

August 1940

Fourth International

The Monthly Magazine of the Socialist Workers Party

JOSEPH HANSEN *writes from Mexico:*

THE ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF LEON TROTSKY

Roosevelt After the Battle of France . *William F. Warde*

Labor and the Elections *Farrell Dobbs*

'National Defense' Hits Labor *Carl O'Shea*

Changes in the Pacific *George Stern*

Spain: Under Franco *Grandizo Munis*

Burnham's Letter of Resignation
The Text; and a Comment

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

We are feeling very kindly towards Jim Farley today. While he is, no doubt, completely unaware of the fact, his Third Assistant in charge of classification, has notified us that the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL is now possessed of a permanent second class mailing permit. When Jim is sitting in his dugout at the Yankee Stadium, his heart full of bitterness toward the Great White Father, perhaps he'll hear of our gratitude and it will ease his pain and disillusionment in bourgeois politicians.

* * *

The possession of a second class permit, will mean of course, that our mailing costs will be considerably lower. While this is a great help and will contribute measurably toward the continued success of the magazine, it cannot compensate for infrequent and sporadic remittances from the branches. We had hopes that last month's column, together with personal letters sent to delinquent branches, would result in the clearing up of many debts and the placing of the magazine on a pay-as-you-go basis. It is entirely possible for the magazine to be self-supporting on the receipts from subscriptions and bundle orders.

The bundle orders are, by far, our major source of income. There are branches that have been hard hit by the bourgeois defections last Spring and could not, therefore, be expected to immediately pay up all the old debts. But even these branches can, and must, pay for each bundle during its current month. Either nobody reads this column (which is entirely possible), or the branches have not been sufficiently impressed with the gravity of the situation.

We have no desire to turn this column into nothing but a finger-pointer. There is much news of interest and information that we should much prefer to write about. However, until the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL is completely out of the woods we must take this means of reminding the

If the number on your wrapper reads:

N 45, or F 4,
your subscription expires with this issue. In order to avoid missing a single issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, be sure to send in your renewal order immediately. \$2.00 for one year, \$3.00 for one year in combination with the SOCIALIST APPEAL.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Published by the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party

Volume I August 1940 No. 4 (Whole No. 4)

Published monthly by the SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up. Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Board:

JAMES P. CANNON JOSEPH HANSEN
ALBERT GOLDMAN FELIX MORROW

Business Manager:
MICHAEL CORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Editorial Comment	83
The Attempted Assassination of Leon Trotsky by Joseph Hansen	85
Roosevelt After the Battle of France by William F. Warde	91
Labor and the Elections.....by Farrell Dobbs	94
'National Defense' Hits Labor...by Carl O'Shea	96
Changes in the Pacific.....by George Stern	99
Spain After One Year of Franco's Victory by Grandizo Munis	102
Burnham's Letter of Resignation...by J. Weber	105
Elements of Dialectical Materialism by William W. Warde	108

MANAGER'S COLUMN
Inside Front Cover

446

comrades of their revolutionary duty to support the magazine. If some of the worst offenders have not made some substantial payment on their back debts by next month we shall be forced to list their names publicly and bring the pressure of party opinion upon them. It is a disagreeable procedure, but an entirely necessary one.

* * *

There is always a danger of gilding the lily when we talk about the Minneapolis branch. However, as long as those comrades continue to be among the party activists, we must run that risk. We are reprinting here, in full, a letter composed by the Minneapolis comrades and clipped to sample copies of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for mailing to 150 trade union officials in that city. This is the sort of promotion we have been urging for all cities. This angle may, or may not fit into your locality, but it shows a method of promotion. It is an excellent way to open contacts with local labor leaders. It increases the prestige of the S.W.P. and the circulation of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. Apply this strategy to your locality and let us know the results. Here is the letter:

* * *

Dear Sir and Brother:

We are mailing you this sample copy of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL in the hope that you will read and enjoy it, par-

ticularly the article written by Farrell Dobbs.

As an active unionist in Minneapolis, you are no doubt acquainted with Farrell Dobbs, former secretary-treasurer of the Minneapolis General Drivers Union, and more recently international representative of the International Brotherhood of

Teamsters in charge of over-the-road work in the Middle West.

Brother Dobbs is a regular contributor to the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. From his rich experiences and his observation and study, Brother Dobbs writes on the most pressing problems facing the trade union movement in the United States. He now occupies the post of national trade union secretary in our party.

Besides his regular articles in the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, monthly magazine issued by the Socialist Workers Party, Brother Dobbs is writing a series of pamphlets dealing with the union movement. His first pamphlet, "Trade Union Problems," is now off the press and available for study, and has been acclaimed by progressive unionists throughout the nation for its clear-cut and simple analysis of current trade union problems and its helpful program for the advance of the cause of unionism.

You may obtain copies of this pamphlet at 10c each, either by calling at the Minneapolis branch headquarters, 919 Marquette Avenue, or by mail. We hope you will want to become a regular subscriber to the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, too. The subscription price for twelve issues is \$2.00. Mail a check for two dollars to 919 Marquette Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and you will be mailed the next twelve copies of this valuable magazine.

Fraternally yours,

Minneapolis Branch, Socialist Workers Party, 919 Marquette Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

OUT NOW!

Manifesto of the Fourth International The Imperialist War and the Proletarian World Revolution

A 48-page pamphlet on—

CAUSES OF THE PRESENT WAR
ROLE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM
WHAT NAZI WAR SLOGANS REALLY MEAN
RESPONSIBILITY OF 2nd & 3rd INTERNATIONALS
WHAT TO DO NOW!

A COMPLETE PROGRAM!
A CALL TO ACTION!

3c per copy to all branches of the S.W.P.
5c per single copy

Published by the:

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY
116 UNIVERSITY PLACE NEW YORK, N. Y.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

The Monthly Magazine of the Socialist Workers Party

VOLUME I

AUGUST 1940

NUMBER 4

Editorial Comment

The Fourth International's Manifesto on the War and Revolution

THE MANIFESTO of the Fourth International on "The Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution" was adopted at the International's World Emergency Conference, held in a neutral country on May 19-26. The Manifesto had necessarily been drafted before the Conference and was adopted by it with only a few minor amendments. Time had to pass for the delegates to make their way back to their respective countries before it could be published.*

Meanwhile every day's events constituted a historical epoch. The real scope of Hitler's blitzkrieg, the Battles of Flanders and France, came after it was written. It is interesting now to examine the Manifesto, some three months after its completion, to see how it has weathered the test of subsequent events and how the Manifesto itself fits into the chart our movement has been making of the course of events during the last decade.

It would not be remarkable if the Manifesto failed that test in important details. On all sides we see the wreckage of the programs and predictions of others. Yet if a political program is scientific it should be able to chart the general course of coming events and steer a consistent course through these events.

To begin with the Manifesto is able to describe the general causes of the present war simply by summarizing the analysis which our movement has been elaborating ever since 1918. We knew that this war was inevitable unless the proletariat overthrew the bourgeoisie, and we have consistently explained why. There were those who denounced this "doctrine of inevitability" as paralyzing the will of the workers to fight against war; these denunciators—the Norman Thomas Socialist party and the Lovestoneites were the American examples—are now partisans of the "democratic" imperialist camp as we predicted they would be. Along with other last remnants of Marxism, the Stalinists had to abandon the Leninist analysis of the coming war, in order to offer as the road to peace the "collective security" program of the Peoples Front. We were the only proletarian party which remained faithful to the Marxist estimate of the imperialist contradictions leading to the war, and we have been proved correct against the others.

On the immediate causes of the war and the relative strength of the contending powers, the Manifesto is able to

base itself upon our theses, "War and the Fourth International," which we published in 1934, and which the Manifesto quotes directly on basic points. We should like to see the Stalinists and the social democrats produce their documents of six years ago and compare them with their present documents! In its section on "The Preponderance of Germany in the Conflict," the Manifesto quotes our 1934 theses which said: "The collapse of the League of Nations is indissolubly bound up with the beginning of the collapse of French hegemony on the European continent. The demographic and economic power of France is proving to be, as was to be expected, too narrow a base for the Versailles system." The 1934 document further declared that "England's rulers are increasingly less capable of carrying out their plans," and the British bourgeoisie is "alarmed by the disintegration of its empire, the revolutionary movement in India, the instability of its positions in China." To these estimates of 1934, the Manifesto—and this before the defeat of Belgium and France—adds its certain opinion that "only the United States is destined to surpass the German murder machine."

On the military and technological dynamics of the war, two memorable examples of dialectical analysis in the Manifesto are particularly worth quoting. "The peace of Versailles has done the Allies a poor service. After fifteen years of German disarmament Hitler was compelled to start building an army from nothing, and thanks to this the army is free of routine and does not have to drag along obsolete technique and equipment." "The industry of England and France, thanks to the assured flow of colonial super-profits, has long lagged both in technology and organization. In addition, the so-called 'defense of democracy' by the social parties and trade unions created an extremely privileged political situation for the French and British bourgeoisie. Privileges always foster sluggishness and stagnation. If Germany today reveals so colossal a preponderance over France and England, then the lion's share of the responsibility rests with the social-patriotic defenders of democracy who prevented the proletariat from tearing England and France out of atrophy through a timely socialist revolution."

Roosevelt's preparations for war, which he and his labor lackeys justify by pointing to Hitler's recent victories, were in actuality already beginning in 1934 because of America's economic crisis, the Manifesto is able to prove by referring to our 1934 theses. At that time we forecast the role of U.S. imperialism in the following terms: "Capitalism in the

*It was published in this country in our weekly, the *Socialist Appeal*, June 29, and is available in pamphlet form.

United States is running head on into those problems which impelled Germany in 1914 upon the road of war. . . . For Germany it was a question of 'organizing' Europe. For the United States it is a question of 'organizing' the world."

Balance Sheet of the Russian Question

After nine months of the Stalin-Hitler pact, during which "democratic" imperialist propaganda, echoed by renegades from our movement, characterized the Soviet Union as an imperialist power bent on war for imperialist aggrandizement, the Manifesto is able to refute these falsehoods by reference to the events. That the Soviet Union remains a workers' state though ruled by a degenerated bureaucracy is a basic concept of the program of the Fourth International. Thence flows the necessity for the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against the capitalist world. In the nationalization of semi-feudal and capitalist property in Eastern Poland—now in the Baltic countries too—the Manifesto points out, "The strangled and desecrated October revolution served notice that it was still alive." Stalin's pact with Hitler, on the other hand, "resulted from the weakness of the USSR and the Kremlin's panic in face of Germany. Responsibility for this weakness rests with no one but this same Kremlin; its internal policy which opened an abyss between the ruling caste and the people; its foreign policy which sacrificed the interests of the world revolution to the interests of the Stalinist clique." The urgent necessity for the revolutionary overthrow of that clique is now again demonstrated by the consequences of the pact, which have endangered the Soviet Union more than ever.

On the basis of this bankruptcy of Stalin's foreign policy and the Kremlin's necessity to recognize its present plight and seek a new course, the Manifesto was able to predict a new turn by the Communist International back toward the "democracies." Since the Manifesto was written, the first signs of that new turn have appeared, notably the abandonment of the "Stop the War Now" slogan by the British Communist party and its replacement by a campaign to "oust the Munichmen from the government," i.e., for a government which will fight the war to the end.

Basis for Understanding French Events

As for the most important event in the war since the Manifesto was written, the capitulation of France to Hitler, that was and remains incomprehensible if one seeks to explain it by the mythology of the "war for democracy"; the democrats cannot possibly explain why the French government did not at least continue the war from its African colonies; but the Manifesto was able to explain it in advance. It says:

"The bourgeoisie never defends the fatherland for the sake of the fatherland. They defend private property, privileges, profits. Whenever these sacred values are threatened, the bourgeoisie immediately takes to the road of defeatism. That was the way of the Russian bourgeoisie, whose sons after the October revolution fought and are once again ready to fight in every army of the world against their own former fatherland. In order to save their capital, the Spanish bourgeoisie turned to Mussolini and Hitler for

military aid against their own people. The Norwegian bourgeoisie aided Hitler's invasion of Norway." One can now add to this list the French bourgeoisie, which followed General Weygand's advice that it was preferable to yield to Hitler and to become a subordinate partner in a Hitlerized Europe rather than to risk the danger of further defeats giving rise to a workers' revolution.

Points the Road to Revolution

Yes, the Manifesto of our international movement stands the test of events. Nor does it, Jeremiah-like, wail amid the chaos. On the contrary it seeks out amid the welter of blood those factors which constitute a new foothold for the workers' struggle. It affirms that the conditions for proletarian revolution are present and does not hesitate to point them out. Of particular interest perhaps for American workers is its emphasis on the role it predicts for the millions of youth who constitute in this country the "locked out generation." "Millions of the youth unable to find access to industry began their lives as unemployed and therefore remained outside of political life. Today they are finding their place or they will find it on the morrow: the state organizes them into regiments and for this very reason opens the possibility for their revolutionary unification." Here is not a trace of pacifist wailing about the fate awaiting these youth in the barracks!

In its concluding section the Manifesto sharply raises, in terms which may startle many American radicals—for in truth the dominant radical tradition in America is "left" pacifism and not Bolshevism—the question of the workers learning the military arts. "All the great questions will be decided in the next epoch arms in hand. The workers should not fear arms; on the contrary they should learn to use them. Revolutionists no more separate themselves from the people during war than in peace. A Bolshevik strives to become not only the best trade unionist but also the best soldier." In the factory the Bolshevik strives for technical competency, the better to be able to help his fellow-workers, thereby to win their confidence and thus win them to the revolutionary movement. In the army and the military training camps the Bolshevik likewise learns all that can be learned; his fellow-soldiers come to look to him for advice and guidance; he teaches them how to protect themselves under fire; and their confidence in him opens the way to political collaboration. Naturally, neither in the factory nor in the army is the Bolshevik "the best" in the eyes of the employer and the bourgeois officer! He does not accept *their* criterion of what is the best. The careful application of this revolutionary approach to the question of militarization is undoubtedly the most important task now facing our party, as this country begins to turn into an armed camp.

We have only touched the highlights of the Manifesto; it is impossible to summarize its 15,000 words, for it is too concisely written.

We cannot ask you to compare our Manifesto to those of the other international tendencies in the workers' movement, for none of them have issued such documents on the war to this day! They are too busy, undoubtedly, from day to day, revising their programs of the day before. Each change

in the war map convulses them anew; they are bereft of any serious, consistent perspective. Therein one may begin to see the chasm that separates them from us. We firmly

continue on our course. To us the changes in the war map testify only to the death agony of capitalism and to the imperative necessity of the socialist revolution.

The Attempted Assassination of Leon Trotsky

By JOSEPH HANSEN

MEXICO—At approximately four o'clock in the morning of May 24, some twenty-five men under the direction of Stalin's GPU penetrated the high walls surrounding Leon Trotsky's house in Coyoacan, and riddled with machine gun slugs the bedroom where Trotsky and his wife, Natalia, slept. Robert Sheldon Harte, the secretary-guard on duty and member of the Socialist Workers Party, was kidnapped and murdered, his body thrown into a shallow pit filled with lime. Leon and Natalia Trotsky owe their lives only to their own cool-headedness in a moment of terrible danger and to a fortunate accident—the belief of the assassins that they had completed their assignment.

Trotsky had been working very arduously the day prior to the assault, and as is his custom on such occasions had taken a sleeping powder. He awoke hazily, thinking he heard the explosions of firecrackers with which Coyoacan commemorates the special days on the calendar. But the explosions were too frequent and they were not far away, as it had at first seemed, but almost within the room. With the acrid smell of powder, Trotsky realized that this was the attempt which he had been expecting for twelve years. Stalin at last had commanded his GPU to correct what he once termed his "major error"—exiling the leader of the 1923 Opposition.

Natalia Trotsky was already out of her bed. She and her husband huddled together in a corner of their bedroom. Natalia made an attempt to shield Trotsky with her body; he insisted they lie flat on the floor without moving. Bullets ripped through two doors of their bedroom, thudding in the wall just overhead. Where were the police who had been stationed outside the walls? Where the guards inside? Surely bound hand and foot, or kidnapped, or already dead.

The door to the room where Trotsky's grandson Seva slept, burst open and a few moments later an incendiary bomb flared up around a small cabinet standing there. In the glare, Natalia saw the dark silhouette of one of the assailants. They had not seen him enter before the bomb flamed, but a number of empty cartridges within the room and five or six shots directly through each of the empty beds proved that this assassin had been assigned to make the final check, to still any movement that might still exist after the cross-fire from the French window opening on the patio and the door to Trotsky's study. In the darkness of the room, and hearing no sound whatsoever now that machine guns were silent, the assassin undoubtedly mistook the form of the bed clothes for the lifeless forms of Natalia and Leon Trotsky. He emptied his gun on those forms and fled.

The old revolutionists then heard what was to them the most tragic sound of the night, the cry of their grandson from the neighboring room, "Grandfather!"

Natalia found her way into his room. It was empty. "They've kidnapped him!" she cried. This was the most painful moment of all.

Seva, however, had awakened when the assailants machine-gunned the door opening from his room onto the patio, the bullets striking the wall barely above him. He immediately threw himself out of bed and rolled underneath on the floor. The assassins smashed through the door and as they passed his bed, one of them fired into it, the bullet striking Seva in the big toe. When they had gone, Seva called out, and then ran from his room, crying, certain that his grandfather and grandmother were dead. He left splotches of blood behind him on the pathway in the patio and in the library.

The guards who had been pinned in their rooms by bursts of machine gun fire across the doorways, now checked the patio. The assailants were gone. They had taken with them the automobiles and kidnapped the guard on duty, Robert Sheldon Harte. Outside, the police were tied, lying helplessly on the floor of their sentry house.

How Did the Assassins Enter?

From the accounts of the guards, the depositions of the police on duty, and the subsequent confessions of some of the assailants who were apprehended by the Mexican police, the story of how the agents of Stalin managed to penetrate the walls is fairly clear.

Five policemen were on duty, three of them asleep. J. Rodriguez Casas, the officer in charge of the police detail since Trotsky's arrival in Mexico, was home in bed at the time of the assault, according to his story.

The assailants, disguised as policemen, approached the two police on duty, shouted, "Viva Almazan!" and at pistol point bound all five. They then went to the barred doors. These doors are never opened at night except under most unusual circumstances and then only when the other guards beside the one on duty are awakened, unless he knows the person who asks admittance and has first checked to see that there is nothing suspicious.

