

Fourth International

Militarization of the USA and the Tasks of the Socialist Workers Party

Thirteenth SWP Convention Resolution

The Struggles of the Colonial Peoples and the World Revolution

*Resolution Adopted by 2nd World Congress
of Fourth International -- April 1948*

Editorials

THE THIRTEENTH
CONVENTION
OF THE
SOCIALIST
WORKERS
PARTY

•
THE SECOND WORLD
CONGRESS
OF THE
FOURTH
INTERNATIONAL

Manager's Column

Radio Speeches Bring F. I. Subs

We have received the first few **Fourth International** subscriptions as a direct result of the Socialist Workers Party Presidential Campaign radio broadcasts. They are \$2.50 combination subs including **The Militant**, weekly paper of the SWP. They came among the very first **Militant** subs from radio listeners.

Since these resulted from only the first broadcast, and there were six more radio speeches which brought even greater immediate response, it is reasonable to expect a considerable increase in the reading of Socialist Workers Party literature, as one important result of the Dobbs-Carlson Campaign.

Of the millions of listeners who heard some part of these radio messages, more than 650 have already written for literature, often in quantities. Obviously thousands of others are also interested and may eventually be reached directly. At all events, this was their first introduction to the SWP.

All who wrote for copies of the radio speeches received them in copies of **The Militant**, along with the election platform of the SWP. Many will surely subscribe. Several have already ordered Pioneer Publishers literature and others will surely do likewise. Requests keep arriving in every mail.

ORDER BUNDLES OF ELECTION PLATFORM

YOU, too, can help spread the message of revolutionary Socialism in this Presidential Campaign by ordering bundles of **The Militant**, containing the radio speeches and platform. The June 7 issue, with the second radio speech by Farrell Dobbs, SWP Presidential candidate, is nearly exhausted. But the others are still available in quantities.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 9 July 1948 No. 5 (Whole No. 87)

Published Monthly by the Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: Algonquin 4-9330. Subscription rates: \$1.00 for 6 issues; \$2.00 for 12 issues; bundles, 20c for 5 copies and up. Foreign: \$1.50 for 6 issues; \$2.50 for 12 issues; bundles, 21c for 5 copies and up.

Re-entered as second-class matter May 27, 1948, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Managing Editor: E. R. FRANK

CONTENTS

The Thirteenth Convention of the Socialist Workers Party 131
By the Editors

Militarization of the USA and the Socialist Workers Party Tasks 134
 Adopted by the 13th National Convention of the SWP

The Second World Congress of the Fourth International 142
By the Editors

The Struggles of the Colonial Peoples and the World Revolution 144

Resolution Adopted by Second World Congress

A Letter from Ceylon 158

The first broadcast by Dobbs is in the May 24 issue. The July 12 six-page Convention issue contains the keynote speech by James P. Cannon, SWP National Secretary, plus

the acceptance speeches of Farrell Dobbs and Grace Carlson, candidate for Vice President, plus the campaign platform. The July 19 issue contains the second acceptance

speeches of Dobbs and Carlson broadcast after the convention.

Bundle prices of these issues are:

July 12	May 24 or July 19
20 for \$1	30 for \$1
50 for \$2	70 for \$2
150 for \$5	200 for \$3
3-issue sets	
10 sets \$1	
25 sets \$2	
75 sets \$5	

Fully 85% of **Fourth International** subscribers also read **The Militant**. More than half of recent new and renewal subscriptions are \$2.50 combination subs including **The Militant** at only 50c a year besides the regular \$2 charge for this magazine. Evidently, our new readers know an unmatched bargain when they see one — 52 issues of a 5c weekly paper for 50c—and the only combination in America that offers a thoroughly Marxist presentation of world events and labor news.

The special \$2.50 combination price cannot be listed on the expiration notices mailed with the magazine, but subscribers may alter these forms or use the coupon on this page when renewing.

“Certainly happy to see the F. I. coming out each month again,” wrote C.S. of Alaska, extending his sub another year.

The 1947 bound volume of **Fourth International** will be ready shortly. It can be shipped anywhere in the world for \$4.50. The index for the year by authors and subjects is available at 50c.

Nearly half of the June subscriptions, 27, came direct from readers and the rest from branches. New York led with 10, followed by Los Angeles, 8; Philadelphia and San Francisco, 5 each, and Minneapolis 4; 12 were foreign subs, 2 new ones and 5 renewals from Canada.

World Events in the Light of Marxist Analysis

**Fourth International
 116 University Place
 New York 3, N. Y.**



I am enclosing \$.....
 Send me
 Fourth International for
 () 6 issues\$1.00
 Foreign \$1.50
 () 12 issues\$2.00
 Foreign \$2.50

Name
 Address Zone
 City State

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 9

JULY 1948

NUMBER 5

The Thirteenth Convention

of the

Socialist Workers Party

By The Editors

The Thirteenth National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party, held July 1-5 in New York City, was preceded by the Republican and Democratic conventions and followed by that of the Wallace party. These four conventions offered sharp contrasts in their respective class characters and political roles.

Three of these conventions, despite minor outward differences, possessed the same class character and fulfilled an identical political function. The Democrats, the Republicans and the Wallaceites frankly came forward as defenders of the rotting capitalist system. As such, their program was devoted primarily to preparing for a new war.

The Republicans and Democrats did this by ratifying through their conventions their Congressional bi-partisan war conspiracy with its ECA, its huge military budgets, "peacetime" conscription of the youth, its red-baiting, its anti-labor offensive, and so on. The Wallaceites paraded as a "peace party" opposed to these bi-partisan warmakers. But pacifism of the Wallace variety is a no less necessary element in capitalist war preparations than the Prussian-type militarism of Republicans and Democrats. While the latter arms the imperialist military machine, the former disarms and disorients the people in their resistance against the warmakers.

In direct contrast, the convention of the American Trotskyists was a genuine mobilization of anti-war fighters. Our program and our spokesmen correctly linked the struggle against war with the workers' struggle to abolish capitalist rule and install socialism.

From this Convention came the call for a new revolutionary change in the USA. The Sons and Daughters of Liberty, heralds of the fight for Independence in the Eighteenth Century; and the heroic Abolitionists, torchbearers of the anti-slavery crusade in the mid-Nineteenth Century, found their Twentieth Century continuators in the participants in the SWP Convention.

Today's Freedom Fighters serve and speak for a new rising class—the industrial workers; they consciously blaze the trail for the socialist reconstruction of society; they are fierce guardians of the people's democratic rights against

the tyranny of the rich and privileged. That is why this Convention issued its clarion call for a completely new type of political regime—the Workers and Farmers Government.

The difference between the three capitalist parties and their revolutionary opponents was no less marked in the character of the delegates to the respective conventions.

Holding the center of the stage at the Republican and Democratic conclaves were the corrupt machine politicians, the corporation lawyers, the Big Brass and the whole retinue of office-seekers, wardheelers and grafters. There was not a single true representative of the working people among them. Those who spoke "in the name" of the people were actually their mortal foes, concerned exclusively with exploiting the poor for personal gain and in the interests of the billionaires.

The Wallaceites, who posed as champions of the people against these servants of the monopolists, are no less skilled in the art of false promises. The "New Party" convention was dominated by two types of political procurers: Liberal phrasemongers leashed to capitalism and Stalinist stooges promoting the Kremlin's foreign policy.

The delegates to the SWP Convention were in their majority members, builders and leaders of unions in basic industries. Incorruptible, virile and dynamic, they were a representative selection of American working men, women and youth, both Negro and white, whose life's work is to build the political instrument for the liberation of the American people.

The whole contrast between the capitalist conventions and that of the SWP was memorably summarized by James P. Cannon, the Party's National Secretary, in his keynote speech on "The Two Americas," broadcast to the country on July 1.

"There are two Americas," he said. "One is the America of the imperialists—of the little clique of capitalists, landlords, and militarists who are threatening and terrifying the world. This is the America that the people of the world hate and fear.

"There is the other America—the America of the work-

ers and farmers and the 'little people.' They constitute the great majority of the people. They do the work of the country. They revere its old democratic traditions; its old record of friendship for the people of other lands, in their struggles against kings and despots; its generous asylum once freely granted to the oppressed.

"This is the America which must and will solve the world crisis—by taking power out of the hands of the little clique of exploiters and parasites, and establishing a government of workers and farmers."

The Work of the Convention

The SWP Convention had a twofold character. It was both a public action and an intra-party gathering. The one launched the first presidential campaign in the twenty years of the American Trotskyist movement. It provided a forum from which the SWP presidential and vice-presidential candidates, Comrades Farrell Dobbs and Grace Carlson, brought over national radio networks the message of socialism to millions of Americans.

The other aspect of the Convention was concentrated upon ways and means of implementing the presidential campaign along with the program and work of the party in the day-to-day struggle in the next immediate period. In this respect, it was a gathering of co-thinkers preoccupied with building a stronger and better party organization.

Despite the limited resources and numerical strength of the Party, these two distinct political tasks were carried out in the best traditions of Trotskyism. The Convention was a magnificent success.

In its public action and internal deliberations alike, the Convention was true to the spirit of revolutionary Marxism which demands unswerving allegiance to principles and straight-forward answers to all vital problems of the working class.

The radio speeches boldly challenged the capitalist regime with hard-hitting agitation, effectively delivered in the spirit of Bill Haywood, Eugene V. Debs and other pioneers of American Socialism and Communism. The power of these broadcasts is confirmed by hundreds of letters from listeners in every part of the country, asking information about the Party, requesting literature for distribution in their locality, and offering to help in our election campaign.

This stirring start for the SWP presidential campaign likewise stimulated and inspired the party ranks who had just passed through a painful period of recession in activities. This came as a reflection of the ebb in labor militancy caused in the main by the misleadership and betrayals of the top union bureaucracy, the Social Democrats and the Stalinists.

The SWP aims to transform itself into a party of mass action. Such a party would become the decisive factor in the struggles of the workers and in the political life of the country as a whole. Today, however, the SWP is too small and weak to play such a role. But, on the other hand, the Party is already so deeply rooted in the key industries and among the Negro people that it is extremely sensitive to every change in the moods of the

masses. The SWP is no sect which is satisfied to eke out a test-tube existence apart from the living mass movement.

The Party's first presidential campaign permits the Party at this stage of its growth to intervene as an important force in national and labor political affairs. Thereby it is enabled to acquire further experience and skill in applying and perfecting the agitation methods of a mass party. The spontaneous response to the Convention broadcasts has shown how much resentment is pent up in the American people against the capitalist rulers and their government in Washington.

In the atmosphere of enthusiasm generated by the launching of the presidential campaign, the Convention approached with sobriety and calm resolution the tremendous practical tasks confronting the Party.

Fittingly enough, the first point on the agenda dealt with the world situation and the progress made by the world Trotskyist movement. The Convention saluted the achievements of the Second World Congress of the Fourth International, expressing itself in agreement with the programmatic documents it has issued. (The International and Russian Resolutions of this Congress appeared in the June issue of our magazine; the Colonial Resolution appears elsewhere in this issue.)

Next came the report and discussion on the present position of American capitalism and its war preparations. The American Resolution, which was unanimously adopted, is published in full below.

While a few delegates supported a Minority Report urging the Party to find a way to participate in the Wallace movement, the controversy over the Wallace issue played a subordinate role in the Convention discussions. It was apparent that the SWP's own election campaign had settled the issue, at least for the year 1948.

There was a rich report and extensive discussion on the trade union question, revolving around the task of building a broad left wing capable of giving new leadership to organized labor.

Next to the presidential campaign speeches, the high point of the Convention was undoubtedly the report and discussion on the Negro Question. The Negro Resolution was based on the invaluable experiences the Party has gone through in this field during and since World War II. It was further enriched by the contributions of those Negro revolutionists who have come to the fore in the Party leadership. The adoption of this resolution marks the beginning of an internal party discussion on all aspects of the Negro problem.

The theoretical progress of the Party in determining its positions on different aspects of the coming American Revolution can be charted by the major resolutions at its last three Conventions. In 1944, our Party settled its line on the principal issues of world politics; in 1946, it produced the Theses on the Coming American Revolution; now in 1948, it has set forth its position on the Negro Struggle.

In addition to its regular day sessions, the work of the Convention was forwarded by a series of evening panel discussions. These covered the various departments of

Party activity in the unions, in the localities, among the Negroes, in relief work, in party literature and propaganda, etc. In the Organizers' Panel, plans for expanding Party work among the youth were adopted.

The growing penetration of the Party into the class struggle was expressed graphically by the concentration of these panels not on abstract generalizations but rather on how best to carry out Party policy and tasks in all these fields of practical activity.

In passing, the Convention disposed of the question of unity with the Workers Party which had itself rejected some time ago unification as a realistic proposition.

On the other hand, the Convention signaled the complete integration into our ranks of the former Johnson-Forrest tendency, which had broken with the Shachtmanites a year ago.

The Convention as a whole and, in particular, the launching of the presidential campaign, constitutes a vindication of the confidence of the Party in its future. Here, too, is another vindication of the confidence that Leon Trotsky, our great martyred leader, expressed repeatedly in the future of the American Trotskyist movement

Revolutionary Optimism

This spirit of revolutionary optimism pervaded the Convention. Our assurance that socialism will eventually be victorious in America reflects the dynamic political strength inherent in the young American working class. No major defeat has ever been suffered by the American workers. Although they are still groping their way toward clear consciousness of their political tasks, they enjoy the incomparable advantage of having no entrenched or fossilized political bureaucracy such as the Social Democracy or Stalinism to break through. There is every possibility that once they break definitively from the capitalist parties they will tend more and more to pass directly into the camp of revolutionary socialism.

The revolutionary optimism of the Convention was expressed most strikingly in the resolute determination to

bring the message of Trotskyism to the American workers in 1948 on a scale never before attempted by the Party. Through the first presidential campaign of the Socialist Workers Party the Delegates correctly saw an unparalleled opportunity to smash the conspiracy of silence on the part of the capitalist press and the lies and slanders of Stalinism; and to reach the working people throughout our land with the truth about the practical possibility of building socialism here. What is more, the opportunity of striking hammer blows against the war plans of the imperialists through the presidential campaign raised the morale of the Convention to new heights.

The Convention voted to raise the largest fund in Party history — \$25,000 to finance the presidential campaign and strengthen the Party. This means great sacrifices for every Party member. However, the Delegates were confident that the friends and sympathizers of the Socialist Workers Party will respond to the unexampled opportunity before us with enthusiasm equal to theirs and that new friends will be found during the campaign who will do their utmost to see that lack of funds does not stand in the way of bringing the message of revolutionary socialism to the maximum number of people.

We urge all our readers to ask their friends to back the presidential campaign of the Socialist Workers Party by sending contributions to the Dobbs-Carlson Fund, 116 University Place, New York 3, N.Y. Your help can do much toward assuring the success of the Dobbs-Carlson Campaign.

The Thirteenth National Convention marks an important phase in the transition of the Socialist Workers Party from a propaganda group to a party of mass action. After long years of study, training and persevering work the Delegates felt the hour had struck for the first big steps in the Party's expansion.

After five full days of rich, educational sessions, the Delegates set out for their homes and their front-line, local party duties charged with confidence and revolutionary determination. The entire Party, one felt, sizing up the Thirteenth Convention soberly and dialectically, is ready for *action, action, and still more action.*

***Spread the message of Socialist Liberation from coast to coast.
Support the 1948 struggle for a Workers and Farmers Govern-
ment and a Socialist America. Send your contributions now to
the Dobbs-Carlson Election Campaign Fund.***

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK 3, NEW YORK

Militarization of the USA

and the

Socialist Workers Party Tasks

Adopted by the 13th National Convention of the SWP, July 1-5, 1948

1. U. S. Imperialism Three Years After World War II

American capitalism came out of World War II victorious not only over its rivals, Germany and Japan, but also over all its "democratic" allies. No power has ever enjoyed such overwhelming preponderance. The monopoly of the atom bomb underscores its supremacy in industry, finance, diplomacy and military affairs.

But in the third postwar year, American capitalism is still far from having attained the imperialist objectives it seeks.

The Far Eastern markets, richest potential area of exploitation, offer now less favorable opportunities for industrial and financial investment than was the case three years ago. Civil war continues in China; Chiang Kai-shek's regime staggers from one military and economic calamity to another. China has become a bottomless drain on Washington instead of the expected reservoir of super-profits. Indo-China and Indonesia are striving to free themselves from French and Dutch imperialism. Elsewhere in the Far East similar conditions of instability prevent American capitalism from fully exploiting these colonial markets and natural resources.

Moreover, American imperialism collides here, as in the Near East and Europe itself, not only with the insurgent masses but also with the power of the Kremlin and its agencies.

Although capitalist rule has been reinforced in Western Europe, thanks to Washington's large-scale intervention and the Kremlin's counter-revolutionary policies, most of the countries there are either bankrupt or approaching insolvency. Despite the modest successes of capitalist reconstruction, despite almost \$20 billion in American grants and loans since V-E Day, inflation continues to rage in Western Europe, slashing deeply into the people's living standards. The partition of Europe into Anglo-American and Soviet spheres of influence blocks the capitalist rehabilitation of Western Europe and generates the sharpest conflicts between Washington and Moscow.

The existing relation of world economic and political forces is more and more intolerable for U.S. imperialism. Toward the close of the third postwar year it is unable to maintain even previous levels of exploiting the world market and world resources. Clear proof of this is the steady decline in U.S. foreign exports and investments since 1947.

