

January 1944

Fourth International

HOW THE 18 WERE RAILROADED TO PRISON

By THE EDITORS

The Month in Review	<i>Editorial Comment</i>
Revolution in Italy?	<i>by Albert Goldman</i>
Myth of Racial Superiority	<i>by Grace Carlson</i>
The Struggle in Lebanon	<i>by Marc Loris</i>

From the Arsenal of Marxism

‘Unified Military Doctrine’

By LEON TROTSKY

Twenty Cents

6-6000
6/10/68

Manager's Column

The many letters we received during the month, both here and from abroad, attest to the high theoretical value of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. We know that all of our readers will be interested in learning what others think about our magazine.

Los Angeles: "I have just finished reading the December issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and in discussing the contents with others find that they agree with my opinion of its excellence. Everyone was particularly enthusiastic about the speeches of Trotsky on 'Marxism and Military Knowledge.' They stimulated great interest and discussion. The editorial section is also very good, especially the section dealing with the 'Fourth Mine Strike and Its Aftermath.' This was a very timely and precise analysis. The issue certainly stands up to the highest standards set by the F.I."

* * *

Sacramento: "Please send me your magazine for six months. Believe me, after reading an old copy of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, it is the magazine I have been looking for. I send \$1. Be sure to send me an order."

* * *

Plentywood, Montana: "I am sending \$1 for the December F.I. today. It was very good this month."

* * *

New York: "Thanks for the copy of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. Your man did a sound job on Burnham, I was glad to see." (This refers to the article by Joseph Hansen, "A Shame-faced Apologist for Fascism" in the October issue).

* * *

Scotland: "I received copies of THE MILITANT and FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and I think that the speech on the dissolution of the Communist International was a marvelous exposition of the correct attitude towards the burial service.

"All the American material that has been reproduced has been excellent material, in particular Cannon's testimony. I think that this will have been of the most use of all in clarifying the ideas of the advanced workers in their attitude toward the Trotskyist movement."

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Volume V January 1944 No. 1 (Whole No. 40)

Published monthly by the
Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 15c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles, 16c for 5 copies and up.

Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: FELIX MORROW

	Page
<i>The Month in Review</i>	
The Jailing of the 18	3
On Cairo and Teheran	4
A Rising Wage Scale	6
How the 18 Were Railroaded	8
Was There A Revolution in Italy?	
<i>By Albert Goldman</i>	11
Lebanon's Fight for Independence	<i>By Marc Loris</i> 14
The Myth of Racial Superiority	<i>By Grace Carlson</i> 17
Far East: Facts and Falsehoods (Book Review)	
<i>By Li Fu Jen</i>	21
<i>From the Arsenal of Marxism</i>	
"Unified Military Doctrine"	<i>By Leon Trotsky</i> 24
The Voice of An Honest Liberal	28
International Notes	16 and 30



England: "We have been receiving THE MILITANT regularly and sometimes the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, for which many thanks.

"Things are moving slowly and surely for us here. We are all back in the struggle, heartened and inspired by the conference. The attacks of the bourgeoisie and their labor-lapdogs are proof of our growing strength.

"We are very short of funds and Marxist literature, and for that reason I have no hesitation in asking you to send us all the

books you can afford. You will be surprised to know that the average wages of the group after deductions for income tax, health, insurance, etc. are in the region of £2.15.0 (about £3 for male adults and about £2 for female adults). With cost of living rising and consumers goods at fantastic prices, you can see how we are fixed. In this town in particular, which is, as you know world-famous for cutlery and steel there is a certain 'shortage' of work—the Labor Exchange or 'plonk' has had a rush in attempting to

scratch up jobs for men laid off. This is part of the general process of contraction due to competition from the superior American industrial capacity. The shadow of Pittsburgh and Bethlehem lies already over Sheffield."

* * *

Scotland: "We look forward eagerly to every copy of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. The material on the Italian revolution in recent issues has been invaluable to me in preparing lectures for workers who are taking a tremendous interest in developments in Italy.

"We have succeeded in establishing a solid basis for our tendency in this heavy industrial centre. The material we are receiving from you is helping us in the most difficult task of training the workers that we are winning over.

"My library is the only one available for workers who want to read Trotskyist material. At the moment I need two books very badly. They are: 'The Revolution Betrayed' and 'The Proletarian Party.' I have managed to borrow a copy of the latter and feel my library lacking without this valuable book. Do you think that you can fill this gap?"

We understand that Pioneer Publishers is trying to supply the literature needed.

* * *

Sales in Chicago have been very good during the past month, according to several letters received from there.

"If we could only have mass meetings every month, I'd have no trouble disposing of the F.I. I took only twenty-six copies to the CRDC meeting and a girl comrade sold them all out. I was very mad at myself for not bringing the other ten I had at the office."

"We had good sales at a meeting Sunday. Sold all the F.I.'s we had there and could have sold some more."

* * *

Sales of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL in New York have increased by two hundred copies during the year. Our agent writes:

"For the last couple of months we have been running out of magazines. After we place the magazine on the newsstands, there aren't enough left for the headquarter sales. Will you, therefore, increase our bundle to 500 copies per month, beginning with the January issue?"

We still have in stock bound volumes of The NEW INTERNATIONAL and FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for the following years:

1938	\$5.00
1939	5.00
1940-41	4.00

If you do not already have your bound volume, get it now.

Order from

Business Manager

Fourth International

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME V

JANUARY 1944

NUMBER 1

The Month in Review

The Jailing of the Eighteen

EIGHTEEN VICTIMS OF CLASS JUSTICE Abetted by the U. S. Supreme Court, Roosevelt-Biddle have brought to a triumphant conclusion their campaign to railroad the 18 defendants in the Minneapolis case to prison. To their December triumphs of secret diplomacy abroad—at Cairo and Teheran—the forces of capitalist reaction were able to add the triumph of their class justice at home: Besides the trade union militants of the Minneapolis Teamsters Local 544-CIO, the Roosevelt administration has placed behind bars the outstanding leaders of the Socialist Workers Party, particularly James P. Cannon, Albert Goldman, Vincent R. Dunne, Farrell Dobbs, editor of *The Militant*, and Felix Morrow, editor of *Fourth International*.

For decades these Trotskyist leaders have been the most consistent protagonists of socialist ideas and ideals, the staunchest fighters for workers' democracy. They were the first in this country to sound the alarm over the danger of fascism.

When Mussolini seized power in Italy, Cannon, Dunne and the movement they represented insisted that unless socialist revolution intervened, fascism would inevitably appear in other countries. Smug apologists of capitalism proclaimed at the time that Mussolini's regime was not without its good points, at worst—a purely Italian phenomenon.

Again during the rise of Hitler, the Trotskyists strained every means to cry out the danger. They were ridiculed. Hitler, claimed the liberals, would never succeed in overthrowing democracy in Germany; if he did come to power, said the Stalinists, his regime would be shortlived; and finally, the workers were told, it, too, was a purely German phenomenon.

When the Coughlinites and other native American fascists together with the German-American Bund wished to hold a provocative demonstration of 18,000 Brown Shirts in New York's Madison Square Garden on February 20, 1939, they were given permission by Mayor LaGuardia, and his police were mobilized to protect them from the wrath of workers. It was the Trotskyists, and only the Trotskyists, heedless of the smallness of their forces, who leaped into the breach with a call for action against the fascist vermin. This fact can never be erased from the record; it remains indelibly in the memories of 50,000 workers in New York who responded to the call of the Socialist Workers Party.

Now the Roosevelt regime, still cynically insisting that it wages war in order to spread "democracy" to the four corners of the earth, has disclosed just what kind of democracy it plans for the people of the United States. Its Congress has passed laws directly contravening the Bill of Rights; its Supreme Court has refused even to consider whether the Smith Gag Act violates the Constitution; its Department of Justice has locked socialists and militant trade unionists in prison cells.

TROTSKYISTS JAILED FASCISTS LEFT FREE Meanwhile such notorious avowed fascists and fascist sympathizers as Father Coughlin, Gerald Smith, Charles Lindbergh, their wealthy sponsors and friends holding high offices in government roam at will, organizing steadily for the day they will attempt to impose fascism on America.

Roosevelt may indeed boast of having found common ground with Stalin at Teheran. Yes, Roosevelt has found common ground with the most ferocious enemies of democracy: not only Stalin but Mussolini and Hitler as well. It is true that the rulers in America have not yet reached the stage where they resort to the firing squad or hired assassins, but their shocking acts in the Minneapolis case disclose a tendency that can be viewed by workers with only the gravest foreboding. A strong movement of protest against the imprisonment of the 18 can give halt to the march of reaction in the United States. It is the duty of every working class organization and all honest defenders of civil liberties to help build such a mass movement of protest; for should it fail to materialize the road will be left wide open for the further triumphs of blackest reaction. We Trotskyists have supreme confidence in the American workers. We are certain that our call for aid will not go unanswered. We know that capitalist reaction will not triumph as easily in this country as in Italy or Germany.

* * *

To our comrades in Roosevelt's penitentiaries, we of the staff of *Fourth International* express our warmest sympathy and strongest solidarity. They stand among those banner-bearers of socialism throughout the world who have been thrown into concentration camps, confined in dungeons, inflicted with torture solely because of their fight for a better society. Opponents of the second imperialist slaughter, they belong to the magnificent tradition of Eugene V. Debs, outstanding American oppositionist imprisoned during the first World War. Like Debs, they are today's living arguments, living examples and models in the crucial battle against all the betrayers of the world working class—the current crop of social-chauvinists, the Social Democrats, the Stalinists and the rest.

We cherish no illusions. It will be difficult to carry on the work which our comrades have been forced to relinquish. Their guidance, their wisdom and long years of experience cannot easily be replaced. Nevertheless we know our tasks and our duties; and pledge ourselves to continue worthily in their tradition of performing both task and duty.

Our most urgent work is to do the utmost to warn the entire working class and all the oppressed of America—colored and white alike—that the primary task in the struggle for emancipation is freeing the 18.

As our comrades begin their prison sentences, let the entire Trotskyist movement take fresh courage. When the great wheel of history makes its next turn, those who now rule the destiny of mankind will themselves end in the prisoners' dock facing the terrible accusation of all outraged humanity. Then those now suffering persecution will see Trotsky's prediction fulfilled: "From the capitalist prisons and concentration camps will come most of the leaders of tomorrow's Europe and the world!"

Secret Diplomacy at the Cairo and Teheran Conferences of the 'Allies'

SECRET DIPLOMACY AT WORK IN TEHERAN

The weeks of continued silence that have elapsed since the termination of "United Nations" conference at Teheran serve only to underscore the secrecy that shrouds this parley. The greatest public expectation was aroused; far-reaching plans and problems, it is admitted, were discussed, yet the people have been told nothing. In the face of this cynical silence, traditional atmosphere of secret diplomacy, the world is nevertheless assured that all has gone well and that bountiful blessings are to be showered upon mankind. Who but the gullible will believe a word of this? If this were true, what possible need could there be for secrecy?

Yet such was the secrecy surrounding the conference that even the capitalist press howled in protest against "the repressive measures taken against accredited American correspondents" who were kept away by barbed wire and bayonets from the Cairo conference and who were then held in Cairo under military orders to exclude them from Teheran. Churchill's deputy, Field Marshal Smuts in a press interview at Cairo on December 8 not only acknowledged this secrecy but insisted that none should "pry into the secrets." He said:

"A word dropped on the wrong side might cause great harm. By your silence you are helping victory."

If their political decisions actually conformed to the noble purposes enunciated in the official pronouncements, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin would have no reason to conceal them. On the contrary, they could only gain by publishing them and proving to the peoples the sincerity and truth of their words.

But they have very good reasons indeed for keeping their agreements hidden. They are engaged in a criminal cabal against the interests of the European, American and colonial peoples. At Moscow, Cairo and Teheran there was hatched a gigantic conspiracy to strangle and suppress revolutionary movements in Europe and Asia. That conspiracy requires silence, secrecy, double-dealing and deceit for its consummation.

According to official pronouncements, the deep-going differences, problems and conflicts which made these conferences necessary have been solved and henceforth only unity and harmony will prevail.

"We are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace . . . We shall seek the cooperation of all nations, large and small, whose people are dedicated to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them . . . into a world family of democratic nations . . . We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit and in purpose."

So says the Teheran declaration. What really lies behind this rhetoric? To answer this question correctly it is first necessary to understand the class character of the conferees and their motives and aims in this war.

ROOSEVELT'S ROLE AT CONFERENCES

The central and dominating figure at both conferences was President Roosevelt, leader of the mightiest industrial country in the world and spokesman for the American monopolists whose aim in this war is to acquire sovereignty over the entire world. In this vast undertaking these monopolists have expended hundreds of billions of dollars—while pocketing untold billions in profits. They have loaded a staggering debt and tax burden on the popular masses, but in return they have built in a few years the greatest air force and navy and an army of ten millions to batter down all obstructions to their plans for world domination.

The commander-in-chief of every capitalist state is entrusted with the execution of the program of Big Business. And so, for Roosevelt the Cairo and Teheran conferences are, like his other official actions, simply a means for furthering the war aims of his class. Washington's most pressing immediate tasks are to defeat its main rivals, Germany and Japan.

On these points the conference declarations and decisions were categorically clear. From Cairo Roosevelt declared that Japan must be crushed and her empire destroyed. Japan is to be stripped of all her stolen and seized territories, Manchuria, Formosa, Korea, the Pacific islands, etc., and thrust back into the island position she occupied in 1853.

From Teheran there issued no appeals to the German masses to rise and overthrow Hitler and the German ruling class. Instead, all emphasis was placed upon the proposed crushing of Germany. Germany's military forces and industry are to be destroyed. Germany is to disappear as a major power. There has been no lack of savage hints that the country will be occupied and dismembered; that the entire German people will be compelled to pay for the costs of the war, etc. Admiral of the British Fleet Keyes is quoted in the *New York Times* (December 9) as calling for "a post-war separation of the German states by a great army of occupation."

At Cairo and Teheran Roosevelt was primarily concerned not with "democracy" and "four freedoms" but with the military defeat of the two rival powers now challenging the right of American capitalism to rule the world. For a defeated Japan, Hirohito is apparently a good enough "democrat" as witness the campaign in the capitalist press, initiated by former U. S. Ambassador to Japan Joseph Grew and indirectly inspired by the State Department, cautioning against "undermining" the Mikado. On January 2 the *New York Times* stated editorially:

"We agree with Mr. Grew that a campaign against the Japanese Emperor would not serve any useful purpose at this time."

Beside Roosevelt at Cairo and Teheran sat His Majesty's Prime Minister Winston Churchill who has arrogantly boasted of

his government's imperialist aims in this war. "I have not become the King's first minister," proclaimed this Tory chief, "to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." Churchill journeyed abroad to salvage the battered British empire, its privileges, its trade, its possessions, not only from his enemies but also from his allies. His primary task was to bargain to retrieve the British possessions in the Far East.

It is no secret that the British lion has met its master in a more powerful beast of prey. In the future Britain can expect to have only so much of its former power and possessions as America's monopolists deign to permit.

On November 25, while the conferences were still in progress, some of the real thoughts, fears, and projects of the leaders of British imperialism were voiced by South African Prime

Minister, Field Marshal Jan Smuts. Smuts, who had been called to London to head the cabinet in Churchill's absence, delivered a speech before the Empire Parliamentary Association with 300 members of the Commons and Lords, including 20 ministers of the government present.

"This war," he said, "has taught us . . . that we cannot get away from the problem of power. Peace not backed by power remains a dream." But the trouble is that England's problem of power will be rendered extremely difficult by the disappearance of three of the five great powers in the new Europe, France, Italy and Germany. Their downfall, Smuts lamented, will leave Russia as "the new colossus in Europe."

Post-war England, he warned, "from a material economic view will be a poor country. She has put body and soul and everything into it to win the battle of mankind. She will have won it, but she will come out of it poor in substance."

"Then outside Europe," he continued, "you have the United States, the other great world power. The question is, how are you going to deal with that world situation?" In order to "strengthen her European position" Smuts proposes that Great Britain conclude a working alliance with "smaller democracies in Western Europe." Such are the prospects of English imperialism as viewed through Tory eyes, such the problems Churchill and his colleagues are working to solve.

Smuts' speech not only reveals the infirmities of British imperialism. It also serves to expose the absence of real unity among "The United Nations." Amidst protestations of harmony they carry on incessant intrigues against one another.

THE "DEMOCRACIES" AND THE COLONIES Colonial possessions are among the chief prizes at stake. Neither Great Britain nor the United States have forfeited any of their pre-war claims to colonial territories wrested from their grasp. Churchill has not abandoned the British claim to Hong Kong, even though Hong Kong is part of China and China is his ally. Moreover, it is implicit in the Cairo decisions and the entire preceding policy that the "liberated territories" are to be returned to their previous rulers. Java and Netherland Indies will presumably go back to Queen Wilhelmina; Burma to King George of England; French Indo-China to the French bourgeoisie, and the Philippines to the United States. Besides, Roosevelt has his eyes already fixed on the Pacific islands grabbed by Japan in the division of spoils among the victors after the last war.

To be sure, at Cairo Korea was promised independence while at Teheran Britain and the U.S. announced their intention to withdraw from Iran. But the postponement of these promises to an indefinite future provoked a sharp reaction from Korean and Iranian leaders. The president of the provisional Korean government in Chungking declared that "free Koreans in Free China are furious about the expression 'in due course.'" Prominent Iranians have suggested that the uninvited protectors depart immediately rather than "after the war."

It is instructive to note that the Cairo conferees did not appeal to the Japanese people to overthrow the Mikado nor did they summon the colonial natives to rise in revolt. Churchill, the oppressor of India, and Roosevelt fear the slightest independent action of the Eastern masses.

"We look to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny, and according to their various desires and their own consciences," reads the Teheran declaration. That day will be long in coming to Asia if the Anglo-American "democracies" have their say. The peoples of the colonies are accorded neither voice nor vote in their

homelands. They are supposed to accept supinely, and even to struggle for, a return to their former servitude.

WHY HOMAGE IS PAID TO CHIANG

This policy of keeping the colonial peoples in subjection may appear to be contradicted by the homage paid to Chiang Kai-shek and the concessions granted—on paper—to China. Roosevelt and Churchill, however, have "promoted" Chiang and permitted him to sit in on their hitherto exclusive sessions in the same spirit as Executive Chairmen of powerful trusts appoint a superintendent to the post of assistant vice-president. The Anglo-American rulers require China's services in their struggle against Japan. The consequences of over six years of war have so enfeebled Chiang's regime that in their own self-interest the Allies are compelled to take certain measures to prop up Chiang's prestige. Economic conditions in China are catastrophic. Inflation is unbridled: the cost of living is today 164 times what it was in 1937. The sufferings of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and white-collar employes are intolerable. There is increasing hostility toward the profiteers, hoarders, speculators, corrupt government officials, new land-owners. Defeatism is rife among ruling bourgeois Kuomintang circles. The breach with the Stalinist-dominated forces in the North remains unrepaired.

External considerations provide supplementary reasons for immediately bolstering Chiang's position. The British need something to cover up the stench of their rule in India; Washington seeks to offset Japanese propaganda and influence which has not been without effect upon the peoples of Burma, Malaya, and the Philippines.

