

# The Fighting Worker

Official Organ of The Revolutionary Workers League, U. S.

Workers of  
The World  
Unite!

Vol. 12—No. 6. Whole No. 132

JULY, 1945

Price 5 Cents

## SYRIANS OBJECT TO "LIBERATORS"

The myth of the fight of the "peace-loving," "democratic" nations against fascist "aggressors" has been exposed once again in the Levant in all its brutality. France, only a short time ago "agonizing" under the iron heel of German occupation, has revealed herself for what she is: a minor imperialist power, fighting to maintain or regain her colonial empire against the two biggest imperialists — the U.S. and Great Britain.

There are two aspects to the struggle going on in the Levant. First there is the antagonism between the peoples of Syria and Lebanon, fighting for their "independence," and French imperialism, attempting to reestablish its colonial system of exploitation over these countries. Upon this struggle is super-imposed the antagonism between the imperialist powers fighting among themselves for the spoils of the war, for the redivision of the globe.

During the first period of the events in the Levant the former aspect was in the spotlight. Although Syria and Lebanon had been granted their independence in June 1941 by the Free-French through a statement by Gen. George Catroux, France demanded greater control over these countries than any other imperialist, more control than the native bourgeoisie, with its nationalist aspirations, was willing to grant her. And she intended to enforce her demands by the force of arms.

On May 18 the Levantine masses answered a French reinforcement of troops in their countries by a general strike which lasted until the actual outbreak of armed hostilities. On May 22 the governments of both countries unsuccessfully tried to call it off to create a more peaceful atmosphere for the sessions of the parliaments. The working masses were on the move. Although their aims apparently did not go beyond those of their bourgeoisie, the Levantine governments could not have come to an agreement with French imper-

ialism, had they wanted to do so.

### BRITISH "SAVE" LEVANTINES FOR BRITAIN

On May 19 the first shooting by French Senegalese troops at a Lebanese demonstration was reported. The tension is growing, individual clashes occur, fighting is reported at Aleppo. The actual beginning of the fighting in Damascus, which was the center of the events on May 30 is described as follows by eye witness Clay Gowran of the Chicago Tribune:

"There was no doubt the French opened the attack, despite the fact they repeatedly claimed Syrian snipers started it. I was standing on the steps of the Syrian government house watching a well-ordered Syrian demonstration against the French in front of the building when the first French machine gun cut loose a few hundred yards down the streets. The demonstrators broke for cover. Within a few minutes machine guns were hammering away all around the government house."

After two days of fighting British imperialism stepped in. On June 1 the French forces were ordered to cease fire upon the "request" of Great Britain. This request consisted in an open verbal threat by Churchill and British armed forces moving into Damascus with Sherman tanks. The inter-imperialist conflict had become the predominant factor.

The situation of Great Britain in the Levant had been superior to that of France from the outset. Not only did she have a greater number of armed forces in Syria and Lebanon proper, but she was ready to draw in reserves from nearby Palestine, Transjordan and Iraq. To this military advantage was added the support of the Levantine capitalists, who allied themselves with British imperialism in their more immediate fight against French domination.

(Continued on Page 2)

## Blind Planning

Government cut-backs in war production mean unemployment for millions of war workers. Over 400,000 workers in aircraft alone are slated to go, plus another 100,000 in shipbuilding. Mr. Krug, the chairman of the WPB, stated to the press, May 29th, that in the coming six month period four million former war workers and soldiers will be on the streets. The AFL and the CIO predicts five and nine million unemployed, respectively, before the end of the year.

What has the administration done to avert mass unemployment? Aside from the glowing editorials in the boss press and the honeyed words of paid propagandists about 60,000,000 jobs and a speedy reconversion, nothing of a definite nature has been done. The WPB, that is immediately involved in reconversions, admits it is in a state of confusion and unpreparedness. Victor Riesenfeld, employer member of the WPB, frankly reveals that reconversion plans are either in the blue print stage or don't make sense.

### PROFITS COME FIRST

A speedy reconversion from war production to peace time production seems to be out of the question. Industrialists are claiming that the shortage of materials will not allow them to go immediately into peacetime production. They further charge that if the government insists upon holding their profits to the 1941-1942 level, the required incentive to produce will be absent. This current opinion among the industrialists may be responsible for chairman Krug's statement, on May 29th, advising that reconversion should be placed in the hands of big business, which should be free of a 'myriad of rules and restrictions.' He wants to lift the ceiling on initiative, imagination and resourcefulness by permitting private industry to choose what to produce, sell and buy. The huge profits that business made during the war are not enough; they must be permitted to make all they can now.

But on the other hand there is no marked tendency to ease up on the "little steal" formula. The line must be held here at any cost. Business Week, a magazine of big business, is of the opinion that any free play of the economic forces in the labor movement, meaning the abolition of the "little steal" formula, will mean strikes, unemployment and general chaos. These gentlemen speak approvingly of the WPB holding the line on wages but are sincerely afraid that the union rank and file will smash the little steel formula.

Along with unemployment, cut-backs mean a sharp reduction in wages for those who are left working. Cut-backs have brought about a reduction in overtime work and if the "little steal" formula is not smashed, this spells a cut in pay. The bosses have started a vicious campaign against the unions, to smash them and as a result will further reduce workers' pay.

### GOVERNMENT SPEARHEADS ATTACK ON WORKERS

The Selective Service Board is leading the way in this campaign by insisting that a returning veteran has seniority over a man with 20 years seniority. This is calculated to put the blame for the veteran's unemployment on the shoulders of the unions if they fight back, and further, to split the working class.

(Continued on Page 2)

## WORLD MASSES MOVE LEFT

The "peace" of Europe is taking its expected form — a greatly heightened class warfare. From one end of the continent to the other a pre-revolutionary situation exists, with France in the key, central position. Starvation, hunger, unemployment, misery, inflation are stalking through the "liberated" areas like a vast specter. And the masses are beginning to rise up in anger.

