

# INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission

Volume 7 No. 6

10 cents

## CONTENTS

**LABOR PARTY**

**CHINA TODAY**

**MARXIST UNITE IN BRITAIN**

**J  
U  
L  
Y**

**1  
9  
4  
5**

---

Issued by the Revolutionary Workers League for the International  
Contact Commission.

Affiliates

Leninist League of Great Britain

Central Committee of the Red Front of Greater Germany

Mail address of publishers

**DEMOS PRESS**

Revolutionary Workers League of the U. S.

708 N. CLARK STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Labor Donated

# LABOR PARTY DISTORTS CLASS STRUGGLE

The Trotskyites' latest move to side-track the workers from revolutionary activity is through a pamphlet, "The American Workers Need a Labor Party". The author, Joseph Hansen, swings airily through 40 pages to expose everything economically and politically bad in rotting capitalism, and then, "following a Marxist view of politics," comes out of the clouds dragging a streamer for a Labor Party - so that we can vote for measures like "...a ceiling of say \$25,000 be placed on high incomes". He fades out on the defeatist slander that because the workers are so backward the Cannonite realists are forced to cut down to a program to suit boys in short pants; and then to "hope" to go ahead little by little. This comes from "intelligent persons" mastering the principles of politics, and, having a "reliable guide" (Hansen's) and a "realizable" goal". Now, "far-sighted militants must begin to explain to shopmates what politics can do to get the unions out of the blind alley where they are stalled today". We of the RWL following our "Marxist view of politics" know that this can be done only be developed workers pitching in to do union work and building rank and file groups in the unions to carry on class struggle action. To keep the fight in the factories! But the Cannonites refuse to run for shop committee posts in the auto factories and refuse to help build or take part in rank and file groups. They cater to second-rate labor fakery and mild reformists so as to get in with the future, some-time promoters of a labor party. They form Labor Party groups. They want to take the fight to the legislatures!

The section on "Roosevelt's War Record" ends without a reference to his conniving with Dan Tobin to smash the Minneapolis Teamsters' Union and jail the leaders because of the leadership's opposition to war. This omission is in line with the Trotskyists' watering down of their war program and falling back on popularizing an attack on the Smith-Connally Act to attract official trade union support for the civil defense of the prisoners that Roosevelt had framed. These centrists "oppose war" but they still back up the bourgeoisie by an attempt to stamp a trade-union label on war through their "Military training of the workers financed by the government...." with control in the hands of such as Bill Green and Phil Murray.

Hansen gives the danger of war a big play and to show how the election of a Labor Party could keep us out, he stresses that the Democratic administration had the power to declare war despite its campaign promise to keep out. But further on, we're told we are plunged into wars because "That small selfish minority through its political party has governed the nation in such a way as to advance the economic interests of the tiny group at the expense of the great majority". We'll bite -- had Roosevelt been preparing for war, been in war through lend-lease, before 1940 or not? And what did Wilkie mean by his opposition to the war being "campaign oratory"? Has there been a fresh turn and a removal by the Trotskyists of the seeds of war from capitalism? Do not the "small selfish minorities" of all capitalistic countries control all Conservative, Liberal, Labor Party, Social Democratic, and Popular Front Parties in democratic republics or monarchies? Is it capitalism that breeds war or is it

just the Party in power? Can a Labor Party UNDER CAPITALISM prevent war? The very idea is ridiculous. Only socialism can end wars.

Hansen quotes Engels, Lenin and Trotsky on everything - but labor parties. Engels, "quite definitely regarded universal suffrage as a means of bourgeois domination...and merely an index of the maturity of the working class; it cannot, and never will be anything else but that in the modern state". And Trotsky, in "Whither France", wrote that this index had only a "symptomatic importance", for, "Here, as in other matters, the question is not settled by arithmetic, but by the dynamics of the class struggle". The workers have never gained power by parliamentary means. But the proletariat did gain power thru revolution in Russia in 1917.

Our "Marxist" quotes Trotsky lengthily under a chapter heading, "Labor Can Build a Planned Economy", but to do so, curiously enough, "State power and domination of economy can be torn from the hands of these rapacious imperialist cliques only by the revolutionary working class". And the quotation ends with, "That is the meaning of Lenin's warning that without 'a series of successful revolutions' a new imperialist war would inevitably follow". He about knocks himself out with this, does he not? That's our line. That's the line of the Old Bolsheviks! Where does an "Independent Labor Party" fit in with "a series of successful revolutions" by "a revolutionary working class"?