If Roosevelt and Churchill really wanted a strong China, instead of lavish gifts promised for the future, they would proceed to arm and equip millions of Chinese to drive the Japanese invaders into the ocean. But this they carefully refrain from doing. Here they reveal their real attitude toward the progressive struggle of the Chinese people for national independence.

WHY THE BOURGEOISIE ACCLAIMS THE KREMLIN

The Anglo-American capitalists are not only concerned with smashing their rivals, preserving their acquisitions, aggrandizing their power and profits, and keeping the colonial masses in subjection. They are just as worried about their position and prospects in Europe where revolution has already erupted in Italy and is ripening on a continental scale.

Stalin comes as a godsend to their counter-revolutionary plots to try to crush that revolution. Stalin's policy in this war is determined above all by the needs and interests of the degenerate Soviet bureaucracy which he incarnates and heads. Stalin seeks to maintain the usurped power, the privileges, and aristocratic pretensions of this layer of Soviet society. The Kremlin's completely nationalistic program and perspectives have recently been exemplified in the official revival of the vilest Russian feudal traditions, heroes and customs; by his cynical burial of the Third International and the substitution of a new national anthem for the revolutionary battle-song "The Internationale."

The capitalist politicians and press have appraised and approved these actions:

"This is important testimony," exults the reactionary *New York World-Telegram* (December 22, 1943), "supporting Russia's sincerity in her retreat from the classic Bolshevik goal of world revolution and in her new preoccupation with the sort of patriotism that world revolutionists used to despise."

What kind of haggling went on between Stalin and Roosevelt-Churchill as the price of his services to them, what Stalin gave and what he received or was promised, humanity is not privileged to know. The President, the Prime Minister and the Marshal prefer to keep mum. Stalin practices the same vile secret diplomacy as Czar Nicholas Romanov, with the same allies, and incidentally, as in the case of Churchill, with the same individuals.

Assuredly, in return for his pledge to aid them in their counter-revolutionary plots Roosevelt and Churchill will give and promise many things to Stalin. The Allied leaders feel sure that they can muster the force to crush German and Japanese militarism. But they feel far less confident of their ability to crush the coming European proletarian revolution. They remember what happened to the attempt to put down the Russian revolution in the last war!

Stalin is indispensable to them. The Anglo-American rulers know that the European masses are gravitating toward the USSR as their hope of salvation; that they admire the Red Army and hail its victories; that they are moving with a keen class instinct toward the road of the October revolution. They also know that current circumstances invest Stalin and his crew with the prestige and influence without which it would be impossible to restrain, mislead, and divert the insurgent workers and peasants from the socialist revolution.

Roosevelt and Churchill are correctly banking on Stalin's fear of the consequences to his regime of a successful proletarian revolution in Europe. The capitalists openly recognize that the Stalinist bureaucrats, conservative to the core, are qualified candidates for the job of hangmen of the revolution. After reviewing the reactionary features of Stalin's regime, the *New York Times* (December 22, 1943) points out that:

"Its leaders are becoming conservative and opposed to any further revolution which might turn against them."

The Stalinists are in mortal fear lest a revolutionary tidal wave resulting in a new workers' state in Germany provide such an attractive pole for all the toilers that their own authority would wane and their privileged position be imperiled. These upstarts and usurpers have other plans for Europe. Their publications talk about converting millions of Germans into serfs, of transporting Germany's industrial equipment into the Soviet Union, of making the German people pay billions in reparations, etc., etc.

The "democrats" are only too happy to publicize these Stalinist proposals. For they help foster hatred and hostility between the Soviet and German masses and to sow division and dissension among the international working class. Here again the reactionary policy of Stalinism plays the game of the imperialists. It even enables them to pose as humane protectors of the German people. Such anti-Soviet rascals as William Green have already taken up the cry originally raised by the friend of Mannerheim's Finland, Mr. Wm. Philip Simms, that the American "democrats" must intervene to frustrate such aims of Stalin.

DISCORDANT NOTES AMID THE AVOWALS OF CONCORD

Despite all avowals of concord, the press continues to print rumors of dissension between the participants at Teheran. Even granting that all the matters discussed were amicably adjusted for the time being, there remains a fundamental antagonism which no amount of diplomacy can overcome or abolish. It is the irreconcilable antagonism be-

tween the Soviet Union with its nationalized property and the capitalist world. No matter how Stalin and Roosevelt-Churchill may strain to shove this contradiction into the background and to pretend that it does not exist, it lurks behind their every move.

Recent history proves that this basic incompatibility between the Soviet Union and the capitalist system is far stronger and more decisive than Stalin's diplomatic machinations. In 1935 Stalin signed a military-diplomatic pact with Laval, the representative of French imperialism. Six years later Laval of Vichy recruited French legionnaires to fight against his former ally. Stalin concluded a pact with Hitler in August 1939. Two years later the Nazi warlord struck without warning.

As for Roosevelt and Churchill, Wm. Philip Simms reminds in the *New York World Telegram* of December 16 about their rabid anti-Sovietism of only a few years ago. Mr. Simms cites the following facts which many have forgotten and others would prefer to suppress.

"The League of Nations expelled Russia. The Vatican sent funds. A \$10,000,000 credit was opened by the U.S. with President Roosevelt's warm approval, and Prime Minister Churchill coined some of his choicest sentences on the subject of aggression. The British and French governments shipped 285 planes, 590 cannon, 100 antitank guns, 5,000 machine guns and 60,000,000 rounds of ammunition and other equipment. The United States came through with another \$20,000,000 loan."

Simms adds: "Today Finland remains the same Finland." Yes, that is true, even though today Mannerheim fights with Hitler, and not with the Allies, against the Soviet Union. And it is equally true that the capitalists in the United States and Great Britain, including Roosevelt and Churchill, remain the same irreconcilable enemies of the workers state even in its degenerated condition and despite Stalinist subservience. Class interests and appetites are far more decisive than diplomatic combinations and agreements.

In the stormy developments ahead for Europe and Asia this fundamental class conflict between the different economic systems represented by the Soviet Union and the "democracies" must inevitably assert itself.

* * *

Secret diplomacy has become the normal method of intercourse between the heads of the dominant powers, their vassals and agents. This infamous practice has reached a new peak at Cairo and Teheran. Those who now rule the destinies of society have grown so arrogant and ruthless, so power-drunk that they believe they can with impunity impose anything they please upon their own peoples and the rest of the world. They will find out however that there is a mightier power on this earth. This is the power of the awakening revolutionary working class and its allies.

The Demand of A Rising Wage Scale in the Light of Recent Labor Struggles

WORKERS IN NO MOOD FOR PLAYING GAMES

The railway and steel wage disputes are straws in the wind. Under pressure of the ranks, the trade union leaders whine and complain about their difficulty in keeping their membership in line. The policy of deception practised by Roosevelt and his labor lieutenants is running its course. It's becoming harder to satisfy the real grievances of the workers with fictitious promises of future relief. With palpitating hearts, a number of top union bureaucrats have been pressed into the uncomfortable role of "playing the game of opposition." Even

so pliant an instrument of the Roosevelt administration as George M. Harrison, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, ventures to speculate: "Maybe it pays to get tough."

The American workers are growing more and more indignant, they are in no mood for games. When John L. Lewis proclaimed that the "miners do not work without a contract" the men who dig the nation's coal took him at his word: the four coal strikes were eloquent testimony to this. In his truly prophetic article, "Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay" (*Fourth International*, February 1941), Leon Trotsky underscored the predicament the union officials now find themselves in:

"The leaders of the [world] trade union movement," he wrote, "sensed or understood, or were given to understand, that now was no time to play the game of opposition. Every oppositional movement within the trade union movement, especially among the tops, threatens to provoke a stormy movement of the masses and to create difficulties for national imperialism."

The American bourgeoisie's fear of oppositional movements in the trade unions and their determination to prevent them were brought forcefully to the attention of Phillip Murray in the recent steel walkout. The head of the CIO had feebly protested a WLB decision refusing to grant the steel workers retroactive pay from the date of the expiration of the steel contract on Christmas eve. Within a few days, 200,000 steel workers had walked out of the plants raising the slogan: "No Contract—No Work!" The chicken-hearted Murray hastened to "call off the strike", when Roosevelt intervened. The apprehensive pilgrimage of the Railway Brotherhood ("maybe it pays to get tough") officials into opposition likewise found Roosevelt moving like a military dictator against the rail workers. He ordered the Army to seize the railroads. Railroad officials were given commissions as colonels, fitted out with uniforms and troops were ordered to stand by ready to run the trains in the event of strike.

IMPORTANT LESSONS OF THE RECENT STRUGGLES

Railroads, steel and coal—these are basic sections of the labor movement. The lessons of their struggles have a tremendous significance for the entire working class. The rising tide of resistance is a harbinger of things to come. There is good reason for the whining of the labor fakery about their growing inability to "hold the line" against their own membership. Their policy of support to Roosevelt's "stabilization program" has led the labor movement into a dead end. They have no other solution than to plead with Roosevelt for a few morsels to appease the clamor of the ranks. The very thought of "playing the game of opposition" sends shivers of apprehension up and down the backs of the labor lackeys of American imperialism.

Under pressure of the increasing mass opposition to wage freezing, Roosevelt may be compelled to sanction an upward adjustment of the Little Steel formula. But this can provide only a fleeting solution so long as wages remain frozen, and prices continue to mount. When Roosevelt first projected the idea of price control, four months before the entry of the United States into the war, *The Militant*, (August 9, 1941) made the following analysis:

"Labor has no reason to believe that the government will really prevent a rise in the cost of living. All signs point to the fact that the workers will be faced with a steady decline in living standards as the war progresses in spite of government 'price fixing.' The fact is that a government run for the benefit of the capitalists will not and cannot curb prices,

for that means curbing the profits of the capitalists who really run the government."

The Militant then concluded:

"When the prices go up, wages must go up. This is the workers' answer to rising prices. . . . Only in this way, through the automatic adjustment of wage scales to the rise in the cost of living, can the workers be sure that, regardless of what happens to government promises, they will avoid a repetition of World War I experiences when promises were given about price control, but only wages were frozen."

While labor bureaucrats failed to understand this, Roosevelt, class conscious spokesman for

the interests of American capitalism, saw far more clearly: He deliberately set about to head off labor's struggle against wartime inflation. In April 1942, Roosevelt presented his "seven-point stabilization program" and tagged on this joker: "I believe that stabilizing the cost of living will mean that wages in general can and should be kept at existing scales." Roosevelt's promise to stabilize the cost of living was a piece of deception to be used as a pretext for freezing wages.

A month later, in May 1942, the War Production Board held its national shipyard wage negotiations conference at Chicago. The AFL and CIO had signed an industry-wide zone stabilization agreement in 1941 at the insistence of the government. This agreement surrendered the right to strike in exchange for an "escalator clause," providing for a five percent increase in wages for every five percent advance in the cost of living. Under this clause the shipyard workers were entitled to an increase of approximately 16 percent. Roosevelt, however, sent a strongly worded telegram to the conference stating:

"The situation that now confronts you is that the full percentage wage increase for which your contracts call, and to which, by the letter of the law, you are entitled, is irreconcilable with the national policy to control the cost of living."

Roosevelt's promise to stabilize the cost of living was utilized by the labor leaders to foist upon their membership a settlement of 8 cents per hour—and even this paltry increase was made contingent upon *the surrender of the escalator clause!* Roosevelt's promise to stabilize the cost of living was thus exchanged for the good coin of the rising scale of wages, more commonly known as the "escalator clause." On the basis of the same counterfeit promise of "stabilization" the Little Steel wage freezing formula was later promulgated by the War Labor Board. This formula was based on an estimated 15 percent rise in the cost of living from January 1, 1941 to May 1942. Appended to the formula was the lie that Roosevelt's stabilization program would prevent any further rise in the cost of living after May 1942.

Fully aware that the inflationary process would—by widening the gap between prices and wages—inevitably lower the standard of living of the masses, Roosevelt's agents on the War Labor Board issued "General Order No. 22" which provided:

"No clause in any labor agreement, commonly known as an 'escalator clause,' relating to wages or salaries subject to the jurisdiction of the National War Labor Board regardless of when the agreement was made, which provides for an adjustment in wage rates after October 27, 1942, because of changes in the cost of living, shall be enforced, where such adjustment would result in rates in excess of fifteen per cent above the average straight-hourly rates or equivalent salary rates prevailing on January 1, 1942."

This decree deprived workers of the most effective means of maintaining their living standard—the rising scale of wages.

THE MONSTROUS FRAUD OF—"STABILIZATION"

While wages remain frozen, commodity prices spiral upward. The cost of living continues its inexorable advance from month to month. Capitalist "stabilization" is a monstrous fraud. As long ago as 1938, before the outbreak of the war, the Founding Conference of the Fourth International forewarned the workers against the stabilization fraud in these words:

"Neither monetary inflation nor stabilization can serve as slogans for the proletariat because these are but two ends of the same stick. Against the bounding rise in prices, which with the approach of war will assume an ever more unbridled character, one can fight only under the slogan of a sliding [rising] scale of wages. This means that collective agreements should assure an automatic rise in wages in relation to the increase in prices of consumer goods." (*Founding Conference of the Fourth International: Program and Resolutions*. Published by the Socialist Workers Party, 1939.)

The attempt of the workers to catch up with the advancing

cost of living will give rise to intermittent conflicts over wage increases. The official trade union leaders offer no solution other than to disorient the ranks by leading them into Roosevelt's labyrinth of Boards, Commissions and Panels where every avenue leads to the wage-freezing Little Steel formula. The patience of the workers is fast becoming exhausted, their nerves rubbed raw. For the militants in the labor movement there is an imperative necessity to show a way out.

Even where a correct method of struggle—the strike—results in gaining small wage increases, as in the case of the coal miners, the energy expended is out of all proportions to the gains won—gains no sooner made than lost through the rising cost of living. Moreover, the fixing of such wage increases in relatively long term contracts containing no "escalator clause"—the protection against increased living costs—becomes a veritable straitjacket. On the other hand, the slogan of: *A Rising Scale of Wages to Meet the Rising Cost of Living* does offer a prospect of a successful solution. Labor's road out of the quicksands of inflation must be marked by that guide post.

How the Eighteen Were Railroaded To Penitentiary

By THE EDITORS

"The next thing that will probably appear on the horizon is attempts of these Sixty Families and their supporters to stop the popularizing of ideas inimical to the capitalists, and to check by legislation the organization of the workers. . . . They will begin arresting people for expressing their honest opinions, and putting them in jail, framing them up."—James P. Cannon, testifying in the Minneapolis trial, November 19, 1941.

* * *

Not in fascist Italy, not in Nazi Germany, not in semi-feudal Japan but in Roosevelt's "democratic" America prison gates closed last month on 18 socialists and trade unionists guilty of no crime other than exercising their right of free speech. Thus did the forces of capitalist reaction add another black chapter to their long record of infamy.

If ever there was needed a classic example of class justice at work, it has been provided in the Minneapolis case. In many of its aspects this case is without precedent in the development of the class struggle in the United States. Never before has the federal government used its legal machinery so nakedly to persecute the workers' political movement. Trotskyists were put on trial and then railroaded to prison for their ideas, for their fight for socialism, for their opposition to imperialist war.

The facts in this famous case establish beyond dispute that a conspiracy involving the highest offices of government now threatens the labor movement—a conspiracy to jail revolutionists and trade union militants, to stifle free speech, and abrogate the Bill of Rights.

Let us briefly review the facts:

In the spring of 1941, Daniel J. Tobin, head of the Teamsters International, came into conflict with the leaders of Minneapolis Teamsters Local 544. In May 1941 Tobin published a bitter attack in his personal organ, the *Teamsters Journal*, denouncing the Trotskyists in the Minnesota teamsters' move-

ment. Shortly thereafter, he ordered the democratically elected leadership of Local 544 to stand trial before his International Executive Board at Washington the first week of June. When the leaders of Local 544 refused to concede to his appointment of a receiver over the union with absolute powers, including the power to expel anyone, Tobin proceeded to move in on the union—all this because the Trotskyists in the union refused to abandon their vigorous struggle to improve working conditions and to give political support to Roosevelt in the then rapidly approaching entry of the United States into the second World War.

As a result of Tobin's actions, 4,000 members of Local 544 at a regular membership meeting on June 9 voted virtually unanimously to disaffiliate from Tobin's organization in the AFL and to accept a charter from the CIO. This move of course created a sensation in the entire Teamsters International.

Tobin lost no time. Four days after the vote of Local 544 on June 13, Roosevelt's secretary, Stephen Early made the following statement to the White House press conference, as reported in the *New York Times* of June 14, 1941:

"Mr. Tobin telegraphed from Indianapolis that it is apparent to him and to the other executives of his organization that because they have been and will continue to stand squarely behind the government, that all subversive organizations and all enemies of our government, including Bundists, Trotskyists and Stalinists, are opposed to them and seeking to destroy local trade unions which are supporting democracy.

"Mr. Tobin goes into considerable detail and states he is going to issue a statement from the Indianapolis office of the teamsters' union. When I advised the President of Tobin's representations this morning he asked me to immediately have the government departments and agencies interested in this matter notified. . . ." (Our emphasis).

Tobin's statement, referred to by Early, and published the same day, declared in part:

"The withdrawal from the international union by the Truck Drivers Union, Local 544, and one other small union, in Minneapolis, and their affiliation with the CIO is indeed a regrettable and dangerous condition. The officers of this local union were requested to dissociate themselves from the radical Trotsky organization . . . those disturbers *must be in some way prevented from pursuing this dangerous course.* . . ." (Our emphasis).

Political Roots of the Case

These two statements amply prove that Tobin, a notorious supporter of Roosevelt and one of his principal political agents in the labor movement, went to Roosevelt upon learning of the vote of Local 544, asked him to intervene, and was promised action.

In addition to doing Tobin a personal favor, Roosevelt had another far weightier political reason. The administration expecting momentarily to plunge the United States into the second World War wished to isolate and silence the advocates of socialism so that their ideas might be prevented from gaining a hearing among the masses dragooned into the slaughter.

And this, it may be remarked parenthetically, occurred only shortly after Roosevelt promised the nation:

"And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you once more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." (October 30, 1940.)

Roosevelt's "government departments and agencies" moved swiftly. On June 27, 1941, just 13 days after the publication of the White House assurance to Tobin, FBI agents raided the branch offices of the Socialist Workers Party in St. Paul and Minneapolis, carting off large quantities of Marxist literature, much of which could have been obtained in any public library in the country.

On July 15, 1941, less than a month later, an indictment drawn up by the Department of Justice was handed down by a federal grand jury against 29 men and women. Count one of the indictment, based on an 1861 statute passed during the Civil War against the Southern slave-holders, charged a "conspiracy to overthrow the government by force and violence." Count two of the indictment charged: (1) Advocating overthrow of the government by force; (2) Publishing and circulating literature advocating this; (3) Forming organizations "to teach, advocate and encourage" such overthrow; (4) Becoming members of such organizations; (5) Distributing publications which "advised, counseled and urged" insubordination in the armed forces. This count was wholly based on the Smith "Omnibus Gag" Act, invoked for the first time in the Minneapolis case. Like the infamous Alien & Sedition Acts of 1798 the Smith Act makes the mere advocacy of ideas a federal crime. Its constitutionality has been challenged by the American Civil Liberties Union, *The Nation*, *The New Republic*, and numerous others. The sponsor of this ultra-reactionary law is the poll-tax Representative Howard W. Smith, leader of the anti-labor bloc in Congress and co-author of the vicious Smith-Connally anti-strike law.

