

COAL BARONS BLOCK CONTRACT AS CONGRESS RUSHES NO-STRIKE BILL

N.A.A.C.P. CONVENTION FLAYS GOVT. JIM CROW

Delegates Hail Firm Stand of UAW Against Bosses' Attempt to Divide Workers

DETROIT, June 6. — Climaxing its four-day Emergency Conference on the "Status of the Negro in the War for Freedom," an overflow crowd of more than 23,000 meeting here in the Olympia Stadium wildly cheered the statement of R. J. Thomas, president of the U. A. W., that his union "would continue to fight for equal rights for all workers regardless of color."

The Conference opened on June 3, the same day that the Packard Motor Co. had been closed down by a strike, which began when white production workers in the aircraft engine division walked off the job after three Negro workers had been promoted to machine jobs. Thomas pointed out that the U. A. W., from the beginning, had defended the rights of its Negro members, and charged C. E. Weiss, company industrial relations officer, and other Packard Co. officials with urging white employees to refuse to work with Negroes. Walter White, Executive Sec. of the N. A. A. C. P., opened his keynote address to the Conference on June 3 with the same charge against the Packard officials.

The crowd attending the Olympia mass meeting was electrified by Thomas' further declaration that he has "absolute evidence" that the Packard strike was promoted by agents of the Ku Klux Klan. The U. A. W. was turning the evidence over to the F. B. I., he stated, and would demand a Congressional investigation.

The firm stand taken in defense of the Negro U. A. W. members at the Packard Co., not only by Thomas, but by other U. A. W. officials who spoke to the delegates at earlier sessions of the Conference was one of the most effective demonstrations of solidarity between white and Negro workers which the majority of the N. A. A. C. P. delegates had ever seen.

Seven hundred and forty-three delegates from 39 states attended the Conference — the largest convention of the N. A. A. C. P. for many years.

The "Statement to the Nation," prepared by a Committee

Delegates Reject Move Against Miners

An attempt to insert a section in the N. A. A. C. P. "Statement to the Nation," praising the "no strike policy of the U. A. W.-CIO" and attacking strikes, "inimical to the war efforts of our country and its allies," was defeated after a heated debate. Grace Carlson, delegate from the St. Paul Branch of the N. A. A. C. P., made the motion to strike out this section. She pointed out that this might easily be interpreted as an attack on the United Mine Workers Union which was fighting in the interests of thousands of Negro miners.

Clarence Sharpe of Cleveland, James Anderson of Los Angeles and several other delegates took the floor in opposition to the "no-strike" clause. Only one Stalinist delegate spoke in support of the inclusion of this section. By common consent, the Committee which had prepared the Statement agreed to its withdrawal after hearing the weighty arguments made against it.

elect on the floor of the Conference was far more representative of the desire of the delegates for militant action against Jim Crowism than the cautious speeches of most speakers on the prepared program.

STATEMENT DEMANDS ACTION

"The N. A. A. C. P. and its members are appalled at the wide discrepancy between our professed war aims of democracy and freedom and the treatment meted out to Negroes in nearly every part of our national life," the statement opens. "The issues with which we are concerned must be raised now. We refuse to listen to the weak-kneed of both races who tell us not to raise such controversies during the war."

Charging that the government itself sets the pattern of discrimination and segregation by the "continued ill-treatment of Negroes in uniform," the N. A. A. C. P. statement calls upon President Roosevelt as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces to use his power to end the government's shameful treatment of Negro citizens. When this demand upon Roosevelt was read at today's closing session, it was applauded vociferously.

Among other demands is one that "representatives of the Negro press be given equal press privileges in attending and reporting Congressional hearings as well as Presidential and other official press conferences." The government is also asked to live up to the Constitution in its employment policies by guaranteeing equal opportunity for work for all regardless of "race, creed, color or national origin."

Although the majority of the N. A. A. C. P. delegates attending the Conference were not industrial workers, and therefore not closely aligned with the trade union movement, the statement calls upon Negro workers "to become full fledged members of organized labor on a basis of equality with all other workers."

Labor Unity Can Stop No-Strike Bill

An Editorial

The Connally-Smith anti-strike bill supported by Byrnes and the Roosevelt administration, is headed for final passage by both houses of Congress.

If the bill is permitted to become law, it will be a criminal offense to "coerce, instigate, induce, agree with or encourage" a person to strike.

This bill is the most vicious union-busting piece of legislation to come out of Congress. It proposes to drive the knife deep into the heart of the American labor movement.

The Congressional jackals and time-servers of the billion-dollar corporations have been scared out of their wits by the Mine strike. They see the growing power of organized labor and they want to cripple it. They want to frighten the labor movement out of its militancy and fighting spirit. They want to make it possible to jail every labor leader, every shop committeeman or steward who possesses the courage and manhood to fight for the rights of labor. They want to crush every voice of protest against the criminal looting of the public treasury by the war profiteers.

Why do these Congressmen dare to propose such union-busting legislation in the face of a labor movement 13 million strong? Because the leadership of the AFL and CIO has been pursuing

a cowardly policy of groveling before the Roosevelt administration. Because the leadership of the AFL and CIO has permitted the labor movement to be subverted into a miserable appendage of the war machine. Because the labor movement is divided. Because the labor movement does not have its own political party and has no voice in the halls of Congress.

Labor has plenty of strength to smash the attempt to thrust the workingman back into conditions of slavery and to roll back this projected anti-labor offensive. The problem is to mobilize the strength of the labor movement and to use it effectively.

Let the miners, the AFL, CIO and Railroad Brotherhoods call a great labor conference in Washington right now. Let them issue a united call to every local union in the country to participate in a militant national campaign to smash this strike-breaking bill.

Faced with the united protest of labor Roosevelt will never dare permit this bill to become law.

Self-defense is the first law of life. Labor must fight now when it has the strength and ability to fight. The Smith-Connally bill must not be permitted to become law.

Miners In The Second Walk-Out

By JAMES COOK
(Special To The Militant)

PITTSBURGH, June 1. — All the miners around here have stopped digging coal. Speaking to a group of miners today, one of them said to me: "The government is supposed to have taken over the mines, but as far as any of us can see we are still working for the same operators. And it makes no difference to us; we can't dig coal when we can't buy enough to eat."

One of the miner's wives said to me, "The government run the mines? It don't look like they want to do it for the benefit of the miners, if they ever are really gonna take over the mines to run. Why, they lifted the ceiling on the \$25,000 salary, \$25,000, — that would be enough to pay the yearly wage of fifteen miners."

From the Pittsburgh area down to Uniontown in the Western Pennsylvania district there wherever I have been and talked to miners it is exactly the same story. "No contract, no-work. No two dollars a day, no contract."

The feelings of the miners today are mingled with anger and sullen determination. "Who did the operators think they were kidding with all of this stalling behind the War Labor Board and the flag waving? Prices have gone so sky high on everything

that you can't even see the ceiling anymore. My wife had to buy some rotten vegetables in order to get a small amount that was good. That's the way the whole-salers in Pittsburgh force the retailers to buy. Why don't the government do something about that instead of trying to make us work for starvation wages so that the coal mine owners can get richer from the war contracts!"

Miners Take The Militant Into Pits

PITTSBURGH, June 2. — From the start of their struggle against the coal operators and the administration The Militant has supported the miners in their demands for a living wage. The paper has been widely distributed in the Pittsburgh area covered by our correspondents.

The miners' reaction to The Militant has been reported to us as follows: "You'll be pleased to know that the miners are now taking The Militant down into the pits with them and passing it on to their fellow workers. In some places they read it while on the main trip down. They all like it."

I asked one of the miners what would happen if the gov't decided to draft them now because they were on strike. "You got something there. Let them draft us."

A lot of us would be getting more from the government for our families then we do now for working in the mines. And, besides it is a lot safer in the army than going down to dig coal every day."

