

---

---

August 1944

# Fourth International

---

---

TROTSKY MEMORIAL NUMBER

•



Leon Trotsky

November 7, 1879 - August 21, 1940

Containing Two Articles  
by Leon Trotsky: *Tasks of  
Communist Education* and  
*Five Years of the Comintern*  
as well as Commemorative  
Articles, Reminiscences  
and Appreciations of  
Trotsky's Work by —

*Charles Cornell, William Simmons, Li Fu-Jen, A. Vincent*  
and others — *The Month in Review . . . by the Editors*

---

---

Twenty Cents

## Manager's Column

Correspondence from our agents during the month records a continuous expansion in FOURTH INTERNATIONAL sales. We quote from some of the letters:

*Detroit:* "We have a new carrier for the F.I., Cass Newsstand at Cass and Michigan Avenues... By the way, the F.I. sales in two places have been steadily rising each month. The magazine is constantly improving."

*Toledo:* "There are now two places carrying the F.I.—Athletic Sport Center and M & M Drugstore. We are going to try to place them in some other stores in town. We tried to sell a subscription to the Public Library. They said they got most of such publications free and wanted to know if they can get a free sub to the F.I."

(We are placing the Toledo Public Library on our mailing list and will do so with any library that has a call for FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.)

*Akron:* "The magazine is sold in Akron at the News Exchange. We sell around ten copies there per month. Please increase our F.I. bundle order by five—we will try to put them on another newsstand."

*Los Angeles:* "From reports I get it looks as if the F.I. is having a good month on the stands. This means our newsstand circulation at the present time is a regular minimum of fifty and in another month or so I should be able to give sixty as our newsstand minimum with the advent of the San Pedro stand sales."

"Another point I want to bring up is the advertising of our newsstands. We are trying to build up one or two regular routes and such an ad would be an inducement to the shopkeepers to carry the magazine and paper as well as help us in building up the routes."

The above report of progress from Los Angeles was followed by a telegram stating, "SOLD OUT. EXPRESS FIFTEEN ADDITIONAL COPIES JULY ISSUE FOR TROTSKY MEMORIAL MEETING."

San Francisco is utilizing their back issues of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL in contact work and is desirous of keeping

# FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME V August 1944 No. 8 (Whole No. 47)

Published monthly by the

Fourth International Publishing Association

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

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

Editor: FELIX MORROW

## CONTENTS

### The Month in Review

Crisis in the German Ruling Class.....	227
Dangers and Tasks Facing the Polish Workers....	228
Leon Trotsky: 1879-1940.....	By the Editors 229
Leon Trotsky, Revolutionary Teacher of the Colonial Peoples.....	By Li Fu-Jen 232
Trotsky on America's Role in Europe	
	By William Simmons 237
Leon Trotsky, Organizer of Victory....	By Karl Radek 239
Tasks of Communist Education.....	By Leon Trotsky 242
How the Fourth International Was Conceived	
	By Ann Vincent 243
With Trotsky in Mexico.....	By Charles Cornell 246
From the Arsenal of Marxism	
Five Years of the Comintern.....	By Leon Trotsky 249



a supply on hand. Our agent in her latest report asks: "Will you please send us 5 copies of the December FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. We're all out of them."

\* \* \*

Inquiries have been received as to whether we have indexes for the various volumes of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. Indexes are available for the last few years and we will be glad to send them to anyone who wishes to have loose copies of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL bound.

\* \* \*

Readers of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL comment about the magazine:

*Chicago:* "The article on the Cuban elections was good. More material on American colonies should appear. I believe an analysis of events in South America during the past year would be informative." (The article referred to, "Significance of the Cuban Elections" by J. B. Stuart, appears in the July 1944 issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.)

*New York:* "I often discuss different articles in the dif-

ferent issues with a friend of mine. She has mentioned several times that she likes the Manager's Column because it gives her a better picture of what the F.I. supporters are doing."

*F.D., Sandstone:* "Reading the F.I. from this distance from the center, I am more than ever impressed with its importance to our movement. It is a powerful supplement to the weekly paper in presenting a rounded picture of major world events, not to mention its own independent role as a theoretical organ. The June issue is well balanced, interesting and informative from cover to cover."

\* \* \*

Comments from readers abroad:

*War Zone:* "Very many thanks for the first parcel which arrived last week. The magazine is well up to the usual standard and that's saying a lot."

"I would like to buy a subscription for 1944 as well as a copy of the Old Man's 'In Defense of Marxism'..."

"In the meantime please ac-

cept my sincere congratulations and appreciation. 'Forward to Victory'."

\* \* \*

*Bristol, Eng.:* "I'm under eternal obligation for receipt of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and THE MILITANT. Am unable to get permit to send money out of the country. Is there a commission I can do for you?"

"See enclosed note from library showing what I've done with copies of the magazine."

(The note from the library states: "In reply to your inquiry I shall be very pleased to accept the issues of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL which you kindly offer to present to this library. Perhaps you will be good enough to bring the periodicals to the library at your convenience, and an official acknowledgement of your gift will be sent to you in due course. Your specimen copy is returned herewith.")

*London, Eng.:* "Like most of the letters you get from Britain nowadays this is a begging one. I'd appreciate if you could send me a file of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for the period May to December 1943. You were kind enough to let me have a number of copies last year to make up some bound volumes, and I am hoping you will be able to complete my 1943 volume... I send greetings both to those of you who are carrying on the work outside the prison walls and to those who have been jailed by American imperialism."

*London, Eng.:* "A friend of mine said he has found in his factory that the workers are very much interested in the F.I. He distributes the magazines as well as THE MILITANT there regularly. They especially like articles dealing with trade union situations in the United States—they are very interested in those. Just to show what kind of articles they like best, they were very interested in DeLorenzo's case."

"His impression of the F.I. is that it should have greater diversity of articles in different fields and all the articles should be short. So far as quality is concerned, it is absolutely the best thing in the whole political field, nothing to compare with it at all."

## The Month in Review

By THE EDITORS

### Crisis of the German Ruling Class: The Nazi - Junker Rift

**WHAT EVENTS OF JULY 20 SIGNIFY** After the July 20 attempt on Hitler's life, the rift between the Nazi politicians and the Junker generals cannot be questioned any longer. The crisis in the German ruling class has begun.

If the defeat at Stalingrad was decisive in turning the tide against German militarism in the East; if the defeat in North Africa foreshadowed the demise of Nazi imperialist power in the West; the split between Hitler and the Junkers is no less decisive for the fortunes of the capitalists at home, in Germany itself.

In that sense it constitutes the prelude to the inevitable outbreak of the proletarian revolution within the Third Reich.

Both the Nazi politicians and the Junker generals are, no doubt, motivated by considerations flowing from the example of Mussolini's collapse in Italy a year ago. The generals want to emulate Badoglio. Hitler wants to prevent the rise of the latter's German counterpart and thus stave off the fate that befell Mussolini.

As in the case of Italy, it is fear of the approaching upheaval of the masses that hastens the decomposition of the ruling class. The Junkers hope to deflect the wrath of the toilers, wearied and decimated by the war, upon the heads of the Nazis. They hope thus to save themselves and somehow to retain leadership after Hitler's fall.

Hitler and the Nazis, on the other hand, try to learn from the Italian example too and to prevent its repetition in Germany. In the regimented meetings at the factories, with which they are supplementing the blood-purge of the generals, they appeal to the class instincts of the masses. They ask support from them for their struggle against the "blue-blooded swine," upon whom they seek to place the blame for the growing military disasters which are debilitating the country.

But neither of the ruling factions can escape their inevitable doom. For the time being, the Nazis appear to have gained the upper hand over the old-line militarists. They have, according to reports, executed more than 3,000 high officers. They have introduced the Nazi salute in the army and "assured" themselves control by a system of political commissars attached to the staffs of the various armies. They have placed the Gestapo's chief hangman, Himmler at the head of the "home forces." For the *n*th time they have proclaimed "complete totalitarization" of the war effort. To the masses who have suffered untold anguish in the eleven years under his "providential" leadership, Hitler holds out the prospect only . . . of the most "total" misery.

**SIGNS OF THE COMING DEBACLE** But the military defeats on all fronts continue unabated. The Nazi lines are crumbling in Poland on the East and in France on the West. The number of prisoners in every sector of their battle-fronts is growing to tremendous proportions. Hundreds of thousands of deserters, according

to reports, are roaming the countryside in the Reich itself. Rumors persist of mutinous actions in the navy, of strikes in the factories, even of the formation of soldiers' councils in the reserves. Under the clouds of the double censorship of the Nazis and the Allies, little light on the actual state of affairs among the German masses is reaching us.

Yet there cannot be any doubt that the conflict at the top is only a reflection of the deep-going unrest at the bottom. That it will further stimulate the tendencies toward civil war all the way down the rungs of the social ladder. Already there are signs that point unmistakably in this direction. William Philip Simms, Scripps-Howard foreign expert, reports on August 2:

"United Nations officials in London are convinced that the revolt against Hitler was not only genuine, but far from being crushed, has only been driven underground temporarily and will soon erupt again with greater violence than ever . . . There seems good reason to believe that there is now a definite peace movement among the German masses, and that the so-called generals' plot was symptomatic, if not the spearhead, of that movement . . . While the Nazis may have quelled the abortive revolt, it can hardly be for long if, as it appears, it was the outgrowth of something much bigger, much more serious and definitely more progressive than just a generals' plot."

Inside Germany, N. Y. *Times* correspondent George Axelson writes from Stockholm on Aug. 6, the developments since July 20 have pushed the "lukewarms and the politically indifferent, the masses of *inbetweens* to make up their political minds and join the opposition." He quotes underground reports "that entire regiments throw down their rifles and walk over to the Russian lines, the men sometimes being led by their officers and at other times acting on their own initiative."

**ECONOMIC BACKGROUND** In the same dispatch he reports that foreign slave laborers "have deserted in droves from factories and farms" and are being sheltered and fed by German farmers and workers! Finally, he sketches the economic background behind the unrest.

"Add to this the fact that most Germans outside the army and party have not eaten a really square, substantial meal for four years, that practically all of them are worrying about themselves or about the fate of some relative, that millions are homeless and propertyless and that the reichsmark has sunk so low that only landlords, restaurants and the rare amusement places still in business accept them, and that they do so only because they have to by law, and one begins to have an idea of what things are like in today's Germany."

The masses of German workers, who are known long ago to have conducted slowdowns in the plants together with their brothers from the occupied lands impressed into Nazi slave labor, can only be emboldened by the quarrel among their rulers. The example of the insurgent Italian workers cannot have been lost to them. The recent general strike of the Danish workers, bringing the Hitlerite oppressor to terms, cannot fail to have impressed them with both the growing weakness of

their masters and the new power of working class solidarity. It was too close to home. How advanced the state of unrest and incipient revolt actually is, we cannot know for certain. But that the masses are already on the move can be gleaned from small items in the Nazi press itself. On August 12, for instance, the *New York Post* carried the following A.P. dispatch:

"Escaped prisoners of war and foreign laborers have begun guerrilla warfare inside Germany, the German press revealed today in a dispatch from Nazi correspondent Werner Gilles... Hitler's newspaper, *Voelkischer Beobachter*, reported that guerrillas had killed four Nazis in one village, and commented: 'Even in the smallest village everything must be prepared for defense against air raids, marauding foreign workers and armed prisoners of war who have escaped.'"

The revolutionary crisis unfolding all over the agonized continent is reaching into the heart of Europe.

**PLANS OF ALLIES AND THE KREMLIN** The Allied Imperialists and their federate in the Kremlin are regarding the outbreak of the social crisis in Germany with mixed feelings. Their delight with the Nazi-Junker rift is more than tempered by their patent fear of the German masses. They have already indicated, through Churchill, that they have plans prepared to deal with a revolutionary Germany.

They have no intention of repeating the pattern of the precarious native bonapartist regime tried with Darlan in North Africa and Badoglio in Italy. The rule of the mailed fist is to be used more openly than elsewhere against the workers in Germany. Allied bayonets, their *own* forces of occupation, are to be entrusted with the major role in the governing of a *partitioned* Reich.