Since last November, U.S. export trade has dropped twenty percent and more. In the export of capital the situation is more critical. Foreign investments, which had been flowing out at the annual rate of \$8 billion, by the first quarter of 1948 dropped one-half, that is, to an annual rate of \$4 billion.

Coupled with this deterioration in foreign trade and foreign investments are the political paroxysms which further upset the highly unstable world economy and postpone prospects of stability. As the Bogota events indicate, these upheavals break out not alone in Europe or Asia but within the closed preserve of Latin America itself.

The economic provisions of the Marshall Plan, rebaptized as the European Co-operation Act (ECA), are specifically designed to:

1. Avert the bankruptcy of Western European capitalism;
2. Sustain sagging U.S. exports;
3. Stimulate export of capital by the government's underwriting an increasing share of foreign investments.

To what extent can these three aims be achieved by dumping new billions of dollars through the ECA into Europe? The ECA can undoubtedly postpone for a limited time the total collapse of European capitalism and provide it with an additional breathing spell. But the ECA cannot restore to capitalist Europe either health or any prolonged equilibrium.

The ECA can artificially stimulate U.S. foreign trade. But even Washington spokesmen have acknowledged that the highest postwar levels will not be regained.

The ECA can step up foreign investments. But there are far narrower limits to dumping agricultural surpluses abroad than to placing foreign loans and investments. Even with the ECA, Wall Street has little hope of returning to the \$8 billion annual rate of foreign investments.

The Marshall Plan billions can no more overcome the basic economic difficulties of American and European capitalism than have the billions already poured out.

The efforts of American monopolists to maintain and stabilize capitalist economy on a "peacetime" basis have proved unavailing not only in Western Europe but also at home. Since V-J Day the postwar boom has had to be

propped up by one major inflationary measure after another.

Most important among these have been the scores of billions of dollars spent for direct military purposes and for foreign loans and grants. The "peacetime" military establishment has been the largest single business in the country, diverting vast quantities of raw materials and necessities into arms production and aggravating all shortages resulting from the war. Prior to the ECA, billions of dollars in grants and loans supplied the greatest single foreign outlet for industry, agriculture and finance.

Despite these and other inflationary measures, within less than three years the output of civilian production in many lines sufficed to saturate foreign and domestic markets. Industry has kept operating at boom levels primarily through speculation. Consequently, inventories are past the \$50 million mark, an all-time record; credit

and installment buying have doubled and trebled, while private debts, commercial and agricultural loans, home and farm mortgages, etc., have likewise multiplied manifold. These are preconditions for a colossal crash.

The sudden speeding up of Wall Street's preparations for World War III primarily arises from its inability to find other means to improve its position on the world arena and at home.

The deepening crisis of European capitalism, the international economic difficulties of Wall Street, the fears of oncoming depression—these are the main factors which more and more exclude continued operation of U.S. economy on its previous "peacetime" basis. These are the compelling international and internal economic forces behind the launching of the Marshall Plan and the new arms program.

2. The Shift Over to War Economy

The drive of American capitalism toward war, issuing from the foregoing conditions, becomes more and more dominant not only in world political relations but also in the economic situation at home.

At present American economy is at the beginning of a transition from the postwar "peacetime" boom to a war economy.

This new development makes necessary a correction in our estimate of the position and prospects of U. S. capitalism set forth in our resolution, "From a Propaganda Group to a Party of Mass Action," adopted by the November 1946 SWP Convention.

Two years ago, we predicted a collapse of American economy and foresaw "growing unemployment and declining production" as the "real prospects directly ahead."

These predictions have failed to materialize. In place of the anticipated economic crash, American imperialism is plunging into a new arms boom. Instead of deflation and unemployment, the masses at home and abroad are confronted by a war crisis, with all its dire consequences.

Two years ago, we did envisage that the world and domestic contradictions of American imperialism could pass over into a war crisis. This variant was discussed in a special section, "Preparations for World War III," which remains valid today. What we then failed to foresee was the speed with which the drive to war would tend to coalesce with the maturing of the international and internal economic crisis. We underestimated how greatly the contradictions of American and world capitalism have become aggravated, how quickly they acquire extremely virulent forms, and how explosively they erupt.

Preconditions for the crash toward which the postwar "peacetime" economy has been heading are imbedded in the present situation of American capitalism. Under certain circumstances, they can erupt with volcanic violence. However, the beginnings of the shift to a war economy now cut across "peacetime" economy.

To the degree that this shift to war economy is speeded up, the threat of immediate depression becomes more remote, since economic factors of a different order then

come to the fore. A capitalist war economy operates in a different manner from "peacetime" economy. The government war machine becomes not only the largest, but the sole, customer for goods and services in one field after another, and thereby temporarily takes care "for the duration" of the problems of foreign and domestic outlets for industry, agriculture and finance.

On the other hand, to the degree that the change-over to a full-fledged war economy is halted or delayed for any considerable interval, the American monopolists would face an even worse economic depression than the one they are now seeking so desperately to escape.

Even in its initial stages the new armament program has become a major economic factor, and tends to alter existing economic conditions, along with the plans and prospects of the capitalist class.

For example, it has already alleviated the economic threat of huge inventories; the prospect of new war shortages induces industry to operate at full "peacetime" capacity, before its war reconversion; it has already spurred Stock Exchange speculation.

While it is too early to estimate how quickly the shift to war economy will proceed, a series of economic, political, military and diplomatic factors will serve to accelerate the push of American capitalism toward a full-scale war economy.

There is the Marshall Military Program for rearming Western Europe, which must presently supplement the Marshall "Aid" Program.

There are the additional billions of dollars in appropriations for the expanded war machine and the conscripted armed forces which will far surpass the sums already allocated for the 70-group Air Force.

Moreover, the limitations of the ECA leave open the possibility of an abrupt worsening of the economic situation both in Western Europe and in the Western Hemisphere. Such a turn in world economy could speed up total war reconversion. Meanwhile the flow of goods in the debilitated world market must more and more tend to be diverted from "normal" channels into feeding the military,

machines of Wall Street as well as of the Kremlin. Increasing billions of foreign capital will likewise flow into war speculation.

Inflation has grown in every country since the termination of hostilities. World inflation is bound to be aggravated in the extreme as Wall Street's rearmament program gathers momentum.

The new arms boom will enormously speed up the inflationary spiral which began with the preparations for World War II, climbed throughout the war years, and soared to record peaks during the postwar boom.

Sooner or later, as the war boom intensifies, the government will be obliged to institute economic controls for the benefit of the capitalist regime which will deal harder and harder blows to the workers' living standards. Laws and decrees will freeze wages while inflation rages beneath a blanket of fictitious price regulations.

* * *

No major capitalist country has attempted to pass from peacetime industrial operation back to a war-footing so soon after a major war.

No major country has ever launched a huge rearmament program without first introducing controls (controlling credit and currency, "regulating" prices, rationing raw materials and basic necessities, freezing wages, and so on).

In place of prewar surpluses we now find shortages of labor and goods. The new arms program coupled with the ECA will aggravate existing shortages and create new ones.

On the eve of rearmament for World War II, U.S. economy had ample room for expansion in industry and agriculture; prices were low; an army of 10 million unemployed provided ample labor reserves. Today, with in-

dustry and agriculture operating at their peaks, expansion of armaments can occur primarily only at the expense of one civilian sector after another. Prices are at all-time highs and moving still higher. Labor shortages, despite signs of lagging employment, must become acute as the armament program gathers headway.

The country's fiscal and credit structure was deflated on the eve of World War II. Moreover, the initial strains were relieved by huge armament orders which England, France, and other countries were able to pay for. Today the domestic fiscal and credit structure is highly inflated. New deficit government spending looms directly ahead, providing a most powerful stimulus for further fiscal and credit inflation.

On the eve of World War II, American agriculture could expand to the maximum. Today American agricultural surpluses are no longer being absorbed by foreign outlets. Washington is confronted with the choice of permitting the agricultural price structure to collapse, or of sustaining it by huge subsidies. The former course would destroy the existing balance between agriculture and industry; the latter course would increase deficit government spending.

Domestic civilian consumption must contract in proportion to the diversion of industry into war production.

These and other new conditions surrounding the launching of the new arms boom, will introduce grave complications into the process of war reconversion. The war reconversion of 1939-41, when the arms boom took up the slack in the domestic market and propelled industry to new heights, was effected under far more favorable conditions than loom ahead. American monopolists will hardly be able to duplicate in the next period what happened on the eve of U.S. entry into World War II.

3. *Wall Street's War Drive*

Our warning two years ago about U.S. imperialist preparations for World War III is the terrible reality today.

The continued existence of the Soviet Union and its role as the second world power presents an insurmountable obstacle to Wall Street's unrestricted exploitation of the world market and world resources, despite any assistance the Kremlin may offer to Washington in return for another agreement.

American imperialists have taken the conquest of the Soviet Union as their strategic aim. Like the German imperialists, they believe that by crushing the USSR they can entrench their power and infuse decaying capitalism with new vigor. The date for the attack, its precise form, as well as possible temporary pacts with the Kremlin, are questions of a tactical order. Such agreements may delay but cannot avert war, any more than did Hitler's pact with Stalin.

Should conditions appear unfavorable, Washington will delay the full-scale assault. But, given propitious circumstances, it can launch an early attack.

With the institution of a big standing "peacetime" army and the mushrooming of the brass hat bureaucracy, militarism, as Trotsky warned years ago, has become a

permanent feature of American life. In the past militarism and dictatorial regimes appeared peculiar to Europe. Today it is evident that the U.S. is not immune to these evils. Indeed, U.S. militarism may surpass its European precursors.

The military caste is already installed as a key faction in Washington's bi-partisan coalition. The brass hats honeycomb the Washington bureaucracy, infiltrating Congress, surrounding the White House, dominating the State Department. Foreign policy is directed by the former Army Chief of Staff. The military men, mobilizing enormous pressure, intervene in the passage of legislation vitally affecting labor's welfare. In occupied territories American Generals rule in the style of Roman proconsuls or Hitler's Gauleiters. The promotion of MacArthur and Eisenhower for the presidency discloses the sweep of this trend to saddle the country with a militarist regime.

In the hands of these labor-hating militarists, a big standing army constitutes a deadly menace to the trade unions. For the first time in its history, American labor sees looming the peril of military dictatorship.

These developments place the struggle against capitalist militarism in the forefront of labor's tasks.

4. Party Tasks in the Fight Against the Warmakers

The analysis made and the slogans raised in Sections 2, 3 and 4 of our 1946 resolution [see *Fourth International*, January 1947] are applicable today in the fight against the warmakers.

The anti-war sentiments pervading the populace have not yet broken through the surface only for the lack of proper political leadership and organization. Our program of anti-war struggle will receive in the coming days a readier hearing among the masses of workers and farmers, the Negroes and other minorities, the youth and the women who hate and fear the prospect of a new war.

The Democratic and Republican parties are conscious war parties, preparing and mobilizing the country for the coming conflict. The top official union leaders act as their assistants and willing tools.

Exploiting the widespread anti-war feelings of the masses, Wallace and his "peace" party are seeking to divert them from a genuine struggle against the warmakers. Wallace confines his "peace movement" within capitalist channels and limits it to demands for another deal between Washington and Moscow. Wallace has already served notice in the press that he will drop even his present pretense of opposition once war is declared. Thus Wallace duplicates the role of similar petty-bourgeois "peace" movements of the past which at the most critical moment betrayed the anti-war struggle and joined the war-mongers.

When the Stalinists promote the Wallace movement as the answer to the need for an effective anti-war party, they are deliberately deceiving the workers. In line with the policy of the Kremlin, the Communist Party is using the Wallace party as a means of pressuring Washington into another pact with Stalin. Workers can place no confidence in a "peace party" headed by the millionaire Wallace.

Nor can they trust the caricature Socialist Party of Norman Thomas who, after a brief show of verbal opposition, endorsed Wall Street's entry into World War II. Thomas is equally ready to support the next war.

The struggle against war is inseparable from a political struggle against all these parties and the war-breeding capitalist system they support. The anti-war struggle is inseparable from the struggle to replace capitalism by the planned economy of socialism. It is possible to prevent the outbreak of World War III only through the victory of the workers' fight for socialism.

With the drive toward war and military dictatorship, our program and slogans against capitalist militarism acquire exceptional timeliness. Events themselves will help teach the workers that they must set as their goal the acquisition of independent skill and power in the military as well as in the political fields.

The capitalists have imposed a conscript army on the American people. The workers should oppose this and demand its abolition. To Wall Street's military conscription of the youth, labor should reply with the demand for control over military training by the trade unions. This will prevent fascist-minded officers from indoctrinating the minds of Americans in uniform with hatred for organized labor.

Within the armed forces themselves, labor must insist upon the right of the rank and file to participate in politics and public life, to elect their own officers, to organize along union lines and engage in collective bargaining. Labor must demand an end to segregation in the armed forces and oppose the imposition of a Prussian military system upon the United States.

The American monopolists are attempting to push through Congress new savage measures like the Mundt-Nixon Bill ostensibly directed against the Communist Party but actually aimed against the unions and fundamental democratic rights of the people. The unions must take the lead in fighting all such fascist-minded legislation.

Washington's war preparations and plans cover the entire globe. The ECA is simply a part of U.S. imperialist economic, diplomatic, and military intervention abroad. Blood-soaked Greece furnishes a preview of what is in store for other countries through such strengthening of capitalist reaction by U.S. imperialism.

The Marshall Plan is the extension to the foreign field of the same policy that the monopolists are applying against labor at home in the shape of the Mundt Bill and Taft-Hartley Slave Labor Law. The Marshall Plan is designed to prop up the most reactionary capitalist regimes and to suppress the revolutionary masses abroad, just as Taft-Hartleyism aims to crush labor at home.

American workers must oppose the Marshall Plan no less vigorously than the Taft-Hartley Law. Support of the Marshall Plan would only strengthen the monopolists in their onslaught on American labor and their march to war.

On the other hand, every victory of the masses elsewhere against the native agents of American imperialism weakens the latter and strengthens labor's positions in this country. Thus both class solidarity and self-interest call for unreserved support by American workers of every mass struggle against native tyranny and Wall Street's intervention.

Many workers are revolted by the crimes of Stalinism. The capitalists are eager to exploit these sentiments in their red-baiting, their union-busting campaigns and their prospective war against the Soviet Union. War against the USSR is not the way to fight and eliminate Stalinism. The fight against Stalinism cannot be waged in alliance with the imperialist war-makers, but only in merciless political struggle against them. The struggle for the Workers and Farmers Government is aimed not at the imperialists alone. The abolition of capitalist rule, especially of its main stronghold in this country, will deal a mortal blow to Stalinism here as well as in the USSR.

The main enemy of the American people and the principal imperialist threat to the peoples of the entire globe is right here in the United States. The name of that enemy is Wall Street imperialism. To guarantee enduring peace, the masses must mobilize to supplant the capitalist government with a Workers and Farmers Government.

5. *The Fight to Maintain Living Standards*

Our 1946 Convention adopted three resolutions on the fight against inflation and the struggle to defend workers' living standards: Section 7 of the main political and economic resolution, entitled "From a Propaganda Group to a Party of Mass Action"; a special resolution on "Wages, Prices, Profits and the Struggle Against Inflation"; and a Supplementary Resolution.

The program and slogans set forth in these documents remain applicable for the next period.

Our central slogan—THE SLIDING SCALE OF WAGES—must be put forward even more vigorously today as labor's most effective weapon against the consequences of inflation. Tomorrow it will provide the answer to the false claims of the agencies of the capitalist government and of the top union bureaucrats that government controls will hold down prices.

If, in their strike actions from 1946 to 1948, the unions had included and won the demand for a cost-of-living bonus adjusted automatically to the rising costs of living, the workers could have protected their living standards and even improved them.

The union officials, however, opposed or misrepresented this demand for a sliding scale of wages wherever it was raised. They permitted the unions to be pushed into fiercely fought and long-drawn out strikes for straight hourly wage increases which were insufficient to compensate for increased living costs and were rapidly wiped out by further price boosts. This false wage policy demoralized and exhausted the workers, permitted the steady decline in their living standards, encouraged the employers in attacks, and weakened the positions of the unions.

Regardless of when government controls are imposed—as they must be sooner or later as the war boom unfolds—the masses now directly confront a fearsome worsening of their living and working conditions. Patriotic shouting

and red-baiting demagogy will not hide the harsh realities of Wall Street's war program on its economic side or cover up the bankruptcy of the official union leadership.

To defend its living and working conditions, labor will be more and more compelled to assume the offensive on the economic field. Uncoordinated and purely defensive struggles like those of early 1948 would doom the workers to one defeat after another.

No less imperative will be the need for labor to take the lead in organizing mass consumer committees to regulate prices effectively, institute methods of equitable rationing, and fight the price-gougers. Such committees will be the best means of combatting profiteering speculators and black marketeers. Government controls through another swindling OPA setup cannot be depended upon to hold down prices. The main aim of new controls will be to freeze wages even more rigidly than during the last war.

With the shift to a full-fledged arms program, new construction and remodeling of old houses will drag to a halt. The housing shortage will become even more serious and acute. To protect the tenants from the rent-hogs, tenants committees must be organized around a program of militant action.

