

AUG 2 1943

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission

Volume 3 No. 3

10 cents

J
U
L
Y

1
9
4
3

Contents

**IS DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM
A PHILOSOPHY ?**

National Liberation And The Proletarian Revolution

STALINTERN DISSOLVED

Affiliates

Central Committee of the Red Front of Greater Germany.
Revolutionary Workers League of the U. S.

Leninist League, Scotland.

Labor Donated

Issued by the R. W. L. for the International Contact Commission.

Mail address of publishers

DEMOS PRESS
708 N. Clark Street
Chicago, Illinois

IS DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM A PHILOSOPHY OR SCIENCE?

Those who do not understand dialectics and those who are opposed to Marxism present the argument that dialectical materialism is not a science. At best, they claim, it is a poor excuse for a philosophy. This type of opposition to dialectics can be easily fought. So far, without exception, everyone of these scholars in polemicizing against dialectics has proven merely that he does not know even what dialectics is.

But there is another type of opposition to dialectics that is more difficult to handle. It is that of the intellectuals who have been "won" over to dialectics, and in the name of dialectics, proceed to revise it to suit their own ideological and philosophical outlooks. Another group of intellectuals, that comes and goes, claims to accept "most" of Marxism as scientific, but rejects dialectics as unscientific.

From time to time our movement deals with these unscientific and revisionist positions. To polemicize against them, to present our position in struggle, helps clarify many points that would otherwise go unanswered. In this case, however, we are presenting a positive statement of our case, leaving for a future date more polemic material on the subject.

RELIGION.

Man, like other animals, was originally under the domination of his natural environment. But slowly in his struggle for existence he modified the natural environment. This process continued until he reached a point of social development in which some measures of security were obtained in opposition to that environment. It is this struggle to satisfy his own needs that has been the determinant factor in man's social relations. Out of this struggle ideas and ideologies have sprung up at every stage, based on the level of productive forces.

Religion was man's first attempt to obtain an all embracing systematic plan to explain man in relation to the world that surrounds him.

The very low economic level of the struggle against nature prevented any scientific understanding of the forces at work in nature. Delecting his all embracing system from his limited observation and knowledge, man had to fall back upon BELIEF. Belief (vs. facts) became the corner-stone of religion; and its dogma of a systematic universe rested necessarily on a subjective, idealistic viewpoint. Historical Materialism clearly

points out the relation of man's mental outlook to the state of his productive forces at a given period. Likewise, the historical development of man from religion, to philosophy, to science expresses a dialectical relationship. As long as a mental position or system of knowledge, such as religion, for example, is based upon the premise of belief in opposition to facts, it is a waste of human effort to attempt to utilize it as a foundation for social development.

PHILOSOPHY

Just as religion goes through its dialectical development so too does philosophy, and both are stages in the development of man's outlook upon the world that surrounds him. Philosophy was, historically, a step forward from religion. It started as a struggle against religion. Not against everything that makes up religion, but at least those dogmas of religion that social development had passed beyond and made untenable. New economic advances laid the basis for this wider and more factual understanding of man and nature, and thereby for a positive criticism of religion by philosophy.

Philosophy plowed the ground and enabled seeds of science to grow. But philosophy fell into its own pitfalls. In criticizing religion it had to sooner or later show that the whole structure, the whole system, was false, and present its own positive system, or else capitulate to the all-embracing system of religion that had an answer (in faith) for everything. In constructing its own system of the universe for man and nature, each different philosophy had to borrow from religion the minute it went beyond the facts and knowledge of the day. Philosophy allied itself with science, but the facts that science unearthed permitted too meager and too slow a process. Philosophy took unto itself the task of "going beyond science", of "pointing the road ahead" for science; of becoming the "science of science". In reality, when science stopped and said we know no more, but must make further investigations, philosophy pushed forward and came forth with many answers which made for many philosophical SYSTEMS. Philosophy went beyond FACTS and fell into the pitfall of FANCY, of belief, of faith. At best it became a RATIONAL FORM of religion.

EVERY MAN'S PHILOSOPHY

One must make a distinction between SYSTEMS of philosophy and the so-called "every day philosophy" of mankind, or "common sense". In reality this is no more than man's ideological baggage in the present class society as to his relations with his

fellow man and to nature. This is mainly a collection of ethical concepts, prejudices, customs, some scientific truths, moulded by class relations to reflect his status in social relations.