The impression the miners give to an outsider in this fight is one of complete solidarity. To a man they are behind their officials and are confident that they will carry the fight through to a victory for them.

From the workers around here in the steel mills and defense plants there has been no adverse criticism of the miners. They are all in sympathy with the miners and for them in their fight.

Many of the miners stated to me that although they recognize that they themselves started the ball rolling in the present fight against the high cost of living they are grateful to the rubber workers and auto workers who by their action demonstrated that they are in sympathy with the miners' fight and are ready to carry their own share of it.

"Let me tell you after the way our Union has kicked in to help all of these unions get started it leaves you with a pretty sick feeling in your stomach the way these union leaders are giving us dirty kicks in the face. Yes! We know that the membership is with us. Ours is the same fight as theirs, and we're going to win this fight!"

Generals Rule Argentina

By TERENCE PHELAN

A junta of Argentine army leaders last week toppled the Castillo government in a bloodless coup d'etat. The Argentine bourgeoisie finds itself confronted with the need of re-orienting its foreign policy in the light of recent Allied victories. They face the prospect of seeing Argentina, most powerful nation in Latin America, being militarily isolated, surpassed, even potentially threatened by Lend-Lease equipment poured into Brazil and other nearby territory, while Argentina herself cannot buy any arms in the United States.

The immediate reason for the overthrow of the Castillo regime was apparently the report that Paraguay had signed a military alliance with Brazil. Argentina, though standing in a semi-colonial relation to advanced capitalist countries, has herself long held a dominating position in Paraguay.

The hasty seizure of power by the Generals was a barracks-overturn. The Argentine people were neither consulted nor did they participate in the "revolution."

BOURGEOISIE BADLY DIVIDED

There is, however, a comparatively strong bourgeoisie in Argentina which is unlikely to allow any military junta to rule

for long. This was promptly reflected in the fact that the junta, once it had the power, did not know what to do with it. The only two civilians it could get for "ministers" were two "illustrious nobodies." General Arturo Rawson's attempt to form a government fell through in 48 hours.

Now, another General, Ramirez, has formed a government which, for the moment, appears acceptable to the badly divided Argentine bourgeoisie, whose rival factions are struggling for power behind the military facade and a stifling censorship.

The likelihood is that if the Generals attempt for long to maintain a purely military dictatorship, they will have a genuinely popular revolt on their hands.

Operators Turn To WLB; Lewis Denounces Owners' Stand 'As Insult To Coal Miners'

U. S. Steel Corporation Takes Lead in Breaking Union Agreement With Illinois Operators Granting \$1.50 Portal-to-Portal Pay

The coal barons have again deadlocked negotiations with the United Mine Workers of America. Following the policy that they adopted three months ago, when the coal controversy first began, they have continued making a mockery of collective bargaining negotiations with the union. Refusing to grant any decent concessions to the union the operators have again tossed the mine case into that "graveyard of grievances," the War Labor Board.

Lewis correctly described the negotiations as "a farcical proceeding in every respect. A stultification of collective bargaining. The sullen, morose attitude of the operators is an insult to the coal miners. . . ."

Under the ruling of the War Labor Board in the miners' case, issued on May 25, both the union and the mine operators

are instructed to report back to the board on June 9 the result of their collective bargaining negotiations. The results of course are nil. The miners' union, as from the first, refused to recognize the authority of this corporation-dominated body, or to be

bound by its Little Steel Formula. Throughout the three months of the coal crisis, it has consistently ignored the Board and its rulings. The miners, of course, will continue this policy.

The coal barons, under the leadership of the steel corporations, remain adamant. They are determined that the miners shall receive no quarter. Their aim is to inflict a decisive defeat to the miners' union, at present the vanguard of American labor. By this action, they hope to teach all American labor the lesson that its wage standards are due to be driven down while war inflation continues and that there is nothing that labor can do about it.

Harry Moses, the representative of the H. C. Frick Coal and Coke Company, a subsidiary of the U. S. Steel Corporation, has taken the lead in blowing up the joint Appalachian Conference negotiations at the very time that the UMW reached an agreement with the Illinois Operators Association for payment of \$1.50 per day as

portal-to-portal allowance. Moses announced that his company, which employs 27,000 men in captive mines of Illinois, Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Alabama, would not be bound by this agreement, and might withdraw from the Illinois Operators' Association.

WLB-OPERATOR'S ALLY

The coal barons are full of confidence that they can continue to hold the coal miners at bay. Under their barrage the Roosevelt Government has buckled and taken over the job of unabashed agent of the mine operators. The War Labor Board has acted throughout the mine crisis as the faithful ally of the operators. It ran interference for the coal barons when it instructed the operators to break off negotiations with the union as the mine workers walked out of the coal pits the second time on June 1 at the expiration of the second mine truce. On June 3, Roosevelt personally threatened to call out troops if the mine workers did not return to work by Monday, June 7, and stated that all miners of draft age who refused to

(Continued on page 4)

More Unions Aid Postal Defense Fund

A \$50 donation to the Kelly Postal Defense Fund was received this week from Local 1981 of the United Steelworkers of America, Maywood, Calif., announced the Civil Rights Defense Committee this week. In response to the appeal by the Los Angeles, CRDC representative, the winner of the \$5.00 door prize spoke for the motion to contribute, and added his prize to the local's donation.

Large contributions have also been received from United Steelworkers of America Local 2172, Los Angeles, and UAW-CIO Briggs Local 212, Detroit, Mich.

Taking 'the Profits Out of War'

"The Treasury has estimated that the total net income of corporations. . . will be about \$25,000,000,000 this year as compared with \$19,500,000,000 last year."

"Even after Federal Taxes have been taken, corporation net income is estimated at slightly over \$9,000,000,000 as compared with \$7,800,000,000 last year." — N. Y. Times, June 4.

GPU ASSASSIN REWARDED

By WALTER O'ROURKE

MEXICO CITY, May 25. — According to a dispatch published on May 23rd in the English section of the Mexican daily *Novedades*, David Alfaro Siqueiros will paint a mural representing the struggle of Cuba for freedom and democracy. This mural, says the report, "will be financed by the Coordinator's Office in Washington and donated to the Cuban government by the recently set up Cuban-American Cultural Institute of Havana." The article concludes by saying that after finishing the mural, Siqueiros will visit Mexico City.

As anyone acquainted with the Civil War in Spain can testify, Siqueiros served as a G.P.U. agent in Loyalist Spain. After the defeat, he returned to Mexico and organized the preparatory espionage and then the machine-gun attack of May 24th which was the G.P.U.'s first attempt on Leon Trotsky's life. One of Trotsky's guards, Robert Sheldon Harte, was kidnapped during this attack and subsequently murder-

ed. His body was discovered buried in a shallow grave next to a cabin that Siqueiros hired and used as a studio; the caretaker arrested at the time testified that he was paid by and took orders from Siqueiros.

SIQUEIROS SKIPS

When arrested, Siqueiros admitted he had organized the spying and participated in the actual attack. This was corroborated by other witnesses. However, he insisted that he knew nothing about the murder of Harte and said that the machine-gun bursts fired from three directions into Trotsky's bedroom were fired for "psychological purposes." The judge, for some reason or other, chose to accept this absurd story. Siqueiros' crime was thus reduced to housebreaking and damage to another's property.

With such minor charges against him, he was allowed to go free under bail. Within a week he skipped bail and later turned up in Chile. Legally, therefore, in Mexico he is a fugitive from justice and, upon return to Mexico territory, he should be arrested.

Dobbs Speaks To Workers In Seattle

On May 28 Farrell Dobbs, Labor Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party, spoke in Seattle on the need of an Independent Labor Party. The meeting was attended by 25 enthusiastic workers, of whom eleven were friends and sympathizers.

A pledge of \$286 was made by the branch for the labor party campaign; and it is expected that additional sums will be raised bringing the total well over \$500 for Seattle.

On June 7 and 10 Comrade Dobbs spoke in Minneapolis and St. Paul.