To the class-conscious workers the simplest fact of politics is, that all political parties, including labor parties, seek office to administer the affairs of the state; that the state exists to carry on the business of the capitalist class in its exploitation of the working class by using the forces of the state -- the police, militia, courts, -- as agencies of suppression. As Engels said, "The State, including the democratic republic, consists of detachments of armed men in defense of property; everything else serves only to embellish or camouflage this fact". (And interesting to note, Italism Trotskyism is demanding "the abolition of the monarchy and the institution of a democratic republic".) (My emphasis)

One might expect a little history of labor parties in the work of a "Marxian" who is pointing the way to a shorter, easier road for the masses -- into the straitjacket of parliamentarism. Could there not be possible pitfalls or stumbling blocks on this shaded highway? Have there not been other, earlier Messianic characters who sought to ease the political task of the workers with "something just as good"? But you'll not learn this from Hansen. No space is given to the trials and ordeals of the Austrian and German workers under Social Democracy: he would have enmeshed himself. Nothing has happened in working class France. Fortunately, he does not prove the Bolsheviks wrong in not ever having taken a labor party short-cut -- nor wrong in "trying" to force a revolutionary program onto the "backward workers" of Czarist Russia. There is not even a casual mention of the British Labor Party. Why? Surely, the record of an "independent labor party" of the age, prestige and vote of the BLP should be bared and considered when we are urged to commit suicide in its fashion. A pretty good student of politics looked into this and reported:

"Naturally the labor party consists for the most part of workers, but it does not follow from this that every party composed of workers is politically a

workers' party. That depends upon who leads it and upon the contents of its actions and political tactics.

"Only the latter determine whether we have before us a real political party of the proletariat. From this standpoint the Labor Party (British) is a thoroughly bourgeois party even though it is composed of workers, for it is led by reactionaries and the very worst ones at that, and completely in the spirit of the bourgeois." Lenin wrote this: let's put his words to the test:

The British Labor Party lined up the workers for war in 1914.

During the general strike of 1926 the BLP acted as a strikebreaker.

In 1924 and 1929 British Imperialism placed the Labor Party in charge of the government; and the interests of the imperialists were taken care of; and fully. The Labor Premier, McDonald, did a thoroughly consistent job -- even to the ordering of wholesale bombings of dissenting Hindus.

Today, we find the BLP inciting, supporting and conducting the imperialists' war. Today, after 40 years of the Labor Party, the workers of England are not one bit more class-conscious.

And here in the United States if the workers would vote a Labor Party -- the People's Front -- "into power" it could only be an attempt to perpetuate a decaying capitalism -- a system long ready for burial. As Trotsky wrote of the BLP in "Whither France": "The...electoral victories of the BLP do not at all invalidate what is said above ("The need of the workers arming themselves... Without this victory is impossible."). Even if we were to allow that the next .... elections will give the party an absolute majority....; if we were to further allow that the party would take the road of socialist transformation -- which is scarcely probable -- it would immediately meet with such fierce resistance from the House of Lords, the King, the banks, the stock market, the bureaucracy, the press, that a split in its ranks would become inevitable, and the Left, more radical wing would become a parliamentary minority. Simultaneously the Fascist Movement would acquire an unprecedented sweep. ...In point of fact, the less the leaders of Labor prepare for it, the more cruel will be the civil war forced upon the proletariat by the bourgeoisie."

And, can the fact be escaped that as the Boss Class comes out of the frying pan of World War II it must jump into the fire of totalitarianism? There is only one alternative to Fascism: Proletarian Revolution! We must capture the capitalist state, not to use it, but to destroy it; and create a Workers' Council Government to build Socialism.

The Labor Party -- American version of the popular front -- is the greatest immediate stumbling bloc in that path.

# CHINA TODAY

A vast and complicated political situation is unfolding in China today. The Chinese "nation" of some 450 million people can be divided as follows:

- 1- The major industrial sections, controlled by Japan directly or through its puppets.
- 2- Stalinist - so-called "Red China" - controlled by the Communist Party of China and claiming 90 million people.
- 3- Sinkiang, which borders both the Soviet Union and its puppet state, Outer Mongolia.
- 4- Tibet, nominally under the leadership of Chiang-Kai-Shek and the Kuomintang, but actually controlled by Britain.
- 5- The major portion of China, under the Kuomintang.
- 6- Manchukuo, controlled by Japan and situated between the Soviet Union and "Red China".