Already the Allied statesmen are warning that a Communist Germany cannot expect to be spared expiation for the crimes of the Nazis. Already they are spreading the slander that the "German nation of criminals" is about to change from Hitlerism to Communism in order to escape punishment. Already the Kremlin, aiding in this counter-revolutionary plot, is inspiring stories of a "Trotskyist" conspiracy to save German militarism.

But the calculations of the imperialists and of their Moscow allies are one thing; the power of the social forces with which they have to cope, another. Precisely because it has been suppressed as in no other country, precisely because it has accumulated under the Nazi lid a vast store of dammed-up mass hatred, the class struggle of the German proletariat will explode with tremendous force. The stormy course of the German revolution will arouse an irresistible enthusiasm among the toilers of the entire world. The great traditions of struggle of the German workers, once they break through the barriers set up by the crumbling Nazi dictatorship, will rise to new heights. The revolutionary German workers will win for their cause the sympathies of the oppressed in every part of the world. Against this force neither the Stalinist bureaucracy, nor the Anglo-American imperialism will remain immune.

### Dangers and Tasks Facing The Workers of Poland

#### DISPUTE BETWEEN LONDON AND MOSCOW

With the Red Army surging across the western Bug River, the frontier established as the "Curzon Line," the Kremlin has proclaimed the formation of a "Polish Committee of National Liberation." This committee is to serve as the civil authority in the territory being occupied by Soviet troops from this line onward.

The proclamation of the new quasi-government has aroused a flurry of diplomatic activity in Allied circles. The premier of the Polish "government-in-exile" at London flew to Moscow to attempt a conciliation of the two "governments." After a week of conferences, the negotiations broke down without any results.

The dispute between London and Moscow is in the main a dispute over the international alignment of the projected Polish government. London wants to assure its allegiance to the foreign policy of British imperialism. Moscow wants to assure for the Stalinist bureaucracy a friendly capitalist ally on the pattern of the emigre Czechoslovak government of Eduard Benes.

Moscow's declaration explicitly states: "The Soviet government declares that it does not pursue aims... of a change of social structure in Poland." This is the identical language used by Molotov after the entry of the Red Army into Rumania. There this statement of policy has been followed by practical measures upholding the domination of the capitalist-landlord oligarchy and suppressing the most elementary rights of the masses. The Polish declaration forebodes the same kind of counter-revolutionary action by the Stalinist agents in Poland.

The manifesto reportedly issued by Stalin's puppet Polish civil administration further bears this out: "All property confiscated by the Germans will be restored." Restored, that is, to the capitalists.

The machinations of Stalin and his puppets are a clear warning of the dangers facing the people of Poland.

Under the leadership of the great Warsaw proletariat, the Polish masses have fought for five years with unexcelled heroism against Nazi tyranny. They have not taken up arms to exchange one set of oppressors for another. They have not fought for the predatory interests of British imperialism and its Polish henchmen of the London "government-in-exile." Nor have they battled in order to submit to the reactionary role of Stalin's bureaucracy and his Polish puppets. They have shown in the course of their tenacious resistance to Hitlerism that they mean to be masters of their own destiny. They intend to strike down root and branch the whole landlord-capitalist system which has heaped interminable misery, starvation and death upon them.

#### STALIN'S TREACHERY AT THE GATES OF WARSAW

As the Red Army approached the gates of Warsaw, the embattled workers gave renewed evidence of this irrepressible determination. Despite five years of bloody Nazi repression, they have arisen again with arms in hand to challenge the oppressor. In an unequal battle, with bare hands so to speak, they seized one section of the city after another. The German forces of occupation were struck with panic and began to evacuate, in the expectation that the assault of the Red Army would be coordinated with the revolt from within. But instead of increasing in intensity, the attack of the Red Army was brought to a standstill. The Nazi military took renewed heart. The heroic workers of Warsaw are being left to battle alone.

By this latest treachery, the Kremlin oligarchy is underlining and emphasizing the counter-revolutionary role it means to play in Poland. Taking a page out of the tactics of Anglo-American imperialism in Italy, the Stalinist bureaucracy leaves the insurgent proletariat to be crushed by the retreating Nazis. It attempts to cover up this latest betrayal by throwing sand in the eyes of the masses of the world who are eagerly following the struggle. After first denying the very existence of the revolt in the city, and then pooh-poohing it as a mere machination of Polish reactionaries to embarrass the Red Army, it is now issuing statements through the press agency *Tass* to the effect that the

London "government-in-exile" is alone responsible for the isolation of the embattled workers of Warsaw.

That the bourgeois "government" in London, the tool of the Allies, does not really worry over the fate of the Warsaw working class is, to be sure, only too true. That government merely seeks to reestablish the rule of the capitalists, landlords and militarists who previously oppressed the masses and ruined the country. Naturally, they seek to make use of the insurgent movement for their own reactionary end. Like Stalin, they too fear the independent action of the masses, which in the end can only turn against the predatory aims of the London "government-in-exile." Only treachery could be expected from that quarter.

**REACTIONARY ROLE EXPOSED IN ACTION** But the heroic fighters of Warsaw expected a different attitude from the approaching army of the Soviet state. The counter-revolutionary bureaucracy is now revealing in action what advanced workers already knew, namely, that its attitude toward the insurgent workers is no different from that of the imperialists.

At the gates of Warsaw, Stalin is being forced to appear in his whole reactionary nakedness before the entire world. As yet he is attempting to cover himself up with deception. The aforementioned *Tass* communique states:

"*Tass* is in possession of information that the London Polish circles responsible for the Warsaw uprising made no attempt to coordinate the revolt with the Soviet high command. The responsibility for the Warsaw happening thus lies entirely with the Polish emigre circles in London."

He hopes to ward off self-exposure by shouting "Stop, thief" at the Anglo-American imperialists with whom he is allied, and their Polish hirelings. Stalin unquestionably fears the fraternization between the revolutionary insurgents in Warsaw and the soldiers of the Red Army besieging it. The nightmare of a revolutionary reawakening of the Soviet masses stares in his face across the gates of the embattled city.

By his own actions, Stalin has taught the masses of Poland

that they can expect only a stab in the back from the counter-revolutionary gang in the Kremlin. They must now draw the lesson of this betrayal. They must organize their forces to counteract it. They must beware of the scoundrelly Stalinist agents in their midst and drive these vermin from their ranks.

With their own armed forces they must continue their independent revolutionary struggle. They must organize and strengthen their workers and peasants councils. They must fight to establish a workers and peasants republic on socialist foundations.

**ROAD AHEAD FOR POLISH WORKERS** They must confiscate the factories and operate them under workers control. They cannot place any confidence in the promises of land reforms issued from London or Moscow but must proceed to divide the estates of the robber landlords among the peasants. They will have to take measures to prevent the restoration of the landlord-capitalist regime and its military oligarchy. They must establish full equality for all minorities.

The Polish masses can realize this program only in relentless opposition and vigilant struggle against all the agents of the Anglo-American imperialists and of the counter-revolutionary Stalinist bureaucracy. They will find their most powerful allies in the workers of Germany who are preparing to rise against the shaken Nazi-Junker regime, and in the insurgent workers and peasants of Central Europe. They must seek to enlist in their common cause the rank and file soldiers of the Red Army, and forge bonds of solidarity with the millions of Soviet workers who remain true to the internationalist ideas and revolutionary traditions of 1917. Through their independent struggle the Polish workers will inspire the Soviet masses to settle accounts with the hated Stalinist bureaucracy.

Arm in arm with these allies the Polish workers must fight to overthrow capitalism and rid Europe of imperialist domination. Their united struggle will assure the revival and extension of the October Revolution and lead to the firm establishment of the Socialist United States of Europe.

## Leon Trotsky: 1879-1940

In his brilliant essay, *The Role of the Individual in History*, Plekhanov summarized the Marxist view on this subject as follows:

"A great man is great not because his personal qualities give individual features to great historic events, but because he possesses qualities which make him most capable of serving the great social needs of his time, needs which arose as a result of general and particular causes. Carlyle, in his well-known book on heroes and hero-worship calls great men *beginners*. This is a very apt description. A great man is precisely a beginner because he sees *further* than others and desires things *more strongly* than others. He solves the scientific problems brought up by the preceding process of intellectual development of society; he points to the new social needs created by the preceding development of social relationships; he takes the initiative in satisfying these needs. He is a hero. But he is not a hero in the sense that he can stop the natural course of things, but in the sense that his activities are the conscious and free expression of this inevitable and unconscious course. Herein lies his significance; herein lies his whole power."

Plekhanov wrote these profound words in 1898. Yet it would be difficult to find a more appropriate, a more exact, a more scientific characterization today of the genius of Leon Trotsky,

whose untimely death at the hands of a Stalinist assassin we commemorate this month for the fourth year.

Like that other revolutionary giant of our time with whose name his own is inseparably linked in history, like Lenin, Trotsky was a *beginner*, a hero, in more than one sense. Each, in his own way, traced the fundamental features of the Russian Revolution to come long before 1917; they saw *further* than the Mensheviks, than all the others of their generation who occupied themselves with the problems of Russian society. Together, they guided the revolution, when it came, to the successful establishment of the first workers state. They desired it *more strongly* than all the Martovs, than all those who vacillated at the head of the revolution which raised them to leadership.

### What They Achieved Together

The great social needs of the time, which arose from the decline of capitalism and its inability to fulfill the wants of society, required an answer. Marxism supplied the answer: the international proletarian revolution. Marxism supplied the theoretical weapons for its achievement in the great works of the *beginners* of modern scientific socialism, of Marx and Engels.

It was in sharpening these weapons, in guarding them against all those who attempted to blunt them. in applying

them to the "new social needs created by the preceding development of social relationships," and in taking the initiative in satisfying them, that the genius of these two giants of the Twentieth Century consisted.

Together they laid the foundations of the first workers state and led it safely through three and a half years of civil war and imperialist intervention. Together they conceived that state as a fortress of the international working class, of its world revolution.

Together, in founding the Communist International, they upheld Marxism as the doctrine of revolutionary internationalism which had been betrayed by the social chauvinists of all nations in the holocaust of the first world war.

After Lenin's death, the role of *beginner*, of the one who "sees *further* than others and desires things *more strongly* than others," fell to Trotsky alone. It is precisely in this latter period, in the period of world reaction that followed the initial success of the international proletarian revolution and threatened to engulf it, that the heroic figure of Leon Trotsky stands out in its brightest light. The success of the revolution, the flood-tide of the first proletarian victory, raised from the depths of the people many talents. In the glow of that victory a whole galaxy of talented men rose to the level of the historical tasks. The dark, reactionary aftermath undermined this whole generation of titans. Stalin finished the process by the physical destruction of his purges. Only the greatness of Trotsky, foreseeing and solving the new problems arising for mankind and taking renewed initiative in their solution, survived in that battle against the stream.

## His Struggle Against the Stream

Philistines, petty bourgeois skeptics and cynics and others, demoralized by their lack of a Marxist anchor in the midst of the wave of working class defeats, saw only the surface phenomena. The whole outcome of the ebb and tide of reaction and revolution in the social convulsions of the post-Leninist period appeared in their limited horizons only as the personal defeat of Trotsky. In their view Stalin won in a struggle of two individuals, in which the former turned out to be the weaker. Ah, if the "strong" Lenin had lived, everything would have been different, they concluded. And then—turned their backs on the teaching of both of the great masters.

Infinitely more profound was the view of Krupskaya who shared with Lenin the years of his Marxist training as well as the years of his triumph. She understood what had happened. In 1926, when Stalin undertook the first steps in the repression of the Trotskyist opposition, she declared: "If Ilyitch were alive, he would be in prison today." She knew as a Marxist, as Plekhanov had said, that the great revolutionist, like all the great, "is not a hero in the sense that he can stop the natural course of things, but in the sense that his activities are the conscious and free expression of this inevitable and unconscious course."