PHILOSOPHERS AND THEIR SYSTEMS

It is necessary to make a distinction between many concepts presented by philosophers and the SYSTEMS that these philosophers have presented. We can accept many of the ideas and concepts, but we must reject the systems. Deduction in analysis and investigation is essential at given stages of the process, but deduction as the METHOD of investigation is false and one-sided. We can say the same thing in relation to logics. Logics, within a proper framework has its value, but logics as a SYSTEM is false, mechanical and one-sided. So too with philosophy. Because we are condemning philosophy as SYSTEMS this does not imply condemnation of all ideas, concepts and investigations carried on by philosophers. Every philosophical system is unscientific, and in the last analysis is either idealistic or mechanical materialist. Even the best philosophical SYSTEMS have loop holes for "God Builders".

THE MATERIALIST PHILOSOPHERS.

In commenting now on the materialist philosophers we do not imply that the idealistic philosophers have contributed nothing, nor do we want to emphasize one against the other. We select the materialist philosophers to show their relation to scientific and dialectical development in the struggle against religion.

No one can deny the historical importance of the contributions of Aristotle, who developed a system of Formal Logic which stood like a mountain, supreme, until Hegel overthrew its tenets and laid the foundation for a higher system of the forms of thoughts. No one is trying to push aside Plato, the founder of philosophical idealism. Considered in his historical setting, like all questions must be considered, he presented contributions. Nor do we forget Heraclitus, (530-470 B.C.) who was one of the earliest dialecticians. But this in no way negates the fact that these SYSTEMS are false and unscientific, and that PHILOSOPHY must be discarded, just like religion, if scientific progress is to be made.

There are plenty of advanced thinkers who have long ago overthrown religion in their quest for scientific knowledge. But there are far too many of these same thinkers who, not only have not started a fight against philosophy, but instead have adopted

one or another SYSTEM of philosophy as their over-all for scientific investigation. In other words, they have thrown religion (as a SYSTEM) out the door, only to find it return through the window in the form of philosophy.

Science must clean its house of both religion and philosophy. Otherwise it has a historical drag of unscientific baggage, weighty as the Alps.

The first tendencies of materialism in philosophy date back to the Ionic School of Greece. Democritus (460-360B.C.) further developed the materialist ideas, followed by Epicurus of Greece and Lucretius of Rome. B. Spinoza, and T. Hobbes, with all of their faults were defenders of the materialist concepts. So too were the French School of Liderot, Helvetius, Holbach and Lametrie. Bacon, the founder of English materialism, also puts in his blows in behalf of materialism against idealism.

As the development of society continued upon an expanding economic base, the production of ideas became differentiated out of the production of things, until we reach the German materialists. Feuerbach is the outstanding materialist in this long chain in the development from materialism to a clear understanding of philosophy. Feuerbach's main contribution was the destruction of philosophy as a special "science". Furthermore, he took giant steps forward in the destruction of idealism. He lacked dialectics and fell short his goal. But his work was progress. Lietzgen presented the materialist and dialectical point of view and stated the "Positive Outcome of Philosophy". Even with his shortcomings he is head and shoulders above the others.

MARX AND ENGELS

While Feuerbach did much in the negative, "destructive", work of unearthing the true facts of the character of philosophy, it was left to Marx and Engels to carry this a step forward and present a positive outcome of the problem. In overthrowing philosophy, Marx and Engels developed Dialectical Materialism. Quite the contrary to the arguments of many so-called "Marxists", Dialectical Materialism is not a NEW philosophy to replace all other philosophies. Dialectical materialism is no philosophy at all. Its very premise, its structure, its whole theoretical foundation is a refutation of ALL philosophy.

Dialectical Materialism is a science, even though a science in its infancy. It is the scientific theory of knowledge as an application of the GENERAL LAWS of nature, social development and human thought.

Is it true that both Marx and Engels spoke of dialectical materialism as a philosophy? Yes, just as Lenin spoke of Socialism in Russia six months after the October Revolution. These are wrong formulations. But if one reads the context of these passages, sees how Marx and Engels used the term, and what their position was, it is clear that they were referring to the beginning stages of the science of dialectics.

When Marx and Engels, on more than one occasion, took up the question of dialectics as philosophy or science, they clearly stated that dialectics represents a science in opposition to philosophy. Marx' thesis on Feuerbach presents fundamental distinctions between dialectics and philosophy.

THEORIES AND THEORIES.

Just like there are leaders and leaders, compromises and compromises, some that are good and some that are bad depending on the class point of view, so too there are "good" and "bad" theories from a SCIENTIFIC point of view.