Congress together with the state and local legislatures, will place the burden of the enormous military budgets and inflation upon the people through new and higher taxes. The struggle against growing taxation will become more urgent as the war program unfolds.

The experiences of the last few years drive home the lesson that every vital economic problem of the workers—wages, working conditions, housing, prices, taxes—becomes a political problem, requiring political means and agencies for its solution. The economic prospects of American workers therefore depend in large measure upon their political prospects, and even more upon their political actions.

6. *Disintegration of the Two-Party System and the Political Road for the Labor Movement*

Symptomatic of the maturing social crisis of U.S. capitalism is the undermining of its two-party system. This was predicted in our 1946 resolution, which pointed out:

The breakup of the camp of "national unity" following V-J Day has unloosed political tendencies cut short and repressed by the war. The Democratic Party, which has governed the country since 1933, is rapidly disintegrating.

With the decline of the Democratic Party, there has come, on the one hand, the Wallace third party movement and, on the other, the growing sentiment for a Labor Party.

These political developments have deep roots in the maladies and difficulties of U.S. economy, the sharpening of social tensions, and the mounting discontent of many sections of the population. The present political situation has its roots in the prolonged depression during the

Thirties which profoundly shook the confidence of the American people in the capitalist system. Its most important outcome has been the rise of the CIO industrial unions.

The CIO originated and is still formally constituted as an economic movement of industrial workers. But from birth, it has necessarily been more than a trade-union organization on the old, craft-bound, conservative AFL model.

The CIO is a social movement of the working class which from its origin was obliged to contend for power with the industrial and financial overlords of America. By its reinvigoration and reorganization of unionism, by its very existence and activity, its nation-wide strike actions and sit-downs, its restrictions upon capitalist power and its tremendous uplifting of the self-confidence of the proletariat, the CIO effected a decisive change in the

balance of class forces in the United States. The consequences of this shift in the relations between capital and labor have yet to unfold in their full magnitude and revolutionary implications.

The deepening disproportion between the social power and economic organization of labor, on the one hand, and its political atomization and feebleness, on the other, expresses the most glaring contradiction in American life. Sixteen million union members and their families, the majority of the people and the producers of wealth, have no representatives of their own in Congress!

The trade union bureaucracy is responsible for the failure of organized labor to take the lead in liberating the people from the capitalist monopoly of politics. The union officialdom, including the Stalinists and the Social Democrats, have deliberately blocked the unions from independent political action in order to maintain their collaboration with the capitalist party machines. The result of their policy of subservience to the Democratic and Republican agents of Big Business is the present helplessness of labor in the face of savage assaults by the bi-partisan Congress and administration on the rights of the unions and living standards of the masses.

But the union bureaucracy is now encountering great obstacles in keeping the workers shackled to the Democratic machine and capitalist politicians. The imperative need for capitalist unity dictated by the war plans of U.S. imperialism has welded Democrats and Republicans into a solid front against the unions and Negroes at home as well as the peoples abroad. The joint policies of the bi-partisan administration and Congress on all major foreign and domestic issues leave little room for the subsidiary sham battles of former years. More and more workers find it impossible to distinguish between a Truman or a Taft, or a Dewey.

The emergence of the Wallace third party has further embarrassed the union leaders by exploding their pretext that it is impossible now to launch a new national political movement opposed to the Democratic-Republican monopoly of politics.

Finally, the growing resentment of the workers against the Democratic-Republican anti-labor measures has hampered the bureaucrats' ability to solicit votes for the old-line capitalist parties.

Despite these difficulties, the labor bureaucracy is still striving with all its might and cunning to divert the workers from the path of independent politics. Most of the bureaucrats, subservient to the State Department, have been seeking new formulas for clinging to the old-line parties and a less discredited presidential candidate than Truman to palm off on the workers.

The Stalinists, on the other hand, as agents of the Kremlin's foreign policy, tout Wallace and his rump capitalist outfit as the answer to labor's political needs.

Despite these differences in candidates, both the official and Stalinist brands of bureaucrats stand united in opposition to any genuinely independent forms of political action by the unions.

The demand for a Labor Party is more deep-seated among the workers than superficial appearances indicate.

The support given Wallace is a perverted sign of the widespread desire for a new political path. The urge toward independent working class politics has not yet found the opportunity or the leadership for adequate expression. The sporadic local experiments along this line, valuable and significant as they are, have been seriously hampered by opposition and sabotage from the officialdom.

This pent-up disgust with the Democrats and Republicans cannot be dammed up indefinitely. It is bound to break through the artificial barriers set up by the officialdom. The union movement cannot protect itself or survive unless the workers consciously enter the political arena and openly contest for power with the capitalist parties.

No Labor Party can be built over the heads or behind the backs of the established unions. There can be no new political movement worthy of support which is not based upon the unions and subject to control and influence by the membership.

The movement for the Labor Party will receive strong reinforcement from the Negroes and other doubly oppressed minorities who are disillusioned with the policies of the bi-partisan government.

This perspective of the divorce of organized labor from the two-party system and the growing demand for the Labor Party must animate our work in the unions and mass organizations. We must persevere in propaganda and agitation for independent political action by the unions and for the formation of the Labor Party. We must continue to participate in the PAC-CIO and the AFL Labor's League for Political Education for the purpose of developing new forces for genuine class political activity. Wherever conditions permit, we must help promote local and state movements to run independent labor candidates for office.

At the present level of the Labor Party movement, our efforts in the mass organizations are largely concentrated upon convincing workers to *form* their own party, and force the leadership to break with the capitalist parties. But as soon as an independent campaign or organization becomes a reality, the questions of program, methods of action and the goal of the new class political movement advance to the fore. The militants must bear in mind that the Labor Party is essentially a stage in the political march of the American workers on the road to power. It is a major step that will advance the political education and heighten the independent political development of the labor movement. It is not and cannot be an end in itself, as the reformists imagine. For us it is a means of hastening the politicalization of the working class as a whole and of speeding the growth of our mass revolutionary party.

In our Labor Party work our principal aim is to spread the ideas of revolutionary socialism, politically educate and recruit workers, and build the revolutionary party. That is the primary meaning and purpose of our 1948 Presidential campaign. In the last analysis, the maturing political crisis of American labor can be solved only through the growth of the Socialist Workers Party, the strengthening of our ties with the toilers, and our ability to lead the fight against capitalism.

7. Stalinism in the U. S.

The entire conduct of the Communist Party since Browder's expulsion two years ago confirms the characterization of its "left turn" and role in the labor movement presented in Section 9 of our 1946 resolution.

We then wrote:

"The pseudo-'left' turn and the expulsion of Browder as an agent of monopoly capitalism, however, produced no fundamental change in the treacherous policies of the CP and only deepened the crisis (in the CP)."

"The Stalinists," we pointed out, "remain the greatest single obstacle in the labor movement to the development of the revolutionary party. Through their national apparatus and their control over a number of CIO international unions, local and central labor bodies, they act as a disorienting force, restraining the workers from independent class action, contaminating the class consciousness of the workers, and continuing under more radical phrases the same class-collaborationist policies they practised during the war."

The all-out support of the Wallace movement by the Stalinists is nothing more than the American application of the reactionary People's Front policy decreed last year by the Belgrade Bureau. It is a continuation under a new form of the previous collaboration of the Stalinists with the "liberal and democratic" elements of the American ruling class. Put forward as its main achievement by the present CP leadership, it will actually lead at the next stage to the aggravation of the crisis inside the CP.

The red-baiting drive, inspired and directed by the State Department, has had a twofold effect upon the Stalinist movement. On the one hand, it has weakened

Stalinist positions inside the unions and many periphery organizations. Many prominent union officials and public figures, both party members and fellow-travelers, have already deserted the CP and moved over to the camp of the American monopolists. As the war pressure increases, more such defections can be expected.

On the other hand, the witch-hunt serves to refurbish the CP in the eyes of its own members and many militants. It helps the Stalinist leaders to suppress more easily internal opposition to their dictatorial regime and People's Front policies. It helps Foster and his associates to divert attention from their wartime and current crimes against the workers. It helps create sympathy for the Stalinists—as targets of capitalist reaction—among radical workers, the Negroes and other oppressed minorities. The Stalinists parade before the masses as the foremost anti-imperialist and anti-war party. We must expose this fraud. We must patiently explain how, under cover of radical phrases, the Stalinists really aim not to combat the imperialists or their war drive, but to reach another bargain with them for the benefit of the Kremlin.

As our 1946 resolution made clear: "Our struggle to rid the labor movement of this treacherous agency of the Kremlin has nothing in common with the campaign of the red-baiters. Our struggle against Stalinism is a component part of our revolutionary program, which is the most effective weapon against the red-baiters. In advancing this program and mobilizing the militants to oppose the red-baiters, we at the same time deal the most decisive blows to the Stalinists."

8. American Labor in the War Crisis

At the 1946 Convention we based our party orientation on (1) a rising curve of strike struggles and (2) the rapid radicalization and politicalization of American labor under the impact of the anticipated economic crisis.

Contrary to these expectations, the labor movement has been subjected to a number of setbacks on both the economic and political fields. The misleadership of the top union bureaucracy, aided enormously by the Stalinists; the anti-labor offensive of the monopolies, greatly reinforced by the red-baiting campaign and the war hysteria—it was these factors amid the conditions of continued industrial boom which dampened the workers' militancy, disoriented them, and plunged them into passivity. This was evidenced, on the one hand, by a sharp decline in strike struggles during 1947; and, on the other, by widespread refusal to vote which facilitated the victory of the Republican Party. The recession in mass militancy strengthened the hands of the most conservative sections of the unions, enabled the most reactionary forces to take the offensive, and restricted the influence of our party as well as its growth.

The temporary shift in the class relation of forces in favor of the capitalists has also tended to postpone and protract the radicalization and politicalization of the American workers. But it has not altered in the slightest

the revolutionary potential of labor, or the tasks of the SWP in transforming itself from a propaganda group into a party of mass action.

The introduction and expansion of war economy, the growing inflation, and even more, the plunge into war itself will goad the workers into new struggles which will have profound revolutionary consequences.

The starting point for our estimate of the impending mass movements against Wall Street's war regime is provided by the struggles which broke out during and after World War II. These past events foreshadow what will come. They are:

1.—The successful wartime strikes of the miners and the struggle against the no-strike pledge which culminated in the unparalleled strike wave of 1945-46.

2.—The mass struggle of the Negroes against Jim Crow which began with the March-on-Washington movement of 1941 and led to subsequent explosions in Harlem, Detroit and other cities.

3.—The world-wide demonstrations of the GIs in 1946 which swept with such force through the army that the brass hats were compelled to yield to the "back-home" demands and revise their immediate military plans.

These sections of the American people will again find themselves pitted against the imperialist war machine.

Millions of women were first drawn into industry by World War II only to be thrown out after V-J Day. They will be herded into the plants while their husbands and sons are conscripted. They will turn upon the warmakers with bitterness and hatred.

Generations of youth, now being groomed for war, are destined to become increasingly disillusioned with capitalism and most receptive to revolutionary socialist ideas.

Illusions of security generated by the postwar boom will give way to feelings of insecurity and resentment as the youth receive, in place of jobs, "careers" as recruits in a permanent conscript army and then as fodder for atomic warfare.

The decisive force in these coming struggles is the industrial workers. The monopolists have already worked out the pattern for placing American labor in a military

strait-jacket. The red-baiting campaign, the terrorization of the militants, abetted by the union bureaucracy, and the war hysteria have served to disorient and paralyze sizable layers of the working class. But these successes of the war-mongers will be only temporary. The workers will not submit like serfs to the repressive measures of the capitalist war regime.

The most advanced sections of labor showed in 1947 their desire and readiness to engage in a general strike to protest against the passage of the Taft-Hartley Bill. The treachery and cowardice of the top leadership derailed this struggle.

In the period ahead, the American workers will be called upon to play a world historic role. Every major struggle on their part, every victory they score over the monopolists will electrify the entire world and galvanize the masses in other countries into action.

9. *The Socialist Workers Party and the Struggle Against World War III*

The central task of the American workers is to create a new leadership capable of guiding them in the coming struggles. The blind alley in which the labor movement finds itself today and the grave dangers confronting it are direct consequences of the incapacity, cowardice and treachery of the union bureaucracy.

Their futile attempts to halt Taft-Hartleyism and the course of their wage negotiations are the latest evidences of the incompetence of the incumbent leadership to protect the most elementary interests of organized labor. On top of this they are again openly selling out the workers to the warmakers.

The increasing popularity of our slogans for the sliding scale of wages, for the organization of a left-wing movement in the unions, for the creation of the Labor Party, plus the slow but steady growth of our fractions and influence in key industrial unions, show how fertile the soil really is for the dissemination of revolutionary Marxism and the growth of our party.

The effects of the current red-baiting drive and the war fever hamper the activity of our members in the unions and may in some cases isolate them for a time. However, the first major upsurge of the labor movement will sweep aside these temporary obstacles. One of the principal tasks of the party in the present period is to help prepare the conditions for this coming upsurge. This can best be done by expanding the political activities of the party.

From this viewpoint the 1948 presidential campaign of the Socialist Workers Party acquires exceptional importance. The first appearance of the Trotskyists on the national political arena is both a major achievement for our small party and a victory for the American working class as a whole.

The presidential campaign enables us to demarcate ourselves not only from the capitalist parties, including the Wallace movement, but also from the Stalinists and Thomas Socialists who falsely speak in the name of communism and socialism. It provides a singular opportunity for putting forward our program of socialist revolution and pointing out to millions of workers that the only road to power is through a Workers and Farmers Government.

Our party has gained valuable experiences in the course of the last war and its aftermath. These experiences have verified the validity and attractive power of the slogans in our Transitional Program. They have demonstrated that the indispensable and still missing condition for the advancement of the labor movement is a trade union and political leadership guided by a correct program and class struggle methods. They have shown how decisive the intervention of even a small number of class-conscious militants can be in influencing the course and outcome of great class battles.

These experiences and lessons will aid our party in withstanding the blows of the enemy and tempering our revolutionary will to struggle. Our ranks enter the new prewar period fortified by their indomitable stand during World War II. They are imbued with the same conviction in the correctness of our program and the same confidence in the capacity of the American workers to rally from all temporary setbacks and move forward to new struggles and new conquests.

As the war program of American capitalism unfolds, the workers, who will increasingly resist militarism, will respond in greater numbers to our ideas. This will open up new opportunities and perspectives for our party.

The "Theses on the American Revolution" adopted at the 1946 Convention set forth the basic conceptions of American Trotskyism on the incurable crisis of American capitalism and the historic mission of the workers to replace it with their own power. The telescoping of the economic crisis, foreseen and predicted at that time, with a war crisis does not alter the revolutionary perspectives outlined in the Theses. Indeed, the possibility of such a variant was taken into account in the following section:

In their mad drive to conquer and enslave the entire world the American monopolists are today preparing war against the Soviet Union. This war program, which may be brought to a head by a crisis or the fear of a crisis at home, will meet with incalculable obstacles and difficulties. A war will not solve the internal difficulties of American imperialism but will rather sharpen and complicate them.

Such a war will meet with fierce resistance not only by the peoples of the USSR, but also by the European and

colonial masses who do not want to be the slaves of Wall Street. At home the fiercest resistance will be generated.

Wall Street's war drive, aggravating the social crisis, may under certain conditions actually precipitate it. In any case, another war will not cancel out the socialist alternative to capitalism but only pose it more sharply. The workers' struggle for power in the U.S. is not a perspective of a distant and hazy future but the realistic program of our epoch.

We live in an era of sharp and sudden turns. Periods of mass upsurge and retreat by the capitalists as in 1945-46 are followed by a violent offensive of capitalist reaction and setbacks to labor as in 1947-48. War is followed by a short interlude of "peace" only to give way to preparations for a new war.

But throughout these fluctuations the main line of

development is toward the sharpening of the class struggle—the widening and deepening of the conflicts between monopoly capital and organized labor. Within these ebbs and flows, passivity and even demoralization may seize the labor movement. Nevertheless, under the conditions of our time these periods of recession cannot be long-lasting.

Every member of the revolutionary party must keep clearly in view this dialectical course of the class struggle. We orient our activity upon the knowledge that even the strongest sector of world capitalism is torn by insecurity and instability and permanently confronts the titanic power lodged in the legions of American labor.

The American imperialists dream of an "American Century" in which they will rule the world. But they reckon without the working class and its party of the socialist revolution to whom the future really belongs.

The Second World Congress of the Fourth International

By The Editors

The Second World Congress of the Fourth International met last April in Paris.

Two years after the International Conference of April 1946, delegates of 22 organizations of the Fourth International coming from all continents gathered to discuss the problems of the revolutionary workers' movement and to work out together the line of the Fourth International for the immediate future.

For the first time since the birth of the international Trotskyist movement there were actually present direct representatives of a world movement, built and developed in the course of a fierce and unceasing struggle against the most powerful enemy forces and currents and based on solidarity in fundamental political ideas and a common program. This program concretizes the ideas of revolutionary Marxism in our epoch.

The delegates of the Second World Congress of the Fourth International took note of the fact that they were meeting on the hundredth anniversary of the *Communist Manifesto*, the first programmatic declaration of revolutionary Marxism and of the world labor movement which it inspired.