Harte, member of the New York local of the Socialist Workers Party, had been in the household scarcely eight weeks. He had been selected for guard duty because of his trustworthiness and because of his willingness to take difficult assignments. His selection came as a grateful surprise to him. He was well known in the Downtown branch where he was a member of the Executive Committee.

The police on duty were themselves completely taken in by the disguises of the assailants, hence it should not be surprising that an American might likewise be deceived. It is quite possible, however, that among those who rang the bell at the door was one person known to Bob as enjoying the confidence of the household. The psychological effect of the police uniforms in conjunction with a few words from such a person: "Bob, these officials have a message of extreme importance for Trotsky," could have sufficiently impressed Harte who had shown himself already to be of more trusting than suspicious nature. In this connection it is significant that one of the guards, also new to the household, levelled his gun on one of the assailants, drew back the hammer, and then torn by indecision lowered his weapon. It is one of the rules of the guard to cooperate in every way with the Mexican police who have extended all possible courtesies to the household. One does not answer this courtesy with a bullet.

One of the police bound outside, Ramirez Diaz, reported that Bob was marched through the doors, protesting but not struggling, his arms pinned by two of the assailants. Despite contradictory versions by those who later confessed, and especially contradictory versions in the Stalinist press, Diaz maintained his story. Even after being held in prison for a month for questioning in relation to the assault, he declared before the court: "Bob was not mistreated by the assailants, because he went with them voluntarily, although held by the arms between two of them." This story seems closest to the facts.

It must be added that it is not excluded that the assailants managed to penetrate or scale the walls in some way other than by the doors and surprised Bob from the inside.

Once within the patio, the assailants divided their forces. The house juts into the patio like the stem of a "T" with Trotsky's bedroom occupying the middle of the stem between the study on one side and Seva's room on the other at the base of the "T." On the right hand side of the "T" is the south wall, on the left hand side the rooms of the guards against the north wall. Part of the assailants stationed themselves between the guards' rooms and the house; the rest stationed themselves at the door of Seva's room, the French windows of Trotsky's bedroom; others went through the library and the dining room and forced the door to Trotsky's study adjoining the bedroom. When they were posted they opened fire simultaneously, those on the left hand side of the house spraying machine gun slugs into the doorways of the rooms where the guards off shift were sleeping. The firing lasted three to five minutes. Some of the guards were able to return the fire, but apparently with no success, although that is difficult to determine since it is an invariable rule of the GPU to leave behind neither dead nor wounded who might serve to compromise the Stalinist organizations.

The assassins took the two automobiles, a Ford used for hauling supplies, and a Dodge. They left behind an electric saw, scaling ladders, rope ladders, drills, a defective bomb containing enough dynamite to have blown up the entire house, several unfired incendiary bombs, one incendiary bomb which was broken on a lawn, destroying the grass, a third which was burning in the entrance to Seva's room

and which Natalia extinguished with blankets, suffering burns on her arm and leg.

The Ford stalled a short distance away, the Dodge was abandoned in one of the exclusive districts of Mexico City.

The tools which the assassins carried, together with the police uniforms for disguise proved that they had prepared well in advance a number of possible lines of attack—that they were not dependent upon the complicity of a guard as alleged later by the Stalinist press. Subsequent events proved that they had just as thoroughly prepared in advance a number of possible ways of placing responsibility for the attempt anywhere but on its author, Joseph Stalin.

The Mechanism of the GPU

Within the Soviet Union, the GPU, hated by the workers, feared by the entire population, feeds upon the workers' state like a gigantic parasitic growth. It is the principal instrument with which the Stalin bureaucracy maintains itself in power. With bribery, corruption, terror, prisons, firing squads it represses and stifles the people, hunts down ruthlessly any voice of opposition.

Outside the Soviet Union, the GPU as an instrument of foreign policy parallels the Comintern. But it is higher in authority than the Comintern and controls its policies and activities. Within the Central Committee of each national section of the Comintern sits at least one representative of the GPU. He is known as the agent of the GPU generally only to the secretary of the party, at most to one or two others of the more trusted members of the Central Committee. The rest can only guess his identity from the unusual degree of authority he exercises.

Within the national section, this highest agent of the Kremlin works at his leisure. He studies the membership of the party in co-operation with those members of the Central Committee who are aware of his identity. Through appeals to party loyalty, through open bribery, and especially through pressure upon those who are expelled from the party and thus cut away from friends, often deprived of a livelihood—sometimes deliberately with this end in view—he builds a national organization of the GPU. This organization is composed of the most daring, demoralized, and cynical members of the Communist Party. They are prepared for anything. They obey orders without the slightest question. They have limitless resources at their disposal.

The GPU enforces a division of labor in its crimes. Its direct agents carry out the technical part of the assignment. The press of the Communist Party, its orators, and its periphery of sympathizers and "friends" of the USSR serve as a protective covering for these agents, masking their activity, parrying aside any probing into their crimes. The assault upon Leon Trotsky furnishes us with a classic example of the GPU's methods in plotting and carrying out a major crime beyond the borders of the Soviet Union.

The Moral Preparation

Since the arrival of Leon Trotsky in Mexico, the official Stalinist press and Stalinist-controlled press have carried on a campaign against him, endlessly demanding his expulsion from the country on the grounds that he is "an enemy of Mexico." When Dr. Atl, a fascist journalist, was in prominence as a minor reactionary figure in Mexican poli-

tics, the Stalinist press attempted to link him by no matter what fantastic means with Trotsky. When the oil companies were expropriated, the Stalinist press charged Trotsky with being their "representative." Lombardo Toledano, the attorney who heads the bureaucracy in the CTM (Confederation of Workers of Mexico), at a public meeting accused Trotsky of organizing a "general strike" against the Cardenas government—naturally without explaining what could motivate Trotsky to such action against the only government in the world willing to grant him the right of asylum. During the Cedillo uprising, the Stalinist press accused Trotsky of connections with Cedillo. Before the Stalin-Hitler pact, the Stalinist press accused Trotsky of being an agent of Nazi Germany. After the Stalin-Hitler pact, they accused him of being an agent of England and the United States. A standard charge was Trotsky's alleged "interference" in Mexican politics; that is, his occasionally answering the calumnies of the Stalinists. This charge at one time received such prominence in the Stalinist press that President Cardenas himself intervened through an interview granted the newspaper *La Prensa*, characterizing Trotsky as a man of honor who had scrupulously kept his promise not to intervene in Mexican politics.

All these charges endlessly repeated, clearly pointed to a coming attempt to assassinate Trotsky. Again and again in the press of the Fourth International this activity of the Stalinist press was exposed as not simple literary exercises for its hacks but as nothing more nor less than preparation for an attempt at assassination. The Stalinists responded with gibes about Trotsky's "persecution mania."

The Physical Preparation

As this moral campaign against Trotsky went on in public, the GPU at the same time began sending some of its assassins and gunmen into Mexico, especially through the Mexican embassy in Paris where Bassols was in charge. Among them, for example, were the notorious GPU executioners in Spain, Mink of the American Communist Party and Vidali (also known as Sormenti) of Triest, who is now in Mexico under the name of Carlos Contreras.

The physical preparation of the assassination began at least last January as the war spread over Europe and the Mexican elections approached. In the tremendous events of the Second World War, Stalin hoped the assassination of Leon Trotsky would pass without furor. The Mexican elections provided the opportunity to cast the guilt upon the candidate opposed by the Stalinists. (Hence the cry of the assailants, "Viva Almazan!")

When Hernan Laborde, del Campo and other leaders were purged from the Mexican Communist Party in March, it was upon the charge of "Trotskyism," that is, not conducting a vigorous enough campaign against Trotsky. Up to that time they had done no more than raise the slogan of "Death to Trotsky!"

David Alfaro Siqueiros, Luis and Leopoldo Arenal, Antonio Pujol, who led the assault on the house, and David Serrano, member of the Political Bureau of the Mexican Communist Party, established a network of spies in Coyoacan, renting houses in all sections of the village which they used in some cases for only a few days. A former wife of Serrano; Julia Barradas de Serrano, with another woman

member of the Communist Party, rented a room not two blocks from Trotsky's house and began the task of seducing the police, carrying out their assignment with a thoroughness that matched the unvarying regularity of the pay they received from the GPU. They reported their progress from day to day to those higher up. One of the police, who became enamored of their unusually easy charms, gave them a photograph of the entire police detail as a "souvenir." In their room after the assault, rough sketches of Trotsky's house were found, apparently work sheets which had been cast aside in constructing an accurate plan of the interior.

The GPU attempted to buy the house which Trotsky at that time was only renting, thus forcing him to become through the timely help of friends in the United States a property owner for the first time in his life.

David Serrano, veteran of the Spanish civil war, who has all the earmarks of one who acts as representative of the GPU on the Central Committee of the Mexican Communist Party, set about to obtain police uniforms.

As the time drew near, the GPU even rented a partially abandoned cabin in the mountains, bought lime, and had a grave dug in the cave which served as the kitchen, a grave which the police are convinced was intended for Trotsky and Natalia but into which the body of Robert Harte was thrown.

A Nest of Assassins

For one reason or another, the GPU failed to draw a water-tight division of labor between its artists of the pen and its artists of the machine gun. Luis Arenal, known in the United States for his former connection with *The New Masses*, was a regular contributor to *Futuro*. Many of the sketches and drawings attacking Trotsky are unmistakably from his pen. David Alfaro Siqueiros was eulogized in *Futuro*, Lombardo Toledano's monthly magazine, as "an artist of great prestige and of universally recognized qualities. Throughout America, from New York to Buenos Aires his work as a painter is appreciated. He is a man who honors Mexico. In any country in the world a person of this class is an object of consideration no matter what might be his political affiliation. In Mexico it is not like this. Lately he has been the object of arbitrary abuses by the city police."

It was this painter whose qualities were not given due consideration by the city police who, donning dark glasses, a false mustache, and a uniform of the city police, headed the gang which made the actual assault. The above appreciation of Siqueiros was from the pen, apparently, of Alejandro Carillo, editor of *El Popular*, who threatened after the assault to have Trotsky jailed by these same city police for "defamation."

Two others of the actual assailants were contributors to Toledano's magazine *Futuro*: Felix Guerrero Mejia, and Nestor Sanchez Hernandez, the latter author of an article attacking Trotsky.

It is doubtful, however, that the main figures in the moral preparation of the attack, who are leaders in the Mexican Communist Party, such as David Serrano, participated as machine gunners. Still further removed from physical participation in the assault are such figures as the lawyer and "transcendental" orator Lombardo Toledano,

whose job it is to function in the trade unions as a mask for GPU activity and an exponent of Stalinist policy without holding a membership card in the Party. Participation of these gentlemen disguised as policemen would have been too sharp a violation of a standard GPU rule. Nevertheless the pages of *Futuro*, *El Popular*, and *La Voz de Mexico* are filled with names of people connected with the assault to one degree or another.

The GPU Intensifies the Campaign

In the March issue of Lombardo Toledano's *Futuro*, same month as the purge in the Mexican Communist Party, same month as the women spies were getting along famously with their assignment, all the Stalinist slanders were brought up to date and dumped into one article against Trotsky.

This article, appearing under the title, "The Significance of Trotskyism," was written by Oscar Greydt Abelenda, a professor in the Stalinist-controlled "Workers' University" in Mexico City, a collaborator of *La Voz de Mexico*, in which he reported, for instance, a secret session of the plenum of the National Committee of the Communist Party, although he does not happen to be a member of that body. The article accuses Trotsky of:

(1) Being the "direct organizer of foreign counter-revolutionary intervention in Mexico."

(2) Of having been recently "expelled" from the "ranks of the Gestapo," (a) Trotsky's connection with the Gestapo as brought out in the "celebrated Moscow Trials" having "never been disproved"; (b) the Hitler-Stalin pact having "placed in evidence that the services of Trotskyism had ceased to be indispensable for the Gestapo."

(3) Of having placed himself "as is logical" in the "service of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) of the United States."

The article further explains that Trotsky was expelled from the Gestapo because of the "links he had made with Wall Street." Trotsky, the article continues, finding himself expelled from the Gestapo had to seek a new boss. "For Trotskyism this was nothing new, since from 1924 it has been found in the simultaneous service of various spy agencies, such as the British intelligence service."

The article ends with the Stalinist moral: "Today it is completely evident that Trotskyism, in Latin America, is nothing more than an agency of penetration, of confusion, of provocation, and of espionage in the service of the imperialists of Wall Street."

Although it is more than two years since the John Dewey Commission exposed all these ancient and mutually contradictory slanders of the Stalinists along with the entire macabre stage show of the Moscow Trials as nothing but a monstrous frame-up, the agents of the GPU still repeat the old calumnies as if the new chiefs of the GPU were incapable of improving upon the fabrications of the purged Yagoda.

When Trotsky named *Futuro* and its editor Lombardo Toledano as having participated in the moral preparation of the assault and hence of being agents of the GPU, *Futuro* responded with the cry, "Defamation!"

Covering Up the Trail of Blood

No one acquainted in the slightest with the historic struggle of the Left Opposition against the corrupt Stalinist bureaucracy entertained the least doubt that the assault was Stalin's epilogue to the Moscow Trials in which he slaughtered the entire old Bolshevik guard. It was merely a question for the police to determine the identity of the specific GPU agents involved.

In order to shunt the police investigation down a false line, the GPU designed two alibis: (1) that the Communist Party had nothing to do with the assault; (2) that Trotsky had organized the assault himself.

There is every indication that the GPU planned to kill Trotsky, carry away his body, and then maintain either: (a) Trotsky organized the assault and kidnapped himself in order to cover up fleeing to the United States; (b) Almazan or Diego Rivera organized the assault in order to bring about United States intervention in Mexico; (c) all these elements, all enemies of Stalinism from completely different points of view, organized the assault jointly in connection with the Dies Committee. Inasmuch as Trotsky escaped them, they turned this carefully prepared defense of the GPU assassins against Trotsky himself and tried to kill him morally where they had failed physically.

On May 25, the day following the attack, Toledano's paper, *El Popular*, writing cautiously because of its intimate connection with the GPU and the uncertainty yet as to whether the police might uncover the actual assailants, maintained (a) that a full investigation must be made and the guilty ones punished "no matter what their political affiliation"; (b) that it was an "assault against Mexico." The first declaration was made to clear Toledano and cohorts if the assailants were captured; the second declaration was preparation for the charge of "self-assault" if the assailants succeeded in escaping the police. The possibility for a campaign on the latter line was further prepared by the declaration that certain aspects of the case were "unclear and suspicious."

On this same day J. Rodriguez Casas, head of the police detail, informed the woman who did the cooking for the Trotsky household, that in his estimation the attack was a "self-assault." This version was later repeated by this woman to the police. This fact, however, was not made public until almost a month later. Other events since then have cast an increasingly suspicious light upon her role.

It was also on this day or the following, as nearly as can be determined from the confessions of some of the GPU agents, that Harte was murdered in typical GPU Nstyle, a pistol bullet in the base of the brain, another in the temple. The last of the GPU agents with him, according to the confessions, were Luis Arenal, the contributor to *The New Masses*, and his brother, Leopoldo.

Why did the GPU kidnap and kill Harte? They could have tied him up as they did the police. Was it to prevent him from naming the person who tricked him into opening the door? Was it to prevent him from possibly identifying the assailants later in a police line-up?

On May 27, *El Nacional* published a most significant story: "Trotsky Contradicts Himself." This "contradiction" consisted of the fact that one of the daily newspapers

had reported Trotsky and his wife as saving themselves from the assassins by throwing themselves flat on the floor, a second newspaper as saving themselves by huddling in a corner, and a third newspaper had reported that Trotsky and his wife did not always sleep in their bedroom.

By a remarkable coincidence, the mechanics of which the GPU can best explain, this same story appeared word for word that same morning in Lombardo Toledano's paper, *El Popular*. It was clear that the principal assassins, those who could give the leads to the higher-ups who were directly linked with the Kremlin, had succeeded in leaving the country. The GPU now believed it had succeeded in turning the police investigation down a false trail. It is still not clear as to the exact GPU agent who inspired the police in this direction. A good deal of suspicion clings to the lawyer Bassols, former ambassador to France, who is a well-known Stalinist and roundly eulogized in the Stalinist press.

The GPU line of "self-assault" now began to be pressed through all the various channels of the Communist Party. At a mass meeting, a Stalinist orator, one of the leaders of the Party, declared it "self-assault." The attack was likened by the Stalinists to the burning of the Reichstag by the Nazis in 1933. (The Nazis blamed the fire on the Communists, just as the Stalinists now tried to blame the assault on Trotsky—that is the real simile.) The Communist Party issued a statement, declaring the assault to have been organized by the "agents of the Dies Committee" working through the ranks of Almazan's party, that the purpose of the assault was a "provocation" as "part of the program of the oil companies."

Slander the Name of Their Victim

At the same time, in direct contradiction to its accusation of "self-assault," the GPU began a campaign against Robert Harte, charging that he was the "leader" of the assault, that he had "betrayed" his chief, that is, sold out to the GPU.

But Toledano's paper, *El Popular*, on May 25, had reported—from undisclosed sources—that:

"The policeman Arias declared that when the individuals dressed as policemen and soldiers entered the house, they encountered Sheldon, and three of them overpowered the Secretary of Trotsky, tying him, which provoked energetic protests which he formulated in Spanish. In order to silence him, they gagged him too, and threw him into one of the automobiles which they had left standing in the street."

This description of Sheldon's resistance is found in no other report of the assault except the one in *El Popular*. It would indicate that Bob put up a desperate resistance. Toledano, with his first hand sources of information, naturally was capable of giving an accurate account of these details.

Beginning with May 27, however, every conceivable type of vilification was launched against Harte in the Stalinist papers. It was said that he had a photograph of Stalin in his room at home warmly autographed by Stalin himself (a GPU slander which not even a telegram to the contrary from his father could dispel); in actuality he was not an American but a Russian who had just got off a boat from Russia a week or two before coming to Mexico; the references with which he landed a job with Trotsky were so

fabulously good that Trotsky had not even checked them; his baggage was still plastered with Moscow labels; he was a typical gangster type; during the assault he ran about the patio in his pyjamas; he had been paid a fabulous sum for the betrayal; it was impossible to steal Trotsky's automobiles without Harte's connivance as he had control of the ignition keys (in reality they were always kept in the cars for emergency use); he did not come as an agent of the assassins but was bought by them in Mexico; he came as an agent but was won over by Trotsky and so only carried out a partial treachery; he acted as a driver of one of the automobiles which carried away the assassins; he was very nervous when he left with the assailants; he was very calm when he left with the assailants and spoke familiarly with one of them known as "Felipe"; he was completely in Trotsky's confidence and led the "self-assault"; he was snug and safe in his father's home in New York.