His scheduled tour dates follow.

DATE	PLACE
June 14—Milwaukee	
June 15, 18—Chicago	
June 19, 20—St. Louis	
June 23, 24—Flint	
June 25, 27—Detroit	
June 28—Toledo	
June 29, July 1—Cleveland	
July 2, 4—Akron	
July 5, 7—Youngstown	
July 8, 10—Buffalo	
July 11, 12—Rochester	
July 14, 15—Boston	
July 16, 17—New Haven	
July 18—New York	

Dates have not yet been announced for meetings in Newark, Philadelphia, Reading and Bayonne.

The End Of The Comintern And The Prospects Of Labor Internationalism

Text of Speech by James P. Cannon Delivered in New York, May 30, 1943

Comrade Chairman, Comrades:

The formal dissolution of the Communist International is undoubtedly an event of great historical significance, even though everybody understands that it is simply the formal certification of a fact that was long since accomplished. Some of the bourgeois commentators and politicians may exaggerate a bit when they speak of the dissolution of the Communist International as the greatest political event since the beginning of the war. But, in any case, there is no question of its transcendent importance. This is recognized on every side, and the event has called forth discussion from every quarter.

There are two ways to view the question. One is from the standpoint of the ruling capitalist powers in the countries allied with the United States in their war against the Axis powers, and their general struggle to maintain the capitalist system of oppression of the workers in the home countries and enslavement of the great masses of the colonial world. The other standpoint from which the dissolution of the Comintern can be discussed is from the standpoint of the liberation struggle of the workers which has had a conscious expression now for 95 years, since the publication of the Communist Manifesto in 1848.

The discussion has all been one-sided so far. All the discussion outside our ranks begins from the premise of its effect upon the fortunes of American imperialism, with particular reference to the war. It is remarkable how so many people, in so many supposedly different camps, take this as their starting point in analyzing the burial of the Comintern. It was to be expected that the bourgeois press would take this point of view because all their interests lie in that direction. But we notice also that such labor leaders as have pronounced themselves show the same bias. They inquire, with straight faces, whether Stalin's action is sincerely meant as a gesture of help and cooperation with our war leaders in Washington and London, or whether it is a mere maneuver. No other aspects of the question seem to concern them.

The same thing is true of the Social-Democratic press. You might think that people who used to have an International of their own would have something to say about the unburied corpse of the Second International, but they passed that over as a matter of no interest. Perhaps they are right in this respect. They sagely discuss the recent events in Moscow and put seriously to themselves — these "Socialists" — the question: Will this help America in the war or not?

Even the Stalinists, who up to a few days ago were the adherents and representatives — even if not formally, owing to the Voorhis Law — of the Communist International, solemnly discuss the action like imitation Congressmen. They



JAMES P. CANNON
National Secretary, Socialist Workers Party

defend the burial of the Comintern without reference to its effect on the struggle of the workers for better conditions and eventual liberation — the original aim of the Comintern — but solely from the point of view of the interests of the American ruling class. Browder writes a letter to the *New York Times* and attempts to reassure this extremely perspicacious organ of America's Sixty Families that the action taken in Moscow is in good faith and in their interests, and that it is not quite sporting of them to raise a questioning eyebrow about the fact.

So far nobody has discussed the question from the point of view which brought the Communist International into existence, that is, of organizing and furthering the worldwide struggle of the proletariat for emancipation from capitalism. But it is this point of view which I want to bring to the discussion here this evening.

Internationalism Indispensable

Of course, the announcement of the formal dissolution of the Comintern is simply the news account of a burial that is ten years overdue. It serves a certain purpose in that it puts an end to a fiction and clears the air of illusions and misunderstandings, to say nothing of very bad odors.

This belated burial of the corpse of the Comintern is a climax, we might say, to a long sequence of events which have extended over two decades. These events, in their high-lights, can be noted as: the death of Lenin; the promulgation for the first time in 1924 of the theory of socialism in one country; the bureaucratization of the Comintern and all of its parties; the expulsion of the Bolshevik-Leninist opposition, first in the Russian party and then in the other parties of the Comintern; the capitulation of the Communist Party of Germany, with its 600,000 members and its 6 million voters, without a struggle and without a fight to Hitler fascism in 1933; the organized, systematic betrayal of the proletariat of the world in the interest of the diplomatic policy of the Kremlin; the murder of the old Bolsheviks; the assassination of Trotsky; the betrayal of the proletariat in the second world war, first to Hitler and then to Roosevelt and Churchill.

Since the beginning of the war the Comintern, the unburied Comintern, was silent as the grave. Now it is formally buried, and that, at least, is a good thing. It is somewhat late, but the old proverb says, "better late than never." By the formal burial of the Comintern, Stalin, for once on the international arena, has unconsciously performed a progressive act.

The bourgeois press and public generally, the political leaders and spokesmen, are very well pleased with the recent pronouncement, even if they understand that it is only a formality. They have good reason to be pleased. The dissolution of the Comintern, and the cynical repudiation of internationalism and the international proletarian organization, is an ideological victory of vast importance for capitalism and reactionary nationalism. They have been quite true to their interests in hailing this action and pushing aside the quibblers who wonder if, after all, it isn't another maneuver.

They have good reason to applaud the action of Stalin, taken through his puppets in the so-called Executive Committee of the non-existent Comintern, because the renunciation of internationalism is a renunciation of the basic premises of scientific socialism. It is a renunciation of the cardinal doctrine which has guided and inspired the struggle of the workers for generations, since Marx's day. The modern movement of international socialism began with the Communist Manifesto in 1848, 95 years ago, with its battle of cry: Workers of the World Unite! The Communist Manifesto proclaimed the doctrine that the emancipation of the workers could be achieved only by their common actions on an international scale. Against the cardinal principle and battle cry of Marx and Engels, and of all revolutionary socialists since that time: —

nationalism were propounded in the Communist Manifesto to their first realization in 1864 in the First International, up until the present time, the conflict within the labor movement between revolutionists and reformists has revolved around this fundamental question. At the heart of every dispute, socialist internationalism on the one side has been contrasted to nationalistic concepts on the other.

We can see in the whole period down to the present day the deadly parallel between revolutionary internationalism, pointing the way to the socialist future, and opportunistic adaptation to the decaying order of capitalism. Marx and Engels were the champions of this idea of internationalism

The Four Internationals

Lenin, the Russian, living as an emigre in Switzerland, with no more than a dozen or two followers that he could name and place, rose up against the whole so-called Second International and the Social-Democratic German parties in the war. He rose up against the bourgeois world, and announced the necessity for the Third International in 1914. Similarly, in the period of the decline and eventual decay and death, up to the formal burial of the Communist International, the great dividing line between the real inheritors of Marx and Lenin on the one side, and Stalin and his cohorts on the other, has been this principle we are discussing here tonight — the principle of internationalism.

Since it was first proclaimed nearly a century ago, in the historic ebb and flow, the idea of internationalism and the organization of the international workers have suffered three great defeats. The organizations have been destroyed, but always the idea rose again after each defeat, corresponding to historical necessity, and found the necessary organizational form on higher ground.

The First International, that is the International of Marx and Engels, was founded formally in 1864. Seven years later came the tragic defeat of the Paris Commune. Along with that great defeat and the great impetus it gave to reaction on the continent of Europe, there was the unprecedented rise and expansion of capitalist industry. The productive forces began to expand and develop on a capitalist basis at an unprecedented rate. This temporarily weakened the revolutionary movement. It was the expansion of capitalism still reaching toward its apex of development which decreed the end of the First International by its formal dissolution in 1876. But the First International didn't die like the Second or like the Comintern. It was dissolved with its honor unsullied. It remained an inspiration and an ideal which still continued to work in the vanguard circles of the workers and in time bore good fruit.