The vast Chinese territory has always been a land of perpetual strife, civil warfare and pillage. In the days before Sun Yat Sen feudal China was controlled by the war lords, who ruled vast gangster empires within the empire. Dr. Sun, leader of the nationalists, organized the bourgeois revolution against this situation. But before he could complete his work he died. A struggle developed within his Party, the Kuomintang, between the right wing under his son-in-law Chiang Kai Shek, and the so-called left wing, under Wang Ching-Wei, with the former victorious.

Following its policy of "socialism in one country" the Stalinist machine in China liquidated itself into the Kuomintang shortly before Sun's death and propounded the famous "bloc of four classes" program. This program, of refusing to build independent soviets and independent workers' militia, of refusing to break with the Kuomintang leadership, led in 1927 to a fiasco and defeat. Thousands of Chinese workers were slaughtered first by Chiang Kai Shek, and later, by Wang Ching Wei.

Following this opportunist policy and defeat, which is excellently described in Andre Maulraux' novel, "Man's Fate", the Stalinists turned to a policy of putschism. The very party which refused to organize soviets amongst factory workers in 1925-27 now began to organize them amongst the peasants in backward and remote sections of the country and to fight a civil war with peasant guerrillas against the Kuomintang forces. For nine or ten years this war raged with sometimes diminished and sometimes augmented fury. As the Chinese Red Army advanced it set up Peasant Soviets, divided much of the land and instituted other reforms.

In 1937 "Red China", following the moves of Stalinism, liquidated its Soviets and instituted full and universal suffrage on the bourgeois model, regardless of sex or class. In other words, where previously only workers and poor peasants were permitted to vote, now all classes could vote, including landlords and merchants - who comprised about 6% of the electorate and elected,

according to CP figures, about 3% of the officials. The government of the "Border Region" was made up of a pyramid system of bodies, with universal elections only to the lower bodies and elections of delegates by the lower bodies to higher ones. The first chairman of the "Border Region Council" was a former member of the Kuomintang, who in 1941 held membership in both parties. The larger representation afforded workers and poor peasants in the original system was eliminated.

Stalinist China is definitely not a Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (Or even a "Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Peasantry"). It is a semi-colonial country, in a very unstable situation, ruled by the Chinese Communist Party, together with some bourgeois liberals, and not only advocating but basing itself on private property and capital. Landlords and landlordism are not eliminated. As a matter of fact, landlords were given sections of land to till and were reinstated to full political rights in 1937. According to the American Stalinist report on "Red China" "the new democracy encourages the development of private capitalism and the ownership of private property..." Its attitude to the land problem is no longer to distribute land but to confine itself to such reforms as lowering rents and lowering interest rates. According to Mao Tse-Tung, head of the CP in China, "legitimate profits from proper commercial enterprises will be guaranteed" and "facilities will certainly be given for the widespread development of private capitalist enterprise". Not only that but industrialization of China "will require a large amount of foreign capital investment".

"Red China" or "Soviet China" is thus neither "red" nor "Soviet". It is a section of China, which temporarily has suspended civil war with Chiang-Kai-Shek in order to engage the Japanese forces in the interests of Allied imperialism. Mao Tse-tung makes no bones about this. The Eighth Route and New Fourth armies are reported to have taken 19 provinces in Manchuria and north, central and south China from Japan. The armies are supposed to have 910,000 regulars and over 2 million "irregular" troops. In 1943, according to Mao, over 64% of the Japanese forces in China and over 95% of Wang's puppet forces were opposing the "Red" Army troops.

"The great efforts made by America and Britain", says Mao, "especially the former, in the common cause (our emphasis) of fighting the Japanese aggressors and the sympathy and aid rendered by their governments and peoples to China, deserve our thanks."

The situation in Sinkiang is somewhat different. That territory is now under the control of Chiang's forces and his General Chu Shao-Liang. It is mostly a grazing land, with some natural deposits of gold and tungsten. In 1934 Soviet Russia, for all practical purposes, took over this territory and set up oil wells, airfields, factories and army barracks. But in 1942, when the Red Army had its back to the wall, the territory again fell under Chungking's control and the Soviet Union sold its properties.

Today, however, civil war is raging in this territory, undoubtedly sponsored by Stalinism. Moslem tribesmen have been swooping down and taking territory from the Chungking regime in Sinkiang and a number of "incidents" have occurred between Sinkiang and Stalinist Outer Mongolia.