These slanders were the moral lime with which the GPU hoped to obliterate all the trails leading to the body decomposing in the mountain cabin.

For several days, as a matter of fact, the Stalinists succeeded in disorienting the police hunt. Two of Trotsky's secretaries were held for two days in jail for "questioning." Two friends of the Trotsky household, one a refugee from Germany, were held for four days in Guadalupe prison. The chauffeur of Diego Rivera was arrested. The house of Frida Kahlo, former wife of the painter, was searched. Seemingly the GPU was forging ahead with its campaign of moral assassination.

The Turn in the Investigation

On May 31, Trotsky issued a statement to the press, declaring categorically that the police hunt had taken the wrong lead. He described the methods of the GPU and named Lombardo Toledano and David Alfaro Siqueiros as being able to "cast light on the preparation of the attempt." In government circles it was reported that President Cardenas himself gave a sharp turn to the police investigation, a turn which brought phenomenal success in uncovering the criminals.

The Communist Party denounced Trotsky's declaration as an "insult to the police." Who was Trotsky to tell them where to look for the criminals? On June 1, Luis Lombardo Toledano, younger brother of the "transcendental" orator, sent a declaration to the press written impressively by hand in green ink: "For Trotsky the police of Mexico are a stupid police. They don't merit any respect. Mexicans think otherwise."

Apparently the GPU considered the blows of Toledano the younger insufficient to counteract the impression Trotsky's article had made. The Stalinist hacks went to work. They labelled the assault "an international black-mail." They protested the arrest of some of the members of their party. They called for Trotsky's expulsion from Mexico. They asserted that the assault was staged solely to contradict President Cardenas' declaration that there was no Fifth Column in Mexico. They dragged in Almazan, the war-mongers, the oil companies, imperialism, hatred of the Soviet Union. They even thought up something bright and scintillating: Trotsky is "an instrument in the Yankee war of nerves against Mexico."

Harry Block, intimate among the highest Stalinist circles of Mexico, editor of a mimeographed news clip-sheet distributed free of charge in the United States by the Stalinist "Workers' University," and the man considered to be the liaison agent between Lombardo Toledano and the old GPU careerist, Oumansky, now Soviet ambassador to the United States, wrote an article casting doubt on the reality of the assault. The *Nation* in the United States, with its usual deference for Stalin's requirements in periods of emergency, gave prominent place to this GPU report from Mexico.

The Communist Party protested with excessive volubility the arrest of two of its prominent members, David Serrano and Luis Mateos Martinez, declaring on June 7 that the police had affected these arrests "after Trotsky made subversive, anti-Mexican, and extremely dangerous declarations." Their wordy protest added: "Our party considers itself outside of all suspicion, since it is a revolutionary party which supports the government of General Cardenas." The Stalinists later amplified this profound argument by declaring that obviously they were not guilty, "since the Marxist movement does not believe in terrorism."

The question, however, was not whether the Stalinist organization is Marxist, but simply: Did the GPU organize the assault?

La Voz de Mexico, Communist party weekly, on June 9 came out with a double headline and a three column story: "THROW TROTSKY AND HIS BAND OUT OF MEXICO!" The article considered it "improper that a chief of police should permit a Trotsky to tell the police what they must do to discover the authors of the 'attempt'."

The reason for this concern over the "propriety" of the police seeking information from Trotsky as to who had machine-gunned his bedroom soon became apparent.

The Mexican Police Solve the Case

The police department of Mexico City on June 18 announced that it had solved the case. Twenty-seven members of the Communist Party were under arrest. Among them, a number had made complete confession as to their participation. David Alfaro Siqueiros, the man who was an "honor to Mexico" according to Lombardo Toledano's *Futuro*, was named as the actual leader of the assault. Above him were individuals from whom he took orders whose names were unknown to the staff members of the GPU caught in the police net. Haikys, formerly in the Soviet legation in Mexico and Soviet ambassador to Spain following the purge of Rosenberg in the civil war, was suspected to be one of these higher-ups. Carlos Contreras, GPU assassin in Spain, appears in the same category. Siqueiros, the Arenal brothers, Antonio Pujol, all members of the Communist Party, had fled Mexico.

The Stalinist press announced the arrests without mentioning the political affiliation of the prisoners, except indirectly in the case of Siqueiros, formerly the "honor of Mexico" but now "mad," "undisciplined" and a "pedant." The false mustache and dark glasses were undoubtedly the "pedantic" touch to his use of machine guns and bombs. It is not clear why they called him "undisciplined."

From day to day further confessions were obtained, es-

pecially from Nestor Sanchez Hernandez, one of the contributors to Toledano's *Futuro*, implicating more members of the Communist Party. Leads from the confessions brought the arrest of the chauffeurs who had driven the automobiles. Some of the police uniforms had been found in the possession of Communist Party members and a pistol which had been stolen from the police guard as they lay bound on the floor of their sentry house.

Lombardo's *El Popular* now attempted a desperate switch in line to clear itself of complicity in the assault, issuing a statement, "reaffirming our attitude in the Trotsky case," that is, the declaration of May 25 in which they demanded an "investigation" and punishment of the "authors no matter what their political affiliation."

The Communist Party, completely bared in its true hideousness to the light of day, lacking any shred of respectability with which to cover itself, was capable only of blinking its eyes in the glare of the most unfavorable publicity it had suffered since the exposure of the GPU assassination of Ignace Reiss in Switzerland. It issued a declaration in the June 23 issue of *La Voz de Mexico* that is almost a chemically pure refutation of itself and a proof which could not be improved upon of the involvement of its staff in the assault. Note the attempt to hang their case on Bob Harte, whose body they had covered with quicklime:

"The work of a gigantic and refined provocation against the Communist Party of Mexico and the workers' movement has been exposed to the public light. . . . Numerous persons appear directly or indirectly implicated (!) among them David Alfaro Siqueiros, named as the leader of the attack. The responsibility of one of the intimates of Leon Trotsky himself, his secretary Sheldon Harte, has been made clear. . . . None of the participants are members of the party (?); all are uncontrollable (!!) elements and agents provocateurs. . . . Public opinion has been surprised by the fact that despite the manifestation of the force of the assailants and the facilities and complicities—such as that of Sheldon—on which they counted, neither Trotsky nor his assistants nor his domestics suffered any harm. This reinforces the affirmation made by us since the beginning, in the sense that the provocation, planned with such refinement as even to have as instruments 'communists' of straw, [With enough bone and gristle to handle a machine gun, however—J.H.] was directed in order to provide a legal base for the attack against and repression of the Communist Party and other revolutionary forces of the country. The espionage services of the warring countries and the Trotskyist organizations which work in Mexico—all these filled with spies and provocateurs as is proved in this self-same case of Sheldon who, while the majority of the implicated have fallen into the hands of the police, has eluded them—[The GPU considered the lime had worked long enough to make this a safe affirmation; also note the word "majority." This word is thrown in deliberately to cover the most important GPU agents still at large.—J.H.] could surely say much about who are the real organizers of the attack on Leon Trotsky. . . . We insist once more that it would be healthy for the country that Leon Trotsky, who

has given pretext for a monstrous provocation against the Communist Party and against Mexico itself, should leave Mexico."

Stalin, as is well known, has long considered the deliverance of Trotsky into his hands an alternative far preferable to the uncertainty of machine-gunning his bedroom.

The Body of Robert Harte

The insistence of the Communist Party on the complicity of Harte was the clearest evidence of his loyalty to the Fourth International. Early in the morning of June 25, this loyalty was confirmed in the grimmest and most tragic way by the identification of his body which the police had discovered in following up the clues provided by one of the Stalinist prisoners.

The GPU was now completely unmasked, not only as the organizer of the assault but as the murderer of Robert Sheldon Harte.

Since the discovery of Harte's body, however, the Stalinist press has not lessened its campaign against Leon Trotsky one whit. On the contrary it has sought to extend the campaign into the Mexican courts. Toledano's papers *El Popular* and *Futuro* have filed suit for "defamation" and *La Voz de Mexico* has announced that it will do likewise. Every issue of *La Voz* continues to demand the expulsion of Trotsky from Mexico and now includes in this demand his secretaries, who it declares are the "executive body" of the Fourth International. A lawyer, Pavon Flores, member of the Central Committee of the Mexican Communist Party, has been assigned to represent the prisoners Serrano and Martinez. In six hours' questioning of Trotsky before Judge Trujillo in charge of the case, Flores attempted to revive the theory of "self-assault" and to insinuate that Harte had talked with Trotsky about the assault the afternoon before it occurred.

When Trotsky answered Flores, he answered this whole maneuver of the GPU: "These questions seem directed toward resurrecting the corpse of the theory of 'self-assault.' It would be better to resurrect the corpse of my friend Robert Sheldon Harte."

Preparation for a Second Attempt

The continued clamor in the Stalinist press is nothing more nor less than the preparation for a second, still better prepared assault by the GPU. Such a second attempt on Trotsky is absolutely certain. Stalin having suffered all the moral and political damage of guilt in the first attempt must now show at least that he is powerful enough to carry out his will. Where he spent at least \$10,000 for the technical

preparation of the first attempt, he will now spend incomparably more. Trotsky's life is in mortal danger.

The GPU a By-Product of World Reaction

In the Stalinist press the three letters "GPU" appear so rarely that it would seem the hacks of the Third International scarcely dare admit to themselves the existence of this dread modern Inquisition. Among the workers of the world there is great reluctance to believe that on the body of the workers' state an organization so horrible as the GPU could have fastened itself. This has lent the GPU outside of the Soviet Union a certain protective coloration of unreality.

But a glance at the still fresh scars on the walls of Trotsky's house where the machine gun slugs struck is enough to convince anyone of the brutal reality of Stalin's terrorist organization. A few minutes reading of the Stalinist press will further convince one that the GPU is very real indeed despite the absence of its name in print.

The GPU is a by-product of world reaction in the period of war and fevered convulsions as society approaches the era of socialism. In the last analysis the GPU is a foul discharge from the decaying body of capitalism where it rests upon the Soviet Union. It directs its terror against the Fourth International in the first line because it is thoroughly aware that the Fourth International is the only force capable of giving the world working class a program that will lead to a successful socialist revolution. The destruction of capitalism will bring with it the destruction of the GPU and the end of Stalin's rule in the Soviet Union. Like the other Inquisition, the GPU will become no more than a memory of that savage pre-historic past before the economic structure received rational organization.

In the great task of building that future society Robert Harte fell as a loyal soldier in the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat. He was not the first of Trotsky's secretaries to become a victim of the GPU. He was the eighth. Before him the following heroes of the working class died: M. Glasman, G. Butow, Y. Blumkin, N. Sermuks, I. Poznansky, R. Klement, E. Wolf. But Bob was the first of the American section of the Fourth International to be struck down by GPU bullets. On one of the new fortified towers which have been constructed in preparation for the next assault by Stalin's GPU, a plaque has been placed:

In Memory
of
ROBERT SHELDON HARTE
1915-1940
Murdered by Stalin

Roosevelt After the Battle of France

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

ROOSEVELT'S SPEECH on June 10th at Charlottesville marked a step forward in the involvement of the United States in the Second World War. On the day Italy became a full-fledged participant in the armed combat, by his pledge of material aid to the Anglo-French allies, the

president publicly adopted the "non-neutral but non-belligerent status" just discarded by Il Duce.

Let us note, in passing, the disregard for democratic procedure with which so momentous an action was taken. The President did not consult Congress or the people to

ascertain their will. He did not even bother to consult his own cabinet (the non-interventionist Woodring was still in it). Once he and his State Department junta, Hull, Welles, etc., decided to throw the nation's resources into the war, Roosevelt simply communicated this news to the country and to the world as an accomplished fact. Congress, the supposed representative of the people, accepted the announcement with no more than a little theatrical growling from the isolationist doghouse. The forms and institutions of the democratic process remain, but the real power is wielded by the Chief Executive who flouts them at his pleasure. So very incompatible is bourgeois democracy with personal dictatorship!

The determination of the Administration to press forward the struggle against Hitler by all means short of direct armed warfare was shown by such actions as the proposed sale of fifty torpedo boats to England, the multi-millioned arms budgets, the drive for universal conscription, and the appointment of the Republicans, Knox and Stimson, to the military posts in the cabinet. Roosevelt's command: "Full speed ahead" signified "full speed ahead—toward war."

Hitler Upsets Roosevelt

"The best-laid plans of mice and men gang aft agley." Roosevelt had evidently expected to use England and France as advance guards in the struggle against German expansion, just as England had calculated on using the ring of states surrounding the Reich. While its continental partners bore the brunt of the war, England counted on arming itself and exhausting its antagonist in a prolonged conflict.

But they reckoned without the might of the German military machine in both cases. The swift successes of Hitler's legions, the surrender of Holland and Belgium, the knock-out blow to France, and the prospective invasion of Great Britain hit Washington with the impact of so many time-bombs, smashing all its previous calculations.

The American imperialists were caught off guard by the speed of Hitler's advance, the sudden revelation of his military prowess, the weakness of his opponents and the sweep of his dominion. The entry of Italy into the war coupled with Hitler's subjugation of Europe sharply altered the international relationship of forces to the disadvantage of the United States. The old balance of world power was upset and a new order was in the process of formation. Every government from Moscow to Madrid and from Tokyo to Buenos Aires was compelled to reconsider its policies in the light of this new stage in the development of the war.

Not last among them was Washington. The American imperialists were placed in the same predicament as the British and French after Munich. Hitler forced Roosevelt to pause and reconsider his course, to alter his plans, and to improvise new tactics. The German victories made the task of crushing Hitler a thousand times more urgent and more difficult. The executive directors of America's ruling class were called upon to devise drastic measures for meeting this terrible threat to their international interests.

Problems of American Imperialism

After the collapse of France, American imperialism faced the prospect of fighting victorious Germany and its satellites single-handed. In any case, it would have to concentrate the leadership of the struggle in its hands. But the fact remained that the United States was in a weak position to launch a world-wide offensive against so formidable a foe.

The United States was unprepared to wage the war from the military standpoint. Its armed forces were inadequate and unequipped for the job they would have to fulfill. Even if the military machine were far more perfected and powerful, the strategic problem of finding a suitable base of military operations against the German coalition had to be solved. With Germany in possession of the European mainland, how and where could American expeditionary forces attack with any fair prospect of success?

The Far East added further complications. Japanese expansion had been held within bounds by the diplomatic and naval collaboration between the United States and the Anglo-French partners. Now this division of labor was being brought to an end. The American fleet by itself was not yet ready to dominate both the Atlantic and the Pacific. Would not an adjustment have to be made with Japan regarding its conquests and claims to mastery in the Far East?

The South American states provided the same headaches for American diplomacy as the Balkans for England. How could the dollar diplomats ward off the economic, political and military encroachments of its enemies and weld the diverse Latin countries into a single unit under Uncle Sam's hegemony? This tremendously difficult problem had to be solved in a hurry and far more effectively than England had done in respect to the Balkans.

Internally the United States was little better prepared. Every division of the armed forces had to be raised to unprecedented and unbeatable dimensions. Every department of domestic life had to be reorganized for total war. Industry had to be geared to produce for the military machine. Labor had to be regimented and taught to subordinate and suppress its demands for the sake of "national defense." All dissenting opinion had to be placed under suspicion as treasonable.

Time was required for these external and internal tasks. American imperialism preferred to wait a while—if it could—before plunging into the inevitable struggle for the re-division of the world.

Election-Year Conventions

Such was the general outlook for American imperialism at the beginning of summer when the two major capitalist parties convened to choose their presidential candidates. The war dominated the deliberations of both conventions as it did all other phases of national activity. The Republican platform makers included a mild statement against involving the United States in European or Asiatic wars as a concession to Republican isolationists and as a bid for the anti-war vote. But their real mind was manifested when they struck out of the platform a declaration that "the blood of American youth" would never be shed on foreign soil.

The isolationist sentiments expressed in the platform were immediately cancelled by the nomination of Wendell Willkie who, according to the authoritative *N. Y. Times*, "is in fundamental agreement with Mr. Roosevelt's policies regarding the great issues of the war." Not since the Democrats nominated Morgan's attorney, John W. Davis, in 1924, has any capitalist party had a candidate so closely identified with Big Business as this utilities magnate. Just as Wall Street chose Willkie to head the great Commonwealth and Southern combine when it was in difficulties in 1932, so now in 1940 the same interests have chosen him to be their representative in the White House.

A docile Democratic party nominated Roosevelt for a third term and likewise went through the motions of making concessions to isolationism while demanding unlimited armament.

Whichever candidate is elected, American imperialism is assured of a trustworthy executive of its aims and interests. Both parties are ready, as usual, to do the bidding of Big Business. There could be no serious differences between them on the fundamental questions of foreign policy. Wall Street prefers Willkie to Roosevelt only because its domestic policies would be safer under Willkie's direction.

Transitional Differences Within the Ruling Class

The differences at the moment in ruling circles over questions of foreign policy are not fundamental, but concerned with certain secondary issues connected with the present problems facing American imperialism. These disputes over questions of tactics have, not a partisan, but an intra-class character. The differences of opinion exist in both parties, reflecting the conflicting considerations within the mind of the ruling class as it tries to determine the *next* steps in relation to the inter-imperialist war.

The disputes in the ranks of the American bourgeoisie engendered by Hitler's advance are reminiscent of the divisions of opinion in England and France in the interval between the Munich settlement and the outbreak of the war. They are episodic disagreements revolving around the problem of how best to deal with the German menace.

The uncompromising pro-war party has unquestionably been consolidated and strengthened as a result of recent events. Roosevelt is the acknowledged leader of the "Stop Hitler Now" movement. In every way he has utilized his official position and powers to enforce the program of this most advanced and aggressive wing of American imperialism. His bold and even reckless words and deeds have helped Roosevelt to muster not only his own party behind his leadership but also a significant section of Republicans in the person of such figures as Knox and Stimson.