On October 27, 1941, the trial began in the Federal District Court at Minneapolis. The principal government "evidence" consisted of innumerable quotations from articles in the American Trotskyist press going back to 1929! Public writings, public addresses of the defendants, radio speeches, leaflets issued by the tens of thousands—these were the main government proofs of "conspiracy."

The government further introduced as evidence photographs

of the great teachers of Marxism (including a picture of Daniel DeLeon). It introduced such leaflets as the one advertising Vincent Raymond Dunne as speaker at a public forum on the action of the Trotskyists in combatting "20,000 Fascists in Madison Square." In the indictment and in the arguments of the prosecution, the government flatly characterized as criminal the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky.

This rabid attack was met unflinchingly by the proletarian defense. Never before in a labor trial in this country have defendants so unswervingly, so consciously and so systematically defended their revolutionary doctrine, utilizing the courtroom as a forum from which to proclaim their ideas. The conduct of the defendants at the trial and throughout all the subsequent stages of the case belongs to the best traditions of international Marxism.

The "Evidence"

No lie is more brazen than the charge that the Trotskyist movement is a conspiracy. From its very inception, Marxism, the doctrine of scientific socialism, taught that the emancipation of the workers could be achieved only by the workers themselves. The task of the revolutionists is to educate and organize the oppressed masses. And this requires the widest dissemination and the most democratic discussion of the party's revolutionary program. Only through the conscious will of the overwhelming majority of the toiling people can the transition from decayed capitalism to living socialism be effected.

These were precisely the ideas that the Trotskyist leaders explained at length during the trial. The basic testimony of the trial—the expositions of Trotskyist views by Cannon and Goldman's speeches have been published in pamphlets, circulated in tens of thousands of copies at home and abroad. A second edition of Cannon's pamphlet, "Socialism On Trial" is now on the press.

The Minneapolis Verdict

The jury returned a verdict of not guilty on the first count of the indictment, thereby revealing the utter flimsiness of the government case. On the second count, involving a new law, the constitutionality of which had not yet been tested, the jury returned a verdict of guilty against 18 of the defendants. Of the remaining defendants, five were released by a directed verdict of the court; five others were acquitted by the jury. Grant Dunne, Local 544 organizer and one of the original 29 defendants, committed suicide three weeks before the trial began. He had been in ill health for a long time as a result of shell shock suffered during the first World War.

Congress declared war on December 8, 1941. On the same day Judge Joyce sentenced 12 to prison terms of 16 months each, the other six defendants to terms of a year-and-a-day each.

The Civil Rights Defense Committee, handling the case in close collaboration with the American Civil Liberties Union and with the support of labor and defense organizations, assisted the 18 in appealing their conviction to the Eighth U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

Meanwhile, Tobin had instigated proceedings against the Secretary-Treasurer of Local 544, Kelly Postal. When the Minnesota teamsters voted to join the CIO, they likewise voted unanimously to turn \$5,000 in the local treasury over to the Union Defense Committee. Kelly Postal turned over the funds as instructed. Brought before one court on a charge of grand larceny, Postal was vindicated when the judge threw the case out of court. But the wheels of capitalist justice do not stop

turning because one judge happens to prove an exception to the rule. Hailed before a second court, Postal was declared guilty and sentenced up to 5 years in Stillwater penitentiary. Judge Selover, who pronounced this cruel sentence, demonstrated his knowledge of the workings of capitalist justice by turning down a motion to appeal the case. Kelly Postal is now behind bars because he obeyed the will of the union membership which placed him in office.

In the same period Roosevelt's Postmaster General moved to take away the second-class mailing rights of the Trotskyist weekly, *The Militant*. Mailings of *Fourth International* have been consistently held-up by the postal authorities. Just as the Trotskyist movement was the first to be hit by the Smith Act, so its weekly organ has been the first working class paper to suffer a reactionary attack upon the freedom of the press.

The Circuit Court Decision

On September 20, 1943 the Eighth Circuit Court handed down its decision. In defiance of the law, the Constitution, and all the principles and traditions of democracy this court upheld the Smith "Gag" Act, giving unconditional endorsement to the prosecution. The defendants had been deprived of their elementary democratic rights and were being railroaded to prison. The circuit court judges declared that all this was done in a correct legal way. Thus did the Court of Appeals uphold the right of free speech, one of the "four freedoms" which Roosevelt has so solemnly promised to export to other countries.

The Civil Rights Defense Committee then carried the case to the United States Supreme Court. What did this august body, largely composed of Roosevelt appointees, do? Did they safeguard the inviolability of the Bill of Rights?

What the Supreme Court Did

In Washington, the case of the 18 was likewise considered by judges expert in serving out capitalist justice. On November 22, 1943, barely more than two months after the appeal was made, the Supreme Court reached a decision that will undoubtedly go down as historic. It denied the petition of the 18 to hear their case.

Consider the circumstances of the case—a peace-time law manifestly unconstitutional, a law directly abrogating the right of free speech. The highest court in the land is presented with the first case to be tried under this law. The government is waging a war ostensibly to make the world free for democracy. The law has been universally denounced—even in the halls of Congress—as "enough to make Thomas Jefferson turn over in his grave" and as "without precedent in the history of labor legislation." Yet the last court of appeal in the land *denies—without a word of explanation—the petition of 18 defendants to hear the case!*

The Honor Roll

On December 31, 1943 the eighteen defendants were taken to the penitentiary. The class-war prisoners are:

James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party.

Albert Goldman, attorney for the SWP and *The Militant*.

Vincent R. Dunne, National Labor Secretary of the SWP.

Felix Morrow, Editor of *Fourth International*.

Farrell Dobbs, Editor of *The Militant*.

Grace Carlson, New York SWP Organizer.

Oscar Coover, Minneapolis SWP Organizer.

Harry DeBoer, Local 544-CIO Organizer.
Max Goldman, Recording Secretary, Local 544 Federal Workers Section.

Carlos Hudson, Editor of *The Industrial Organizer*, Local 544 weekly paper.

Clarence Hamel, Local 544-CIO Organizer.

Carl Skoglund, Local 544-CIO Organizer.

Oscar Schoenfeld, former Organizer Local 544 Federal Workers Section, Youth Division.

Emil Hansen, Local 544-CIO Organizer.

Jake Cooper, Minneapolis truck driver.

Edward Palmquist, Local 544-CIO Organizer.

Karl Kuehn, Local 544-CIO Federal Workers Section Organizer.

Alfred Russell, former officer Omaha Teamsters Local 554.

* * *

The American ruling class is repeating in the second World War its record of the first World War when, under President Wilson and his Attorney General Palmer, raids were conducted from coast to coast and socialists, members of the Industrial Workers of the World and other worker militants were arrested by the hundreds for their opposition to imperialist war. The most prominent of these heroic figures who got a taste of capitalist justice and "democracy" was Eugene V. Debs.

During the succeeding years, liberals ascribed these abominations to war "hysteria." It was a purely temporary psychological aberration, they vowed. And they furthermore explained that capitalist democracy had learned its lesson. As the second World War approached they salved their consciences with confident predictions that such raids, such "hysteria," such abrogation of civil liberties would not again be repeated. Ironically enough, Attorney General Francis Biddle christened himself in office with a promise that under his tenure there would be no persecutions such as had marred the reign of Palmer of World War I notoriety.

The Minneapolis case, coldly and calculatingly organized by "government departments and agencies" in *peacetime* not only dissipates these illusions and lies, but proves that the turn toward reaction was *conscious* on the part of the Roosevelt regime.

Despicable Role of Liberals

Most miserable and despicable of all the roles in this sordid display of capitalist justice is that played by the liberals. In 1940 they did not hesitate to denounce the Smith "Gag" Act. It was clearly anti-labor in their eyes then. Noisy protests came from the liberals when this law was enacted. In 1941 the law came into action for the first time. A different matter.

They tried to explain it away. The labor movement was assured "again, and again, and again" that none of its members would go to prison—not under the democratic Roosevelt regime! Roosevelt, to be sure, had signed the Smith "Gag" Law, but that was sheer oversight, a misunderstanding, implied the liberals.

When it actually turned out that the court returned an adverse decision, the liberals quickly announced that the higher courts would never sustain it. They assured the labor movement that the higher courts would declare it unconstitutional. Weren't the members of the Supreme Court appointees of the liberal Roosevelt? Weren't they moreover all staunch liberals themselves—those black-gowned dispensers of justice?

Weren't many of them members and mainstays of the American Civil Liberties Union these two decades and more?

When the Supreme Court actually handed down its brazen decision—the first of its kind in the history of the United States—the silence of the grave enveloped the liberal press. They participated in the conspiracy of silence in which the entire capitalist press has engaged. Search *The Nation*. Search *The New Republic*. Hunt with a high-powered microscope for a forthright declaration on the Minneapolis case from this whole cowardly crew. You will find nothing but yawning emptiness.

* * *

And these were the gentlemen who pointed their fingers at the morals of the Bolsheviks; and who paraded as champions of democracy and defenders of the rights of the people. They are the ones who waxed indignant when Leon Trotsky labeled them *sycophants*.

When the test came, when it was necessary to speak out against the monstrous abomination committed by Roosevelt-Biddle and the Supreme Court, they simply followed the lead of that court, pulled their tails between their legs and crawled

silently into their kennels. Thus they do their part in spreading the "four freedoms" over the six continents and seven seas.

* * *

In preparing an assault on the labor movement as a whole, capitalist reaction invariably begins by trying to pick off the vanguard, the most consistent, resolute and advanced section of the working class. This was done in Italy and in Germany. That is why fire was levelled first in this country at the Trotskyists. And that is also why the labor movement cannot permit the eighteen to remain in jail. For thereby a most dangerous precedent is set, and a most powerful weapon left in the hands of reaction which can proceed to slash the labor movement to pieces, and to imprison whomever they please.

The workers are perfectly able to defend their own historic interests. The prime requisite for this is that they depend on their own strength and organizations, and not on anyone or anything else. The labor movement can and must back the nationwide movement of protest launched by the Civil Rights Defense Committee. *Free the imprisoned men who have proved themselves incorruptible fighters for socialism and for workers' rights! Demand the unconditional pardon of the eighteen!*

Was There A Revolution In Italy?

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

In Morrison's column in *The Militant* of September 25, wherein he tried to explain why the Italian revolution failed to develop, Morrison said: "A revolutionary situation brought to the highest tension by the fall of Mussolini passed without a revolution." I was surprised when a comrade protested against this statement on the ground that it is incorrect to say that there was no revolution in Italy. My surprise became astonishment when other comrades also stated their belief that there was a revolution in Italy.

The resolution adopted at the last Plenum of the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, and published in the December issue of *Fourth International*, does not seem to have settled the question. For I and others, who go on the assumption that there was no revolution in Italy, accept the resolution as well as those comrades who insist that there was a revolution in Italy.

Does the difference arise as a result of a disagreement as to the course that events took in Italy? This can hardly be the case, although the discussion on the question may bring out a difference of opinion as to the actual course of events. It is most likely that we all agree on the facts and that our differences are terminological in character, arising as a result of different meanings given to the term "revolution." Even if that is all that is at issue, it is necessary that we discuss the question so that the problem is clearly understood. It is true that at times a terminological difference can lead to different political conclusions, as was shown in the case of our struggle against those who insisted that the Soviet Union is not a degenerated workers' state but a bureaucratic-collectivist state. I see no possibility of any difference in political conclusions arising as a result of a different interpretation given to the events in Italy. Nevertheless, to avoid the confusion that must inevitably result if some insist that there was a revolution while others contend that there was no revolution in Italy, it is important to discuss the matter.

As a result of the defeats of the Italian army, the workers, peasants and soldiers were filled with bitter resentment to-

wards the Mussolini regime. Above all they wanted an end to the war. Beginning with March of this year the workers in the industrial centers went out on strikes and staged huge demonstrations. A serious revolutionary situation was developing.

The Overthrow of Mussolini

The Italian ruling class was confronted with the central problem of finding the best means to avoid or suppress a revolution. It could not depend upon its own army to save it from revolution for the simple reason that the army also was infected by defeatist and revolutionary ideas. The Italian revolution could be suppressed by the use of the German army. But this meant continuing the war on the side that offered very little chance of victory.

The dominant section of the Italian ruling class, represented by Badoglio and the King and even by some in the higher ranks of the fascist hierarchy, had arrived at the conclusion that the winner in the war would not be Hitler but the democratic imperialists. To make peace with the latter meant losing less than to continue the war on the side of Hitler until he was defeated. All factors dictated the necessity of an attempt to avoid an uprising of the masses by either making peace with the Allies or actually shifting to their side.

Mussolini had first to be removed both to avoid a revolutionary uprising and to make peace overtures to the Allies. Roosevelt and Churchill would find it somewhat difficult to deal with Mussolini because that would have made it too obvious to the masses of the "United Nations" that the war has nothing to do with any struggle against fascism. Whether Mussolini was removed after negotiations for peace with the Allies were commenced, or whether Badoglio and the King understood that Mussolini had to be removed before overtures could be made is not important. The Italian dictator had to leave the scene to permit the capitalists to attempt solving their very serious problems.

The removal of Mussolini followed the pattern of a typical

palace revolution where one section of the ruling clique eliminates its leader and replaces him with someone else from the same clique. The Plenum resolution correctly speaks of the fall of Mussolini as a *coup d'etat*. Churchill and some right-wing liberals dignify the ousting of Mussolini by calling it a revolution, but their purpose in doing so is to get the support of the masses for the Badoglio regime.

* * *

Arising as a result of the defeats suffered by the Italian army, the revolutionary situation existing prior to the fall of Mussolini reached a point of white heat with his fall. The masses were set into motion on a huge scale and were held back from revolution only by the presence of the German army and by the hope of the masses that Badoglio would succeed in making peace with the Allies.

The Revolutionary Possibilities

Would the German army have succeeded in suppressing a revolt of the masses? It is idle to speculate. But it must be remembered that unarmed or poorly-armed masses have no chance against a well-armed and disciplined army. From that correct proposition reformists draw the conclusion that a revolution is impossible, forgetting that a conscript army is composed of the same human material as the masses and is also seized with a revolutionary spirit during a revolutionary situation and is affected by the revolutionary action of the workers. The proof of this proposition can be found in the fact that the Italian army as such could not be relied on to fight against the Italian workers. At any rate the Italian masses did not go ahead with their revolution partly because they did not want to come into conflict with the German soldiers who have not yet been seized by the revolutionary spirit.

One needs only to consider the situation of that section of Italy where the German army has control to realize that the Italian masses can do nothing against an undefeated German army that follows the orders of its officers. In the industrial heart of Italy where the revolution was most powerful, the German army is in complete control. Had the Italian masses acted quickly, immediately after the fall of Mussolini, they could have established a workers' government and organized an army to fight the German army. But for such quick action a powerful revolutionary party having the support of the masses was indispensable. Under the fascist regime such a party was unable to develop.

Aside from the fact that the Italian masses faced the German army, they also hoped that Badoglio would succeed in giving them peace. The successor of Mussolini very cleverly proposed the kind of peace that the masses longed for—one that provided for the complete neutrality of Italy, with the German army leaving and the Allied armies not coming in. Such a peace was of course impossible. As a matter of fact peace for Italy, so long as the war was going on, was a fantasy. Only a struggle for peace was possible and such a struggle could be waged solely by a workers' government basing itself on the European revolution and winning support from the English and American workers.

The most significant action of the workers and one which most accurately reveals their attitude in the period immediately following the fall of Mussolini is the half-hour strikes which they staged every day. It was a daily reminder to Badoglio that he was tolerated only for the purpose of obtaining peace.

With the unconditional surrender of Badoglio and the invasion by the Allied forces, Italy, as was expected, became a

battle-ground and the revolutionary situation was arrested. There was no test between the forces of revolution and those of reaction. That test must now wait for another day.

* * *

Where and when, then, was there a revolution in Italy? I use the term not in the general sense of a fundamental change but only in the sense which it has when one refers to the February or October revolution in Russia or the November revolution in Germany. In the sense, that is, of a fundamental change of regime, directly resulting from a struggle of the masses. There is no necessity to discuss the difference between a political and social revolution nor need we discuss revolution as a process, because these questions are not germane.

Obviously one can speak of the "revolution in Italy," meaning either the forces existing in the social structure driving towards a revolution or the coming revolutionary change. In the same sense do we speak of the European revolution. But this is something different from making the flat statement that there was a revolution in Italy.

Revolutions in recent times are characterized not only by the fact that fundamental changes in the regime take place as a direct result of the struggle of the masses, but also in that the power is actually transferred into the hands of the masses, in the first instance. If the workers are not sufficiently conscious of their own interests they turn the power over to those who are considered representatives of the people but who, in practice, serve the interests of the capitalist class.

In the Russian revolution of February 1917, the workers, supported by the peasant soldiers, overthrew the Czarist autocracy but turned over the power which they had in their hands to the socialist (Menshevik) intellectuals who in turn gave it to the Provisional Government representing the Russian capitalists.

There is a tendency to equate the Badoglio regime to the Provisional Government of Russia after the revolution of February 1917. A very superficial analogy. In Russia, after February 1917, Soviets were immediately organized and governmental power was lodged in them. But since they were under the leadership of Menshevik and Social-Revolutionary compromisers, the power of government was transferred to the Provisional Government. Had the Italian workers overthrown Badoglio, established Soviets and placed compromisers in the leadership, who in turn would have permitted people like Sforza to rule, we would have had a situation similar to the one that existed in Russia following February 1917.

The Italian masses were on the verge of overthrowing the Badoglio regime and had this happened it is not excluded that Workers' Councils would have retained the power. Although a new generation of workers has grown up under the fascist regime, a generation that has no knowledge of the October revolution, a large section of the working class includes within its revolutionary consciousness an understanding of the Bolshevik idea of having the Workers' Councils exercise government power. It is quite possible that, under the leadership of this layer of the Italian workers, the preliminary stage of a bourgeois democratic regime can be and would have been skipped over. The failure of the Italian revolution to develop leaves that problem unsettled.

The fact remains that at no time after the palace revolution removed Mussolini did the masses or their representatives dictate or direct who should be in the government and what it should do. The ousting of Mussolini set the masses into motion on a large scale but they did not overthrow the government and take power into their own hands.

It may, however, be contended that in addition to successful revolutions there are unsuccessful ones, the best example being the Russian revolution of 1905. Can it be said that there was an unsuccessful revolution in Italy?

To say that the Russian revolution of 1905 was not successful is only partly true. As a result of the political general strike in October 1905, the Czar was compelled to grant a Duma with a fairly liberal election law. The power was not altogether taken away from the autocracy but there was a sufficiently fundamental change in the regime, coming as a direct result of the struggle of the masses, to justify using the term revolution to describe the events. Moreover, the 1905 revolution also includes an attempt by the workers to destroy the autocracy altogether and to gain power for themselves. The October general strike was only part of the revolution. In December there were armed insurrections in Moscow and elsewhere. In other words, there was a test of strength between the workers and the regime, and the workers were defeated. The fundamental characteristic of an unsuccessful revolution is a conscious *attempt* on the part of the workers to overthrow the government and establish a different government.