Although reports on France are hidden in back pages of the daily press, enough is known to confirm that the French Republic is on the verge of a working class revolution. On June 3rd 75,000 ex-prisoners of war staged a mighty demonstration in Paris over food shortages and unemployment. Strikes have been occurring daily. The DeGaulist government has been meeting regularly with CGT trade union leaders and attempting to behead the movement by making minor concessions.

## Truck Drivers Defy the WLB

June 22, 1945

The current strike wave sweeping the country is best typified by the truck strike now going on in Chicago. This strike follows on the heels of a strike held late last month under the leadership of the Chicago Truck Drivers, Chauffeurs and Helpers Union, Local 705. Over 10,000 strikers have succeeded in disrupting truck movements in the city, but the strike is at present without a leadership. This is due in part to the sellout activities of the AF of L leaders, in part to personal cowardice, in part to the intransigent attitude of the Small-Contractors Act.

The workers have struck the industry in order to gain a five dollar weekly raise in pay with a reduction from fifty-one to forty-eight hours of work per week at straight time. The government has always claimed that its contracts require time and a half pay for all work over forty hours a week. Yet we here observe the spectacle of the government openly playing the role of strikebreaker on this question. Not only has the WLB rejected the workers' demands; it seems that every government agency must reveal its role in this strike. The ODT acts to repeal the draft deferment of all strikers, in cahoots with the Selective Service Boards; Longnecker, the ODT boss, openly states that he is out to break the strike; the army comes in to furnish drivers and armed guards to smash the strike.

### HOW TO WIN

It should be clear that the workers can win their strike ONLY ONE WAY. They must spread the strike to every related industry. No truck must move without a strike committee permit, and these permits must be granted only for genuine emergencies: hospital necessities, foods to prevent suffering to the workers, etc. This means ALL truck locals must join the strike. Railroad workers must decline to handle scab-delivered goods. Factories must refuse to accept or deliver goods for shipment by scab drivers.

Above all incessant work must be done to teach the soldiers whose interests they are serving. It is not an inspiring sight to see helmeted G.I.'s manning weapons-carriers conveying trucks. But it is doubtful that the G.I. is prepared to use these weapons under all circumstances. For example, if the wives

(Continued on Page 2)

Minimum wages for Paris office workers have been raised slightly; the differential between Paris and outlying cities has been cut a bit; some maximum wages have been abolished for piece workers; coal miners have received some gains. But the government remains adamant in its refusal to raise basic minimum wages scales from approximately 40c to 46c per hour.

Toward the end of May, returning war veterans, tired of asking the government to get clothes for them, just took things into their own hands and cleaned out clothing stocks of some of the biggest department stores. As a parting gesture of irony they told store managers to send the bill to the government and they threatened to continue the same tactics in getting food.

The black market is flourishing openly and the value of the franc is constantly falling. In order to check it DeGaulle has issued new currency in exchange for the old, but it is doubtful if this will stem the tide. Lack of transport and lack of raw materials is keeping the country in stagnation, unemployment and hunger.

### REFORMISM UNDERMINES WORKERS

The Stalinists — now that DeGaulle has made peace with Uncle Joe in Moscow — and the other labor fakers in the CGT are attempting to put a damper on the strike movement, even to the point of calling it "fifth column" activity. But the strikes continue and they involve not only workers but students and unemployed as well.

Added to these internal ills the French imperialists are having trouble keeping the Empire in line. A revolt in Algeria took the lives of scores of Frenchmen — quite a few of whom were Stalinists who are now again on the imperialist bandwagon. And, of course, there is the trouble in Syria, dealt with elsewhere in our paper. The most open French imperialist role is being carried out in Indo-China.

All of Europe is moving leftward in a gigantic sweep. Most observers believe the elections in Britain during July will undoubtedly show appreciable gains for the British Labor Party. In the Municipal elections in France the Stalinists made astounding gains. In Northern Italy the Stalinists and Socialists are practically the only political forces of any following. For the first time in history the social-reformist Communist Party is a factor in Dutch politics.

The growth of Stalinism or of the forces of the Second International

(Continued on Page 2)

## Chinese Masses Under Double Yoke

The most recent developments in China clearly reveal the incoluble contradictions between the interests of the rival imperialist powers, as well as the impossibility of ANY capitalist government satisfying the needs of the hundreds of millions of Chinese. Much is being made in the American boss press of the Japanese retreat from south-central China. It would appear to the incautious reader that the Kuomintang armies are winning terrific battles. In fact, the Japanese are retreating with scarcely a struggle, and in good order. This is probably due to a combination of factors, chief of which are: 1) the need for concentrating its armies near their bases in North China, Manchukuo, and Japan proper; 2) the increased aid given by American imperialism to its stooge Chungking regime; 3) fear of mass uprisings in the areas under their control, aided by the Yanan "Border Region" government.

The second of these three points is worth noting further. It is perfectly clear that Hurley and Wedemeyer have succeeded where Stil-

well failed. That Chungking is now completely under the thumb of the American boss class is plainly revealed by the recent series of government reorganizations. Latest of these is the most far-reaching: Chiang has resigned as premier of Chungking China and has appointed T. V. Soong. Soong has for many years been the flunkey of American imperialism in the Far East. Hence his appointment means further inroads on behalf of Yankee control of China.

### CHINESE MASSES REAWAKENING

But the most outstanding feature of this period is the gradual reawakening of the Chinese masses. Demonstration have taken place in Chungking against the American soldiers. While these have taken the FORM of protests against the "jeep girl," it is clear that their CONTENT is at variance with the interests of the Kuomintang regime. Moreover, even in the larger industrial cities under Japanese con-

(Continued on Page 2)

BRAND 3

## WORKERS OF THE WORLD

### SLAVE-LABOR IN THE U.S. AND G B

The "liberation" (conquest) of Italy by the Allies started almost two years ago, and yet the labor of Italian prisoners of war is being exploited in Great Britain to a degree that seems unbelievable. About 150,000 German and 160,000 Italian prisoners of war are being used as slave laborers in Britain. They are being used at the hardest work — roadbuilding etc. — at a pay of 60 cents to \$1.20 weekly. Their employers have to pay current civilian wages, the difference going to the government which provides for their upkeep.