The outcome of these disputes still remains in doubt. But the pattern of the gigantic struggle is clear. On the borders of China a battle is raging between the masses, on the one hand (fettered with horrible inflation, hunger, and misery) and a bloc of imperialist powers, and their puppets both of the right and the left. And along with this struggle there exists a three-cornered fight: an attempt by the Soviet Union under Stalinism to build a buffer area of Manchukuo, Korea, "Red" China, Outer Mongolia and Sinkiang, and a struggle between Japan and America (with both these powers opposed to the program of expansion of the Soviet Union) for control of Asia. Aligned with America is the Kuomintang.

## I I

Let us now turn to a number of theoretical questions.

First of all our attitude to Soviets in general and to "Soviet" China in particular.

There are three types of Soviets (Workers' Councils) possible. First a Soviet under Marxian leadership during the period of dual power and after the seizure of power by the proletariat. Naturally such Soviets receive full and uncompromising support by the Marxists.

Then there are Soviets, during dual power which are under the control of the social-reformists or, in rare occasions, the liberals. Although we are for a Soviet Republic and for establishment of Soviets in general, we may or may not support such Soviets under given conditions. For instance during the Russian Revolution Lenin was in favor, for a time, of withdrawing support from the Menshevik-Social Revolutionary Soviets and organizing the seizure of power around Factory Committees. After the seizure of power the Soviets would either be revamped or new ones organized consonant with proletarian power.

The third type of Soviets are caricatures, Soviets in name only. Such Soviets were, for instance, the Chinese Soviets after 1927. Composed exclusively of peasants in very backward areas they could not be instruments of proletarian revolution, but merely of nationalist reform. Furthermore they were not instruments of dual power, since dual power in China had long been liquidated - mainly as a result of the treachery and opportunism of the very forces that were now building "Soviets". To have supported such caricatures would have been ludicrous. Trotsky, in the days when he was still a Marxist, pointed this out.

The problem in China today, however, is not one of supporting Soviets or not supporting Soviets. There are no Soviets in China, either in Chungking or "Red" China. "Red" China is merely a nationalist regime, under social-reformist control, somewhat to the left of iron-fisted Chungking. One of the main differences is that Chiang has been forced, thru total lack of a mass base, to support the old feudal war lords, whereas the Yenan regime has a peasant mass base and supports nascent capitalist interests, as well as peasant cooperatives.

Furthermore, so long as there was no World War and so long as the struggle

between Japan was directed against semi-colonial China the Marxists could support the struggle of the Chinese nation, at the same time advocating independent working class action such as the organization of militias and Soviets, but on the general perspective of marching separately from both the Chiang-Kai-Shek forces and the Stalinist forces, but striking together with them against the common enemy. Under such circumstances victory over Japan would not mean a strengthening of world imperialism but a definite weakening of one of its major links. Today, however, such a policy is no longer possible. Today China - both "Red" and white China - is fighting WITHIN the imperialist war. Victory over Japan can only mean a proportionate strengthening of American Imperialism and in no sense a weakening of world imperialism. Our policy in China must be a policy of Revolutionary Defeatism, wishing for and working for the defeat of the Chinese nationalists of both stripes and the imperialist overlords who are attempting to utilize and exploit China.

Within this framework we must naturally continue to advocate Soviets and Workers and Peasants militia, but we are no longer for a victory on the military front against Japan. (Nor are we for victory over America in the Japanese puppet sections.) On the contrary we advocate Lenin's policy of defeatism, breaking the front, helping to turn the imperialist war into a civil war.

Now, supposing that in this confusing situation, the "Red" armies engage in civil war against Chiang-Kai-Shek. The Marxists will refuse to support either force. But we may utilize the situation to advance the cause of social revolution. Depending on the objective situation and the relationship of forces we might decide to march separately from Mao Tse-Tung's armies but strike together with them against Chiang-Kai-Shek's armies - similar to our strategy in Spain in 1936-39 - but all the time working on the program of defeatism in the broader war.

Let us take another possible variant. Supposing that, as a result of the Soviet Union's possible change of policy from alliance with America to conflict with it, the "Red" Chinese forces withdraw from the war against Japan and engage in a purely civil war against the Kuomintang. There too we would attempt a policy of "march separately and strike together". But such a policy does not mean and can not mean support of "red" China itself or of its leadership. It merely would mean using different weapons against one part of China than against another part; it would merely mean delaying the military struggle against Stalinist China until such time as the most direct military opponent could be defeated and an undermining policy relative to the Stalinist hold over its territory.

