti, Panama, Nicaragua, have suffered U.S. military intervention at one time or another.

There is scarcely a single country in all Latin America which has not experienced, through backdoor methods, arming of phony revolts, financing of oppositions, the "capture of governments" more friendly to the incursions of dollar imperialism!

Roosevelt again proclaimed American suzerainty over the whole hemisphere. He said he prayed that it would not be necessary to do more than keep war away from this hemisphere, "but," he added, "should it be necessary to do more than that, I am convinced we should be successful."

Roosevelt and the War Deal are, indeed, preparing to do "more than that." The extension of the war in Europe has been put to use to cram down acceptance of another \$650,000,000 additional to the already gigantic naval budget. Admirals are paraded before a Senate committee to hold up the specter of an Allied defeat. Newspapers are filled with "reports" of secret Japanese naval building bringing the naval strength of that country up to and beyond the naval strength of U.S. imperialism.

The "preparedness" campaign which paved the way for the entry of the U.S. into the last war has already been far exceeded in the present period. Roosevelt says: "I pray to God, but . . ." That's a big but. It's a but which hangs the lives of millions of our youth. It's a but which should serve as a loud warning to the workers of the whole country.

This Is Not Our War!

Last time we were told it was to make the world safe for democracy. It led after the huge slaughter and sacrifice to the rise of Hitler and Mussolini and the destruction of the few small democratic rights enjoyed by the peoples of the world, and thence directly to a new world war among the imperialist gangsters for the re-division of the world's spoils. That's what this war is. All the rest, about democracy and civilization, is the same baloney that was handed out in 1917.

There will be no real democracy for the peoples, no real opportunity to build up a rich and fruitful civilization on a world scale until we put an end to the system that breeds these wars—the capitalist system itself.

We're not going to achieve that end by letting ourselves be bamboozled again into defending one band of the capitalist gangsters (the Allies) against another (Germany). Continuation of the capitalist war will lead to the extinction in all lands of the few remaining liberties enjoyed by the workers and the people as a whole. It will lead to a nightmare of mutual destruction in which great totalitarian camps will pit their strength against each other and preserve that strength by brutalizing the peoples of all nations.

The way out is not to be dragged into the war of the boss powers.

The way out is to fight the real war of the workers, the war for the socialist revolution, the war for the destruction of capitalism, the only war that will really end all wars by destroying the capitalist system that makes for war. It is in this war that we call upon the American workers to enlist!

'Anti-Trust' Campaign Designed to Break Back of Unionism

On March 29 the morning papers reported the indictment, under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, of Local No. 3, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and its officers. In striking at this New York union, the Department of Justice was assaulting the biggest and most important local in the building trades unions of the country, one which is justly famous among workers for having pioneered in establishing the 30-hour week as a practical solution for unemployment.

The following speech, ably defending not only Local 3 but the entire labor movement against the union-busting drive, was delivered by a representative of that union on March 29—the same day the indictments were announced—to a meeting of the American Labor Aid at the Cultural Center, 125 West 33 St., New York. The American Labor Aid, in addition to its work of defending all labor cases brought to it and its aid to anti-fascist refugees, is now campaigning to awaken the labor public to the dangers inherent in the "trust-busting" campaign directed against the unions—Editor.

By H. H. BROACH
Educational Director
Local No. 3, I.B.E.W.

Thurman Arnold's Crusade: Is it trust-busting or union-busting? He is Assistant U.S. Attorney General in charge of the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice. Before this he was a law professor at Yale. And he wrote a book—"The Folklore of Capitalism." He wrote about trusts. His book, it is claimed, landed him his present position.

In his book Mr. Arnold said: "Trust busting . . . made Theodore Roosevelt a great man. . . . Theodore Roosevelt never accomplished anything with his trust busting. . . . The

crusade was not a practical one. . . .

"Men like Senator Borah founded political careers on the continuance of such crusades, which were entirely futile but enormously picturesque, and which paid big dividends in terms of personal prestige. . . ."

Theodore Roosevelt had five attorneys to help him. Mr. Arnold has 196—and his crusade includes labor unions and their officials. He says "the Clayton Act exempts legitimate labor activities from the anti-trust laws." So his position is based on what he says are not legitimate activities. He

calls these "unreasonable restraints of trade."

Mr. Arnold first says what is legitimate or unreasonable. He first decides who should be prosecuted. Then the courts take their turn at saying what is unreasonable. But we know this word unreasonable has many meanings to different people.

It was not unreasonable to a few judges to rule that the U.S. Steel Company, the United Shoe Company and other huge concerns are "reasonable" trusts.

But it was unreasonable to some judges for union men to object to installing material produced in other states by non-union men at lower wages. This was a "conspiracy in restraint of trade." It was unreasonable for labor even to try to control the price of the only commodity it has to sell—labor lives. It often becomes "unreasonable restraint of trade" when labor interferes with the "profits of those who buy labor lives!"

FIVE FORMULAS FOR PERSECUTING UNIONS

Mr. Arnold prosecutes unions and their officials under the 50-year old anti-trust law for five types of "unreasonable restraint" which he made public Nov. 20, 1939. These "restraints" recall

what Clarence Darrow, the great criminal attorney, once said:

"The (employers) opposition is not now so much directed against the union as against everything it does. Most people are willing that workmen shall be organized, provided they do nothing but pass resolutions and pay dues."

Let us examine Mr. Arnold's five types:

1. "Unreasonable restraints . . . to prevent the use of cheap material, improved equipment, or more efficient methods."

Well, in the electrical field there is a National Board of Fire Underwriters. It determines the risk. It fixes the insurance rates. It decides what material is safe or unsafe. Inspectors pass on the materials. The union and its officials have nothing to say about the cheapness or quality of materials.

But unions may be interested because a product is made by non-union workers—perhaps by convict labor or child labor—and which threatens to displace union workers. And what is wrong with this? Supreme Court Justices Brandeis, Holmes and Clarke said:

"May not all with a common interest join in refusing to ex-

pend their labor upon articles whose very production constitutes an attack upon their standards of living and the institution which they are convinced supports it (the attack)?" (Duplex Printing case)

However, states are constantly excluding competitive products from other states. One mid-west state even requires outsiders to put a red coloring in milk when sending it into the state. Naturally people won't buy red milk—and this kills competition. But this is not an "unreasonable restraint of trade." When union workers say, "Buy our labor so we may eat; we get little work; protect our wages and living standards," that is an "unreasonable restraint." Then they are criminally indicted, as were the Electrical Workers' Union No. 3 and its officials.

Mr. Arnold's prohibition of interfering with "improved equipment or more efficient methods" brings up the whole question of labor-destroying devices and machines. No sensible person wants to stop progress. Workers simply want to live and to share in what is called progress.

Consider this: Today the Bell Telephone System employs about 20% less employees than in 1930. Yet it has more telephone sta-

tions in use—more average daily calls—and greater profits. Henry Epstein, New York State Solicitor General, had this to say:

"In the period of 1929-35, about 185,000 workers were dismissed by that corporation . . . despite maintenance of the famous \$9 dividends, of \$52,000,000 increased dividend payments, 185,000 workers were discharged. Efficiency, mechanical improvements, etc., all contributed. . . ."

"Take . . . the relative social deficit in the destitution of 185,000 families as against the social value of improved gadgets and the cash dividends to a few. . . ." (Letter to N. Y. Times, Nov. 26, 1939)

The Appellate Division of the New York State Supreme Court recently noted that employers do not use the latest improvements when these would destroy their investments. This court held that unions are not required to submit to "the disadvantages which flow from the introduction of such improvements." The court said:

"To prevent unemployment is a legitimate labor objective. . . . This right should be entitled to the same protection as is the right of an employer to use machinery for the purpose of mak-

(Continued on Page 4)

Resolution Adopted by Socialist Workers Party Convention

Convention Held April 5 - 9 Reaffirms Policy Of Unconditional Defense of the Soviet Union

1. The Second World War, now in its opening stages, is an imperialist war for the re-division of the earth. This estimate of the character of the war has been elaborated in the greatest detail by our international movement over a period of ten years, and has been verified by all the events since the actual outbreak of the war. Among the territories the imperialist powers covet is the territory of the U.S.S.R., the one-sixth of the world from which capitalist enterprise has been excluded since November, 1917. They would like to smash the Soviet state's monopoly of foreign trade, which for twenty-two years has prevented imperialist finance, industry and trade from competing against Soviet enterprise within the Soviet Union; to make available to the capitalist world this field for capital investment and its rich granaries and raw materials on terms dictated by the capitalists; in short, to reduce the Soviet Union to a colonial or semi-colonial status.

"Every big war, irrespective of its initial motives, must pose squarely the question of military intervention against the U.S.S.R. in order to transfuse fresh blood into the sclerotic veins of capitalism." In these words, our international theses, "War and the Fourth International" (1934), sounded a warning to the revolutionary workers to foresee this inescapable result of the contradiction between the U.S.S.R. and the imperialist states and to be on guard. These words are more than ever true today.

2. The imperialists' response to the Finnish events strikingly confirms the prediction and warning of our thesis. The Second World War included among its fronts from the first a rabid ideological campaign against the Soviet Union. Under the pretext provided by the Finnish events, this ideological war against the U.S.S.R. immediately reached a scope and intensity surpassing anything since the actual imperialist intervention in the first years of the revolution. In actual fact the war against the Soviet Union at that point already passed the ideological stage (Roosevelt's credits to Finland, Hoover's fund-raising committee, revival of the League of Nations as center of the anti-Soviet drive, American, British and Italian arms and planes to Mannerheim, etc.). Powerful sections of the ruling class in all imperialist countries endeavor to compromise the differences between Britain and Germany in order to unite them against the Soviet Union. Even without this, however, as indicated by their reaction to the Finnish events, the "democratic" imperialists may shortly go over to a direct and full-fledged war against the Soviet Union.