The same system of exploitation is used in the United States, with only this difference that the prisoners are paid a full 80 cents a day. During the first four months of 1945 the U.S. government made \$800,000 by this procedure.

The class struggle goes on in the armies, among the prisoners of war. At Fort Douglas, Utah, 200 Italian prisoners of war refused to work longer hours than civilians. In reprisal they were put on a diet of bread and water, and forced to sleep out in the rain with only one blanket and some salvage tenting for shelter.

### FRENCH WORKERS GROW STRONGER

The French proletariat is on the move. Despite Stalinist-reformist domination the French workers are taking direct class action, striking and demonstrating. The returning war prisoners are at the fore in the food and clothing riots, occurring daily.

On May 12 the Paris dockers struck for higher wages, completely stopping all activity at the wharves. A last minute agreement — raising the salaries of office, bank and department store clerks from a minimum of 3,100 francs (\$8) to 3,900 francs (\$79.80) — averted a threatened strike of between 300,000 and 350,000 white collar workers in Paris.

The general strike in Marseille, called to enforce demands for social reforms, spread to the Toulon and Avignon regions. The general strike order was followed so completely that the whole economic life in that part of France, including government offices, stopped. The strike was almost as complete in Lyon (3rd largest city of France).

### "ORDER" IN THE COLONIES

More than 10,000 Arabs were killed or wounded in Algeria by the French armed forces called out to suppress what the bourgeois papers call a food "riot." It took the French forces who are supposed to have brought the "advantages of modern civilization to the poor ignorant natives" to suppress these same natives rebelling for their right to eat. "Order" is still not completely restored.

### SOCIALIST MINISTER ARRESTS STRIKERS

Van Acker, Belgian Socialist prime minister, played well the now traditional role of the revisionists when the capitalist class calls to its aid when the workers take the offensive. He represented the best interests of Belgian capitalism when he broke the general strike of the Belgian miners. Hunger was more convincing to the Belgian miners than a "socialist" prime minister, so they used the only weapon workers have to win their economic demands. They went on strike.

Van Acker brutally forced the miners back to work. When the workers of Liege called a 24-hour general strike in defiance of the government's outlawing of strikes, Van Acker countered with "an undisclosed number of arrests."

On the other hand, Belgium is trying to regain the 40,000 foreign miners she had imported before the war, in order to lower the living standards of the Belgian miners and through this competition break their fighting spirit.

### ROMANIA

70,000 persons of German origin have been deported from Romania to central Asia, and 36,000 refugees, who fled from Bessarabia prior to Soviet occupation in 1940, have been removed forcibly to the Soviet Union. It is obvious that all these thousands of people are not Nazi supporters. They are rounded up and deported not on the basis of their political activity but on the basis of their national origin. They are brought to the Soviet Union to serve as slave labor.

The fact that the "country of the Soviets," the country where socialism is supposed to have been built, agrees to and depends upon the exploitation of foreign slave labor demonstrates the extent to which the Soviet Union has been misled by the Stalinist bureaucracy.

## BLIND PLANNING

(Continued from Page 1)

The unions must counteract this by pointing out to the veteran the economic causes of his unemployment under capitalism and fighting for his right to a job at union rates as a member of the working class, not at the expense of other workers, which in the long run will be to his disadvantage. The same is true of the Negro worker who will be hit the hardest by reconversion.

Reconversion, like all other problems of capitalism, is being met with the same indecision, the same planlessness, and the same anarchy that so characterizes capitalism. If unemployment is to be averted, labor must do the job. Labor must fight

for the destruction of the infamous "little steal" formula and for repudiation of the WLB, which is an anti-working class instrument. Labor must fight for the 30 hour week with 48 hour pay as a method of taking care of some of the unemployed. It must further fight for trade union wages for all those who will be unemployed, and for the complete unity of labor regardless of race, nationality or military service.

Moreover, all these partial solutions will only alleviate, not cure the situation. Labor's only way out is to overthrow capitalism and establish workers control of production for use, not profit.

## Left Move

(Continued from Page 1)

is not something that the Marxists welcome, but it is a barometer of the leftward shift of the masses. Stalinism is playing the same role following this war in Europe that social-democracy played after the first carnage — as breakwater for the tides of Revolution.

Therein lies the danger of the present period. The program and tactics of bourgeois "democracy" can not keep the masses quiet. As a matter of fact the policies of the military governments will breed discontent, guerrilla struggles and mass uprisings. That has already been shown in Northern Italy. The Allied military forces were afraid to arrest the Stalinist leader, Togliatti, while addressing a crowd of 80,000, and it had to release the Socialist Nenni from jail despite the fact that both spoke in military zones against the orders of the British and Americans.

But everywhere in the world today social-reformism is stepping into the breach to bolster up the decaying capitalist system. What the out and out capitalist agents can not do with blood and thunder, Stalinism, social-democracy and the centrist lickspittles are doing with honeyed words and demagogic promises.

The reformists are calling for "democracy," for an "end to hunger," for "jobs," for "nationalization," etc. But as usual they forget just one thing — that the state does the bidding of the ruling class, not the exploited class. Jobs, security and democracy can not be gained under capitalism, no matter how many "good" parliamentary representatives are elected. Only the Revolutionary Overthrow of Capitalism can defeat fascism and stave off further imperialist wars.

### REFORMISM THE ROAD TO FASCISM

The danger at the moment in Europe therefore does not come from Fascism, but from those opportunist forces which are paving the way for a Fascist restoration. By demoralizing the working class, by giving them illusory goals, the way is made clear for dissension and disharmony.