If we consider the three phases of the development of human thought, from religion, to philosophy, to science, we will find three basic concepts of theory. The theoretical premise of religion is primarily that of BELIEF and FAITH. The most subtle of the religious theories of today rests in the last analysis on these theoretical premises.

In regard to philosophy each system is based upon certain "basic" assumptions, plus deduction; no matter how elaborate the attempt to build up the "proof" of the assumptions and the "logic" of the deductions.

It is sad, but true, that many so-called theories of "scientists" in various fields of research have no more solid basis than the theories as presented by the philosophers. Many fields of science, still in their infancy, have large numbers of quacks; for example, the social "scientist" who defends the capitalist system, or the "scientists" who have given us the Nazi "race theory". This is philosophy disguised as science, just as some religions are disguised as philosophies.

Science makes a distinction between a verified hypothesis applicable to many related phenomena and a hypothesis without proof. One must be sure to know how the "scientist" is using the term before he can judge its value.

For the dialectician, as we have often said, theory is the accumulation and reflection of practice to be used as a guide to action. Theory and practice are merely two sides of one question. The problem of theory is a problem of practice. It is the interaction of theory and practice and their "unity in struggle" that constitutes forward steps in scientific development. Historically, science develops through practice. The theoretical science that is of any value, is a summation of practice as a tool in the struggle to conquer nature. Theory based on OBJECTIVE REALITY becomes real knowledge able to predict, to foretell, to help us CHANGE THE WORLD. Only those fields of science that use as their primary weapon this theoretical position on the question of theory make real progress.

Let us state that while the basic use of theory rests upon practice as a guide to action, upon sound and tested theoretical structures, there is also the need and room for the use in research work, of AUXILIARY hypothetical theoretical concepts. Such concepts are tools, just like a boxer carries out shadow boxing. A boxer who only shadow-boxes is no more a boxer than a "scientist" who uses only hypothetical premises.

WHAT IS SCIENCE ?

Science is more than just systematized knowledge or "truth". Science is an accumulation of knowledge of general laws and facts as the working rules of a given field of investigation. It separates itself from religion and philosophy by this very premise. But that is not all. Science must present a factual explanation which can be proven of objective reality under observation. If it is scientific it must give man real knowledge over natural and social forces, to enable man to analyse, control and foresee.

Each special field of science is nothing more than the study of a specific FORM of MATTER IN MOTION that is isolated by man and studied to enable us to learn of its internal laws, its cause and effect, its development and decay through contradiction, and its relation to other forms of matter in motion. The classifications of science can take no other path than the hierarchy of the forms of matter in motion. Science, which deals with the analysis of the different forms of matter in motion, automatically excludes religion and philosophy from its realm.

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM AS A SCIENCE.

The philosophers attempted to construct their systems as the "science of science" by gathering together all of the knowledge

of the day (which they accepted) and out of this "timber" construct their house. The strength of this house was as strong as its weakest plank, and as much of it was very unscientific and limited, the house was very weak. Dialectical materialism presents no such house of cards.

Dialectical materialism can lay claim to being THE theory of knowledge and therefore, the scientific method of investigation, only because it bases itself upon OBJECTIVE REALITY. Dialectical materialism as the theory of knowledge is a part of Dialectics as the GENERAL LAWS OF NATURE, SOCIETY, AND HUMAN THOUGHT. The PARTICULAR laws of nature, etc., are the concretization and investigation in each sphere of the different forms of matter in motion. These general laws of matter in motion are not deduction out of the thin air. They represent the fruit of the research of man throughout his historical development. The discovery and understanding of dialectics was made possible when the mode of production and social development reached a certain stage of development. To be more exact, it has come when man has reached the turning point in his historical development, a turning point where behind him stretches thousands of years of the exploitation of man by man through Slavery, Feudalism and Capitalism; and before him lies the road of the cooperation of man against nature, the elimination of the exploitation of man by man.

Necessity was the mother of this discovery: the necessity of man to free himself from exploitation by man. This in turn is based upon the real material factor of the productive forces having reached a level of organization which enables man to produce abundance for ALL mankind.

Upon this firm historical foundation, Marx and Engels brought forth dialectical materialism. Upon the firm foundation that the proletariat as the last class in the social chain of classes develops this weapon of science for its own freedom and thereby the freedom of mankind from human slavery. The very foundation of science is the foundation of dialectical materialism. Anyone who confuses dialectical materialism with philosophy has yet to learn the fundamental laws of dialectics.

3.1.43.