3. That the Second World War took the form it did in its initial stages—the imperialists turning upon each other before going on to seek the destruction of the Soviet Union—was envisaged by our theses, "War and the Fourth International." As a result of Stalin's reactionary foreign policy and the defeats imposed upon the workers by the Comintern, imperialist fears of revolution temporarily abated; under Stalin the Soviet Union appeared in the world arena as an auxiliary to one imperialist camp or the other. Nevertheless the fundamental antagonism between the imperialist world and the Soviet Union remained, basically far deeper than the antagonisms among the imperialist powers. Stalin's attempt to take advantage of the war to strengthen his military-strategical position in the Ukraine and the Baltic galvanized the imperialists into a new high stage of war-preparations and belligerent acts against the Soviet Union. Stalin's continued "neutrality" was desired by the democratic imperialists only on condition that he make no attempts to strengthen himself against the eventual imperialist assault on the Soviet Union.

They Serve the Soviet's Enemies

4. A direct falsehood, and a direct service to the democratic imperialists, is the attempt to characterize the Soviet Union and Fascist Germany as identical kinds of states ("red and brown fascism," "red and brown imperialism," etc.). These amalgams are employed by the imperialists and their lackeys in attempting to render more plausible their chauvinist justification of the war as a "war of democracy against fascism." To characterize the Soviet Union in such terms represents a yielding to the pressure of the democratic imperialists. This is demonstrated by the fact that the centrists in the labor movement (Socialist Party of Norman Thomas, Lovestoneites, etc.) found it but a step from the employment of these characterizations to outright democratic patriotism in support of the Finnish bourgeoisie and its imperialist backers.

5. The war of the imperialists against the Soviet Union is enormously facilitated by the Soviet bureaucracy and its outer apparatus, the Comintern. In direct contrast to the revolutionary public diplomacy of Lenin and Trotsky, the Kremlin clique wages its secret diplomacy without explanation to either the Soviet or the world proletariat; thus each new move of the Kremlin in the world arena arouses the darkest suspicions and weakens the loyalty to the Soviet Union of even the most advanced workers. The repulsive character of Stalinist propaganda for the defense of the Soviet Union—identifying the defense of the U.S.S.R. with acceptance of Stalinist policy in all spheres—engenders in many workers the rejection of both. Stalinist propaganda on behalf of the Nazi-Soviet alliance undoubtedly drives sections of the proletarian vanguard, outraged by Stalin's cynical betrayal, into a subjective attitude of antagonism to the Soviet Union in order to safeguard their defeatist attitude toward Nazi Germany. This subjective attitude is today one of the most powerful levers in the hands of the social-patriots. In these various ways the Kremlin adds its weight to that of the democratic imperialists in creating enormous pressure upon the revolutionary vanguard to abandon the concept of the defense of the Soviet Union against the capitalist world.

6. It is under the foregoing conditions that the Socialist Workers Party is confronted with the task of re-stating its attitude toward the Soviet Union today. The conditions under which we undertake our task may be summed up succinctly: **OVERWHELMING PRESSURE TO ABANDON THE SOVIET UNION.** All tendencies to regard the Soviet Union as a lost cause, to cross it off and say there is nothing left of the conquests of the great revolution worthy of defense, signify a capitulation to this pressure. The revolutionary quality of our party, and its capacity to stand up in the war crisis, is tested at this point, above all, by its ability to withstand this pressure of the capitalist world and remain faithful to the defense of the Soviet Union.

STAND ON USSR IS A KEY TO WHOLE PROGRAM OF A PARTY

An analysis of the Soviet Union constitutes inevitably more than an academic task; a Marxist analysis is at the same time a programmatic declaration on the basic questions of the proletarian revolution. The interpretation of the history of the classical bourgeois revolution, the French Revolution, has been for 150 years the battleground of contending bourgeois and petty-bourgeois (and later also the proletarian) camps. It is likewise with the unfolding of the first successful proletarian revolution.

Who made the Russian Revolution? Why was it successful? Why did the working class surrender its power to a privileged bureaucracy, and under what conditions will it retrieve its power? Should the Soviet Union be defended? What is the relation between Bolshevism and Stalinism? Is the U.S.S.R. a workers' state even though degenerated? Is it an asset or a liability to the international working class? The answer to these and related questions is also the answer's program for the working class in his own country. It is especially important to point out this fact today in the democratic countries, where under pressure of the imperialist war-mongers, erstwhile "friends" of the Soviet Union have revised their views in conformity with those held by bourgeois democracy, yet attempt to palm off their views as "revolutionary" (Lovestoneites, Socialist Party, Independent Labor Party of England, etc.). Abandonment of the revolutionary Marxist estimate of the Soviet Union and its course is merely a preliminary to—where it is not simultaneous with—abandonment

of a revolutionary attitude against the bourgeoisie of one's "own" country.

The Nature of the Soviet State

7. The Soviet state was founded in November, 1917 upon the theory of Marxism and by means of the strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution flowing from that theory. Marxist theory was conclusively vindicated by the October Revolution. The revolution transformed private property into state property, the necessary form of economy for the transition from capitalism to socialism. Control of this property was exercised by the working class through the Soviets (workers' councils elected on the basis of occupational representation), the factory committees, the army committees, the trade unions and the revolutionary party. This Soviet democracy constituted the dictatorship of the proletariat sketched by Marx, exercised uncompromisingly against the bourgeoisie, both national and international, and against all irreconcilable enemies of the workers' state. It was the broadest and most genuine democracy which has ever existed.

Nevertheless, it was denounced from the first by currents in the labor movement (Second International, International Federation of Trade Unions, anarchists, "pure and simple" trade unionists, etc.) who were partisans of other methods—at bottom, bourgeois-democratic methods—of solving humanity's problems. In their material and ideological war against the Soviet Union, they pointed to contradictions between the model of the workers' state as sketched by Marx and Lenin, and the reality. No one, however, was more critical than Lenin, and more observant than he, in pointing out the gaps between ideal and reality. Since Lenin's death, those who carried on the Leninist tradition, the Bolshevik-Leninists—now the Fourth International—continued to subject the Soviet Union to the most thoroughgoing critical analysis. All valid criticism of the Soviet Union—the scientific explanation of the developing gap between the Leninist ideal and the harsh reality—is the achievement of the Bolshevik-Leninists.

Among the immediate factors which intervened between ideal and reality were the vast destruction and expending of the resources of the country brought by the imperialist war from 1914-1917, the destruction accompanying the civil war and the imperialist intervention of the whole capitalist world in the ensuing years, and the necessary emergency measures to combat these conditions which the Soviet state had to take. These were not, however, the decisive factors which intervened between ideal and reality and which transformed the Soviet democracy of 1917 into Stalin's totalitarian regime of 1939.

8. The ideal of the Soviet state sketched by Marx and elaborated by Lenin was an ideal for an international workers' regime. Only on a world scale, on the basis of the material and technological resources of at least the advanced countries could the Soviet state be built and endure along the lines of the model outlined by Marx and Lenin.

The Soviet Union will perish unless the revolution is successfully extended to one or more advanced countries, said Lenin. True enough, he expected the wrecking of the Soviet state, rather than its degeneration; to put it more correctly, he did not sharply differentiate between these two possibilities. The two are not, however, contradictory. Degeneration must inescapably end at a certain stage in downfall.

The Degeneration of the Soviet State

9. The degeneration of the Soviet state is part of the price paid by the Soviet and world proletariat for the failure to spread the revolution into Western Europe. The responsibility for this process of degeneration rests first of all upon the social-democracy which collaborated with the capitalist world in crushing the post-war revolutions in Western Europe. The claim elaborated by the social democracy and its bourgeois allies, that the degenerate bureaucracy of the Soviet Union is the logical outgrowth of the Bolshevik doctrines of Lenin and Trotsky, is a contemptible attempt to justify the counter-revolutionary role of social democracy. The Bolshevik-Leninists, the Left Opposition, fought the degeneration at every step. If Stalinism triumphed over the proletarian core of the party it was only because Stalinism adapted itself to, and literally became the tool of, the imperialist world.

10. The pressure of capitalist encirclement upon an isolated workers' state was particularly malignant in backward Russia. The backward economy which the Soviet Union inherited from the Czarist Empire has been deprived of free access to the advanced technology of the Western world by the hostility of the capitalist world. That, in spite of this, Soviet economy was able to multiply its output by ratios of acceleration unprecedented in history, testifies to the superiority of state property over the anarchy of private property. But it could not, out of nothing as it were, outstrip the rate of productivity of advanced technology elsewhere. It remains behind the capitalist world by the decisive criterion of productivity per man hour. And in this fact lie the roots of the Soviet bureaucracy.

11. Where goods are scarce and their control and consumption constitutes a privilege, it is inevitable that a distinction will arise between privileged and unprivileged. In the Soviet Union this took place when the scarcity of consumers' goods and the universal struggle to obtain them generated within the state a policeman (the bureaucracy) who arrogated to himself the function of distribution. Hostile pressure from without imposed on the policeman the role of "defender" of the country, endowing him with national authority under cover of which he was doubly able to plunder the country. This policeman, the Stalinist bureaucracy, differs from other labor bureaucracies—such as the Second International, which are generated by a similar process of economic scarcity, but one artificially imposed by capitalist property relations upon the advanced countries—in the greater power it wields; for while the labor bureaucracies in capitalist countries rule the workers with brutal disdain, they are themselves servitors of the ruling class and its state, whereas the Stalinist bureaucracy itself possesses the state apparatus in the Soviet Union. The Stalinist bureaucracy, in short, differs from the ordinary labor bureaucracy in that it is the bureaucracy which rules over a labor movement which destroyed its capitalist class in 1917. But the destruction of the Russian capitalist class did not free the Soviet Union from the pressure of world imperialism. As the conservative urge to maintain privileges gained under an economy of scarcity in a capitalist country motivates a labor bureaucracy to serve its "own" ruling class, so the anxiety to conserve privileges under the economy of scarcity imposed upon the Soviet Union by capitalist encirclement has led the Stalinist bureaucracy into the service of the dominant ruling class internationally—world imperialism. Where the labor bureaucracy in a capitalist country serves its "own" rulers as long as the latter allow it to retain its status quo (and the "enemy" imperialist rulers when its "own" ruling class dispenses with its services in favor of the Fascist bureaucracy—as the German social democracy, for instance, now serves Germany's enemies), the Kremlin serves now one, now another group of imperialist powers, depending upon which bloc can better assure it of retaining its status quo in the Soviet Union.