Already in Ontario, Canada, the results of reformism are being felt. The Canadian Commonwealth Federation has suffered a sharp defeat at the hands of the Conservatives. Their representation has fallen to less one third of what it was two years ago. It seems that the masses instinctively recognize the uselessness of parliamentary juggling, and in their confusion are turning to the demagogy of the Right.

No "moderate" palliatives, no compromises in principle are possible today. They all lead to one end, back to Fascism. The role of Stalinism, as a left flunkey of the bourgeois regimes in France and elsewhere, like the role of social-democracy following the last war and today in England, is treachery and can only bring fatal results to the masses. The position of Trotskyism which demands a "bourgeois republic" in Italy, a Labor Party (capitalist) government in England, and in general calls for organization of a left wing form of Popular Frontism, is the centrist replica of the Stalinist virus.

Support of capitalism in any form today can only lead to more death, more unemployment, more fascism, more war. Only an uncompromising battle with so-called democratic forms of boss rule can stave off the Fascist form and bring on a successful Socialist Revolution.

For Independent Workers Councils and Workers Militia in Europe, supplemented with mass action to gain democratic rights and better wages, — that is the road along which success can be gained.

## Double Oppression

(Continued from Page 1)

control, the pressure of the masses is bearing fruit. Here again we see a duplication of the maneuvers in Italy. The Japanese armies move out as the Kuomintang armies move in, thus insuring against either the revolutionary masses or the reformist Yen-an regime moving in. The daily papers are again carrying stories about rumored Eighth Route Army and New Fourth Army penetrations in the direction of the larger cities "in order to create civil war."

No one should hold illusions about the Yen-an regime. There is precisely one feature of its policy which we enthusiastically support, but for entirely different reasons from those of its Stalinist leaders. The so-called "Red Armies" have long pursued a policy of fraternization with the enemy. Japanese prisoners are not kept against their will. If they elect to remain in the Border regions, they are better treated than even the soldiers. This is a policy which, if America were not at war with Japan, would reap a harvest of rebellion in the Japanese army. Unfortunately, it is impossible to convince the Japanese that he should be for defeat of "his own" imperialists if you tell him at the same time that the American imperialists deserve to defeat the Japanese. In other words, what is needed is a revolutionary policy — for the DEFEAT of ALL the imperialists (American, British, Japanese, etc.) and their overthrow by the workers and oppressed masses of China, Japan, England, America, etc.

With the intensification of misery in Japanese regions inevitable, the masses of industrial Japan are hourly growing riper for proletarian revolution. The movement will spread through the industrial areas of China and sweep away both the Chungking regime and the reformist forces of Mao Tse-Tung. Only in this way will the Chinese masses be liberated from the double yoke of industrial and virtual colonial exploitation.

## RENEW YOUR SUB!

## Truck Drivers Defy the WLB

(Continued from Page 1)

of strikers or sympathizers block off a truck from movement, it is very doubtful that the G.I. will use his machine gun. The worker in uniform must be reminded that blind obedience to orders leads to events like MacArthur's shooting of World War I veterans at Ananostia in 1932.

The workers of Local 705 went back to work on the basis of a fake promise to "reconsider" their demands last month. This time there must be no such concession. Concessions based on promises to return to work are always demoralizing in their effect. It is the task of the strikers to spread their strike throughout the transportation and allied industries. In order to do this they must find ways of counteracting the propaganda of the boss class radio, press, etc. It is of the utmost importance to issue a daily strike bulletin, so that the public will know the strikers' side of the story. But this requires a well-organized strike committee, with a militant class struggle leadership and the strictest rank-and-file control.

## Syrians Object

(Continued from Page 1)

What makes the British intervention so touching is the consistency of Churchill's role: from suppression of the masses in Greece to ostensible protection of the masses in Syria. Can the leopard have changed his spots? Or can it be that Churchill is primarily concerned with the needs of British imperialism first, last and always?

### AMERICA PLAYS ITS OWN GAME

While the U.S. was apparently backing up Great Britain against France its general policy in this last period has been that of encouraging the Arab League, — which is necessarily antagonistic to both these powers — in order to infiltrate itself more and more into the Near-East, and on the basis of its economic superiority establish a firm imperialist domination in this part of the world. One of the big attractions of the Near-East is its great oil resources.

While the American capitalist press and the Levantine bourgeoisie are hailing the British "liberators," let us see what the outcome will be for the Syrian and Lebanese working masses. They have borne the brunt of the fighting, their own weapon — the strike — was the first used, from their ranks came the hundreds of victims. But they will gain nothing. Their own bourgeoisie is still exploiting them. They will only have exchanged French domination for British domination.

The events in Syria and Lebanon have demonstrated again that so long as the working class — even in colonial countries — supports its bourgeoisie instead of fighting for its own class interests, it can only lose in the fight. Only in a common fight with their class brothers of all countries against imperialism and for workers' state power will the workers of colonial countries achieve freedom from all oppression.

## Open Letter

(Continued from Page 3)

is a crime against humanity and against the working class in particular. Support of "national unity" means support of capitalism, and support of capitalism means MORE WAR, MORE INTERVENTION AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION!

Fellow workers, break with this social-patriotic, reformist policy! Only a program of class struggle and proletarian revolution can save humanity! No truck with bourgeois democracy. Fight fascism by fighting capitalism. No more labor parties or popular fronts to chain us to capitalism. For independent working class action.

Break with Stalinism. Join the Revolutionary Workers League, the only revolutionary Marxian organization in America.

Political Committee  
Revolutionary Workers League  
affiliated with the  
International Contact Commission for a New (Fourth) Communist International.