NATIONAL LIBERATION AND THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION

The bourgeois revolutions of the last century which leveled off Feudalism and laid the foundation for the development of the capitalist mode of production, were unable to complete the democratic and agrarian tasks that confronted them. This historical limitation was inherent in the economic structure of continued exploitation of man by man through the form of wage slavery. So today, in the decay of the capitalist system we find in every country, even in the most advanced, such as the United States, England, France and Germany, unfulfilled agrarian and democratic demands.

In addition to this carry-over, there is the problem of nationalism created by the suppression of minorities by the leading imperialist powers. These subject small nations, such as Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, etc, living with their national aspirations in advanced capitalist economic relations, are in turn "little imperialists" who subject and exploit other minorities. As we have said before, the problem of national liberation arising from the unfulfilled agrarian and democratic demands of the past differs from the "national liberation" problem of those capitalist nations which are subjected by imperialism. Their strategical and tactical problems must be worked out accordingly.

But the Shachtman Trotskyites are in too great a flux to follow through to a consistent line.

Kicked out by Trotsky as a petty-bourgeois current, rejecting the position for the defense of the Soviet Union, with part of their leadership paying only lip-service to dialectical materialism, they at least had to start thinking for themselves. They no longer had Trotsky to lean on. So far this independent thinking has not solved any of the problems, nor has its leadership found its way back to Marxism. On all the major questions, such as defeatism, political and organizational independence of the revolutionary Marxian organization, Labor Parties etc., they continue to give lip-service to the false Trotsky positions. Nevertheless this independent thinking has caused motion in their ranks, developing more positions on many questions than one can shake a stick at.

On the question of national liberation and the proletarian revolution this same process is proceeding in their ranks. Whereas the Red Front of Germany and the R.W.L. took up and adopted its theoretical position on the national question in Europe in relation to Fascism, etc., at the time of the Munich conference, the

different Trotsky factions, as usual, only began to argue this question after the national problem crashed on their peaceful discussion table.

The reason we have so much confusion on the national question and the road to power is because the proletariat has inherited not only the unfulfilled agrarian and democratic demands of the past, but also must solve the new "twilight" forms of nationalism in the small capitalist countries that are subjected by larger capitalist (imperialist) powers. These small capitalist countries have long ago, unlike the colonial countries, passed through their national or bourgeois-democratic revolutions. This is the problem that Hall of the Shachtmanites mixes up in the April 1943 "New International".

Years ago the socialists and stalinists, though in different ways, presented the position of "two revolutions"--first the democratic revolution and then the proletarian revolution. In one form or the other the centrists have duplicated this formula. For example, Trotzky presented the struggle in Spain in the 1936 civil war as a struggle between democracy and fascism, instead of clearly pointing out that the class struggle in Spain had reached the point of Communism or Fascism. Behind the slogan of democracy or fascism was concealed the formula of two revolutions: first a defeat of Fascism by Democracy, and then a struggle between Democracy and Communism. They did not recognize the proletarian revolution.

Shachtman's group does this with the coming revolutions in Europe, using the question of national liberation as the formula to drag in other dead cats.

"Ordinarily the phrase 'proletarian revolution' is quite clear and simple. We mean the socialist revolution." Here is where the Trotskyites take a clear and simple question and immediately warp it for their own false ends. The proletarian revolution does not "clear and simple" mean a SOCIALIST revolution. Marxists equate a proletarian revolution with the term SOCIAL (not socialist) revolution in distinction to a political revolution. A political revolution means a change in the groups, sections of the class in CONTROL of the state power, without changing the property and class relations of the society; while a social revolution means a change in the class and property relations as well as in state power to favor a new mode of production.

In all European countries, where the Nazi have taken over and have driven out the former governments there are developing

revolutionary situations. These revolutionary situations are arising out of economic break-down caused by war destruction and general capitalist decay. In these revolutionary situations the governments in exile under Anglo-American domination hope to carry through only a POLITICAL revolution if possible. They are going to do everything possible as agents of the Anglo-American imperialists to prevent a SOCIAL revolution, a proletarian revolution.

Even before the war, since 1914, history's first point on the European agenda has been the proletarian revolution.

These revolutionary situations maturing in Europe (and Asia and other parts of the earth) are so deep that their solution involves social revolutions. Only if the proletariat are defeated in these revolutionary struggles, and only on the basis of DEFEATS can the exploiters establish their successful political revolutions.