"Herein lies his significance," Plekhanov concluded, "herein lies his whole power. But that significance is colossal, and the power is formidable." That colossal significance, that formidable power—which the philistines have no understanding of—Trotsky displayed precisely in the struggle with Stalin, from its inception in 1923, and particularly in the years that followed.

It was in the course of that seventeen years' struggle that Trotsky, in defending Marxism, in rescuing the ideas of Lenin from Stalinist falsification, made his greatest contributions to the science of the proletarian revolution.

He and he alone, traced the degeneration of the Soviet state from its earliest bureaucratic manifestations until its present corruption under personal and totalitarian rule of Stalin. From the initiation of the ruinous theory of "Socialism in one country" through to the great betrayals that finally unleashed upon the working class the present devastating war. He taught the revolutionary workers of the world what to reject in this degenerated first workers' state as treachery to their class; what to defend in it as a conquest of the revolution of 1917 necessary to their further progress.

Trotsky, and he alone, analyzed the forces in German society that led to the defeat of the working class and the rise of Nazism as a menace to the whole world proletariat. In the process, he armed the vanguard of the workers with the only strategy and the only tactics of defeating fascism—a task for which both social democracy and Stalinism proved themselves impotent and bankrupt.

Trotsky alone exposed the nefarious role, the Menshevik politics of Stalinism in China. In the course of his brilliant polemics, he developed the whole program of the colonial revolution by means of which the enslaved masses of Asia, Africa and South America will free themselves from imperialist oppression.

Trotsky was the first to recognize and outline the enormous predatory role of American imperialism, rising as the most powerful counter-revolutionary force in the world. He was the first to provide the masses of Europe with the rallying cry, the Socialist United States of Europe, in which the whole strategy of the struggle against the new imperialist colossus is summed up.

Trotsky, above everyone else, detected from the beginning the social elements leading to revolution in Spain and in France and provided the theoretical arms for the revolutionists in the ensuing struggles there.

Then, after Stalinist treachery aided in betraying the Spanish revolution and the French workers' struggles in 1936, Trotsky pointed out every move in world politics leading to the inevitable outbreak of the second imperialist war. To combat the depredations against the working class by means of which imperialism aimed to prepare itself for the new holocaust and to conduct the war for the shrinking markets, Trotsky hammered out the great program of Transitional Demands. As the whole world became transformed into an armed camp, he drew the sharp outlines of our proletarian military policy.

## His Legacy to the Workers

All of these tremendous contributions were crowned in the foundation of the Fourth International in September 1938. The Fourth International is Trotsky's legacy to the working class of the world. It is the continuation of the party of Lenin under the conditions of the world reaction that engulfed and destroyed his Bolshevik party in the Soviet Union. It is the instrument that alone is capable of overcoming this reaction and of extending to a world scale the October revolution which the Bolshevik party began in Russia in 1917.

Trotsky's greatness, his ability to *see further*, is concentrated above all, in this crowning achievement. All of his criticism of social developments led to the inescapable conclusion: *the conditions for proletarian revolution are overripe. The only element lacking is leadership—the tested party of the working class.* It was to the building of this crucially imperative element that Trotsky particularly devoted his great brain and his almost super-human energy in the whole last period of his life.

His entire life set the example for the type of party toward



which he strove. In his great speech "On the Foundation of the Fourth International" he expressed this attitude most succinctly:

"Only the Fourth International looks with confidence at the future," he said. "It is the world party of the socialist revolution! There never was a greater task on the earth. Upon every one of us rests a tremendous historical responsibility. *Our party demands each of us, totally and completely.* Let the philistines hunt their own individuality in empty space. For a revolutionary to give himself entirely to the party signifies finding himself. Yes our party takes each one of us wholly. But in return it gives to everyone of us the highest happiness: the consciousness that one participates in building for a better future, that one carries on his shoulders a particle of the fate of mankind, and that one's life will not have been lived in vain."

He "desired things *more strongly* than others." And he strove to infuse the greatness of his *strong will* into the party which he founded.

## Last Great Ideological Fight

Every great revolutionist has had his epigones, his false disciples, those who bowdlerize and distort his great ideas. Marx and Engels had their epigones in the reformist revisionists around Bernstein and Kautsky, who corrupted and destroyed the Second International. Lenin's epigones were headed by Stalin and they laid low the Third International. In the Fourth International there were candidates for the role of epigones too—epigones of Trotsky. They were the revisionists of Marxism that arose in the Socialist Workers Party around Burnham and Shachtman. Fortunately, Trotsky was able, unlike Marx, Engels and Lenin, to confront these would-be epigones in his life time. The last great ideological struggle of his life, was a struggle in defense of Marxism in which Trotsky exposed the would-be epigones as outright opponents and enemies of the "Trotskyism" which they claimed to espouse. In the course of that struggle, every foundation stone of the Fourth International, from the organizational conception of the party to its basic theory, from its tactical program to the fundamental philosophy of dialectic materialism came under attack. Trotsky led the irrefutable defense. Trotsky characterized the neo-revisionism as essentially, skepticism.

"If we dare to call the people for a revolutionary change of society, we carry a tremendous responsibility," he explained to the petty bourgeois skeptics, "which we must consider very seriously. And what is our theory, but merely the tools of our action? These tools are our Marxist theory because up to today we have not found better tools. A worker is not fantastic about tools—if they are the best tools he can get, he is careful with them; he does not abandon them or demand fantastic non-existent tools... It is very characteristic of the disappointed intellectual. He sees the war, the terrible epoch ahead with losses, with sacrifices, and he is afraid. He begins to propagate skepticism and still he believes it is possible to unify skepticism with revolutionary devotion. We can only develop a revolutionary devotion if we are sure it is rational and possible, and we cannot have such assurances without a working theory. He who propagates theoretical skepticism is a traitor."

In guarding the party against this treacherous poison, in proving once again, against the skeptics, the rational base of Marxist theory, Trotsky strengthened more than ever the revolutionary devotion of its ranks. He could challenge his own fate in this conviction:

"The hangmen think in their obtuseness and cynicism that it is possible to frighten us. They err. *Under blows we become*

*stronger.* The bestial politics of Stalin are only politics of despair. It is possible to kill individual soldiers of our army, but not to frighten them... *It is not possible to frighten us.*"

## Four Years After Trotsky's Death

The four years since his death have only confirmed Trotsky's conviction over and over again.

The assassination of the Old Man was, indeed, an irreparable loss to our movement. But Trotsky had already said: "*Under blows, we become stronger.*" They could not frighten us... The forces of Trotskyism took the blow as a challenge and redoubled their efforts.

American imperialism followed Stalin's blow with another heavy attack: the jailing of the 18 leaders of the Socialist Workers Party. Again, as Trotsky predicted, "Under blows, we became stronger." We redoubled our efforts in the face of the new challenge.

The heavy hand of imperialist persecution has in the latest instance fallen upon the British Trotskyists. Again, we can be sure, the challenge will be met by a strengthening of our forces. "It is not possible to frighten us."

A week before the outbreak of the present war, the French ambassador to Germany reported to his Foreign Minister his historic interview with Adolph Hitler:

"If I really think"—I (Ambassador Coulondre) observed—"that we will be victorious, I also have the fear that at the end of the war there will be only one real victor: M. Trotsky." Interrupting me, the Chancellor shouted: "Then why have you given Poland free reign?"

By "M. Trotsky"; of course, both the spokesman of French "democracy" and the head of German fascism meant the socialist revolution which Trotskyism alone represents today. As the present phase of the war, the defeat of Nazi imperialism, nears, the fears of Coulondre and Hitler are being re-echoed by the Allied statesmen. Vice President Wallace and former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles warn of the danger of a "Trotskyist Germany" arising to shake all of Europe. They merely repeat the dread and the consternation they have heard expressed in the Kremlin. Stalin's murder of Trotsky could not lay the specter of Trotskyism. "The bestial politics of Stalin are only politics of despair."

## Trotsky's Forecast

The greatness that was Trotsky—his role as the *beginner*, who sees *further* than others and desires things *more strongly* than others—has been rooted imperishably in the party, in the International which he prepared, founded and consolidated. It has entered history now as an *objective* factor.

The patent fears of the present rulers of the world only underline Trotsky's reminder:

"*We are not a party as other parties. It is not by chance that the imperialist reaction persecutes us madly, following furiously at our heels.*"

In the knowledge that the persecutions of the imperialists are in reality futile attempts to stop the relentless course of history, we can gain only the greatest confidence from the fears they express about Trotskyism. We can share the firm conviction that the Old Man expressed at the founding of the Fourth International in 1938:

"*During the next ten years the program of the Fourth International will become the guide of millions and these revolutionary millions will know how to storm earth and heaven.*"

# Leon Trotsky, Revolutionary Teacher Of the Colonial Peoples

By LI FU-JEN

The development of a Marxist program and strategy for the colonial revolution belongs exclusively to our epoch—the epoch of wars and revolutions leading to the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a socialist society. It was Lenin who first outlined this program and strategy. But its detailed unfoldment and its first concrete applications were the work of Leon Trotsky, Lenin's great co-worker. Trotsky's writings on the problems of the colonial revolution, many of which still await publication, would fill numerous volumes. They form an integral and indispensable part of the program and strategy of the world socialist revolution and rank with the greatest of Trotsky's immense contributions to the development of Marxist theory and revolutionary socialist practice.

In a preface to the Afrikaans edition of the *Communist Manifesto*, first published by Marx and Engels in 1848, Trotsky observed that this founding document of the international socialist movement contained no reference to the struggle of colonial and semi-colonial countries for national independence. This was due, he pointed out, to the fact that the founders of scientific socialism considered the socialist revolution in Europe to be, at most, a few years distant. The destruction of capitalism in Europe would "automatically" bring liberation to the oppressed peoples. However, history did not adhere to this optimistic timetable. Not only did the European proletariat fail to destroy capitalism in its classic stronghold, but capitalism penetrated ever more deeply into the backward colonial countries, leading in time to the creation of powerful national liberation movements. Here was a new and mighty revolutionary factor. Its emergence set up an objective need for a colonial revolutionary program and strategy.

If in the period of the progressive upswing of capitalism the seizure of colonies was essential to enable the discharge by the bourgeoisie of what Marx described as their special historic mission, namely, "the establishment of the world market, at any rate in its main outlines, and of a production upon this basis" (Karl Marx, letter to Engels, Oct. 8, 1858)—then today, in the era of the decline and decay of capitalist economy, retention of colonies, with the opportunity to plunder their natural riches and exploit their inhabitants, has become a *vital condition of the very survival of capitalism on a world scale.*

## Revolutionary Internationalism

It is this profound and demonstrable truth which furnishes the basis of the reciprocal inter-relationship of the socialist movement of the proletariat in the advanced capitalist countries and the national liberation movement in the colonies and semi-colonies. These latter countries embrace more than half of the world's population. The liberation of their inhabitants is as important for the working-class as their continued enslavement is for the imperialist bourgeoisie. For Trotsky, this was the point of departure in the work of creating a colonial revolutionary strategy. It was the internationalist axis around which he always and unflinchingly built. "The Communists," declared the *Manifesto* of 1848, "everywhere support every revolutionary

movement against the existing social and political order of things." To which Trotsky added:

"The movement of the colored races against their imperialist oppressors is one of the most important and powerful movements against the existing order and therefore calls for complete, unconditional and unlimited support on the part of the proletariat of the white race." (Leon Trotsky, "90 Years of the Communist Manifesto," *New Internationalist*, Feb., 1938.)

National liberation movements in the colonies and semi-colonies unfolded after the first imperialist world war and were the immediate product of conditions created by the war.

## Growth of the Working Class

Until the end of the nineteenth century, imperialist exploitation bore almost exclusively the character of outright robbery and spoliation. Economic development of colonial areas was confined to such measures as were necessary to aid in the extraction of raw materials and the marketing of finished commodities produced in the capitalist countries of the West. It was British *commercial* capital, for example, which first penetrated India. Such industrial development as took place was incidental to the central aim of commercial exploitation. Britain's capitalists built cotton mills in Bombay only when it was discovered to be cheaper to process Indian-grown cotton on the spot, with cheap Indian labor, than to ship it to Lancashire for spinning and weaving, especially since a large part of the finished products was destined for sale in India and nearby countries. In line with the same policy, British capitalists erected cotton mills in Shanghai to handle the Chinese cotton crop as well as part of the Indian crop.