STILL A WORKERS' STATE

12. Despite the depredations of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the Soviet Union remains a workers' state. More accurately, it is a degenerated workers' state, having been stripped of many of the characteristics it possessed under Lenin's government: above all stripped of Soviet and party democracy and of Leninist internationalist policy. The Soviet Union retains, however, its class character—like the trade unions plundered by the labor bureaucrats, reduced to servitors of the bosses but still remaining in

fundamental antagonism to capitalism. Despite all the inroads of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the chief conquest of the overturn achieved by the October Revolution in the realm of economy remains: state property. So long as the nationalized property is not overturned or seized by the imperialist powers, the Soviet Union remains a workers' state, degenerated though it is.

13. The Stalinist bureaucracy represents merely a temporary malignant growth. The conditions for its triumph—the backwardness of the country and the imperialist environment—bear a temporary and transitional character, and will disappear with the victory of the world revolution.

Only postponement of the world revolution nourishes the bureaucracy. It feeds on the defeats of the world working class. It maintains its arbitrary rule only because the Soviet masses have not been awakened by revolution without. It plays no independent role in production. It serves no need of production. On the contrary, bureaucratism has become the worst brake on the technical and cultural development of the Soviet Union. This was veiled for a certain time by the fact that Soviet economy was occupied for two decades with transplanting and assimilating the technology and organization of production in advanced capitalist countries. But the higher the economy rose, the more complex its requirements became, all the more unbearable became the obstacle of the bureaucracy. The constantly sharpening contradiction between them leads to uninterrupted political convulsions. The explanation for this is to be found precisely in the fact that the bureaucracy is not the bearer of a new system of economy peculiar to itself and impossible without itself, but is a parasitic growth on a workers' state. The monstrous purges in the U.S.S.R. testify to the fact that Soviet society tends organically toward ejection of the bureaucracy. The Stalin regime is a regime of permanent crisis. By the sweep and monstrous fraudulence of his purge, Stalin testifies to nothing else but the incapacity of the bureaucracy to transform itself into a stable ruling class.

14. The primary danger of the end of the Soviet Union as a workers' state and its transformation into a capitalist state comes from imperialist intervention. The imperialist invaders will find allies within—there is growing within the bureaucracy a wing which realizes that the bureaucratic caste can insure its positions of privilege only through rejection of nationalization, collectivization and the monopoly of foreign trade, replacing them with "Western civilization," i.e.—capitalism. This section of the bureaucracy seeks, as its way out of the conflict which rages between the needs of the nationalized economy and the bureaucracy's organic incapacity to manage it, a place as a compradore bourgeoisie in the service of the imperialist powers.

The Foreign Policy of the Stalinist Bureaucracy in the War

15. Like the foreign policy of all regimes, the foreign policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy is a continuation of its internal policy. The bureaucracy has lost all faith in the creative capacity of the masses whom it plunders. It has established a system of ruling without any control from below. Thus it has crystallized beyond reform a political regime which would be fatally disrupted by an awakening of the masses. These internal characteristics of the bureaucracy enter into its foreign policy. The interests of the U.S.S.R. demand, above all, successful proletarian revolution, especially in the advanced countries, and a common plan of economy with such workers' states. The bureaucracy, however, began its reign without any faith in the possibility of successful revolutions elsewhere, formulating this lack of faith in its theory of "socialism in one country"—that is, from the outset the bureaucracy adopted a perspective which ruled out revolutions elsewhere. Its further development (degeneration) soon brought the bureaucracy to the realization that revolutions in the advanced countries would destroy the basis of its political regime, which rests on the passivity of the masses. Hence, the foreign policy of the bureaucracy is directed, first of all, toward the bourgeois governments and not toward the international working class. The good-will of bourgeois governments is the primary objective of the Soviet bureaucracy.

16. The Communist International serves the Kremlin in its foreign policy solely as a means of winning the good-will of the "friendly" bourgeois governments and of hindering the foreign policy of the "enemy" governments. Thus that section of the proletariat influenced by the Comintern is transformed into an auxiliary force of one imperialist camp or another. The Kremlin, through its foreign agency and also in its own name, proceeds to embellish and idealize the "friendly" imperialism, calling upon the proletariat to subordinate itself to the "friend." After five years of duping the workers with slogans for the "defense of the democracies," Moscow is now engaged in whitewashing Hitler's marauding policy as one of "peace." The Kremlin has become the most valuable agency of imperialism, for the power and prestige of the Kremlin enable it to serve a "friendly" imperialism to a far greater degree than the Second International was ever able to serve. These services of the Comintern have become an extremely attractive bargaining point in the Kremlin's overtures to the imperialist powers.

Stalinist Alibi Is a Fraud

17. The leaders of the Comintern justify this policy by the general proposition that an isolated workers' state must utilize the contradictions in the camp of imperialism. The general proposition is indisputable. An isolated workers' state cannot fail to maneuver between the hostile imperialist camps; and maneuvering means temporarily supporting one of them against the other. However, this constrained support for one bourgeois state against another is justified only when it is demonstrated in the full view of the world proletariat that the isolated workers' state is thus saved from destruction and that the support is not purchased by suspension of the working class' struggle to overthrow that bourgeois state. By these criteria, the alliance with Hitler must be condemned.

18. The Brest-Litovsk peace reinforced German imperialism against France and England and sacrificed the national independence of the Ukraine. The class-conscious workers, however, could understand without difficulty that signing of the treaty was necessary for salvaging the workers' state. Having saved itself by that peace, the Soviet Union could later destroy the peace. Here is the classical example, under the internationalist regime of Lenin and Trotsky, of maneuvering between the imperialist camps.

STALIN CANNOT EXPLAIN

In the alliance with Hitler, however, the Kremlin does not claim that it is constrained to accept the alliance in order to continue to exist; nor does it represent the sacrifice of Poland as a bitter necessity imposed upon the Soviet Union by the imperialist powers. On the contrary, the Kremlin boasts of its alliance and does not trouble to explain how it can possibly justify having aided Hitler in enslaving some twenty-three million Poles. The economic transformations in the provinces occupied by the Red Army, covering eleven million people, can scarcely be said to compensate for delivering more than twice that number to Hitler. Under these conditions, the oppressed classes and peoples throughout the world have been affronted by the alliance with Hitler, thus weakening extremely the international position of the Soviet Union.

19. As in the occupation of the Polish Ukraine, so in the invasion of Finland, the Kremlin poses and resolves the question, like all other questions of its policy, absolutely independently of the ideas and sentiments of the international working class. That

its "successes" monstrously compromise the Soviet Union and wreak havoc in the international working class, does not concern it at all.

20. The Stalinist bureaucracy cannot provide the international working class with a satisfactory explanation of its invasion of the Polish Ukraine and Finland, because a full explanation would constitute a damning indictment of Stalinism. Stalinism is directly responsible for the fact that Finland has remained up to now an outpost of imperialism on the Soviet border. By its internal and external policies—the plight of the Finnish population of Soviet Karelia and the fate of the German proletariat under Stalinist leadership were the two facets of Stalinist policy which struck home most directly to the Finnish masses—the Stalinist bureaucracy drove into passivity a proletariat and peasantry which had always been foremost in the vanguard of revolutionary fighters in the Czarist Empire, which had conducted a heroic civil war (1918) and which had illegally maintained a powerful Communist party up until the rise of Hitler. The Soviet Union could not aid the Finnish revolution of 1918; it could certainly have aided a revolution any time in the last decade. That no revolution eventuated is the responsibility of Stalinism. Instead of Leningrad being protected by a successful Finnish proletarian revolution, it is "safeguarded" by an invasion of Finland. Essentially the same story can be told of the Polish Ukraine. Stalin cannot explain this without exposing himself.

Why We Condemn the Invasions

21. Our condemnation of the military intervention of the Stalinist bureaucracy is motivated by our defense of the Soviet Union. The military-strategic advantages gained in the Polish Ukraine and Finland are far outweighed by the negative results—that the Kremlin purchases its alliance with Hitler by putting the Comintern to work whitewashing him; that the Ukrainian provinces were purchased at the price of aiding Hitler to enslave 23 million Poles; that the invasions are carried out without consideration of the will of the workers of the Soviet Union, or the occupied territories, or the international proletariat and, indeed, in direct violation of the ideas and feelings of the masses, and consequently compromise the Soviet Union and disorient the world working class.

22. Our condemnation of the military intervention of the Stalinist bureaucracy has nothing in common with the attacks upon the Soviet Union by the social-democrats, petty-bourgeois democrats, anarchists, etc. These non-Bolshevik critics of the Kremlin hypocritically denounce the Soviet Union as imperialist for using military force and for violating existing borders. For us, however, the borders of the capitalist world are not at all inviolate, and military force may very well serve revolution, as in the aid given by the Red Army to the revolution in Georgia in 1920. We argue as defenders of the Soviet Union, the non-Bolshevik critics as its enemies. It is impossible, therefore, for revolutionists to find any common ground with non-revolutionists in condemning the foreign policy of the Soviet bureaucracy.