The Anglo-American imperialists will first try to use semi-fascist governments; to the degree of class pressure and to the degree that the revolution burns up these forces, they will feed out bourgeois-democratic governments and even Peoples' Front Governments of socialists, stalinists and labor traitors to stem the tide toward proletarian dual power.

Only eclectics can speak of first a political revolution--and then a social revolution. On this point our centrist friends will claim to agree with us. But Hall has taken this dynamic process and covered it with other labels to conceal the real process. The Shachtmanites speak of the "proletarian revolution"--first settling the question of national liberation--and then--the SOCIALIST revolution. In living reality (of the dynamics of events) the national liberation "revolution" they speak of will be the POLITICAL revolution of the exploiters under Anglo-American domination, as the first PHASE of the SOCIAL proletarian revolution.

In this same article the writer says, "But between now and the time when such a proletarian, socialist revolution succeeds, many struggles and revolutions can and will take place which are not under the leadership of revolutionary socialist parties, and revolutionary socialist slogans. One such struggle is the movement for national liberation in occupied Europe which leads in the direction of a revolution which will facilitate the socialist revolution." Here the writer has confused the question of a revolutionary SITUATION in which the exploiters and the working class have two different roads for a solution. The bourgeois-

democrats, to reestablish the rule of exploitation and hold in check the workers, have the road of "national liberation", while the workers from the first day of the same revolution, which is a social revolution, have as their aim the SOCIALIST SOLUTION. The exploiters want to STOP the social revolution by sidetracking it in "national liberation" channels that will liberate nothing and solve less.

In the quotation just given we have an example of the centrist formula for the TWO REVOLUTION THEORETICAL CONCEPT. This is a revision of Marxism.

Now let us connect up the problem of "national liberation" with socialist demands and see how these two aspects of ONE revolution are solved in the course of the road to power.

Of course the working class fights for the unfulfilled agrarian and democratic demands in Europe as well as in the colonial countries. But the bourgeois (social) revolution in Europe has long since been accomplished and is outmoded, and these demands can now be solved only by the proletarian (social) revolution.

The first PHASE of the revolution will be highly colored with the "national liberation" and the dead cat of the exploiters "return" to bourgeois democracy. The Anglo-American intervention with bullets and food will strengthen this tendency. It is their life-saver to STOP, to CHECK the revolution, to exhaust it, beat it down into this mould.

Our job is to recognize this reality in the first phase of the revolution, present a program and slogans to win ALLIES and backward sections of the workers who fall for the Anglo-American bourgeois line of "national liberation", to help the masses over this first difficult phase into the direct struggle for power.

In this first phase it is a life and death race between the revolutionary marxists, on the one hand, and the Anglo-American imperialists and their fascist and reformist agents on the other hand, to CRYSTALIZE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND FORMS to channelize this revolutionary motion of the masses.

Ours is simple. It is the dual power of Workers Councils, of Soviets. The imperialists' is even simpler. It is to re-establish the state forms and structures of what was there before Hitler, all the way from Monarchist regimes to Peoples Front regimes, whichever commodity goes over best in each country.

But if you first HELP channelize the mass sentiment into the pitfalls of "national liberation"--and then, later, after the exploiters' state forms are well developed--you work for the socialist solution--you are too late.

Hall says, "One such struggle is the movement for liberation in occupied Europe which leads in the direction of a revolution which will FACILITATE the socialist revolution." The struggle for "liberation" will not FACILITATE the socialist revolution when it is within the framework of the TWO revolution concept. It will not facilitate the workers' ends when you first help the gourgous-democrats build their capitalist institutions and police and states such as Peoples Fronts (and Labor Parties as the American form), and other structures controlled by the exploiters and their agents. To do this is to help the bourgeoisie create obstacles to the struggle of the workers to fulfill the revolution.

The struggle for a solution of the agrarian and democratic carryovers in Europe and for "liberation" is progressive ONLY if carried out on the line of channelizing this sentiment towards soviets with socialist aims at the very first phase of the revolution, clearly pointing out that the SOLUTION of these "national liberation" problems is possible only if the proletariat establishes its own state power, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now let us take another aspect. The living dynamics of the revolutions unfolding in Europe will take the complicated path to the seizure of power by the working class. In the first phase of the SOVIET POWER the dictatorship of the proletariat will be concerned mainly with solving the agrarian and democratic carryovers. The material process will not be first "national liberation", and then socialist steps. The process will be of a combined development where measures in the direction of a socialist solution will overlap and accelerate the direct satisfaction of agrarian and democratic demands.