The seizure of the factories by the Italian workers in September 1920 can be considered an unsuccessful revolution. For it was not simply a sit-down strike to achieve economic demands. It was an act of workers who consciously aimed at taking over the factories permanently. There was no revolutionary party to assume the leadership of the masses, and the reformist leaders persuaded the workers to evacuate the factories.

At no time was there any decisive test of strength between the Badoglio regime and the workers. The key to the nature of the situation during the fifty days between the fall of Mussolini and the invasion of Italy by the Allies can be found in the half-hour daily strikes. The Italian workers were mobilized and ready to act. Anxious above all to have peace but unwilling to have the Allies take possession of Italy, they gave Badoglio a chance to achieve peace. The half-hour strikes indicated that the masses were ready to act and would act if Badoglio did not give them the peace they wanted. Before they had a chance to act, the unconditional surrender was announced and the invasion was on. With the transformation of Italy into a battlefield the masses had to retreat.

A revolution is characterized by the independent action of the masses, but not every time the masses act independently do we have a revolution. Demonstrations of the masses, no matter how large and imposing, even when they bring about changes in the existing government, are not necessarily revolutions. In Russia, between February and October 1917, the workers and soldiers staged several huge demonstrations resulting in governmental changes but it occurred to no one to call these changes revolutions. The demonstration that took place in Petrograd in July 1917 was an armed one and undoubtedly exceeded anything that occurred in Italy after Mussolini's fall. It was characterized by Lenin as something less than a revolution and more than a demonstration, showing how careful Lenin was in designating the nature of important actions of the masses.

* * *

Some comrades may feel that since fascism in Italy was destroyed and since, in general, it was expected that fascism would be destroyed as a result of a proletarian revolution, there must therefore have been a revolution in Italy. That would constitute reasoning not on the basis of actual events

but on the basis of doctrine, a type of reasoning alien to the spirit of Marxism.

When Lenin, upon his return to Russia from exile, presented his April theses advocating the taking over of power by the Soviets, leading Bolsheviks accused him of going contrary to his theory of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. He answered them in the words of Goethe that "theory is grey but green are the facts of life." As we all know, Lenin at no time minimized the importance of theory. He meant to indicate that a Marxist must base his theories on the facts of life and not on any doctrine previously propounded.

Forecasts and Reality

It is almost certain that in the writings of Trotsky and other comrades who wrote on the subject assertions will be found that fascism will be destroyed only by a proletarian revolution. It happened, however, that a combination of factors led to the destruction of fascism in Italy without a proletarian revolution. Only superficial people and charlatans will seize upon an error in predicting a concrete event as an indication that the basic line is incorrect. Our basic line is that fascism as a threat to the proletariat will be destroyed only by a proletarian revolution. That does not mean that under certain circumstances, in a particular country, the capitalists themselves will not move to get rid of fascism. Our basic line means that capitalism has reached a stage when, in the last analysis, the alternative confronting mankind is either fascism or socialism.

The ease with which the capitalists, represented by Badoglio and the King, were able to overthrow Mussolini is explained by the fact—which Trotsky indicated—that the fascist regime had been transformed into a military-police dictatorship. It is inconceivable that the Italian capitalists could have ousted or would have wanted to oust Mussolini in the early days of fascism when it had a powerful mass base.

Fascism comes to power on the basis of a mass movement composed largely of lower middle class elements and de-classed proletarians. It loses that base when it becomes evident that it will not and cannot fulfill its demagogic promises of the days when it was making a bid for power. It must then rely solely on the military and police machine that it creates while in power; and the leader of the regime can then be overthrown by a palace revolution. Mussolini, in the later stages of his rule, was practically in the same position as a dictator of any of the Latin-American countries.

In ousting Mussolini and in proclaiming the end of fascism the Italian capitalists conclusively verified our basic doctrine that fascism as a government is not established on the basis of a new social system but is simply a form of government resorted to by the capitalists to destroy all vestiges of democracy in order to save their social system. When to retain fascism means the probable loss of their wealth and power the capitalists will not hesitate to get rid of it. The theories which proclaimed fascism as a new social system have been proved false.

* * *

Conclusions

It is obvious that the revolution in Italy has begun. I use the word "has" because the revolution has not been crushed by the invasion of the Allies; it has only been interrupted. When recently the students at the University of Naples shouted for the elimination of the monarchy against the liberal speakers who favored a regency, they thereby indicated that the

masses are ready for revolutionary action. And one must remember that the masses are far to the left of the republican students. If the German army is driven out of Northern Italy, where the Italian industrial workers are concentrated, we can confidently expect that they will not be satisfied to remain under the rule of the Allied armies.

But to say that "a revolution has begun" is not the same as saying "there was a revolution." Trotsky, writing about the sit-down strikes in the French factories, at the time Blum be-

came Premier, asserted that the French revolution had begun. No one now speaks or writes as if there was a revolution in France in 1936.

It is best to be accurate in characterizing an event even if inaccuracy does not lead to any serious consequences. It certainly avoids confusion. It is best to say that the Italian revolution began and to avoid saying that there was a revolution in Italy.

December 15, 1943.

Lebanon's Fight For Independence

By MARC LORIS

On November 10 the newspapers carried two important news items in regard to French affairs. The first was Giraud's retirement from his position as chairman of the French Committee of National Liberation in Algiers. With the General went four of the Commissioners who were his supporters in the Committee, leaving de Gaulle sole chairman with an indisputable majority behind him. Giraud's elimination from the committee marked the final collapse of the set-up arranged by Washington and London beginning with the Darlan deal. After the assassination of Admiral Darlan, Giraud was installed by the American and British governments, but despite this help, he could not conceal the complete vacuum of his regime. A compromise with de Gaulle became unavoidable and last June a new regime was formed, crowned by a committee in which the two factions had equal representation. All these moves and the forces behind them have been analyzed in previous issues of this magazine. The instability of the new committee was foretold at the time of its formation (*Fourth International*, July 1943.) Giraud's departure from the committee marks a new victory for the left bourgeois-democratic tendency which de Gaulism has become, mainly under the pressure of the underground movement in France.

The second news item informed that the Chamber of Deputies of Lebanon had voted for full sovereignty and independence. Lebanon is a small state in the Middle East, the control of which was given to France after the last war, by the League of Nations in the form of a "mandate." After the departure of the reactionary Giraud did the Algiers Committee, bursting with democracy, undertake to put an end to colonial oppression? If anybody had that illusion, he was to lose it quickly.

The Lebanese Chamber unanimously passed a law to the effect that the French should henceforth have no say in what might or might not be discussed in the Chamber; the Lebanese would have their own flag and Arabic would be the one recognized State language. Immediately after the vote, the French authorities clamped a strict censorship on communications and the press. French police occupied newspaper offices in Beirut, the Lebanese capital. Then Helleu arrived, the delegate of the French National Committee of Liberation (one has to laugh in writing down these words). And his first action, on November 11, was to order the arrest of President Bedhara El-Khoury, Premier Riad Solh and other members of the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies and of the Government. Helleu appointed Idde, "one whom the French can trust," as "Chief of State." Such is the irony of history that this Quisling was invested with the exact title that Petain had taken in France.

After Lebanese police refused to obey French orders to suppress protests against the arrests, Senegalese soldiers, whom French imperialism has traditionally used for its dirty work against French workers in strikes and against revolting colonial peoples, fired on demonstrators at Beirut and at Tripoli. Street fighting ensued for several days, with an undisclosed number of victims.

True Visage of Committee

By its actions the French National Committee showed to everybody—even to those who do not want to see—what it really is, namely, a rescue committee of French imperialism. The Gaullists have been fond of speaking of the "new France" of tomorrow that will make a clean sweep of the filth of past French politics. But in the Lebanese affair the Gaullist Committee showed that it has remained true to the imperialist traditions of the Third Republic.

Syria and Lebanon, countries long civilized, were formerly part of the Ottoman empire in which they were relatively autonomous. Lebanon is partly inhabited by a population of Catholic faith, the Maronites, and this was France's original pretext for showing a special interest in the country. Catholic schools and missions were the carriers of French penetration. During the last war "for democracy" Turkey sided with Germany and in 1916 the British and the French entered into a secret agreement known as the Sykes-Picot treaty, by which they divided the spoils: Palestine and Arabia for the British; Lebanon and Syria for the French. Is it necessary to add that these champions of "democracy" did not even bother to consult the peoples concerned?

After the last war, France swept away the Lebanese national government and moved in. French corporations and banks grabbed all they could. The political regime under the Third Republic became more severe than it had been under the Ottoman empire. The whole operation was juridically sanctioned by the League of Nations which gave Lebanon and Syria to France as a "mandate".

The history of Lebanon and Syria since then has been one of incessant revolts against the French yoke. In 1925 armed rebellion broke out and for a while it seemed almost successful. But French imperialism managed to crush it, and has since then maintained its rule by a combination of open violence and innumerable promises of independence which have never been fulfilled. Political oppression goes hand in hand with economic exploitation and pillage.

De Gaulle promised independence to Syria and Lebanon in June 1941. And during an official trip in November 1941, General Catroux announced to the Lebanese and Syrian peoples

that their independence was coming, although the "how" and the "when" were left in the dark. When de Gaulle failed to keep that promise but instead in November 1943 shot and jailed those who asked for its fulfillment, he simply followed the long tradition of the Third Republic. De Gaulle's main argument during the crisis was that France had received her "mandate" over Lebanon and Syria from the League of Nations and could not relinquish it except by action of the League of Nations. What the League of Nations is nowadays is hard to say. But if we place ourselves for a moment on this juridical plane, isn't it clear that de Gaulle made a promise he knew he could not fulfill?

By invoking the sanction of the League of Nations, de Gaulle revealed the hypocritical character of his previous promises of independence, made at a time when his movement was extremely weak and had to marshal support by any means. Moreover, during the twenty years of her "mandate" over Lebanon and Syria, France has many times violated the rules prescribed by the League of Nations for a mandatory power (the establishment of a constitution within a certain time, etc.) These "obligations" had been fixed by the great powers, mainly Britain and France, but France did not even bother to respect them. De Gaulle's invoking the juridical impossibility of granting independence only reveals the emptiness of the case of French imperialism.

Lebanon is a mountainous country and as such has been a refuge in the past for heretic religious sects. The population of the country is now divided mainly into Maronites, who are Catholics of special denomination, Druses, who have a religion of their own, and Moslems. In past centuries bloody conflicts took place. The French have incessantly played on these religious differences, as the British do in India. But the failure of these intrigues is patently clear in the present crisis. The unity of the nation against French oppression is symbolized by the fact that the jailed President El-Khoury is a Catholic while Premier Sohl is a Moslem.

Immediately after Helleu's first repressions, both the Maronite Archbishop and the Grand Mufti of Lebanon protested against the French action. A dispatch to the *New York Herald Tribune* stated on November 16, in the midst of the crisis: "For the first time in many years Moslems and Christians are united against the French." And, further: "The most interesting aspect of the present disturbances is that members of all religions and sects are united."

Before the present war the French colonial empire was already out of proportion with France's economic strength. Defeat has now changed France into a minor power. However, she still formally remains the second greatest colonial empire in the world. This is a very unstable situation.

The prestige of France has greatly suffered from her defeat, creating an objective condition for colonial revolts. The cry for independence heard today in Lebanon will be heard tomorrow in Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria. Three weeks after the Lebanon crisis de Gaulle has felt obliged to grant more civil rights to the Arabs in Algeria. In Morocco French administrators have had to make in recent weeks quite a few promises to the Arabs. Tomorrow promises will not be enough.

The measures taken by the French in Lebanon aroused angry protests throughout the Arabic world. Sympathetic demonstrations were especially vehement in Egypt. War has brought to the Middle East economic disorganization. On the other hand, phrases about democracy and freedom have little appeal in countries plundered by those who utter these phrases. And so, the Arabic world has been watching with a growing

impatience a war from which it expects nothing. Egypt, for instance, remained neutral while the British and German armies were fighting on her soil.

When Egyptian students demonstrated in the streets of Cairo shouting "We are soldiers of Lebanon!"—this is easy to understand. However, something quite unexpected happened. It soon appeared that Churchill was also ready to fight for Lebanon. Churchill? Yes, Churchill himself, the chief of a government that holds four hundred millions of Indians in political oppression and economic destitution. But didn't Churchill put Gandhi and Nehru in jail for exactly the same reasons that de Gaulle jailed El-Khoury and Sohl, namely, for asking the independence of their respective countries? In this Lebanon crisis, it is hard to decide where the most disgusting hypocrisy lies: in a de Gaulle, head of a Committee of Liberation, fighting tooth and nail against the independence of Lebanon, or in a Churchill, oppressor of India, proclaiming himself champion of this independence.

On November 12, at the opening of the crisis, the British Foreign Office announced that the British government had protested to French officials in Beirut against their summary measures. The following day the British were reported "ready to act." The British government made it clear that it was ready to seize control quickly in Lebanon "if necessary," the Associated Press reported. On November 15 it was reported that the United States had joined Great Britain in making strong representations to the French Committee. On November 17 it was learned from London that "unless the situation is speedily cleared up, it is possible that British military power will intervene." Churchill was really going to fight for Lebanon's independence!

British arguments against the French can be reduced to two. First, Lebanon is situated in an area of vital strategic importance. Second, the British government has associated itself with the pledge of independence given by de Gaulle and Catroux to Syria and Lebanon; and, in consequence, the British government has to keep its pledges to the Lebanese in order to maintain British honor throughout the Arabic world.

These arguments are, to say the least, rather strange. The military location of the country was precisely the reason invoked by Britain in India for "postponing" the independence of this nation until after the war. In Lebanon, however, it becomes an argument for immediate independence—from the French. The casuistry of imperialism is very rich indeed. The second argument—that Britain cannot break one of her pledges—can only make us smile if we remember, among many others, the long series of broken pledges to India.

During the last war France and Britain divided the spoils of the Ottoman empire among themselves, but the Middle East and especially Syria and Lebanon became a field of intrigues and a battleground between the British Intelligence Service and the French *Deuxieme Bureau*. Now, with her prestige below par in the Arabic world, Britain is of the opinion that Lebanese independence would be a good concession—the more so since she has in this case no need of giving something of her own. Whether Britain started the crisis by letting the Lebanese leaders know that she would not oppose their move or whether she availed herself of an opportunity not originated by her, it is impossible to say with the information available here. In any event Churchill could not let such an opportunity pass.

There is another reason behind the Anglo-American intervention. The Darlan deal and the Churchill-Roosevelt friction with de Gaulle have tarnished the democratic reputations

of these two gentlemen and they are only too eager to show that, after all, de Gaulle was no more of a democrat than they, and perhaps even less. Finally, Anglo-American intervention in the Lebanese crisis is a serious warning to de Gaulle. All the French colonies are now in the power of Anglo-American armed forces. On the morrow their independence can become the object of the solicitude of London and Washington—if de Gaulle, that is, the resurgent French bourgeoisie, is not subservient enough.

When the crisis developed, de Gaulle sent to Beirut General Catroux, a professional colonial administrator, known for his cruel regime in Indo-China. Catroux's first action was to complain about British interference. He is reported to have said in Beirut on November 19 that "Great Britain should confine its interest in Lebanon to purely military affairs and leave France to deal with political matters." However, the position of French imperialism is not such that a Catroux could give lessons to Great Britain and on November 21 the French Committee in Algiers approved a settlement involving the immediate release of the arrested president and ministers. They were released and reinstated on November 22. (French troops had been withdrawn from the streets on November 20.)

But the whole situation still remains quite obscure. The crisis had started with the vote of independence by the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies. Was that vote to remain valid or was it nullified? Nothing precise has appeared in the press, and after the bare announcement of the settlement news practically ceased.

What probably happened is that the reinstatement of the nationalist leaders was the beginning of a period of bargaining, with British and American diplomacy active behind the scenes. Formally, the settlement seems like a return to the *status quo ante*. But exactly which status? The situation preceding the vote by the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies or the one immediately following the vote? This point, which is decisive to the entire question, remains obscure. However, it may be said that a return to the *status quo* preceding the vote is hardly conceivable. The impotence of the French to act in the present situation has been clearly demonstrated. On the other hand, it is not sure that London and Washington want to damage the prestige of the French *too much*. Moreover, the Lebanese nationalist leaders have in the past shown more than once, their ability to collaborate with the French. Therefore some new compromise may be reached.

But besides the French, British, American imperialisms and the nationalist leaders, there are other forces. There are the Lebanese masses. Nobody, the British no more than the French, has been eager to mention the participation of the masses in

the present crisis, but from a few indications we can measure its extent. On November 21 a dispatch from the Palestine-Lebanon frontier states that:

"The general strike in Lebanon is reported to be continuing today, the twelfth day in all the large towns. Only a few foreign commercial establishments are not affected."

"The twelfth day" means that the general strike broke out immediately after the vote for independence. On November 22 a dispatch from Cairo, reporting the releasing of the President and the Premier, added: "Strikes are continuing." Since then no news has been forthcoming.

The problem of the immediate future of Lebanon may be clarified a little if we look at what has just taken place in Syria. The crisis in Lebanon had immediate repercussions in neighboring Syria. On November 30 the Syrian Chamber of Deputies voted to rid the Constitution of Article 116. This article is the only one which refers to France. It gives the French authorities the right to veto any bill proposed by the Chamber of Deputies. The vote to abolish Article 116 took place a few days after Catroux's visit—on his way back from Beirut to Algiers—to Damascus, Syria's capital, and was not followed by any reaction on the part of the French. Under these circumstances the vote would indicate that the political grip of the French has been broken and that Syria and Lebanon are henceforth politically independent, no matter what formal gestures may be taken in order to save the prestige of France.

This is the most favorable hypothesis allowed by the complete and strange lack of news since the announcement of the settlement and the extreme vagueness of the news of the settlement itself. The precarious character of such independence is obvious. It may disappear at the end of this war as it disappeared after the last war. But even if Lebanon and Syria can keep their political independence, French investments—in banks, railroads, port facilities and utilities—remain. Tomorrow British and especially American investments will increase. The fate of these countries is foretold by Iraq. Iraq was a "mandate" given by the League of Nations to Great Britain in the same way as Lebanon and Syria were given to France. Subsequently Iraq became politically independent, but, held in the grip of British imperialism, cannot escape from economic poverty. The national independence of the people of the Middle East is only a stage in their fight against imperialism. This struggle cannot be carried to the end by the native bourgeoisie. The young proletariat of these countries, in alliance with the workers of the great imperialist powers, can alone break the grip of imperialism that keeps the whole Middle East in stagnation and misery.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

England

From a letter from England we extract the following lines:

London, Nov. 2, 1943.

Dear friends,

At the moment here it is like living on top of a volcano. Nothing of any magnitude is happening on the class war front but any moment violent eruptions can and will take place.

The Barrow strike dealt the bourgeoisie a sharp blow. It came as a shock to them and it scared them. At the same time not only the ruling class influence but also the

authority of the Labor leaders is being undermined in the tremendous radicalization that is taking place.

Even extreme reactionaries like Viscount Suirdale are being compelled—not without trepidation, it is true—to evoke the support of the Stalinist party in by-elections. The Barrow strike, however, showed the true value of the Stalinist party. They are completely exposed and have earned the bitterest hatred of the workers there.