23. The Kremlin's crimes in foreign policy are simply a continuation of its crimes against the national economy of the Soviet Union. Its foreign policy flows from its internal policy: they constitute the mode of existence of the Bonapartist bureaucracy of a degenerated workers' state in capitalist encirclement—nothing more or less than that. The disease necessitates surgical treatment; but that can be done only on the basis of the scientific diagnosis elaborated above. Those who, overcome by the spectacle of Stalinist degeneration, seek to exorcise it by all sorts of epithets ("imperialism," "red fascism," "the bureaucracy is a new class," "no longer a workers' state but a bureaucratic state," etc.) do not help the cure of the disease. On the contrary, by abandoning the precise, Marxian definitions painstakingly elaborated and developed with the years by our international movement, and replacing our Marxian definitions by epithets from the arsenal of the democratic-imperialists, they only sow confusion and play into the hands of the enemies of the Soviet Union.

Regeneration of the Soviet State

24. The armed overthrow of the Soviet bureaucracy by the working class is the necessary condition for the regeneration of the Soviet state. This political revolution is the chief task of the revolutionists in the U.S.S.R. Each day added to the domination of the bureaucracy helps rot the foundations of the socialist economy and increases the chances for capitalist restoration. The bureaucracy has, by its destruction of Soviet democracy, left open to the Soviet workers only the road of armed overthrow of the bureaucracy as the means for reviving Soviet democracy.

Within the Soviet Union today only preparatory propagandistic work is possible. The impetus to the Soviet workers' revolutionary upsurge will probably be given by revolutionary events outside the country. The Soviet workers' fear of the hostile surrounding capitalist world is Stalin's guarantee for his continued domination. Were the horizons of the U.S.S.R. ringed with red instead of brown, the Soviet masses could be depended upon to settle all scores immediately against the bureaucracy. The chief strength of the bureaucracy lies not in itself but in the disillusionment and passivity of the masses, in their lack of a new perspective. A wave of revolutionary struggle of the masses in the imperialist countries, certain to come in the course of the war, will open a new perspective of struggle for the Soviet masses. The struggle against social inequality and political oppression, for the freedom of the trade unions and the factory committees, for the right of assembly and freedom of the press, legalization of soviet parties, revival of the Soviets as representative bodies democratically elected on the basis of occupational representation, revision of planned economy from top to bottom in the interests of producers and consumers, the fight against the international policy of the bureaucracy and its secret diplomacy—these will be the slogans that will mobilize the masses, and the aims of their uprising against the bureaucracy.

WE SHALL OVERTHROW STALIN

The mobilization of the masses of the Soviet Union for these aims is the task of the Fourth International. The social hatred stored up by the workers against the bureaucracy—this is precisely what, from the viewpoint of the Kremlin clique, constitutes Trotskyism. The Kremlin fears with a thoroughly well-grounded fear the bond between the deep but inarticulate indignation of the workers and the organization of the Fourth International. For there is but one party capable of leading the Soviet masses to insurrection—the party of the Fourth International.

25. The growth of the productive forces in the Soviet Union as a result of the nationalization of the means of production in 1917 and in spite of the depredations of the bureaucracy signifies that the regeneration of the Soviet state will take place on a far higher economic and cultural basis than in 1918. Nevertheless, the solution of the economic contradictions of the U.S.S.R. will remain, as in 1917, solvable only in the international arena, by the world revolution. Only by linking Soviet economy to the advanced economy of the great states, once these come under the rule of the proletariat, will the danger of another degeneration be averted. But in that way it will be averted. The international revolution will put an end to all bureaucracies by putting an end to all special privilege. Control and consumption of goods will no longer constitute a privilege. Science and technology on a world scale have provided the foundations for an economy of plenty, and only the old, obsolete property forms stand in the way.

26. For an independent Soviet Ukraine, is one of the fundamental slogans of the coming revolution in the U.S.S.R. The right of self-determination, brutally violated by Stalin, must be reinstated. The indubitably widespread movement for Ukrainian independence will become the property of the capitalist restorationist movement unless it is channeled in the revolutionary movement; a channel it will find in any event. A regenerated Soviet state would easily find the way to mutually satisfactory collaboration with an independent Soviet Ukraine in a genuine Union of Soviet Republics. The same considerations hold for a

(Continued on next page)

On the Defense of the U.S.S.R.

(Continued from Page 2)

national-freedom movement which may develop among the Byelo-Russian and other nationalities in the Soviet Union.

Defense of the Soviet Union

27. We have always stood for the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against the capitalist world or internal attempts at capitalist restoration. Never was it more necessary to reiterate this principle than today, when the unfolding of the Second World War demonstrates that inherent in it is an attempt by the imperialists to restore capitalism in the U.S.S.R. Defense of the Soviet Union is a class duty, as it is a class duty to defend any section of the labor movement against the capitalist world. We defend the Soviet Union against capitalist blows, irrespective of the circumstances and immediate causes of the conflict.

28. Defense of the U.S.S.R. is the logical corollary of our analysis of the first workers' state. All kinds of democratic, idealistic, ultra-left, anarchistic theories, ignoring the character of Soviet property relations or the class contradiction between the Soviet state and the bourgeois states, lead logically, especially in case of war, to counter-revolutionary conclusions.

29. Our conception of the defense of the U.S.S.R. remains in its basic fundamentals the conception which the revolutionary movement held at the very birth of the Soviet State. The defense of the Soviet Union was always conceived of as an integral part of the international revolution. The defense of the Soviet Union was conceived of as subordinated to the world revolution, in the specific sense that a part is subordinated to the whole. The Bolsheviks in 1918 were prepared to risk the existence of proletarian power in the Soviet Union for the sake of the German revolution, by virtue of the criterion that the success of the German revolution—one of the major advanced countries—was more important than the Russian revolution. Likewise today, if the U.S.S.R. were allied with Germany in the war, the German revolution would unquestionably menace the immediate interests of the defense of the U.S.S.R.; nevertheless we, like the Bolsheviks in 1918, would be for the most decisive measures to assure the success of the German revolution. This in no wise signifies the negation of the defense of the Soviet Union or a conflict between it and world revolution; for the world revolution, or any part of it more significant than the Soviet Union, such as the German revolution, would constitute in the end the most decisive defense of the Soviet Union.

30. Since the triumph of the Soviet bureaucracy (1923), the defense of the Soviet Union has involved a clear distinction between the needs of the Soviet Union and the needs of the bureaucracy. Since 1923 defense of the Soviet Union, for revolutionists, has in no way signified political support of the rulers of the Soviet state. In 1920 we supported the Red Army march into Poland as motivated by the interests of the revolution, likewise the aid given by the Red Army to the revolutionists in Georgia in wresting it from a puppet-government of the imperialists. Those were acts dictated by revolutionary considerations to the revolutionary-internationalist government of the Soviet Union. The Stalinist bureaucracy, however, represents interests and ideas almost the opposite of the interests and ideas of the October Revolution and we can therefore give no support to its politics, including its military politics (invasion of Poland, Finland, etc.).

Not Defense of Bureaucracy

31. Since 1927 our movement has proclaimed that the needs of the defense of the Soviet Union as a workers' state is fundamentally separated from the bureaucracy's defense of the U.S.S.R. It was then stated that, in the interests of the genuine defense of the Soviet Union, the proletarian vanguard can be obliged to eliminate the Stalin government and replace it with a revolutionary-internationalist government which would coordinate the defense of the U.S.S.R. with the furthering of the world revolution. The change of government was then conceived to be possible by the reform of the Communist party. In 1933 the Bankruptcy of the Communist International became evident when the great German party was ordered to go down before Hitler without striking a blow. We abandoned the perspective of reform of the Communist parties, including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The necessary change of government could, consequently, take place only by building a new revolutionary party capable of taking over the government (the new party was of course illegal by fiat of the Stalin government). By 1936 the complete extirpation of the former power of the Soviets made clear that the political revolution would take place only in the form of armed overthrow of the Soviet bureaucracy. The development of our program for the regeneration of the Soviet state, as thus outlined, was always, however, and remains so today, predicated on the conception that the task of regeneration was the best and most decisive way of defending the first workers' state.

32. Our abandonment (1933) of the perspective of regenerating the Communist International and its parties did not fundamentally affect our perspective of regenerating the Soviet state. A party and a state are not objects of the same order. A party is a selection of people on the basis of certain ideas and methods. This selection, in the Third International, became so fundamentally opposed to Marxism that we were obliged to abandon all hope of regenerating it. But the Soviet state differs from a party in that it is a complex of social institutions which continues to persist in spite of the fact that the ideas of the bureaucracy are now almost the opposite of the ideas of the October Revolution. Above all, the nationalized property in the means of production persists and determines the class character of the Soviet Union. That is why we do not renounce the possibility of regenerating the Soviet state. That dictates to us its defense against the capitalist world.

33. Defense of the Soviet Union against imperialism includes, of course, the newly occupied territories which, with the nationalization of their means of production, have become identical in class character with other parts of the U.S.S.R.

34. Our slogan for an independent Soviet Ukraine is the application to the field of the national question of our general slogan for the revolutionary overthrow of the bureaucracy. In the same sense that the revolutionary overthrow of the bureaucracy does not conflict with the defense of the Soviet Union, but on the contrary, best serves that defense, so the independence of the Soviet Ukraine will facilitate the defense of the Soviet Union. The same considerations motivate our slogan for an independent Soviet Finland.