Hall continues his false "two revolution" concept. "In order to achieve the ousting of Hitler the masses must be ready to struggle directly against their own collaborating bourgeoisie and the forces of Hitler occupation. On order to make the socialist revolution, the masses must be prepared to break with their own "democratic" bourgeoisie and its labor agents, to fight against the counter-revolutionary stalinist regime which stands ready as the executioner of the Eastern socialist revolution and above all with the international bourgeoisie which as

always stands ready with its tremendous economic and military resources to intervene in any one of the national sectors of its battlefronts."

In other words, with one kind of proletarian revolution you can get rid of Hitler; but it takes another kind of proletarian revolution, a second socialist revolution, to get the whole hog. This mechanical separation of the task of getting rid of Hitler and the "collaborating" bourgeoisie, from the next task of getting rid of the "democratic" exploiters, is the worst kind of eclectic thinking. It is treated as two separate problems. This is just what the "democratic" exploiters want.

Even if treated as two phases of one problem in TWO STAGES OF TIME it is wrong. To begin at the beginning and kick out Hitler and the collaborators involves at the same time a struggle with the "democratic" bourgeoisie over democratic, proletarian, and socialist demands. The two aspects of the problem will merge in TIME element. Does Hall think the Anglo-American imperialists and their underground agents are going to allow a time to lapse between the kicking out of Hitler by the revolution and the time they come in to proclaim their God given right to rule the roost?

The equation we have presented elsewhere on the opening of the second front answers this question. The second front in Europe will be determined primarily by the class relations in Europe and not by the desire to smash Hitler's control. To smash Hitler is part of the military strategy, which is dependent on class relations. When the class relations get out of Nazi control, when the danger develops of the rise of dual power, then the Anglo-American imperialists will bring in their forces and their agents, from the Pope to the clericals, from the Monarchists to the reformist hangmen, from the Red Cross to the machine guns.

To separate the "national liberation" coloring of the first PHASE of the proletarian (social) revolution from the SOCIALIST steps for solution is to negate the whole struggle of the working class in advance.

May 12-43.

STALINISTS ABOLISH THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The resolution of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the C.I., which calls upon its sections to dissolve the international center is the most shameful piece of Jesuit trickery these social-patriots have yet issued. In the name of Marx and Lenin they present a political position that has been condemned throughout the whole period of revolutionary proletarian history.

They did not even see fit to gather enough stooges to make a quorum of the Executive Committee. As a subcommittee, the Presidium takes the action. From the standpoint of democratic centralism and their own constitution this is illegal. Only after the majority vote is taken can there be dissolution. Legally, at present it is only a recommendation. But this is not the important issue. The Stalinist bureaucrats never paid any attention to democracy in their organization and what Stalin and his clique decide is automatically carried out.

CRIMES OF STALINISM HELPED HITLER

We are told by the resolution that already in 1935 the 7th Congress took into account the changing situation and the need for greater flexibility and independence of its sections. The resolution forgets to say that this change in policy was based upon the new turn following the seizure of power by Hitler, after the "Third Period" policy of mechanical application of ultra-left tactics on an international scale resulted in disaster for their forces all over the world. They forget to tell us in the resolution that their program (against the German revolution) was a major factor that enabled Hitler to take power, forcing them further to the right of their "People's Front" line and false united front with Social-Democracy.

The resolution says the same considerations guided them in allowing the United States section to withdraw from the C.I. But everyone knows, even a dummy like Dies, that Browder and his crowd withdrew because of the new law passed by United States making it a penalty to have international affiliations with bodies outside the country advocating overthrow.

BUCROCRACY REPLACED DEMOCRATIC-CENTRALISM

These "democrats of democrats" say that the same consideration led them "to avoid interference in the internal organizational affairs of the Communist Parties." Everybody knows that no section of the Stalinist international had one iota of independence, and has not had since the expulsion and murder of all opposition.

If these "reasons" are lies--then what are the reasons?

The resolution states that the war did not enable them "to convene a congress of the Communist International." This is worse than a lie. With their international apparatus and their GPU they could convene ten congresses if they so desired. Their boats ply all the seas. But they would only stand exposed if they got together. They can carry out their betrayal of the working class and colonial masses, their support of the imperialist war, better without congresses which would only reveal their bankruptcy.

We are reminded that Marx "always subordinated forms of organization of the working class movement and methods of working of such organizations to the fundamental political interest of the working class movement as a whole." This is true, but liquidation without replacing it with a better organization, a superior organization, is not a question of FORMS of organization. It is a question of the content of the organization, of whether an international working class organization is necessary at all.