The Second International followed. It was formally launched in Paris in 1889, thirteen years after the formal end of the First International, and died as a revolutionary organization on the 4th of August, 1914. The 4th of August was the day when the Social-Democratic deputies in the Reichstag voted for the war credits of German imperialism. But between the manner and form of the end of the Second International and that of the First, there is a great contrast that we should not forget. The First International succumbed to external conditions, to the defeats, the spread of reaction and the expanding development of the capitalist productive system. It went down gloriously. The Second International, on the contrary, ended as a result of the betrayal of the leadership in a period when capitalism had already long passed its peak and had entered into its decline and bankruptcy. The Second International capitulated at a time when the neces-

Lenin's Program

Lenin said in 1914: "Because of the war, we must build the Third International in order to coordinate the activities of the workers in struggling against the war and in all that will follow from it." Stalin says to the workers of the world in 1943: "Because of the war, dissolve international organization and confine yourselves to the framework of your own bourgeois fatherland." In this contrast between the words of Lenin, who thought the war was a means of underscoring and emphasizing the necessity for an international organization of workers, and the words of Stalin, who says the war is a sufficient reason to disband international organization — in this contrast you have the measure of the two men and of what they represent in history.

Already in 1914, the First World War had demonstrated beyond all question that the bourgeois national states, as an arena for the development of the productive forces of mankind, were already outlived and had to give way to a broader basis. National capitalism had already entered into its bankruptcy in that time, more than twenty years ago. The most tragic expression of the bankruptcy of capitalism was the fact that it could find no other way out of the conflicts between out-lived national states than in the explosion of the terrible war that cost ten million lives and crippled and maimed twenty million more.

And it was precisely the demonstration, by the terrible fact of the war; it was precisely the war, that caused Lenin and Trotsky, and such as they, to realize that even the Second International as it had existed before the war, as a rather loose federation of national parties, could not be rebuilt. Trotsky expressed it, that the war sounded the death knell of national programs for workers' parties. They drew the lesson from the experience of the last World War, 1914-18, not only that the workers must reconstitute their organization on an

and of corresponding action. The nationally limited, narrow-minded trade union reformists of England and other places renounced the idea of internationalism. With the idea of gaining small favors for the day at the expense of the interests of the class as a whole and of the future, conservative trade unionism, even in Marx's day, took a nationalistic form and had a nationalistic outlook. In the first World War of 1914-18 the great resounding struggle which took place between the revolutionary wing headed by Lenin and Trotsky on the one side, and Kautsky & Co. on the other, had as its great criterion, its touch-stone, the question of international organization.

sity and urgency of international revolutionary organization were a thousand times more apparent than in the case of the First International.

The Third International was born of war and revolution and struggle against nationalism in March 1919, twenty-four years ago. This International, too, died ignominiously from a false theory, from capitulation and betrayal, and is buried in 1943, without honors, without regrets.

As far as the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat are concerned, the formal event was anticipated and nobody was taken by surprise. We have been struggling against the national degeneration of the Comintern for a long time. This struggle, as a matter of fact, began in 1923. That is twenty years ago. It is startling in these days, in contemplation of this final ceremony of burying the non-existent Comintern, to read the polemics of Trotsky written twenty years ago in Russia. At the very first signs of national degeneration, Trotsky, like a physician, put his finger on the pulse of the organization and detected the fever of nationalism and pointed out what it was and what it would lead to. He began a struggle twenty years ago in the name of internationalism against the theory of socialism in one country, against the conception that the workers could find any other way to salvation except through international organization and joint struggle against capitalism on a world scale.

This fight began in the factional and ideological disputes of 1923. The fight took international form in 1930 in the organization of the International Communist League shortly after Trotsky was exiled from Russia and began, from his refuge in Turkey, to communicate with co-thinkers on a world scale. In 1938, the unceasing struggle of Trotsky and his disciples was climaxed by the World Congress of the Fourth International in 1938.

Trotsky, the unfailing champion of internationalism, in the uncompromising struggle against every form and trace of nationalist degeneration, was finally assassinated by an agent of Stalin. But his imperishable ideas are incorporated in the new international organization of the communist workers, the Fourth International.

Stalin's action, formally dissolving the Comintern, was taken in the midst of the Second World War, an appropriate time. The international organization which was presumably formed to enable the workers to take advantage of the difficulties of national capitalist states to promote the international revolution, is dissolved with a cynical explanation that it doesn't fit the conditions of the war. Kautsky, in 1915, explaining the collapse of the Second International when the war started, said that the International is an instrument of peace, not of war. Kautsky was the originator of this monstrous theory. Stalin simply repeats it, nearly thirty years later when it is thirty times more false.

international scale, but that they must base this reorganization on an international program and not on the sum of national programs.

Thus, the war of 1914, which signalized the bankruptcy of the national capitalist states, was, in the eyes of Lenin and Trotsky, the greatest motivation for an extension of the idea of internationalism in program as well as in form of organization. Now, a quarter of a century later, when the bankruptcy of capitalism has developed into its death agony, when an explosion takes place in the Second World War in even more tragic loss in human life and material culture — now, after this, Stalin and his traitor gang, have the cynical effrontery to tell the workers that there is no need of international cooperation and international organization.

There isn't a shadow of logic or reason, if you proceed from the point of view of socialism and the cause of the proletariat, in any of the explanations given by the Stalinists for renunciation of internationalism. The explanation given by the bourgeois press and bourgeois political leaders is more correct and honest because it frankly proceeds from the point of view that is of interest to them, that is, to the capitalist world order, and they can see in it a very good thing. But that it is no good for the workers is quite obvious.

Even the bourgeoisie recognize internationalism in their own way. The bankruptcy of national limitness has become so clear to the bourgeoisie that all their most perspicacious leaders have been compelled to renounce the idea of national isolation altogether. Isolationism as a political tendency stands discredited in bourgeois politics. And in this situation, in this terrible war that is caused by the artificial prolongation of the life of national states as separate economic units, Stalin and his puppets tell the workers: "Confine your ef-

(Continued on page 3)

The Third International Is Dead -- Long Live The Fourth International!

(Continued on page 2)

forts to the national limits in which you find yourselves. Support one set of bandits against another set of bandits." That, workers of the world, heirs of Marx and Engels, heirs of Lenin and Trotsky and the Russian Revolution, that is your destiny in 1943, pronounced by Stalin and his gang.

This treacherous advice not only defies Marxist doctrine and tradition but it violates the most fundamental features of the prevailing world situation. It betrays the workers in the metropolitan centers and even omits any mention of the many million masses in the colonies and the semi-colonies who were awakened by the Russian Revolution and the Communist International to the struggle for life and freedom.

I think that the frankest and most heartfelt expressions of opinion by the chosen leaders of the democratic world bourgeoisie — Mr. Churchill and Roosevelt — really were off the record. They didn't have the heart to put down in public print what they really think of Stalin and his order dissolving the Comintern. That could only make fun of the explanation that the time has come in 1943 to go back to the national boroughs and forget the world arena at the very moment when they, the leaders of the bourgeoisie, are looking over the whole world and talking only in global terms. Stalin's explanation, intended to deceive trusting workers, can cause only the most cynical amusement to Churchill and Roosevelt, tinged with contempt plus a little appreciation for a very valuable favor. They at least have no illusions about national limitations either of economy or of politics, and certainly not of war. They have as little illusion on that score in their own way and from their own point of view, as Lenin had in this way, which was not the same way, and from his point of view which, needless to say, was not the same as that of Churchill or Roosevelt, or of Stalin.

If you take down from the bookshelf that imposing library of polemics, manifestos, appeals, analyses, written by Lenin from the 4th of August, 1914 on, you see running through the whole collection, like a red thread, the idea of internationalism. His manifesto, the manifesto of the Bolshevik Central Committee against the war, raised the demand already in 1914 for the creation of the new Third International. His attitude led him and the Bolsheviks to the Zimmerwald Conference in 1915, to Kienthal in 1916, and then to the revolution in 1917 in Russia.