What Unconditional Defense Means

35. Our defense of the Soviet Union is an unconditional duty. It is unconditional in two senses:

(a) We do not demand that the Soviet bureaucracy, prior to our participation in the defense of the U.S.S.R., make any agreement or concessions. Indeed, "defense" can have meaning only in this sense. For if we demanded that the bureaucracy first comply with certain conditions, or that the circumstances under which we would defend a workers' state against imperialism be of a certain character, that would not be defense at all but, rather, defeatism. For it is not a fact that we are ready to defend the United States, for example, under certain conditions—e.g., control of the country by the working class? "Conditional defense" is a misuse of terms. One is either a defender or a defeatist.

To require nothing of the bureaucracy as a condition for our defense of the Soviet Union—that signifies also that our defense has nothing in common with that of the bureaucracy.

(b) We do not shelve our aim of a political revolution in the U.S.S.R. during the war. Recognizing that the overthrow of the bureaucracy would immensely strengthen the U.S.S.R. in conducting the war, our objective of a political revolution remains in the period of the war and, indeed, becomes absolutely imperative. A number of considerations should make this obvious. If the course of the war should push Stalin into a complete military alliance with Hitler, pressure for capitalist restoration would in all likelihood come most immediately from "ally" Hitler and the "compradore" wing of the bureaucracy. Hitler would demand entry into the country for German technology to facilitate war production—but in the form of capitalist concessions, and he would be supported in his demands by the "compradore" wing of the bureaucracy. Enmeshed in the alliance, the bureaucracy

would resist ineffectively, if at all. Under such conditions the resistance to capitalist restoration would require mobilization of the Soviet masses in revolutionary struggle against capitalist restoration and its agents within the Soviet Union. Such a mobilization could have as its object only a political revolution for the regeneration of the Soviet state.

The difference between this political revolution and a social revolution in an imperialist country, apart from the obvious fact that the former would not have as its task the overturn of private property, is that, whereas in the imperialist country we continue the class struggle without considering the effect on the military front, in the Soviet Union the political revolution would have to be carried on with one of its objects being to safeguard the borders at all times against imperialist invasion. In this sense, and only in this sense, our aim of political revolution is subordinated to the task of defending the state property against imperialist attack.

They Bow To "Democrats"

36. The attempt of the democratic-patriots (Norman Thomas, Lovestone, etc.) to characterize our policy as a capitulation to Stalinism is a conscious and deliberate falsification. They had to go over bodily to the camp of the "democratic" imperialists (American Labor Party resolutions) before they had the effrontery to so characterize the same policy which in former years (when they were tail-ending the Stalinists) they slandered as "anti-Soviet." No less contemptible is the attempt to draw from our position the implication that we will join Stalin in crushing proletarian movements in the Soviet Union or elsewhere. Our struggle against Stalin's armed forces in Loyalist Spain should be sufficient refutation of the charge. We defend the nationalized property of the Soviet Union against the imperialists. Successful proletarian revolutions, in the Soviet Union or elsewhere, would constitute the best possible defense of the Soviet Union. Hence we would defend those revolutions, arms in hand, if necessary against Stalin's armed forces. That is the obvious meaning of our specific slogans for an independent Soviet Ukraine, an independent Soviet Finland, and a political revolution for the regeneration of the Soviet state.

37. The fundamental difference between our conception of defense of the U.S.S.R. and that of the Stalinists is today especially sharply posed. On the question of the German revolution Stalin is whitewashing Hitler, presenting his "peace" policy as good coin, calling the masses to struggle only against those opposed to Hitler's policy. The Comintern press indignantly repeats Goebbels' charges against the British as responsible for the attempted bombing of Hitler, and utilizes the occasion to warn the workers that Hitler's replacement would most likely take the form of a monarchist restoration aimed against the U.S.S.R.—ergo, Hitler should remain. We, on the contrary, insist that the hostility of the German working class against the Nazi regime must in the course of the war find the way to destroying the Nazi regime. Not merely because the Nazi regime is an unstable, treacherous ally of the U.S.S.R. but above all because a German revolution would far outweigh in importance the Russian Revolution.

The specific weight of the German revolution and its successful prosecution are in no way impeded, however, if the vanguard of the German working class gives due consideration to the needs of the U.S.S.R.—its real needs and not those asserted by the bureaucracy. If, for example, Hitler finds himself constrained by the logic of the situation to send military supplies to the Soviet Union, the German workers would have no reason, in that concrete instance, to resort to strike or sabotage. The development of the German revolution would find sufficient scope while facilitating whatever material aid the Soviet Union would be receiving from its imperialist ally.

38. In the imperialist countries fighting against the U.S.S.R. in a war, also, the proletariat must not lose sight of the interests of the U.S.S.R.; in cases of real necessity, the workers must resort to the most decisive action in order to hinder the sending of soldiers and supplies against the U.S.S.R.

The practical differences dictated to the workers on each side in connection with the defense of the U.S.S.R. in no way modify the fundamental principle that, in all imperialist countries, independent of the fact as to whether or not they are in alliance with the U.S.S.R., the proletariat must develop the class struggle with the purpose of seizing power as soon as possible.

THE MAIN DANGER

39. For the revolutionary vanguard in the democratic imperialist countries, where their voices are being drowned out by the anti-Soviet thunder, the real danger now is not the danger of confusion between our concept of what is worthy of defense in the U.S.S.R. and that of the Stalinists, but the danger that we may give direct or indirect help to the dominant political current which tries to identify the U.S.S.R. with the Fascist states. In order to inspire the workers to defend the Soviet Union, it is vitally important to make clear to them what we defend (nationalized property), against whom (the imperialists and the bureaucracy), and how (by revolutionary means). This work of developing clear and inspiring slogans will not produce miraculous results, for we are working amid the thunderous din of democratic-

The Struggle for a Proletarian Party

By JAMES P. CANNON
National Secretary, S.W.P.

(The following article is the first chapter of a pamphlet written by comrade Cannon to sum up the seven-months' discussion in the party on the question of the Soviet Union and the "organization" question. The pamphlet was published in the Internal Bulletin. Now that the Third National Convention of the party has settled the disputes by a decisive majority, this article will acquaint our readers with the party's estimate of the dispute. In the next issues of the APPEAL we shall publish other chapters of comrade Cannon's pamphlet—Editors.)

I.

What the Discussion Has Revealed

Political struggles in general, including serious factional struggles in a party, do not take place in a vacuum. They are carried on under the pressure of social forces, and reflect the class struggle to one degree or another. This law is demonstrated in the most striking manner in the development of the present discussion within our party.

At the present time the pressure of alien class forces upon the proletarian vanguard is exceptionally heavy. We must understand this first of all. Only then can we approach an understanding of the present crisis in the party. It is the most severe and profound crisis our movement has ever known on an international scale. The unprecedented tension in the ranks signals a conflict of principled positions which is obviously irreconcilable. Two camps in the party fight for different programs, different methods and different traditions.

What has brought the party to this situation in such a short space of time? Obviously it is not a suddenly discovered personal incompatibility of the individual leaders involved; such trifles are symptoms of the conflict, not causes. Nor can a conflict of this depth and scope be plausibly explained by the flaring up of old differences of opinion on the organization question. In order to understand the real significance of the crisis it is necessary to look for profounder causes.

For those who understand politics as an expression of the class struggle—and that is the way we Marxists understand it—the basic cause of the crisis in the party is not hard to find. The crisis signifies the reaction in our ranks to external social pressure. That is the way we have defined it from the outset of the crisis last September, immediately following the signing of the Soviet-Nazi pact and the beginning of the German invasion of Poland. More precisely, we say the crisis is the result of the pressure of bourgeois democratic public opinion upon a section of the party leadership. That is our class analysis of the unrestrained struggle between the proletarian and the petty-bourgeois tendencies in our party.

We define the contending factions not by such abstract general terms as "conservative" and "progressive." We judge the factions not by the psychological traits of individuals, but by the programs they defend. The discussion has revealed not a difference of opinion about the application of the program—such differences frequently occur and usually have a transitory significance—but an attempt to counterpose one program to another. This is what has divided the party into two camps. Naturally, these terms, which we have used from the beginning of the discussion to characterize the two tendencies in the party, are meant as definitions and not epithets. It is necessary to repeat this in every debate between Marxists and petty-bourgeois politicians of all types; the one thing they cannot tolerate is to be called by their right name.

The leaders of the opposition consider it outrageous, a malicious faction invention, for us to place this class signboard above their faction, when their only offense consists in the simple fact that they turn their backs on the Soviet Union and deny it defense in the struggle against world imperialism. But our definition and description of such an attitude is not new. Back in the days when

imperialist propaganda. Our voices may very well be drowned out for a time by the first waves of patriotism. We are going today against the stream. He who argues against our program from the standpoint that it is difficult to make it persuasive to the workers, is thereby yielding to the democratic pressure; if logical, he will end up in the patriotic camp.

40. We are not a government party; we are the party of irreconcilable opposition, not only in capitalist countries but also in the U.S.S.R. Our tasks, among them the "defense" of the U.S.S.R., we realize not through the medium of bourgeois governments and not even through the government of the U.S.S.R., but exclusively through the education of the masses, through agitation, through explaining to the workers what they should defend and what they should overthrow. Such a defense cannot give immediate miraculous results. Our work must be directed so that the workers on whom we have influence should correctly appraise events, not permit themselves to be caught unawares, and prepare the general sentiment of their own class for the revolutionary solution of the tasks confronting us.

This kind of defense of the U.S.S.R. naturally differs, as night from day, from the official defense which the Stalinists conduct. The difference is summed up in these slogans. The Stalinists say: "For the Fatherland! For Stalin!" The defense waged by the Fourth International is carried on under the slogan: "For Socialism! For the world revolution! Against Stalin!"

REJECTED BY CONVENTION

Minority Resolution On The U. S. S. R.