LIES ABOUT HISTORY TO CONCEAL CRIMES

These Stalinists are masters at rewriting history for their own fake ends. Now they tell us that Marx dissolved the first international, as a logical step forward, as progress. Actually, the "laying of the foundation" was accomplished in spite of the liquidation. The struggle in the first international with the Anarchists, strongly entrenched in Europe, forced its transfer to America and its peaceful burial.

There is nothing in common between the Stalinist arguments for liquidating an international center in the period of the second imperialist war when we are on the eve of social revolutions in Europe and Asia, and the events and the period of history that forced the liquidation of the first international

The Stalinists not only think the workers are stupid and know nothing about the history of the first international, they also think the workers don't even remember what happened after 1919, when the C.I. was founded by Lenin and Trotzky.

They tell us the C.I. was founded to uphold the principles of the working class movement, to help establish real working class parties, to help mobilize the workers for their economic and political interests, to struggle against Fascism and the "war which the latter was preparing,..." and for the support of the Soviet Union against the Fascists.

These weasel words, this fakery is an infamous insult to Lenin and Trotsky and all the Marxists who sacrificed to help build the Communist International from 1919 on up to the period Stalinism took it over.

Lenin's international was organized for no such limited purpose.

The revolutionary Marxists organized the Third International because the Second International had sold-out the workers in the first world war to the imperialists. Stalin cannot talk of this because the Stalinists are repeating, on even a worse level, the betrayal of the Second International.

The Comintern was organized to defend the conquest of October and to EXTEND THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION to Germany and to the whole world. Stalinism cannot talk of extending the revolution. They are doing all they can to help smash the revolutionary movement and the developing revolutions.

The Third International was organized to overthrow capitalism. But Stalinism cannot talk of overthrowing capitalism while calling for the support of the imperialist war, while supporting capitalism all over the world.

The Bolsheviks organized the Third International to guide the masses in their struggle for power, in their fight to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat against the dictatorship of the exploiters. But Stalinism cannot talk about this. Stalinism helped the Peoples Front in France and Spain to defeat the revolution. It helped Chiang Kai Chek behead the Chinese revolution.

The liquidation of the C.I. by the Stalinists is not only a capitulation to the Anglo-American imperialists. Its very

reasons are a capitulation to the imperialist war, to the anti-working class line of Roosevelt and Churchill, to the Davies new mission to Moscow to line up aid to defeat the coming revolutions.

The Stalinists can only talk about defending workers' rights, about fighting Fascism, etc. Any social-patriot, any labor agent of the capitalists can say the same thing in the United Nations camp.

THE STALIN-HITLER PACT

The Stalinists skip the history of the Comintern--up until the Fascists invaded Germany in 1941. They skip over 20 years of its existence. They skip not only the period of Lenin and Trotsky, but also the period of the Left Opposition, and also the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact.

They talk as though they are the real fighters against Fascism. But Fascism and reaction came to power in Germany, in Spain and other places due to the false anti-working class policies of the Stalinists.

When they signed the Hitler-Stalin Pact, a pact which was the signal for the second imperialist world war, they accused England and France of "fomenting the war", of being capitalist war mongers. And they said Hitler wants peace. They said they could live peacefully with Hitler Germany. Let us hear what Molotov said about the Hitler-Stalin Pact at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in October 1939:

"Today, as far as the European great powers are concerned, Germany is in the position of a state which is striving for the earliest termination of the war, and for peace, while Great Britain and France, which but yesterday were declaiming against aggression, are in favor of continuing the war and are opposed to the conclusion of peace."

"One may accept or reject the ideology of Hitlerism, as well as any other ideological system; that is a matter of taste."

"It is fear of losing world supremacy that dictates to the ruling circles of Great Britain and France the policy of fomenting war with Germany. Thus the imperialist character of this war is obvious."

"Our relations with Germany have radically improved. Here the development has proceeded along the line of strengthening our

friendly relations, extending our practical cooperation and rederring Germany support in her efforts for peace."

ABANDON INTERNATIONALISM EVEN IN WORDS

Yesterday Trotsky advanced his famous "French turn" and revision of Marxism on the question of the liquidation of the political and organizational independence of the revolutionary Marxian organization. His formula was to liquidate into the Second International--which, according to Trotsky, was the hope of the coming revolution. History has proven this false, has proven that along with the many ensuing splits, the Trotskyites have moved far to the right and have followed up that capitulation with further revisionism in every principled field of theory and action.