Still another variant. Supposing the Red Armies of the Soviet Union should march through Manchuria and encamp in Stalinist China. So long as the Soviet forces would continue to defend capitalist and semi-feudal property relations in "Red" China the Marxian policy would be to fight them just as we fight the imperialists, with gun at hand; although in the broader war against Japan and America we would be for the victory of the Soviet Union. (For a fuller exposition of this position see the May issue of INTERNATIONAL NEWS)

The Chinese situation today is extremely unstable and will remain so for some time to come. Political borders are defined by the successes or defeats of various armies. Within the imperialist war there are large elements of civil War -



such as the Sinkiang struggle and such as the enormous armies deployed both by Mao and Chiang to "watch" each other.

In the coming period when the whole imperialist war may be drowned out in a general world conflict of classes these elements of civil war will loom large and will dominate the scene. The policy of the Marxists must thus be flexible as to strategy and tactics, but firm in its insistence on independent mass action and the independence of the Marxian Party as its central theme.

READ AND SUBSCRIBE TO

# FIGHTING WORKER

Popular Organ of the REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, U.S.A.

affiliated to the INTERNATIONAL CONTACT COMMISSION

The Fighting Worker contains popular analysis of national and international events; featured articles on economics; and interesting columns of comment.

Subscription rates are \$1.00 a year. Single copies 5¢. Bundle orders of 10 or more sent to you postage paid at the rate of 1¢ a copy. SPREAD THE FIGHTING WORKER!

Order from DEMOS PRESS, 708 N. Clark St. Chicago, Ill.

# SOUTH AMERICAN PEONAGE

In Colombia (Buenaventura) probably one of the more backward areas of South America relatively speaking, one finds all the advanced attributes of modern imperialism combined with the carryovers of an agrarian, feudal economy.

Here one finds the influences and reflections of the struggle for control of this market by foreign capital.

American capital comes into the foreground immediately. Through its Grace Company (which is really a part owner of Pan-American Airways, whose business is by no means confined to air passage and freight), it owns and controls practically this whole section of the country. In fact the whole West Coast of South America has been pierced and exploited to some degree or other by this vulture of American Imperialism.

American finance capital is however not the only power here. The British in a less powerful position have been able to import a considerable amount of finished commodities. It seems, however, that one of the fulcrums of its influence is through the Dutch American Airways and probably through certain Swedish concerns who seem to a large extent to be controlled by English capital. One is able to get a tainted odor of the machinations of German finance capital here, but since this war has gone on for six years, at least four of which, American Imperialism exerted its full power in forcing the Germans out of the South American market, one only notes signs of German penetration by seeing a few commodities in stores marked Made in Germany.

This struggle of the various Imperialist powers for control of the South American market brings out in relief the condition of the masses.

Here is a country (at least this one part that was observed) where the extreme backwardness of the economy causes the most miserable existences possible for a people. The great majority of the people live in little one or two room shacks and they are shacks in the true sense of the word. Candlelight is still the principal source of light, although closer to the town one finds dim electric lights. It is one of the great contradictions of capitalism that in a cafe on the main street of the town one will find the most modern modes of lighting (fluorescent) and one block away, lighting by candlelight.

One can still observe in the town many remnants of the handicrafts period. The shoemaker, the tailor, the tombstone maker, etc. Clothing made by sewing machine, although subsidiary to manufactured goods, is still very important.

A river runs through a section of the town. It is here that the people, the natives of the interior, bring their agricultural products and fish in the most primitive and crude dugout canoes and sailing boats, to a crude street market along the stream.

The exploitation of native labor by the big foreign companies is indeed terrific. This town is principally a seaport and depot for all goods coming into the country.

The majority of the population therefore earns its living through working in or around the ships coming in. The workers are employed on a virtual slave labor basis. They work twenty-four hours a day and sleep when the work slows down. Perhaps they average four hours sleep a day. Their food is brought to them on the job by young girls and boys aged six to twelve. (There is no education. Legally there is one year free education, three months of which is vacation period. Any education above this must be paid for.) The wages are very low.

There is no union. The discontentment of the workers with their conditions was expressed in a strike which took place a week before our arrival. It was quickly smashed by the numerous police and military guards around the docks.

There is one outstanding point. Everywhere you go you see some sort of military soldier, sailor or policeman. Such is the democracy of Colombia.

About the only signs to show that the country is at war are the few scattered government propaganda posters against Germany and Japan.