WE DEPEND  
ON  
CONTRIBUTIONS  
FROM WORKERS  
FOR  
PUBLICATION  
AND  
DISTRIBUTION  
OF  
THIS PAPER

## The International News and Fighting Worker

can be purchased:

PEOPLE'S BOOK SHOP

18 Noel St.

London W1, England

THE FIGHTING WORKER

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, U. S.  
(Affiliated to the Provisional International Contact Commission for a New Communist (4th) International)

Subscription \$1.00 per year

Published monthly by

DEMOS PRESS  
708 N. Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

PLEASE NOTE: There is no connection between Demos Press and the Social Science Institute located at the same address.

STALINISM DEVELOPS "NEW LINE"

Since the accession of Stalinism to power in the Soviet Union the various Stalinist parties all over the world have been nothing but agents of Uncle Joe's foreign policy. Based on a theory of world status-quo, that foreign policy has necessarily been one of sharp zig-zags.

The "new" line of Stalinism — now being developed in the U.S.A. — can be understood only in this light. During the days of the Weimar Republic in Germany, Stalinism had a pact with that nation. Then, following the rise of Hitler to power, Stalin and his cronies made a pact with France. The idea behind it all was to stave off a "cordon sanitaire" by pitting France against Germany and thus — Stalin hoped — averting war with the Wehrmacht. The price for this Pact was enormous. The "Communist" International gave up every vestige of militancy and class struggle, in favor of national unity and chauvinism.

But the Franco-Soviet Pact solved nothing. War between imperialism and the Soviet Union became inevitable. In a desperate attempt Stalin made a pact even with Hitler. During this period he apologized for Hitler's war policy. He accused Germany and France of being "aggressors," and defended Hitlerite Germany as a "peace loving" nation. But this skulduggery saved nothing either. In 1941 Germany attacked the Soviet Union and once again Stalin went "bar-gain-hunting." This time he made a deal with America and Great Britain. Again — a temporary respite.

But the honeymoon is coming to an end. World imperialism will inevitably attack the Soviet Union. As a matter of fact they have been attacking it for years, both on the outside and from within. Stalinism knows that this friction is growing. It was visible at Frisco, in the Air conference, in the negotiations with Germany to end the war, in Trieste and in hundreds of other issues.

Stalinism is therefore attempting to gain CAPITALIST friends to check the two Allies and the whole imperialist world. It is again using its Stalinist parties as bargaining agents. Two courses lie open to it: to divide the U. S. from Britain and make a pact with one of them against the other; or, to make a pact with the various small and weak powers, like France, Italy, etc. Either way, however, Stalinism must make itself respectable to world capitalism as a whole.

Thus its "new" line changes only minor tactics. Its fundamental program still remains one of national unity and support of one's own imperialists. If it threatens to use strikes here and there it will still do so within the framework of national unity, of class collaboration.

Stalinism is making another attempt to "balance its enemies." Can it succeed? We doubt it. Too many of the gains of the October Revolution have been given up. The Soviet Union is sick internally; a great class struggle is looming within its borders. And finally — above all — the working class is rapidly becoming disillusioned with the policies of reformism of the "Communist" International.

Splits are occurring in various Stalinist parties. The masses are pushing rapidly to the left throughout Europe.

Without the ability to mislead the world working class, the role of Stalinism as a world force and within the Soviet Union will be at an end.

Unfortunately such a conclusion is only negative. The defeat of the Soviet Union by the imperialists, even if it defeats Stalinism at the same time, will not help the world working class. On the contrary.

Every effort must be bent now to build a new world party of Marxism to avoid such a contingency, to avoid further defeats for the workers of Europe and Asia; and in the process to actually defend the Soviet Union by extending the October Revolution.

ALL ARE GUILTY

The Stalinist bureaucracy in Russian has arrested 16 representatives of the London Polish government-in-exile, including some social-democrats. The London Poles claim that the 16 were promised safe conduct. Moscow denies this fact and charges that the 16 were guilty of acts against the military interests of the Red Army.

Regardless of any of the claims, however, one thing is certain: the 16 gentlemen were in effect, agents of British Imperialism and were unalterably upholding the imperialist war. As far as the working class is concerned they deserve not one iota of mercy or aid, any more for that matter than do Stalin, Bevin, Henderson, Browder or Churchill. They are all treacherous enemies — either open or hidden.

Unfortunately, in this case the prosecutors are just as guilty of infamy as are the accused. It is no wonder that Stalin doesn't open up the books and give the 16 Poles an open and immediate trial. It is no wonder that he permits no outside defense for these gentry. After all Stalinism too is guilty of crimes against the working class and against the Workers State.

Revolutionists will have no sympathy for the 16 agents of imperialism. But we hope the day will soon come when the working class will mete out similar justice to Stalin and his band of hoodlums as well.

**INTERNATIONAL NEWS**  
Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission

Labor Party Distorts Class Struggle  
China Today  
South American Feasage  
Marxists Unite in Great Britain

Subscription \$1.00 a year 10c per copy  
Order from Demos Press  
708 North Clark St., Chicago, Illinois, U.S.

Nazi Trials a Fake

Much ado is being made about "atrocities" trials. The imperialist governments intend to punish "war criminals" who were particularly brutal to Allied prisoners. What a monstrous farce! As if imperialist war is not the height of organized brutality!

If a Nazi general ordered the beheading of one American aviator he is a criminal, but if he led a military campaign which killed off thousands — so long as he did it in the accepted manner of mass murder — he is a civilized gentleman. The Wall Street legalists recognize him as an honest adversary. Such balderdash!

The fact is —

ALL IMPERIALISTS ARE GUILTY OF ATROCITY IN THIS PRESENT WAR, AND THE WORKING CLASS WILL YET METE OUT PUNISHMENT TO THOSE WHO STARTED THIS WAR AND WHO LED IT THROUGH FIFTY MILLION DEATHS AND THE CRIMINAL SPENDING OF ONE TRILLION DOLLARS. The criminals are not only the generals and the colonels who order the actual shooting, but behind them the governments and the capitalists in whose interests they did the ordering.