The unofficial organization of this tendency has been undertaken by William Allen White's "American Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies," which was launched with the President's blessing, privately promoted by Wall Street financiers, and we may assume, the British propaganda service. Some individuals in this group have demanded an immediate declaration of war against Germany; others are typified by Stimson, who, shortly before his appointment as Secretary of War, proposed that Amer-

ican battleships convoy American shipments of war supplies to England. One queer expression of this tendency is the "Union Now" movement, which proposes to merge the U.S.A. and "the Six British Democracies" (Ireland included) into one Federal Union "before it is too late." Of course, the United States is to have the majority of votes in this English-speaking union. The defect of the League of Nations in this regard has been remedied!

The isolationist camp consists of all those who are, for the time being, opposed to the full program of the interventionists for various reasons of expediency, military, political, financial, etc. Leading isolationists base their position upon grounds of military unpreparedness. Their most articulate spokesman is General Hugh Johnson who keeps shouting: "For God's sake, let's stay out of this war for two or three years—at least, until we're ready to go in!"

Others within this group wish to defer decisive action until certain diplomatic realignments are consummated. Prominent among these are the editors of the *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York News*, who have suggested concluding a deal with Japan for the purpose of presenting a stronger front against Germany.

At the right wing of this tendency stand the American Chamberlains and Lavalists who dream of effecting a compromise with Hitler and sharing the world markets together with him. In his speech to the Republican convention warning that, instead of insulting the dictators, we must be prepared to live together with them, Herbert Hoover outlined the ideas of the appeasers, who speak for the most conservative elements among America's Sixty Families.

Senator Wheeler's abject capitulation to Roosevelt in Chicago shows how small are the differences between the interventionists and the main body of "isolationists."

All these factions of the American bourgeoisie and their representatives from Roosevelt to Hoover are animated by the same aim of safeguarding the positions of American imperialism. They disagree concerning the ways and means of doing so. These episodic differences can easily vanish overnight with a change in the world situation. So unstable and shifting are the positions of individuals in both camps that radio forum program directors have complained that they can no longer tell from day to day to which one any particular person belongs.

The War Deal Develops

The Roosevelt administration has yet to recover from the state of alarm bordering on panic caused by Hitler's onset. It is still in the process of laying out its new course. The strategical goal remains unchanged: to mobilize all available forces for the showdown with German imperialism. But a fresh set of tactics must be worked out to accomplish that end. The domain of foreign relations is full of question-marks which will demand positive answers in the near future.

The current confusion concerning foreign policy in Washington is reflected in the recent actions in respect to South America. The repeated warnings to Germany and Italy to respect the Monroe Doctrine and not to poach on the United States preserves, the hasty dispatch of two warships to Uruguay upon the report of a Nazi putsch, the

proposed scheme for cartelizing the national economies of the Western hemisphere under Uncle Sam's financial control, the convoking of a twenty-one nation conference at Havana which promises to be fruitless as its predecessor at Peru—all these moves betray an experimental and provisional character.

The fact is that the United States can no longer continue the conciliatory methods of the Good Neighbor policy toward South America. In its next phase American imperialism will have to treat the South American countries as brutally as Hitler has treated the countries of Europe. Recalcitrant governments will be whipped into line by armed force. There will be no room for independence or neutrality on the part of the South American nationalities. To date, however, the United States only stands upon the threshold of this policy; it still hesitates to put it into effect.

The net result of the new situation has been to defer the date of military intervention and to accelerate activities in all other directions. One military bill after another, requests for billions upon billions have been presented to Congress and passed overnight. The national industry is being transformed into a military workshop. Every word and deed in daily life, from applications for relief to the province of the arts and belles-lettres, is scrutinized and appraised by the official and unofficial patriots from the single standpoint of "national defense."

Despite the vast scope of his preparations for war, the delay imposed upon Roosevelt enabled him to adapt himself momentarily to the isolationist wing of his own party, at least until his nomination was secured, and to maintain his pose as defender of the peace. On the opening day of the Democratic Convention Anne O'Hare McCormick pointed out in the *N. Y. Times* some causes for Roosevelt's "pacifism."

"In the interval between Philadelphia and Chicago, there are signs that the Administration has receded from the attitude Mr. Roosevelt took in his Charlottesville speech. This is partly due to the French collapse, or perhaps to the realization, pressed home by Premier Paul Reynaud's last frantic appeal for American help, that we are not able to back up fighting words with commensurate deeds. Up to that time we had been using words as threats, hoping to help the democracies and deter the dictators by speaking out; but when France fell, it finally became clear that broad-

casts are not enough to stop bombers. Or it may be that the President retreated from his advanced position because of the imminence of the convention."

Roosevelt's tactical retreat is temporary and will be succeeded by a new step toward war with a new turn in the world situation or as soon as the military might of the United States is brought to the proper level. In any case, the era of "fighting words" is giving way to the era of "fighting deeds." The War Deal is entering upon its penultimate phase.

Workers Must Also Reorient Themselves

The new stage in the development of the war, which has led the government at Washington to revise its outlook, likewise dictates a change of tactics on the part of the American working class and especially its revolutionary section. The central fact in the new situation is the rapid militarization of the United States. This movement, arising from the deepest necessities of American imperialism, cannot under present conditions be arrested or reversed. The old days of relatively peaceful struggle are vanishing daily and with it the practices of bourgeois democracy. This warring world can no longer tolerate either democracy or pacifism. Henceforward all the peoples must be regimented in totalitarian fashion for the imperialist struggle and all questions must be settled by armed force.

These facts have already been recognized by the rulers at Washington and guide their policies today. It is equally imperative for the advanced workers to understand these facts and to recast their tactics in accordance with them. American imperialism is mobilizing its resources and training its forces to accomplish the overthrow of its imperialist rivals and to conquer the world for itself. It has irrevocably staked its survival upon the power of its arms, though it is not yet ready to put them to the test.

The workers who are the victims of bourgeois militarism must learn to militarize themselves in order to realize their own class aims: the conquest of the world for Socialism. Universal military training we shall have in the United States in any event. To the proposals of the bourgeoisie we cannot answer with pacifist and isolationist arguments; those are finished since May 10. We can answer only by developing a program of universal military training under workers' control.

Labor and the Elections

By FARRELL DOBBS

HISTORY is made daily now, if not hourly. Yesterday great battles were fought for a few miles of territory; today a battle is for the conquest of entire countries. Great military powers are reduced in a few days to the role of a pawn. Political regimes beat their breasts in defiance one day only to collapse the next. The rotten structure of capitalistic society stands completely exposed before the eyes of the world working class. And with it the political quackery of the misleaders in the ranks of labor. The "middle way" has gone with the German conquests of Denmark

and Norway. The fatal policy of working class support to "democratic" capitalism has brought the French workers new legions of dead and a totalitarian regime.

In the midst of these events the workers of the United States prepare to vote for a president to hold office during the next four years—four years which are pregnant with such events as would surpass the happenings of 400 earlier years. But the political policies of the officialdom of the trade union movement remain unchanged. They have learned nothing.

The AFL has proclaimed neutrality in the election campaign; it takes no official position. The individual officers are free to back whomever they choose. Hillman, Murray, Kennedy, Thomas, and others of the CIO have declared for "friend" Roosevelt, as have the bulk of the AFL leaders. Dubinsky is in the Roosevelt camp but no longer in the CIO. A few "rebels" are for "friend" Willkie. John L. Lewis has attacked Roosevelt, defended Hoover, told the Republicans how they could be a "party of the people" and ballyhooed for Wheeler, representative of the copper trust, proposing him as a Democratic candidate and material for a third party leader. Both the AFL and the CIO have solemnly presented proposals for the Republican and Democratic platforms.

The very mention of the idea of an independent labor party frightens the wits out of these pro-Roosevelt Paul Reveres who are dashing madly up and down the countryside, shouting "The Republicans are coming." John L. Lewis has not as yet indicated whom he will support, nor has he evidenced any thought of independent working class political action (his white hope, Wheeler, went back to Roosevelt at Chicago). Where there is not outright hostility to the proposal to form a labor party, there is widespread inertia on the question. It is sometimes argued that the trade unions have gotten along without a labor party in the past so there can be no practical reasons for getting heated up about it now. But the problem is not as simple as that. It is necessary to examine the conditions of the past and the problems of the present before making a decision.

Why No Labor Party Before

Samuel Gompers carved the first unit of the AFL out of the most highly skilled trades. Its growth thereafter was confined, in the main, to these narrow and select fields. The later inclusion of the miners and the needle trades workers as unions embracing almost all workers in a mass production industry were exceptions to the rule. The AFL has never at any time represented more than a small fraction of the industrial workers. There has always existed as the backbone of the AFL a skilled group of workers capable of commanding above-average wages and most generally able to control the labor market in their trade.

The AFL, jealous of its privileged position, has always been quick to resist fiercely any attempt at additional organization by a non-AFL union. This gave the employers an excellent stop-gap against broad mass organization. They could make concessions to this small minority and compensate for the outlay at the expense of the great majority which thus remained unorganized. The final struggle of the Knights of Labor, the activities of the Anarchists, the rise of the I.W.W., all helped to give the bosses an extra push toward cooperation with the AFL.

American capitalism was able until recently to afford certain concessions to the trade unions without seriously impairing its profits. It was then motivated both by the necessity of self protection and the ability to make small concessions. Then, as now, the politicians of the Democratic and Republican parties voted and acted according to the dictates of the corporations and the banks. It is not difficult to understand how, under these conditions, Gompers was able to outlaw independent working class political action

and establish the theory that the trade unions have "friends" among the politicians of the employer-controlled political parties.

Capitalism still is and will continue to be motivated by the necessity of protection against the organized workers. But the AFL can no longer play its former role. It has been partially transformed in itself. And alongside it stands the CIO, just as powerful, if not more powerful, than the AFL. Further, capitalism finds itself less and less capable of making concessions even to skilled minorities. Those trade union leaders who continue to adhere to the Gompers political policy do so because "that's the way Grandpaw did it." They do not have a policy based on present day conditions. The majority of the officialdom, both AFL and CIO, falls in this category. They repeat the original sin of subordinating the workers to the political leadership of the bosses without having even the slender pretext of the originators of this policy.

What Has Happened Since 1929

A periodic capitalist crisis struck like a thunderbolt in 1929. The business index started on a dizzy descent which took three and a half years to hit bottom. Roosevelt came into office and undertook the job of patching up the cripple. He was forced by the severity of the crisis to make certain concessions to labor. The trade union officialdom hailed him as a Moses come to lead them out of the wilderness. But the workers reacted by flocking into the unions and pressing for direct action against the employers. This pressure from the mass production workers soon broke through the shell of the aristocratic AFL and the industrial unions of the CIO were formed.

Militantly pushing the fight against the corporations, the CIO workers rolled up impressive victories. The CIO enjoyed a phenomenal growth. Capitalism was forced to make concessions, one after another. But the CIO campaign was less than a year old when the business index again hit the skids, dropping back as far in nine months as it had in two and a half years during the previous decline. The four and a half years of "Roosevelt prosperity," based mainly on a movement of light industry, could no longer sustain itself.

The CIO leadership was frightened by the militancy of the rank and file. The workers had already been led—in "Little Steel"—into a severe defeat in an attempt by the leaders to substitute dependence on "friendly" politicians for trade union action in a strike. The leadership welcomed the new crisis as an opportunity for them to move openly to curb strikes.

The mass production workers brought problems into the CIO which demanded action on the political front. The direct fight against the bosses, necessary as it was, could not alone provide an adequate solution. Sentiment grew for independent working class political action. Labor's Non-Partisan League was formed by the CIO. It was not permitted, however, to be anything more than a streamlined method of applying the old AFL political policies.

These latest convulsions of capitalism have created the industrial unions. The AFL has also grown. The combined membership of the trade unions is today more than twice any previous figures. Capitalism finds its contradictions

permanently sharpened. Yet the leaders of this new union movement are capable of nothing better than to continue to look to the capitalists for political leadership. They cannot visualize the working class doing its own political thinking.

Now Labor Faces the War

The present perspective of capitalist strategy is not based on a movement of the light industries; it is based on preparations for war. No matter whether a Roosevelt, a Willkie or any other capitalist politician is in the White House, this will be the program. They all have one plan for the workers—regimentation in industry and combat service in the military machine. The plan is of course sugar-coated so that the gullible among the trade union leaders will swallow it the quicker. Many of these leaders even seize upon the “defense program” as an alibi for a welcome escape from direct struggle against the bosses.

The industrial unions, just as the craft unions, have been unable to solve all the workers’ problems. The need for political action grows sharper. It is true that the business index has been hesitatingly working its way upward, especially since the war started. This has momentarily made the problem of workers’ political action less acute. But this is only momentary. American capitalism is strong, but its contradictions are stronger.

The trade unions are receding more and more into purely defensive activity. Under these circumstances they will lose members and become weaker. The treasuries will grow slimmer. The tasks will be bigger, but the means smaller. The leadership will become even more disoriented; the rank and file more dissatisfied. The situation will be worse for the CIO than for the AFL. The AFL will be more capable of resistance because of its aristocratic base. It will have less opposition than the CIO which, with its broad base among the mass production workers, will meet head-on resistance from the corporations. A much more energetic policy is possible in the direct struggle against the employers, but even with the most militant leadership, trade union action alone is not adequate.

As the trade unions become more and more aware of their inability to cope with all the problems of the workers, they are pushed toward the road of political action which is a generalization of economic action. Political action generalizes the needs of the workers and directs the struggle not against individual bosses or groups of bosses, but against the employers as a whole through their apparatus of

state. Despite all the official opposition and inertia on the question, the objective necessity for a working class political party is present. The political channel must be developed if the class struggle is not to be crushed.

Why We Want A Labor Party

The Socialist Workers Party presents the program for the fundamental solution of the problems of the working class. It welcomes all workers into its ranks. But it must be stated frankly that the numerical growth of the Socialist Workers Party has not kept abreast of the radicalization of the broad mass of the workers. It does not as yet have sufficient authority in the general labor movement to attract a mass following. This is not unnatural. The program of the S.W.P. is based on a careful analysis of the capitalist system, the international experience of the working class under capitalism, the role of the class in bringing about a socialist society. It is a party of advanced political thought. Many of the trade union militants have found their way into our ranks. The great mass of the workers, however, are learning mainly by actual experience. They have passed through the first stage of their training in the trade unions. It is now necessary for them to enter actively into the political arena.

At present the best medium for this political education is an independent labor party based on the trade unions—a working class political party which will present its own candidates from its own ranks for election. This political channel will enable the workers to generalize their needs and mobilize powerful forces for the struggle to obtain concessions from the bosses. These demands will also treat with the needs of the unemployed and the deep layers of highly oppressed workers who remain unorganized. They will lend their weight to the fight. Small farmers, merchants, professional people and other middle class elements will follow the leadership of the workers in such a political fight against the banks and the corporations.

It must be remembered that a trade union which places reliance upon the political agents of the employer is building a structure on quicksand. A policy of independent working class political action is necessary at all times. We repeat: an independent labor party is not the fundamental solution of the problems of the working class. If its creation is delayed too long it might be an unnecessary, even a backward, step. However, at the present time, the formation of a labor party based on the trade unions is a progressive step. The Socialist Workers Party will help to create it.

‘National Defense’ Hits Labor

By CARL O’SHEA

IF THE GALLUP POLL has not already become one of the propaganda techniques of the federal government, it reveals a great paradox in the sentiments and present stage of political understanding of the masses. This poll has recently announced that 93 percent of the American people are opposed to sending the army and navy abroad to fight. During the ten months since the European war began, only one percent of the people have shifted their anti-war stand.

But other recent polls by the Gallup organization indicate that a majority of the people (though not such decisive majorities as oppose fighting capitalism’s wars) approve the President’s national defense program.

Assuming that the poll itself is not being used as a device to sway public opinion, there is revealed here a popular misunderstanding of the true nature of “national defense.”

National defense, for an imperialist nation, has never

been anything but a slogan to prepare for war, to justify war, and to attack the workers and living standards of the masses at home.

It is always in the name of national defense and peace that the imperialists of all countries hurl their armies into the field. The war machines are always designated as instruments of national defense. No imperialist nation ever admitted that it started a war (note the conflicting claims of Germany and England in the present war). So the military forces are always called "defense" forces, even when they are used in efforts to conquer and enslave peoples thousands of miles from the home country.

The many trade unionists who today endorse the national defense program would pause if they but realized that to approve national defense is to approve the war for which the machinery of national defense will be used.

These unionists will soon see that the national defense program backed by Roosevelt and Willkie is being used as an excuse to direct all sorts of repressive measures against organized labor—such as the use of the Federal Bureau of Investigation against unions and strikers, the sending of union militants to penitentiaries, the denial of relief to courageous unemployed, the breaking and the outlawry of strikes, big slashes in wages, the lengthening of hours.

Unfortunately great numbers of workers still do not think of national defense in this light. When the worker or the farmer or the small person in the cities speaks about national defense, he is thinking about defense of his wife and children and relatives and friends, defense of his home, defense of his neighborhood and the corner store where he is accustomed to meet with his friends, defense of the fishing stream and the duck pass he frequents—defense of these things from invasion, bombs, parachutists and poisonous gas from some enemy, more or less vague.

The War Drive Against Labor

But when the capitalist and his general staff, his press, his ministers and educators, his newsreel and radio commentators, speak of national defense, they mean throwing huge subsidies to heavy industries, they mean installing the big bankers and industrialists at all the important switches and controls in Washington, they mean the seizure of colonies and markets abroad—and they mean diverting funds from the unemployed to war, they mean the opportunity to stage frame-ups like the Mooney-Billings affair at the Preparedness Parade in San Francisco in 1916, they mean using the War Department to train and equip "Home Guards" for use against the unions. They mean dealing smashing blows at labor, of the type that labor would not tolerate in peacetime.

A revelation as to what organized labor faces in the coming period is the opposition to the recent strike of the CIO Shipbuilding Workers Union against the Federal Shipbuilding Company (a subsidiary of Stettinius' U.S. Steel) at Kearny, New Jersey. No sooner had the 6,000 workers struck for a 10c hourly wage increase and a week's vacation with pay, than Washington swooped down to drive the workers back into the yards with their demands unmet.

Roosevelt led off with the statement he expected cooperation between labor and capital to avoid strikes. The Labor Department rushed a conciliator to Kearny to lure the men

off the picket line. The FBI mobilized and descended on the strike. The Secretary of the Navy cried, "We cannot afford to have trouble of this sort in these times." Representative Hoffman introduced a bill in Congress to outlaw all strikes on "defense projects." (Almost any job is a "defense project" in these times.) Hoffman proposed to throw any striker in jail for six months and fine him \$1,000. Representative Barden judged, "This is no time for any union to grab off 10 c an hour wage increases." Representative Cox of Georgia branded the strike "treason." And the strikers, own CIO leaders, together with top CIO officials, demanded the strikers go back to work empty-handed. Sidney Hillman had put through his first job as labor's representative on the national defense commission.