A member of the strike committee visited a plant owned by Vickers-Armstrong near London to appeal for support for his striking comrades in the Barrow Vickers plant.

He was attacked by the Stalinist shop stewards who, it can be said, wielded large influence if not control over the workers there. After he had defended the action in Barrow and explained the strike-breaking role of the Stalinist party, the workers voted a not inconsiderable sum of money (I can't recall the exact amount—over 400 pounds) which had been collected for the Stalinist *Daily Worker* fund to the Barrow strikers! On hearing of this our comrades went down to the plant to sell our press and were well received. In the Notts coal fields we got a similar reception in hitherto Stalinist strongholds. . . .

A. H.

The Myth of Racial Superiority

By GRACE CARLSON

History will record the fact that in the "enlightened" twentieth century more millions of human beings were enslaved by the colonial systems of the powerful capitalist "democracies" than at any previous epoch. Only in the future socialist society will the full record of capitalist violence, hypocrisy and deceit be revealed. Then, socialist historians will paint a picture of French, English and American imperialist rulers of our day, holding down helpless masses of colonial peoples with one hand, while grasping in the other a copy of the "Declaration of Independence," the "Magna Charta," or the "Declaration of the Rights of Man."

Of the approximately two billion people inhabiting the earth today, only one third are white peoples of European descent, but they keep the other two thirds—the brown, black and yellow peoples—in colonial subjection. "All men are created equal," "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," "Equal rights for all"—the political slogans which helped the eighteenth century capitalists seize power from the feudal lords have long been collecting dust in national archives. But equalitarian mottoes did not obtain for the white capitalist rulers of the democracies the rich lands and poorly paid labor of the colored peoples of the world which they needed so desperately. Bloody and brutal imperialistic offensives had to be launched in Asia, Africa, and a hundred other regions so that capitalist "democracy" could function. The myth of white racial superiority was evolved as a vindication of these crimes. (Hitler's vicious persecution of the Jewish people, which he attempts to justify on the basis of the superiority of the "Aryans," or more particularly, the Nordics, to all other sections of the white race, is simply an application of this theory of white superiority to one segment of the white race.)

The Lie of Racial Superiority

The idea of racial superiority was not a twentieth century invention. Conquerors of all ages had recourse to this convenient theory, not only in order to excuse crimes committed against those whom they enslaved, but even more in order to set one group of subject peoples against another. "*Divide et impera*" (divide and rule) is the classical expression of this policy used so successfully by the Roman tyrants against the conquered tribes of northern Europe and Britain. How much more successful have been the descendants of those former subject peoples, the English, French and German imperialist rulers of today, in "dividing and ruling"! For not only has the technique of empire-building been vastly simplified by modern scientific developments, but the population of the globe has increased so tremendously since the days of imperial Rome that, whereas the "world-conquering" Caesars dominated only scores of millions of colonials, the twentieth century capitalist lords of the earth rule over nearly a billion people!

In his book, *Hereditary and Politics*, the English biologist, J. B. S. Haldane writes,

"The earliest statement of that doctrine [racial superiority] known to me is found in the Book of Genesis where the curse on the children of Ham is related. It is worthy of note that if this attribution of priority is accurate, the doctrine of racial superiority is originally a Jewish doctrine, although it is now being used against the Jews in Central Europe." (*Op. cit.*, p. 23.)

According to the Biblical story, Ham, the legendary ancestor of the Negro people, was condemned by the curse of his father, Noah, to be a "servant of servants" to his brothers, Sem and Japheth. It is interesting to note that anti-abolitionists in the United States found refuge in the "word of God" many centuries later. An entire volume, *The Bible Defense of Slavery*, was published in Kentucky in 1852 by one such figure, Josiah Priest, as an attempted justification for the continued enslavement of the Negro people.

The dubious historical distinction of having best phrased the doctrine of "white supremacy" goes to the English poet, Rudyard Kipling, a staunch supporter of imperial Britain's policies in the colonial countries. In his poem, "The White Man's Burden," Kipling wrote in 1899:

"Take up the White Man's burden—
Send forth the best ye breed—
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captive's need;
To wait in heavy harness
On fluttered folk and wild—
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child."

The Ancient Civilizations

But the theory and even the expression of the false concept that one race is inherently superior to others did not always have the one-sided character of the "superior" white race *vs.* the "inferior" colored peoples. Haldane quotes a contemptuous reference made by the writer, Said of Toledo, about the Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of northern and central Europe,

"They are of cold temperament and never reach maturity. They are of great stature and of a white color. But they lack all sharpness of wit and penetration of intellect." (*Op. cit.*, p. 138.)

Said of Toledo wrote in the eighth century when the Moors—of mixed Negroid and Semitic extraction—had conquered all of Spain which thus became part of the great Arab empire that stretched all across Northern Africa and Asia Minor. At a time when the future exponents of "white supremacy" were still immersed in the superstitiousness and intellectual backwardness of Europe's Dark Ages, these highly cultured colored peoples were making great strides in the mathematical, medical and physical sciences, as well as in the arts.

The great historic pasts of others of today's so-called inferior peoples can also be cited in refutation of the false doctrine of "white supremacy." The average white student of history knows little about the early Dravidian civilization in India; the Chinese culture of several centuries before Christ, and more notably of the 7th, 8th and 9th centuries A.D.; the advanced civilization of the Mayan and Aztec Indians in Mexico and Central America over a thousand years ago, and so on.

If little is known by white students of the great cultural achievements of the early peoples of India, China, Mexico and other regions, characterized today as "backward," still less is known of the remarkable history of the black peoples of Ethiopia. In *Black Folk, Then and Now*, a scholarly work modestly designated by its author W. E. B. DuBois as "an essay in the history and sociology of the Negro race," there is a wealth of information about the Black Kingdom.

"Research in the Nile Valley and study of the records establish the fact that ancient Ethiopia in what is now the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan was the seat of one of the oldest and greatest of the world's civilizations. The golden age of this culture dates from the middle of the Eighth Century before Christ to the middle of the Fourth Century after Christ. But its beginnings go back to the dawn of history, four or five thousand years before Christ and in a way Ethiopian history parallels that of ancient Egypt.

"A reasonable interpretation of historical evidence would show the history of the Nile Valley was something as follows: Negro tribes migrated down the Nile, slowly penetrating what is now modern Egypt. They there gradually came in contact and mingled with whites from the north and Semites from the east. Stimulated to an unusual degree by this contact of the three primitive stocks of mankind, the resulting culture of Egypt was gradually developed." (DuBois, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-23.)

What Do Conquests Prove?

Why then have modern historians been silent about the high cultural attainments of the black peoples of ancient Ethiopia, glowing accounts of which have been preserved in the writings of such Greek and Roman historians as Homer (ninth century B.C.), Herodotus (fifth century B.C.), Pliny (first century A.D.), and Ptolemy (second century A.D.)? Why have the role of Negro blood and ancient Negro culture been denied their proper place in the historical explanations of the development of Egyptian civilization? Because, as Professor DuBois correctly points out, the needs of the white slave traders of the 16th, 17th and 18th century Europe and the United States made it necessary to distort and hide all favorable facts and interpretations of the history of the black peoples. DuBois writes:

"The whole attitude of the world was changed to fit this new economic reorganization. Black Africa, which had been a revered example to ancient Greece and the recognized contender with imperial Rome, became a thing beneath the contempt of modern Europe and America. All history, all science was changed to fit this new condition. Africa had no history. Wherever there was history in Africa or civilization, it was of white origin; and the fact that it was civilization proved that it was white. If black Pharaohs sat on the throne of Egypt they were really not black men but dark white men. Ethiopia, land of the blacks was described as a land of the whites. . . . If at any time, anywhere there was evidence in Africa of the human soul and the same striving of spirit, and the same build of body found elsewhere in the world, it was all due to something non-African and not to the inherent genius of the Negro race." (*Op. cit.*, p. 221.)

The fact that a race has been conquered and held in subjection is no proof that it has an inferior culture to that of the conqueror. Still less does the fact of conquest prove the biological inferiority or superiority of peoples. When the Nazi "blitzkrieg" swept over a dozen countries of Europe in 1939-41, Hitler's sociologists and historians hailed the victories as conclusive proof of the *inherent superiority* of the Teutonic branch of the so-called Aryan race. Now, the armies of Hitler are in retreat. Does this fact then offer proof of the *inherent inferiority* of the Germans? Both aspects of this false racial theory will be dismissed by Marxists and an explanation sought in the social and economic factors involved in the situation. The highly efficient productive system of Nazi Germany, closely geared to a modern and radical type of war machine, continued victorious in Europe until it came into conflict with the war machine of the still more advanced American system of production, which had far greater resources in

material and manpower. This basically important economic factor, coupled with the great social weight of the superior morale and resistance of the workers and soldiers of the Soviet Union, swung the balance against the Nazi "invincibles."

As in this short term historical demonstration of the fallacy of one strongly held belief in racial superiority, so has history offered a thousand other long-term illustrations of the reversal of the roles of the dominant and the subject peoples, of the conquerors and the enslaved.

Neither the testimony of written history nor the extensive research findings of archaeologists, paleontologists and anthropologists offer grounds for a belief in the innate superiority of the white race. The period in which the white race has dominated all of the other races of the earth—a few hundred years at the most—measures only a relatively short span of recorded historical time. It is but an infinitesimal portion of geological time.

Nature experimented for millions of years in the production of organisms capable of adapting themselves to their environment, or as in the case of man, the highest type of organism, capable of changing his physical environment and developing mutually protective relations with other members of his species. As a background against which to measure the relative dominance of the various races, the following figures will be useful:

Origin of the earth	10,000,000,000 years ago
Dawn of life on earth (first living cells)	2,000,000,000 years ago
Evolution of great anthropoid apes	10,000,000 years ago
Earliest types of modern man evolved	1,000,000 years ago
Primitive civilizations established in Asia and Africa	10,000 years ago

The Pre-History of Modern Man

In the age-long evolutionary process from "amoeba to man," living organisms were forced to adapt themselves to cataclysmic planetary changes. Not until somewhere around 10,000 B.C. did the geography of the world become similar to that of the world today. In the millions of preceding years, geological and geographical change was the rule. Enormous internal activity created constantly changing patterns on the earth's surface—mountain ranges were thrust up or rearranged; continental outlines shifted; some continents disappeared into the earth's seas; the depth of the seas was increased in one millennium, decreased in another.

Vast and extreme changes of climate occurred. Centuries of an almost planet-wide period of tropical temperature were succeeded by long ages when ice and snow covered great sections of the earth's surface. Against this background of constant and tremendous climatic, geographical and geological change, primitive man, only recently evolved from his ape-like ancestors, had to find ways to feed, clothe and shelter himself and his family, or face extinction.

Countless numbers of sub-human or "almost-human" species did become extinct after living on the earth for centuries, possibly even for millennia. Only those species which had evolved such physical and mental traits as enabled them to adapt themselves to the changing environment and to compete with hostile species could survive and reproduce.

The Neanderthals—so-called because the fossil remains and primitive tools of this "almost-human" species were first found at Neanderthal, Germany—were dominant on this earth 250,000 years ago. Thousands of years later, they were ex-

terminated either by the ancestors of modern man or by freezing and starvation during one of the glacial periods. Superior in cranial capacity to the early types of modern man, the Neanderthal man had a certain definite inferiority of body structure. He could not turn his head from side to side or look upward, nor could he oppose his finger to his thumb as modern man can. Such physical characteristics, possessed by modern man's ancestors, had real "survival value."

Other physical characteristics, possessing "survival value," were evolved by various species of *Homo Sapiens*. Skin color is one outstanding example; for under the intense heat of the tropical sun, only such species could best survive as had sufficient skin pigmentation. When white or light-skinned types, the hereditary ancestors of the white race, were evolved, it was necessary for them to migrate to areas of temperate or cold climates because their skins, lacking sufficient pigmentation, could not protect them from the violent rays of the tropical sun. In 1943, their blond descendants returning to the tropics as soldiers in an imperialist war are reported by Army medical authorities "to be 'cracking up,' due to the constant bombardment of the sun." (*Science News Letter*, May 22, 1943, p. 324.)

Unscientific Criteria

The new types of early man, with widely varying physical characteristics, which evolved in response to tremendous environmental changes, represent the original "pure" races. From these "pure" races, the several modern races and national types have been formed by a complex process of interbreeding, selection, and other changes flowing from differences of environment, nutrition, etc. But it is impossible now to speak of "pure" races. Anthropologists tell us that there were probably no "pure" races left after the great human migrations and general mixing of the races that occurred at the time of the last glacial period, 18,000 years ago, when most of Europe and a great part of North America were covered with ice.

Evidence for the truth of this statement lies not only in the fact that fossil remains of various racial types have been found all over the world, but that among the living "races" there are no clean-cut scientific differentiations. Racial classification has become, therefore, a very confused and arbitrary matter. Some anthropologists classify the peoples of the world on the basis of skin color and come out with three, five or seven "distinct" races. Others use hair texture, cephalic index

width of head
length of head

or a combination of all three of these indices (skin color, hair texture, skull structure), and in this way derive anywhere from two to 17 main races.

The range of classification may be gleaned from the estimates made in the past: Virey said that there were two races in the blood; Ripley and others claimed three; Kant found four; Blumenbach, five; Buffon, six; Hunter, seven; Aggassiz, eight; Pickering insisted on 11; Bory St. Vincent, 15; Desmoulins, 16; Morton, 22; Crawford, 60; Burke, 63. . . .

The classification sanctioned today by a great many anthropologists, i.e., three main races: the Negroid or "black"; the Mongoloid or "Yellow-brown"; and the Caucasian or "white," can be used for practical purposes, but it must be understood that there is a tremendous overlapping between the races on physical characteristics, even on skin color. Just to give one example, the African Bushman or Hottentot member of the "black" race is far lighter than many swarthy Spanish or Italian "whites." Long-headed (dolichocephalic) and round-headed (brachycephalic) types are found in all three races.

So, likewise, will one find straight-haired, woolly-haired and wavy-haired members of each of these three main "races."

Race politicians who like to give a scientific coloration to their propaganda attempt to show that the Negro is lowest on the scale of evolutionary development, the Mongolian, slightly higher, with the Caucasian at the peak. Considerable "evidence" is brought forth to prove that the Negro has more primitive physical characteristics, i.e., that he is not so far removed from the anthropoid apes.

Dr. Otto Klineberg, Columbia University's expert on race psychology, has marshalled an impressive array of facts to contradict this pseudo-scientific claim.

"The Negro is by no means the most ape-like of the three races," he writes in his book, *Race Differences*. "The ape, for example, has practically no lips and the thick everted lips of the Negro may therefore be regarded as the most human and most advanced; in this respect, the Mongolian is closest to the Anthropoid, and the Caucasian intermediate. In the hairiness of the face and body, the Caucasian, and particularly the North European [Nordic] resembles the ape most closely. . . . the Negro is next and the Mongolian farthest removed. In hair texture, the Caucasian is again closest; the Mongolian is intermediate, while the frizzly hair of the Negro is the least ape-like of the three. In the length of his arms, the Negro may seem to be the most closely related to the gorilla and the other great apes, but it is only fair to note also that in the length of his legs, he is the farthest removed. The hierarchy will entirely depend on the features which are singled out for observation." (*Op. cit.*, p. 34.)

Attempts to create distinct subdivisions of the white race on the basis of physical characteristics result in still more confusion. The most fashionable division is into the Nordics—tall, long-headed, blue-eyed blonds; Alpines—medium height, round-headed, blue or brown-eyed brunettes; Mediterraneans—short, long-headed, dark-eyed brunettes. ("Latin," "Aryan," "Semitic" are terms descriptive of basic languages not of physical types. To speak of "Latin," "Aryan" and "Semitic" races is therefore completely misleading.) Klineberg says very correctly, "'Unclassifiable' or 'mixed' types are very definitely in the majority and there are large regions in which 'pure' racial types are very rare exceptions."

The "Intelligence Test"

His conclusion on the subject of racial classification is a devastating answer to fascist theorists:

"To preach in favor of race purity, as has been done so often in recent times, is, therefore, just anthropological nonsense. It is many thousands of years too late, not only for Europe and Europeans, but for other parts of the world as well; there are no longer any pure races to be kept pure." (Otto Klineberg, *Race Differences*, pp. 25-26.)

"Race" is, in fact, a political concept which has no precise anthropological definition. Because the concept of "superior" and "inferior" races has been an extremely useful weapon in the hands of the ruling classes, it has persisted despite numerous scientific demonstrations of its falsity. When all other proof has failed, the die-hard Nordic theorists and the devout believers in white supremacy cover up their own unscientific positions by referring to the results of intelligence testing among the various "races." They point to the undeniable fact that, on the average, Negroes rate lower than whites on intelligence tests; Mexicans and Indians also score lower than whites while "Nordics" have higher scores than South Europeans. These facts are pointed to triumphantly as irrefutable scientific proof of the superiority of the "white" race over the colored races, and of the "Nordics" over all other sections of the white race.

When the French psychologist, Alfred Binet, the "father of intelligence tests," issued the first set of mental tests in 1905, he, like all other psychologists, believed that these tests measured sheer native intelligence and were completely uninfluenced by environmental factors. If this were true, the problem of determining the relative abilities of the various races would indeed be comparatively simple. But as data from intelligence test studies accumulated during the past four decades, psychologists have been forced to conclude that the presence or absence of educational and cultural opportunities in the given environment exerts a tremendous influence on the individual's test performance. Since the environments of the vast majority of the members of the oppressed colored races are particularly meager in educational and cultural opportunities, all evidence as to the inferiority of colored peoples which is based on intelligence test results must be heavily discounted.

In order to evaluate these test results properly, it is necessary to examine the basic assumptions of intelligence testing. Psychologists do not measure intelligence *directly* in their mental tests, but *indirectly*, for they measure only what the individual has learned. The score earned by a given individual is fixed on the basis of the scores of another group of individuals who had previously taken the test, the so-called standardization group. Thus, a particular individual is considered to be above or below average in intelligence by the comparison of his score with the scores of the group on which the test has been standardized. Test results are usually presented in terms of "Mental Age," i.e., a child of ten who gives an average performance on the intelligence test is said to have a Mental Age of 10. Then, the formula

$$\frac{\text{Mental Age}}{\text{Chronological Age}} \times 100$$

is used to derive the Intelligence Quotient (I.Q.) which in the case cited above is 100. I.Q.'s below 100 are below average; above 100—superior.

Dr. Martin Jenkins of Howard University wrote in a recent article on the intelligence of Negro children,

"It is obvious that such comparisons are valid *only* if the individual being rated and the standardization group have had an equal opportunity to obtain the experiences presupposed common by the test." (*Educational Method*, November 1939, p. 108.)

Effects of Poverty on I.Q.

He then goes on to show that the school facilities for Negro children are decidedly inferior to those provided for white children and that the Negro people as a whole come from poverty-stricken homes where they have few opportunities to obtain the type of cultural information which is utilized in intelligence testing.

Klineberg presents considerable evidence to show that Negro groups, that have had the benefit of a fairly adequate environment, score higher than "whites" who have lived in a poverty-stricken environment. Most significant is the report that in the First World War test scores of Negro soldiers from the northern states (Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois) exceeded the Army Alpha intelligence test scores of "whites" from such southern states as Mississippi, Kentucky, Arkansas, and Georgia.