The "atrocities" trials farce is being put forth in order to gain a few scapegoats for the masses and to hide this underlying crime — IMPERIALISM. But the capitalists do not have their heart in it. After all how can Thomas Lamont be anxious to bump off his old crony Mussolini? They use to golf together each year and admire each other. How can Churchill order the death of the Fascists in Germany and in Italy whom he openly praised only a few years back? These are blood brothers of the "democratic" capitalists.

After the public has been given a few scapegoats we can rest assured that other Fascists will be re-incorporated into the dictatorial structure of Europe today. American correspondents in Germany already report that thousands of Nazis are back at their old jobs, with the military forces excusing this procedure on the grounds that there are no others to take their places. Allied imperialism is divorcing itself from only a few of the top layers of its Fascist brothers; the rest it clutches hopefully to its bosom.

OPEN LETTER TO MEMBERS OF CPA

(Continued from Page 4)

...were satisfied, they did not criticize, they said nothing. Now they are turning around and crucifying him. They, as much as he, are at fault.

But Browder knows better than to voice such thoughts. Instead he is already making speeches on the "Crisis in the Coalition," attacking British imperialism, etc. Soon we will hear attacks on the American monopolists. We will find that we are in a "new period of sharpening struggles," and the perspective of post-war class peace will fade away.

THE SOURCE OF BROWDER'S LINE

Duclos' criticism of Browder scarcely scratches the surface. To go further would expose the fact that Browder and Duclos stand on the same ground, that if Duclos' premises are correct then Browder's line was correct. It is a stubborn fact, which neither Duclos nor Browder dare recognize, that Browder's course is essentially a development of Duclos' theories and of the theories of Stalinism.

Truly Duclos has unbridled arrogance and contempt for the rank-and-file to condemn Browder and at the same time ignor his own, and his masters' — sins. What was the WORLD policy of Stalinism until the European victory and the San Francisco Conference? How was it expressed in France, for instance?

The United States, Britain and

Russia were, they said, fighting for democracy against Fascism. Stalinists everywhere called for national unity of labor and capital, subordination of the class struggle, opposition to strikes, collaboration with all forces, including the imperialists, that "fought" fascism. They dropped the suspect term "imperialists" and distinguished instead "businessmen of good will" and "fascist Tories." Even in Duclos article there is no mention of imperialists — he merely denounces "men of the trusts."

Stalinism rejected and rejects the idea of socialism as a revolutionary outcome of the war; it wants national unity and democratic capitalism only. It has supported and supports imperialism against the revolutionary demands of the masses. It refuses to recognize that in life itself the war is posing the issue of socialism or capitalist dictatorship, that other solutions are only temporary, giving the capitalists time to recover their strength.

Duclos doesn't use the word "imperialism" because his French CP is supporting French imperialist policy in Syria and Lebanon. True, it criticises the "excesses" of that policy, but it does NOT demand independence for these colonies. The same is true for French Indo-China, where Duclos' Party has spear-headed the demand for a French army to "liberate" Indo-China.

Duclos has endorsed French and Russian participation in the San Francisco Conference — a confer-

ence whose main intent is to divide up the world, establish a police force against the revolutionary masses everywhere, and to line up the entire balance of the world against the Soviet Union.

All of this policy rests on the Stalinist drive to nationalism, to the theory of "socialism in one country," abandonment of the world revolution, sacrifice of the masses throughout the world as pawns in the game of power politics. In 1924 Stalin and Bukharin discarded the Marxian position for the extension of the October Revolution to the rest of the world as the most important task of the world working class. Stalinism based itself on maintaining the world status-quo, on safeguarding the Workers' State by compromising with one section of capitalism against another. From 1924 to the early thirties Stalinism had an agreement with the German Weimar Republic, aimed at counteracting a French "cordon sanitaire."

From 1933 on, the policy was reversed in favor of a Franco-Soviet pact aimed at neutralizing Hitler's rearmament program. But when this alliance with imperialist France broke down — as we Marxists predicted it would — Stalinism, WHICH LONG AGO GAVE UP HOPE IN THE WORKING CLASS REVOLUTION AND WAS, AND IS, INTERESTED ONLY IN MAINTAINING THE WORLD STATUS QUO SO FAR AS THE CLASS STRUGGLE IS CONCERNED, Stalinism now found itself forced to make a pact with Hitler.

Did the Stalinists expose the imperialist role of Germany when the war broke out in 1939? No. Molotov stated that Germany was in the position of a "PEACE-LOVING NATION" and that Britain and France were the aggressors. At that time Browder had the unanimous support of the CPUSA in declaring this an imperialist war and in insisting that "the Yanks are not coming." In this period Roosevelt's foreign policy was characterised by Browder as imperialist. We all remember the Rooseveltian reaction to this criticism: Browder was convicted of passport fraud.

But the agreement with Hitler was short-lived. It did not give Stalinism the peace it needed. ONLY THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION THROUGHOUT THE WORLD CAN DEFEAT FASCISM AND BRING PEACE TO HUMANITY. But, one attacked by German imperialism, Stalinism, WITH NO FAITH IN THE WORKERS OF THE WORLD, again made a deal — this time with "democratic" imperialism. From June 1941 on it has again and again characterised this war as a "people's war," "a democratic war against fascism."

WHY MAINTAIN CLASS UNITY NOW?

But if American policy today is dominated by the "men of the trusts" (that is, IMPERIALISTS), then what kind of a war is being fought in the Pacific? We think it is clear that a Stettinius and a Clayton can only wage an imperialist war.

But if this is an imperialist war, then Marxists must oppose it. And it is not enough to use harmless phrases of criticism. Lenin pointed out that Marxists must fight to turn the imperialist war into a civil war.