The most important political consequence of this incidental industrial development was the appearance in these vast backward lands of an industrial proletariat, pitted against the imperialist exploiters. Whereas foreign *commercial* capital had merely raised up an embryonic native or national bourgeoisie as agents of imperialism (the compradores), the foreign *industrial* capital which followed produced an industrial working-class which had a single, undisguised interest in relation to the imperialists—*uncompromising struggle against them!*

During the first world war, when the economic pressure of the imperialists was relaxed because of preoccupation with the military struggle in Europe, the industrial development of the big colonial lands took on an accelerated pace. The native compradores and some of the big native landowners entered the industrial field, creating enterprises in competition with those of the imperialists. Thus the "national" bourgeoisie came to flower. The industrial proletariat grew correspondingly. It was these developments which set the class pattern for the great revolutionary upheavals in the colonial countries in the decade after the war, above all the abortive Chinese revolution of 1925-27.

Class relations are decisive for revolutionary Marxists in determining the character and perspectives of revolutionary movements and the political strategy necessary to bring them



to fruition. The class criterion is as mandatory for the colonial countries as it is for the capitalist metropoli. Trotsky, following Marx and Lenin, insisted upon this criterion in opposition to Stalin and all the other revisionist opponents and betrayers of socialism. It runs like a red thread through his voluminous speeches and writings on the problems of the colonial revolution. Most of these speeches and writings were concerned with China and the Chinese revolution. In the class relations of China are refracted the class relations of the colonies in general. The essence of Trotsky's thought on China will therefore furnish the key to revolutionary Marxist policy in the entire colonial question.

## Character of the Revolution

"In its immediate aims," Trotsky wrote in 1938, "the incomplete Chinese Revolution is 'bourgeois.' This term, however, which is used as a mere echo of the bourgeois revolutions of the past, actually helps us very little. Lest the historical analogy turn into a trap for the mind, it is necessary to check it in the light of a concrete sociological analysis. What are the classes which are struggling in China? What are the interrelationships of these classes? How, and in what direction, are these relations being transformed? What are the objective tasks of the Chinese Revolution, i.e., those tasks dictated by the course of development? On the shoulders of which classes rests the solution of these tasks?"

"Colonial and semi-colonial—and therefore backward—countries, which embrace by far the greater part of mankind, differ extraordinarily from one another in their degree of backwardness, representing an historical ladder reaching from nomadry, and even cannibalism, up to the most modern industrial culture. The combination of extremes in one degree or another characterizes all of the backward countries. However, the hierarchy of backwardness, if one may employ such an expression, is determined by the specific weight of the elements of barbarism and culture in the life of each colonial country. Equatorial Africa lags far behind Algeria, Paraguay behind Mexico, Abyssinia, behind India or China. With their common economic dependence upon the imperialist metropoli, their political dependence bears in some instances the character of open colonial slavery (India, Equatorial Africa), while in others it is concealed by the fiction of state independence (China, Latin America).

"In agrarian relations backwardness finds its most organic and cruel expression. Not one of these countries has carried its democratic revolution through to any real extent. Half-way agrarian reforms are absorbed by semi-serf relations, and these are inescapably reproduced in the soil of poverty and oppression. Agrarian barbarism goes hand in hand with the absence of roads, with the isolation of provinces, with 'medieval' particularism, and absence of national consciousness. The purging of social relations of the remnants of ancient and the encrustations of modern feudalism is the most important task in all these countries.

## The National Bourgeoisie

"The achievement of the agrarian revolution is unthinkable, however, with the preservation of dependence upon foreign imperialism, which with one hand implants capitalist relations while supporting and re-creating with the other all the forms of slavery and serfdom. The struggle for the democratization of social relations and the creation of a national state thus uninterruptedly passes into an open uprising against foreign domination.

"Historical backwardness does not imply a simple reproduction of the development of advanced countries, England or France, with a delay of one, two or three centuries. It engen-

ders an entirely new 'combined' social formation in which the latest conquests of capitalist technique and structure root themselves into relations of feudal or pre-feudal barbarism, transforming and subjecting them and creating a peculiar relation of classes.

"Not a single one of the tasks of the 'bourgeois' revolution can be solved in these backward countries under the leadership of the 'national' bourgeoisie, because the latter emerges at once with foreign support as a class alien or hostile to the people. Every stage in its development binds it only the more closely to foreign finance capital of which it is essentially the agency. The petty bourgeoisie of the colonies, that of handicrafts and trade, is the first to fall victim in the unequal struggle with foreign capital, declining into economic insignificance, becoming declassed and pauperized. It cannot even conceive of playing an independent political role. The peasantry, the largest numerically and the most atomized, backward, and oppressed class, is capable of local uprisings and partisan warfare, but requires the leadership of a more advanced and centralized class in order for this struggle to be elevated to an all-national level. The task of such leadership falls in the nature of things upon the colonial proletariat, which, from its very first steps, stands opposed not only to the foreign but also to its own national bourgeoisie." (From the Introduction by Leon Trotsky to Harold R. Isaacs' *The Tragedy of the Chinese Revolution*, London, 1938.)

These views concerning the peculiarity of class relations and, consequently, the special character of "bourgeois-democratic" revolutions in historically belated countries do not rest, as Trotsky proceeded to point out, on theoretical analysis alone. They had been submitted to a "grandiose historical test" in the Russian revolutions of 1905 and February and October, 1917. These three revolutions proved beyond all question the incapacity of the national bourgeoisie in a backward country to solve the tasks of the democratic revolution. Hence the need to orient the proletariat toward the seizure of power. Lenin put the matter thus:

"Our revolution is a bourgeois revolution, the workers must support the bourgeoisie—say the worthless politicians from the camp of the liquidators. Our revolution is a bourgeois revolution, say we who are Marxists. The workers must open the eyes of the people to the fraud of the bourgeois politicians, teach them not to place trust in promises and to rely on *their OWN* forces, on *their OWN* organization, on *their OWN* unity, and on *their OWN* weapons alone." (Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XIV, part 1, p. 11.)

## The Chinese Catastrophe

In the case of Czarist Russia the Bolshevik theory of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution received positive vindication in the victorious October overturn. The Russian workers, allied with the lower layers of the peasantry, and led by the Bolshevik Party, overthrew both Czarism and capitalism. The tasks of the democratic revolution were solved through the dictatorship of the proletariat, which then proceeded to socialist tasks.

In China, on the contrary, the theory of proletarian hegemony, the very core of Bolshevik policy, received *negative* confirmation in a monstrous revolutionary catastrophe. Stalin and Bukharin, the then theoreticians of the Communist International, chopped the historic process into separate, independent stages in accordance with a lifeless schema which decreed that only the "democratic" revolution was on the order of the day and that consequently the leadership of the revolution belonged and could only belong to the bourgeoisie. The formula of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry,"

which Lenin had discarded in 1917 in favor of the proletarian dictatorship, was revived and expanded into the infamous "bloc of four classes," prototype of the so-called Popular Fronts of later years. In this bloc—in reality a bloc of party tops and nothing else—the right to represent the peasantry was given to the party of the national bourgeoisie, the Kuomintang. The Communist Party, the party of the proletariat, gave up its political independence and entered the Kuomintang. The workers were thereby subordinated to the political control of the national bourgeoisie. And this criminal break with proletarian class policy, this disregard of the plain lessons of Russian revolutionary history, this rejection of the still fresh teachings of Lenin, was palmed off on the young and inexperienced Chinese Communist Party as—Bolshevism!

In order to justify this treacherous policy of class collaboration, Stalin-Bukharin adduced the fact of imperialist oppression which supposedly impelled "all the progressive forces in the country" toward an alliance against imperialism. Thus the national bourgeoisie was invested with a progressive role, that of a fighter against imperialism for national liberation. But this, as Trotsky pointed out, "was precisely in its day the argument of the Russian Mensheviks, with the difference that in their case the place of imperialism was occupied by Czarism."

## Bourgeois Counter-Revolution

As we have already seen, the national bourgeoisie is incapable of conducting a progressive fight, a fight to the end, to realize the aims of the democratic revolution, foremost of which, in the colonial countries, is the destruction of imperialist domination. This incapacity has a dual basis: 1. The close ties of the bourgeoisie with the imperialists and the elements of rural reaction; 2. Fear of mobilizing the masses, who, in the high tide of the struggle must inevitably pass over to the fight for the destruction of bourgeois property. But when the masses rise against imperialism as they did in China in 1925-27, the bourgeoisie endeavors to take charge of the movement and to use it to extract concessions from the imperialists. It then stamps upon the revolutionary masses and drives them back to their old slavery. Such, in reality, is the character of the "democratic" revolution under bourgeois leadership.

Nevertheless, insisted Stalin-Bukharin, Chiang Kai-shek (the leader of the Chinese national bourgeoisie) was conducting a struggle against imperialism. And so it really appeared to the superficial minds in the Kremlin. Actually Chiang was engaged in a *limited* struggle against certain militarists who were the agents of a *single* imperialist power—Britain—in the hope merely of forcing concessions from the imperialist overlords of the country. This is not the same thing as a principled all-out struggle to the finish against the entire system of imperialist domination. Today Chiang Kai-shek conducts a fight against Japanese imperialism, and in the process passes into the service of Anglo-American imperialism, thus preparing a new slavery for the Chinese nation. The alleged anti-imperialist role of the national bourgeoisie was sharply characterized by Trotsky in words which he sought to burn into the consciousness of the revolutionary vanguard:

"The so-called 'national' bourgeoisie tolerates all forms of national degradation so long as it can hope to maintain its own privileged existence. But at the moment when foreign capital sets out to assume undivided domination of the entire wealth of the country, the colonial bourgeoisie is forced to remind itself of its 'national' obligations. Under pressure of the masses it may even find itself plunged into a war. But this will be a war waged against one of the imperialist powers,

the one least amenable to negotiations, with the hope of passing into the service of some other, more magnanimous power. Chiang Kai-shek struggles against the Japanese violators only within the limits indicated to him by his British or American patrons. Only that class which has nothing to lose but its chains can conduct to the very end the war against imperialism for national emancipation." (From the Introduction by Leon Trotsky to Harold R. Isaacs' *The Tragedy of the Chinese Revolution*.)

## The Lesson of China

According to Stalin-Bukharin, the policy of the bloc of four classes was to lead to completion of the democratic revolution in China and thus open the road to the socialist dictatorship of the proletariat. What happened is a matter of history. Chiang Kai-shek, instead of leading a "democratic" revolution, emerged as the leader of a triumphant counter-revolution. The shaken imperialists recovered all their positions. The agrarian problem remained unsolved. What does all this mean for future revolutionary policy?

It means—and this is the most vital part of the lesson which Trotsky taught to the new revolutionary cadres—that between the bourgeois-military dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek and the dictatorship of the proletariat *there can be no intermediate "democratic" regime*. It means that if, in the high tide of the coming colonial revolutions, the proletarian vanguard party should seek to bring about the establishment of such a regime, instead of orienting the workers toward the seizure of power and the creation of a proletarian dictatorship, only fresh revolutionary catastrophes can result.

Almost as if answering in advance the false and treacherous policies of the Stalinist betrayers of the Chinese revolution—particularly the stupid Menshevik theory of stages—Lenin in his famous *April Theses*, written in April, 1917 to rearm the Bolshevik Party and prepare its revolutionary triumph, had proclaimed the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat to be the *sole* means of carrying through the agrarian revolution to the end and of winning freedom for oppressed peoples. But the regime of proletarian dictatorship could not, because of its very nature, limit itself to bourgeois-democratic tasks within the framework of bourgeois property relations. The rule of the proletariat automatically places the socialist revolution—destruction of bourgeois property relations and the liquidation of class rule—on the order of the day. The socialist revolution is thus uninterruptedly linked to the democratic revolution and is an organic outgrowth of it.