The balance sheet of these hundred years of struggle of the world proletariat and of the colonial peoples for their emancipation from the yoke of capitalist exploitation and oppression, to bring humanity forward from the stage of barbaric prehistory into that of socialist civilization—at present appears to some rather meager and doubtful. The death agony of capitalism continues to toss humanity from economic crises into wars, into dictatorial and fascist regimes, that mark the devastating totalitarian decomposition of present-day society. The situation is darkened even more by the monstrous degeneration of the USSR under the rule of the Soviet bureaucracy. The bureaucracy has disfigured socialism and added to capitalist barbarism a phenomenon which, although different in its historic origin and in its social essence, is symmetrical to it.

Hardly three years after the end of the second imperialist war, which ravaged the planet and brought all the contradictions of capitalism to fever heat, humanity once again faces a chain of calamities inherent in the very nature of this system: the perspectives of a new world economic

crisis, the threat of dictatorship and fascism, the danger of an atomic third world war.

The delegates at the Second World Congress of the Fourth International were acutely conscious of these dangers. They took note that, benefiting from the betrayal of the labor movement by the reformists and Stalinists during and after the war, the world bourgeoisie headed by American imperialism has launched a general economic and political offensive against the standard of living and the civil rights of the working class and of the colonial peoples. They issued in the name of the World Congress a rousing appeal to all the exploited to forge their class front against the offensive of capitalism.

This is the principal task at present. However, the working class cannot attain any real success by remaining on the defensive. It must pursue the struggle to its ultimate consequences, the seizure of power and the overthrow of capitalism.

The internal economic contradictions of capitalism inexorably drive it toward the establishment of new Bonapartist and fascist dictatorships throughout the world, and toward a

new atomic war. The danger of reaction is becoming clearer in France and in Italy, in the United States, in the countries of Latin America and even in India—which has only just obtained the first “national” government of its native bourgeoisie.

The war preparations in the United States and elsewhere are becoming ever more ominous. Capitalism is seeking to postpone the threatening economic crisis and to survive, above all, by developing its war economy.

That is why the appeal of the World Congress stresses the need for an immediate united front of the oppressed within the more general perspective of preparing for a revolutionary solution, in order to avoid a new wave of fascism and war. How can such a solution succeed? The Soviet bureaucracy, which arose from the society established by the October Revolution as an uncontrollable, autocratic privileged caste, thinks only of increasing its privileges at the expense of the masses inside the USSR and in the countries which it controls. With this aim in mind, it has created an authoritarian and bureaucratic political regime in the USSR never before equalled in history. The Stalinist bureaucracy can only discredit socialism everywhere by its barbaric police and bureaucratic measures that throw the masses into passivity or into the hands of reaction.

All over the world the Stalinist parties, pliant instruments in the exclusive service of the Soviet bureaucracy against imperialism, have derailed and disoriented the masses by their policy of “national unity” with the “democratic” bourgeoisies. They are incapable of gathering the masses into a common front against the offensive of capitalism and of reaction, even when they attempt to utilize mobilizations of the masses (as is actually the case ever since the “turn” of the Cominform at Belgrade) not for the overthrow of capitalism everywhere, but as a means of pressure on imperialism for a compromise with the Kremlin. The Stalinist leadership is historically doomed. To the extent that it maintains its hold on broad masses, it can only prepare new defeats and new disasters.

The delegates at the Second World

Congress of the Fourth International therefore call upon the workers and all the exploited of the world to consider the underlying meaning of the crisis of humanity—which is the crisis of the revolutionary leadership of the labor movement—and to build a new leadership under the banner of the Fourth International.

But the World Congress was not merely a stock-taking by a gathering of revolutionary militants who are keeping alive in the midst of disorientation the flame of revolutionary Marxist thought, of the present reality, of its problems and perspectives. It was more than that. It was an expression of the unshakable determination of our movement to penetrate ever deeper into the mass struggles. It was an expression of the boundless confidence of our movement that the final decision, after a tragic, sanguinary experience—long when measured on the scale of a human life-span and grandiose when seen in the mirror of history—belongs to the masses who are preparing the socialist future of mankind.

The strength of the Fourth International lies in the revolutionary action of the masses. Marx declared a hundred years ago in the immortal pages of the Communist Manifesto; *The communists have no interests separate and apart from those of the rest of the working class and are distinguished only by their clearer understanding of the conditions, the road and the general aims of the movement.* The Fourth International is the conscious communist movement of our day. Its program expresses the immediate as well as the historic interests of the working class. When the masses, aided by the experience of the decisive events inevitably before us, begin to shake off the hold of their old leaderships, they will recognize in the Fourth International their own class conscience raised to the level of their historic mission.

The World Congress rejected with contempt all the wailings, the jeremiads and the doubts of the disillusioned, of the skeptics, of petty bourgeois critics of every stripe who have lost all faith in the working class. It rejected just as strongly the so-called “theoretical” justifications of those who accept as a “necessary” detour the replacement of the socialist revolution—which can result only from the conscious work of the democratically organized masses as the ruling class—by the totalitarian caricature of Stalinism.

The Fourth International! acclaims as its own the struggles of the workers, the colonial peoples, the exploited of all countries who deeply aspire to cut themselves loose from the putrefying domination of two historically reactionary forces, imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy. Together with the masses, the Fourth International will fight to lay the bases of a humane free society of equals, made possible for the first time in history by the prodigious conquests of man over nature.

The confidence of the Fourth International in its future is confidence in the victorious future of the revolutionary workers’ movement and of socialism. The Manifesto addressed by the Second World Congress of the Fourth International to the exploited of the entire world declares:

“Today Bolshevism lives anew on five continents. Its ideas are spreading. Its organizations are gaining strength.

“After surviving the terror of Stalin as well as that of Hitler, the Fourth International is sure of its future. For within it lives all of Marxism in our epoch and the whole indomitable will to liberation of the world working class.

“On the scale of a human life, its progress may seem slow. On the scale of history, its victory is already certain.”

A New Pamphlet, containing the Radio Speeches of Farrell Dobbs, Presidential Candidate of the Socialist Workers Party, Grace Carlson, Vice-Presidential Candidate and James P. Cannon, National Secretary of the Socialist Workers Party.

32 pages

10 cents

Struggles of the Colonial Peoples and the World Revolution

Resolution Adopted by the Second Congress of the Fourth International -- Paris, April 1948

1. *Revolutionary Movements in the Colonies After the 2nd World War*

1. The conclusion of World War II witnessed a series of violent eruptions of national liberation struggles in the colonial countries. These struggles, expressing the crisis of imperialism in the epoch of capitalist decline, brought sharply into relief the major problems of colonies and semi-colonies. Hitherto, the colonial struggles had remained by and large in the background of the historic struggles of this century, despite the fact that fully three-quarters of the world's population lives in the colonial countries, while the super-exploitation of this huge mass of humanity provides the real foundation for the material and cultural development of Europe in particular.

The postwar colonial struggles in the Far East have given a demonstration of the swift development of political consciousness in backward countries—so swift and sweeping that the struggles in these countries have soared to levels comparable with the class struggles in Europe. The events in Viet Nam and Indonesia, in particular, were of historic significance. For in these countries struggles moved not only along the road of liberation from imperialism, but also and above all, along the road to power. Herein lies one of the characteristic features of colonial and semi-colonial struggles of our epoch—that is, the necessity of conquering state power in order to achieve freedom.

Moreover, the history of the struggles in Viet Nam and Indonesia provided a further verification of the theory of the permanent revolution, although in negative form. For these struggles demonstrated clearly that the anti-imperialist national liberation struggles can reach fruition only under the leadership of the proletariat, however small this proletariat may be; and that the bourgeoisie in the colonies is not only utterly incapable of wresting the colonial countries from the orbit of imperialism, but is in fact obliged to maintain these countries within the imperialist framework. The native bourgeoisie combines with the very imperialism against which, in the early stages of the struggle it had fought—in order to quell, ruthlessly curb and even crush the revolutionary struggles of workers and peasants.

The postwar struggles in the Far East, especially in Java and Viet Nam, offer still further testimony of the validity of the permanent revolution by revealing the combined character of the world revolution: The forward leaps of the struggles in the backward countries enable the colonial revolutions more and more to keep pace with, and even at times to outdistance the progress of revolutionary struggles in the metropolitan countries. This becomes most evident when we compare the revolutionary events at the

end of the last imperialist world war with those at the conclusion of the First World War.

In the first case, the workers seized power in Russia, and fierce struggles for power shook a number of European countries; while the struggles in Africa and Asia, which, during the immediate postwar period took the shape of strikes and demonstrations, did not reach the plane of struggles for power. The situation was sharply changed and almost reversed at the end of World War II. On the one hand, in Europe there were the big resistance movements, which fell apart into their class component parts; and then, in one country after another, the class struggle was beaten back by imperialism in Western Europe and by Stalinism in Eastern Europe, either before or at the very moment when these struggles rose to the plane of combat for state power.

On the other hand, in Viet Nam and Indonesia the mass struggles against imperialism unfolded rapidly, and rose with tremendous energy to the plane of struggle for state power; and, in fact, for a period, the power was actually torn from the grasp of France and Holland and held by the nationalist forces.

The struggles of the colonies and semi-colonies constitute an essential and a major part of our epoch of wars and revolutions. Indeed, they contain within themselves the necessary strength to achieve power (as demonstrated by the theory of permanent revolution). All this has been forcibly thrust to the fore by the actual struggles for and the temporary conquest of power in Viet Nam and Indonesia. The absence of a genuinely revolutionary party prevented these struggles from reaching their goal.

These events, taken in the setting of the struggles throughout the Far East—the Chinese civil war, the movements in Burma and India, etc.—show not only the enormously increased specific weight of colonial struggles, not only their growing importance, but also their international significance both for imperialism as well as for the world struggle for emancipation and for socialism.

2. The following factors, in particular, have played a determining role in precipitating the crisis that had been developing over a long period in colonial countries owing to a whole series of internal conditions, economic, social and political.

a) The prestige of the imperialist rulers has steadily declined as a result of the sharp reverses suffered by them. The peoples, hitherto terrorized by savage repressions, have understood that their masters are far from invincible. This has considerably strengthened the will of the masses for emancipation.

b) The vicissitudes of the war brought about an important loosening—and in certain cases a complete rup-

ture—of relations between colonies and mother countries. New occupants took the place of traditional oppressors, upsetting to one degree or another the old established order. Thus in Viet Nam and Indonesia, the Japanese, before their capitulation, facilitated the establishment of national governments committed to "independence."

c) The war loosened the economic ties between the old imperialist powers—Britain, France and Holland—and some of their colonies, affecting in particular the supply of capital goods by the mother countries to the colonies. At the same time, these powers have maintained their economic and military domination, thus blocking the colonies to a lesser or greater extent from purchasing capital goods from other powers and from carrying on trade in general. This has aggravated the economic situation in the colonies and has revealed still more sharply the condition of chronic crisis which imperialism produces in its colonies.

d) The absolute and relative weakening of the old imperialist powers, on the one hand, and the ascendancy of U. S. imperialism, on the other, have instilled some of the colonial bourgeoisie with the hope of exploiting to their own advantage the inter-imperialist contradictions, within the framework of their dependence on the old imperialist powers.

A cursory listing of these factors suffices to make it clear that the break-up of the colonial world is far from accidental.

The First World War and the October Revolution had already provided the points of departure for an upsurge of the oppressed masses in colonial and semi-colonial countries. But the scope of the movements in that epoch, the specifically independent role of the proletariat and the shocks suffered by the metropolitan countries, were small indeed in comparison with the scope of present-day struggles, in comparison with the role played by the proletariat in these struggles and the profound disturbances in the old colonial empires today.

Immediately following the First World War, and in some cases not until several years later there were movements in a limited number of countries (India 1921 and 1930 and 1932, China 1925, Morocco 1926). In most instances the proletariat was still weak and trailed after the bourgeois parties (Congress Party in India, Kuomintang in China), so that the British, French and Dutch imperialists were able to maintain virtually intact and unaltered their old systems of domination. The end of World War II, on the other hand, has been marked by a revolutionary crisis involving all the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the Far East, the Near East, the Arab countries. In the countries of North Africa the crisis has assumed a different character and scope, while in Southern Africa there has been a national awakening.

With the end of World War II, the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, who constitute the overwhelming majority of mankind, have ceased to be what they were at the beginning of the Twentieth Century — the passive objects of the policies of world capitalism. They have become a more and more determining factor in world politics.

Whilst the Nineteenth Century was marked by the awakening and assertion of nationalities in Europe, the middle of the Twentieth Century has inaugurated the in-

creased struggles for national demands among the old nations of Asia and North Africa, and the awakening and assertion of national consciousness among the immense colonial countries of the African continent.

3. One of the main features of the period which opened up with the end of World War II is the dislocation of the great colonial empires (Great Britain, France, Holland). This dislocation is one of the essential elements of the present instability of the capitalist world.

In the development of the world revolution, with its characteristic combination of class struggles in the mother countries with the social and national struggles of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, the Second World War and its consequences have considerably increased the specific weight of the struggles of colonial and semi-colonial peoples in relation to the struggles of the proletariat of the great imperialist powers. The depth of the crisis of these old imperialisms is notably measured by this, that a large part of their superprofits, which enabled them to corrupt a layer of the workers, has disappeared, and that they are no longer able to maintain the equilibrium at home without making serious inroads into the living standards of the workers in the metropolitan centers.

The combined international character of the world revolution becomes more manifest than ever in the light of the great revolutionary struggles at the end of the war.

The developing revolutions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, which, at the close of the Second World War, assumed considerable proportions in a number of countries (Viet Nam, Indonesia) have experienced setbacks and defeats.

Will imperialism succeed in completely restoring its domination over the colonial and semi-colonial peoples? The profound changes which have occurred in world economic and political relations and in the consciousness of vast colonial masses exclude any return to the past. Imperialism is forced to seek for new forms of colonial domination. But the present state of world relations, the weakness of the old imperialisms, the impossibility for American imperialism to supplant or support all of them everywhere, the basic weakness of the national bourgeoisie, the growing disillusionment in the traditional nationalist parties, the absence of reformist organizations with established traditions—all these factors render the contradictions in the colonial countries even more profound than in the metropolitan countries. Therefore, even should the labor movement in the metropolitan countries be crushed (which by its very nature cannot take place rapidly), this could not prevent the revolutionary period resulting from the Second World War from prolonging itself in the colonies. Nor could it alter the profoundly unstable character of imperialist domination for a long time to come.

Many crises will continue to pose the problem of the struggle for independence against imperialism, and, at the same time, the struggle for the workers' and peasants' power against the colonial bourgeoisies who lean on imperialism. Consequently, the colonial countries constitute major centers of work for the Fourth International and for the building of revolutionary mass parties indispensable for the victory of the exploited colonial masses.

The setbacks sustained by the revolution in Viet Nam

and Indonesia are the products of the isolation of these movements, owing to the insufficient aid from the metropolitan countries, the treason of the Stalinists, the weakness of the revolutionary parties, and especially owing to the uneven development of the revolutionary process in the two most important countries in the Far East, China and India.

The uneven development of these struggles in the Far East tends to be overcome by their combined character. Furthermore, the evolution of these struggles is affected by the development of the struggles in Japan, where a ceaseless ferment among the workers has been taking place since the defeat of Japanese imperialism in the Second World War.

II. *The Redivision of the World and the New Rivalries Between the Powers in the Colonies*

The war has upset traditional world relations. Great Britain, which occupied the dominant position in the colonial and semi-colonial world, has found her power profoundly shattered (to the benefit of the United States) and has been obliged to work out a new Empire strategy. In its advance toward world domination, the U. S. is compelled to pay special attention to colonial and semi-colonial countries where old rulers are tottering and which are of importance from several standpoints: strategic outposts, natural resources (oil, uranium, etc.), vast markets, fields of capital investment. The role of the U. S. in the colonies is therefore growing in weight. The expansion of U. S. positions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is at the same time spurred by the wish to prevent the extension of Russian influence and to secure decisive positions in case of conflict with the USSR.

A. *Great Britain's Retreat*

(a) Great Britain's retreat is most clearly noticeable to date in the Far East. As late as 1939, British commercial interests and investments in China (10 billion dollars) were greater than those of all other powers combined. But during the war, American intervention to a large extent replaced the British, who gave up almost all their advantages in China. Their chief remaining stronghold is Hong-Kong, an extremely important, but isolated, position. In general, British influence counts for little in the Pacific, which is becoming a vast American lake.

(b) For decades, the *Near and Middle East* were under almost exclusively British influence. Britain considered control over these countries vital for the protection of the route to her Far-Eastern Empire. The importance of these regions was enhanced by the discovery of oil fields.

British positions in this sector remain strong, even today, but they are beginning to give way to American penetration. At the same time, Britain's influence is changing in form.

Iraq and Transjordan remain the pillars of British imperialism in the Middle East. Iran, on the other hand, has witnessed a decline in British influence, as a result of in-

ternational rivalries. The strength of Soviet pressure on Iran calls forth American interference: the U. S. no longer trusts Britain to bar the road to Russia single-handed. Henceforth, British influence is to be restricted to the region of the southern oil fields, around the Persian Gulf.

British positions in Egypt are very precarious at present. The wartime economic development of that country resulted in a greater sharpening of social relations compared to the other Arab countries. Popular pressure against imperialist domination has attained a force that would require the use of huge military detachments by Great Britain, in order for her to maintain herself by bloody repressions. Facing such a costly and perilous solution, Britain had to consider the total evacuation of Egypt in a relatively short period of time.