Can Stalinism pursue such a policy. Obviously not. We feel safe in predicting that if the campaign of the world bourgeoisie, notably of American and British capitalism, succeeds in embroiling the USSR in war with Japan, you will again be told you are fighting for democracy. On the other hand, if the USSR is NOT embroiled in this war, then the Stalinist position will be a new edition of "the Yanks are not coming." In any case, the line will flow not from the needs of the toiling masses throughout the world, but rather from the dictates of the current foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

To summarize the basis of this "policy": Stalinism will put forward any "revisionist" idea, depending solely on the needs of power politics, on the interests of Stalinism in the Soviet Union. The imperialists can have the rest of the world, so long as they leave Stalinism at peace in the Soviet Union. The whole trouble is that imperialism wants the rest of the world AND THE SOVIET UNION TOO. In making pawns of the world masses Stalinism is sacrificing the only real defense of the Soviet Union for the future.

Support of "national unity" today (Continued on Page 2)

# OPEN LETTER TO MEMBERS OF CPA

The criticism of the policies of Earl Browder and the American Communist Political Association, made by Jacques Duclos, secretary of the French Communist Party, and appearing in the May 24 Daily Worker, raises a number of very serious questions for the rank-and-file Club member or sympathizer. The scathing rebuke, originally published in the Cahiers du Communisme, shows evidence of having been written with great care; the language is very deliberate and studied. Yet Duclos finds it necessary to charge Browder with:

"Liquidation of the independent political party of the working class in the U.S.A."

"A notorious revision of Marxism expressed in the concept of class peace in the U.S., the possibility of the suppression of the class struggle in the post-war period, and establishing harmony between labor and capital."

"Sowing dangerous opportunist illusions."

"Obscuring the perspectives in the eyes of the working masses."

In addition Duclos approvingly quotes Foster, who said that Browder's course "would be a catastrophe for the labor movement."

Duclos makes these accusations against Browder and the line followed by the American CP and CPA for the past fifteen months. He does NOT say, as Browder would like, that the line was correct then, but now, with new conditions, a new line is needed. What then are the questions that face the thinking Club member of sympathizer who is striving to advance his understanding and practise of Marxism?

## HOW IS THAT REVISION POSSIBLE?

Browder's line was the Party's line. It was adopted by a national Convention. Delegates representing 80,000 members were there. These delegates, by and large, were the most active, capable and advanced in the entire Party. With them sat the top national leadership. There had been intensive pre-convention discussion. Yet all these people voted unanimously for a "notoriously revisionist" program, "liquidationist," "sowing opportunist illusions," "catastrophic for the labor movement." Isn't this astounding? Isn't this something worth worrying about?

It was not a minor issue that somehow slipped by. It was a question of the broadest political policy on a national scale and with international implications. For 15 months this policy was pursued, and all who opposed it were ruthlessly condemned. It required a voice from another land to effect a change (though Browder now says the American CPA was considering a change).

WHY did the membership vote for, and practise, revisionism and opportunism? There are only two possible answers:

a) The delegates and Party leaders who approved Browder's line were simply political illiterates, unable to distinguish between Marxism and revisionism, unable to see the difference, even in practise, between a militant working class policy and an opportunist policy.

This is obviously true of those who sincerely considered Browder's line Marxist. It is also true of those whose faith in Browder overcame their doubts. A revolutionist with a clear grasp of Marxist fundamentals cannot just submerge them in faith and go along for a year. Yet all these "best elements" did just that. Their doubts, i.e., their understanding of Marxism in theory and practise, were too weak. Those who could sacrifice training, principles and convictions for blind faith in a leader cannot be considered Marxists — they do not even understand much of what Marxism is.

b) The people who endorsed Browder's line knew it was "catastrophic," revisionist, against the interests of the working class. They voted for it in spite of that.

But how could people who knew better just "go along" like that? How could Foster, who said Browder's line meant "catastrophe" for the labor movement, keep his differences within the Central Committee, hide them from the membership and even from the Convention? Is that Marxism — to be convinced that your Party is being led into revisionism, opportunism and catastrophe — and NOT TO SPEAK OUT AT THE CONVENTION?

Those who thus went along and knew better were either utterly depraved careerists to whom principles mean nothing and who look at the movement as a job trust in which their prestige and rank are all-important, or:

They voted for revisionism, against the working class, because they thought such a policy would help the Soviet Union. In this case, too, principles and convictions are secondary, and the working class can be sacrificed without a qualm.

These are the only two answers. One is as harsh and unpalatable as the other. The truth probably lies in a mixture of both answers: ignorance, faith, careerism, and a cynical readiness to sacrifice the interests of the American worker.

## PARTY DEMOCRACY

Much is now being made of self-criticism. Many members are heartened by this. But these members fail to see below the surface. The self-criticism is partial, rigidly limited, and points only in one direction. It deals only with Brow-

der's line against Duclos' line. But what was the source of Browder's line? On what political basis does it rest? How about the assumptions underlying it? These questions will remain outside the sphere of self-criticism, untouched. No one will raise them. The membership will conclude its self-criticism satisfied, for the most part, that the organization is now in good hands. The leadership they have had has unfitted them for critical thinking. Loyalty and hope will cover all.

For example, will anyone ask how it is that Duclos, from France can quote from documents by Foster that Foster himself promised not to reveal to the membership? Will anyone think back to the Convention and wonder what kind of party democracy could cause the suppression, AT THE CONVENTION, of all differences in the top leadership?

A Convention is the organization's highest body — higher than the Central Committee. The Convention evaluates the work of the Central Committee, determines the broad policies for the coming period, elects the same or a new Central Committee. But the Central Committee LIED to the Convention, came in with a solid front concealing divergent opinions. The Convention made its decisions without having heard Foster's criticism, perhaps without even knowing that there were differences. What kind of Party democracy at the Convention, or in the pre-convention discussion, could conceal such deep-going differences. According to Duclos, about 35,000 members did not go along from the CPUSA to the CPA, probably in disgust with the new line. Was it democratic to deprive these forces of the assistance of capable leading forces in their criticism during the pre-convention discussion?