One point must be remembered. This area and town (Buenaventura) is one of the more backward areas of the country so that the manifestations and contradictions of the system are in bolder relief. Nevertheless the more industrial areas like Cali, Medellin, and Bogota, must be very similar except for the fact that the workers are at least organized into a few trade unions and probably have slightly better working conditions

#### LIMA-CALLAO, PERU

In these two towns we see further indications of the relationship of South American countries to World Capitalism

Whereas in the advanced capitalist countries, United States, England, etc., the contradictions and needs of the system are expressed through the Imperialist war and the production of "military" commodities and the development of all production along the lines of war needs, in South America we have the reverse. Because of the backwardness of the economies, because of their relatively low development, production is primarily along the lines of "peacetime" commodities. There is considerable building of new factories, importation from the United States and England of machinery, etc.,. But whereas in advanced parts of the world these are war goods factories, here dress, clothing, shoe, and other factories are being built. There are a few heavy goods industries, but they are a minute part of the economy.

Relative to Colombia this area is much more advanced; nevertheless, it is only the advancement of a country or area which is basically agricultural. This is reflected in the standard of living of the working class and the lack of commodities which in the United States are taken for granted by the majority of the working class. The workers' homes are the South American version of our slums. But there is a complete lack of any sanitation whatsoever except what has been recently introduced. There is no such thing as a toilet, toilet paper, proper garbage disposal, etc.. The majority of the working class lives in terrible filth. Only the ruling class and sections of the middle class live in what one may properly call a home.

In and around the outskirts of Lima and Callao you can see the "homes" of the Peruvian Indians, a certain section of whom seem to be absorbed by the expanding industrial activity. They live in the most miserable of shacks made of a few boards. Shelters or huts would be a more proper name for them. Many have small plots of land, the crops of which they take to the town to sell.

What type of democracy exists in this country Peru is evident to the most casual observer passing through the country. The police are everywhere and in an alarming proportion. You cannot walk more than a few hundred yards without meeting one. An election was about to take place but it seems as though one candidate was running for election. Everywhere there were signs URETA POR PRESIDENTE! URETA, URETA, URETA, that was the only name anywhere. Peru has one of the most vicious dictatorships in South America, but it is classified by American Imperialism as a democracy and as one of the United Nations.

Whereas the bigger and more powerful capitalist countries have been able to cope with the problems of the depression through the Imperialist War evidences of the depression can still be observed here. The Government has certain houses set aside for the unemployed and special restaurants with low priced meals for the workers.

#### CHILE

Chile however has an entirely different political atmosphere. Chile is the most "advanced" country on the West Coast of South America. Its tremendous deposits of sodium nitrate and copper have made it a ready prey for the Imperialist powers. Essentially all of Chile's copper and nitrate deposits belong for American firms (Anaconda, etc.), but the British have certain interests as well.

The German penetration is most evident here. Many Germans emigrated to Chile before the war and the large amount of German commodities seen everywhere is an indication of the degree of German influence. America's entrance into the war, together with the blacklists that were issued by both England and the United States, weakened much of the German influence.

One interesting note in connection with the recent troubles between the United States and Argentina (which is largely under the control of British Capital) is the talk that has been going on in Chile about war with Argentina. The United States has been sending military supplies and equipment for the Chilean army and has given the Chilean navy certain naval craft. It seems that if Argentina didn't capitulate to the demands of the United States, Chile would have had to go to war to solve the problem by force. Actually the war would be between Great Britain and the United States, who control the economy of each of these countries. But it would be Argentina (representing Great Britain) and Chile (representing the United States) that would be doing the fighting.

A bourgeois-democratic government is in power. There seem to be a dozen and one political parties in existence, indicative of the relationship of classes and the tenor of the class struggle. The "Communist" Party and the Socialists both seem to be pretty well integrated in the political scene. Chile's political complexion is somewhat similar to Mexico's - a "People's Front."

The standard of living of the workers is about the same as in the other countries. Perhaps due to the fact that they are better organized, it is a little higher.

The form of the political struggle in Chile is on a much higher plane than it is in the United States. The workers, especially those in the unionized industries, have the general political concept that capitalism is no good. There are countless strikes and struggles against the huge interests and vested powers. In the United States or other countries we get only a slight inkling of the true situation. The reformists have a wide and open influence. This is recognized easily by any foreigner through the many signs and slogans written everywhere in the streets, sides of buildings, etc., and the results of a recent election. There is a lot of political activity but it all seems to be corralled in the wrong channels.

One point mentioned must be clarified. That is the position of the military and police forces in these countries. Their main importance is the fact that they are the crystallized wing of the Right. Every one of these groups in Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Chile has been trained by officers of the German Army before the beginning of the war. They exist as cults unified by the one idea of "Fascist Militarism". They are the best arm of the exploiters in South America against the Working Classes.