## Theory of Permanent Revolution

"Such was (Trotsky observes), in broad outline, the essence of the conception of the permanent (uninterrupted) revolution. It was precisely this conception that guaranteed the victory of the proletariat in October." (Idem.) In China, it was the violation of this Bolshevik conception, or, more accurately, its outright rejection, that guaranteed the victory of Chiang Kai-shek and the bourgeois counter-revolution.

The theory of permanent revolution was originated by Marx. Lenin made of it a powerful lever of revolutionary victory. Trotsky, the authentic continuator of the work of Marx and Lenin, defended and developed the theory in its manifold aspects in the course of nearly two decades of struggle against the Stalinist falsifiers and betrayers, thereby rearming the revolutionary vanguard in preparation for future great struggles. Trotsky's writings on the permanent revolution are the theoretical mainspring of proletarian revolutionary strategy and are

an obligatory study for all who aspire to lead the working-class in the struggle for socialism, whether in the capitalist countries of the West or in the backward colonial countries. The theory of the permanent revolution is the Marxist antithesis of the reactionary theory of socialism in one country which, under Stalin, became the official state doctrine of the Soviet Union. It also stands in diametrical opposition to Stalin's Menshevik policies which brought the Chinese revolution to disaster.

"The permanent revolution, in the sense which Marx attached to the conception," wrote Trotsky, "means a revolution which makes no compromise with any form of class rule, which does not stop at the democratic stage, which goes over to socialist measures and to war against the reaction from without, that is, a revolution whose every next stage is anchored in the preceding one and which can only end in the complete liquidation of all class society." (Leon Trotsky, Introduction to *The Permanent Revolution*, New York, 1931, p. xxxi.)

## Trotsky Explains Theory

What does this mean for the so-called backward countries, the colonies and semi-colonies? Trotsky proceeds to explain:

"With regard to the countries with a belated development, especially the colonial and semi-colonial countries, the theory of the permanent revolution signifies that the complete and genuine solution of their tasks, *democratic and national emancipation*, is conceivable only through the dictatorship of the proletariat as the leader of the subjugated nation, above all of its peasant masses.

"Not only the agrarian, but also the national question, assigns to the peasantry, the overwhelming majority of the population of backward countries, an important place in the democratic revolution. Without an alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry, the tasks of the democratic revolution cannot be solved, nor even seriously posed. But the alliance of these two classes can be realized in no other way than through an intransigent struggle against the influence of the national liberal bourgeoisie.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat which has risen to power as the leader of the democratic revolution is inevitably and very quickly placed before tasks that are bound up with deep inroads into the rights of bourgeois property. The democratic revolution grows over immediately into the socialist, and thereby becomes a *permanent* revolution.

"The conquest of power by the proletariat does not terminate the revolution, but only opens it. Socialist construction is conceivable only on the foundation of the class struggle, on a national and international scale. The struggle, under the conditions of an overwhelming predominance of capitalist relationships on the world arena, will inevitably lead to explosions, that is, internally to civil wars, and externally to revolutionary wars. Therein lies the permanent character of the socialist revolution as such, regardless of whether it is a backward country that is involved, which only yesterday accomplished its democratic revolution, or an old capitalist country, which already has behind it a long epoch of democracy and parliamentarism.

"The completion of the socialist revolution within national limits is unthinkable. One of the basic reasons for the crisis in bourgeois society is the fact that the productive forces created by it conflict with the framework of the national state. From this follow, on the one hand, imperialist wars, and on the other, the utopia of the bourgeois United States of Europe. The socialist revolution commences on the national arena, is developed further on the inter-state and finally on the world arena. Thus, the socialist revolution becomes a permanent revolution in a newer and broader sense of the word; it attains completion only in the final victory of the new society

on our entire planet." (Leon Trotsky, *The Permanent Revolution*, pp. 151-155.)

In the domain of practical politics, these views of the character and class dynamics of the revolution obligate the party of the revolutionary vanguard in the colonial countries to a policy of irreconcilable struggle against imperialism and its native ally, the national bourgeoisie. It must not permit itself to be led into a policy of class conciliation and class collaboration when the national bourgeoisie, for its own class reasons, displays a "left" face to the masses, as did Chiang Kai-shek. It must remain completely independent of all other parties and enter into no blocs or alliances with them. It must not mix its own class banner with the banners of other classes and parties, much less kneel before another's banner. It must keep unswervingly to the single aim of leading the proletariat toward the conquest of power in alliance with the masses of peasants.

During the revolutionary crisis in China, Trotsky strove to imbue the Communist International with these fundamental revolutionary ideas, and through the C.I. to deflect the Chinese Communist Party from the fatal opportunistic course to which it was being held by Moscow. To no avail. Reaction against the Leninist ideas of the October Revolution was mounting. The Chinese revolution went down in disastrous defeat. Trotsky and the Bolshevik-Leninists of the Left Opposition were expelled from the ranks of the Russian party. Trotsky himself was exiled.

This was not, as bourgeois commentators believed, a mere personal defeat for Trotsky. It was a defeat for Bolshevism, a defeat for Marxism and Leninism. This defeat reflected the growth of reaction both within and without the Soviet Union. Thus Trotsky appraised what had occurred. But Trotsky was not only a revolutionary Marxist theoretician. He was also an active revolutionist. For him the defeat of the Chinese revolution, and the triumph of Stalinism in the Soviet Union and the Communist International, called for a Marxist analysis in order to avoid future catastrophes and clear the road for future revolutionary victories. The first need was to understand what had happened, and why, in order to furnish a basis for regrouping and rearming the revolutionary vanguard.

## Rearming the Vanguard

Trotsky's efforts to steer the Chinese Communist Party on to a correct revolutionary path in the great and tragic events of 1925-27 had a great preparatory value for this later work. Several thousand young Chinese Communists had gone to Moscow for training in the Communist University of the Toilers of the East. A large number of them, influenced by Trotsky's tireless fight to guide the Chinese revolution toward victory, joined the ranks of the Left Opposition. Most of the remainder were silent adherents of Trotsky's Bolshevik program. On November 7, 1927, the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution, when Stalin was preparing to exile Trotsky from the Soviet Union, the young Chinese revolutionists paraded through Moscow's Red Square with other foreign Communist delegations. On the banners which they carried were inscribed the slogans deemed appropriate by the Stalinist controlling clique. But as they passed in front of Stalin they flipped the banners over and disclosed a slogan reading: "Long Live Trotsky!" This was not just a personal tribute to Lenin's greatest comrade-in-arms, but a declaration of solidarity with his ideas. The banner-bearers were arrested and later murdered by Stalin's counter-revolutionary regime. A few—very few—of the Chinese revolutionists in Moscow at that time escaped the blood-purge and managed to return to China to form the nucleus of the Left Opposition

which later became the Chinese section of the Fourth International.

In his first place of exile, in Alma Ata, Trotsky set himself the task of analyzing the revolutionary disaster in China. The Stalinist clique in Moscow sought to make the Chinese Communists the scapegoats and to prevent any real discussion of what had occurred. Trotsky, however, insisted on dragging the whole lamentable story into broad daylight, drawing from it all the necessary lessons, in order to lay bare the mainsprings of the defeat and prepare for future victory. For, as he said, "one unexposed and uncondemned error always leads to another, or prepares the ground for it." In this essential work he had in mind not only the arrival—even if with some delay—of a new revolutionary situation in China, but the future of the entire colonial revolutionary movement. In Alma Ata he wrote:

"The lessons of the second Chinese revolution are lessons for the entire Comintern, but primarily for all the countries of the Orient. All the arguments presented in defense of the Menshevik line in the Chinese revolution must, if we take them seriously, hold trebly good for India. The imperialist yoke assumes in India, the classic colony, infinitely more direct and palpable forms than in China. The survivals of feudal and serf relations in India are immeasurably deeper and greater. Nevertheless, or rather precisely for this reason, the methods which, applied in China, undermined the revolution, must result in India in even more fatal consequences. The overthrow of Hindu feudalism and of the Anglo-Hindu bureaucracy and British militarism can be accomplished only by a gigantic and an indomitable movement of the popular masses which precisely because of its powerful sweep and irresistibility, its international aims and ties, cannot tolerate any half-way and compromising opportunist measures on the part of the leadership." (Leon Trotsky, *The Third International After Lenin*, New York, 1936, p. 212.)

From his various places of exile, first in Alma Ata, later in Turkey, France, Norway and Mexico, Trotsky followed with passionate interest the regroupment of the revolutionary vanguard in the colonial countries, first as cadres of the Left Opposition, later as sections of the Fourth International, on the basis of the Bolshevik-Leninist program. It was largely due to his efforts, brought to bear through participation from afar in their discussions, that three separate groups of Chinese Left Oppositionists were united in the year 1931 to form the Communist League of China, now the Chinese section of the Fourth International. And it was on the basis of Trotsky's teachings on the colonial revolution—above all the lessons which he drew from the abortive Chinese revolution—that sections of the Fourth International later grew up in India, Ceylon and Indo-China and in the semi-colonial countries of Latin America.

## Letter to Indian Workers

One of the last documents which Trotsky wrote was a letter to the workers of India on the eve of the outbreak of the second imperialist world war. He foresaw, under the conditions of a new imperialist conflict, a mighty resurgence of India's struggle for national liberation and took occasion to repeat his oft-voiced warning of the treacherous nature of the national bourgeoisie and the inevitability of defeat of India's liberating struggle unless the proletariat, under the banner of its own revolutionary party, assumed the leadership of the masses and carried the struggle through to the very end.

"The Indian bourgeoisie," he wrote, reiterating for the hundredth time what has become an elementary Marxist truism, "is incapable of leading a revolutionary struggle. They

are closely bound up with and dependent upon British imperialism. They tremble for their own property. They stand in fear of the masses. They seek compromises with British imperialism no matter what the price and lull the Indian masses with hope of reforms from above. The leader and prophet of this bourgeoisie is Gandhi. A fake leader and a false prophet! . . . In the event that the Indian bourgeoisie finds itself compelled to take even the tiniest step on the road of struggle against the arbitrary rule of Great Britain, the proletariat will naturally support such a step. But they will support it with *their own* methods: mass meetings, bold slogans, strikes, demonstrations and more decisive combat actions, depending on the relationship of forces and the circumstances. Precisely to do this must the proletariat have its hands free. Complete independence from the bourgeoisie is indispensable to the proletariat, above all in order to exert influence on the peasantry, the predominant mass of India's population. Only the proletariat is capable of advancing a bold, revolutionary agrarian program, of rousing and rallying tens of millions of peasants and leading them in struggle against the native oppressors and British imperialism. The alliance of workers and poor peasants is the only honest, reliable alliance that can assure the final victory of the Indian revolution." (Leon Trotsky, "An Open Letter to the Workers of India," Coyoacan, July 25, 1939, *New Internationalist*, Sept., 1939.)

How fresh these words sound today, now that Gandhi, once again, seeks to make his peace with British imperialism after pretending, in the opening period of the war, to really lead the independence struggle of the Indian masses!

---

## TRIBUTE TO THE OLD MAN BY THE CHINESE TROTSKYISTS

*The following tribute to Leon Trotsky by the Communist League of China, Chinese section of the Fourth International, was published in Shanghai at the time of the murder of the Old Man by Stalin's hired assassin. This translation is the first that has ever been printed abroad:*

"By the death of Leon Trotsky, the workers and oppressed peoples of all the world, including China, have lost their most gifted and ardent champion. Tirelessly and selflessly and without thought for his personal welfare or safety, he battled for more than 40 years in the cause of the downtrodden and oppressed. To this great liberating struggle he brought a diversity of talents rarely given to a single man. Together with Lenin he led the Russian Revolution to victory and created the Red Army which fought off its enemies. Despite the later degeneration of the Soviet state, he continued its most able revolutionary defender and labored indefatigably for its revival by promoting the cause of the international socialist revolution.