The homes and general environmental conditions of the Mexican and Indian people and of immigrant workers, especially the Italian and South European workers, are almost as poverty-stricken as those of the Negroes. That members of these most bestially exploited groups receive lower scores on

intelligence tests than those who come from environments which provide richer cultural opportunities proves only that intelligence tests are not valid tests of *native* ability.

Dr. Paul Witty found the average I.Q. of children from the homes of professional people to be 116; from semi-skilled laborers, 105; and from day laborers, 92. (*Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 1928, p. 141.) The well-known positive relationship between socio-economic status and intelligence formerly led psychologists to conclude that poor people were poor because they were unintelligent! Statements such as the following, made by Stanford University's Professor L. M. Terman, the author of the "Terman Revision of the Binet-Simon Intelligence Test" were accepted uncritically only fifteen years ago:

"Our data," said the Professor, "show that individuals of the various social classes present differences in early childhood—a fact which strongly suggests that the causal factor lies in original endowment rather than in environmental influences." (*The Twenty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I. Nature and Nurture: Their Influence upon Intelligence; Part II. Their Influence upon Achievement.* 1928, p. 272.)

An even more graphic expression of the same cynical "upper-class" point of view was given by Dr. Leta Stetter Hollingsworth:

"Individuals of surpassing intelligence, as measured by intelligence tests, create national wealth, determine the state of industry, advance science and make general culture possible." (L. S. Hollingsworth, *Heredity and Environment*, 1926, p. 297.)

Other Factors in I.Q. Testing

But even these dyed-in-the-wool hereditarians have had to modify their opinions as evidence accumulated of the improvement in I.Q. of children of feeble-minded parents who have been placed in average or superior foster homes; of great increases in the I.Q.'s of children who attended a superior type of school; of marked changes in the I.Q.'s of Negro children brought to New York City from southern communities, etc. The conclusions reached by Dr. Walter Neff in a critical survey of the studies dealing with the relationship between socio-economic status and intelligence are accepted by most psychologists today (very reluctantly by some, to be sure):

"All of these facts taken together lead to a conclusion which we feel is forced and inescapable. Just as Klineberg has shown that the standard intelligence tests are inadequate instruments for measuring the native ability of different races, so do we find that these tests cannot be used for measuring the capacity of different social levels within our society. . . . All the summarized studies tend to show that low cultural environment tends to depress I.Q. approximately to the degree agreed to as characteristic of laborers' children and that a high environment raises I.Q. correspondingly. All, then, of the twenty point average difference found to exist between children of the lowest and highest status may be accounted for entirely in environmental terms." (Walter Neff, *Psychological Bulletin*, 1938, pp. 754-55.)

Not only does the lack of homogeneity in social, economic and educational status make comparisons of intelligence test performances of the white and colored races very difficult, but differences in motivation also complicate an interpretation of the test results. For a full exposition of this aspect of the problem as well as of the whole question of race differences, Klineberg's book on the subject should be studied. It is possible here to cite only a few of the examples which Klineberg gives to prove that members of different racial groups are not equally interested in intelligence tests, and therefore do not compete with equal energy.

1.—Testers working among the Dakota Indians found

great difficulty in securing answers to their questions because "it is considered bad form to answer a question in the presence of someone else who does not know the answers."

2.—Australian aborigines, accustomed to group thinking and to a group solution of problems could not comprehend why they should work on a test problem alone. The experimenter, Porteus, relates the great bewilderment manifested by members of a tribe, of which he had just been made a member, at the fact that he would not help them solve the problems of the performance test.

3.—A study of Negro and white girls in a Pennsylvania reformatory showed that Negro girls quickly lost interest in the test procedure. "They are suspicious as to the value of the task," writes the experimenter, Baldwin. Anyone familiar with the pattern of segregation and discrimination against the Negro people could add that the Negro girls were also very probably *suspicious* of the psychologist who was asking them so many questions.

Similarly, differences in culture, or, as Klineberg defines it, "those attitudes and experiences which an individual receives from the society of which he is a member" have a determining effect on test performance. Here again, it is possible to give only a few of the illustrations which Klineberg has brought together to show that because of differing cultural backgrounds, two equally intelligent individuals from different racial groups would give very different answers to intelligence test questions.

I.—On the Army Alpha test (given to the soldiers in the First World War) one question reads, "Why should all parents be made to send their children to school?" The "correct" answer is that "school prepares the child for later life." The experience of many American Indians, however, has been that schooling completely unfitted their children for life on the reservation. So they gave the "wrong" answer.

II.—A picture completion test, part of the Army Beta (a performance test) requires that the subject draw in the missing chimney of a house. One Sicilian child drew in a crucifix, because "his particular experience had taught him that no house was complete without one." Similar facts may be adduced to any number.

Although it is an undeniable fact that heredity sets certain limits for mental development, thoughtful scholars after weighing all the evidence have concluded that these limits are very broad and that individuals of every race have tremendous possibilities for mental development if given richer environmental opportunities.

Food and Intelligence

So simple a thing as an adequate diet can constitute a richer environmental opportunity for the ill-fed children of the poor. A New York physician, Dr. A. Newton Kugelmass, reported at a meeting of the American Association on Mental Deficiency in the spring of 1943, that the intelligence of small children can be increased as much as 18 points in I.Q. by proper diet. His conclusion was based on a study of the intelligence test results of 182 children, who were malnourished at the time of their first test, but better nourished when the second test was given. Children who were well nourished when both tests were given showed no such mental improvement. (*Science News Letter*, May 22, 1943, p. 331.)

From all this we Trotskyists draw the following conclusion: In order that an equal opportunity may be had by all peoples for adequate food, decent clothing, proper shelter, full and rich educational and cultural stimulation, the capitalist system which breeds poverty, misery, race discrimination, war, fascism, and a host of other attendant evils must be abolished. The white and colored workers of the "democracies" must break down the barriers of racial segregation which the capitalist rulers have erected between them. Together with the millions of colonial peoples, they can destroy this decadent social system and with it the capitalist-inspired myth of racial and national superiority.

In the new international socialist world which must and will be built, not racial segregation and discrimination, but widespread interracial mixing and collaboration will be the rule. A new stage of evolutionary development will have been reached; a new unified world race, created. Man, the highest product of the century-long evolutionary process, will have then succeeded, in the words of the great social scientist-revolutionist Leon Trotsky, in ending "the tyranny of man over man." *December 15, 1943.*

The Far East: Facts and Falsehoods

By LI FU-JEN

AMERICA'S ROLE IN ASIA—By Harry Paxton Howard. New York, 1943. Published by Howell Soskin. Price \$3.00.

* * *

It was once said of a well known British journalist in Shanghai, a gentleman of the Tory "die-hard" school, that he knew everything about China but understood nothing. The author of this book, having lived in China and Japan for more than twenty years, gathered considerable information about the Far East and its peoples. Some of the more important events in modern Chinese history he was able to observe at fairly close range. Yet his experiences and observations apparently brought him no closer to an understanding of the essential problems of the Far East than is indicated in this book.

The work is the product of a muddleheaded mind which fails utterly to grasp the significance of what it apprehends. Some of the observations recorded by the author are quite

childish. No thought or idea is made concrete and carried to its logical conclusion. The author traffics in abstractions and vague generalities and tries to pass these off as solutions to problems. His characterizations of men and events are superficial in the extreme. The reader who wades through the book will gather considerable information (which is also available elsewhere, however), but will have acquired no more understanding at the end of it than he had when he commenced Chapter I.

In the two opening chapters, Howard gives a rude sketch of the early history of eastern Asia. Then follow chapters on Japan, Korea, Manchuria, China and India, with the last reserved to "America's Role in Asia."

America's role in Asia, as every enlightened person knows, has been the role of an imperialist power in search of markets, fields for investment, profits. This fact emerges clearly enough

from the book, though Howard, refusing to call things by their true names, seeks to invest the manifestations of America's imperialist role in Asia with an accidental rather than systematic significance. This results, not in a program for ending imperialism, but in homilies to the imperialists to mend their wicked ways. Thus the record of American imperialism in the China opium trade is one "in which it is difficult to take pride" in the official role of the American government as regards Korea, which was "betrayed." The traffic in opium and Chinese slaves by "American adventurers" (read imperialists) was also "dishonorable." Japan's war against the Czarist empire in Manchuria in 1904 opened with what the author calls an "unprovoked" and "treacherous" attack by the Japanese. The Japanese attack on Korea in 1894 was "treacherous." And the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931 was "undeclared war of the most vicious and unprovoked type." Howard does not say what it is that makes declared war more moral than undeclared war. But he does talk of "international law and decency" and he wants "us" (the American imperialists) to "cleanse our record . . . of the long-standing shame of our betrayal of Korea."

Moral indictments of imperialism have been made ever since there was an organized socialist movement and the colonial peoples embarked on struggles for their liberation. Howard has added nothing new to the record. What is needed is not a reiteration of these indictments of imperialist iniquities, but a program for ending them. There is such a program—that of the Fourth International. It calls for the smashing of imperialism by revolutionary struggle both in the colonies and the imperialist metropoli, and the institution of socialist republics which will work together cooperatively in the interests of all. There can be no end to national oppression with all its horrors and barbarities, no end to war, no end to the unspeakable privations of the common people everywhere as long as imperialism, with its perpetual mad scramble for profits, continues to live. Howard would call this "Marxist jargon," a phrase he uses in his book. But what is *his* program? Insofar as he has one at all, it is simply to set out in the crusading spirit of Christianity and show the imperialists the error of their ways. More precisely, he would confine his missionary work to the *American* imperialists. For Howard supports the imperialist war and wants the rest of the imperialists crushed by their American rivals.

The key to the character of the book as a whole is furnished in the author's introduction, in which we find praise for the pre-Pearl Harbor administration of the Philippines, "where the democratic but not yet independent Philippine Commonwealth was truly a beacon of light in the despotic darkness of Asia." Howard does not attempt to explain how "democracy" could prevail under a native puppet regime of American imperialism when every act of the Legislature was subject to veto by the American High Commissioner. Nor does he define what he means by "democracy." For him, presumably, a Congress or Parliament with periodic elections is sufficient proof of the reign of "democracy," even if the acts of the Legislature can be overridden and nullified by a "dictator" (the High Commissioner) who is responsible only to an alien government. And when he casts his learned gaze toward India (in which country he has never set foot, incidentally) we are not surprised to find him discovering democracy there—in the Mohamadan provinces. The Viceroy can veto every act of the provincial assemblies. He can even dissolve them and send the members home. But no matter.

Howard perhaps reaches his muddled and childish best in

his chapters on Japan. Very correctly, he differentiates between the common people of that country and the militarists, and decries "propaganda of hatred" against the former, who are victims of the imperialistic militarists. But then his thought dissolves into the nothingness of abstraction and confusion. "We," he says, must "encourage" the "democratic opposition" in Japan "by making it clear and specific that we are determined to end Japanese militarism, and that we appreciate and will cooperate with the common people of Japan in their desire to earn a decent living by legitimate labor and trade and legitimate investment at home and abroad."

A "Program" for Japan

Who are the "we" whom Mr. Howard wants to "encourage" the "democratic opposition" in Japan? Presumably the hard-boiled imperialist administration in Washington which has already so tellingly illustrated its love of democratic oppositions by placing the fascists Darlan and Giraud in power over the natives of "liberated" North Africa and the "democrats" Badoglio and King Victor Emmanuel in the "liberated" part of Italy. It cannot be doubted that when the time comes the same gentlemen in Washington will have no difficulty in finding a "democratic" militarist in Tokyo to rule over the "liberated" Japanese people—unless the Japanese people forestall them by carrying through their own revolution. And since when have the common people of Japan, the poverty-stricken workers and peasants, ever had a desire for "legitimate investment at home and abroad"? Here the author descends to the most arrant nonsense, for it is only the imperialists of Japan, whose interests the militarists serve, who have any such desire or the means to implement it.

The common people can scarcely manage to exist, let alone invest. It is precisely the imperialists' desire for "legitimate trade and investment" that led them to plunge the common people into a terrible war which has brought and can bring them nothing but suffering. And it is precisely to nullify and stifle Japanese "legitimate investment," and to make East Asia safe for American imperialism and its "legitimate investments," that Roosevelt and his class backers are making war on Japan. Yet Howard assigns the American imperialists the impossible task—impossible because it would be contrary to their deepest interests—of encouraging the *Japanese imperialists* (that's whom it comes down to in reality) to make "legitimate investments." This is his alternative to Japanese militarism. This is his program for peace in the Far East. It would be hard to imagine anything more stupidly fantastic.

Perhaps it is unprofitable to attempt the untangling of such nonsense. But Mr. Howard has set himself up as an instructor on Far Eastern affairs and appears on lecture platforms as an "authority." Adequate warning against this charlatan is therefore in order. Having no program to oppose to the program of imperialism, Howard takes refuge in vague generalities. Thus he wants "us" (who—the American imperialists, the workers, the farmers?) to tell and convince the Japanese people that "we are determined to destroy this evil power (Japanese militarism) and all that it means, and to establish an order of things which will permit the Japanese like every other Asiatic people to live and work in freedom and security." What *kind* of an "order of things"—capitalism or socialism, the rule of the imperialist bourgeoisie or the rule of the common people? These are the real alternatives. The imperialist leaders know that the only alternative to imperialism is the socialist revolution and they firmly choose to maintain imperialism even if that requires the decimation of half the human race.

Howard keeps mum on this point and takes refuge in meaningless phrases. Thereby he stamps himself as a supporter of imperialism.

Addressing a plaintive query in the direction of Washington, Howard asks: "How far has our Government come to the realization that not merely Japanese Empire, but all domination of one people by another people means inevitable and unending conflict over the spoils of such Empire?" In other words, he wants "our" government to cease being imperialist. The imperialists, you see, are simply shortsighted people who only need the light of Howard's wisdom to turn them from their evil ways. Says he: "The darkest of perspectives opens before us, if peace is made by men as shortsighted as those who directed the war and the 'peace' a quarter of a century ago." Being myopic himself, Howard attributes the same defect of vision to the imperialists. Alas, it is not the imperialists who are shortsighted. They look after their interests well, in war and in peace, without benefit of Mr. Howard's advice.

Moralistic Homilies

Howard's book is extremely childish in parts, as, for example, when he discovers as "one of the most fundamental characteristics" of the Japanese their "dislike of superiors, especially when the latter are arrogant and overbearing." Or, again, his statement that "the most distinctive characteristic of the Japanese soldier is his deep desire to avoid death and return home alive." There is nothing Japanese about either of these attitudes. They are universal traits.

The author builds up an imaginary opposition between Japanese big business and the Japanese militarists, depicting the former as being opposed to wars for imperialist expansion. He admits that Japanese companies profited from the exploitation of Korea, but it is the Japanese army which exploits "both Manchuria and Japan." It is, of course, true that the army consumes a great part of the profits of empire and this does lead to some conflicts between big business and the army. But this is not the same thing as a principled opposition. In this country, too, big business opposes army "waste," because its only concern is profits and it wants the cost of empire kept as low as possible.

To deny the interest of the big corporations in Japanese military enterprises, however, is to deny that the Japanese ruling class has any effectual say in the nation's affairs. Up until Pearl Harbor, after Japan had been engaged in almost continual warfare on the Asiatic continent for ten years, and despite the heaviest taxation, the Japanese corporations continued to reap vast profits, as their published balance sheets showed. In the occupied areas of China, the houses of Mitsui and Mitsubishi were presented, intact, industrial enterprises taken from Chinese by the Japanese army. Japan's wars have been quite profitable for the bourgeoisie and they support these wars in the expectation of greater profits in the future, when, as they hope, the territorial conquests of the army can be exploited in peace. But Howard says, in effect, that Japanese big business has lost control, that it has been virtually expropriated, that the militarists are getting everything—as if they were a new ruling class! This view has been advanced before with regard to Italy and Germany, where the Fascists and Nazis, with no more justification, were depicted as having expropriated the big capitalists. It is strange that these same "expropriated" and powerless capitalists, in the case of Italy, were able, when forced by pressure from the masses, to get rid of Mussolini and his all-powerful Fascists when they no longer

could serve their interests. We may see a similar development in Japan when the war-weary people refuse to fight any longer for imperialist aims. Mr. Howard will then discover that the Japanese militarists, now riding so high, are not so independent and all-powerful as he imagines.

Political Charlatanism

The author perpetrates numerous outright asinities which can be summarized briefly. The Monroe Doctrine, he blandly asserts, was intended to "preserve developing democracy in Latin America" and was "an emphatic veto upon the aims of European absolutism to re-establish its political system in South and Central America." But, as every political literate knows, this is merely the official idealization of the Monroe Doctrine. By it, the Yankee imperialists in reality served warning on their foreign competitors that Latin America was *their* preserve for trade and investment. Democracy had nothing to do with it. Where in Latin America (with the single possible exception of Mexico) has there ever been any "democracy" to preserve from "European absolutism"?

He also tells us that "the financial mainstay of the Soong Dynasty at Chungking" (meaning the Chiang Kai-shek government) "is the United States Treasury." This is a patent misstatement. The fearfully oppressed masses of China are Chiang's financial mainstay. The amounts wrung from them in taxation, both direct and indirect, exceed by many times the total of China's American loans, including the \$500,000,000 made available by Washington last year and the rather paltry lend-lease advances—all of which, in any case, is intended ultimately to be repaid by China's sweating, starving millions.

The Only Alternatives

Howard wants "democracy" in China—naturally. How is it to be obtained? Simple! "The People's Political Council which now exists under the Chiang Kai-shek rule *must be made a body elected by the Chinese people themselves, and not appointed by the Kuomintang.* The Kuomintang itself must cease to be a dictatorial party." The italics are Howard's own, so he evidently attaches great importance to the words they emphasize. But who is going to make over the People's Political Council, give it a democratic face-lifting? And by what magic process is the Kuomintang going to cease being a dictatorial party? Howard does not even pose these questions. Which alone justifies us in our previous description of the man as a charlatan.

Chiang's regime, according to Howard, is simply "dictatorial." But the Japanese puppet government at Nanking, headed by Wang Ching-wei, is (believe it or not!) "fascist." This bald and unsupported political definition is of a piece with the rest of Howard's obtuseness hiding in the garb of erudition. One suspects, however, that he uses the word "fascist" as a term of abuse rather than as a scientific political definition. And in this, perhaps, he is merely atoning for past friendly association with Wang Ching-wei's regime. He was a contributor to Wang's English-language organ, the *People's Tribune*, for many years and the association continued until he left Shanghai in 1941. Significantly, he omits mention of this phase of his activities from the otherwise not entirely truthful outline of his Far Eastern career which appears on the dust jacket of his book. It would seem that he discovered the "fascist" character of Wang's regime only after he had set himself up in business in New York as a "democratic" authority on the Orient.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

“Unified Military Doctrine”

By LEON TROTSKY

Last month we began the publication of Leon Trotsky's theoretical military work in connection with the building of the Red Army. Published in this issue are two speeches delivered on November 1, 1921 before the Scientific Military Society attached to the Military Academy of the Red Army. The discussion on “unified military doctrine” took place on the first anniversary of the founding of the Scientific Military Society.