There is one more point that is of great importance. That is the attitude of the people in these countries toward the American, whether he be a worker or otherwise. Incidentally, this view is held everywhere around the world in one form or another.

The attitude of the people is that the Americans have everything-try to get as much as you can out of them - robbery is not excluded. This idea of course is based upon the fact that the American worker comes from the most highly industrialized section of the world. He has the highest standard of living and uses many commodities which workers in other countries would never dream of possessing. This does not mean that the American worker is not part of the exploited. It means that the level of his exploitation is on a higher plane than that of the others. The American working class from the point of view of amount of surplus value created for the capitalists are probably the most exploited section of the working class in the world.

If the American working class is to approach workers of other countries it must be on a class basis. It must be based on International working class solidarity, on the idea of the Permanent Revolution, that only through the workers of the world uniting the economies of the world can we truly liberate ourselves from the monster grip of Capitalism

WE DEPEND ON YOUR CONTRIBUTION  
TO PUBLISH THE  
INTERNATIONAL NEWS

# MARXISTS UNITE IN GREAT BRITAIN

## REVOLUTIONARY ORGANIZATION FOUNDED.

Arising out of an approach by the Communist Workers Group to the Leninist League of Gt. Britain for discussions on amalgamation, an agreement has now been ratified by both organisations and will take effect as from the 30th June, 1945.

The first approach was made by the Communist Workers Group on the 21st January, 1945, on the basis of its adherence to the "Fourteen Point Programme" of the International Contact Commission for the New Communist (4th) International. The Leninist League is the officially recognised affiliate of the I.C.C. in Great Britain.

The name of the amalgamated organisation will be the Revolutionary Workers Association of Gt. Britain. An immediate approach has been made to the International Contact Commission in Chicago, U.S.A., for recognition as its official British Section.

The first Conference of the new organisation will take place on the week-end of 30th June, 1945, at which its Constitution will be adopted and officers and committees elected.

The programme and policy of the Revolutionary Workers Association will be based upon the international policy of the I.C.C., as contained in its basic political policy, the "Fourteen Point Programme", and the published policy given in its official organ "International News".

The first policy statement to be issued by the new organisation is an open letter to all workers on the "Sham General Election". The statement briefly, but plainly shows that socialism will not be achieved through parliament, but through Workers Councils of Action in the factories, mines and shipyards, under the leadership of the workers own revolutionary party.

It goes on to show that the main issue before the whole world today is whether or not capitalism should be abolished. The attitude of the R. W. L., to existing parties is defined, and whilst the new organisation cannot yet put forward candidates of its own, a call is issued to all workers to build the new organisation for the struggles ahead.

Workers who are dissatisfied with the policy of the parties of which they are members, or workers who are not members of any political party, are urged to get in touch with the R. W. A., for literature, information, etc. The name and postal address is: Revolutionary Workers Assn., c/o P.B.S., 18, Noel Street, London, W.1., Gt. Britain.

AGREEMENT ON THE AMALGAMATION OF THE  
COMMUNIST WORKERS GROUP AND THE LENINIST LEAGUE OF GT. BRITAIN.

THE COMMUNIST WORKERS GROUP and the LENINIST LEAGUE OF GT. BRITAIN having exchanged information on the political and organisational policy of their respective organisations agrees to the following Articles of amalgamation:--

Article I - Amalgamation. The two organisations shall amalgamate into one organisation, to be known as the REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS ASSOCIATION OF GT. BRITAIN.

Article II - Political Policy. The acceptance of the 'Fourteen Point Programme' of the International Contact Commission for the New Communist (4th) International as its international policy. Appendix (A).

Article III - Affiliation to International Contact Commission. The amalgamated organisation shall make application to the International Contact Commission for affiliation and recognition as its official affiliate in Gt. Britain.

Article IV - Constitution. The acceptance of the draft Constitution as the Constitution of the amalgamated organisation. Appendix (B).

Article V - Assets and Liabilities. The amalgamated organisation to take over all assets of the two organisations and be responsible for all liabilities outstanding as at the half-year 30th June, 45.

Article VI - Officers of New Organisation. The officers of the new amalgamated organisation to be elected at a joint session of the two organisations.

Article VII - Amalgamation Conference. Subject to the ratification of this agreement in accordance with Article VIII, a joint session of the two organisations shall be held on the 30th June, 45, which joint session shall be known as the First Conference of the new Organisation.