Similarly, Britain's inability to maintain herself in the face of postwar disturbances and rising anti-imperialist sentiments, the shrinking of her Empire resources and the subsequent necessity to reduce expenditures, has obliged Britain to announce the withdrawal of her troops from Palestine.

(c) It follows from this analysis that we are witnessing both a modification in the form of British influence and colonial exploitation, and a radical change in her Empire strategy.

Forced to limit her military potential, Great Britain no longer seeks to impose her rule by direct military occupation. She tries to safeguard her economic and financial interests in the Near and Middle East by means of an understanding with these semi-colonial countries. This policy is similar to that carried out in India and Burma.

Strategically, Britain is in fact abandoning her positive control over the Mediterranean, limiting herself to the upkeep of a few important bases: Malta, Cyprus, Gibraltar, and the Lybian ports (Tobruk and Benghazi). Generally speaking, the U. S. is in the process of taking over from the British in the Mediterranean.

(d) In accordance with the plans of the War Office, Great Britain is falling back strategically and economically on her possessions in Africa. The center of Empire defense is to be established at Kenya. It is intended to develop all the resources of Southern and Eastern Africa. Intensive development is taking place and being planned to compensate for the British losses suffered in other parts of the Empire and at the same time to give the British-African bloc the economic unity and strength indispensable for its strategic role. Large capital investments, amounting to over 100 million pounds per year, have been made in mines, industries and other properties in the Union of South Africa. A large number of British enterprises have established branches there during the same period, in accordance with the general plan of industrial decentralization of the metropolitan country and the consolidation of the African Empire. On a smaller scale, the process is being paralleled in British East Africa.

B. *American Expansion*

In its relations with the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the U. S. possesses the advantages deriving from

its economic and financial omnipotence; furthermore, it is not discredited as are the old colonial powers.

a) *In the Far East.* The collapse of Japanese power left the U. S. an uncontested mastery of the Pacific. As the sole occupiers of *Japan*, the American imperialists make it their main bastion in the Far East. They are restarting certain sectors of Japanese industry—much to the disquiet of Great Britain and China. They want to make *Japan* the main industrial center of the Far East again.

One of the essential objectives of U. S. imperialism is the possession of the immense *Chinese* market. To this end, the U. S. put forward the "Open Door" principle, i.e., the non-division of *China* into zones of influence, and the freedom of private initiative. The overwhelming economic superiority of the U. S. would also enable it to ensure for itself the totality of the *Chinese* market. But the fulfillment of this policy has since the end of the war met with great internal difficulties: civil war, inflation, thefts, corruption, etc.; and is affected by the U. S.-Soviet antagonism in the Far East and the existence of strategic positions held by *Russia* (Port Arthur, Russian rights in *Dairen*, and in railways).

From October 1945, to the summer of 1946, the Americans granted massive military aid to *China*. This military aid is due to the revival of the civil war and the threat constituted by the installation of *Chinese Communist* forces in *Manchuria* following its evacuation by *Soviet* troops. General Marshall, Truman's special envoy, tried in January, 1946 to put an end to the civil war by seeking an agreement between *Chiang Kai-shek* and the *Communists* through the formation of a coalition government making room for the latter. This American attempt was dictated by the need of halting the dismemberment of the country and of chronic civil warfare which would exclude any serious reconstruction of *China* and imperil *Wall Street's* plans of penetration. The failure of the Marshall solution, on the one hand, and, on the other, *Chiang Kai-shek's* resistance to the complete domination of American capital over *Chinese* economy, resulted in the abrupt stoppage of American military aid in September 1946. But the U. S. is unable to allow itself to lose interest in *China*, and thus permitting *Soviet* influence to extend in a country of such importance. The grave reverses suffered by the government troops who for lack of munitions have been unable to use their American equipment, have led the *Washington* circles to project once again immediate and massive assistance.

The occupation by the U. S. of a great number of territories in the Pacific completes their domination in this sector. Independence was formally granted to the *Philippines* on July 4, 1946, but nothing has been altered in the subjection of the Archipelago. Moreover, American ambitions in *Melanesia* and *Polynesia* cannot but arouse some friction with *Great Britain*, *Australia* and *New Zealand*.

b) *Penetration in the old empires.* American supremacy in the Far East is pushing the U. S. to encroach upon the old colonial empires in this part of the world. The most vulnerable possessions are obviously those of the weak or enfeebled imperialisms such as *Holland* and *France*. The aid given by the U. S. to restore the domination of these

powers over *Indonesia* and *Viet Nam* is balanced off by a strengthening of the American mortgage on *Southeast Asia*. The U. S. has advanced its interests in *Indonesia* by imposing itself as an all-powerful arbitrator during the negotiations between the *Indonesian nationalists* and the *Netherlands*. In *Viet Nam*, the U. S. intervention behind the scenes is having more and more influence on the bargainings. Its pressure is essentially exerted in the direction of eliminating *Stalinist* influence from the *Viet Nam* and bringing the conflict to an end.

Furthermore, the French possessions of the Pacific (*New Caledonia*, *Oceanian islands*) have since the war become incorporated in the American economic orbit. Finally, U. S. interests do not spare *Portuguese* possessions in the Far East, particularly *Macao*, where the Americans wish to establish a naval base, the strategic importance of which is obvious. American influence has also strongly increased in the *British West Indies*. This has aroused *Britain*, which is considering the creation of a *West Indian Federation* as a counterweight for the attraction of the powerful neighbor.

American penetration is equally felt in *Africa*. In *South Africa*, American interests have been constantly growing. American capitalism has a fairly large share in *Transvaal* industry and has acquired new positions in the gold mines. American capital is also interested in the markets of French "Dark" *Africa*.

In *French North Africa*, American penetration is mainly taking place in *Morocco*, under the form of private American investments, by the importation of material and capital. Since the war, the U. S. has become the main supplier of the *Sherifian Empire*.

A similar tendency, although less marked, makes itself felt in *Algerian* and *Tunisian* foreign trade.

c) *U. S. Mediterranean policy.* American intervention in the *Eastern Mediterranean* is having a more direct effect. The May 1947 laws on aid to *Greece* and *Turkey* and President Truman's speech at that time, mark a decisive turning point in American policy in this sector. The loan of 100 million dollars to *Turkey*, which was solely devoted to military and strategic purposes, has transformed *Turkey* into an advanced American bastion against the *USSR*.

The military control over the *Iranian* army, recently won by the *USA*, completes the security measures on the very frontiers of the *USSR* taken in this sector.

In *Syria* and the *Lebanon*, *France's* departure and the bad relations with *Great Britain* have permitted the U. S. a strong development of their commercial relations; these two countries have been swamped with American goods.

By their skillful policy since the beginning of *Ibn Saud's* reign, the Americans have managed to secure exclusive concessions in *Saudi Arabia*, in the larger part of this territory with its rich petroleum resources.

Thus in all parts of the colonial world, American imperialism is grabbing the lion's share. Its overwhelming economic and financial superiority over all the other imperialist powers of the world which have emerged enfeebled or undermined from the *Second World War* every day facilitates its penetration in new points of the globe. But

this penetration has proceeded unevenly. While U. S. capital has virtually displaced the British from China and South America, this process has been much slower and more difficult in India and Africa.

American intervention in colonial countries assumes a twofold aspect. On the one hand, it helps the imperialists whose bases have been shattered, to restore order and capitalist rule wherever they are directly threatened. But, on the other, it seizes the opportunity to intrench itself in these countries and to prepare its taking over of the heritage. Thus the aid given to the old colonial powers represents for them a double-edged weapon.

Furthermore, the wealth of the United States exercises an undeniable attraction on the weak bourgeoisies of the colonial and semi-colonial countries and thus also acts in the direction of undermining the old empires. American imperialism is in a position to offer these bourgeoisies a perspective of economic dependence and of apparent political independence. This so-called political independence means, above all, the right of these bourgeoisies to exploit the colonial masses more intensely for their own account plus an obligation to remain within the orbit of American politics.

C. *The Areas of International Friction*

The new factor of American expansion has upset the old map of big power rivalries.

The dominant antagonism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the Far and Middle East is that between the USSR and the USA.

a) In the Far East, the *USSR and the USA* are colliding with each other especially in China and Korea. After evacuating Manchuria, the Soviet Union seeks to keep it in its sphere of influence by means of Mao Tse-tung's armies, which are carrying out renewed offensives. Korea, which has been under Japanese domination since 1905, had its independence officially recognized in Cairo in 1943 by China, the US and Great Britain, and later, in 1945, at the Moscow Conference by the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, Korea was the object of a veritable race at the end of the war, a race which ended up in cutting the Korean peninsula into two water-tight halves: the Russians occupy the industrial North (coal, iron, electricity) whilst the Americans have moved into the South, which is more densely populated and essentially agrarian. This partition has completely disorganized the economic life of the country.

The *Near and Middle East* are the theater of a competition where the stake is petroleum and control of the Eastern Mediterranean. Here the US has made considerable gains recently. The positions gained by the USA in Iran and Turkey are so many setbacks for the USSR. The attitude adopted by the USSR on the partitioning of Palestine is based on the hope that the Kremlin may be able to penetrate the Near East by taking advantage of the troubled situation that will arise from the British withdrawal.

b) Although the *U.S. and Great Britain* try as much as possible to align their policies, in view of the Russian danger, nevertheless serious points of friction continue to

exist between these two powers.

The Americans in the Far East, especially in Japan, are pursuing an anti-British policy which is causing great anxiety in the City.

Generally speaking, Britain shows anxiety on account of American economic domination over her dominions and colonies. As a matter of fact, important parts of the British Empire (Canada, Australia, West Indies, South Africa) were drawn more and more into the American orbit during the war. Great Britain is today trying to swim against the stream of US penetration by maintaining and consolidating her imperial preference system, despite American objections; by strengthening the economic bonds of the Empire as a whole, and by knitting closer its African possessions (refusal to hand Southwest Africa over to UN Trusteeship, Pan-African plan, etc.).

III. *The Search for New Forms Of Imperialist Domination*

New conditions compel the imperialists to revise their traditional forms of domination. It is impossible for them to continue ruling arbitrarily and enslaving the colonial peoples in the same way as in the past. To avoid losing everything, they are increasingly forced to grant nominal independence when the aspirations of the masses become too powerful. In every instance, in order to prevent or retard an open struggle, they endeavor to camouflage their rule with a democratic facade. A trait common to all these attempts takes the shape, on the one side, of a quest for stronger support among the colonial bourgeoisie so as to stem the mass movements, and on the other side, of encouraging and even artificially creating divisions within the respective bourgeoisies and countries.

Immediately after the war, imperialism tried to give its new forms of colonial domination an international juridical formula within the framework of the United Nations, namely, "trusteeships." But this formula has up to now been disclosed as lacking any content whatever. While paying lip service to "trusteeship," the old imperialisms have generally refused to place under "trusteeship" their colonies and mandates. For its part, the UN, far from trying to show the least inclination of realizing this demagogic formula in life, and far from opposing imperialist interventions in the colonies, has shown itself in the Security Council to be a valuable instrument in the service of imperialism. This was notably the case in UN's intervention in Indonesia, where it made itself the mouth-piece of Yankee imperialism's will against the aspirations of the Indonesian peoples.

The imperialists tend more and more to resort to *indirect* rule through closer collaboration and greater compromises with the national bourgeoisie in countries where the insistent demand for independence can no longer be evaded. These political methods tend to mask as far as possible the economic domination, still extremely great, and in fact, decisive, of the countries which have been granted independence. Imperialism continues to dominate by sheer weight of its influence in the economy of these countries.

The imperialists, at the same time, tend more and more to try to secure their hold over the insurgent colonies by means of artificial divisions and partitions. Whilst the defenders of colonialism used often in the past to claim that imperialism played a unifying role for a whole number of countries, decaying capitalism, in order to maintain its domination, has had to put to an end this role of "unifier" and has instigated new separatist movements (Pakistan, Indonesia, Viet Nam, Palestine).

This process has not proceeded in the same way in all the colonies. It is particularly marked in certain countries of the Far East and Middle East. As against this, there has been a reinforcement of the positions of the old imperialists in Central and Southern Africa, where the evolution of the anti-imperialist and social struggles has only just started and, while making great strides, is still backward, in comparison with the countries of the Far East.

The old imperialisms are not applying their new forms of domination in a systematic manner. On the contrary, the application of these new forms proceeds empirically, by rule of thumb in a fashion which varies from one country to another, corresponding to the pressure and to the correlation of forces. This can be seen by examining the policies of the various imperialist powers.

British Policy

The war has seriously shaken the century-old British Empire. In Asia, the British positions had already suffered many serious attacks by Japan, in the economic and social fields, during the prewar years.

Japan's military attack on the Asiatic continent came only as the logical sequence of her economic offensive. When, after the capitulation of Japan, the British armies returned to Burma and Malaya, they found countries economically disrupted by the consequences of war and occupation, and politically stirred by powerful currents of nationalist hopes. Although India could be kept under the British yoke throughout the war and although the crushing of the August 1942 uprising had paved the way for an era of veritable military dictatorship, the forces of revolt continued to accumulate among the masses. They erupted again in November 1945, when British imperialism brought to trial former fighters of Chandra Bose's Indian National Army. A wave of demonstrations and strikes that shook the country was followed by the Royal Indian Navy mutiny of February 1946 supported by the Bombay workers. This sounded the alarm signal to imperialism.

Great Britain could find no solution in the strengthening of her military and repressive apparatus. This was ruled out by her definitely reduced economic position in which she emerged from the war. Britain sought a solution through granting a nominal independence—spectacularly marked by the withdrawal of British troops, but leaving the economic bases of British rule substantially intact. In India, this maneuver is most clearly revealed. By creating two states—as artificial as Pakistan and India, without geographic or economic unity—Great Britain kills two birds with one stone: On the one hand, she superficially satisfies the nationalist aspirations of the masses, diverts into communal strife their hostility to imperialism, weakens

the country beyond repair, blocks any serious economic progress and prepares for herself a wide field for maneuvers by playing off one Indian state against the other. Great Britain will endeavor to impose her will on both and to ensure her possession of mines, plantations, industries and banks. India's independence thus means that imperialism no longer dominates the country directly, but rather through the agency of the indigenous bourgeoisie and feudal landlords; and that the partition of India guarantees to Great Britain the subjection of the Hindu and Moslem bourgeoisies to her wishes.

In Burma, which lost her independence relatively recently (1886), the masses' hostility to the British exploiters became translated during the war into a refusal to participate in the war on the Allied side; and after the Japanese capitulation, into a long series of separatist demonstrations and nationalist agitation. Here, too, the British had to find a solution: They did so by negotiating with the leaders of the Anti-Fascist League which started out as a broad nationalist movement, including the Communist and Socialist parties, the Rangoon trade unions, and the peasant unions. It was purged in 1946 by the leader Aug San and was transformed into a reactionary weapon of the owning classes. Independence will in reality serve to hand over to the Burmese owning classes the responsibility for putting the squeeze on the masses in the interests of imperialism. At the same time, the endemic civil war in Burma, and the internal dissensions among the bourgeois and semi-feudal camps make an appeal for British support imperative for those in power.

In Malaya, Britain has granted a larger share of political participation to the native bourgeoisie, maintaining her naval and military bases substantially intact.

In Africa, where developments lag behind the Far East colonies, British imperialism continues her traditional forms of domination. She strives to extend and fortify her rule on the basis of a great postwar export of capital to Southern and—to a lesser extent—East Africa. In thus making up for its retreats in the Far and Middle East, British imperialism overcomes the unevenness of development. But it does so in such a way as to produce an ever greater synchronism between the Orient and Africa, and thereby it digs the grave of its gigantic African Empire.

The French Empire

During the occupation of France, the "Free French" led by de Gaulle had to rely to a great extent on the African colonies. De Gaulle was thus driven to promise to ameliorate the conditions of the colonial masses, in order to draw them into the war effort. These promises are contained in the statements made at the Brazzaville Conference at the beginning of 1944, which drew a general outline of the future postwar colonial organization. At this Conference originated the term "French Union" as a substitute for the "French Empire." The formula proposed a "freely consented association" of the overseas peoples with France. Among the most outstanding decisions were: the abolition of forced labor, the granting of trade-union rights and the establishment of a "non-citizens" college, giving the native population the right to vote and ensuring

them a—limited—representation in the Assemblies of France.

In reality, these decisions have brought only limited results and have hardly modified the colonial system of exploitation. Forced labor has been reintroduced under various subterfuges, trade-union rights are constantly being violated by the administration and the colonists. As for the right to vote, the sending of a few native deputies to the French parliament does not make the colonial system taste any sweeter. Moreover, by using all sorts of pressure, intimidation and corruption, the administration and the colonists who are all-powerful, in most cases prevent the election of authentic representatives of the colonial masses.

Under the democratic emblem of the "French Union," repression has actually been more ferocious and sanguinary than ever, as witness the massacres in Algeria of May, 1945, the killings in Madagascar and the war against Viet Nam.

The Assembly of the French Union, established by the new Constitution is nothing but a caricature. It has power only to formulate wishes; nor is it the product of any elections, since one-half of it consists of elements sent by local administrations, in accordance with the pleasure of the Administration.