Now, in all the plans of the Social Democrats, to say nothing of the imperialists, in 1914 — in all their plans to do away with international organization, to harness the workers to the war machine of their respective capitalist masters in the different countries, the one thing that was not counted

upon occurred in Russia, a little surprise — merely a revolution. The revolution that first overthrew the Czar in February and then overthrew the bourgeoisie in October was one of those unheralded events of the past World War which upset all calculations.

We do not see any mention of that in the order of dissolution, as we may call it. There is no talk about revolution. There is no talk about socialism. There is no talk about anything except winning the war against Hitler. Lenin's steps, from 1914 on, led through these events I have mentioned to the Russian revolution, the conquest of power by the proletariat of Russia, supported by the peasantry and led by the Bolshevik party of Lenin. That didn't end Lenin's fight against the theory of Kautsky that internationalism is an instrument of peace, not of war. In view of the collapse and bankruptcy of capitalism, as well as in anticipation of another war, Lenin and his party sponsored in 1919 the formation of the Comintern.

So, you see, throughout the whole course of Lenin's work, his manifesto after the betrayal of the German Social Democracy, his participation in the conferences at Zimmerwald and Kienthal, in the revolution of 1917, and the formation of the Comintern in 1919 — every act of Lenin from first to last took place under the banner of internationalism. The premises of the Third International were that the dissolution and collapse of the capitalist world order made necessary the organization of the proletariat for the seizure of power in the capitalist states, the federation of the socialist states into a world federation, and the inauguration of the world socialist order.

Lenin saw the Russian revolution as only the beginning of this world-wide process. Lenin and Trotsky and the Bolshevik party as a whole understood that Russia could not stand isolated in a capitalist world; it could not remain as a national utopia. They saw it as a fortress of the world proletariat. Their policy was to unite the Soviet Union, representing the fortress of the world proletariat, with its allies in the world. And who were the allies of the Soviets as Lenin and Trotsky saw them? Not Churchill. And not even Roosevelt. Their allies were the world proletariat in the capitalistically developed countries and the colonial peoples. Under this leadership the workers of the war-torn countries lifted their heads again. They were re-inspired with socialist ideas. They reorganized their ranks. They formed new revolutionary parties. They made heroic attempts at revolution in Europe. The colonial masses were awakened for the first time to political life, to revolt against age-old slavery, and inspired to throw off the imperialist yoke altogether.

Stalin's Treachery

Such was the course of development under Lenin's leadership of the Comintern. Under Stalin's leadership, which was tainted from the start with narrow-minded nationalism, the world movement was betrayed: the Soviet Union was isolated; the services of the Comintern and its parties were sold like potatoes on the market to the various camps of imperialists for dubious pacts, for dribbles of material aid, at a very cheap price. Lenin and Stalin — the creator of the Third International and its grave digger — these two represented ideas and actions which are in polar opposition to each other. They can in no way be reconciled. I notice that while they had the effrontery to refer to Marx, in the order dissolving the Comintern, they left unmentioned its founder. That at least was a wise omission, because Lenin's name would have been out of place there, as Marx's was also.

In the course of twenty years, from 1924, when the fatal theory of socialism in one country was first promulgated, to the sorry, dishonorable end of the Comintern in 1943; in that whole tragic degeneration, we can see above everything else the decisive role of theory in political action. Stalin didn't begin with the dissolution of the Comintern. He began with the theory of socialism in one country. From this false theory everything else has followed — the betrayal of the world proletariat, the isolation of the USSR behind her national barriers, the purges, the Moscow trials, the mass murders, the assassinations, and, finally, the dissolution of the Comintern.

There is a profound lesson in this terrible sequence of events for all the generation of the young proletariat awakening to political interest and political life. Trotsky explained it in 1928 in his book, which was here referred to by the chairman. In "The Criticism of the Draft Program of the Comintern" he explained to the communist workers of Russia and the world that precisely this theory of socialism in one country, with its inevitable nationalistic implications, would inevitably lead to the degeneration and downfall of the Comintern. When this was written 15 years ago, the great majority of communists considered this a great exaggeration and even an insult to Stalin and his co-workers in the Russian party. But Trotsky, who did not impute design but only ignorance to these people at that time, explained that good intentions cannot help you in politics if you proceed from a false theory. It is like a mariner setting a false course which can only lead the ship to an unintended destination.

The struggle against the theory of socialism in one country was conducted in the name of internationalism. And in the name of internationalism Trotsky and his disciples struggled against its disastrous consequences, as they began to reveal themselves in life. As the tragic course of events unfolded, Trotsky, step by step, analyzed, he explained, he threw the Marxist light on all the great events as they happened, before they happened, and afterwards he drew the necessary conclusions. He was not deterred by persecution; he was not dismayed by the few numbers that surrounded him, nor by the renegacy of others, nor by the sneers of philistines.

Trotsky did not consider in the first place numbers, popularity, success of the moment, any more than did Marx and Engels and Lenin. He considered historical necessity. He considered the task of formulating for the proletariat the program showing the shortest road to the realization of its historical

goal. His work and struggle bore fruit in the creation of an international nucleus of revolutionary fighters, and eventually in the formal organization of the Fourth International, in the World Congress in 1938.

At the time it was formed the great politicians of the mass parties of the Social Democracy used to sneer at Trotsky's little handful and his insignificant Fourth International. The heroes of the London Bureau, the centrists who, if they could not organize mass parties could, at least, talk about them, used to argue against Trotsky that he didn't have many followers. And the Stalinists, backed by the limitless material resources of the Soviet Union, with money, tremendous apparatus, a subsidized bureaucracy, and GPU murder machine at their disposal — with all this tremendous weight at their side, they hounded, persecuted and derided Trotsky and the Fourth International.

But in the brief period since the Founding Congress of the Fourth International, in a brief five years, every other international organization of the workers has been hurled down to ruin as Trotsky predicted they would be, without one stone left standing on another. This was the fate of the Second International of Social Democracy, of the London Bureau of the centrists, and now it is the fate of the Stalinists, admitted and acknowledged by themselves. They have all been destroyed by the war, as Trotsky said they would be. But the Fourth International remains. And with it lives the principle of internationalism which alone can show the tortured masses of the world the way out of war and slavery to the socialist future of humanity.

In this past period since 1864, each international organization of the workers in passing from the historical scene, left something accomplished, left something behind upon which its successor could build for the future.

The First International left an imperishable ideal, an unsullied record, as an inspiration for the workers from that day to this, a glorious memory.

The Second International died ignominiously through betrayal in 1914. Nevertheless, in the period from 1889 to that fatal day in August, 25 years later, it built great mass organizations of the workers, and handed on experience in organization of incalculable value, upon which the Third International was able to build. Also, the initial cadres of the Third International didn't fall from the sky. They came right out of the heart of the Second International. Thus, in spite of everything, the Second International left a great heritage.

The Third International, which has ended now in shame and disgrace, has nevertheless left behind the richest treasures for the future. Its founders, Lenin and Trotsky belong to us; nobody can dissolve the tie that binds the new generation of revolutionary workers to Lenin and Trotsky, to their teachings, their example, their beautiful memory. The record of the long internal struggle from 1923 to this date, the struggle of Trotsky and his co-thinkers and disciples, belongs to the proletariat of the world. The record of that struggle is the basic literature upon which the whole new generation which is destined to lead the world will be educated and trained. The first four Congresses of the Comintern, held under Lenin's leadership in 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922 — four congresses in

four years — produced documents which are the basic program of the movement that we uphold today.

And, in addition to that, out of the Third International, before it died and long before it was buried, came the initiating cadres of the Fourth International. Thus, looking at the thing always from the standpoint of the international proletariat and disregarding no elements in the whole survey, whether they are positive or negative, we have a right to



say that the balance sheet of the Communist International, in spite of everything, shows a great historical credit balance.