These 1921 speeches were first published in Russian by the Supreme Military Council of the USSR in its three volume edition of Leon Trotsky's “How the Revolution Armed Itself” (Moscow, 1925 Vol. III, Book 2, pp. 201-209). This is the first time they appear in English. The translation from the Russian original is by John G. Wright.—*Ed.*

* * *

PREFATORY REMARKS

Comrades, we are now engaged in taking a balance sheet, sifting our ranks and making necessary preparations. Our work in the army has now become minute, detailed, mosaic in character. But it would be unworthy of a revolutionary army to fail to see the forest for the trees. Just because all our efforts in the field of military work are now being directed toward concretizing it, and rendering it more detailed; and because we are turning our attention to partial questions, which make up the whole, we must precisely for this reason tear ourselves away time and again from this detailed work in order to take a survey of the structure of the Red Army as a unity. Here we confront the question of military doctrine and the question of unified military doctrine which are sometimes identified. The conception of military doctrine does not at present appear in a clearly delineated form, nor is it filled with any exact and specific scientific content. The conception of unified military doctrine has been given in part and on the whole a mystical and metaphysical content by those who view it as something akin to an emanation of the national spirit.

Owing to a sharp turn of history a rather natural attempt is being made at present on the plane of the revolutionary class struggle to fill the conception of military doctrine with class content. The realization of this attempt still lies ahead. The greatest vigilance must be exercised here lest one permit himself to be lured into a mystical or metaphysical trap, however it may be disguised with revolutionary terminology; for from a class military doctrine one can only get mysticism and metaphysics, whereas what we want is: A concrete, rich, exact historical conception. For this reason we ask ourselves first of all: Is military doctrine an aggregate of military methods or a theory? Or is it an art, an aggregate of certain applied methods that teach one how to fight?

It is imperative to distinguish between science as the objective knowledge of that which is, and art which teaches how to act.

* * *

(Following these prefatory remarks by Leon Trotsky, the

first report was delivered by Professor Neznamov. After him the floor was taken by Petrovsky, Verkhovsky, Vatsetis, Tukhachevsky, Svechin and several other active and prominent workers of the Scientific Military Society. Trotsky then summarized.—*Ed.*)

* * *

TROTSKY'S SUMMARY SPEECH

Before discussing the gist of the question let me remark that Comrades Verkhovsky and Svechin, while seemingly at opposite poles, stand closest to each other. Comrade Verkhovsky is seized by something akin to terror because, as he says, there is so much discord among us, and we are not agreed on anything and in such a situation it is hardly possible to build anything, let alone gain victory. But, after all, we have built something, and we have not waged war so poorly. I am among those least inclined to idealize the Red Army, but when we had to defend ourselves, we were able to deal blows to our enemies, notwithstanding the discord among us. Comrade Verkhovsky, in my opinion, takes a subjective approach: he overlooks the incontestable—the Red Army's foundation, which no one has questioned and which has actually been erected by the working class. The army once possessed its old summits; there were conscientious and honest elements among the old officerdom, but they have been and are being dissolved. Our army has promulgated a new principle and is creating a commanding staff of a new social origin—a commanding staff, which is perhaps a little bandy-legged, insufficiently literate, but nevertheless endowed with a great historical will. All of us are guilty of mistakes in theory, but how is it possible not to see the essence of the matter, the *foundation* which is unconquerable, but to which no one has pointed? What is there for Comrade Verkhovsky to be afraid of? With his excellent military virtues, he has nothing to fear.

Groundless Fears

Comrade Svechin says that should some doctrine be invented, he, Svechin, will be made to suffer thereby, because a censorship will be clamped down. Comrade Svechin, an old military man who very much reveres Suvorov and Suvorovist traditions, shies away in fear of censorship. He fears lest military doctrine prevent the free development of ideas—which is in part the same thought as Comrade Verkhovsky expressed. If unified doctrine is understood to mean that there is a ruling class which has gathered the reins of the army into its own hands, then none has raised his voice in protest against this. Let us recall what was written in 1917 and 1918, in our theses, in our reports to the Soviet Congresses: Their basic idea was to apply to the country's armed forces the consciousness and the will of the working class which had founded a new power and a new state. This is a firmly established fact no longer challenged even by those who used to dispute it; while those who

tried to fight against it with arms in hand have suffered reverses and have stopped trying.

For example, there is the volume *Smena Vekh**. These people who once supplied Kolchak with his Ministers have understood that the Red Army is not an invention of a handful of emigres; not a robber's band but the national expression of the Russian people in their present phase of development. And they are absolutely right. None will try deny that a new commanding staff has appeared which is realizing in life the strivings of the toilers, even though in building the army it commits sins against Russian and military literacy. Our misfortune is that the country is illiterate and it will of course require years and years before illiteracy disappears and the Russian toiler begins to commune with culture.

An attempt was made here particularly in Comrade Vatsis' very rich and valuable speech to give the broadest possible conception of doctrine. Military doctrine embraces everything indispensable for war. War demands that a soldier be healthy; to keep the soldier healthy, in addition to his rations and equipment, a certain hygiene is needed, medicine is required. Herein lies the gist of the thought's aberration. If Clausewitz** said that war is a continuation of politics by other means, then some military men turn this idea around and say that politics is an auxiliary means of war; that all branches of human knowledge are auxiliary sources of military knowledge; and they equate military doctrine with all human knowledge in general. This is absolutely wrong.

The Will To Victory

We are next told that it is necessary to have the desire to fight; it is necessary to have the will to victory. But haven't we all seen the Russian people show this will to victory; haven't we seen it spring to life among the peasants of the Don and the Kuban who have produced their own Budenny, their own cavalry, something quite different from the past when the old Russian nobility used to impose their will on the people. This will to victory has been born even in Russian moujiks, oppressed for ages, let alone the workers. But one must have the will to victory, one must have the desire to fight

**Smena Vekh*—the name of a publication of a tendency among Russian White Guard emigres, primarily, among their intellectual circles. An anthology, *Smena Vekh*, was published in Prague in 1941; and presently a periodical of this same name began to appear there. Both these publications were devoted to an explanation of the motives which had caused the *Smenovekhovtsy* (literally, "changers of signposts") to pass from a position of irreconcilable hostility toward the Bolshevik power to one calling for joint collaboration. These White Guard intellectuals viewed the New Economic Policy of 1921 (the NEP) as a retreat from "communism to capitalism"; and argued that this "evolution of the Bolsheviks" must logically lead to the "reestablishment of bourgeois relations", and to the strengthening of Russia as a state capable of defending her independence and interests. They later issued a daily paper *Nakanune (On the Eve)* in Berlin. This tendency headed by Ustryalov, Kluchnikov, Potekhin and others is the true historical originator and precursor of similar theoretical positions since propounded as "original discoveries" by contemporary renegades from Marxism.—*Ed.*

**Karl von Clausewitz (1780-1831). Prussian general and military theoretician. His best known work "Ueber Krieg und Kriegfuehrung," three volumes Berlin 1832-34, bears unmistakable signs of the influence of the Hegelian dialectic. Clausewitz participated in the campaigns against Napoleon and later served as head of the Prussian General Staff (1831). From 1812-13 he was in the service of the Russian army.—*Ed.*

not for the mere sake of fighting. A great historic goal is indispensable. Czarism had its own goal, and under the previously existing conditions a section of the people espoused it and to some extent developed a will to victory. Well, is there a historic goal in the war at present? Is there such a goal or not? How can any one doubt that there is such a goal, that the present government disposes of detachments of advanced workers who draw the peasantry behind them. It is no accident that we are scoring victories. Therefore there must have been the will to victory. It springs not from military doctrine but from a specific historical task which constitutes the meaning of our entire epoch.

We are also told that it is necessary to know when and why to fight. It is necessary to find one's orientation in the international situation. Well, didn't we find it? Comrade Svechin has said here that the revolutionary epoch is an epoch of empiricism. What shall I say? Never before, in no other country has there been a power so highly theoretical as ours. When still a group of underground emigres we said that the capitalist war would inevitably culminate in revolution. Prior to the revolution we predicted it in theory. What is this if not a theoretical prognosis? The application of science in this field cannot of course be so exact as in astronomy; our calculations are off by perhaps 5 to 10 years. We had hoped for a continuation of the revolution in the West. This did not happen, but nevertheless we did forecast the character of the development.

What does the ill-starred Brest-Litovsk Peace represent? It, too, was an orientation and a theoretical calculation. Our foes had calculated that their own existence was an immutable fact, whereas our existence represented a piece of irrationality; but we held the standpoint of theoretical prognosis and calculated that their days were numbered, whereas our existence remains an immutable fact. I cannot be a military doctrinaire if only for the lack of the necessary military rating, but I did participate together with other comrades in elaborating the following prognosis: It is impossible to fight the Germans and therefore we must make concessions in order to smash them later on. What is this if not an orientation? The knowledge when to fight was supplied us by the basic tenets of Marxism in their application to a given situation. But the desire to fight and the knowledge when to fight still does not provide everything needed for the *ability* to fight. And here military art or knowledge enters into all its rights.

But why is it necessary to drag in absolutely everything under the sun into military knowledge? There are a few things in this world besides military knowledge; there is communism and the world tasks that the working class sets itself; and there is war as one of the methods employed by the working class.

A Few "Innovations"

At this point I must say that those comrades who spoke here in the name of a new military doctrine have completely failed to convince me. I see in it a most dangerous thing: "We'll crush our enemies beneath a barrage of red caps." This happens to be ancient Russian doctrine.

As a matter of fact, what did some comrades say? They said that our doctrine consists not in commanding but in persuading, convincing and impressing through authoritativeness. A wonderful idea! The best thing would be to give Comrade Lyamin 3,000 Tambov deserters and let him organize a regiment with his method. I would very much like to see

it done. But how is it possible to do anything at all by a mere stroke of the pen in the face of differences in cultural levels and in the face of ignorance? Our regime is called a regime of dictatorship; we do not conceal this. But some people say that what we need are not commanders-in-chief but commanders-in-persuasion. That's what Kerensky had.

Authoritativeness is an excellent thing, but not very tangible. If one were to impress solely through authoritativeness then what need have we for the *Cheka* and the Special Department? Finally, if we can impress a Tambov moujik solely through our authoritativeness, then why shouldn't we do the same with regard to the German and French peasants?

Comrade Vatsetis reminded us that truth is mightier than force. That is not so. What is correct is only this, that those oppressors who were ashamed of the brute force they applied always covered it up with hypocrisy. Truth is not superior to force; it cannot withstand the onset of artillery. Against artillery only artillery is effective. If you say that the cultural level of peasants and moujiks must be raised, then you are uttering what is an old truth to us. We are all for it and our state apparatus and, in particular, our military affairs must proceed along this line. But it is naive to think that such a task can be solved on the morrow.

We are told that the doctrine of the Red Army comprises of partisan actions in the enemy's rear and raids deep behind the front lines. But the first big raid was made by Mamontov*, while Petlura was the leader of partisan formations. What does this mean? Just how does the doctrine of the Red Army happen to coincide with the doctrines of a Mamontov and a Petlura?

Hasty Generalizations

Some comrades have tried to reduce the doctrine of the Red Army to the use of hand-carts for transport. Inasmuch as we lack macadam roads and armored trucks, we shall of course use hand-carts for transportation, that's better than lugging a machinegun on one's back. But what has military doctrine to do with it? This is an absolutely incredible manner of posing the question. Our backwardness and lack of technical preparation can nowise provide material for military doctrine.

As touches maneuvering, let me point out that we are not the inventors of the maneuverist principle. Our enemies also made extensive use of it, owing to the fact that relatively small numbers of troops were deployed over enormous distances and because of the wretched means of communication. Much has been said here about the seizure of cities, points, and so on. Mamontov captured them from us, and we from him. This is in the very nature of civil warfare. In one and the same theater of war, we had our allies behind Mamontov, while in our midst were Mamontov's allies. Mamontov executed our agency; we, his. An attempt is now made to build a doctrine on this. It is absurd.

Comrade Tukhachevsky sins in the sphere of overhasty generalizations. In his opinion positional warfare is defunct. This is absolutely wrong. Should we continue to live in peace conditions for 5 or 10 years—which is not at all excluded—a new generation will have grown up; the nerve-racking war

moods under which we labor will have disappeared. A retardation of the revolution in the West would mean a breathing spell for the bourgeoisie. Technology is being restored by them as well as by us. We shall be enabled to move up larger and better equipped masses of troops; and with an army of greater mass and better armament there is produced a denser and more stabilized front. An explanation for our excessive maneuvering—which resulted time and again in our advancing 100 versts only in order to retreat 150 versts—is to be found in the fact that the army was so very thin and weak in relation to the given spaces; the armament was so inadequate that the outcome of battles was decided by factors of secondary nature. Why should we seek to hold on to this? What we need is to go beyond this stage of maneuvering which is only the obverse side of guerrilla warfare. I have often recalled that in the first period of the building of our army some comrades said that large formations were no longer needed; that the best thing for us would be a regiment of two or three battalions with artillery and cavalry—and this would comprise an independent unit. Expressed herein was the idea of primitive maneuvering. We have gone beyond this and any idealization of maneuvering would be dangerous in the extreme.

Defense and Offense

It was pointed out here that we must solve problems involving the role of artillery in relation to infantry. In the Kiev area I happened to be present during a heated dispute over the reciprocal relations between artillery and infantry. Every army has hundreds of such questions. This means that on the basis of our civil war experience we must carefully study our statutes and adapt the most important regulations to comply with field conditions. Our statutes must be submitted to a review. We must work them over in our consciousness in terms of our practical experience.

We are proffered a solution to the problem of offense and defense. We are told that our army must take the offensive. There is a great deal of confusion here, and I am afraid that Comrade Tukhachevsky supports in this connection those who are muddling and who say that our army must be an offensive army. Why? Since war is the continuation of politics by other means, therefore our politics should be offensive. But are they? What about Brest Litvosk? And what about our yesterday's declaration of readiness to recognize pre-war debts? It is a maneuver.

Only a daredevil cavalry man is of the opinion that one must always attack. Only a simpleton is of the opinion that a retreat is tantamount to doom. Attack and retreat can be integral parts of a maneuver, and may equally lead to victory. At the Third World Congress of the Communist International there was a whole tendency which insisted that a revolutionary epoch permits only of attack. This is greatest heresy. It is the most criminal heresy which has cost the German proletariat needless blood and didn't bring victory. Were this tactic to be followed in the future it would lead to the destruction of the German revolutionary movement. In a civil war it is necessary to maneuver. And since war is the continuation of politics by other means, how can we possibly say that military doctrine always demands the attack? The Parisian newspaper *Journal des Debats* contains an article by a French general who writes the following:

"In Lorraine we French did the attacking. As a result of our offensive the Germans retreated. But they made a calculated retreat. They withdrew their front-line forces, moved up well camouflaged machinegun and artillery posts, and pro-

*Mamontov was a colonel in Czar's army who became a cavalry general in Denikin's White Guard Army. In 1919 Mamontov gained fleeting fame by the capture of Tambov and his raid into the Red Army's rear during which his cavalry did great damage, destroying supplies, supply trains, lines of communication, etc.
—Ed.

ceeded to annihilate an enormous number of our living forces. It was a catastrophe. How did our victory in June 1918 begin? The German offensive might have proved decisive. But we had learned from them in 1914 and employed an elastic defense, passing over to a counter-offensive after the Germans had exhausted their forces. And we smashed the German army."

You cite the Great French Revolution and its army. But don't forget that the French were at the time the most cultured people of Europe—not only the most revolutionary but the most cultured and, in point of technology, the most powerful, provided, of course, we discount England which was powerless to act on land. France could permit herself the luxury of offensive politics. But she crashed none the less. Although France did long march triumphantly across Europe, it all terminated in Waterloo and the restoration of the Bourbons. But we are among the most uncultured, the most backward peoples of Europe. Historical fate compelled us to accomplish the proletarian revolution in an encirclement of other peoples not yet seized by it. Wars lie ahead of us and we must teach our General Staff to appraise the situation correctly. Should we attack or retreat? Precisely here, knowledge of the most flexible and elastic kind is required; and it would be the most colossal blunder for us to impose upon the members of our General Staff the doctrine: Attack always! It is the strategy of adventurism and not revolutionary strategy.

I am likewise in disagreement with the second proposition advanced by Comrade Tukhachevsky. He considers that the transition to a militia army is incorrect. There are many difficulties in effecting the transition but we are nevertheless passing over to militia forms. In our country with a population of over 100,000,000 we are maintaining an army of one million. This is an approach to a militia. France has 700,000 soldiers, while we have about 1,000,000. Another step in this direction and we shall arrive at a pure militia. We will proceed cautiously because there are difficulties in the reciprocal relations between workers and peasants. But our new policy brings us closer to the peasant and not further away from him. Go to any village you choose, talk there with a moujik and he'll tell you that his attitude toward the Soviet power is friendlier today than it was yesterday. If we grow richer a year hence, and we shall of course grow a little richer, and in two years still richer, this spiral will begin to expand. But even then we shall not act upon the moujik by way of wholesale persuasion as certain young members of our General Staff presume.

In any case, not only persuasions and embraces will have to be employed but also compulsion, although to a lesser degree than hitherto. At the same time much more favorable conditions for organizing a militia will arise among the peasants and the working class. For this reason, doctrine calls only for a reduction of the element of compulsion to lesser proportions than those required in an army of a barracks type. But if we derive our doctrine from the principle that a militia is unnecessary and that what we need is a barracks army, then we shall arrive at all sorts of false metaphysical propositions.

And now, Comrades, I sum up briefly. He speaks the truth who says with regard to the will to victory that the ability is not always to be observed among our commanding staff to develop partial victories and partial successes to full victory. An explanation for this is to be found in the worker-peasant composition of our new commanding staff which inclines to be very easily satisfied with the very first successes attained. But our dispute is over the will to victory in general. I must cite the following example: As all communists know, Turkestan

was cut off from the rest of the world, surrounded by Dutovists and other White Guards, but was nevertheless able to hold out for one and a half years without any aid from the outside. What is this if not a manifestation of colossal will to victory? You cannot supply a better example as ground for doctrine. What doctrine other than Marxism can enable one to orient himself in a situation? You should get and read Chicherin's notes and the articles in *Pravda* and *Izvestia*. They point out a correct orientation in the international situation. Take the English *Times* or the French *Le Temps*: Their language is far more exquisite than ours but we orient ourselves in the international situation 100 times better. That's why we have been able to hold out for four years under conditions of blockade and shall continue to hold out.

The Need to Study

Our doctrine is called Marxism. Why invent it a second time? Besides, in order to be able to invent anything except a hand-cart, it is necessary to go to school to the bourgeoisie, once the ability to orient ourselves and the will to victory are given. It is necessary to instill in the minds of our platoon, battalion and division commanders that they must possess not only the will to victory but must also know how to make reports and understand the meaning of maintaining communications, setting up guards, gathering intelligence. And for this the experience of old practice must be utilized. We must study our ABC's. Of no earthly use to us is a military doctrine that declares: "We'll crush our enemies beneath a barrage of red caps." We must eradicate such bravado and revolutionary snobbery. Chaos results whenever strategy is developed from the standpoint of revolutionary youth. Why? Because they have not learned the statutes thoroughly. We looked upon the Czarist statutes with disdain, and thanks to this did not teach them. Yet the old statutes prepare the new.