If the Kearny strike was not a perfect test case, it is only because the union militants were not well enough organized to put the ranks on guard against the government and the CIO leadership, and to fight for the men's demands, defense program or no defense program. Then we should have seen just how far Roosevelt has moved from the days he was denouncing the "economic royalists."

When the Kearny settlement was finally negotiated late in June, it didn't contain the 10c hourly wage increase demanded—nor the one week vacations after one year, nor the closed shop, needless to say. Workers who have let themselves be talked off the picket line before a settlement don't have much strength in the negotiations.

Now all navy shipyards have scrapped the 40-hour week and ordered the 48-hour week basis and the army plants have done the same. Today the workers receive time and one-half for Saturday work. Soon they will be told to work straight time, and the heads of the AFL and CIO will urge them to accept. Then the week will be lengthened to 54, to 60, to 70 hours, to a seven-day week. Commodity prices and commodity taxes will continue to rise. That is what happened in France and England.

What Happened to Six Strikes

The same pressure applied to the Kearny strikers has been directed against every other important union dispute since then: the Railway Express strike, the Cloakmakers "stoppage," the Aluminum dispute, the Marine Cooks & Stewards conflict, the General Tire strike, and the proposed strike on the Minnesota iron range.

Roosevelt, the army, and the Hillmans and Greens are not going to have ANY more strikes, if they can avoid them.

On July 10th, Roosevelt personally intervened in the threatened strike of 30,000 members of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks against the Railway Express agency for a shorter work week. The president tied the hands of the union for sixty days and appointed a three-man board to investigate. Roosevelt's proclamation declared the dispute "threatens to interrupt inter-state commerce to a degree calculated to deprive the country of essential transportation service."

When the Joint Board of Cloakmakers Unions timidly announced a "stoppage" of their 35,000 members July 11th, Governor Lehman of New York immediately summoned the ILGWU leaders and the employers to Albany, with the heavy-handed reminder that "labor strife in the coat and

suit industry would be contrary to the public interest at this time when we are trying to conserve all of our human and material resources." The workers were almost immediately directed back to the shops, with their demands left in the hands of an "impartial" body.

"We kept uppermost in our minds Governor Lehman's admonition that in these perilous times when national defense is the paramount problem of our country, both labor and industry must cooperate for the general welfare," stated David Dubinsky.

The Aluminum Workers Union, when its members demanded a wage increase in that most democratic of industries, the aluminum monopoly, saw its leaders summoned to Washington by the chief conciliator of the labor department and sternly warned that "under the circumstances no other alternative is available" save to withhold strike action. "Officers of the union gave quick assurance they would," the press reports. When the settlement went through on July 13th, it provided for a 2c hourly increase instead of the 10c demanded by the 14,000 workers.

The Marine Cooks & Stewards "acceded to a federal request" to delay their strike against 175 ships on the Pacific Coast—and in the settlement lost their right to rotate the jobs of chief stewards among the union membership. Henceforth the shipowners will designate the stewards.

The General Tire strike in Akron was stopped by Father Haas of the Labor Department, who was able to talk the 1,200 strikers into going back to the plant with their demands compromised and with a new agreement that would bar all strikes in the future.

The threatened strike of the SWOC against two iron mines on the Minnesota iron range never did get under way. The state capitol said the strike was invested with "public interest," and invoked the Stassen labor law to bar the men from striking for thirty days. A threatened strike of 8,000 members of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers in Utah was similarly blocked in July "by teamwork between Steelman's conciliator, the Utah State Labor Department, and the National Defense Commission."

The General Staff's Labor Lieutenants

"While the magnates of monopoly capitalism stand above the official organs of state power, controlling them from their heights, the opportunist trade union leaders scurry around the footstool of state power, creating support for it among the working masses. It is impossible to perform this filthy chore so long as workers' democracy within the trade unions is maintained. The regime in the unions, following the pattern of the regime of the bourgeois states, is becoming more and more authoritarian. In war time the trade union bureaucracy definitively becomes the military police of the Army's General Staff in the working class. . . ."

The labor lieutenants of American capitalism, mirroring this characterization of them in the Manifesto of the Fourth International on the war, join the war machine and gag and handcuff the workers whom they are supposed to represent. The heads of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers have already been incorporated into the government's military ap-

paratus. Unquestionably, other trade union leaders will find their places beside Sidney Hillman, Daniel Tobin and Daniel Tracy as direct associates of the general staff, with one unspoken but implicit order to fulfil: keep your followers down.

Such union officials justify their entering the government service by explaining to their followers that labor must have its own representatives to guard its interests in the national defense program. Yet if the union leaders actually stood up for the rights of unionism, they would be immediately outvoted, if not thrown out of their precious government posts. Hillman is one of the eight members of the national defense advisory commission. On all labor issues, the commission will vote 7-1 against Hillman and 8-0 against organized labor.

Matthew Woll protested Hillman's appointment. Woll did not protest on the grounds that Hillman was giving labor sanction to the war machine. Woll did not denounce Hillman for joining openly the camp of the enemy. Woll protested because Roosevelt didn't name an AFL man to the defense commission. Woll has discovered that the war is being fought over "freedom and labor's rights," and has pledged Ernest Bevin, British labor minister, the "fullest moral and political support of American labor."

The general secretary-treasurer of the International Association of Machinists writes in *Liberty* magazine to plead with the FBI to help his union combat "spies and saboteurs," that is, militant workers. William Green has pledged the president that "in case of emergency, members of the American Federation of Labor will be glad to work sixteen hours a day." The CIO executive board has called upon "all labor organizations fully to cooperate with Sidney Hillman as labor member of the National Defense Commission, and in this manner to make labor's contribution to the national defense program effective, constructive and adequate to the requirement of the national emergency."

William Green has even gone so far as to deliver the main address before the graduating class of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, where he told the coppers that organized labor wants to be friendly with them, and that clashes between the police and strikers should be eliminated altogether.

"The FBI inspired new respect for law enforcement among our people by promptly and thoroughly stamping out kidnapers of children," said Green. "I predict that with your aid the FBI will win an even more glorious place for itself in history by promptly and thoroughly stamping out the representatives of subversive forces who would kidnap our liberties."

There you see revealed, in a few sentences, the soul of the labor lieutenant of capitalism.

William Green expresses the most contemptible of all forms of that contemptible middle class philosophy of pacifism, pacifism in the class struggle. Green does not want any "clashes between police and strikers." This can only mean that he doesn't want the workers to fight for their rights, or to resist the attacks of the employers. For if the workers DO struggle, they immediately confront the police. What Green really wants is peace in the class struggle, peace at any price to the workers, even if it means the

workers have to capitulate to every demand of the employers.

The FBI the saviors of little children of the rich! Green has already forgotten, or he remembers approvingly, that the main job of the FBI these days is beating down strikers and the unemployed, and framing militant workers. It was Green's friends of the FBI who functioned as agents provocateur and stool pigeons among the Minneapolis WPA strikers; who worked for a whole year to frame leaders of drivers' unions in the Middle West; who were sent into the New York drivers' strike and the Kearny strike; and who used thuggery and third-degree methods against members of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union. It is the FBI men who have a standing order to bust into EVERY important strike today.

We Don't Fear This War

Between the intelligent union militants and the Hillmans

and Greens stand the great mass of workers, who today will accept to a greater or lesser degree the idea of "national defense," even of a new "war for democracy." Let the social democrats and the anarchists and the liberals draw pessimistic conclusions about this fact. Marxists, who better understand the process by which the masses prepare themselves for revolutionary action, face the future confidently. The special virtue of the workers has never been that they, as a class, understand clearly the interests of themselves and of humanity and see the goal of a socialist society. The special virtue of the workers is that capitalism forces them to suffer the most, that capitalism disciplines them on the job and in the armies, and that when they are finally pushed into a place where they must resist, they will fight in a disciplined way under leaders who have earned their trust and confidence, for a goal that will free themselves and all humanity from the unending terror of capitalism.

Changes in the Pacific

By **GEORGE STERN**

THE BALANCE OF POWER tautly maintained in Asia and the Pacific for half a century has been shattered by the German conquest of Europe.

Britain, long master in Asia, is master no longer. Declining British world power has reached its final quarter hour. The vast domains ruled or dominated by the British raj are once more on the imperialist market. The British lion's share of the plunder of the East is about to fall to other beasts of prey.

In the decades of British decline, especially since the close of the first world war, Japan and the United States have been rivals for succession to the British command in Asia. Between them Britain tried to maintain the same kind of balance it so disastrously tried to preserve between France and Germany on the continent of Europe. Today, however, a weakened Britain faces the direct assault of the Reich it helped to rearm. American expansionist aims in the Pacific have consequently been superseded by the sudden and pressing need to defend the American hemispheric empire against the attacks, economic, political, and military, of the new masters of Europe. The balance of power in the East has thus already swung automatically and deeply in favor of Japan.

The impending redivision of spoils in the East will be far greater in scope and weightier in import than that which followed the first world war. At the end of that war Japan was able to retain only a portion of the relatively meager holdings it had seized from the defeated Reich. The rest it had to disgorge, partly at the demand of the United States. A decade later, in 1931, Japan moved into Manchuria. Britain, obsessed by the dream of forging an iron ring around the Soviet Union and hopeful of preserving its own sphere in southern Asia by giving Japan *lebensraum* in the north, gave aid and comfort to the Japanese drive. France, moved by identical motives, did likewise. Together they checkmated the somewhat more vigorous resistance which the United States wanted to offer. The British thus tried to

"appease" Japan as they later tried to "appease" Nazi Germany. The results were parallel. In 1937 Japan moved from Manchuria into China proper, just as Hitler moved from the Rhineland to Austria, and thence to Czechoslovakia. This summer of 1940 British supremacy in Europe has already been brought to an end by Germany and British supremacy in Asia is directly challenged by a grateless Japan.

Out of the last war Japan secured a few German islands in Oceania and a few German railways in China located mainly in the German "sphere" in Shantung. Today, as the direct result of Germany's victories in Europe, the dazzled Japanese imperialists see within their grasp the incomparably richer Asiatic holdings of Britain and of the fallen empires of France and the Netherlands. France and Holland are already helpless and Britain, they believe, is about to become so. The United States they see immobilized by the new menace in the Atlantic. Not since the end of the 19th century when the great powers in harmony or in discord, separately or together, tore huge pieces out of the prostrate body of China, has such an opportunity for plunder presented itself. The balance of power established in its essential elements at that time is at an end. Japan now means really to be master in the house of Asia.

Japan Faces Difficulties

This intention, however, does not in itself quite settle the matter. Asia is too big and Japan too small for blitzkrieg conquests. Japan has had recent and eloquent experience of this fact. Manchuria was invaded and taken nine years ago and is not yet a wholly "pacified" province. The war in China proper was begun three years ago and China is yet far from conquered.

Germany and Italy, moreover, cannot be expected to leave all the pearls of all the Indies to Japan, assuming that they complete their conquest of the British and French empires. All Asia and Japan itself are still far too dependent

upon the industry and markets of Europe for Japan to be free of concern over what might befall them before the war has run its course.

For it is clear that the inter-imperialist conflict has by no means exhausted its stock of sudden shifts and changes. The surprises are not over. The battles of Poland, Norway, Flanders and France were but the beginning. Tomorrow's battle of Britain will not be the end. The United States understands it must meet and try to conquer the new masters of Europe and is preparing to do so. It may have to postpone but decidedly will not entirely abandon its intention of reducing Japan to its proper proportions in an American-dominated Pacific basin. The two ocean fleet and monster air force already projected for this purpose may take four or five years to build. Japan cannot be wholly confident that even in that time her present apparent freedom of action will continue. For there remains still unanswered the huge "question" of the USSR, sprawled across the continents of Europe and Asia.

Stalin, fearful of the weakness of the regime he has done so much to undermine, took refuge behind a pact with Berlin and ended years of intermittent border warfare with Japan by signing a truce with Tokyo. He hoped the resulting war among the powers would lead to mutual exhaustion. He too has been cruelly disappointed in the event. He knows that between a German Europe and a Japanese Asia, the Soviet Union will have to fight or else be broken between them. That is why he has moved his western defenses to the Baltic. That is why the Far Eastern Red Army is again being prepared for the conflict with Japan which Stalin had hoped was postponed, at least for a number of years. The possibility of a "parallel" policy in Moscow and Washington is another "surprise" the Japanese must count upon in the re-casting of Pacific accounts that is now only beginning.

China Still Fights On

But before they can be ready for any of these eventualities, the Japanese must somehow complete their long-deferred conquest of China. The entire might of their military machine has been expended on the good Chinese earth for three years. Vast territories have been taken—encircled rather than conquered. The continued presence in the conquered areas of British, French and American forces and interests and the continued necessity to concentrate Japanese economy upon the difficult task of nourishing the war machine have prevented the Japanese from realizing on their conquests. The resistance of the Chiang Kai-shek regime to the Japanese has in the main reflected Anglo-American and Soviet counter-pressure against the Japanese continental drive. Through French Indochina and from Burma and down the long road from the Turkestan frontier arms and planes and supplies have continued to trickle in quantities small enough, but sufficient to brace the Chinese positions behind the impregnable Yangtze gorges.

Consequently the first efforts of the Japanese to exploit the new situation have been directed toward choking off these crucial sources of supply. Even before the final debacle in France, the French government yielded to Japanese pressure, promising to stop all arms traffic over the railway into Yunnan. When Paris fell and the armistice

followed, Japanese warships were sent to the Indochina coast and troops were concentrated in nearby Hainan. The French hastily agreed to admit Japanese "inspectors" to Indochinese border points to supervise the execution of the agreement. Actual occupation of this rich French colony, like the occupation of the even richer Dutch East Indies, awaits the settlement of Japanese accounts with the British.

These accounts are large. The entrenched positions in China represented by one billion and a half dollars in British investments are the principal heights the Japanese expect to scale. But here too the Japanese have begun the exploitation of their new advantage by forcing the British to join in isolating the Chungking Chinese government. As in the case of Indochina, the Japanese made a show of force. Their troops ringed Hongkong, British South China citadel which has for a century tapped all the wealth of the Pearl River valley. The island port was thrown into panic. European women and children were hastily evacuated. Under this pressure the British on July 13 yielded by agreeing to close the Burma route to China for a period of three months. A few days later the announcement was permitted to appear that the British were seeking to arrange a Sino-Japanese peace. This effort is designed to save both time and face. If the German assault on Britain achieves its purposes, matters in China will be arranged without British intervention. Meanwhile, the British are maneuvering desperately to prevent immediate Japanese action at a time when Britain is hopelessly without defenses in its Eastern possessions. The success of these maneuvers may depend not only upon the speed and success of the German attack but equally upon the course pursued by the United States.

When Holland fell early in May and the Dutch East Indies were cast adrift, Washington took a strong stand, the Indies being one of the principal sources of rubber consumed by U.S. industry. Washington announced it would tolerate no change in the status of this South Sea archipelago. Subsequently, however, the defeat of France and the perilous plight of Britain deprived this warning of its sting. The U.S. fleet is still at this writing in the Pacific. But it is no longer free to steam westward to enforce the "status quo" of the East Indies or any other object of American imperialist interest. It waits instead upon the outcome of the Battle of Britain. It waits mostly upon the fate of the British navy in that battle. Should the British navy or the better part of it go under or otherwise pass into German hands, the U.S. fleet will head pronto for Panama and the Atlantic, and at that moment precisely the last serious obstacle for the Japanese in the form of a rival imperialist force will be removed from the scene and the admirals and generals of the Mikado will feel freer to proceed with their plans.

Prospects for Colonial Revolts

It is not, however, solely upon the plans of imperialist chancelleries and the movements of imperialist fleets that the fate of the backward peoples of the East depends. The possibility of sudden shifts and changes in the war has not been exhausted. Neither has the possibility of national and colonial revolt in the domains under dispute. The imperialists are at war for the second time in a generation for

re-division of the world's colonies. But the subjected peoples of these colonial and backward countries may still demand a voice and force a hearing in the determination of their fate. This may not be the least of the "surprises" still to come.

The very fact that a new imperialist re-division has appeared on the order of the day in Asia is, like the war in Europe, a consequence of the revolutionary defeats of the past two decades. The Second International, and later the Third International of Stalin, each in its own way, rescued imperialism in Europe after the first world war, and in the East during the decade of colonial wars and revolutions that followed the armistice of 1918. In the principal colonial and semi-colonial countries, particularly in India and China, the defeat of these struggles was characterized primarily by successful arrangements between the imperialists and the native bourgeoisies at the expense of the revolting masses of workers and peasants. Because the Communist International under Stalin failed to lead the workers of India and China along the road of the proletarian revolution, the Gandhist Congress Party and the Kuomintang were able to keep both those great countries safe for imperialist exploitation.

Gandhi repeatedly dispersed the concentrating forces of the Indian revolution, diverting them into channels of compromise that left British rule intact. China was swept in 1925-27 by the greatest mass uprising of workers and peasants in the history of that country. But the Communist International subordinated the Chinese Communists to the bourgeois Kuomintang, yoked the workers to the national bourgeoisie, with the result that the latter crushed the mass movement in return for a few crumbs from the imperialist table. China was thus laid open to the depredations of the Japanese imperialists and India was held fast in the fetters to which new masters now seek the keys.

In China today that important section of the bourgeoisie represented by such figures as Chiang Kai-shek and T. V. Soong has resisted the Japanese invasion—after years of efforts to come to terms with the invaders—only because they could hope for a larger share of the loot under British and/or American domination. They are not wedded to the national struggle, as such. Tomorrow, should the prospect of effective British and/or American resistance to Japan disappear entirely they will readily adapt themselves to the new scheme of things. Between the Soviet Union on the one hand and Germany and Japan on the other they will find new room to maneuver. In India, while Gandhi and his Congress hold in check any movement of the workers to "embarrass" Britain's war effort, the British will not hesitate to barter away the lifeblood of Indians in the interest of preserving whatever they can of their huge share in Indian wealth and the product of Indian labor.