Stalin can bury the dead organization but he cannot bury the great progressive work the Comintern accomplished in its first years. He cannot bury the Fourth International which has risen, phoenix-like, from the ashes of the Third. We know very well and we don't try to conceal the fact that the numbers of the Fourth International are small. But its ideas are correct, its program represents historical necessity, and, therefore, its victory is assured. Its program consciously formulates the instinctive demands of the workers and the colonial peoples for emancipation from capitalism, fascism and war.

Even today, striking workers who never even heard of the Fourth International, are denounced as "Trotskyists" whenever they stand up for their rights, just as the workers and soldiers in Russia in 1917 under Kerensky were denounced on every side as "Bolsheviks" and heard then, for the first time in the denunciations, the word "Bolshevik." Trotsky relates in his "History of the Russian Revolution" how they began to say to themselves, "If what they are accusing us of is Bolshevism, then we had better be Bolsheviks."

So it will be again wherever workers stand up for their rights, express their instinctive will to struggle for a better future, and are denounced as Trotskyists. In good time they will learn the name of the Fourth International, its meaning, its program, and ally themselves with it.

Long Live the Fourth International!

No one can dissolve the Fourth International. It is the real Comintern and it will keep the banner unfurled in the faces of all traitors and renegades. And we assert confidently that it will be strengthened and grow and triumph until its organized ranks merge with the whole mass of humanity. The song which no Stalin can render obsolete ends its chorus with the words: "The International shall be the human race." And this chorus has a profound political meaning. It is not merely a poetical expression.

The peoples of the world in the various countries, through coordinated international effort, will pass over, in their great historic march, from capitalism to socialism through the transitional period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. As they progress toward the complete classless socialist society, all the various workers' organizations which have been instruments and mechanisms of the class struggle, that is, the parties, the unions, the cooperatives, the soviets, will gradually lose their original functions. As the classes are abolished and class struggles consequently ended, all these instruments of class struggle, will tend to coalesce into one united body. And that one united body will be the organized world society of the free and equal. The International shall really be the human race.

We disciples of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky, we partisans of the Fourth International, retain undimmed that vision of the future. To see that vision even now, to see it clearly through the fire and the smoke of the war, is simply to be in accord with historical development, to foresee the inevitable march of events and to prepare for them. To fight for this vision of the socialist future, to hasten its realization, is the highest privilege and the greatest happiness for a civilized man or woman in the world today.

Arguments For The Comintern Dissolution

By M. Morrison

In dissolving the Communist International, the Presidium, under the orders of Stalin of course, felt compelled to furnish some reasons for such an unexpected and drastic measure. This was necessary not only to justify the dissolution before public opinion but to furnish a "line" for the puppet leaders of the Stalinist parties to follow. Without such a line there was the danger that the little bureaucrats would give various and contradictory reasons and thus make confusion worse confounded. Naturally there was no danger that the petty bureaucrats would disagree with the decision to dissolve the C. I. There was only danger that they would not all agree upon the explanation for the dissolution.

It was out of the question for the heads of the Comintern to give the real reasons for the dissolution. Stalinist leadership exists by virtue of deceit as well as of violence. To state the truth would mean to disillusion the followers of the Stalinist system.

How could Stalin possibly state that the C. I. was founded for the purpose of promoting the world revolution, that this purpose had long ago been given up and that its only function was to control the various sections so that they would remain loyal servants of the Stalinist bureaucracy? How could he state that, since it was possible to control the Communist parties without the apparatus of the Comintern, it was well worth while to abolish it in order to create a better atmosphere for present and future bargaining with the capitalist states?

Stalin had to present reasons which give the appearance of a theoretical approach. This kind of an approach is best in order to deceive his followers who are unable to see through the flimsy character of the theory.

The organizational form chosen by the First Congress of the Communist International has been outgrown by the growth of the movement. This is the basic reason advanced to justify the dissolution. The statement of dissolution does not show how the organizational form has been outgrown. And even assuming that the organizational form has been outgrown, why is it not possible to change that form to conform with the growth of the organization?

The dissolution of an organization founded for the purpose of achieving a political and social objective is justified either by the gaining of the objective or the impossibility of carrying on any work under the given circumstances. Marx and Engels found themselves compelled to dissolve the First International because of the second situation. To justify the dissolution of the Third International Stalin must necessarily falsify the reason for the dissolution of the First International.

Another reason advanced for the dissolution is the differences in conditions existing in the countries of the world. No one will deny the existence of those differences but why did not Stalin, who lived at the time of the founding of the International, object to its being organized on the ground that conditions in the various countries were different? No one would have argued that conditions were the same all over the world.

The International was organized on the basic premise that, in spite of the differences of conditions existing in the various countries, the world as a whole was united by the growth of the productive forces and the worldwide system of exchange. If one were to consider differences in conditions as an obstacle to the organization of an International, then no International would have ever been organized.

The Stalinists may argue that a new factor has arisen since the organization of the Comintern, sharpening the differences between the countries. That factor could be only the victory of fascism in Germany. Fascism, however, came on the scene when Lenin and Trotsky led the Third International. Mussolini came into power before Lenin died. No suggestion for the dissolution of the

Comintern came from Stalin or anyone else at that time.

If the victory of fascism brought a new factor into the situation, it could only be of a nature which would make all the more necessary the existence of an International. For the victory of fascism in one country strengthens the fascist movement in all other countries. Fascism is an international danger and, far from being a factor leading to the dissolution of an International, should be the cause of its building and strengthening.

Stalinist stupidity and crassness have no limits. It is almost impossible to believe that the "growth and political maturity of the Communist parties" should be adduced as one of the reasons for the dissolution of the C. I. But there it is right in the announcement of the dissolution and one must deal even with the stupidest of arguments. Does it mean that an international is organized solely for training immature parties? To be sure, that is one of the functions of an International. But its reason for existence does not cease because immature parties have become mature and small parties have become large. Since an International is organized for the purpose of common action on a world scale, it would follow that the stronger and the more mature the parties are the greater the justification for the existence of an International. It is only when this happens that an International organized for the purpose of world revolution could hope to consummate its purpose.

If the growth and maturity of the Communist parties constitute a reason for dissolving the C. I., then it should have been dissolved before the German, French and Czech parties were annihilated and reduced to a small group of bureaucrats functioning in Moscow. Those parties were many times larger than the American party, today the largest party of the C. I.

By "growth and political maturity" Stalin must mean such a bureaucratization and degeneration of the Communist parties that he can be certain of their support without guiding and watching them. It is quite true that the Stalinist parties will support the Stalinist bureaucracy no matter what its policies are. All the arguments propounded in the Soviet press will be faithfully copied by the Stalinist press in the rest of the world. This does not mean that Stalin is ready to permit the Stalinist parties to decide for themselves what to do on important questions, especially those involving the Stalinist bureaucracy. Stalin is not the one to take chances on his henchmen.

Not a single plausible argument is advanced in the statement of dissolution justifying throwing the Comintern overboard. Naturally a revolutionary Marxist is the last one to weep over the dissolution of an organization which is in reality an obstacle to the revolutionary movement. If Stalin had furnished the world with the real reason for the dissolution of the C. I., it would have constituted the only progressive thing he did since the Stalinist bureaucracy began the struggle against revolutionary Marxism. In dissolving the Comintern, Stalin has presented the world with reasons that are not only false but extremely reactionary in their implications.

The Statement of dissolution frees the sections of the Comintern from their obligations arising from the statutes and resolutions of the Congresses of the Communist International. A completely superfluous statement. For Stalin freed the sections of the statutes and resolutions of the Congresses long ago. For many years his policies have been contrary to the resolutions of the first four Congresses. The sections of the Comintern have been instruments of the foreign policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy. They will continue that same role until Stalin decides it will best serve his interests to do away with the Stalinist parties altogether.

(To be continued)

Now on the Press

The Struggle for a Proletarian Party

By James P. Cannon

This companion volume to Leon Trotsky's "In Defense of Marxism" contains the basic documents on the building of a genuine workers' party, written during the fight against the Petty-Bourgeois opposition.