Marxists have always assimilated the old knowledge; they studied Feuerbach, Engels, the French encyclopedists and materialists, and political economy. Marx devoted himself to the study of higher mathematics after his hair had grown gray. Engels studied military affairs and natural sciences. It will do incalculable harm if we were to inoculate the military youth with the idea that the old doctrine is utterly worthless and that we have entered a new epoch when everything can be viewed superciliously and with the equipment of an ignoramus.

Elementary Details

Among the younger generation there is of course a revulsion to routine. This is inevitable. But our Academy of the General Staff and the Revolutionary Military Council will do everything in their power to curb this; and they will be correct in so doing. I do not look upon this discussion as final. A few things have been taken down stenographically; we shall read it over and publish some of it; and perhaps we shall have other gatherings like this. Meanwhile, let us not tear ourselves away from elementary needs, rations and boots. I think that a good ration is superior to a poor doctrine; and as touches boots, I maintain that our military doctrine begins with this, that we must tell the Red Army soldier: Learn to grease your boots and oil your rifle. If in addition to our will to victory and our readiness to self-sacrifice we also learn to grease boots, then we shall have the best possible military doctrine. And for this reason our attention must be turned to these practical details.

Now a word concerning technique. Our technique is of course poor but Europe can't attack us today: Her working class will not permit it. Hence the conclusion: Europe tolerates us. She enters into economic relations with us. Concessions are coming along, although at a steep price. Through its concessions and trade relations European imperialism will be compelled to develop our industry and with its own hands arm us technically against itself. There is no escaping this. Imperialism is destined to do it, must do it. Were I to say this publicly before an audience of Lloyd George, Briand and Millerand, they would shy back in alarm but would nevertheless be constrained to do it, for they have no other way out. They are driven into relations with us by the European and world crisis and by the pressure of their working class.

Finally, it is done not by governments but by individual capitalists who think of their profits first and always. Hence flows the conclusion: Don't rush ahead: Comrade Svechin was correct in saying that time works in our favor. Time is a very important factor in history. Sometimes a word uttered five minutes too soon means the loss of a campaign; five minutes too late is likewise no good; the timing must be exact. We must now gain a little technical and economic fat. Our economy is in a state of disruption and recovering very slowly. We shall have further occasion to debate military doctrine, clarify our conceptions and render them more precise. The debate will serve only to advantage in the building of the Red Army. I propose that in honor of the Red Army we join in an army cheer!

The Voice of an Honest Liberal On Events in Italy

WHAT GAETANO SALVEMINI
WROTE IN *NEW REPUBLIC*

the war developments, particularly Italy, that whenever the truth does appear it is indeed a noteworthy event. Gaetano Salvemini, distinguished among the liberal crew for his integrity and courage, wrote an article on Italy, "From Moscow to Naples," which appeared in *The New Republic*, December 27, 1943; and which we unhesitatingly reprint below in full because it does tell the truth about vitally important issues and, therefore, should get the widest possible circulation.

We have only one comment to make: Gaetano Salvemini begins by making "public penance" for his previous false estimate of the Eden-Molotov-Hull conference. This shows the true stature of the man. But, in our opinion, Salvemini errs grievously in accounting for the source of his blunder which derives not, as he believes, from a lack of caution or wishful thinking on his part, but rather from continued adherence to bourgeois democracy. So long as this false, blind faith is retained "errors," "surprises," "shocks," etc., are unavoidable. The text of Salvemini's article follows:

* * *

"In the November 15 issue of *The New Republic* I wrote that Stalin's common sense had yielded a good crop in Italy, and that this crop was to be found in the Declaration issued by the Moscow Conference of November 1. Before expressing my satisfaction, I should have been a little more cautious. Thus I have to make public penance for the sin of overconfidence I committed in a fit of wishful thinking.

"On November 3, two days after the issuing of the 'historical' Moscow Declaration, the King of Italy went to Naples, and the American public was told that he had received an 'ovation,' and that 'through his trip to Naples he apparently had won the first round in his fight to retain his throne—at least temporarily.'

REACTION WINS
FIRST ROUND

"Then on November 9 we were regaled with the news that the units of anti-Fascist volunteers, which were organizing in the Naples area for the purpose of fighting against the Germans, had been disbanded, and that the men would be drafted into the regular Italian army under

Antonio Basso, 'one of the King's generals.' This man was director general of artillery when Mussolini declared war on France in June, 1940. Thus he was one of the men responsible for Italy's ludicrous armaments after years of boasting and after \$9,000,000,000 had been squeezed from the Italian people for war preparations. In an interview given to the correspondent of the *New York Times* (November 26), he stated that the only fault of the King was 'to be strictly constitutional.' Yes, precisely. The King by allowing Mussolini to destroy the Constitution to which the King had sworn loyalty, was 'strictly constitutional.' What did he do? He named Mussolini head of the government and kept him as head because the people wanted Mussolini.' He 'only followed the popular will. . . . One should not blame the King but all Italians.' Basso forgot to add that the Italian people never had a chance to say whether they really did like Mussolini or not, and that if they had given evidence of becoming restive, the King would have ordered General Basso to bring them back to their senses, and he, General Basso, would have received a promotion, a higher salary and some fresh decoration for carrying out the King's orders.

"In his interview Basso also revealed that in June, 1940, he had told Mussolini that the army had 'only enough shells for a few days.' Mussolini 'said there were enough, since the war would end in a few days. He would not listen to reason in the attack on Greece either, although everyone warned him. He would only listen to clownish collaborators.' Was Basso not one of those collaborators? Why did he keep his job and salary, together with those clowns? Had Mussolini won the day despite the lack of ammunition, Basso would not only still collaborate with him but praise him to the skies.

"The 'Committee of Liberation' in Naples designated Signor Rodino as the new Mayor. Signor Rodino once belonged to the People's (Christian Democratic) Party, and there was no danger that he might foster 'chaos and anarchy.' Badoglio appointed Mayor Signor Enrico Cavaliere, a man who had served under Mussolini: another 'King's man.' This was the second round won by the King.

"Then, on November 1, the Associated Press told us that 'in the town of Grumo, about twenty miles west of Bari, a professor was arrested by the carabinieri [royal police] for talking publicly against the King. Other incidents have been reported to Allied authorities from other towns.' This was the third round.

FOURTH ROUND FOR REACTION "Then on November 18 the same Associated Press brought us the tidings that in the town of Avellino a major of the Italian army, followed by soldiers, had entered the offices of a paper which had dared to demand immediate abdication 'to clear the foul air of Italy' and had 'smashed furniture, destroyed type-faces and then abused the editor. A number of anti-monarchists in Avellino were threatened by the same soldiers.' The details of the affair have no importance. What does matter is the fact that we have here a true and proper 'punitive expedition' according to the classic Fascist pattern. The town of Avellino, being near the fighting front, is under the strict supervision of the AMG. Nobody has yet told us that the leader and other heroes of that 'punitive expedition' were arrested. This also fits perfectly into the classic Fascist pattern. This was the fourth round.

"Then in Naples a commander of a submarine took offense at an article in the local paper. The commander and its crew visited the offices of the paper 'in a body.' 'He and three other officers berated the editor, who was lured outside, where the sailors spat on him and threatened him.' In this case again, according to the classic Fascist pattern, nobody has told us that the officers and their men were arrested. This was the fifth round.

SIXTH ROUND FOR REACTION "Then on November 21 we were told that 'all elements of Italian opinion will now have genuine freedom of the press in accordance with a new directive from Allied Headquarters.' As a consequence in Naples the author of an article attacking the King was 'asked to cut it down' for 'lack of space.' 'It was asserted that lack of newsprint was the only thing that prevented any number of papers being printed here, 'by any and every shade of opinion.' This was the sixth round.

"Freedom of public meeting has been restored 'in full measure' to the Italian people. But a meeting held at the University of Naples, at which the public called for the abdication of the King, 'resulted in a military ruling prohibiting public assemblies of five or more persons without a permit.' This was the seventh round.

"Under such conditions it is no wonder that those army chiefs who are responsible for Italy's misfortunes are raising their heads and becoming insolent. In an interview with the *New York Times* (November 26), General Basso not only made no secret of the fact that he was there to uphold the rights of the King, but attacked those who did not wish to go on swallowing the King, and went on to pass judgment on Croce, 'a philosopher who enjoyed [!] a certain [!] esteem in Naples!'; on the anti-Fascists, who are 'simply talking now with an eye to future posts' (as if Fascist generals had ever done anything else than keep their eyes

on their future posts); on Count Sforza, who wants to replace the King but cannot give the people grain and fats; on the president of the University of Naples, 'who is an employee of the state and should not mix in politics'—'he is an inciter of trouble and should be removed at least until Italy is freed; then all the citizens can say whether they want the King' (but not whether they do not want him).

"While no newsprint was available for an article which might displease Badoglio and Basso, newsprint was available for posters, leaflets and pamphlets espousing the cause of the King. On November 26 the Associated Press circulated the following:

"The monarchist 'Blue Party,' newest group to enter Italy's political arena, opened a high-pressure campaign today to rally support to the shaky cause of the royal House of Savoy. . . . Placards calling on the people to rally to the monarchy . . . were posted on buildings in the city. Pamphlets reminding the people of the services of the House of Savoy to Italy were disseminated throughout towns and villages in that part of the country liberated from the Germans. . . . The leaders are not prominent Italians, but a number of aristocrats and highly placed army and navy officers are reported to be members.' . . .

"Then, on December 8, a unit of Italian soldiers was thrown into the furnace in an attack which 'was little short of suicide. . . . The Italians were cautioned against attempting a frontal attack, but that is precisely what they did . . . The first wave of attackers was virtually destroyed. The second, shoved in frantically from the reserve, suffered grave casualties. . . . It might as well be admitted that no one was very much surprised' (*New York Herald Tribune*, December 13). The commanding general who chose to make the frontal attack was surely both incompetent and brutal. But as Badoglio in one of his recent interviews told us, Mussolini attacked France in June 1940, because he needed a few thousand dead in order to get a seat at the impending peace conference. In December 1943, Badoglio needed a few hundred Italian dead to enhance the prestige of the royal house. This is why on the eve of the battle we were told that the Crown Prince had flown over enemy lines, 'a trip which takes courage and demonstrates a general desire to rehabilitate himself in the eyes of the people.' The stupid butchery of December 8 was, if our count is correct, the eighth round won by the King in the span of no more than one month after the Moscow Declaration.

"It is impossible to understand why the wise men of London and Washington are still particular about Carol of Rumania and Ahmed Zogu of Albania. These gentlemen are no worse than any other king of Southern Europe. Distribute equal justice to all kings and gangsters everywhere in the world, for Heaven's sake!"

GAETANO SALVEMINI

[Reprinted from *The New Republic*, December 27, 1943.]

How the Counter-Revolution Triumphed in Italy, 1920-1922

In September 1920 Italy was on the verge of revolution. A brief history of this period follows:

The Federation of Metal Workers, which was soon joined by other unions, including even the Catholic organizations and the nationalist Italian Labor Alliance, presented the demand for a 35% wage increase to meet the sky-rocketing prices, and set about to introduce the 8-hour working day by the self-action of the workers. Although the movement embraced from the very

outset more than 500,000 workers, the Italian capitalists flatly rejected the demands.

The Metal Workers Federation then issued a call for a nationwide general strike and summoned the workers to seize the factories in the event of lock-out. Despite this final warning, the capitalists answered with lock-outs. The metal workers then proceeded to occupy more than 300 enterprises in the Milan area alone.

The ruling class and its then reigning Giolitti government were impotent. The

troops could not be relied upon; the government did not dare call them out. The movement rapidly spread to the metal workers of all Italy who were joined by the workers in other industries. Everywhere factories were seized, around them barricades were erected and machineguns mounted by the workers. The peasants began dividing the landlords' estates. Capitalism appeared doomed in Italy. *Left without any resources in their own class, the capitalists could rely now only on their labor agents.*

On September 9, 1920 the Executive Committees of the Socialist Party and the General Confederation of Labor, controlled by the Socialist Party, met in joint sessions but could arrive at no decision. The question was then referred to the plenary sessions of the national committee of the General Confederation of Labor. In other words, the leaders of the Socialist Party had in effect abdicated; but there was no revolutionary leadership to replace them. The vital issues of 1921 were settled in Italy within the highest trade union body.

Gennari (later one of the founders of the Italian Communist Party) insisted, in the name of the Socialist Party on giving unlimited support to the movement which had already passed beyond the limits of economic demands and was actually being transformed into a social revolution. D'Aragona, the then General Secretary of the Confederation of Labor and one of the leaders of the reformist right wing in the Italian S.P., demanded that the struggle be confined to economic demands; and agreed, as a last resort, only to the introduction

of workers' control of production.

The revolutionary elements were in the ascendancy in the ranks, but in the top leadership arch-conservatives and vacillators predominated. The resolution submitted by D'Aragona received the support of the social patriot Turati, and of Serrati, who at the time held a centrist position. With the support from the centrists, the labor lieutenants of Italian capitalism triumphed: D'Aragona's resolution received 591,245 votes as against 409,569 votes for Gennari's resolution.

As a result of this close vote the leadership of the 1921 movement definitively passed into the hands of the reformists who met with Premier Giolitti and on September 15, 1920 formally renounced all further struggle. They struck a bargain, telling the workers that they must remain content with a promise of workers' control and other concessions, all of which remained on paper.

Betrayed and beheaded, the revolutionary movement of 1920 was quickly dissipated. The workers were compelled by their reformist leaders to surrender all their con-

quests, to return the enterprises to the capitalists. This plunged the Italian masses into dejection and apathy. The road for reaction was cleared. In the absence of an experienced revolutionary leadership capable of executing an orderly retreat in the face of this terrible defeat through capitulation, the triumph of reaction in Italy was guaranteed in advance.

The panic-stricken Italian bourgeoisie, saved in its last extremity by the treachery and cowardice of the reformists, regained its confidence and staked everything on the fascist gangs. By the end of September 1920 the revolutionary advance was at a standstill; November already witnessed the first major assaults of the fascists against the workers' organizations (the seizure of Bologna). In the months that followed, the fascists proceeded systematically to destroy the Italian labor movement. At the end of 1922 the power passed into the hands of Mussolini, thus sealing the victory of counter-revolution in Italy, and stabilizing capitalism there for another two decades.

J. G. W.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

Scotland

In previous issues we reported the news of a split in Glasgow, one of the most important centers of the British Communist Party. We have just received a letter from one of these militants who have broken with Stalinism. He writes:

December 12, 1943

"Dear Comrades,

"I have in front of me the article in *Fourth International* of August 1943, in *International Notes*. The part I am referring to is: "C. P. Workers in Glasgow Turning to Trotskyism." Now I happen to be one of those stewards. However, before I break into the reasons for writing to you, I will tell you something about ourselves first.

"We realized, as the war progressed that the C.P. line was turning more chauvinist every day and then it was too much. We

resigned. Some of us had 8 years', 12 years' membership with the party. Now we realize that the C.P. is the counter-revolutionary force all ready to hand. In our particular factory we have formed a local and collected quite a good membership. Now we are doing a lot of good not harm as was the case throughout the factories that we work in. We realize, however, that our revolutionary education is only beginning.

"What surprises me is the horrible way in which the historical facts are twisted and construed and then placed before the average C.P. member in book form. When you get out of the Communist Party you realize that the books we should have been reading are practically unobtainable. Now this is where you come in, Comrades. Now, as I have said, we have formed a local in D—; and I am the secretary of it. From our own center in London we get some *Militants* now and then and a *Fourth Inter-*

national. But on the back pages of the *Fourth International* is the thing that keeps worrying us. That is the heading: "YOU NEED THESE MARXIST WORKS!" So, at one of our local meetings, it was decided to write to you and see what you could do for us in the way of literature. I don't want to specify any particular books as I don't know how the money is going to work out. I don't know if our £ is worth 2 or 20 shillings. So we decided to place before you our particulars and let you choose the literature to send us.

"Well Comrades, I hope you won't think this letter too much of an imposition as we are complete strangers really, but as revolutionists, we have a lot in common. I will draw to a close now. I trust you get this letter O.K. and I hope to hear from you."

Yours fraternally,
R. B.
Sec. D— Local.

SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
116 UNIVERSITY PLACE
NEW YORK 3, N.Y.

I am enclosing \$..... Send me
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
for

- () 6 months.....\$1.00
- () 1 year.....\$2.00

Name.....
Address.....
City.....

To Understand What Is Happening In Italy--

FASCISM & BIG BUSINESS

By DANIEL GUERIN

339 Pages (Paper Cover)

\$1.00

Today's events are illumined by this historical analysis of the rise of fascism in Germany and Italy. The best Marxist book on the subject.

Order from: PIONEER PUBLISHERS
116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.



LEON TROTSKY'S

Great Marxist Classic

IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM

(Against the Petty-Bourgeois Opposition)

- How Is the Class Nature of the Soviet Union Determined?
- How Do Revolutionists Defend the Soviet Union?
- What Are the Prospects for Socialism During This War?

Leon Trotsky discusses these and many other problems of revolutionary politics and Marxist theory in this book. "In Defense of Marxism" brings together in one volume all the important articles and letters written by Trotsky during the last year of his life (1939-1940) against the ideas and methods of the fugitives from the struggle for socialism.

240 PAGES

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

Order Now From
PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

THE STRUGGLE FOR A PROLETARIAN PARTY

By

JAMES P. CANNON

What are the organizational methods of Leninism?
What stages of development has American Trotskyism passed through?
What is unprincipled combinationism in politics?
These and many other key questions of Bolshevik politics are discussed and clarified in connection with the most important conflict in the development of American Trotskyism and in the history of the Fourth International.

LEON TROTSKY wrote about this companion volume to his "In Defense of Marxism":

"It is the writing of a genuine workers' leader. If the discussion had not produced more than this document, it would be justified."

302 PAGES

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

Order Now From
PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

Aid Labor's 18 Political Prisoners And Their Families

DEAR FRIENDS:

We have just lost the right to think and to speak. The American Civil Liberties Union reports that this is the first time the Supreme Court has declined to review a test case under a law involving freedom of speech and press. This is important because for the first time since 1798 it is a federal crime to express an opinion!

Now 18 members of Minneapolis Truckdrivers Union Local 544-CIO and of the Socialist Workers Party must begin serving their 12 to 16 months in prison.

These 18 fighters for freedom of speech and press will serve their dreary 7,900 days in prison because they had the courage to fight for our liberties. It is a vicious, tyrannical law that takes away our freedom to enjoy the democratic rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

The immediate sufferers will be the prisoners and their wives and children who are dependent for food, clothing and shelter upon the earnings of these brave fighters. But we, YOU AND I, CANNOT LET THEM DOWN!

You and we must assume the obligations of caring for these victims of political persecution and their families. YOU AND WE must let them know that we will not forget them and their families.

These 18 were put behind bars solely because of their union activities and their socialist ideas. We can't let down these 18 prisoners who fought OUR fight for the right to think and to speak. Please send us your contribution.

JAMES T. FARRELL, Chairman
CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE
160 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY 10, N. Y.

Here is my contribution of \$..... to the fund
for the relief of the 18 political prisoners in the Minneapolis
"Gag" Law case and their families.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY and STATE

(Signed)

JOHN DEWEY

A. J. MUSTE

MARK STARR

JAMES T. FARRELL

GEORGE NOVACK