(REJECTED BY CONVENTION)

1. The present war, which began with the invasion of Poland by the German army on September 1st of last year, is a new struggle among the great powers for a re-division of the earth; for the hegemony on the European continent, and in particular for rule over the majority of oppressed mankind, living in the colonies and semi-colonies of Africa, Asia, Oceania, and Latin America. Thus, in its decisive aspects, the present war is of the same general character as the war of 1914-18, this time occurring on a foundation of far more acute and desperate conflict and social degeneration. All attempts to describe the war, from the point of view of any of the participants, as being fought for the rights of national self-determination (Poland, Finland), for the sake of "democracy against fascism" (Britain, France), to "break the hold of capitalist plutocracy" (Germany), for "socialist liberation" or "defense of the Russian proletarian revolution" (Soviet Union) are only social-patriotic devices for hiding the true character of the war from the masses, and enlisting the support of the masses for one or another participant or group of participants.

2. From the socially reactionary character of the war there follows the strategy which revolutionary socialists are obligated to adopt with respect to it. The revolutionary orientation may be summed up as THE STRATEGY OF THE THIRD CAMP. This strategy envisages the struggle on a world scale against the war, against all the belligerent governments and belligerent armies, and for the international socialist revolution. The troops of the potential army of the third camp are to be found in the ranks of the workers and poor farmers, the women and the youth, in all countries, in the enslaved populations of the colonies, semi-colonies, subject-nations, throughout the world, all of whom have only sorrow, starvation and death in prospect from the war, and for whom socialist revolt against the war alone can offer solution. The ranks of the army of the third camp will be forged by the rejection of any support of any of the warring governments or armies, the resolute pursuance of the class struggle in all countries, irrespective of its influence upon the fortunes at the military fronts, and the fight for liberation by the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies. The guiding slogans of the third camp are summarized by: AGAINST THE WAR! PEACE THROUGH SOCIALISM! FOR THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE OF THE OPPRESSED PEOPLES THROUGH THE SOCIALIST UNITED STATES OF EUROPE! FOR A SOCIALIST UNITED STATES OF THE AMERICAS! FOR A FREE AFRICA! FOR A FREE

ASIA! FOR A WORLD FEDERATION OF SOCIALIST REPUBLICS!

Puts U.S.S.R. In Imperialist Camp

3. The Soviet Union is participating integrally in the world imperialist war for the re-division of the earth. The Russian revolutionists and the Russian masses generally neither desired nor welcomed Stalin's war. The Soviet workers and peasants and the nationally oppressed peoples of the U.S.S.R. will express their discontent and hatred of the counter-revolutionary bureaucracy and its predatory war as an anti-war opposition movement—the only real basis for the revolutionary overthrow of Stalin in the present war. The reactionary character of its participation is demonstrated equally by: the policy and aims of the Soviet government and army—bureaucratic expansionism—which in no way advance or defend the interests of the Russian or the world proletariat, but on the contrary are solely in the interests of the preservation and extension of the power, privileges and revenues of the bureaucracy; the character of the alliance with Germany; and by the effects of its participation, which are in no way to advance the pre-requisites of the socialist revolution—above all the independent struggle of the proletariat and the colonial peoples for power, freedom, and socialism—but on the contrary to wipe out those pre-requisites. Stalin's present war is no more a "war in defense of nationalized property" than Daladier's is a "defense of democracy."

4. Revolutionary socialists are obligated therefore to revise the former conception of "unconditional defense of the Soviet Union," which, under the circumstances of the present war, leads to a strategy which is in direct opposition to the interests of the world socialist revolution. The general strategy of the third camp applies to the Soviet government and armies as to the other belligerent powers. In certain concrete cases, as, for example, in the invasion of Finland, we raise such slogans as, "Withdraw the Red Army from Finland!" "Stop the war!", etc. The slogans FOR A FREE SOVIET UKRAINE! and for freedom of the other non-Russian nationalities within the Soviet Union who may wish it, FOR WORKERS' CONTROL OF INDUSTRY! FOR WORKERS' DEMOCRACY! DOWN WITH PRIVILEGE! FOR THE OVERTHROW OF THE BUREAUCRACY! and the struggle for these and for the other economic and social demands of the workers and peasants, irrespective of the effect of this struggle upon the mili-

Shachtman was paraphrasing Trotsky and not Burnham, he himself wrote:

"At bottom, the ultra-leftists' position on the Soviet Union, which denies it any claim whatsoever to being a workers' state, reflects the vacillations of the petty-bourgeois, their inability to make a firm choice between the camps of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, of revolution and imperialism."

This quotation, from an article written in the New International by Shachtman two years ago, can be accepted as a scientific definition of the opposition combination and its present position, with only one small amendment. It is hardly correct to describe their position as "ultra-leftist."

The leaders of the opposition in the past have written and spoken a great deal along the lines of the above quotation. Year in and year out in innumerable articles, documents, theses and speeches the leaders of the opposition have been promising and even threatening to defend the Soviet Union—"In the hour of danger we will be at our posts!"—but when the hour drew near, when the Soviet Union almost began to need this defense, they welched on their promise.

So with the program in general, with the doctrine, the methods and the tradition of Marxism. When all this ceased to be the subject for literary exercises in times of tranquility and had to be taken as a guide to action in time of war, they forgot everything that had been said and written and started a frantic search for "new and fresh ideas." In the first half-serious test they revealed themselves as "peace-time Trotskyists."

And this shameful performance, this betrayal of Marxism, has taken place in the American section of the Fourth International even before the formal entry of American imperialism into the war. In the bible of the opposition, their document on "The War and Bureaucratic Conservatism," we are assured that the party crisis "was provoked by the war." That is not precisely accurate. America has not yet formally entered into the war, and thus far we have only a faint intimation of the moral and material pressure which will be brought to bear against the proletarian vanguard under war conditions. Not the war, but merely the shadow of the approaching war was enough to send Burnham, Shachtman and Abern on their mad stampede.

Gratuitously attributing to the party their own panic, these philosophers of retreat and capitulation express the opinion that comrades who read their document on the party regime "will draw from it cynical or discouraged or defeatist conclusions." They add: "The future is dark." And Burnham, who bared his petty-bourgeois soul in a special document entitled, "Science and Style," proclaims with malicious satisfaction—the wish is father to the thought—the downfall of the Fourth International. The reality is diametrically opposite to these lugubrious observations.

In the proletarian majority of the party there is not a trace of pessimism. On the contrary, there is universal satisfaction that the defection of a section of the party leadership revealed itself in time, before the war, and under conditions where it could be combatted openly and in free discussion and beaten down. The virtual unanimity with which the proletarian cadres have rallied to the defense of the party and the Fourth International, the militancy and irreconcilability with which they have met the attack of Burnham, Abern and Shachtman is living proof of the vitality and indestructibility of our movement. That is a good omen for the future. It gives us confidence that it will stand up against the real test of war when it comes. It gives grounds for the most optimistic calculation that the Fourth International will not only "survive," but conquer in struggle.

We Do Not Fear the Future

As for the "hard future"—the Bolshevik-Marxists never expected that the period of the death agony of capitalism could produce anything but crises and war with their inevitable repercussions in workers' organizations, including the party of the workers' vanguard. From these "hard" circumstances, the Fourth Internationalists only drew the conclusion that the grandiose social convulsions, which we foresaw and analyzed in advance, create the conditions out of which the oppressed masses, impelled by iron necessity, must carry through the social revolution and the reorganization of the world on a socialist basis. Only one thing is needed: a genuine Bolshevik party of the vanguard. Only Marxism can be the program of such a party. Burnham and his sorry disciples, the ex-Marxists, ex-Trotskyists, offer a program that has nothing in common with Marxism or the proletarian revolution. From this arises the fundamental conflict between the majority and the opposition, a conflict which is manifestly irreconcilable and to which all other questions, however important, are nevertheless subordinate.

In the course of a few months discussion the differences between the majority and the opposition have reached such depth and scope as to completely overshadow all questions of party regime. If all the alleged faults of the regime were true, and then multiplied ten times over, the whole question would pale into insignificance beside the principled differences which now clearly separate the two contending factions. The struggle of the opposition ostensibly began as a struggle against the "Cannon regime," and as a defense, or at any rate as an anticipation, of the "changing" position of Trotsky. But in a short time it unfolded as a fundamental conflict with the Fourth International over all the questions of our program, our method and our tradition.

tary front, together with the international orientation proposed in the general slogans applicable to the war, these alone answer the needs of the Russian masses, including the genuine defense of nationalized property and its utilization for socialist development, and will fuse their struggle with that of the masses of the entire world for PEACE THROUGH SOCIALISM.

Poses Various Possibilities

5. It is not possible to give in advance a detailed reply to all hypothetical variants of future developments of the war. But, for example, if the present enemies of Germany were to engage the Red Army on Russian or non-Russian soil, as an extension of their opposition to Russian aid to Germany and conflict with Stalinist bureaucratic expansion—that is, if the character of Russia's participation in the war would remain the same (as described in point 3), our present position would remain unchanged. However, if the character of the war changes from one of inter-imperialist conflict, in which the Red Army acts as a pawn of one imperialist power and as an instrument of bureaucratic expansion, into a war determined by the capitalist imperialist politics of destruction of Soviet state property and the reduction of Russia to a colony—that is, is determined by the world antagonism of capitalist imperialism and Soviet nationalized economy—our position would change corresponding to the change in the character of the war. In such a war, the Stalinist bureaucracy, despite the fact that it continues to defend, in its own way, its power and revenue, would be conducting a progressive war. The revolutionary working class would in this case adopt the position of defense of the Soviet Union. Our position would be dictated by the interests of the world proletariat which coincide with the struggle to defend Soviet nationalized property from liquidation by any imperialist power or powers. The defense of the Soviet Union would be conducted by us independently, without for a moment abandoning the political struggle against the counter-revolutionary bureaucracy.