Nevertheless, whatever the handicaps inherited from the defeats of the past, the subject peoples are still in a position to fight for and win their freedom. They rose almost everywhere to achieve it after the first war among the powers. The imperialists had succeeded in crushing the workers' revolutions everywhere in Europe except in Russia. In the colonies they fought down the national movements with a combination of brute force and concessions to the native exploiters. While this method provided a temporary "solu-

tion" for the imperialist rulers, it brought no solution to the pressing problems of the colonial peoples, produced no advances out of their backwardness, provided no significant outlet for even a relative growth of their productive forces. Instead it accelerated the expropriation of the colonial petty-bourgeoisie, perpetuated the serfdom of the colonial peasantry, and increased the burdens of the colonial proletariat. The concessions made by the imperialists to the native exploiters were niggardly enough, but with the onset of the world economic crisis beginning in 1929, not even these could be maintained. The crisis instead enormously sharpened the antagonisms in the imperialist camp and led to new blows at the colonial peoples—Japan's invasion of China, Italy's invasion of Ethiopia—and finally to the outbreak of the new world war. For the colonies this war offers only the prospect of deepening exploitation, no matter whether the old masters remain or new masters take their place.

For capitalism has already more than sufficiently demonstrated its dissonance with the productive forces. It can no longer assure to the workers in the advanced countries even a subsistence standard of living. Should it succeed in surviving the present war its totalitarian form would be generalized on a world scale. In the past, imperialist rule in the colonies has meant the stifling of economic development and the perpetuation of backward economic and social relations in their most oppressive forms. If an imperialist "solution" of the present world conflict is imposed, a still greater rate of exploitation will be forced upon the backward countries and the thralldom of the past deepened multifold. At the outset of this war the Allies once more offered their colonial slaves promises of "freedom" and "cooperation" after the war had again ended in an Allied victory. The chances of such a victory have now, to put it mildly, been somewhat dimmed. But had it occurred, is it possible to doubt that these promises would be redeemed only in the crueler deceptions of a new Versailles? Germany and its satellites for their part fight only to rule by blood and iron alone. The colonial peoples can be under no illusion as to what Hitlerite domination will mean.

Like the workers of the entire world, therefore, the toilers of the East face the choice of descent into a helotry even deeper than has been their lot until now or the renewal of their common struggle for the socialist revolution, the socialist reorganization of society which can alone end imperialist exploitation forever. The hopes of liberation of the colonial peoples are bound up even more decisively than before with the emancipation of the workers of the whole world. The colonies will be freed, politically, economically and culturally only when the workers of the advanced countries put an end to capitalist rule and set out together with the backward peoples to re-gear world economy to social needs instead of monopolist profits. Only in this way will the colonial and semi-colonial countries be enabled to emerge from their varying stages of backwardness and take their places as integral sections of a new and advancing world order.

The chances of such a struggle are no idle dream. Should the workers of India rise and join with the Chinese and together unite with Russian workers and peasants overthrowing Stalin, even in the midst of imperialist invasion,

the picture of Asia, and indeed of the whole world at war, would rapidly change. It may yet be, as Marx once conjectured, that the liberating struggle for the entire world will be ignited in the East. The imperialists are fighting for a new balance of power. Such a balance can mean only the

balance of the labor of hundreds of millions of sweated slaves against the profits of a handful of super-imperialist masters. There is still time to strike for a new kind of balance and establish a new kind of power, a socialist balance created by workers' power.

Spain One Year After Franco's Victory

By GRANDIZO MUNIS

SINCE THE END of the Spanish civil war not a few transformations have occurred among the victors as well as among the defeated. Far from having consolidated his regime upon gaining the victory, Franco gives the appearance of living only provisionally, menaced from without by the rivalries of the imperialist bandits and from within by the heterogeneity of his own forces whose opposition is sharpened from day to day. As for the workers' parties in emigration, they are affected by crises and internal struggles which can have important consequences above all in view of the size of the Spanish emigration, in which the proletarian proportion is very high.

The price Franco must pay for the military and diplomatic support of Italy and Germany has not been disclosed. It is certain enough that this help was not gratuitous, and the concessions to Italy in the fishing industry, to Germany in the metallurgical, represent nothing more than a public advance on the secret war commitments. Besides this there is talk of concessions to Italy in connection with the Balearic islands which cut the maritime communications between France and her colonies, of concessions to Germany in Spanish Morocco, of fortifications along the French frontier, of the fortification of Sierra Carbonera which was prohibited to Spain in the treaty ceding Gibraltar. Situated immediately behind the Rock, at a higher altitude, large caliber artillery on Sierra Carbonera would nullify the strategic value of Gibraltar, especially with possession of the African side of the straits. Although we do not know its details, without doubt there is a secret treaty with Germany and Italy along these or similar lines. If during the war of 1914-18, Germany in return for nothing more than favorable neutrality offered Spain all of the French province of Rosellon, a part of French Morocco, Tangiers, and a free hand in Portugal, the promises at the present time must be much more extensive and tempting to the sclerotic "new empire" of Franco.

According to Franco's Minister of the Interior, more than seventy percent of the railway transportation equipment and more than fifty percent of the highway transportation equipment was destroyed during the civil war. A considerable percentage, although not made public, of the electric industry was also lost; the fishing industry has dropped to less than half; the textile industry has been equally affected for the worse and paralyzed for lack of cotton; many coal mines require costly repairs before they can again be exploited; three-fourths of the Spanish ports have suffered damages so extensive that they are in urgent need of repairs; destroyed buildings present a grave problem and the merchant fleet has almost completely disappeared. Where to turn in order to reconstitute this

destroyed constant capital? Despite its accentuated tendency in favor of Hitler, the Franco regime found itself obliged to deal amicably with the democracies. Commercial treaties already signed with England and France carry provisions to furnish Spain for the first year with consumption goods in exchange for certain war materials, whereas during the succeeding years Spain must provide them with consumption goods. The United States for its part has already authorized credits in cotton for Franco which will place a part of the Catalan industries in movement. In war, more than in peace, these treaties have no other objective except obtaining certain guaranties in foreign policy.

This is the source of the neutrality decreed by Franco and tolerated for the time being by Hitler and Mussolini. But the problem is barely in its preliminary phase. For their part Italy and Germany will demand that Franco fulfill the promises contracted to the extent required by the development of the military operations. If Mussolini sends his troops to reinforce those of Hitler, they will not be satisfied with Spain's neutrality, no matter how partial it may be.

The Internal Regime

The corporative state, which constitutes the maximum aspiration of the Spanish Falange, is very far from being a reality. The function of the fascist trade unions has been decorative up to this time. All the measures and projects of corporativism remain suspended because of the opposition which they excite among the victors. The regime is today a mixture of the classical Spanish clerico-military dictatorship with a fascist tint contributed by the Falange. Franco, who as head of the State is at the same time the "Caudillo" of the Falange, reformed the statutes of the Falange, suppressing the anti-clericalism which Primo de Rivera would have liked to borrow from Hitler. In truth, every reactionary regime in Spain is inseparable from the domination of the clergy, which at the same time is the biggest capitalist and the biggest landowner. Franco was quick to give it satisfaction to a degree unknown even under the monarchy. All its properties have been returned, completely free from levies, as at the height of the Middle Ages. The big landowners have also been reinstated in their properties and indemnified for whatever damages they suffered. Likewise all the capitalists expropriated "by the reds" who have not been able to recover their properties are to be indemnified by the State. Naturally this will be at the expense of the working class.

Under the deceitful name of Agrarian Reform, a project for the irrigation and cultivation of lands has been announced, with regulations to be established by the state experts. The project provides for indemnified expropriation

of landowners who refuse to accept the official regulations and subsidies for those affected by the reforms. The peasants do not receive the least benefits. Actually it is nothing more than a project motivated by the total lack of agricultural implements and of capital. If Franco succeeds in obtaining these, the landowners would be able to realize upon the double business of accepting subsidies for their fertile land and of selling to the state the almost valueless barren lands.

The same absence of capital and of basic materials paralyzes the major part of industry. The Spanish bourgeoisie cannot speculate on the profits of war and enrich themselves as in 1914-18. To accomplish this with Germany would present insurmountable difficulties during the war period. On the other hand, the Spanish bourgeoisie, in their reactionary anxiety to humble Catalonia, laid the basis for competition with it, promoting industry in other regions. If circumstances favor the development of industry in other provinces than Catalonia, the results will be contrary to those envisaged by its promoters. The power of the Catalan proletariat, which up to now has been disproportionate to the rest of the country, will gain an equally powerful auxiliary in the coming social crisis.

It cannot yet be said that fascism in the form familiar to us in Germany and Italy has triumphed in Spain. Nor can it be identical; it must be adapted to the semi-feudal and clerical nature of the country. Yet Spain, "one, great, free," is far from being "one" even leaving aside the political activities of the exploited classes; it is far from being "great," nor can it become so without the proletarian revolution; as for "freedom," it does not exist either for the victorious classes or for the political heads, who must throw themselves at the feet of this or that imperialism.

Bearing in mind the internal disputes of the victors and the desires of the British bourgeoisie, the Republican, Socialist, and some anarchist leaders dream of the re-establishment of "constitutional normalcy" in the near future. If this is a stupid chimera, it at least gave them a good pretext for unconditionally supporting the French-British bourgeoisie. Certainly in view of the demoralization of the Spanish proletariat, brought about by the betrayal of all those who dream of constitutional normalcy, the monarchy can perhaps hope to renew the constitutional farce of the beginning of the century. Despite everything, it can be assured that no reactionary regime would survive any half-way democratic election in Spain. With or without the Spanish Falange, with or without the military dictatorship or clerical monarchy, the Spanish workers and peasants will continue to be shot, persecuted, and exploited. The difficulties of the Franco regime can facilitate the revivification of the proletarian class-consciousness.

Repression and the Attitude of the Masses

Spain during four centuries was a country of continuous repression; under Franco it suffers one of the most barbarous of its history. In order to commit crimes against the freedom, the life, or the possessions of any one not a fascist, the Law of Political Responsibility was promulgated, administered by the courts of exception. All those who directly or indirectly collaborated with the "reds" or

those who simply permitted the defeat of the fascist uprisings through their passivity are subject to the penalties provided by this law. All those who were not active reactionaries before 1936 can be condemned at any moment. Any private denunciation is sufficient for the special court constituted in each province to decree trial and prison. The entire trial is secret, the defendant has no right to know the accusation or to defend himself and can be condemned without him questioning the accuser. The sources of information which the courts utilize in applying the Law of Political Responsibility reflect perfectly the physiognomy of the country. The parish priest, the commander of the Civil Guard, and the chief of the Spanish Falange in the locality of the defendant submit what information the court needs. The penalties vary from confiscation of property to thirty year prison sentences or death. No more is necessary to make clear that the immense majority of the people are involved under the Law and live in constant terror. As a result the entire country has been swept by a wave of denunciations unheard of since the days of the Inquisition. The courts are incapable of handling all the cases. Bull rings, theaters, all the places capable of housing men in the manner of cattle have been converted into jails now jammed with a half million men. The majority of those who constituted the Republican army still remain in the concentration camps.

The number of shootings decreed by the courts is so high that the fascist press has ordered that the executions not be published. Nevertheless, in February, 1940, a French governmental source gave the number as 800 monthly. But along with the courts, the young gentlemen of the Spanish Falange act as assassins. Frequently making incursions in the jails and concentration camps, they seize those detained and already condemned to twenty or thirty years, or not even brought to trial, and take them out to the cemetery to be killed. In March we were notified from Asturias that thirty miners had been assassinated in this manner by the young Falangist gentlemen. This terror has begun to affect their own conservative elements, obliging Serrano Suner, chief of the butchers, to recommend publicly to his paid assassins "clemency for the defeated."

Despite the terror, the activity of the revolutionists pre-occupies the authorities. In the mountains of Andalusia and Asturias numerous groups of armed guerrillas remain, who oppose and disarm the Civil Guard, descending unexpectedly on the highways and villages, and carrying out audacious executions of isolated fascists. The authorities drop proclamations by airplane inviting them to surrender. The solidarity of the people animates and maintains them. In Madrid a clandestine organization of the CNT (anarchists) was recently discovered which maintained an active printed propaganda. Internal relief exists which works with surprising success: From the concentration camps, and from the jails themselves, it has succeeded in delivering and placing in safety in France, individual militants whose lives were in danger. It appears that recently the CNT celebrated a national plenum in an unnamed city.

As for the mass of the people, they remain passive and demoralized, but profoundly hostile. A militant Bolshevik who lived in Barcelona for a year after the entrance of the fascists made the trip to the French frontier on foot with-

out money, asking the peasants for ways and means of evading the vigilance of the Civil Guard. Not a single person denied him lodging and advice.

We do not pretend to build illusory hopes about the capacity of this hostility to defeat Franco in the near future, but it is a base which will soon permit the development of underground revolutionary organizations of great strength.

The Level of Life of the Poor

For obvious reasons unemployment is almost complete in industry and is very extensive in the rural districts. The majority of the proletarian and peasant population is in complete lack of any income. Those who work make six or seven pesetas in the city as the ordinary wage, in the rural districts the daily wage has dropped to two or three pesetas. The cost of living on the contrary is triple that of the pre-war level. And this figure covers only the prices established by the official rationing. In reality this figure is nothing more than a fiction. Food is distributed very irregularly and in small quantities. Meat has been set at one hundred grams a person and the distribution is not weekly. As for vegetables, wheat, cooking oil, rice, the Minister of the Interior has confessed that "we are very far from covering the necessities of consumption."

Consequently, speculation has been unchained so violently that the government finds itself obliged to impose increasing fines and to jail some merchants. This does not do away with the necessity of turning to the speculators in order to secure the necessary food. Quite the contrary, among the hierarchs of the "new empire" the speculators have their fixers and associates. In this market, prices are far above the reach of the best paid workers, including the lower stratas of the petty-bourgeoisie. Hunger extends from the proletarian aristocracy to those comfortably placed. In order to eat satisfactorily in Spain today, it is necessary to be rich or at least a local chief of the Spanish Falange. The general misery is much worse than during the war, constituting one of the gravest problems facing the fascist authorities. In order to get an evil-smelling bowl of soup distributed by the women of the "Social Aid," queues form of such size they terrorize the official press. The partisans of a monarchical restoration utilize the misery of the masses in order to picture the return of the Bourbons as the only road to health. And without the least doubt, the urgent problem of supplies will be one of the most powerful determinants of Franco's foreign policy. His rule cannot long support itself if it does not succeed in soon solving this problem.

Political Parties in Emigration

After the hour of defeat follows the hour of recriminations. The Spanish emigration has confirmed this often repeated affirmation with an extensiveness proportionate to the high number of its emigrants. In all the parties raised voices are bringing to light secrets and corruption which were no secret to anyone. Other voices reply in identical terms and the polemic thus acquires the characteristics of a dispute between fish-mongers. But this gives a perfect image of what the Popular Front was. That Negrin, del Vayo, the Stalinists, almost all the Republican chiefs and workers' leaders committed thefts and now live richly in

the emigration is generally known and does not merit consideration in a serious polemic.

But what has been written as political polemic is equally miserable and reveals the profoundly reactionary nature of the Popular Front. The ex-president of the Republic, Manuel Azana, has just published a book, decadent in style and saturated with hate toward the proletariat. "La Velada de Benicarlo." The glorious epic of July 19, the heroic struggle betrayed during a period of almost three years, is judged by one of the principle initiators of the Popular Front as a mad daughter of rancor, thirst for blood, crime. The workers in arms are qualified as assassins, the taking over of property as rape, and while he lacks a single word of condemnation for the assassinations perpetrated by the fascists, he sallies in defense of the reactionaries shot by the workers, representing them as martyrs. Without changing a comma, the book could have been subsidized by Franco's propaganda service. Here is an ally of Stalinism.

To find this class of sworn enemies of the proletariat, who appeared during the civil war as its leaders, it is not necessary to search among the Republicans. Among the Socialists two men have spoken with as much hate for the masses as Azana: Indalecio Prieto, Minister of the National Defense, and Julian Zugazagoitia, Minister of the Interior. They too see in the revolution nothing but crimes, personal revenges, blood, robbery. Prieto has said cynically that the workers provoked the fascist insurrection by carrying on too many strikes and asking too high wages. With such ministers one wonders how the Spanish people could resist fascism for three years.

From the left Socialist wing, Largo Caballero, in accordance with his custom, or better his incapacity, has written scarcely more than a few letters to his friends. In these he tries to unburden the responsibility for the defeat upon Russia and Stalinism, representing himself as an honest man, who did not fill his pockets with gold. But if they are not full of gold, they are drenched with the blood of May, 1937.

All this literature, like that of the anarchists, appearing in newspapers and magazines, speculates upon the Stalinist and the Russian influence. Each one of these people who were Stalin's most cowardly servants tries to save himself by casting off in this way the burden of responsibility. Vain gestures of opportunists! If in their time the crimes of Stalinism, its propaganda were tolerated and esteemed by Republicans and Socialists it was because it served the interests of both the one and the other. If the Stalinists had not existed in Spain, Prieto, Negrin, and other Socialists did not lack the qualities of a Noske. For their part, the anarchists revert to the same expedient in their anxiety to hide their own complicity or incapacity to understand the fundamental laws of the proletarian revolution.

Not one of them has characterized even with half-way accuracy the fundamental causes of the defeat. Not one has analyzed the reactionary nature of the Popular Front, with the Stalinists or without them; nor analyzed the embryo of the proletarian State which surged up in the committees; the reconstitution of the capitalist State with the collaboration of the extreme left, CNT, FAI, POUM, and the liquidation of the organs of the dual power. Some anarchist comrades begin to speak of the necessity of having taken

power, but they are far from understanding what this signifies and requires, without mentioning that some of them collaborated with an enthusiasm worthy of Stalinism in the destruction of the committees. In its entirety, the balance of the Spanish revolution cannot be completed except by the Spanish comrades of the Fourth International.

From now on classical anarchism in Spain can be considered liquidated. The heads of the CNT have repeatedly recognized that the anarchist books did not correspond to reality. In France, Garcia Oliver himself has taken the initiative in the creation of a political party followed, it seems, by the former anarchist military chiefs. This has nothing to do with a revolutionary evolution but constitutes only the confirmation and fixation in a political party of the betrayal of Garcia Oliver. Like that of Angel Pestana years ago, the new party will be one more reformist appendix of the bourgeoisie. Those who said to the workers in May, 1937, "cease firing," thereby allying themselves with the Assault Guards, are forever finished as revolutionary leaders. The mass of the CNT workers react violently against Garcia Oliver. Without doubt, the idea of taking power is not so strange to the proletariat as before the civil war. Many have clearly understood this necessity and are orienting themselves hesitatingly in a political direction. Two camps will shape out little by little in Spanish anarchism. On one side there will be the chiefs who consummated the betrayal together with the opportunists whom they supported; on the other side the revolutionary workers will acquire political consciousness and swell the ranks of the future party of the Spanish proletariat. Our Spanish comrades are in connection with anarchist workers in Mexico, Santo Domingo, and France which permits us to hope for important progress in this direction.