"He kept undeviatingly to this course in the face of streams of slander, monstrous frame-ups and continual threats against his life by the Kremlin clique and their hired agents.

"The hand of Stalin, guiding the hand of the assassin who encompassed his death, has brought the career of the great revolutionist to a premature end. In his writings and labors, as well as by his exemplary life as a man and a revolutionist, Leon Trotsky has bequeathed a rich heritage to the international proletariat and all the oppressed. Under the banner which he unfurled and so bravely upheld until his last breath—the banner of the Fourth International—his great work will reach fruition. This will be an imperishable monument to Leon Trotsky, who lived and died for the emancipation of mankind."

# Trotsky on America's Role in Europe

By WILLIAM SIMMONS

At the time of the United States intervention in European affairs following the defeat of the German proletariat in 1923, Trotsky raised within the Comintern the important issue of the American imperialist struggle for world hegemony. Trotsky proceeded in his analysis from the idea that "world economy is a mighty reality which holds sway over the economy of individual countries and continents": a genuinely internationalist approach. From then on that question became one of the major issues of conflict between Trotsky and the Left Opposition on the one side, and the Stalin bureaucracy on the other.

Trotsky did not raise the issue of American imperialist expansion merely for theoretical discussion. He sounded a warning to the proletariat, and particularly to its leadership at that time, the Comintern, to prepare itself for the revolutionary situations that were bound to ensue from this unbridled expansion.

## European Capitalism's Blind Alley

The development of the United States, said Trotsky, has driven European capitalism into a blind alley. It has placed Europe on more limited rations in world economy. For Europe this is "a situation ten times worse than before: the same capitalist social forms, but more reactionary; the same tariff walls, but more rigid; the same frontiers but narrower; the same armies but more numerous; an increased indebtedness; a more restricted market. . . . If today England rises a little, it is at the expense of Germany; tomorrow it will be Germany's turn to rise at the expense of England. If you find a surplus of the trade balance of one country, you must seek for a corresponding deficit in the trade balance of another country. . . . European capitalism has become reactionary in the absolute sense of the term, that is, not only is it unable to lead the nations forward, but it is even incapable of maintaining for them living standards long ago attained. Precisely this constitutes the economic basis of our revolutionary epoch. Political ebbs and flows unfold on this basis without in any way altering it."

Later on, when he submitted his criticism of the draft program of the Comintern to the sixth congress, Trotsky formulated the question still more concisely:

"Furthermore," he declared (referring to the draft program), "it has not been made clear that the inevitable further development of American expansion, the contraction of the markets of European capitalism, including the European market itself, entails the greatest military, economic and revolutionary disturbances such as will leave all disturbances of the past in the shade."

"It has not been made clear that the inevitable further onslaught of the United States will place capitalist Europe on a constantly more limited ration in world economy which, of course, does not involve a mitigation, but on the contrary, a monstrous sharpening of the inter-State relations in Europe with furious paroxysms of military conflicts, because States as well as classes, are even more frantically fighting for a hunger ration, nay, a diminishing ration, than for a lavish and growing ration."

"In the draft it has not been made clear that the internal chaos of the State antagonisms of Europe render hopeless a

more or less serious and successful resistance to the constantly more centralized North American republic and that the overcoming of the European chaos in the form of the Soviet United States of Europe is one of the first tasks of the proletarian revolution, which, in not the least degree as a result precisely of State barriers, is much closer in Europe than in America and which will therefore most likely have to be defended from the North American bourgeoisie."

## Revolutionary Solution of Problem

To those who tried to minimize the issue raised by Trotsky, by referring to the imminent economic and industrial crisis in the United States, he replied: "In a critical epoch the hegemony of the United States will prove even more complete, more open, more ruthless, than in the period of boom."

Needless to say, Trotsky's warning was not heeded by the Comintern and his prognosis was, from the outset, met with a hail of abuse by the Stalin bureaucracy. The most diversified accusations were leveled against him. He was accused of a pacifist denial of the existence of European contradictions. He was accused of acceptance of Kautsky's theory of ultra imperialism, and of many other sins. The simple truth of the matter was that Trotsky's international approach, his prognosis as well as the conclusions he drew therefrom, ran exactly counter to the reactionary Stalinist theory of "socialism in one country." These basic differences have, of course, been vastly accentuated since then. In fact they are in the very crucible of world politics today.

## Trotsky's Analysis Verified

History brought its own verification of Trotsky's analysis. The dialectic interplay of world relations created by the United States advance has, indeed, erupted in violent outbursts. The monstrous sharpening of inter-State relations in Europe has actually brought furious paroxysms of military conflicts. The advent of Hitler only accelerated the pace, and the fury. Events are now moving in more rapid strides toward the climax of our revolutionary epoch.

But history has also added a new chapter. It is as yet unfinished, but nevertheless destined to command major attention in the days ahead. Trotsky indicated the main outlines of this new chapter before his assassination; but he did not live to see it unfold in all its fearsome consequences.

While the might of American imperialism is pervading the entire planet, the red star of the Soviet Union grows more luminous. The great achievements of the Red Army have thrust the Soviet Union forward to a position to be reckoned with seriously even by the dominant American imperialists. To them this question is indeed paradoxical. On the one hand they see the enormous proletarian power embodied in the nationalized economy. On the other, Stalin, heading it, reveals himself as their friend and ally. They know that there can be no lasting peace between nationalized economy and capitalist economy. That is not their aim. Which will prevail? That is the question plaguing the rampaging imperialists. And so, history is already raising the curtain for the most gigantic conflict still to come.

But the Stalin bureaucracy has turned the lessons of Octo-



ber entirely upside down. It attempts to transform the Soviet Union, created as a bridge to the world revolution, into a barrier against it. In the advancing revolution it sees its own doom. Consequently, Lenin's struggle against imperialism has been perverted by Stalin into collaboration and political agreement with imperialism. Stalin has only now, twenty years after Trotsky's warning, recognized the expansion and the power of the North American republic. Moreover, he has accepted its world hegemony as an already established fact. Now he is endeavoring to subordinate the Soviet Union to the economic, political and military might of the capitalist United States for the defeat of the European revolution. For the European revolution is the specter haunting them both.

## American Imperialism at the Soviet Frontier

With the doom of Hitler—and this is a foregone conclusion—the power of the United States will virtually touch the borders of the Soviet Union. Will this then mean that it has thereby settled the problem of Europe? No! On the contrary. That problem will then really arise in all its complexity.

An unofficial spokesman for the Roosevelt administration, Forest Davis, has made this quite clear by his statement that “when Germany falls, there will be no military power, no barrier, between the Soviet Union and the English Channel.” In the strict sense of his terminology this is perfectly true. Whatever border lines the imperialist chess-players may draw; whatever interim bourgeois democratic regimes they may be forced to support, with or without the connivance of Stalin; and even backed by a “united nations” police force, these can furnish no more stable equilibrium than when European capitalism was originally driven into its blind alley. In the world of reality, however, there will be a power between the Soviet Union and the English Channel—and it will have supporters across the Channel. When Hitler falls, the revolutionary proletariat will be the decisive power in Europe. And that is the power destined to begin the end of the capitalist system.

This is the reason why the United States is again primarily preoccupied in European affairs, economically, politically and militarily. Its overwhelming preponderance in world economy, and its struggle for complete hegemony, makes this mandatory. The more it advances, the more it becomes interested in maintaining “order” in every corner of the globe. Obviously this means the maintenance of the capitalist order.

## Soviet Economy and the European Revolution

Then what about the mighty power represented by the nationalized economy of the U.S.S.R.? In many ways, and in spite of the Kremlin oligarchy, this power is inextricably bound up with the dawning of the new day in Europe. It is bound up as well with the present threat to the capitalist economic system. Even now the victories of the Red Army and those of the allied armies do not have the same meaning in the minds of the European masses. Nor are the results the same.

Inadvertently the unofficial spokesman for the Roosevelt administration submits the evidence when he says: “The administration's Russian policy becomes the cornerstone of its approach to the whole complex of post-war Europe. . . . Central and Eastern Europe is in our war diplomacy of planning for the future the important point where the Western powers meet the dynamics of the Soviet Union.” And the unofficial spokes-

man hastens to make it really clear that the concept he is defending is that of a world policy and of world conquests. He hastens to make it clear that at the present conjuncture this embraces the whole of Europe, including the Soviet Union, when he adds, “the focal point of the United States diplomacy is Moscow. . . . Why? Because political activity radiating from Moscow concentrates attention upon the lands into which the Red Army is likely to march.” The lands are named: Poland, Finland, the Danube Basin, the Balkans, and Germany.

But the relations of Washington and Moscow to the post-war problems of Europe are completely contradictory. On the threshold of the great revolutionary events in Europe, Roosevelt placates Stalin and plays upon his fears of these events. He seeks to enlist the Kremlin oligarchy for a joint partnership to strangle the European revolution.

Foreseeing Stalin making such a choice, Trotsky wrote in an article in *Liberty*, January 1940, in which he discussed the Stalin-Hitler pact: “Stalin is completely ready to repeat his Spanish performance on a world wide scale, with the hope of better success this time in buying the friendly attitude of the future victors through having proved that no one better than he can curb the Red specter, which for terminological convenience will again be labeled ‘Trotskyism’.”

Yet, Stalin's fear of, and hostility toward, the proletarian revolution are entirely matched by the American imperialist fears of and hostility toward the Soviet state and its nationalized economy. So long as its means of production remain national property, backed up by the state monopoly of foreign trade, it will constitute an insurmountable barrier in the way of complete American world hegemony. And, to the same degree, it will remain an inspiration and an example for the proletarian revolution to follow in other countries. Therefore, if expressed forthrightly and bluntly, the statement by the unofficial spokesman, quoted above, would read: Control of Europe and the maintenance of its capitalist system presupposes the annihilation, or at least the complete neutralization, of the Soviet Union.

## Contradictions of the Kremlin Oligarchy

However, the contradictions in this situation beset the Kremlin oligarchy itself. A partnership to strangle the European revolution, if successful, would destroy the only real support of the Soviet Union. Simultaneously, and antagonistically, it would leave the field open for inundation by American economic and political control. On very good grounds the Kremlin oligarchy fears any attempt by the United States to consolidate its power and hegemony over Europe. That would bring to the Soviet borders a foe much more formidable than Hitler's Germany.

Of course, the Stalinist bureaucracy is committed to the defense of the Soviet border. Motivated by sheer self-preservation, it will be compelled, in order to forestall a bigger and more deadly assault, to strive for the extension of these borders further westward, in one form or another. In fact, plans are already being hatched within the Kremlin walls for the building of its own cordon sanitaire. Poland and Yugoslavia are now being drawn into its orbit. Simultaneously the Kremlin masters no doubt nourish the vague hope that they will be able to subordinate the European revolution to their own bureaucratic interests by extending the specific sphere of Stalinist influence. That much is indicated by Stalin's decree of a federation of “autonomous” republics. In other words—a Stalinized federation of Europe as against a Socialist United States of Europe.

Trotsky, in his *Liberty* article mentioned above, already



gave the undeniable answer to such "hopes." Referring specifically to Germany, he said: "The totalitarian regime can be crushed only by a tremendous attack on the part of the German workers. They will carry out their revolution, surely, not in order to replace Hitler by a Hohenzollern or Stalin."

Trotsky added: "The victory of the popular masses over the Nazi tyranny will be one of the greatest explosions in world history and will immediately change the face of Europe. The wave of awakening hope, enthusiasm, will not stop at the hermetic borders of the U.S.S.R. The popular masses of the Soviet Union hate the greedy and cruel ruling caste. Their hate is only dampened by the idea; imperialism is watching us. Revolution in the West will deprive the Kremlin oligarchy of its sole right to political existence."

### Trotsky's Prediction

In the relations between Roosevelt and Stalin, each personifying in his own way a mighty power, insurmountable contradictions remain the outstanding characteristic of their respective political positions. At the same time these individual positions furnish a classic example of the interpenetration of opposites.