6. In the United States, our main enemy remains at home. The special task of the Socialist Workers Party is resistance to all attempts of the bourgeoisie and its government, and of the labor bureaucracy and social-patriots, to exploit the crimes of Stalinism for the purpose of identifying it with revolutionary socialism, and for the purpose of whipping up an imperialist pro-war spirit among the masses and of dragging the country into war.

SOCIALIST APPEAL

Vol. IV, No. 16 Saturday, April 20, 1940

Published Weekly by the
SOCIALIST APPEAL PUBLISHING ASS'N.
at 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

Editorial Board:

FELIX MORROW ALBERT GOLDMAN

General Manager:

GEORGE CLARKE

Subscriptions: \$2.00 per year; \$1.00 for six months.
Foreign: \$3.00 per year, \$1.50 for six months. Bundle
orders: 3 cents per copy in the United States; 4 cents
per copy in all foreign countries. Single copies: 5 cents."Reentered as second class matter December 4,
1939, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of March 3, 1879."FIGHT WITH THE SOCIALIST
WORKERS PARTY FOR:

1. A job and a decent living for every worker.
2. Open the idle factories—operate them under workers' control.
3. A Twenty-Billion dollar Federal public works and housing program.
4. Thirty-thirty—\$30-weekly minimum wage—\$0-hour weekly maximum for all workers on all jobs.
5. Thirty dollar weekly old-age and disability pension.
6. Expropriate the Sixty Families.
7. All war funds to the unemployed.
8. A people's referendum on any and all wars.
9. No secret diplomacy.
10. An Independent Labor Party.
11. Workers' Defense Guards against vigilante and Fascist attacks.
12. Full social, political and economic equality for the Negro people.

Statement of the
National Committee

The readers of the APPEAL are already familiar with the resolutions adopted by the recently concluded National Convention of our party. These resolutions (published last week) made extremely liberal provisions for the participation of the leaders of the minority in party work. The resolutions offered them the opportunity to continue the discussion in defense of their point of view in the Internal Bulletin and in the NEW INTERNATIONAL, on the condition that they refrain from issuing an independent publication in opposition to the press of the party.

These decisions of the convention have been rejected by the leaders of the minority. This conduct left the National Committee no alternative, under the instructions of the convention, but to suspend the minority leaders from the party until such time as they signify their readiness to abide by the convention decisions. This action was taken by the National Committee, at its meeting held on April 16, in order to protect the party against disruption. At the same time the terms of the suspension leave the way open for the suspended members to reconsider the question and return to their places in the party leadership and in its editorial boards on the basis of the convention decisions.

'Treachery' In Norway

An astounding picture has been drawn in the press this last week of how Germany overran southern Norway without resistance. Traitors in every branch of the government and the armed forces, situated in positions where they could deliver or render harmless fortresses and warships, airports and government buildings and industrial plants, worked hand-in-glove with the German invaders. So widespread was the net of these traitors that it is scarcely possible to think of them as a group of agents of Germany; it is more accurate to speak of a certain caste in Norwegian society which decided to deliver Norway to Germany.

Even if we discount nine-tenths of these press reports, the residue is still enough for us to draw certain important conclusions concerning the realities of Norway—and of every other "democracy." While at the head of Norway officially stood a "socialist" government—to boot, it was a

government of the Norwegian Labor Party, which is supposed to be the most "left" of the parties of the Second International—in the real places of power, in the most strategic military and industrial centers, were arch-reactionaries who, without consulting the government or the people of Norway, had the power to decide to hand Norway over to the Nazis.

Let us understand clearly what this means. This caste of traitors came to the conclusion that their best interests were served by facilitating Germany's invasion, and their will dictated what happened. We happen to see this so glaringly in this case, because the decision that the caste made was contrary to that which the American press—which functions openly now as part of the Allied camp—would have liked it to make, and hence the American press indignantly exposes the "conspiracy."

But suppose this caste of traitors had, instead, decided to throw its support to the Allies? Then the American press would not have called them traitors or their act a conspiracy but, on the contrary, would have written only about "the people of Norway deciding" to facilitate an Allied invasion instead of a German one. But in that case, just as in the present case when this caste favored Germany, IT WOULD BE THESE ARCH-REACTIONARIES WITHOUT CONSULTATION WITH THE PEOPLE WHO WOULD DECIDE WHAT NORWAY SHOULD DO.

In venting their rage against the Norwegian reactionaries for favoring Germany, the American press has involuntarily laid bare for every worker to see the real mechanism of all the "democracies."

The same mechanism operates in this country. The people of this country will have no real voice in deciding whether this country shall go to war, and against whom. A semblance of "popular" support will be worked up for the war through the systematic poison pumped into our heads by the press, movies, radio, the speeches of Roosevelt and his Democratic and Republican collaborators—but this poison is being pumped into us at the command of the American equivalent of those who decided which way Norway should go. They decide, not the people.

Who are those that decide? America's Sixty Families—the powerful plutocrats who really run this country and will continue to run it, no matter who sits in Washington, until the day when the American working class takes the power into its own hands and takes away from the plutocrats their economic power.

Tomorrow, if it should serve the interests of America's Sixty Families, they would call a halt to the roar of pro-Ally propaganda and turn on a stream of pro-Nazi propaganda. For they decide in which of the imperialist camps this country should line up.

Anybody who talks about fighting for this country against Germany or Japan, or whoever the "enemy" is, simply is delivering himself as cannon fodder into the death-machines of the Sixty Families.

We are not pacifists and we're not isolationists. We know that this country can't stay out of a warring world. We're not against all wars. Because we're for the one war in which it is worth fighting—the war of the working class against the bosses. We'll defend this country—when this country is ruled by the workers. We'll war against fascism and reaction anywhere—but only when the armies which carry banners against fascism are the armies of a Workers' Republic or the revolutionary workers' forces within the fascist countries.

Any worker who doesn't understand that, doesn't understand what has just happened in Norway.

F.B.I. and C.I.O.

Now a CIO affiliate has fallen victim to the "trust-busting" campaign of the Department of Justice—the Fur Workers Union. Let neither John L. Lewis or anybody else deceive himself: the fact of Stalinist influence in the fur union might explain why it was the first CIO union to be touched—the government moves first against the discredited Stalinists because they are so vulnerable—but that doesn't at all mean that other CIO unions won't be next.

In this case the CIO top officialdom made a gesture or two of solidarity—pretty perfunctory gestures. In AFL cases, the CIO officials continue tacit approval of the prosecution. Lewis & Co. are cutting off their noses to spite their faces.

In the World of Labor

By Paul G. Stevens

Three Organizations Decide to
Unite as 4th International Party

Fernin Olea, fraternal delegate of the Revolutionary Socialist Party of Chile to the Third National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party, provided us with the following summary on the Chilean situation and the formation of the R.S.P.:

1. The Socialist Party entered the Popular Front combination in 1937 with a fifty-point platform; but the real point of the Popular Front was to elect a presidential candidate opposed to Gustavo Ross. The Popular Front candidate was the bourgeois radical, Pedro Aguirre Cerda, and the Socialist Party sacrificed its own candidate, its leader Grove.

2. After the victory in the October 25, 1938, election, the Socialist Party convoked a General Congress in December to decide on its participation in the new government. At that congress were to be observed the first symptoms of open opposition to the reformist politics of the S.P.

3. This opposition grew in the course of the first year of the Popular Front government. The first serious incidents came in September, 1939, when the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist Party attempted to effect a rapprochement with the Vanguardia Popular Socialista (a movement previously openly pro-Nazi but which, with the support of the Stalinists, had entered the Popular Front). With a combination with this organization, the S.P. leadership thought to counter-balance the Stalinist-Radical bourgeois alliance which was outweighing the S.P. in government decisions.

The Socialist Youth Federation (Federacion Juvenil Socialista) did not accept the S.P. policy and its general secretary, Krug, together with other leaders and active youth, were violently expelled from the S.P. These elements formed the Revolutionary Socialist Left (Izquierda Revolucionaria Socialista) in November, 1939.

4. New incidents came just before the VI General Congress of the S.P. which took place at the end of December, 1939. Numerous militants were expelled and various sections reorganized by the S.P. leadership.

Two tendencies constituted the opposition: one which was organized around Cesar Godoy, an S.P. deputy in parliament, and another, Trotskyist, which was organized under the name Ala Izquierda Socialista (Left Socialist). The two tendencies agreed in their condemnation of the dishonest practices of the government, of the S.P. leadership and of the leadership of the trade unions, whose principal body, the Confederacion de Trabajadores (Workers Confederation) is controlled by the S.P. and the Communist Party, with a slight majority in the hands of the S.P.

The Left Socialists and the Godoy group made an agreement on the following platform: (1) Democratic centralism and liberty of discussion; (2) reinstatement into the party of those expelled for political reasons; (3) the candidacy of Godoy for General Secretary of the party.

5. Grove was elected General Secretary over Godoy by an insignificant majority. The result was that many militants left the party. These,

together with those expelled, constituted in January, 1940, the Revolutionary Socialist Party (Partido Socialista Revolucionario) and immediately established contact with the previously-organized Revolutionary Socialist Left and with ex-members of the Communist Party who had become disgusted with the Stalinist regime and its international politics.

6. At the Congress of the Revolutionary Socialist Left in February, there were fraternal delegations from the Revolutionary Socialist Party and the Internationalist Workers Group (Grupo Internacionalista Obrero), (the latter has been affiliated to the Fourth International for some time). At this Congress it was agreed to form a Committee for Unification of the three organizations.

7. In March the Revolutionary Socialist Party published its first pamphlet, which consists of a Manifesto, a Declaration of Principles, a program of action, and the statutes of the party. A second publication, a new translation of Marx's Criticism of the Gotha Program, in the press.

In its Declaration of Principles, the Revolutionary Socialist Party declares that the World Party of Socialist Revolution (the Fourth International), "represents with fidelity and purity the interests of the working class," and in its statutes states that the party's International is the Fourth International.