The POUM, which passed through a sharp crisis of differentiation upon the declaration of the European war, has remained atomized and inactive. For the right wing, which retains the leadership, the war has been almost providential. In distinction from the growing activity of the revolutionary wing, represented by the factions of Rebull and the Bolshevik-Leninists, the right wing (Rovira, Gorkin) has remained at rest and in possession of a power which in reality represents nothing and is good for nothing. The right wing supports and defends all the errors committed by the POUM during the revolution. Adhering to the phantasmagoric London Bureau, it expresses an exacerbated anti-Trotskyism. Finally, it joined the JARE (Junta de Auxilio a Refugiados Espanoles). This organization of Indalecio Prieto is very explicit in its support of French-British imperialism. It has declared its support and invited the Spanish workers to serve the democracies. In this way the POUM collaborates today with the social-patriotic betrayers. In order to confirm this tendency even more,

Gorkin was present at the convention of the American Socialist Party, thus establishing a direct political relation between the POUM and the rotted social-democracy. Gorkin, whom Negrin's courts gave the unmerited favor of condemnation for the May successes, shakes hands with those who supported the governmental repression.

The Revolutionary Regroupment

For its part, the left wing has understood the fundamental errors of the POUM, traced a program, is orienting toward a break with the centrists and either sympathizes with the Fourth International as in the case of Rebull, or belongs to it as in the case of the Bolshevik faction. The war, while retarding this process of differentiation, will not block it. Between the militant revolutionaries of the POUM and us, collaboration will each day grow stronger until we find ourselves in one party under the program of the Fourth International.

The Stalinists have come out of the Spanish experience organizationally decimated and politically hated. The petty-bourgeois elements conquered by the politics of the Popular Front or by its predominating position, are returning to their original position, denouncing Stalinism. Even Negrin and del Vayo, who were its unconditional straw dummies, have broken with it, hypocritically pointing their fingers. Self-interest commands. Negrin's and del Vayo's interests are not in Moscow but intertwined with the democratic bourgeoisie. They cannot support the politics of the Hitler-Stalin pact without breaking completely with the international social-democracy.

The workers at the base who still remain with Stalinism, are either old communists, or isolated without knowing where to go, or have begun to move toward our tendency. In any case the collapse of Spanish Stalinism is complete. Although the money which they appropriated in Spain enables them to sustain a large press and to feed a few corrupt intellectuals, the Stalinist nuclei in emigration are composed of bureaucrats, agents of the GPU, gunmen for whom Stalinism is a lucrative business. As in Germany, Italy, and other countries, so in Spain, the Stalinist party is a bureaucratic fiction well sustained by large quantities of money.

Fiallyn, the Bolshevik-Leniists have excellent nuclei of militants in Mexico, France, and Spain. Contacts with revolutionary workers of all tendencies enables them to carry on work of great importance in the emigration. The enormous experience through which they passed predisposes the workers of all the different tendencies to our principles. With fraternal assistance it will be possible to constitute a good revolutionary leadership in the emigration and to lay the basis for illegal work in fascist Spain. In this and that place in Spain the revolutionary spirit has not died.

Burnham's Letter of Resignation

JAMES BURNHAM, the author of the following letter, was the chief theoretician of the group which, after a seven-months' discussion in the Socialist Workers Party, refused to abide by the decisions of the Third National Convention of the party, held in April of this year. The group was

suspended until it would signify its intention no longer to violate the convention decisions. Now its chief theoretician has drawn the final conclusions from the position around which the group was organized.

The letter is published here for the first time. The

"Workers Party" group to which it is addressed, our readers will recall, insisted during our pre-convention discussion that all party discussion shall be held publicly before the

workers. No sooner had they left us than they had a good opportunity to do so, by publishing Burnham's letter to them. Strange to say, they did not.

New York, May 21, 1940
To the National Committee
of the Workers Party:

I am compelled to place before the committee the question of my status in relation to the newly formed Workers Party.

The faction fight in the Socialist Workers Party, its conclusion, and the recent formation of the Workers Party have been in my own case, the unavoidable occasion for the review of my own theoretical and political beliefs. This review has shown me that by no stretching of terminology can I any longer regard myself, or permit others to regard me, as a Marxist.

Of the most important beliefs, which have been associated with the Marxist movement, whether in its reformist, Leninist, Stalinist or Trotskyist variants, there is virtually none which I accept in its traditional form. I regard these beliefs as either false or obsolete or meaningless; or in a few cases, as at best true only in a form so restricted and modified as no longer properly to be called Marxist.

This communication is not meant to be an elaborate analysis or a lengthy personal credo. Nevertheless, I wish to illustrate my opinions with a few specific examples:

I reject, as you know, the "philosophy of Marxism," dialectical materialism. I have never, it is true, accepted this philosophy. In the past I excused this discrepancy and compromised this belief with the idea that the philosophy was "unimportant" and "did not matter" so far as practise and politics were concerned. Experience, and further study and reflection, have convinced me that I have been wrong and Trotsky—with so many others—right on this score; that dialectical materialism, though scientifically meaningless, is psychologically and historically an integral part of Marxism, and does have its many and adverse effects upon practice and politics.

The general Marxian theory of "universal history," to the extent that it has any empirical content, seems to me disproved by modern historical and anthropological investigation.

Marxian economics seems to me for the most part either false or obsolete or meaningless in application to contemporary economic phenomena. Those aspects of Marxian economics which retain validity do not seem to me to justify the theoretical structure of the economics.

Not only do I believe it meaningless to say that "socialism is inevitable" and false that socialism is "the only alternative to capitalism"; I consider that on the basis of the evidence now available to us a new form of exploitive society (what I call "managerial society") is not only possible as an alternative to capitalism but is a more probable outcome of the present period than socialism.

As you know, I do not believe that Russia can be considered a "workers state" in any

intelligible sense of the term. This opinion, however, is related to far more basic conclusions: for example, that Stalinism must be understood as one manifestation of the same general historical forces of which fascism is another manifestation. There is still doubt in my mind as to whether this conclusion applies also to Leninism and Trotskyism.

I disagree flatly and entirely, as Cannon has understood for a long while, with the Leninist conception of a party—not merely with Stalin's or Cannon's modifications of that conception, but with Lenin's and Trotsky's. I disagree with the theory of the party, but even more, and more important, with the established pattern of behavior which displays the character of the party as a living reality. The Leninist type of party seems to me incompatible with genuine scientific method and genuine democracy.

In the light of such beliefs, and others similar to them, it goes without saying that I must reject a considerable part of the programmatic documents of the Fourth Internationalist movement (accepted by the Workers Party). The "transition program" document seems to me—as it pretty much did when first presented—more or less arant nonsense, and a key example of the inability of Marxism, even in the hands of its most brilliant intellectual representative, to handle contemporary history.

These beliefs, especially in their negative aspect—that is, insofar as they involve disagreement with Marxism—are not at all "sudden" or episodic, nor are they products merely of the recent faction struggle. Several I have always held. Many others I have held for some years. Others have, during the past year or two, changed from doubt and uncertainty into conviction. The faction fight has only served to compel me to make them explicit and to consider them more or less in their entirety. I understand, naturally, that many of them are not "new" or "original," and that in holding some of them I find myself in very bad company. However, I have never been able to judge the truth of beliefs by the moral character of those who hold them.

* * *

The newly-formed Workers Party is a Marxist party, and more particularly a Bolshevik, a Leninist party. This is not a mere matter of definition. It is guaranteed alike by its programmatic documents (especially the key document on "The Aims, the Tasks, and the Structure of the Workers Party"), by the statements and convictions of the overwhelming majority of its leadership and of a substantial majority of its membership, and by the habits of action of this majority. It is strikingly symbolized by the statement on the masthead of *Labor Action* that the party is a section of the Fourth International, by the definition of its theoretical magazine as "an organ of revo-

lutionary Marxism," by the reiterated appeal in the key document above mentioned to "the revolutionary traditions of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky" and to the "principles of Marxism," and by the convention episode of the cable to Trotsky. Nothing whatever in the faction fight indicated a decisive tendency away from this orientation; on the contrary, every sharp suggestion in such a direction was at once blocked. In reality, the split from the Socialist Workers Party was not based upon anything fundamental, and the Workers Party exists now as a faction of the Trotskyist movement. This was the actual cause of the extreme difficulty which the faction found in drawing up its position on "the nature of the party," and in differentiating that position from Cannon's. This was hard to do, was in fact not done, because the two positions, except in details and emphases, did not really differ.

I do not, of course, wish to mitigate my own share of responsibility of what happened in the immediate and more distant past. I wish here to record the facts as I see them, among which is the fact that I have not been a full-time political worker and have not accepted a full share of organizational responsibility.

* * *

From the facts about my own present beliefs and the character of the Workers Party, the following conclusion inescapably follows: I cannot be a loyal member of the Workers Party; I cannot accept its program or discipline; I cannot speak or act for it. Naturally I do not disagree with *everything* for which the Workers Party stands. I believe that socialism would be a good thing if it can be achieved (though "socialism as a moral ideal" is in bad repute among Marxists, we learn). I agree with the Workers Party attitude toward the war, at least insofar as this was involved in the just concluded faction dispute. But I share agreement on those points with many other organizations and tens of thousands of individuals wholly apart from the Workers Party. To the extent that I function politically, I cannot confine what I say and do to rhapsodies on the desirability of socialism and denunciations of both camps in the war. This was brought home to me with particular keenness by the first public mass meeting of the Workers Party. For I tried to figure out what I could say, and I could not find any way of saying what I felt I ought to say and still appear on the platform as a loyal spokesman of the group. I finally compromised once more, spoke "safely" on the third camp, and felt like a liar when I had finished.

Two alternatives only, therefore, present themselves to me:

Continuing as a member of the party, I can immediately launch a faction struggle along the lines suggested by this document.

This struggle would, of course, be, from a political and theoretical standpoint, far broader and more fundamental than the struggle just concluded with Cannon and would have as its general aim, from my standpoint, to break the group altogether away from Marxism.

Or I can simply separate from the Workers Party.

From the usual conception of "principled" and "responsible" politics, the first course is incumbent upon me. However, I do not believe that it makes sense under the actual circumstances. On the one hand, a sharp faction struggle now in the Workers Party (in which my point of view would be supported by a very small minority) would mean the breakup of the group, at the very least its reduction to impotence—and it begins with foundations none too firm. What could be gained would not be worth while, would simply not mean anything politically. On the other hand, I personally am not willing to undertake leadership in such a struggle. I am not, have not been, and cannot be a "practical politician" and "organization man," above all not a leader.

Thus the second course alone remains.

It will be thought and said by many that my present beliefs and the decision which follows from them are a "rationalization" of, on the one side, the pressure of a soft and bourgeois personal environment, and, on the other, the influence of the terrible defeats of labor, and mankind during the past twenty years, and of the war crisis.

I should be the last to pretend that any man should be so brash as to imagine that he knows clearly the motives and springs of his own actions. This whole letter may be an over-elaborate way of saying the single sentence: "I feel like quitting politics." It is certainly the case that I am influenced by the defeats and betrayals of the past twenty and more years. These form part of the evidence for my belief that Marxism must be rejected: at every single one of the many tests provided by history, Marxist movements have either failed socialism or betrayed it. And they influence also my feelings and attitudes, I know that.

As for my "personal life," how is one ever to know which is chicken and which egg, whether unwillingness fully to enter Marxist politics confuses beliefs, or whether clear beliefs keep one from entering Marxist politics fully? I am a little tired, I confess, of the habit of settling accounts with op-

ponents and critics, of deciding scientific disputes, by smug references to "rationalizations" and the "pressure of alien classes and influences." Because this habit is a well established part of the tradition of Marxism is not the least of my objections to Marxism.

My beliefs are facts; and the defeats and betrayals, and the mode of my life and my tastes are also facts. There they are, whatever the truth about sources and origins and motives.

* * *

On no ideological, theoretic or political ground, then, can I recognize, or do I feel, any bond or allegiance to the Workers Party (or to any other Marxist party). That is simply the case, and I can no longer pretend about it, either to myself or to others.

Unfortunately, one factor still remains. This factor is a sense of moral obligation and responsibility to my past self—seven years dominated, however, inadequately but on the whole, by Marxism or any comparable structure, cannot be wiped out by a few minutes at the typewriter—and more especially to other persons, to those with whom I have joined in loyal collaboration on both sides, and to others who have been influenced in their ideas and acts by me. Trotsky and Cannon will exploit my decision as a confirmation of their views—Burnham's quitting will be, by their remarkable but humanly understandable logic, evidence for the truth of their opinions on the character of the war, the nature of the Russian state, and the role of Russia in the war. To many members of the Workers Party, my separation will appear as a desertion. From a moral and personal point of view, I cannot but agree that there will be a good deal of truth in this latter judgment.

But this factor, weighed against the others, is no longer sufficient to decide my actions. Indeed, it now seems clear to me that if it had not been for these moral and personal considerations, I should properly have left the party some while ago. On the grounds of beliefs and interests (which are also a fact) I have for several years had no real place in a Marxist party.

This communication constitutes my definitive resignation from the group. However, because of the obligations which I recognize, I am, within strict limitations, prepared to discuss with the committee, if the committee so wishes, the manner of my separation. There are four alternatives:

1. The committee can expel me. There

would be no difficulty in finding grounds for expulsion: I have already written an article, which, if published in the non-party press (and there is the opportunity for such publication), would be adequate grounds.

2. I can simply withdraw, without any special notice being taken on either side, from the group and its activities.

3. I can be, nominally, granted a "leave of absence" for six months. If this alternative were chosen, there should be no misunderstanding. The future is never certain, but the probability of such a leave's coming to an end would be very slight indeed.

4. I am, finally, prepared, if the committee feels that it would make any serious difference in this first period of the group's independent existence, to carry out a form of partial collaboration during the next two months. This would consist primarily of writing signed and unsigned articles for the party press, consistent with the party's position; and during that time refraining from public acts contrary to the party and its program. At the conclusion of these two months, any of the three other alternatives could be put into effect. I would not like this fourth solution, to be quite honest, but, as I have stated, I am prepared to accept it.

* * *

Writing this letter has been a painful and difficult task for me. It is in no way an impulsive act, but has been preceded by the most careful and lengthy deliberation. I am above all anxious that I avoid giving any impression that I seek to excuse or extenuate myself, my own weaknesses or deficiencies or failures. I do not propose to blame others or history for my faults. When I say that I reject Marxism, I do not at all mean that I am scornful of or consider myself "superior to" Marxists. Not at all. I am humble, believe me before the loyalty, sacrifice and heroism of so many Marxists—qualities found so widely within the ranks of the Workers Party. But I cannot act otherwise than I do.

Believing as I do, I cannot wish success to the Workers Party; but I can and do wish its members well. To the extent that each of us, in his own way and arena, preserves the values and truth and freedom, I hope that we shall continue to regard ourselves as comrades, whatever names we use and whatever labels may be tied around our necks.

Fraternally yours,

JAMES BURNHAM

BURNHAM'S letter of resignation from the self-styled "Workers Party" adds the expected period to his break with Marxism and his desertion of the working class movement. What better commentary could there be on the nature of that group which followed Burnham out of the Socialist Workers Party than the fact that they did not dare to print his letter of resignation from their group! Burnham's letter is overwhelming confirmation of our previous characterization of the splitters.

Burnham was the only one of the group who had any real views in the factional struggle that preceded their defection. Shachtman refused to take any stand on the basic

questions in dispute. So clear was the course followed by Burnham to the "theoreticians" of the "Workers Party" that they were willing to follow him out of the movement and to embrace him in a new party. Burnham felt embarrassed, nay distressed, by their devotion, but nevertheless he has wrenched his coat-tails violently from their grasp. He has said finally and at long last what he really had in mind (and what the Socialist Workers Party had deduced correctly), and now has said it in such unmistakable terms that the light at last dawned on his associates and it became at long last to Shachtman "crystal clear that he has abandoned the struggle against war and for socialism"—when

Burnham told him so and not before. One might suppose that Shachtman would offer some sort of apology or explanation to his misguided followers for his defense of Burnham against the now-proven predictions which we made, that Burnham was on his way out of the movement. But no! It turns out that Shachtman was quite open-minded in his association with Burnham and was merely waiting for "time alone to tell what (Burnham's) future role in the movement would be." Time obliged. It obliged at breath-taking tempo.

The record speed with which Burnham jettisoned the whole cargo of Marxism is in its way an index of the heightened tension of the class struggle as the United States rushes headlong towards entry into the war. The capitalist ruling class, facing a mortal struggle, has set in motion every single agency at its command to suppress resistance to its aims. Already the work of provocateurs is added to the barrage of Fifth Column propaganda and the usages of the FBI. Open violence has thus far occurred on a small scale—but that is a harbinger of the future. Burnham's course stands revealed now as the process of giving way to this class pressure and then yielding completely to it.

In vain the failure of the "Workers Party" to print Burnham's letter of resignation! Can they hide from themselves the patent fact that they were led by an element who, under the test by crisis, turned tail and fled the movement? The statement of the Workers Party can be characterized only as a cynical attempt to suppress the plain lesson to be learned from the Burnham defection. Not even the simple sentence: "We made a mistake." That means an unprincipled persistence on the same false course.

The ideological line of retreat from the movement pursued by Burnham has its dialectic significance. The pressure of alien classes is almost invariably reflected in a Marxist party by attempts at revision of Marxist theory followed by proposals to change practical policies. Burnham's first break with Marxism occurred when he attempted to characterize the Soviet Union as a "bureaucratic" state that was neither working class nor capitalist. At first he insisted that he still accepted the Marxist class theory of the state, but that Russia was an exception. Soon this theory reflected itself in politics. Under the furious outcry of petty-bourgeois democrats against the Stalin-Hitler pact and the invasion of Finland, Burnham refused to lend support to unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack. The Socialist Workers Party rejected this reflection of petty-bourgeois ideology inside its ranks. In short order

Burnham found himself *forced by his own logic* to generalize his attitude—to reject the Marxist theory of the state, then to abandon the materialist conception of history and the theory of class struggle. Relentlessly the dialectics of the class struggle forced Burnham out of the camp of the working class.