The policy of the French Union approximates that of Great Britain at present, in its tendency to use, more than in the past, the native bourgeoisie as a transmission belt for imperialist interests. But it differs insofar as France is economically feebler than Britain and has a smaller margin for maneuvers with regard to concessions. Besides, France is not faced anywhere in her colonies with a colonial bourgeoisie so developed as that of India. The French concessions do not go beyond the right of independence "within the framework of the French Union," a framework which is more like an iron collar. Diplomatic representation and the army remain in French hands; finance and the entire economy remain subject to the interests of the mother country, and so on. Under these conditions, to speak of independence is a bitter piece of irony.

Holland's Policy

The wealth of the Dutch bourgeoisie has been acquired in the course of three centuries of frenzied exploitation of the Indonesian peoples, who, under the most brutal regimes, started asserting their autonomist aspirations even before 1914. The Japanese, who occupied Indonesia from February 1942 encouraged before they capitulated, the formation of an independent government, under the Presidency of Dr. Soekarno. At the end of the war, the Dutch found themselves confronted with a *jait accompli* — Indonesia was independent. Even with the aid of British troops, it was out of the question for them to reconquer by military measures a country which was up in arms against their domination. It was equally out of the question for them to allow this source of Dutch revenue to dry up.

In a declaration of Queen Wilhelmina in December 1942, the Netherlands Government announced its intention of creating a Commonwealth after the war, in which the metropolitan country and the colonies would enjoy equal status. During the stormy postwar negotiations with the Indonesian national government, the meaning of this

"equality" became apparent. The policy of Dutch imperialism is similar in the main to the line of French imperialism toward Viet Nam. Holland, too, is trying to support herself on the Indonesian bourgeoisie, but her own weakness coupled with the vital importance for her of exploiting the wealth of Indonesia prevent the Dutch from going very far on the road of concessions.

Refusing actually to accord independence to the Indonesian Republic, Holland endeavors to confine the new State within double barriers. On the one side, by integrating it into the so-called Federalist Indonesia, which also includes the Republic of Borneo and the Indonesian East (small islands of the East Indies, Celebes, Molucca, New Guinea) and which has been constituted under august Dutch patronage; and on the other side by creating a Netherlands-Indonesian Commonwealth. Finally, as France tried in Indo-China, Holland is trying to divide the Indonesian bourgeoisie by artificially creating separatist movements in various parts of the islands.

The July 1947 military assault was intended to complete the strangulation of the Indonesian Republic. It must be emphasized that Holland could succeed in maintaining her positions in Indonesia only thanks to Anglo-American military aid and equipment. The U. S. is interested in Indonesian oil and in the rubber and tin trade.

IV. The Colonial Bourgeoisie and the New Forms of Imperialist Rule

All these forms of indirect domination are only relative and passing in value. By leaving more room to the colonial bourgeoisie, imperialism merely paves the way for sharper social struggles, pitting the working masses more directly against the native exploiters. The masses will presently realize that they can free themselves completely from imperialist domination only by overthrowing the national bourgeoisie and taking power in their own hands.

The national industrial and commercial bourgeoisie who find themselves bound to and at times coalesced with the landlords, and whose numerical strength is slight, have in the past manifested only a timid opposition to imperialism, aiming to enlarge their own base of profit and exploitation.

To conduct their struggle against imperialism, they needed the support of the masses, but at the same time, they lived in fear of these same masses, particularly of the agrarian revolution, and they have always shown themselves eager to reach a compromise with the imperialists.

With the new forms of domination which the imperialists are tending to adopt, with these *indirect forms of rule* in which the national bourgeoisie occupies a more important place, the indigenous capitalists become more firmly the allies of imperialism, and more directly the oppressors of the masses, while at the same time becoming less capable of playing a serious oppositional role.

In those countries where the revolutionary movement has acquired a broad scope, as in Indonesia and Viet Nam, the native bourgeoisie has shown that it does not hesitate to place itself at the disposal of the imperialists against the toiling masses.

World War II has reduced virtually to zero the pretensions of the bourgeoisie of the semi-colonial and colonial countries to struggle against imperialism. In certain countries the bourgeoisie showed itself ready to struggle only in order to put itself at the disposal of the imperialist power strong enough to protect it against the movement of the masses. This appears to be the case for a certain number of French colonies, notably Morocco where the penetration of American capitalism grows more and more considerable.

There is an apparent outward development among those national bourgeoisies which still find themselves under the thumb of British imperialism. Thus, Egypt makes serious claims on Lybia and in the first instance on Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. These tendencies do not express either the strength or the growing independence of the national bourgeoisies in relation to imperialism. What they actually express is the inability of their industrial sectors to compete on major markets with imperialism. Hence this search for markets in weaker countries. We find expressed here the comprador character of the bourgeoisie as an intermediary for imperialist goods in search of new markets; and, generally speaking, the subordination of the national bourgeoisie to the old imperialist power. To the extent that the native capitalists strive to strengthen their position in relation to this power, these same tendencies express their increasing transformation into the victims of inter-imperialist competition and rivalry.

The indigenous bourgeois parties express various features of their class corresponding to their particular country.

In *China*, the Kuomintang has now decomposed into many rival cliques and the clamor for reforms is above all an attempt, up to the present still in vain, to reform the Kuomintang for the profit of the strongest Chinese capitalists. The Kuomintang, in capitulating to US imperialism, keeps losing its popular base and suffers continued reverses at the hands of the "Red" peasant armies.

Tied up with US imperialism, the Kuomintang plays an utterly counter-revolutionary role in relation to the Chinese masses as a whole. Never before has the comprador character of the Kuomintang bourgeoisie been so evident as in its abject capitulation to US imperialism. The existing friction between the Chinese bourgeoisie and US imperialism becomes increasingly subordinated to the antagonism between Soviet Russia and the US and to the class struggle in China itself.

In *Indonesia*, the dismemberment of the Republic finds its expression in the camp of the national bourgeois leaders. In January 1948, Shahrir and his followers broke with the Socialist Party and disclosed increasingly capitulationist tendencies. The new Government, on the contrary, while accepting the responsibility for a treaty which abandons a large territory to the imperialists, has been regrouped under the leadership of Mohamed Hatta, the Masjoemi Muslim, the Nationalist Indonesian Party of President Soekarno and the Stalinist and Socialist parties.

In *India*, the transition from direct to indirect rule does not qualitatively change the character of imperialist exploitation. Imperialism dominates by the sheer weight of

its economy in the country as a whole, and by its control of the Indian Ocean. All exchange banks as well as the bulk of foreign trade are vested in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie. They own by far the most decisive sectors of the economy (mining, plantations, jute, transportation—except for railways—insurance companies, along with a section of textiles). The Indian bourgeoisie has unquestionably increased its share of the spoils during the two world wars notably in textiles, but its share in every other sphere of the economy is subordinate. And even in those fields where Indian capital has penetrated, it is more or less powerless to decisively alter the preponderance of British capital. It stands in danger of being squeezed to the wall and crowded out, despite a measure of disinvestment of British capital, which finds itself more than compensated for this by a most intensified exploitation of the workers.

The basic industries still remain undeveloped. The bourgeoisie is incapable of carrying out the industrialization of the country. Although there has been some advancement in heavy industry such as iron and steel, the most essential premise for industrial expansion as electrification is still undeveloped. Any considerable independent role on the part of the Indian bourgeoisie would involve a thoroughgoing industrialization of the country, especially the development of its basic industries, excluded under imperialism. It is possible to speak of an independent role of the Indian bourgeoisie, only in the context of a thoroughgoing industrialization of the country, which in the framework of decaying capitalism in its state of decline can be ruled out in advance. It will be no less impossible for the Indian bourgeoisie to expand with regard to the purchase of machine tools from, or have any kind of independent trade with, hard currency areas.

Coupled with the foregoing economic factors, is the fact that, despite the withdrawal of the army of occupation, the Indian Ocean remains a British lake, from which Britain is capable of enforcing her will on the bourgeoisie of India and Pakistan.

Although the bourgeoisie of India has moved up the ladder of colonial status, it has not leaped from the ladder of colonial status to the ladder of independent status.

The All-India Congress is the political party of the Indian bourgeoisie. It has exploited the combativity of the masses in order to obtain concessions from British imperialism. Right from its accession to power the Congress has shown its class nature by resorting to the most brutal repressions.

The Moslem League, lead by Jinnah, has been able to develop a mass base in the backward peasant regions, following the agrarian policy of the Hindu Congress Ministers who do not carry out a single serious reform and who protect the big landowners. The Moslem League contains at one and the same time feudal landlords who consider it as a rampart for their privileges, the growing Moslem bourgeoisie swamped by Hindu capitalists, and the peasant masses attracted by the demagogic support given to agrarian reforms. Its advent to power in Pakistan will not fail to rip asunder this heterogeneous agglomeration.

In the *Middle East*, the Arab League, founded in 1945, at the behest of the British, includes, on the one hand, statesmen with divergent interests and, on the other, contending social classes: old feudal leaders sold out directly to imperialism and the young bourgeoisies seeking to extend their influence and markets. The result is that the Arab League does not present any real homogeneity and only arrives at a common understanding in exceptional cases. Neither decadent feudalism nor the bourgeoisie condemned to remain an abortion is capable of unifying the Arab world.

V. The Peasantry and the Proletariat

1. Capitalism has introduced into the colonial countries elements of capitalist economy which have led to the overthrow of their ancient social structure. This process was accelerated in the course of the Second World War, which made necessary the development of economic resources in a whole number of colonial countries (Egypt, Palestine, Manchuria, Korea, certain regions of China, and others).

In spite of these economic developments, the economy of most colonies preserves a predominantly peasant character.

Two main categories must be distinguished:

a) The peoples among whom a certain national consciousness had existed for a long time, such as India, China, Viet Nam, Korea, Indonesia, the Middle Eastern countries, Egypt, North Africa, whose overall structure is comparable and whose problems are parallel, despite very important differences resulting essentially from a different level of economic development.

The peasantry in all these countries constitutes a very large majority of the populace. These peasants live in exceeding misery and under precarious conditions, on dwarfish plots of land which do not allow them to eke out a subsistence, while at the opposite pole a handful of big landowners own among them most of the land. In these countries, usury is a scourge daily lashing the peasant population. Everywhere, famine stalks more or less permanently. All these conditions place the peasant in the position of virtual serfdom and make *the agrarian revolution* the motor force of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. The agrarian question is further aggravated by the existence of extreme rural concentrations, especially in the Far East. Hence results a particularly explosive nature of class relations in the countryside.

b) These are the countries where national consciousness is just beginning to awaken, notably in the countries of so-called Darkest Africa.

These countries are characterized by a much less advanced social differentiation and by the survival of ancient tribal structure (French Equatorial Africa, Belgian Congo, Portuguese West and East Africa, British possessions in East and West Africa).

The great mass of the population lives on the land under archaic conditions, often as a collective, based on the village. They suffer from the abuses of colonial ad-

ministration (limitation of agricultural rights, forced sale of their products at rates fixed by the administration, taxes, forced labor, etc.).

Big estates are mainly in the hands of the colonial companies. There is only a budding bourgeoisie, primarily commercial, crushed from birth by the competition of the big companies (prohibition to import or export except through these large concerns). Those individuals who rise above the mass are as a rule the village chiefs appointed and paid by the administration which uses them chiefly as tax collectors.

The proletariat is extremely limited, being concentrated in a few transport enterprises (railways, ports, post offices).

2. The struggles in the colonial countries have invariably confirmed the permanent character of the revolution through experiences, often costly ones, of the oppressed masses of these countries. The peasant revolts and uprisings *to seize the land for those who till it*, a problem which is tied up with the issue of national independence, have been unable as yet to reach their goal for lack of an alliance with the proletariat. As it is stated in the resolution of the Founding Congress of the Fourth International in 1938 entitled, "The Class Struggle and the War in the Far East." "It is on the shoulders of the proletariat that the twofold task rests of achieving the solution of the national problems and of clearing the way for the socialist reconstruction of society by elevating itself to the position of ruling class in alliance with all the exploited masses of the cities and villages."

The agrarian revolution is permanent in character. It comprises a whole series of economic and social measures and transformations whose very nature is such that they can only be a part of the socialist reconstruction of society. These changes are inconceivable in the epoch of cataclysmic capitalist decline, within the framework of capitalist property and social relations in the countryside. The agrarian revolution embraces the expropriation of big landowners; the nationalization of the land; the division of this nationalized land among the peasants on an equalitarian basis and the cancellation of mortgages and other debts; the conversion into State farms, to start with, of that part of the land which at the time of nationalization had been farmed on a modern capitalist basis; the establishment of collective farms on other sectors of the land; the industrialization and mechanization of agriculture; the development in a harmonious way, from small-scale agriculture to State farming, while at the same time extending the fullest possible aid to the poor peasants in low-priced fertilizers and equipment; the levelling of the economic and cultural gap between city and country; and the fostering of closest ties between the workers in the cities and the small farmers.

The agrarian revolution may thus be viewed as a component part of the socialist reconstruction of society. Hence follows the necessity for the *dictatorship of the proletariat* allied with the peasantry through a *Workers and Peasants Government*, that is to say, in general for a State equipped to carry out the complex tasks of the agrarian revolution, as an integral part of its whole

economic policy. The alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry is indispensable not alone for a consistent struggle against feudalism, semi-feudalism, and capitalist oppression of the peasant. The proletariat is not only the sole class able to lead the scattered, unstable, hesitant and dependent peasantry on the road toward the agrarian revolution, by introducing the class struggle into the countryside. But, what is more, this alliance under the leadership of the proletariat must be continued in the shape of the Workers and Peasants Government. *State power in the hands of the leading working class*—here is the precondition for carrying through and consummating the agrarian revolution.

3. The upheavals produced by the war have accelerated the numerical growth of the proletariat, its concentration as well as its class consciousness.

If the numerical weakness, on the one hand, along with the absence of basic industries, on the other hand, weigh against the colonial proletariat, then, contrariwise, its union with the poorest layers of the peasantry is made extremely easy because of its own recent peasant origins and its still very powerful ties with the villages.

In many colonial countries of the Far East there have existed since the creation of the Third International communist and revolutionary movements which have sunk deep roots into masses of workers and through them among certain peasant layers.

But the most striking fact of the progress as a class accomplished by proletarians in colonial countries is the powerful growth of the trade union movement, after World War II.

The rise of this union movement is a great factor in the education of the masses and it spurs the struggles to higher levels. In the Far East, the downfall of Japan's rule brought with it the establishment of powerful trade union movements, especially in Japan herself and in Korea. These movements have shown a magnificent spirit in their demands and are very dynamic in their aggressiveness. Korea witnessed the first general strike in its history in March 1946. In Japan, there is unceasing ferment. In China, too, the proletarian struggles have revived in the great industrial centers. In India, the end of the war has also brought with it a large-scale development of trade union struggles in the great industrial centers, especially in Madras and Bombay. Characteristically enough, the mass influence of Indian Trotskyists was able to grow principally through trade union struggles.

In the semi-feudal and reactionary states of the Near and Middle East, the workers face the greatest difficulties in wresting the recognition of their trade union rights or their right to set up central trade union bodies.

In Iraq, where a strong trade union movement developed from 1941 to 1944, the government undertook vast repressive actions. Unions also took a giant forward step in Egypt, where since 1945 unceasing strike waves have taken place, drawing into the struggle tens of thousands of workers (Shubra-al-Kaima textile mills near Cairo). The Egyptian Government has answered with the most ferocious repressions.

Only Syria and Lebanon enjoy a legal development of

the trade union movement, and here it has become entrenched.

In French North Africa, the trade union movement has existed as an affiliated branch of the French CGT (Confederation of Labor). In Tunisia, the branch attached to the CGT in October 1946 decided to constitute itself as an autonomous center, directly affiliated to the World Trade Union Federation. In Morocco, trade union rights are not yet recognized for Moroccans and any Moroccan trade unionist is liable to imprisonment although this law is not generally applied. Trade unions have grown despite these difficulties and they have led important strikes recently.

In the French East and Equatorial Africa, trade union rights were only granted in 1945. The unions immediately experienced a stormy growth, making possible a veritable leap in political consciousness among large masses in regions which had been extremely backward, such as Cameroon. In September 1945, a decision was made to form trade union organizations amongst the Africans. These developed particularly in the metal industry, transport and building employes.

In South Africa, where the color problem predominates, the African trade unions lead a barely legal existence, and suffer ferocious repressions. Nevertheless, they and other non-white unions are growing (250,000 members in 1947). In August 1946, 125,000 African miners went on a heroic strike; the repression was bloody. The process of unionization continues despite new laws which threaten to illegalize the movement completely.

Finally, it is noteworthy that a Pan-African Trade Union Conference was held in April 1947 at Dakar, under the auspices of the WTUF, attending were 50 delegates who represented 21 trade union organizations with a total of 800,000 members. The independence of the Trade Unions Movement in the French colonies in Africa free from control of the French CGT is an indispensable condition for its free and full development. Coupled with the need for this independence is the need of greater centralization of the trade unions, corresponding with growing union organization of the African workers.