Stalin and his bureaucracy at the head of the Soviet republic, which was created originally as a bridge to the world revolution, have become Great Russian nationalists. This is an inevitable outcome of the reactionary theory of "socialism in one country." At the same time the "nationalism" of this bureaucracy is also its exact opposite. It is that of a usurping clique having attained its power *against* the Soviet nation, for the Kremlin oligarchy is motivated in all its political acts solely by the idea of the preservation of its own power and privilege. Essentially, this is what spells its inevitable doom.

Roosevelt, on the other hand, heading the most powerful national capitalist aggregation, which was able in past decades to expand on its own national territory, has now made "internationalism" his basic political thesis. This is dictated, of course, by the struggle of American imperialism for world hegemony. Yet, simultaneously this "internationalism" represents the exact opposite of extreme nationalism. It is even more the latter than the former, for in its onslaught in every corner of the globe American imperialism is attempting to subordinate the rest of the world to its specific national aims. Precisely this, however, will also prove its fatal weakness.

On this particular point Trotsky also drew the unassailable conclusion, as valid today as when it was submitted in his criticism of the Comintern draft program:

"On the other hand it has been left entirely unmentioned—and this is not the least important phase of the same world problem—that it is precisely the international strength of the United States and the unbridled expansion resulting from it, that compels it to include powder magazines throughout the world among the foundations of its structure—the antagonisms between the east and west, the class struggle in old Europe, uprisings of the colonial masses, wars and revolutions. This on the one hand transforms United States capitalism into the basic counter-revolutionary force in the present epoch, becoming constantly more interested in the maintenance of order in every corner of the globe, and on the other hand prepares the ground for a gigantic revolutionary explosion of this already dominant and still increasing world imperialist power. The logic of world relations leads to the idea that the time of this explosion cannot be very far apart from that of the proletarian revolution in Europe."

# Leon Trotsky, Organizer of Victory

By KARL RADEK

The article printed here was first published in *Pravda* in 1923 and an English translation was carried that year in *Inprecorr*, the press bulletin of the Comintern. Radek's appraisal of Trotsky's role in the creation of the Red Army and in the civil war victories was thus in the nature of an official tribute by the whole Communist movement of that time. Despite the miserable subsequent fate of its author, the article retains this signal importance. It is testimony to the true appreciation of the great organizing genius of the revolution by the whole generation that fought at his side. The labors of the Stalin machine of falsification are futile. They cannot erase the fact that "this bright page in the history of the Russian Revolution will always be bound up with the name of Leon Davidovitch Trotsky."—Ed.

History has prepared our party for various tasks. However defective our state machinery or our economic activity may be, still the whole past of the party has psychologically prepared it for the work of creating a new order of economy and a new state apparatus. History has even prepared us for diplomacy. It is scarcely necessary to mention that world politics have always occupied the minds of Marxists. But it was the endless negotiations with the Mensheviks that perfected our diplomatic technique; and it was during these old struggles that Comrade Chicherin\* learned to draw up diplomatic notes. We are just

\* Gregory Chicherin was Soviet Commissar of Foreign Affairs at that time (1923).

beginning to learn the miracle of economics. Our state machinery creaks and groans. In one thing, however, we have been eminently successful—in our Red Army. Its creator, its central will, is Comrade L. D. Trotsky.

Old General Moltke, the creator of the German army, often spoke of the danger that the pen of the diplomats might spoil the work of the soldier's sabre. Warriors the world over, though there were classical authors among them, have always opposed the pen to the sword. The history of the proletarian revolution shows how the pen may be re-forged into a sword. Trotsky is one of the best writers of world socialism, but these literary advantages did not prevent him from becoming the leader, the leading organizer of the first proletarian army. The pen of the best publicist of the revolution was re-forged into a sword.

### Marxist Military Literature Was Scant

The literature of scientific socialism helped Comrade Trotsky but little in solving the problems which confronted the party when it was threatened by world imperialism. If we look through the whole of pre-war socialist literature, we find—with the exception of a few little-known works by Engels, some chapters in his *Anti-Duehring* devoted to the development of strategy, and some chapters in Mehring's excellent book on Lessing, devoted to the war activity of Frederick the Great—only four works on military subjects: August Bebel's pamphlet on militia, Gaston Moch's book on militia, the two volumes of

war history by Schulz, and the book by Jaures, devoted to the propaganda of the idea of the militia in France. With the exception of the books of Schulz and Jaures, which possess high value, everything which socialist literature has published on military subjects since Engels' death has been bad dilettantism. But even these works by Schulz and Jaures afforded no reply to the questions with which the Russian Revolution was confronted. Schulz's book surveyed the development of the forms of strategy and military organizations for many centuries back. It was an attempt at the application of the Marxian methods of historical research, and closed with the Napoleonic period. Jaures' book—full of brilliance and sparkle—shows his complete familiarity with the problems of military organization, but suffers from the fundamental fault that this gifted representative of reformism was anxious to make of the capitalist army an instrument of national defense, and to release it from the function of defending the class interests of the bourgeoisie. He therefore failed to grasp the tendency of development of militarism, and carried the idea of democracy *ad absurdum* in the question of war, into the question of the army.

### Origin of the Concept of the Red Army

I do not know to what extent Comrade Trotsky occupied himself before the war with questions of military knowledge. I believe that he did not gain his gifted insight into these questions from books, but received his impetus in this direction at the time when he was acting as correspondent in the Balkan war, this final rehearsal of the great war. It is probable that he deepened his knowledge of war technique and of the mechanism of the army, during his sojourn in France (during the war), from where he sent his brilliant war sketches to the Kiev *Mysli*. It may be seen from this work how magnificently he grasped the spirit of the army. The Marxist Trotsky saw not only the external discipline of the army, the cannon, the technique. He saw the living human beings who serve the instruments of war, he saw the sprawling charge on the field of battle.

Trotsky is the author of the first pamphlet giving a detailed analysis of the causes of the decay of the International. Even in face of this great decay Trotsky did not lose his faith in the future of socialism; on the contrary, he was profoundly convinced that all those qualities which the bourgeoisie endeavors to cultivate in the uniformed proletariat, for the purpose of securing its own victory, would soon turn against the bourgeoisie, and serve not only as the foundation of the revolution, but also of revolutionary armies. One of the most remarkable documents of his comprehension of the class structure of the army, and of the spirit of the army, is the speech which he made—I believe at the first Soviet Congress and in the Petrograd Workers' and Soldiers' Council—on Kerensky's July offensive. In this speech Trotsky predicted the collapse of the offensive, not only on technical military grounds, but on the basis of the political analysis of the condition of the army.

"You"—and here he addressed himself to the Mensheviks and the SR's—"demand from the government a revision of the aims of the war. In doing so you tell the army that the old aims, in whose name Czarism and the bourgeoisie demanded unheard-of sacrifices, did not correspond to the interests of the Russian peasantry and Russian proletariat. You have not attained a revision of the aims of the war. You have created nothing to replace the Czar and the fatherland, and yet you demand of the army that it shed its blood for this *nothing*. We cannot fight for *nothing*, and your adventure will end in collapse."

The secret of Trotsky's greatness as organizer of the Red Army lies in this attitude of his towards the question.

All great military writers emphasize the tremendously decisive significance of the moral factor in war. One half of Clausewitz's great book is devoted to this question, and the whole of our victory in the civil war is due to the circumstance that Trotsky knew how to apply this knowledge of the significance of the moral factor in war to our reality. When the old Czarist army went to pieces, the minister of war of the Kerenski government, Verkhovsky, proposed that the older military classes be discharged, the military authorities behind the front partly reduced, and the army reorganized by the introduction of fresh young elements. When we seized power, and the trenches emptied, many of us made the same proposition. But this idea was the purest Utopia. It was impossible to replace the fleeing Czarist army with fresh forces. These two waves would have crossed and divided each other. The old army had to be completely dissolved; the new army could only be built up on the alarm sent out by Soviet Russia to the workers and peasants, to defend the conquests of the revolution.

When, in April 1918, the best Czarist officers who remained in the army after our victory met together for the purpose of working out, in conjunction with our comrades and some military representatives of the Allies, the plan of organization for the army, Trotsky listened to their plans for several days—I have a clear recollection of this scene—in silence. These were the plans of people who did not comprehend the upheaval going on before their eyes. Every one of them replied to the question of how an army was to be organized on the old pattern. They did not grasp the metamorphosis wrought in the human material upon which the army is based. How the war experts laughed at the first voluntary troops organized by Comrade Trotsky in his capacity as Commissar of War! Old Borisov, one of the best Russian military writers, assured those Communists with whom he was obliged to come in contact, time and again, that nothing would come of this undertaking, that the army could only be built up on the basis of general conscription, and maintained by iron discipline. He did not grasp that the volunteer troops were the secure foundation pillars upon which the structure was to be erected, and that the masses of peasants and workers could not possibly be rallied around the flag of war again unless the broad masses were confronted by deadly danger. Without believing for a single moment that the volunteer army could save Russia, Trotsky organized it as an apparatus which he required for the creation of a new army.

### Utilizing the Bourgeois Specialists

But Trotsky's organizing genius, and his boldness of thought are even more clearly expressed in his courageous determination to utilize the war specialists for creating the army. Every good Marxist is fully aware that in building up a good economic apparatus we still require the aid of the old capitalist organization. Lenin defended this proposition with the utmost decision in his April speech on the tasks of the Soviet power. In the mature circles of the party the idea is not contested. But the idea that we could create an instrument for the defense of the republic, an army, with the aid of the Czarist officers—encountered obstinate resistance. Who could think of re-arming the White officers who had just been disarmed? Thus many comrades questioned. I remember a discussion on this question among the editors of the *Communist*, the organ of the so-called left communists, in which the question of the employment of staff officers nearly led to a split. And the editors of this paper were among the best schooled theoreticians and

practicians of the party. It suffices to mention the names of Bukharin, Ossonski, Lomov, W. Yakovlev. There was even greater distrust among the broad circles of our military comrades, recruited for our military organizations during the war. The mistrust of our military functionaries could only be allayed, their agreement to the utilization of the knowledge possessed by the old officers could only be won, by the burning faith of Trotsky in our social force, the belief that we could obtain from the war experts the benefit of their science, without permitting them to force their politics upon us; the belief that the revolutionary watchfulness of the progressive workers would enable them to overcome any counter-revolutionary attempts made by the staff officers.

### Trotsky's Magnetic Energy

In order to emerge victorious, it was necessary for the army to be headed by a man of iron will, and for this man to possess not only the full confidence of the party, but the ability of subjugating with his iron will the enemy who is forced to serve us. But Comrade Trotsky has not only succeeded in subordinating to his energy even the highest staff officers. He attained more: he succeeded in winning the confidence of the best elements among the war experts, and in converting them from enemies of Soviet Russia to its most profoundly convinced followers. I witnessed one such victory of Trotsky's at the time of the Brest-Litovsk negotiations. The officers who had accompanied us to Brest-Litovsk maintained a more than reserved attitude towards us. They fulfilled their role as experts with the utmost condescension, in the opinion that they were attending a comedy which merely served to cover a business transaction long since arranged between the Bolsheviki and the German government. But the manner in which Trotsky conducted the struggle against German imperialism, in the name of the principles of the Russian revolution, forced every human being present in the assembly room to feel the moral and spiritual victory of this eminent representative of the Russian proletariat. The mistrust of the war experts towards us vanished in proportion to the development of the great Brest-Litovsk drama.

How clearly I recollect the night when Admiral Altvater—who has since died—one of the leading officers of the old regime, who began to help Soviet Russia not from motives of fear but of conscience, entered my room and said: "I came here because you forced me to do so. I did not believe you; but now I shall help you, and do my work as never before, in the profound conviction that I am serving the fatherland." It is one of Trotsky's greatest victories that he has been able to impart the conviction that the Soviet government really fights for the welfare of the Russian people, even to such people who have come over to us from hostile camps on compulsion only. It goes without saying that this great victory on the inner front, this moral victory over the enemy, has been the result not only of Trotsky's iron energy which won for him universal respect; not only the result of the deep moral force, the high degree of authority even in military spheres, which this socialist writer and people's tribune, who was placed by the will of the revolution at the head of the army, has been able to win for himself; this victory has also required the self-denial of tens of thousands of our comrades in the army, an iron discipline in our own ranks, a consistent striving towards our aims; it has also required the miracle that those masses of human beings who only yesterday fled from the battle-field, take up arms again today, under much more difficult conditions, for the defense of the country.