Burnham half-heartedly acknowledges in his document, in what he hopes will be accepted as an engaging manner, that his action is based on the desire to quit politics. When a class-conscious worker becomes disheartened, he generally does retire from politics and becomes apathetic. In the very letter of resignation that takes Burnham out of the ranks of the workers, however, he speaks of an article for the press. Assuredly, as an intellectual, the professor will continue to write and express opinions publicly. And he is perfectly free to do so. But we insist on precise evaluations. Burnham has quit, not politics in general, but proletarian politics. His Third Camp proved to be only a brief resting place for his trek back to the camp of the bourgeoisie, more accurately the camp of the petty-bourgeoisie. In company with them he already holds that reformism, Leninism, Stalinism, Trotskyism are merely "variants" of Marxism. Furthermore (the next stage in his logic!) Stalinism and Fascism are but twins, manifestations of the same "general historical forces." He is at present in the mood of "doubt" as to whether Leninism and Trotskyism belong to the same category—but since "time alone" resolves these questions, give him a little time!

His reference to a "managerial" society can be characterized at once as complete capitulation to totalitarianism, exactly as the Stalinists capitulated in Germany to make Hitler's victory inevitable. Burnham says now that he never accepted the philosophy of Marxism. In actuality what he means is that he never had any real faith in the workers and in their ability to carry civilization forward to the next stage, that of socialism. Since he never had this faith we cannot accuse him of losing it. Fundamentally it is this mistrust of the masses that drives Burnham into acceptance of the "probability" of a "managerial" society as the next step in history. Burnham confuses the pressures inside his own cranium with the forces of history. He thinks "Marxism must be rejected" because of all the Burnhams past and present who have abandoned it. To an entirely different world belongs the faith of the working masses: they cannot permit civilization to slide back into barbarism but must carry humanity forward, despite temporary setbacks, to socialism.

J. Weber

Elements of Dialectical Materialism

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

MARXISM is the scientific theory of the revolutionary proletarian movement which aims to overthrow the outlived capitalist system and erect a new socialist order in its stead. Dialectical materialism is the philosophical foundation of Marxism.

The Scope of Dialectical Materialism

Many times in the history of the labor movement capi-

talist spokesmen have sought to confine the activities of the workers within narrow limits. Workers are advised to restrict their activities to a particular plant or industry or within the boundaries of one country. Labor organizations are warned against entering politics, and, once they do become an independent force in political life, are cautioned against seizing state power on their own account. These "No Trespassing" signs are put up for one purpose: to

keep the workers from invading these privileged precincts so that reactionary forces can enjoy their undisputed possession.

We encounter an analogous phenomenon in intellectual life. Here the outright bourgeois enemies of Marxism strive to constrict revolutionary Socialist thought within the narrowest limits: the domain of the human mind. Marxism, they assert, is false; dialectical materialism is an intellectual absurdity. The petty-bourgeois revisers of Marxism, not so bold or consistent in their opposition, seek to circumscribe its application in another way. Marxism, they say, is half-true, or true of only half the world. It applies to social phenomena but has no relevance to purely physical phenomena. The theory of dialectical materialism is a relic of religion or of Hegelian idealism. Both schools of criticism, the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois, agree in excluding dialectical materialism from nature.

Dialectical materialism admits no such barriers to its field of operations. It has a universal character. It takes all reality for its province. The materialist dialectics applies to all phenomena from the most distant nebulae and the most remote time to man's most intimate feelings and elevated thoughts.

Just as the revolutionary proletariat aims to conquer the earth for socialism, so dialectical materialism, which is the philosophical expression of that movement, seeks to extend its sway over all departments of knowledge, contesting the right of rival ideologies to rule over them. It is a militant, uncompromisingly critical, revolutionary philosophy, which aims to refashion the old world of thought as radically as the revolutionary proletariat aspires to reconstruct the existing social order.

The Unity of Marxism

Marxism must repel every attempt to limit the scope of its application because it is a monistic view of the universe. Dualistic and pluralistic philosophies split reality into radically different categories of being, absolutely opposed one to the others. Mind is set up against matter; the individual against society, society against nature. Theories based upon the absolute disjunction and opposition of the various aspects of reality suffer from incurable contradictions. The inherent disunity in their conceptions of the world cannot be overcome.

Dialectical materialism, however, regards reality as a single historical process of material development. This process is unified by its material constitution and connections. At the same time this material universe has become quantitatively and qualitatively diversified in the course of its evolution so that individual segments and aspects can be distinguished and dealt with as separate units. But however isolated they may be, these subdivisions of existence continue to maintain essential relations with one another and with the historical process as a whole.

Accordingly, dialectical materialism cannot recognize any absolute cleavages between the component parts of the universe. Nature, society, and the human mind are three qualitatively different yet organically related creations and constituents of the one historical process. Nature is the primary product of material evolution; society developed out of nature and consciousness out of society.

The theory of dialectical materialism exhibits the same inner unity, organic interconnections, and systematic character as the various subdivisions of material reality it represents in thought. Its ideas have been derived from a comprehensive study of natural, social and intellectual processes and relations.

The basic conceptions of dialectical materialism have in the first place been taken from nature, not arbitrarily imposed upon it, as malicious critics insist. They have been extracted from nature according to the best methods of scientific thought and models of scientific practice.* These ideas reflect processes, forces, and relations which actually exist and operate in objective reality before they have been formulated by dialectic thought, as radium is present and active in pitchblende ore before its extraction in pure form by smelting. These principles are subsequently employed for the further investigation of natural phenomena and for human welfare as x-rays are used for experimental purposes in laboratories or for treating certain kinds of disease.

Although differing from the rest of nature in important respects, human society is an intrinsic part of the material world, an extension and off-spring of it. Historical materialism results from the application of the laws of dialectical materialism to this particular portion of material reality, human society in its manifold processes of development. It is a special form of the more general theory, just as society is a special form of material existence.

The same general laws that govern the myriad modes of motion and transformation in nature also hold for that part of the material world composed of associated human beings which we call society. But human society has, in addition to the natural laws which it shares in common with other material formations, its own special laws of development, which had to be discovered before mankind could obtain a scientific knowledge of society. In the theory and method of historical materialism Marx gave to the world for the first time the key to an understanding of the laws governing the evolution of society.

Just as every phase in the evolution of nature up to and including its highest product, associated humanity, has its own specific laws of development, so each stage in the evolution of society on this planet has had its own kind of material organization and special laws of development. Scientific Socialism is the fruit of the application of historical materialism to capitalism and its transition into the next higher stage, the socialist organization of society. Each of these three divisions of the Marxist system reflect a particular portion of reality in its process of historical realization. Dialectical materialism covers the universe at large, historical materialism human society, and scientific socialism human society in its present and prospective phase of existence.

These three parts of Marxist theory unfold one out of the other, the specific from the general, the concrete from the abstract. They are so organically interlinked that they cannot really be disjoined, although they may be considered separately for purposes of thought.

In addition to nature and society, reality has a third

*Engels is perfectly clear on this point. "Nature is the test of dialectics. . . .", he wrote in *Anti-Duehring*. "To me there could be no question of building the laws of dialectic into nature, but of discovering them in it and evolving them from it."

dimension, human consciousness. Consciousness arises in the human species on the threshold of its emergence from the animal state as an expression and expansion of social life. Men began to conceive ideas about their activities and environment in conjunction with the production of the material means of their social existence. Each subsequent stage of social development has had an intellectual organization, forms of consciousness, and methods of thought corresponding to its productive powers and material level. The higher the level of social development, the greater has been the comprehension of reality since each successive step in the progress of human knowledge is based upon the material and intellectual acquisitions of its predecessors.

As the scientific system of the Socialist movement, the most advanced tendency of historical development, Marxism has reached new heights in the understanding of intellectual as well as natural and social processes. It has created a distinctive theory of the nature and activities of mental life, its own method of thought, its individual logic. The Marxist method of thought is the materialist dialectics. The dialectical method of reasoning about material reality is the highest form of conscious thought.

The coherence of Marxist theory is rooted in the material unity of the historical process. The general laws of development of this process constitute the content of the materialist dialectics. The materialist dialectics is not only an instrument for analyzing thought but also for probing to the depths social and natural phenomena. So far, its greatest achievements have been in the sphere of sociology but, properly employed, the dialectical materialist method can be of immense aid to scientific investigation in all fields of knowledge.

The Materialist Basis of Marxism

Marxist thought is first of all materialist. It conceives the universe in all its manifestations to consist of matter in motion. Matter should not be pictured as inert, characterless, and leaden, as it is often misrepresented by opponents of materialism. On the contrary, material substance has been found to be electrically energetic, infinitely plastic, and, in organic beings, can even become sensitive, alive and intelligent.

Matter in the course of its development has assumed the most diverse forms. A light-ray and a louse, a dream and a solar system are all manifestations of material existence. The modes of material motion are as endlessly varied as its actual and potential formations. The network of electronic pulsations in the subatomic world, the rush of the planets through space, the migrations of animals, the activities of society, and the intricate circuits of the human nervous system and brain are all combinations of material motion in a lower or higher degree of development.

The properties of matter are limitless, and new ones are constantly being brought forth. Electromagnetism, which is today regarded as the fundamental form of material energy and is rapidly becoming the main motive force of modern technology, has been discovered, investigated, and put to practical use only in the past century. Many modes of its activity remain obscure or unknown. What further powers and properties material reality holds within itself, hidden from our perception, we cannot even guess.

The physical world existed before the appearance of mankind or any living being on this earth. It maintains itself independently of man's existence, perception, or thought. Neither God nor mankind created the world; the world gave birth to man and man created the idea of God.

The Materialist Theory of Knowledge

If, as materialism holds, everything in the universe consists of matter in motion, then the human mind must likewise be a material phenomenon. Dialectical materialism does not shrink from this conclusion but wholeheartedly embraces it. In agreement with the practice of modern science, it looks upon the mind as a natural outgrowth and the highest product of universal evolution.

The individual sciences from astronomy to social psychology study the main links in the chain of material development which has culminated in the emergence of human intelligence. Aside from the abundant evidence of scientific research, the material origins of the psychic powers can be observed in the growth of every human being from a sperm cell completely absorbed within the maternal womb to independent existence and intelligent control of its bodily activities. The life-cycle of the individual reproduces in a condensed version the historical evolution of the species.

If the collective intelligence of mankind has developed out of nature and society, the mind of the individual does not and cannot exist except as a function of his brain and his body. The gradual growth of intelligence, the effects of lack of food, narcotics, or a hard blow on the head upon one's own consciousness, the disappearance of intelligence at death testify to the dependence of mind upon its material bases.

Mental functioning is a thoroughly natural organic process. The operations of the human mind, remembering, dreaming, learning, reasoning, speaking, etc., have the same material character as such functions of the digestive apparatus as swallowing, chewing, digesting and excreting. Many schools of thought make a mystery of the mind, treating it as some supernatural power. Although the activities of the thought process have their special features and peculiar laws which can be uncovered only through direct analysis, they are in themselves no more enigmatic than other kinds of organic behavior. Human beings think as spontaneously as they work, eat and reproduce themselves.

Through the brain and nervous system the mind is connected with the body, through the body with society, and through society with the rest of nature. These spheres of existence provide the mind with the materials and motives for its activities just as they furnish the stomach with the food for its assimilation. Every human mind remains permanently anchored to these material foundations. The most extravagant speculations of thought, the wildest dreams, the most refined ideas cannot transcend the boundaries of material suggestion nor find any sources of material for its productions outside of those given by the material forms and forces which encompass man on all sides. Nature is the mother of all things and all ideas, and to it they eventually return.

From this materialist standpoint, it is not difficult to solve the problem which has vexed so many thinkers and

led to many wrong and fanciful notions: "How can we know the world around us?" The materialist immediately replies to the skeptical philosopher who doubts our ability to know the external world: "Why should we not be able to know it?" We have come out of the womb of this world; we are made of the same stuff; we remain part of it throughout life; and dissolve into it at death. Is it more extraordinary for the human mind to reflect the surrounding world than for the sea to reflect the sky? If a body can move through space, why cannot the mind actively penetrate reality? If the human hand can grasp objects and man-made tools can reshape them, why cannot the human mind also grasp and remold objects?

In fact, mental activity transforms physical sensations into particular ideas and systems of thought just as physical labor converts sugar-cane into pure sugar. The mind, one kind of organic energy, absorbs and alters its materials like any other natural agency into something bearing its own stamp and characteristic of its own mode of production.

Of course, human reflection, intellectual penetration and philosophical conception are far more complex and highly developed modes of organic functioning than the simpler natural and social processes cited above. But to the materialist, to the scientific thinker, there are no impassable barriers between these various categories of phenomena. All illustrate the capacity of one part and process of nature to react to and act upon another, to represent and to transform it, to separate, to recombine and to express its essential qualities.

The second riddle propounded by the sceptics: "How can the mind know the truth about the external world?" can be solved along the same lines. People did not begin to reason, nor do they continue to reason, for the pure pleasure of thinking. Men think for practical purposes, in order to act properly and attain their ends. Man's intellectual capacities, ideas, and philosophies have developed along with and out of man's social struggle against nature and his growing mastery over it. If their thought did not more or less correctly represent objective reality, if it did not help them to function more efficiently, if it did not force nature to serve man's ends and thus satisfy his vital needs, men would long since have ceased to cultivate their mental powers. These would have withered away or diminished in importance like the caudal appendage or the sense of smell.

The test of man's ability to know the external world truly is to be found in practice. Despite setbacks and stagnation, man's intellectual comprehension of the world has steadily increased together with his practical mastery over nature. Every improvement in man's material circumstances and powers of production has been accompanied by an advance in his mental capacities. Since we cannot see any insuperable limits to the material productive powers of society, we cannot set any limitations upon the progress of the intellectual powers of mankind.

There is an interesting illustration of this fact in *Anti-Duehring*. There Engels expresses doubt whether the subatomic world can ever be directly explored and known owing to the interference of light-rays. Recently, however, scientists have devised the electronic microscope which avoids light-ray interference and enables physicists to penetrate far more deeply into the constitution of matter than had been thought possible only a few years ago.

Materialism Versus Idealism

The question of the relations between mind and matter has divided philosophers into two main schools of thought. The materialists view matter as the primary reality, regarding sensation, consciousness, and reasoning as secondary and derivative qualities. The idealists have a totally different conception of their mutual relations. If it is admitted to exist at all, matter is considered an inferior, degraded form of existence deriving from and dependent upon mind, or God, the author of mind.

The materialist theory of knowledge and of the nature of mind conflicts with the idealist outlook at every important point. Where the materialist states that mind is a product of natural evolution, the idealist asserts or implies that it possesses some sort of supernatural power. This power, according to the idealist Plato, emanated from the mind's access to a realm of pre-existing eternal ideas; according to Christian philosophy it comes from divine sources.

The materialist looks upon mental operations as functions and forms of organic behavior. Idealism segregates reason from the rest of human activity and endows it with a unique status and categorically different powers. Thanks to mysterious transcendental powers of intuition or revelation, idealism declares that the mind has insight into special realms of being, apart from the gross material world and inaccessible to ordinary people. This takes its crassest form in the belief in communication with the souls of departed mortals or with ghosts. It assumes religious form in the belief that superior individuals or favored members of religious sects, prophets, mystics, saints, priests and popes, can communicate with God.

Where idealism doubts or denies man's ability to know the external world or to know its innermost characteristics, materialism holds fast to the unshakeable conviction, confirmed by the intellectual progress of humanity, by scientific knowledge, and by everyday experience, that the world around us is subject to intellectual penetration and comprehension in ever-increasing measure. Where idealism circumscribes man's knowledge, materialism sees the way clear to its advance. However imperfect, partial, and approximate our ideas of reality must necessarily be at any given time, materialism, unlike religious or idealist theories of knowledge, refuses to idolize and prostrate itself before man's present ignorance. Our knowledge of nature, of society, and of our selves has absolutely increased under our eyes. Far from being near the end of its intellectual acquisitions and powers, mankind is today only at the beginning.

It has often been objected that, since the mind conceives many things not to be found in reality, mind must be essentially different from the rest of reality. A false conclusion has here been drawn from a correct fact. The fact that one portion of material reality, the mind, possesses properties and products not to be found elsewhere is not peculiar to the mind. It is a universal feature of reality. Just as there is much in the mind that cannot and will never be present in other parts of nature, so there is much in the rest of nature that has not yet and never will be possessed by the mind. Humanity's imagination is still surpassed by its ignorance.

PROTECT LEON TROTSKY FROM STALIN'S GANGSTERS

On May 24th, Stalin's hired murderers attempted to assassinate Leon Trotsky at his home in Coyoacan, Mexico. The details appear in this issue of the *Fourth International*.

Stalin's latest and most serious attempt to murder Trotsky was meticulously planned and carried out in a workman-like manner. There is abundant evidence of the experienced hands of the GPU assassins.

After brutally murdering Robert Sheldon Harte, the secretary-guard who was on watch, the attackers proceeded toward the main objective in their gruesome task, the assassination of Comrade Trotsky. Hundreds of rounds were fired from the machine guns into the patio and the house.

But they failed. Comrade Trotsky remains alive to hound Stalin with his merciless exposures of every step taken by this hangman of the October Revolution and the world proletariat.

This experience demonstrates that the defense must be entirely revamped and made much more in-

tricate and complete. It is necessary to build fire-towers for the guard, redoubts, bomb-proof shelters and anti-bomb screening. Provisions must be made for more efficient lighting, additional alarm protection, automatic defense mechanisms and numerous other measures. The services of military architects, recommended by the Mexican government, have been engaged to assure technical precision in this work. Considerable quantities of material are needed. Skilled workmen must be employed. And above all else, the job must be done quickly.

We have no doubt that all members of the party and all sympathizers will recognize the importance of doing everything possible to re-enforce the defense of Comrade Trotsky. Under the present world conditions we alone are in a position to provide this defense. It depends on us alone.

Make all checks and money orders for the defense of Leon Trotsky payable to *Coyoacan Fund*, and mail them to *Rose Karsner, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y.*

COYOACAN FUND

Rose Karsner
116 University Place
New York, N. Y.

I wish to aid in protecting Leon Trotsky's life against further attacks, and
am enclosing \$..... for that purpose.

Name

Address

[] I wish to remain anonymous