Article VIII - Ratification. This agreement shall be submitted to the respective organisations for ratification prior to the 30th June, 45.

Signed: COMMUNIST WORKERS GROUP.

Signed: LENINIST LEAGUE OF GT. BRITAIN.

## BRITISH TROTSKYIST CANDIDATE FOR PARLIAMENT DEFEATED.

In the parliamentary bye-election during May at Neath in Wales, the British Trotskyists put up their first candidate for parliament.

He was overwhelmingly defeated. 84% of electorate voted, some 30% to 40% more than average in bye-elections. The Labour Party candidate, the nominee of the miner's union, received some thirty thousand votes. The Nationalist candidate over six thousand. The Trotskyist under two thousand.

The reasons for the defeat are important. The Trotskyists' own paper declared that there was much anti-Labour feeling among the miners, and when the Nationalist poll is added to the Trotskyist it gives over 25% as having voted against Labour. The miners are probably more politically mature than any other section of the population, yet the Trotskyists failed to convince more than a small minority. Why?

Briefly there are two reasons. The Trotskyist candidate was an outsider, whereas his two opponents were Welsh, known and respected locally, further, despite the fact that he had been among those Trotskyists who had been arrested last year under the infamous Trades Dispute Act of 1927, he had no record of struggle amongst the working class which could carry weight with the miners.

The second reason is, however, what probably determined the small poll. The Trotskyists claim that the central issue in their campaign was "Labour to Power" - "Break the Coalition". While it is true that the Coalition Government continued in office during this bye-election, no thinking person who followed politics in Britain believed that the coalition would long outlast the ending of the war against Germany. The Labour and Liberal leaders had repeatedly emphasised this. The Labour Party rank and file were restive for the ending of the truce. No single labour bureaucrat dared to come out openly against the slogan "Break the Coalition". No wonder the Neath miners saw no reason for voting Trotskyist. They voted Labour because they ACCEPTED THE TROTSKYIST LINE.

This bye-election exposes the Trotskyist claim to be revolutionary Marxists.

Their complete bankruptcy in producing a revolutionary line of action, their line of "Labour to Power" shows that their role is to provide the traitor Labour leaders with a "Marxist" left cover. To the Trotskyist rank and file it is necessary to say "Break With Your Centrist Organisation - Join The Revolutionary Workers Association in Building a Real Marxist Revolutionary Party."

May 1945  
London.



REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS ASSOCIATION

AN OPEN LETTER TO  
ALL WORKERS ON THE  
SHAM GENERAL ELECTION.

c/o P.B.S.,  
18, Noel Street,  
London, W.1.

June, 1945

Fellows Workers:

You are being asked to return a new Government from one of the two main parties, the Labour Party or the Tories. Both parties are determined to maintain capitalism. This they screen by lavish, lying promises of full employment, housing, pensions, independence for India and the Colonies and the abolition of imperialist wars. Although capitalism has exposed its inability to solve any social crisis, both parties have the audacity to ask for your mandate to continue the capitalist system. The main issue before the whole world today is whether or not capitalism should be abolished.

No party, barring one small "parliamentary reform" socialist party - certainly not the two main parties - has asked for a vote on this issue. Therefore the General Election is a SHAM. No matter who gets in, the workers will be swindled.

The Tories are completely identified with the defence of the privileges of "Big Business". The Labour Party who in their 1929-31 government introduced such anti-working class legislation as the infamous "Means Test", ask to be returned on a programme of "Public Control". This is a deliberate trick to deceive the workers into believing that it means the overthrow of capitalism and the introduction of socialism. A Labour Government, because of its pseudo-reformist character, will inevitably carry out the dictates of "Big Business" as it did before, and, as its power to deceive grows less, it will conspire with the representatives of "Big Business" to pave the way for rule by terrorism - FASCISM.

We, a comparatively new working class organisation, cannot yet put candidates in the field. The only candidates we can endorse are workers who are free from discipline of treacherous parties and who fully serve their class. But we must issue a warning! SOCIALISM will not be achieved through parliament but through WORKERS COUNCILS OF ACTION in the factories, mines, shipyards etc., under the leadership of the workers own REVOLUTIONARY PARTY.

Such a party we are building. We need your help. Write for our literature. Start discussion groups at your place of work.

BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS ASSOCIATION.

Yours fraternally,

Revolutionary Workers Association.

N.B. The Revolutionary Workers Association is the British Section of the International Contact Commission for the building of the New Communist (4th) International.