VI. Stalinism, Social Democracy And the Colonial Problem

1) Stalinism in the Colonies

It is in colonial and semi-colonial countries that Stalinism started in 1925 to apply a policy of class collaboration and to elaborate a theoretical justification for it (the Bloc of Four Classes in China). To this end, the Stalinists had to idealize, among other things, the role of the national bourgeoisie. The degeneration of Stalinism in its collaboration with the bourgeoisie found a most repugnant expression during the war, when the Communist parties pronounced themselves in favor of accepting colonialism, so as to give full satisfaction to their imperialist allies. To illustrate, the Indian Stalinists declared themselves against the 1942 uprising and for supporting the war to the bitter end alongside of British imperialism and under its orders. Similarly, in 1945, the Algerian Stalinists approved the massacres of French imperialism and condemned

the Algerian mass protest demonstrations as fascist intrigues. Thus, likewise, the Indo-Chinese Stalinists (who had dissolved themselves into the Viet-Minh) advocated the incorporation of Viet Nam in the French Union, against the will of the Viet-Nam working and peasant masses.

In fact, the policy of the Stalinists in the colonies—as everywhere else—was above all dictated by the nationalist interests of the Moscow bureaucracy. In China they subordinated the war against Japanese imperialism and the national struggles against Chiang Kai-shek to the wartime alliance with imperialism. The Stalinist intervention in the Viet Nam is also dictated by the needs of Soviet diplomacy to occupy an important strategic position in Southern China. The policy of the Stalinist parties in the Middle East and Egypt is also dictated by the rivalry between the USSR, on the one hand, and the U.S. and Great Britain, on the other.

In some African countries where Soviet interests are not involved directly, the native Stalinists align themselves with the requirements of Stalinist policy in metropolitan countries rather than in accordance with the interests of the exploited masses.

The pro-colonial policy of the Stalinists has led to such disastrous consequences for these parties that they had to execute a turn, corresponding more or less to the one that had to be carried out in Europe following the increased tension between the USSR and the USA. In this way, the Stalinists in Algeria, for instance, tried again to draw nearer to nationalist formations (Friends of the Manifesto, Algerian People's Party—the PPA) by a display of greater militancy against imperialism; but they refuse to come out in favor of a break with the metropolitan country and they remain the defenders of the "French Union."

Amongst the tendencies of Stalinist policy in the colonies is their inclination not toward the poor peasants, but certain well-to-do layers. The most characteristic example is that of Chinese Soviet territories. The "Chinese Soviets" started as peasant revolts. Consequent to the defeated revolution of 1925-1927 these revolts led to the establishment of peasant bands who became more or less settled in certain regions of Northern China. In the "Soviet territories" the policy of Stalinist leaders (Mao Tse-tung), was oriented toward the constitution of a layer of well-to-do peasants.

The agrarian program of Viet-Minh sponsored by the Stalinists is aimed at winning the support of the landowners. From the start of the revolution, Viet-Minh leaders banned the division of land and refused to cancel debts and mortgages or to suppress usury.

The Stalinists in colonial countries defend the Menshevik theory of revolution by stages, the theory that native capitalism has to develop before there can be any talk of fighting for socialism (cf. Ho Chi-Minh's statement).

2) *Stalinist Parties in Mother Countries and the Colonies*

The policy of Stalinist parties in metropolitan countries in relation to the colonies, is equivalent to a policy of an agency of imperialism. Especially in the early post-war days, the Stalinist parties in the metropolitan coun-

tries championed colonial policies indistinguishable from the traditional reactionary colonial policies of the Social Democracy.

Operating within the limits of class-collaboration with imperialism and on the ground of the theory of "Socialism in one country" and its twin the "peaceful co-existence of the USSR and of world capitalism," the metropolitan Stalinist parties unconditionally and absolutely subordinate, adjust and gear their policy toward the colonies in accordance with the Kremlin's own policy toward their respective imperialist power and their own resultant relationship with this imperialist power.

Thus from 1939 to 1941 the metropolitan Stalinists from time to time would rehoist their soiled flag for the independence of the colonies. But they never did so in order to promote the liberation of the colonies, but exclusively for the sake of embarrassing imperialism and preparing the soil for a rapprochement, for collaboration and horse-trade between the Western imperialist powers and the Kremlin. They kept their propaganda strictly within the scope of their fundamental policy of class collaboration.

From 1941 to 1945 the metropolitan Stalinists threw overboard the slogan of independence and strove might and main to shackle and yoke the colonies and semi-colonies to Roosevelt and Churchill.

In the post-1945 years when the Stalinists entered bourgeois cabinets in a number of countries in Europe, the full measure of their treachery toward the colonies and even toward their sister parties in certain colonies (Viet Nam) became quite apparent.

The French C.P. Ministers and Deputies aided in quelling the Algerian uprising; they voted war credits for the infamous campaign against the Viet-Nameese struggle for independence; they came out in favor of the "Union Francaise"; they took part in the administration of colonial rule in French West Africa.

The Italian C.P. Deputies clamored not for the independence—but for a partial restoration—of Italy's lost African empire.

The Dutch Stalinists, did not ever lift their little finger to assist Indonesia, but, on the contrary, helped suffocate Indonesia within the confines of the "Dutch Commonwealth." They condemned the heroic struggles of Tan Malakka and of the resolute revolutionists. They voted for nationalists (the Treaty of Linggadjati). They sanctioned the unholy collaboration between the Indonesian-bourgeois capitulators and the Dutch Government.

Such has been, to a greater or lesser degree, the shameful record of the metropolitan Stalinists toward the colonies from the day they rejected independence for Morocco during the Spanish Civil War, through their treacherous "sanctions" campaign during Abyssinia's struggle against fascist domination, down to the unprecedented postwar betrayals of the colonies by the Stalinists in the metropolitan countries. The sum-total of their colonial policy is to function as agents of imperialism on the basis of class collaboration inside their own country, while acting throughout as agents of the class-collaborationist foreign policy of the Kremlin.

3) The "Left" Turn of 1947 and the Colonies

Stalinism marked the beginning of its latest "left" turn with the creation of the Cominform. This 1947 turn opens a phase of political acts of treason by the Stalinist parties in colonial as well as metropolitan countries. Continuing a quarter of a century of incessant betrayals, the Stalinist conduct and leadership of the struggles under the "left" turn must inescapably reveal its limitations, its inability to complete the agrarian revolution in China and Indo-China; its role as a brake (e.g., the acceptance of compromises with the Dutch in Java and the French in Viet Nam); and its naked counter-revolutionary character (e.g., assassinations of Trotskyists and other militants, frame-ups, imprisonments, military intervention against the masses, and the rest). Stalinism must continue, as in the past, to reveal itself as utterly incapable of carrying out the major tasks in colonial and semi-colonial countries, namely, the agrarian revolution, the solution of the national question, the struggle for full democracy, the overthrow of imperialism.

The Communist parties, however, especially in the colonies, play dual and self-contradictory roles: There is the Stalinist ideology and policy at one pole; and a great proletarian and mass base, at the other. This mass base must repeatedly collide with the ideology of the "bloc of many classes," and of "revolution by stages." In the days to come, in the race between revolution and World War III, the Stalinist parties will be driven, on the one hand, to cling tenaciously to their mass base and to engage this base in struggles; and, on the other hand, to limit persistently these self-same struggles as befits any new agreements and deals between the U. S. and the Soviet Government.

In the revolutionary crisis in the colonies the Stalinists at the head of these struggles must come into collision with the momentum of the masses themselves who will at certain times go into action spontaneously. This revolutionary momentum, born of the masses' aspirations, will have repercussions among the "rank and file" militants of various Communist parties.

If a Fourth International party is lacking, sections of these militant fighters in CP ranks, will be either physically destroyed by the Stalinist apparatus, or isolated, or fall back disillusioned and demoralized. The intervention of a revolutionary party in such crises will not only rescue millions of militant CP'ers from Stalinist terror and despair, but will draw them into a genuine revolutionary party. Participating shoulder to shoulder with millions of courageous militant communists in colonial and semi-colonial countries in their struggles against imperialism; relentlessly exposing and attacking Stalinist policies and ideology, driving deeper and deeper the wedge of its own program between the militants and the leaders of Stalinist parties—here is the way whereby the Fourth International will, in the colonial and semi-colonial countries where Stalinism is a force, be able to overcome the obstacle of Stalinism and find a bridge to the masses as well as to the mass parties of action. In this era of colonial struggles many opportunities to wean the militants and the mass base away from the CP, will undoubtedly occur. Combining

a firm, unbending, implacable opposition to Stalinism with the most flexible tactics in approaching the members and the mass base of the CP, the parties of the Fourth International in the colonies and semi-colonies will overcome Stalinism and lead the proletariat, in alliance with the peasantry and all the oppressed, to the fulfillment of the tasks of the permanent revolution in the colonies.

4) The Social Democracy

Traditional Social Democracy never struck root in the colonies. Such a formation as the Socialist Party of India, although it operates essentially on the basis of reformist ideas, has arisen not as a wing of metropolitan Social Democracy but as a petty bourgeois Left Wing of the national bourgeoisie on the basis of the national emancipation movement.

Nevertheless, the role of Social Democracy in the mother countries, in relation to the colonies, possesses a real meaning for the colonially oppressed. In relation to the colonies, the Social Democracy—whether it be the Labour Party of Britain or the Socialist Party of France or Holland or Belgium—has invariably appeared and functioned as an agency of imperialism. The policy of the Social Democracy differs in no fundamental respects from the colonial policy of the Stalinists in the instances already cited or taking it overall.

The ground for Stalinist treachery is class-collaboration deriving from ties with the Kremlin. Conversely, the ground for Social Democratic treachery and reaction with regard to the colonies is, in its turn, likewise class-collaboration, but one which derives from material ties between the labor aristocracy and the bourgeoisie engendered by the imperialist super-exploitation of the colonies. This factor demarcates the Social Democracy from Stalinism in relation to the colonies and invests the Social Democratic colonial policy with a greater consistency, continuity and stability. A typical example is that of the French Social Democracy which has, since the liberation, furnished French imperialism with the bulk of its leading cadres (Ministers of the Colonies up to 1947, Governors, Generals, etc.). They are the ones who directed the most bloody repression against the colonial masses (Texier, Chataigneau, Naegelen in Algeria, de Coppet in Madagascar, Maes in Tunisia).

The classic case is that of the British Labour Party. It was the progeny of the labor aristocracy fattened by a share of the superprofits which a rising British imperialism drained from the colonies. It attained its peak strength at a moment when the British Empire is shaken and weakened to its foundations. Radicalized, in the last analysis, by the profound dislocation and retreat of British imperialism in the Far East, the British working class heaved into the seats of power to solve their problems, the very party which is historically the child of imperialist superprofits, which has had inexorably to strive to reestablish the domination of imperialism over its weakened colonies; and which is therefore utterly incapable of liberating British labor from the boons of colonial exploitation—a liberation which is the necessary premise for emancipating the British proletariat from wage-slavery.

To the colonial masses the Labour Party has demonstrated that it is the continuator of British imperial policy. To the metropolitan workers the Labour Party will more and more demonstrate the all important fact, namely, that the revolt of the British proletariat, and indeed of the privileged proletariat throughout Western Europe, against colonial slavery; that their rejection of any benefits from or share in the colonies, is a basic condition for their own class emancipation.

Furthermore, the lesson of the Social Democracy in general and of the British Labour Party in particular is this, that not only must metropolitan labor break with imperialism in order to overthrow its own capitalist masters; not only must metropolitan labor recognize its capitalist class as an imperialist class, but, to the extent that the metropolitan proletariat does break with imperialism, to the same extent it is necessary for it to link itself with the proletariat and the oppressed in the colonies. The imperialist slave-link between mother country and colony, must not only be decisively broken. It must be replaced by a class link of solidarity and joint struggle between the metropolitan and the colonial workers. Historical development itself assists this process. But the more conscious it becomes, all the more speedily will the metropolitan proletariat liberate itself. Generally speaking, this task assumes the shape of a break with the Social Democracy in the metropolitan countries for the sake of uniting with the colonial toilers for the overthrow of imperialism. This is the major lesson which must be learned from the five decades of experience with the Social Democracy in relation to the colonies.

VII. Tasks of the 4th International in the Colonies

The program of the Fourth International in the colonies and semi-colonies flows from an understanding of the law of uneven and combined development, and from the theory of the Permanent Revolution.

(1) The revolutionary party in the metropolitan countries has among its tasks the following:

To support unconditionally the anti-imperialist struggles of the colonies; to fight jointly with and assist in every way the colonial masses in their struggle for complete independence from the imperialist yoke; to lead the class struggle in their "own" country against capitalism and patiently teach the workers that this is the best means of giving practical aid to the colonial movements, struggles and revolutions. All this is in the best traditions of working class internationalism.

Wherever imperialist armies occupy a colonial or semi-colonial country, the revolutionary party in the metropolitan country, in close collaboration with the colonial section, must struggle for the withdrawal and return home of all imperialist troops. At the same time it conducts revolutionary agitation for—and in collaboration with the colonial section strives to bring about—solidarity between the metropolitan soldiers and the colonial struggle, calling upon them to fraternize with the insurgent masses of the colonies and semi-colonies.

In event of war by an imperialist power against a colony or semi-colony, our section in the metropolitan country shall work for the military defeat of the imperialist country.

(2) The general task in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is to struggle for the expropriation and overthrow of imperialism, for national independence and self-determination for each and every oppressed colonial country and nationality. In this struggle, the agrarian revolution acts as a motor force in such predominantly peasant colonies and semi-colonies (Far East, Middle East, Near East, North Africa). In Southern Africa, however, the primary dynamic factor of the anti-imperialist struggle is the movement against racial and color oppression and for equality and democratic rights. The parties of the Fourth International adapt to the existing conditions in each country the Transitional Program, estimating the maturity of the struggles in applying correctly the more advanced transitional slogans.

Parties of the Fourth International fight to defend the interests of the young working class in the colonies and semi-colonies, especially by demanding progressive labor legislation (shorter working-hours, shop stewards, social security, and so on).

In certain colonial or semi-colonial countries like China, serious convulsions of the regime can precipitate a revolutionary situation, posing the question of armed revolution. The Fourth International prepares itself and strives to mobilize the proletariat for such eventualities by calling for the organization of workers, peasants and soldiers into committees; and for the establishment of a Workers and Peasants Government based on these armed committees.

In China the Fourth International stands opposed to imperialist intervention and domination (that is to say, in the first instance, the U. S.); and against the comprador bourgeoisie (the Kuomintang) and landlords in their combined assault, backed by imperialism against the peasants and workers of "Red China" and of "Kuomintang" China itself. Whilst supporting and participating in every mass struggle against Chiang Kai-shek and his imperialist backers, the Fourth International wages a determined struggle against Stalinist policies and terror, calling for the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry in order to realize agrarian revolution in life, win national liberation and struggle for a Workers and Peasants Government.

The revolutionary party of China "supports" the Stalinist-controlled peasant armies and vigorously fights against Kuomintang landlords who want to reestablish the old order in the villages. It declares that despite the reactionary leadership of the Chinese Stalinist party, its miserly agrarian-reform policy does, nevertheless, bear a progressive significance and the peasants' defense of these meager gains is, of course, wholly just.

Therefore, the Trotskyists in "liberated" areas will fight without hesitation on the side of the peasants to resist the Kuomintang's reactionary offensive, while, at the same time, in the course of the resistance, exposing the compromises and betrayals of the Stalinist party and fighting its reactionary policy. In the rear of Chiang Kai-shek the Trotskyists advance the slogan for an uncondi-

tional armistice, while supporting every anti-war and pro-peace movement of the masses (See, Resolution of the Communist League of China, February 13, 1948). The Chinese Trotskyists struggle to push every reform timidly projected by Stalinism and bring it to its logical conclusion. In doing so they emphasize that agrarian reforms are unattainable without a firm alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry. They struggle for the democratization of the Red Armies and for placing the power in the hands of democratically elected Peasants and Soldiers Committees in the "liberated" territories.

In Viet Nam the Fourth International stands for the struggle against French imperialism as Enemy No. 1. While supporting and participating in every real struggle against French rule it denounces the counter-revolutionary maneuvers and the nationalist monarchy of Bao Dai who aims to win the support of American imperialism. It constantly exposes the compromising policy and weak compradore character of the bourgeoisie and of the Stalinist-led Viet Minh. It rejects in toto any acceptance of the "French Union." It fights against all opportunist and rotten compromises, and for the agrarian revolution; for a complete severance of ties with France; for a united Viet Nam and for a Workers and Peasants Government.

In Indonesia the Fourth International regards Dutch imperialism as the main enemy, combats every reactionary deal between the national bourgeois parties with the imperial overlords and consistently counterposes to the "Dutch Commonwealth" the struggle for Indonesian independence.

In India the Fourth International poses as the major task the overthrow of British imperialism and its Indian bourgeois collaborators. This implies the expropriation of all foreign-owned enterprises. It regards the national bourgeoisie of India and Pakistan as no longer capable of playing a progressive role in the anti-imperialist struggle. It endeavors to win the leadership of the proletariat in its social struggles against the national bourgeoisie and their imperialist chiefs. It calls for the agrarian revolution and sees in the proletariat the sole class capable of solving the land question, in an alliance with the peasantry. The peasantry cannot play an independent and leading role. In India the Fourth International stands for the fullest democracy in India, Pakistan and Ceylon and against all fake Constituent Assemblies. It stands for full independence, denouncing all forms of imperial domination such as Dominion Status. It fights for the right of autonomy and of self-determination, up to and including the right of secession for each constituent state. It fights for the unity of India based on the right to independent statehood and secession. It denounces the arbitrary partition of India into Hindustan and Pakistan and seeks to promote the United Socialist States of India with full rights of statehood for every nationality.