Now the Stalinists advance even worse, yes childish, non-political arguments in defense of their liquidation.

"But long before the war it became more and more clear that with increasing complications in internal and international relations of various countries any sort of international center would encounter insuperable obstacles in solving the problems facing the movement in each separate country"...

NATIONALISM TO REPLACE INTERNATIONALISM

Insuperable obstacles? If "any sort of international center would encounter insuperable obstacles", then ANY KIND of international is of no value. We must reject the Marx, Engels, Lenin principled position on internationalism and revert back to a national solution of our working class problems. This is the stupid and childish argument of Stalinism. Yet it controls millions on a world scale who follow this Catholic Church mumble-jumble.

Long after Marx' Capital clearly revealed the processes in the capitalist mode of production, long after the productive forces have battered down national boundaries and made it an elementary fact that the problems of the workers and oppressed masses can find a solution only on an international basis the Stalinists tell us to go back to nationalism!

Fight the international plans of the exploiters with national plans?

According to Stalinism we have outgrown internationalism and the new development is back to nationalism. Listen to this:

"The organizational form of uniting workers chosen by the first congress of the C.I. answered conditions of the first stages of the working class movement, but it has been outgrown by the growth of this movement and by the complications of its problems in separate countries, and has even become a drag on the further strengthening of the national working class parties."

In Lenin's day the International was alright, but today it is antiquated! In the first world war we needed an international, but in the second world war we don't need it to fight the exploiters!

In all the lies, there is one true remark. Undoubtedly the Stalinist International "was a drag" on the national parties! Its anti-working class policies, bureaucracy and mechanical control became a blight on all its national sections and the workers they influenced.

The liquidation of the Stalintern does not mean that all the sections within the different countries are going to be dissolved. Some will be sent into other parties, such as the Labor Party, some will change their names, some will go underground, but a strong bureaucratic underground machine will remain, dominated by the murderous GPU.

WORKERS TOLD TO FOLLOW NATIONAL FLAG

How an organization that even claims to be revolutionary can issue an order abolishing its international and NOT SAY ONE WORD about the developing revolutions in Europe and Asia, nor one word about the aims and preparations of American Imperialism to dominate the world through beheading the revolutions is beyond understanding -- unless the document is written to mislead, unless it is a product of betrayal and capitulation to the Anglo-American imperialists.

Yes, they speak of "uprisings" against Hitler, but not of social revolutions against capitalism. Their aim is to oust Hitler, but to KEEP CAPITALISM in Germany, to PREVENT social revolution.

They end their "Order" asking for a renewed struggle against "German fascism and its associates and vassals."

You cannot defeat fascism in its German or Italian FORMS while supporting bourgeois democracy which paves the way for different national forms of fascism at home.

History has proven on more than one occasion that you cannot fight capitalism by supporting one group of imperialists who are at war against another group of imperialists. You cannot defend the workers interests by supporting one group of capitalists against another group of capitalists.

The organizational liquidation of the C.I. was preceded by the political liquidation of the C.I. and its parties as a weapon for the workers' interests. Altho this occurred way back in the twenties, in the period of the Chinese revolutions, it became clear to most of us only when Stalinism and its policies helped Hitler into power.

The liquidation of the C.I. was long overdue. But not for the reasons the Stalinists give. The Stalinist was a revisionist, non-Marxist anti-working class agency of imperialism. Moreover, its leadership spent 20 years in emasculating and destroying the revolutionary program and spirit and members of the C.I., and in corrupting and stultifying the organization. Only such a combination could make possible the irresponsible impudence of such a political statement, such reasons for liquidation, and such high-handed and bureaucratic procedure.

Those who believed that the Stalinist represented Marxism and the interests of the working class now face the contradiction that in the period of greatest need their international center is dissolved - and on the basis of a rejection of internationalism! No wonder the Coughlins and the Dies welcome the reasons even more than the act!

The truth is just the opposite of what the Stalinists say. The working class needs today more than ever an international center of revolutionary working class parties based upon Marxian principles and democratic centralism, the kind of International Marx and Lenin wanted to build and started to build, but did not live long enough to finish.

That is now our task. It is the task of the INTERNATIONAL CONTACT COMMISSION and every other revolutionary Marxist force and group. The International Contact Commission has made a beginning in this direction, but only a beginning. Now is the time to build! As Lenin said:

"Have the Will to Build a Party and the Oppressed of the World Will Come to You."

May 25, 1943.