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

Order now from

Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Pl. New York 3, N. Y.

SUBSCRIBE NOW TO

The Militant

WEEKLY

Clip and mail this coupon

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

I enclose ☐ \$1.00 for a 6 month subscription to The Militant

☐ \$2.00 for a year's subscription to The Militant.

Name

Address

City

State

THE MILITANT

Published in the interests of the
Working People

VOL. VII—No. 24 Saturday, June 12, 1943

Published Weekly by
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASS'N
at 116 University Place, New York, 3, N. Y.
Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547

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

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



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

— LEON TROTSKY

JOIN US IN FIGHTING FOR:

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

Czar Byrnes

President Roosevelt has appointed James F. Byrnes Director of War Mobilization, with the most extensive powers granted to an individual in this war. Byrnes, it is reported, will function as "Assistant President," supervising domestic life while the Commander-in-Chief concentrates upon military and international affairs.

Roosevelt's new lieutenant-commander was for many years a poll-tax Senator from South Carolina. He has been notoriously an enemy of labor and a friend of Jim Crow. He opposed the Wage-Hour law and most other progressive labor legislation and fought bitterly against the anti-lynch bill while in the Senate. He never made any secret of his hostility toward the under-dogs, black or white. Byrnes helped block passage of the Federal anti-child-labor law because the mill operators of his state profited from the work of youngsters.

The CIO and AFL recently condemned Byrnes for manipulating the War Labor Board like a puppet from behind the scenes and blocking any reasonable wage-increases for the workers in the packing-houses, steel mills, and arms plants.

Now this anti-labor, anti-Negro politician rules over organized labor and the rest of the American people.

The capitalist-controlled press has said that the President's appointment "is definitely a move in the right direction." They mean that it is definitely a move to the right. Roosevelt's increasingly reactionary anti-labor program requires men such as Byrnes to execute it.

Connally Bill

131 Republicans and 100 Democrats supported the Connally anti-strike and slave labor bill which was adopted by the House last week after passing the Senate. The principal Congressional sponsors of this vicious legislation, Senator Connally of Texas and Representative Howard Smith of Virginia, are leading figures in Roosevelt's Democratic Party.

The provisions and penalties of this bill make it virtually impossible for any union to take action

in defense of the legitimate interests of its members. It would prevent one union from supporting another, and the officers of an international union from aiding its constituent locals. This ax placed in the hands of the administration can be wielded not only against the miners but against any union which fights for its rights.

The uninterrupted attacks upon the labor movement emanating in the past few months from the Democratic-Republican coalition have demonstrated again and again that the trade-unions cannot get along under present conditions without a political party of their own. Such an Independent Labor Party could not only ward off the blows of the ultra-reactionary Democratic-Republican union wreckers in Washington but could press for pro-labor, tax, price and other legislation which would benefit the working people instead of the coupon-clippers and union-hating industrialists.

How much the capitalist Congressmen and poll-taxers fear this prospect of independent labor political action is evidenced by the fact that the Connally bill prohibits labor unions from making contributions to political parties. This is one more good reason for opposing the bill. It is another good reason for creating a Labor Party.

Two Revolutions

Last Friday the Argentine government, last important neutral in the western hemisphere, was overthrown. The Argentine masses were conspicuously absent from this carefully-prepared military coup d'etat executed by Generals admittedly no less reactionary in their views than Castillo. One General was Minister of War in the deposed President's cabinet.

Nevertheless this change of regime was welcomed in Washington and London because it appeared that the new dictators would be far more cooperative with the Anglo-American allies. The N. Y. Times even discerned a "sunrise" of democracy for Argentina in this somewhat undemocratic overturn. "The Argentine revolution seems to be about as democratic as military revolution can be." (N. Y. Times, June 6.)

In India hundreds of millions of people have been struggling to throw off their backs the hated English exploiters and oppressors. Thousands of their leaders have been jailed, beaten, maimed, murdered. A reign of terror rules India behind the black curtain of censorship.

Neither London nor Washington have expressed any pleasure at this movement of the Indian masses.

A newly-installed military dictatorship in Argentina — that's occasion for rejoicing among the "United Nations."

A democratic regime and national freedom for India — that's to be condemned and stamped upon ruthlessly.

Just how do these two attitudes square with the claims that this is a people's war?

For A Free Press

In recent weeks several important national weeklies and daily papers have published editorials condemning Postmaster General Walker's revocation of *The Militant's* second-class mailing rights. *Colliers' Magazine* for May 8 writes: "If the Post Office Department can make this ban stick... what publications may not the Post Office be banning next, on similar pretext? We're glad to see the American Civil Liberties Union go to bat for *The Militant*; and we hope *The Militant* (though we disagree absolutely with what we understand it habitually says) will win the fight."

The *Philadelphia Record* for May 13 points out that: "Grounds on which *The Militant* has been suppressed by the Post Office Department establish a dangerous precedent. . . As the *New York Times* observed editorially, 'encroachments on the freedom of the press almost always begin with publications we can do without and affect individuals with whom most of us do not sympathize.' The paper has criticized the Darlan deal, the Government's policy on labor and treatment of Negroes."

The March 25 *Chicago Daily News* remarks: that "in any case, the mailing privileges of a periodical ought not to be at the mercy of a mere official whim." And the *Chicago Tribune* adds on March 29: "The jungle of postal rules and regulations can be employed as a means of suppressing or censoring the free press, and this power, in the hands of a department head who is also the leader of the entrenched political party, is dangerous to a degree that can hardly be exaggerated. The postal laws have been abused in the past, and there is no assurance now that the administration may not seek to invoke its postal policing powers against others in political opposition."

"The postal regulations as now drawn make possible roundabout invasion of freedom of utterance and deprive the object of this attack of access to the courts and the right of review, since he is compelled to stand his trial and offer his defense before the very authorities of the postal department who have condemned his publication in the first instance."

The Postmaster General's attack upon *The Militant* is such a threat to freedom of the press that even powerful capitalist publications have been impelled to protest against it.

It Is Time to Build An Independent Labor Party

Coal Operators Block Agreement With UMW

(Continued from page 1)

comply with his strike-breaking orders would be reclassified by their local draft boards.

The Policy Committee of the UMW, in ordering the coal miners to return to work on Monday, June 7, made clear that this action was only another truce "up to and including June 20." The Policy Committee directive stated that "this action was taken to protect your union and its membership."

The lackeys of the coal and steel barons in Congress, however, are busy right now, trying to protect their masters against the possibility of another general miners' strike. Both the House and Senate have passed versions of the Smith-Connally anti-strike bill, the most ambitious attempt at union-busting, yet to come out of Congress. If this bill is permitted to become law, John L. Lewis, all the officers of the UMW, as well as the ordinary committee men in the mines, could be fined \$5,000 and sent to jail in case the coal miners walk out again on June 20 and the officers of the UMW refuse to convert themselves into scab-herders and strike-breakers. It is now clear that the industrialists would like to provoke the coal miners into another strike and be in a position to crush it in cold blood.

AFL-CIO LEADERS BEAR ONUS

Not the least responsibility for the hard fight which the miners are forced to wage on behalf of their just demand falls on the

heads of the top officialdom of the AFL and CIO. From the first days of the coal controversy they have acted as the waterboys for Roosevelt. They have supported his attempts to "isolate" the miners and to break the unity of their ranks.

Both the AFL and CIO Executive Boards, meeting in the midst of the coal crisis, saw fit to condemn the miners' strike and to take that occasion to reiterate their determination to keep the labor movement in the chains of the no-strike pledge. This treacherous conduct was climaxed on June 2 when the AFL and CIO representatives joined with labor-hating industrialists and their professional lackeys of the WLB in denouncing the second miners' strike and directing the mine operators to break off negotiations with the unions. These traitorous "labor-statements" sought to drive the knife deeper into the hearts of the miners when they supported Roosevelt's order instructing the coal miners to return to work with the implied threat that troops would be sent to the mine fields if the miners did not comply with his order.