8. The new party that will result from the fusion of these organizations has great perspectives: (1) Because its militants and its theories are imbued with the Trotskyist ideas of proletarian internationalism. (2) Because those discontented with the Socialist Party do not find in any other group a firm ideological base. (3) Because those discontented with the Communist Party have not succeeded in creating any other independent group. (4) Because the new party has a genuine and effective proletarian base and many of its militants are those who developed the active trade union work of the C.P. and S.P.

March, 1940

Fernin Olea

After attending the S.W.P. convention, comrade Olea added the following appendix to his report:

"Concerning the international question raised by the war, the German-Soviet pact and the war in Finland, the P.S.R. had not taken, at the time of my departure from Chile, any official position; but in the Central Committee there prevailed the position supported by the national convention of the American party. The same thing happened in the Revolutionary Socialist Left and the Internationalist Workers Group.

"I believe that in no case will a minority in the P.S.R. take a stand against the unity of the party, and this position will also be maintained in the course of the process of unification between the P.S.R. and the other groups."

It is clear that our movement in Chile is leaving the stage of propaganda groups. A unified party of the forces at our disposal in Chile means, from its inception, a party of action in the mass movement.

'Anti-Trust' Campaign Aimed
To Break Back of Unionism

(Continued from Page 1)

ing a profit." (Opera on Tour, Inc., v. Weber, et al.)

2. "Unreasonable restraints . . . to compel the hiring of useless and unnecessary labor."

Mr. Arnold gives an example of an extra man on a delivery truck. But the principle is what matters—not Mr. Arnold's example. And just who is to say what is "useless and unnecessary" labor? Who is to decide the proper speed of a worker? Surely not lawyers and judges who never did a day's manual labor in their lives? And who will decide the borderline of exploitation?

Two men working six hours each often means "useless and unnecessary" labor—if one man can be induced or forced to work twelve hours. And what about the older workers being thrown on to the human scrap heap? Is it better for human beings to starve than to have "unnecessary" labor?

When the General Electric, Westinghouse and others pay low wages and show huge, unnecessary profit that is not an "unreasonable restraint." And when lighting fixture manufacturers in other states pay poverty wages so as to make unnecessary profit, that is not an "unreasonable restraint."

But when union electrical workers say, "Buy our labor; we get little work; don't drag us down to the lower paid workers"—that is an "unreasonable restraint." It creates "useless and unnecessary" labor, Mr. Arnold claims.

3. "Unreasonable restraints . . . to enforce systems of graft and extortion."

4. "Unreasonable restraints . . . to enforce illegally fixed prices."

The indictments against Local

Union No. 3 and its officials certainly do not come under these points.

The indictments are based solely on the charge that the union and its officials endeavored to obtain, spread and maintain work for members.

The general cry of "racketeer" is used to conceal and confuse the attack on unions.

When court judges have been caught selling their decisions for cash, the anti-trust law was not used against them. Such law was not used to convict dishonest lawyers, politicians, government officials, stock manipulators, ministers and bank officers. Surely we have not so soon forgotten the Falls, Dohenys, Sinclairs, Forbes, Whitneys, Mantons and many others.

A NEW WEAPON IN THE
UNION-BUSTING ARSENAL

5. "Unreasonable restraints . . . to destroy an established system of collective bargaining."

Mr. Arnold says this covers jurisdictional disputes and strikes. These occur between unions over which one shall do certain work or jobs. For instance: When the New York Edison Company built a power house it had a contractor do the electrical construction work with regular union electricians. Later the Edison employees formed a union and the company wanted to use these employees to do this work at 50% less wages.

In the New York tunnels the "Sand Hogs"—despite a decision rendered against them by proper union authority—want to do certain electrical work done for years by Electrical Workers' Union No. 3.

In New York the Longshoremen's Union has been trying to

hold a weekly rate of \$44 while a union affiliated to the CIO offers to work for \$27.50. It was in this dispute that the Longshoremen's Union and its officials—Joseph Ryan and others—were indicted. Mr. Arnold held that this was a jurisdictional dispute—"a conspiracy in restraint of interstate trade."

Here is how a "jurisdictional" dispute can be created to wreck unions: There are AFL union trades on a building. The builder signs an agreement with the CIO. The AFL union trades strike. Then they and their officials are criminally indicted for "destroying an established system of collective bargaining." Seems fantastic doesn't it? But it is all too true.

However, labor has never before heard that jurisdictional strikes are unlawful under the anti-trust law. And labor has certainly never had a monopoly of such disputes. Various states, many departments of government, courts and even churches are constantly involved in jurisdictional disputes of one variety or another.

The United States was born in a fight over jurisdiction. Cities, towns and villages often squabble over territorial jurisdiction and against encroachment. It seems that a democracy is impossible without jurisdictional disputes of various kinds.

Of course such disputes between labor unions do harm. Bad feeling is created all around. Almost all humans deplore and condemn them—the same as they do war. But humans still go to war. And such disputes and strikes are a form of war—a war mostly for jobs. Provide enough jobs for men and you will hear little or nothing of such disputes.

Australian 4th
Internationalists
Fight Against War

By PAUL SCHWALBE

(Comrade Schwalbe, an active member of the Fourth Internationalist movement since 1929, has spent considerable time in Australia during the past three years and is now a member of our Australian section—Editor.)

The Australian island-continent, 28 times the size of Great Britain, has less population than New York City. When we think of the numerous troopships that have already left for the European battlegrounds, and the Mauretians and Queen Marys that are on the way to Australia for human cargo—we begin to realize the terrible drain upon the manpower of Australia, the suffering of those left behind, the inevitable decline of living standards and the eventual collapse of the whole economy of Australia.

In the circles of Britain's high society, where the real rulers of Australia meet, it is a matter of congratulatory comment that their agents down under are going the limit, without serious resistance from the so-called Labour Government or the Trades Union leadership, in a program that will ship regularly at least 2,000 young men in every month to their deaths.

The docility of the Stalinist upper crust is almost unbelievable. They were driven out without resistance from the Yarra Banks at Melbourne, traditional workers' meeting place, three and four weeks in succession, by a couple of dozens of sixteen-year old boys or a handful of uniformed hooligans. Instead of organizing Workers Defense Guards and depending upon the workers, they appeal repeatedly to the local police, federal and state governments, and army heads, to restrain the kids or soldiers!

The contrast between the Stalinists and the Trotskyists is clear-cut. When our comrades set up their platform and banners for a demonstration, they do so with heads erect and defiant hearts, singing the International. In Sydney, in the Domain, where many thousands of politically-advanced workers congregate every Sunday afternoon, the Trotskyists have always depended on the workers around them, together with their organized Defense Guards, for protection, in many cases very successfully.

Events during my stay in Sydney revealed the appalling cowardice of the Stalinists. They were loud only in their abuse and calumny against Alfred Bradley, delegate from the Boot Trades Union to the New South Wales Trades and Labor Council, who had repeatedly proposed to the Council the formation of a Workers Defense Guard to protect labor's rights. With the aid of the Stalinist votes, the proposal was defeated. The slogan for Workers Defense Guards is, however, beginning to make headway. I have just learned that the Melbourne branch of the Boot Trades Union has carried a resolution for it.

The Australian section of the Fourth International, the Communist League, has made its greatest mark in the fight against the imperialist war. An inspiring demonstration took place in the Sydney Domain last fall, where several hundred workers of draft age responded to the call of our speakers to boycott the National Register by burning the blanks in a great bonfire before the speakers stand. It was an impressive sight, to see the flames of protest and discontent from that fire reach skyward in the shadows of the Government and Army buildings!

Our Communist League holds street meetings almost nightly in all parts of Sydney, attracting increasingly larger audiences, as our comrades fearlessly attack the war and the proposed conscription. Our meetings always have large and colorful banners, with clear and effective slogans calling spiritedly for action against the war. The uniformed hooligans who attempted at first to break up our meetings have been effectively discouraged, with the aid of workers who volunteered to defend our meetings.

Our Movement Composed of Workers

Our people are also active in the mass organizations of the workers. Undoubtedly the high degree of discipline and dogged devotion to the League is accounted for by the fact that over 75% of its members are composed of union members, and that the League is almost 100% proletarian. Many of them are employed in the ship armament and machinist trades, some in the boot trades and printshops, and not a few are migratory workers, who do the technical work in the party headquarters during the slack season.

Work among the unemployed is a major task. Our comrades are instrumental in publishing "The Unemployed Workers' Voice," which is systematically circulated in the unemployed districts in every big city in Australia. The distribution problem has been solved by the unemployed themselves, who in great numbers take turns in distributing it at the main unemployed registration offices.

Much could be added to attest to the high degree of spirit that characterizes the Australian Section of the Fourth International. The comrades are determinedly setting about to transform their monthly organ, the "Militant," into a weekly. They support several full-time organizers and functionaries. Our comrades are notably selfless, giving all they have. These worker-comrades are accomplished speakers, writers, and are well-developed in the various arts and techniques necessary for revolutionary agitation and propaganda.

Such spirit, devotion and activity could not fail to have its impact. Particularly important is the effect on the Stalinists. The bulk of our membership has come from the Australian Communist party, which is comparatively large. Those that have come over lately from the C.P. are of exceptional quality, recruited in most cases from the leading cadres of the Stalinist organizations, and the drift toward us is still going on.

As a case in point, while this is being written I have received the March issue of the "Militant," announcing the break of Betty Roland, noted radical playwright who, we are sure, will follow the example of Rawling, Baracchi, Jack Kavanagh and others who preceded her into our ranks.

MAY DAY MASS MEETING! Wednesday, May 1st

SPEAKERS:

FARRELL DOBBS

JAMES P. CANNON

IRVING PLACE Irving Place and 15th Street
New York City