In the Arab States of the Middle and Near East and in North Africa the sections and groups of the Fourth International stand for the unification of Arab countries into a Federation of Free Arab Republics. These sections struggle for the ousting of British and French imperialism—and against the imperialist intervention of the United States.

They struggle against the landlords—accomplices of imperialism; against their tool, the Arab League; and for Constituent Assemblies and for the widest democracy.

As for *Palestine*, the Fourth International rejects as utopian and reactionary the "Zionist solution," of the Jewish question. It declares that a total renunciation of Zionism is the *sine qua non* condition for the merging of Jewish workers' struggles with the social, national and liberationist struggles of the Arab toilers. It declares that to demand Jewish immigration into Palestine is thoroughly reactionary just as it is reactionary to call for immigration of any oppressor people into colonial countries in general. It holds that the question of immigration as well as the relations between Jews and Arabs can be decided adequately only after imperialism has been ousted by a freely elected Constituent Assembly with full rights for the Jews as a national minority.

On the African Continent the revolutionary party fights for a Free Africa. It struggles for full democratic rights for all. It consistently and uncompromisingly fights against racial discrimination, segregation or color bars in every single walk of life. It strives to organize in trade unions and to win the leadership of the rapidly growing young and strong proletariat—the only class able to lead the tribal and peasant toilers in their agrarian revolution; the only class which can lead the African masses to national liberation and freedom. The only class that is thereby able to consummate the great struggles which this profound awakening to national consciousness already heralds to the world. It struggles for the total ousting and overthrow of British, French, Belgian, Spanish, and Portuguese imperialisms. It fights for independence and self-determination for the toilers of all the States in Africa.

* * *

The complex tasks of colonial revolutions are impossible of solution without the leadership of the revolutionary party, based on Marxist theory and Bolshevik organizational methods. The only parties resting on these twin pillars in the colonies are the sections of the Fourth International. These parties, however, while equipped with the indispensable theoretical, political and organizational ideas and methods are still faced with the task of transforming themselves into mass parties of the proletariat. The history of colonial struggles has repeatedly shown in a negative way, the necessity of a revolutionary party to lead these struggles and their tasks to a successful completion.

The building of mass parties of the Fourth International in the colonies takes place not as an offshoot of its sections in the metropolitan centers but on the soil of indigenous conditions, peculiarities, complexities, and problems. In harmony with all this, each Trotskyist colonial party must integrate and adjust and apply the world program of the Fourth International.

The revolutionary party does not turn its face toward those layers of the population which are bound up, by privileges or social and political ties, with imperialism.

and its allies. On the contrary, such a party turns to those who are the most exploited and oppressed, socially and nationally in city or country. The revolutionary party is, in the first instance, rooted in the proletariat of the big cities and rests on the growing alliance of the urban proletariat with their agricultural brothers, and the alliance of both of them with the peasant poor and with the urban oppressed in general. This party undertakes to lead to victory the struggle of all the toilers and all the oppressed in these countries.

The Fourth Internationalist parties orient themselves in this direction, and direct their labors, particularly among organized union workers whose best elements provide their firmest cadres, along this path. Wherever the trade union movement has developed, the sections of the Fourth International orient themselves to gaining the leadership of the organized workers; and undertake the organization of the unorganized workers. This orientation is the sole guarantee for steering the party clear of petty-bourgeois nationalist illusions in the colonies and semi-colonies. Wherever the workers are divided along racial or caste or religious lines, the sections of the Fourth International at all times wage an uncompromising struggle against racial and caste prejudices, basing themselves on the historic destiny of the proletariat in general, and in

particular, on that section of the proletariat who actually have nothing to lose but their chains.

On the shoulders of the Fourth International rests the task of building for the first time the revolutionary class party in the colonies and semi-colonies. Its mission is to spare the colonial working class the dire defeats of the European proletarians. It is the first International which has actually brought into its leadership the most qualified representatives of the young colonial proletariat. Its ideas have today the capacity to expand beyond the iron curtain, through the jungles and across oceans with an astonishing speed, leaping from "Dark" Africa to Japan, from Korea to Egypt. The Fourth International will prepare on these lands, which know nothing of working-class defeats, the most radical upheavals that history has ever known.

Through revolutions led by the proletariat, the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the world will be raised to the industrial and cultural levels of the advanced countries. By combined and complementary revolutionary struggles in America, Europe, Asia, and Africa the system of world capitalism, with its imperialist and colonial slavery, will be hurled away as a thing of the past. And the socialist reconstruction of all these Continents, modern and backward alike, shall take place.

A Letter from Ceylon

COLOMBO, Ceylon. — This letter is written in the very midst of the great "Independence" racket in Ceylon and just after its climax at both the official and mass ends. February 4th was "appointed day" on which Ceylon was to attain its new status. But the celebrations connected with them were really due for the period from the 9th when the Duke of Gloucester, brother of the King of England, was due to arrive for the biggest-ever tamasha (shindig) planned by the sycophantic bourgeoisie of Ceylon.

The highlight of the Duke's visit was to be the ceremonial opening of the (new) "Dominion" Parliament of Ceylon on the 10th. A special assembly hall was fitted out in an old RAF hangar. 20,000 spectators were to sit around and behind the 101 members of the House of Representatives and the 30 members of the Senate while the Duke intoned the "King's speech." And once the plaintive strains of "God Save The King" had been wailed, the Prime Minister was to unfurl (not hoist — note the delicate distinction) a Sinhalese (Ceylonese) flag just outside the building.

Such were the plans: But everything went awry before and during the event. To begin with, the BLPI (Trotskyist) contingent in Parliament called the bluff about the flag business. What our new

imperialist-agency holders had promised the masses was that the Duke himself would haul down the British flag and run up the Sinhalese flag! A little adroit Parliamentary questioning, along with a hard fight over the flag question, forced out the truth. The question was shown to be not whether the Sinhalese flag was to fly over all but whether it was to have the exclusive right to fly below the Union Jack. In other words, Ceylon was to continue under the British flag and the whole question of national flag was only so much eye-wash. Thus was the BLPI stand on this question fully vindicated and the emptiness of dissident LSSP (split off from BLPI) abstentionism once more shown up.

Then came the question of the ceremonial attendance at the King's speech. That the BLPI Parliamentarians would not attend was expected for the simple reason that they alone had boycotted the King's speech, on the previous occasion when it was delivered by the Governor (now Governor General). The CP too soon announced their decision not to attend because this flowed from their having joined us in voting against the fake independence motion of the government. The question was the LSSP (which had abstained at the voting on the independence motion). What would they do? The whole working class of Ceylon was

glad to hear their announcement that, despite their abstention from voting, they would abstain from attending the King's speech ceremony. We can assure our readers that we did not in the circumstances enquire from them how abstention on this occasion was not "exhibitionism" as they had alleged our boycott of the Governor's visit to have been!

It is necessary to say that on this occasion we proposed that boycott should proceed beyond mere abstention from attending at the Assembly Hall and take some more positive form, e.g., a public meeting. The CP was agreeable. The LSSP left the impression of being agreed, though its leader Dr. N. M. Perera was none too specific. But in the meantime, after the decision of the other sections of the Opposition to attend the ceremony got known, the government decided to snipe at the boycott.

A few days before the 10th the Speaker suddenly communicated with the working-class party members in the House of Representatives demanding that they declare their intention to attend before he provided seats for them in the Assembly Hall. The intent behind this move was to prevent there being empty chairs to greet the Duke and apprise him (and the host of international observers who would be present) of the boycott. But the Speaker was

counting without his BLPI hosts. The leader of our Parliamentary fraction, Comrade Colvin R. de Silva, immediately wrote back demanding the unconditional provision of the seats under threat of a demonstration at the Assembly Hall itself! The Speaker scuttled — and twenty-five empty chairs duly protested the independence racket to the Duke of Gloucester! (7 BLPI, 10 LSSP, 6 CP — including a senator each — and 2 independents.) Incidentally, the "Times" carried a photo distinctly showing the empty seats.

In the meantime the BLPI took the initiative in addressing the LSSP and CP for a united front meeting during the celebrations, against this fake independence and for real independence. The CP agreed, and so did the LSSP at the first joint meeting of the three parties' delegates. However, the LSSP recoiled from its agreement within 24 hours! The illuminating reason given by Dr. N. M. Perera was "theoretical differences".

It is necessary to say that this allegation of Dr. N. M. Perera was correct. The LSSP and its theoreticians hold a novel dualistic theory of independence. According to them Ceylon has got "internal" independence but not "external" (whatever that may mean), or again, political independence but not economic. The British Government's "Independence Bill," it would seem, takes us forward towards independence while, presumably, the Defence and other Agreements (which preceded it and were the precondition to it) drag us back part of the way again! That the agreements were the precondition for the passage of the Bill is apparently irrelevant; and the analysis of the class relationships as a whole is seemingly unnecessary to these neo-Marxists. They prefer to work with the vulgar theory of a gradualistic progress toward independence instead of with the Marxist conception of the "dialectical leap" from colonial status to independence. The net result is that they cannot effectively protest the fakery of the "Independence" that has been "granted" to Ceylon and indeed fall into the position of having to persuade the masses that there actually is some progress" to enthuse about.

That the above remark about the LSSP is correct will be shown by the outcome of our plans. Although we were let down by them we went ahead with the CP with our plans for a meeting. The police refused us permission for any day on which the Duke was in Colombo. We could not therefore arrange for a meeting on the 10th as originally contemplated but had to make do with the 11th. But what an 11th it proved to be!

The meeting was fixed for 4:30 p.m. Several thousands had already gathered at the Galle Face Green by that time despite the burning afternoon sun and

although many a workplace was not yet closed. But the crowds kept streaming in; and even the bourgeois "Times of Ceylon" was compelled to state next day that over 35,000 attended the meeting. The Sinhalese "Lanka Dipa" estimated the attendance at over 50,000. Such was the mighty demonstration which the Colombo masses made against fake independence and for real independence in the very midst of the celebrations which had been planned in order to lull them and dull the edge of their hostility.

The meeting found the LSSP in a fix. "Theoretical differences" being too hot a potato to carry in public, they had shifted their emphasis to "untimeliness" as their reason for not participating in the meeting. Indeed, they actually set going rumours that the meeting would be wrecked by our opponents — the wish being father to the thought, as was shown by a scurrilous article they circulated at the meeting itself. The position they took was: this was "a period of reaction" in which the flag-wagging of the bourgeoisie had "thrown to the surface the worst kind of ultra-nationalist sentiments." Class issues had "temporarily got blurred." To organize a "counter-demonstration" to the Senanayaka celebrations "in this setting," said they, was therefore "stupid adventurism" to which "the LSSP had refused to be a party." "A revolutionary movement," (don't you see?) "should not be jeopardized by any desires for cheap adventurism and snobbish exhibitionism."

The sheer spite of the phraseology we have quoted is a measure of their chagrin when over 35,000 of the people who were alleged to be drugged by patriotic propaganda attended the meeting and applauded enthusiastically every attack on Senanayaka's fake independence. The truth, of course, was that they were foisting on the masses their own idea that this "independence" constituted considerable "progress" even though it did not amount to "complete independence." The masses looked on it otherwise. This was apparent to us at very stage and especially when, in the very midst of the Assembly Hall tamasha and after, we went down into the streets selling a pamphlet denouncing both the fake independence and its celebration. Fully 8,000 copies were sold in two days despite the high price of ten cents for five pages! Besides, even little children had been heard remarking that there was a noticeable lack of cheering for the Duke. Only the LSSP discerned in the inevitable sight-seers at a pageant a drugged mass, and that because they had drugged themselves with a false theoretical position. What a remarkably instructive example of the importance of a correct theory as a guide to action.

Despite the rank provocations of the LSSP, both the CP and the BLPI speak-

ers at this meeting took care, while repudiating this nonsense, to repeat their call to the LSSP even now to join the united front. In fact, our line calling for a united front of the working class parties was rapturously received. The Stalinist Democratic Front was not only not understood but actually got lost on the way — their chairman, Dr. Wickremasinghe, who spoke last, virtually followed our line in his speech!

All Colombo, if not all Ceylon, was openly hostile to the action of the LSSP. Mass pressure on them to come into the demonstrations became irresistible. Their own rank and filers had been seen at the meeting denouncing their leaders' mistakes. The result was that the LSSP had to go back on its position within 24 hours! Their top leader, theoretician and mass speaker, Philip Gunawardene, himself appeared at a meeting organized by the (Trotskyist-dominated) United Youth Front on the 12th to ask apologetically whether they "really believed" that the LSSP, "which had always been with them in their struggles since 1936," would desert them in this struggle.

What a plea! And what a confession! And this ironically enough, at the very moment when a letter from his twin, Dr. N. M. Perera, appeared in the bourgeois "Times" denouncing the meeting as "adventurist," "exhibitionist," etc., etc. The LSSP attempt to sabotage the demonstration had failed. The BLPI had succeeded in mobilizing mass pressure on these recalcitrants and dissidents. A long step had been taken towards the BLPI-LSSP-CP UNITED FRONT for which the masses in process of a regroupment after the June strike defeat patiently thirst. Trotskyism had triumphed over sectarianism and ultimatism once more!

Yours Comradely,
S. B. DISSANAYEKI

Send for Your Free Copy of the

1948 Election Platform

of the

Socialist Workers Party

can be obtained by writing to

SWP PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN
COMMITTEE

116 University Pl., New York 3

Books and Pamphlets on Socialism and the Labor Movement

BY LEON TROTSKY

The First Five Years of the Communist International, vol. I	384 pp. Cloth	\$2.50
The Revolution Betrayed	308 pp. Cloth	2.00
	Paper	1.00
In Defense of Marxism	240 pp. Cloth	2.00
	Paper	1.50
Fascism—What It Is—How to Fight It	48 pp.	.15
Lessons of October	125 pp. o.p.	
Whither France	160 pp. o.p.	
Stalinism and Bolshevism	32 pp.	.10
Their Morals and Ours	48 pp.	.20
War and the Fourth International	36 pp.	.20
Leon Sedoff	32 pp.	.10

DOCUMENTS OF THE FOURTH INT'L AND THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

Fight the Slave Labor Law—Statement of National Committee of SWP	16 pp.	.05
Only Victorious Socialist Revolution Can Prevent the Third World War—Manifesto of April 1946 World Conference of the Fourth Int'l.	32 pp.	.10
Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution	48 pp.	.15
Manifesto of the Fourth International to the Workers and Peasants of India	24 pp. o.p.	
Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Dissolution of the Comintern (with The End of the Comintern—by James P. Cannon)	36 pp.	.10
Resolutions of the Eleventh Convention of the American Trotskyist Movement	48 pp.	.15

PROBLEMS OF THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT

Stalinists on the Waterfront—by Art Preis	32 pp.	.10
Build a Labor Party NOW— by George Clarke	16 pp.	.10
Veterans and Labor—by Charles Carsten	24 pp.	.10
American Workers Need a Labor Party — by Joseph Hansen	48 pp.	.15
Jobs For All—by Art Preis	24 pp.	.10
Maritime—by Frederick J. Lang	182 pp.	1.00
Trade Union Problems—by Farrell Dobbs	44 pp.	.10
Your Standard of Living—by C. Charles	32 pp.	.05
Wartime Crimes of Big Business— by George Breitman	16 pp.	.05

PIONEER POCKET LIBRARY

No. 1—The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International (The Transitional Program)	64 pp.	\$.25
No. 2—The Suppressed Testament of Lenin —with an article by Leon Trotsky	48 pp.	.25

BY JAMES P. CANNON

American Stalinism and Anti-Stalinism	48 pp.	.15
The Coming American Revolution	32 pp.	.10
The History of American Trotskyism	280 pp. Cloth	2.00
	Paper	1.00
The Struggle for a Proletarian Party	320 pp. Cloth	2.00
	Paper	1.50
The Russian Revolution	32 pp.	.10
The End of the Comintern	36 pp.	.10
Memorial Address "To the Memory of the Old Man"	16 pp.	.05

THE NEGRO STRUGGLE

The Struggle for Negro Equality—by John Saunders and Albert Parker—3rd Edition, with an introduction by Charles Jackson	48 pp.	.10
Negroes in the Postwar World by Albert Parker	16 pp.	.05
Vigilante Terror in Fontana— by Myra Tanner Weiss	24 pp.	.10

ON THE FAMOUS MINNEAPOLIS TRIAL

In Defense of Socialism—by A. Goldman	92 pp.	.10
Who Are the 18 Prisoners in the Minneapolis Trials? With a foreword by James T. Farrell	32 pp.	.10
Why We Are in Prison	56 pp.	.10
Defense Policy in the Minneapolis Trial— by Grandizo Munis and James P. Cannon	64 pp.	.20

OTHER BOOKS ON SOCIALISM AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Fascism and Big Business—by D. Guerin	276 pp.	1.75
The Assassination of Leon Trotsky— by Albert Goldman	74 pp.	.15
Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Spain —by Felix Morrow	208 pp.	1.00
From Lenin to Stalin—by Victor Serge	112 pp.	.50
Russia Twenty Years After—by V. Serge	310 pp.	2.50
Why Did They "Confess"?—A Study of the Radek-Piatakov Trial	32 pp.	.10

ORDER FROM

PIONEER



PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.