The very essence of internal party democracy is in free discussion by the Party leaders when the discussion period is opened. That is where members learn the most. Lacking that, intellectual stultification develops — and we get a unanimous vote from "Marxists" in favor of liquidation and opportunism.

## BROWDER THE SCAPEGOAT

Why does Duclos name only Browder in his criticism? The whole Party leadership except Foster and Darcy, supported Browder. (Darcy was expelled BEFORE, not AT the Convention, as Duclos claims; and Foster held his tongue and also voted for liquidation). By singling out Browder, Duclos saves face for the rest of the CPA leadership. The charges of opportunism and revisionism — these are the worst political charges in the movement. It would not do to discredit the entire leadership too much. This cynical sacrifice of Browder's prestige will help to absolve the others

in the eyes of the membership.

## WHY THE DELAY?

Why the fifteen month delay in "correcting" Browder's line? This simple question leads far. The first speech by Browder on the "new line" was in December, 1943. It was public. It reached most of the Stalinist movement abroad in the next few days. Pravda has a regular Tass correspondent in Washington, has a regular daily cable service. In addition to the Pravda correspondent, there are the American news agencies. The CPUSA must have corresponded generally with other parties. That is a routine matter (or how DID Duclos know what Foster said, and buried, in the top committee?) Moreover, there are the official Soviet government agencies here and Party members in the merchant marine who always take along Party literature.

In other words, within a few weeks at most, every major "Communist" Party in the world knew the new Party line in the United States. But no one spoke up. (Duclos states, without proof, that the Australian and South African Parties disagreed. If we grant this, the fact still remains that no MAJOR Party spoke up). Two parties, says Duclos, officially endorsed the new line. All the others kept silent, and by their silence indicated approval. THE RUSSIAN PARTY SAID NOTHING.

What does all this mean? Why does Duclos speak just NOW, fifteen months later? And why does Duclos have so much weight that an article by him brings an immediate retreat in the CPA?

Because for a whole year the American line has had the silent endorsement of the Russian Party. Browder's line fitted the needs of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union. The Stalinists in Russia, like the Stalinists in America, hoped that Browder's abject obeisances to imperialism, his support against strikes, his endorsement of free enterprise and the profit system, even in the post-war period, would mollify the imperialists and win concessions. They hoped, in an opportunist way, for an elimination of the class antagonism between the Soviet Union and world imperialism.

The imperialists freely, if contemptuously, accepted Browder's aid against the working class. But with the end of the war in Europe they felt it possible and necessary to step forward more openly in their true characters — robber barons hungry for investments and colonies, fearing and hating the Soviet Union.

True, the working class suffers confusion and disorientation when it finds its "best friends," the National Association of Manufacturers,

on the offensive against it, but this is the inevitable price of Browder's line.

Now Stalinism needs a new tactical line — not complete support to imperialism, but a pressure group, a threat to the imperialists if they go too far. For the Russian Party to speak out could too easily be denounced by the imperialists as "interfering" in American domestic affairs. So Duclos is selected. He is head of an important party, not yet discredited, and not formally connected with the Soviet Union.

At any time in the last fifteen months, a single word from the Soviet Union would have sent Browder fleeing in the opposite direction. That word need not have been public; there are a hundred avenues by which the American CPA can be reached secretly. Or it could have been spoken through Duclos or some other figurehead. Browder would have understood. The entire leadership would have understood, as it does now. But that word was not spoken.

It is worth noting that Browder paid no attention to the criticism of the Australian or South African Parties. Politically it was just as valid. But somehow he knew they had no backing. Likewise, somehow he recognized the voice behind Duclos.

## BROWDER'S REPLY

To speak of a reply or an answer is to dignify Browder's position. With suppressed rage he says: "The end of the war in Europe requires a fundamental review of all problems . . ." He dare not defend himself and his course. Instead he takes a sideswipe at the dissolution of the Comintern: "Since the American C.P. left the C.I., and especially since the dissolution of the C.I. in 1943, there has been no institution through which the American Marxists could counsel with the Marxists of all lands on the multitude of questions which are essentially international in character. We therefore must discuss through the press, our chief available substitute for organized consultation, inadequate though it may be."

If Browder had the political courage and integrity to speak out, he would state that if the dissolution of the CPUSA is non-Marxist and liquidationist, then the dissolution of the C.I. is an even worse betrayal. He would openly blame world Stalinism and its Soviet leaders for leaving him with no C.I. for guidance. He would point out that he had done no more than follow the general line of Stalinism. Thus, he gave up the CP after they gave up the C.I. He went all out for class peace because they went all out for collaboration with imperialism at Teheran. He went too far, in terms of post-war perspectives, but they

(Continued on Page 3)

## » » R. W. L. Programmatic Highlights « «

- 1—Against the imperialist war — a war for plunder, profit, markets and spheres of influence.
- 2—For the Proletarian Revolution which alone will end imperialist war and defeat fascism.
- 3—For a new Fourth (Communist) International. For a new Revolutionary Marxian Party in the United States.
- 4—Against a Labor Party and all other forms of Popular Frontism.
- 5—For independent working class action on the political and economic fields. For strike action

now — including the sitdown strike — to gain better wages and working conditions. No faith in reformists and Labor fakery.

6—For full equality for the Negroes, Mexicans, Chinese, Japanese and all other oppressed minorities in the United States. Against Jim Crowism and Anti-Semitism.

7—For Workers Defense Squads in the Unions and elsewhere to defend the working class from the Fascist inroads of capitalism.

8—For full and unconditional independence for

the Philippines, Virgin Islands, Porto Rico and all other territories of the United States, including those islands and areas now occupied by American military forces. For the right of self-determination for all colonies.

9—For the defense of the Soviet Union against World Imperialism and Stalinism. Extend the October Revolution. For a political revolution in Russia to reestablish Workers Democracy and continue toward Socialism.

10—For a Workers Council Government in the United States and all over the world.

# ONLY PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION CAN DEFEAT FASCISM!