MINER'S FIGHT CONTINUES

The men who dig the coal are still continuing the fight. Their magnificent conduct in the second miners' strike has demonstrated that they are contemptuous of threats and that their hearts are indeed of oak. In the last three months they have so dramatized the plight of the coal miners that no one dares repeat today the slander that the miners have no

grievances and that the mine strikes arose as a result of the action of one individual. They have given the lie to this slander again in the battle they waged against calling off the second mine strike and granting another truce.

Even as late as Wednesday June 9, thousands of miners in Pennsylvania, W. Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky refused to return to work until the operators signed a satisfactory contract with the union.

The miners may not have many friends among the top officialdom of the AFL and CIO. But the rank and file of the most progressive unions of both labor federations have demonstrated that they are back of the miners and their heroic fight. The problem of the miners today is how to achieve organizational and united labor support for their fight; how to translate the moral sympathy of the AFL and CIO rank and file into solid organizational backing.

The miners must insist that their Policy Committee employ the same aggressiveness and energy displayed in the coal fight in securing the active backing of the auto workers, rubber workers, steel workers, etc., etc. The miners' fight is crucial for the whole labor movement. The solidarity of the most important industrial unions in this fight will insure victory. It is the duty of every trade union militant to work for the achievement of such a united labor front.

CORPORATION ADMITS GUILT

Anaconda Wire and Cable Co. of Indiana, one of the corporations caught red-handed in selling defective materials for Lend-Lease and the armed forces, has "agreed to enter pleas of nolo contendere in the government's \$5,000,000 war fraud case against them." (N. Y. Times, June 8.)

The company was indicted last December by a grand jury on eight counts of conspiracy to defraud.

The case against these profiteers is so airtight that they have chosen to throw themselves on the mercy of the court rather than have their crimes openly aired.

TIMELY ARTICLES IN JUNE F. I.

The three month coal crisis which has shaken the entire country and precipitated a rift in the relations between Roosevelt and organized labor is carefully analyzed by E. R. Frank in his important article in the June issue of the Fourth International just off the press. This noted mid-west trade-unionist reviews the development of the dispute between the UMW and the coal operators and explains the profound consequences of the miners' fight upon the entire labor movement.

Albert Parker, popular columnist on *The Negro Struggle* in *The Militant*, contributes an article on "The Negro in the Post-war World" which demonstrates why Jim Crow will not only continue but become worse if decaying capitalism is not replaced by a socialist society.

The Fourth International deserves congratulations for making available in English for the first time one of the classic documents from the literature of the October Revolution, Larissa Reissner's eye-witness account of the birth of the Red Army at Syvazhsk. Also featured in the June issue is the official statement of the Socialist Workers Party on the dissolution of the Comintern, Washington's Plans for Italy by Felix Morrow, and The Month in Review by the Editors.

The F. I. sells for 20 cents a copy; \$2 for a year's subscription. Order from the Business Manager, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

WHY we Defend the Soviet Union
By ALBERT GOLDMAN
Pioneer Publishers
116 University Place
New York City

Important UAW Locals Back Labor Party

By JOHN SAUNDERS

DETROIT, June 4.—The strikes of the miners, the rubber workers of Akron, the auto workers of Detroit, and the series of lesser strikes throughout the country, make clear that the apathy which has for so long permeated the ranks of labor is beginning to disappear. In the course of these strikes the workers have run headlong against the entire governmental machinery which has forced them back on the job without securing the many demands or settling the grievances which have been piling up since Pearl Harbor. This has at least given the workers sufficient food for thought. To help along their thinking process both houses of Congress have been pushing through anti-strike and anti-union legislation.

These events have squarely posed before the rank and file workers of Detroit, the absolute necessity of forming an Independent Labor Party. The sentiment in the ranks was best expressed by a worker on the floor at the last meeting of Hudson Local 154-UAW on May 28 when he stated: "We are sick and tired of the 'friends of labor.' What we want and need are labor men in Congress."

This local then and there went on record for a labor party and directed its representatives to the coming State CIO convention on June 28 at Detroit to speak for the formation of such a party. This followed similar action by Briggs Local 212, Detroit Steel Products Local 351, Fleetwood Local 15, and Chevrolet Drop Forge Local 262, all of the UAW. Other locals in Detroit and Flint have been holding educational meetings around the labor party question, indicating the direction in which the workers are moving.

The Labor's Non-Partisan League Convention which takes place on June 11-12 will most likely further help to crystallize the sentiments of the ranks and push them forward on the road of independent political action. Although the LNPL is far from being a representative body of all the local unions of Michigan, any progressive action taken at this convention will stimulate the political awakening of the workers and serve as a basis for the formation of a progressive group that will push independent labor action at the next State CIO convention.

That the Stalinists fear the setting up of an independent labor party was clearly indicated in a recent meeting of the Wayne County Council which they dominate and where the Stalinist wheelhorse Nat Ganley, business agent of Local 155-UAW, attacked the LNPL for fostering independent political action on the part of labor. Ganley said it was alright to have the American Labor Party in New York where the Democratic Party was controlled by the Farley forces who were opposed to Commander-in-Chief Roosevelt and where the Republicans were likewise against the President's policies. This condition did not apply to Detroit, maintained Ganley, where the Democratic Mayor Jeffries was a good Roosevelt man and therefore there was no need for setting up a labor party. The Democratic machine, which Ganley admitted was thoroughly riddled with old-line wardheelers, is good enough for the Stalinists.

Just as in their attempts to stop the workers from strike struggles, so by their opposition to an Independent Labor Party the Stalinists have exposed their reactionary role to new sections of the working class whose political consciousness is awakening in this period. The inexorable logic of the present situation is driving the workers to independent political action. The resolutions of the Briggs, Hudson, Steel Products, Fleetwood and Chevrolet Locals are signs of this trend.

AFL-CIO Leaders Seek To Salvage Bankrupt OPA

To its record of bankruptcy, the OPA is adding new scandalous pages of petty grafting, profiteering, etc. In recent days have come revelations concerning Mr. Maxon, deputy administrator of the Detroit OPA, who utilized his post in order to stock up rationed food items, coffee, sugar, etc. in the Maxon "cabin," consisting of 11 buildings, three bars, a baseball diamond and a golf course.

In New York Russell M. Potter, on quitting his post as local OPA director, charged that "right within the heart of the OPA we have a situation more insidious than any Black Market." (N. Y. Times, June 4.)

The OPA and its policies were denounced last month as "a complete flop" by the AFL Executive Council. Its statement declared that there had been only "feeble, fumbling, half-hearted efforts. . . to keep prices in check;" that the entire price control program "has broken down;" and the much publicized roll-back was just a "mockery."

Instead of reducing prices, the roll-back policy of the OPA, the AFL statement adds, has made it possible "for profiteers to create artificial food shortages and to reap unconscionable profits through black market operations."

Two weeks ago, 200 members of Local 12 UAW-CIO picketed the Toledo office of the OPA, carrying placards demanding an end to sky-rocketing food costs. This demonstration was conducted by shop stewards and committeemen who spoke for 30,000 workers in sixty of Toledo's industrial plants.

On June 4, Green and Murray left a joint statement in the White House declaring that the OPA "has failed to roll back or even hold prices of strategic cost of living items. Many OPA dollars and cents price ceilings are higher than the high food prices reached in the first week in May."

This being the actual case, one would think that the AFL-CIO leaders would stop pinning any hopes on such a discredited institution. Instead, the leaders of the UAW-CIO plead in full-page ads on June 3 that the "OPA should be strengthened not destroyed." Green and Murray rush to Washington—to appeal that the OPA be "compelled" to do what it is impotent to accomplish.

Real wage increases, not phony tongue-in-the-cheek promises, are what all workers need to meet soaring living costs. That is why the miners' struggle has the overwhelming support of the rank and file of organized labor.