That these politico-psychological mass factors played an important role is an undeniable fact, but the strongest, most concentrated, and striking expression of this influence is to be found in the personality of Trotsky. Here the Russian revolution has acted through the brain, the nervous system, and the heart of its greatest representative. When our first armed trial began, with Czecho-Slovakia, the party, and with its leader Trotsky, showed how the principle of the political campaign—as already taught by Lassalle—could be applied to war, to the fight with "steel arguments." We concentrated all material and moral forces on the war. The whole party had grasped the necessity of this. But this necessity also finds its highest expression in the steel figure of Trotsky. After our victory over Denikin in March 1920, Trotsky said, at the party conference: "We have ravaged the whole of Russia in order to conquer the Whites." In these words we again find the unparalleled concentration of will required to ensure the victory. We needed a man who was the embodiment of the war-cry, a man who became the tocsin sounding the alarm, the will demanding from one and all an unqualified subordination to the great bloody necessity.

### L. D. Personified the Revolution

It was only a man who works like Trotsky, a man who spares himself as little as Trotsky, who can speak to the soldiers as only Trotsky can—it was only such a man who could be the standard bearer of the armed working people. He has been everything in one person. He has thought out the strategic advice given by the experts and has combined it with a correct estimate of the proportions of social forces; he knew how to unite in one movement the impulses of fourteen fronts, of the ten thousand communists who informed headquarters as to what the real army is and how it is possible to operate with it; he understood how to combine all this in one strategic plan and one scheme of organization. And in all this splendid work he understood better than anyone else how to apply the knowledge of the significance of the moral factor in war.

This combination of strategist and military organizer with the politician is best characterized by the fact that during the whole of this hard work, Trotsky appreciated the importance of Demian Bedny (communist writer), or of the artist Moor (who draws most of the political caricatures for the communist papers, posters, etc.) for the war. Our army was an army of peasants, and the dictatorship of the proletariat with regard to the army, that is, the leading of this peasants' army by workers and by representatives of the working class, was realized in the personality of Trotsky and in the comrades co-operating with him. Trotsky was able, with the aid of the whole apparatus of our party, to impart to the peasants' army, exhausted by the war, the profoundest conviction that it was fighting in its own interests.

### Inseparably Linked in History

Trotsky worked with the whole party in the work of forming the Red Army. He would not have fulfilled his task without the party. But without him the creation of the Red Army and its victories, would have demanded infinitely greater sacrifices. Our party will go down in history as the first proletarian party which succeeded in creating a great army, and this bright page in the history of the Russian revolution will always be bound up with the name of *Leon Davidovitch Trotsky*, with the name of a man whose work and deeds will claim not only the love, but also the scientific study of the young generation of workers preparing to conquer the whole world.

# Tasks of Communist Education

By LEON TROTSKY

This article first appeared in English in *Inprecorr*, the press bulletin of the Communist International, in its issue of August 16, 1923.

\* \* \*

It is frequently asserted that the task of communist enlightenment consists in the education of the new man. These words are somewhat too general, too pathetic, and we must be particularly careful not to permit any formless humanitarian interpretation of the conception "new man" or the tasks of communist education. There is no doubt whatever but that the man of the future, the citizen of the commune, will be an exceedingly interesting and attractive creature, and that his psychology (the futurists will pardon me, but I fancy that the man of the future will possess a psychology) will be very different from ours. Our present task, unfortunately, cannot lie in the education of the human being of the future. The Utopian and humanitarian-psychological viewpoint is, that the new man must first be formed, and that he will then create the new conditions. We cannot believe this. We know that man is a product of social conditions. But we know too that between human beings and conditions there exists a complicated and actively working mutual relationship. Man himself is an instrument of this historical development, and not the least. And in this complicated historical reflex action of the conditions experienced by active human beings, we do not create the abstractly harmonious and perfect citizen of the commune, but we form the concrete human beings of our epoch, who have still to fight for the creation of the conditions out of which the harmonious citizen of the commune may emerge. This, of course, is a very different thing, for the simple reason that our great-grandson, the citizen of the commune, will be no revolutionist.

## The "New Man" and the Revolutionist

At first glance this appears to be wrong, it sounds almost insulting. And yet it is so. The conception "revolutionist" is permeated by the highest ideals and morals which we have taken over from the whole preceding epoch of cultural evolution. Thus it would seem that we cast an aspersion on our posterity when we do not think of them as revolutionists. But we must not forget that the revolutionist is a product of definite historical conditions, a product of class society. The revolutionist is no psychological abstraction. Revolution in itself is no abstract principle, but a material historical fact, growing out of class antagonisms, out of the violent subjection of one class by another. Thus the revolutionist is a concrete historical type, and in consequence a temporary type. We are proud of belonging to this type. But by means of our work we are creating the conditions of a social order in which no class antagonisms will exist, no revolutions, and thus no revolutionists. It is true that we can extend the meaning of the word "revolutionist" until it comprises the whole conscious activity of man directed towards the subjection of nature, and towards the expansion of technical and cultural gains. But we have no right to make such an abstraction, such a limitless extension of the conception "revolutionist," for we have by no means fulfilled our concrete historical revolutionary task, the overthrow of class society. Consequently, we are far from being required to educate the harmonious citizen of the commune, forming him by careful

laboratory work, in an extremely disharmonious transition stage of society. Such an undertaking would be a wretchedly childish Utopia. What we want to make is champions, revolutionists, who will inherit and complete our historical traditions, which we have not yet carried to a conclusion.

## Revolution and Mysticism

What are the main characteristics of the revolutionist? It must be emphasized that we have no right to separate the revolutionist from the class basis upon which he has evolved, and without which he is nothing. The revolutionist of our epoch who can only be associated with the working class, possesses his special psychological characteristics, characteristics of intellect and will. If it is necessary and possible, the revolutionist shatters the historical obstructions, resorting to force for the purpose. If this is not possible, then he makes a detour, undermines and crushes, patiently and determinedly. He is a revolutionist because he does not fear to shatter obstacles and relentlessly to employ force; at the same time he knows its historical value. It is his constant endeavor to maintain his destructive and creative work at their highest pitch of activity, that is, to obtain from the given historical conditions the maximum which they are capable of yielding for the forward movement of the revolutionary class.

The revolutionist knows only external obstacles to his activity, no internal ones. That is: he has to develop within himself the capacity of estimating the arena of his activity in all its concreteness, with its positive and negative aspects, and to strike a correct political balance. But if he is internally hampered by subjective hindrances to action, if he is lacking in understanding or will power, if he is paralyzed by internal discord, by religious, national, or craft prejudices, then he is at best only half a revolutionist. There are too many obstacles in the objective conditions already, and the revolutionist cannot allow himself the luxury of multiplying the objective hindrances and frictions by subjective ones. Therefore the education of the revolutionist must, above all, consist in his emancipation from that residue of ignorance and superstition, which is frequently found in a very "sensitive" consciousness. And therefore we adopt a ruthlessly irreconcilable attitude to anyone who utters a single word to the effect that mysticism or religious sentimentality might be combined with communism. Religiousness is irreconcilable with the Marxist standpoint. We are of the opinion that atheism, as an inseparable element of the materialist view of life is a necessary condition for the theoretical education of the revolutionist. He who believes in another world is not capable of concentrating all his passion on the transformation of this one.

## Darwinism and Marxism

Even if Darwin, as he himself asserted, did not lose his belief in God for all his rejection of the biblical theory of creation, Darwinism itself is none the less entirely irreconcilable with this belief. In this, as in other respects, Darwinism is a forerunner, a preparation for Marxism. Taken in a broadly materialist and dialectic sense, Marxism is the application of Darwinism to human society. Manchester liberalism has at-

tempted to fit Darwinism mechanically into sociology. Such attempts have only led to childish analogies veiling a malicious bourgeois *apologia*: Marx's competition was explained as the "eternal" law of the struggle for existence. These are absurdities. It is only the inner connection between Darwinism and Marxism which makes it possible to grasp the living flow of being in its primeval connection with inorganic nature; in its further particularization and evolution; in its dynamics; in the differentiation of the necessities of life among the first elementary varieties of the vegetable and animal kingdoms; in its struggles; in the appearance of the "first" man or manlike creature, making use of the first tool; in the development of primitive cooperation, employing associative organs; in the further stratification of society consequent on the development of the means of production, that is, of the means of subjugating nature; in class warfare; and, finally, in the struggle for the uplift of the classes.

To comprehend the world from such a broad point of view signifies the emancipation of man's consciousness for the first time from the residue of mysticism, and the securing of a firm foothold. It signifies being quite clear on the point that for the future there are no inner subjective hindrances to the struggle, but that the sole existing obstacles and reactions are external, and have to be overcome in various ways, according to the conditions of the conflict.

How often we have said: "Practice wins in the end." This is correct in the sense that the collective experience of a class,

and of the whole of humanity, gradually sweeps away the illusions and false theories based on hasty generalizations. But it may be said with equal truth: "Theory wins in the end," when we understand by this that theory in reality comprises the total experience of humanity. Seen from this standpoint, the opposition between theory and practice vanishes, for theory is nothing else than correctly considered and generalized practice. Theory does not defeat practice, but the thoughtless, empirical, crude attitude to it. In order to be able properly to estimate the conditions of the struggle, the situation of our own class, we must possess a reliable method of political and historical orientation. This is Marxism, or, with respect to the latest epoch, Leninism.

Marx and Lenin—these are our two supreme guides in the sphere of social research. For the younger generation the way to Marx is through Lenin. The straight road becomes increasingly difficult, for the period is too long which separates the rising generation from the genius of those who founded scientific socialism, Marx and Engels. Leninism is the highest embodiment and condensation of Marxism for direct revolutionary action in the epoch of the imperialist death agony of bourgeois society. The Lenin Institute at Moscow must be made a higher academy of revolutionary strategy. Our communist party is permeated by the mighty spirit of Lenin. His revolutionary genius is with us. Our revolutionary lungs breathe the atmosphere of that better and higher doctrine which the preceding development of human thought has created. Thus it is that we are so profoundly convinced that tomorrow is ours.

# How the Fourth International Was Conceived

By ANN VINCENT

Our movement has the right to consider itself the representative and the historical standard-bearer of revolutionary socialism. It is at the end of a chain whose links were the Communist League of Marx and Engels, the International Workingmen's Association (First International), the Second International, the Bolshevik party of Lenin, and the Communist International. But in order to establish the specific beginnings of our movement it is necessary to begin with the year 1923 in the U.S.S.R.

## The Left Opposition

The October Revolution established the first Workers' State, but remained isolated. "Without revolution in Europe," said Lenin repeatedly, "we shall perish." History verified the truth of his words, but in its own manner. Degeneration appeared in the apparatus itself of the new regime—the party that led the revolution to victory.

The resistance to corruption of the party came from Trotsky. The struggle began in the fall of 1923. On October 8th, he sent a letter to the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission denouncing the stifling of the right of criticism on the part of party members. This is the first document of our movement. It can be compared to what had been for Bolshevism the famous vote on the statutes of the party in 1902.

Beginning with the question of the internal regime of the party, the struggle grew progressively to include all problems of revolutionary tactics and strategy. Outside of the USSR,

opposition groups appeared in most of the sections of the Communist International. The connections of these groups among themselves, and with the Russian Opposition, remained precarious. Many of the groups arose in opposition to one of the aspects of Stalinist policy. Their political solidarity was far from complete. One group that proved of great importance for the future of our movement, the Left Opposition in the American communist party, appeared belatedly on the scene, in 1928.

The organizational cohesion of the International Left Opposition was not seriously undertaken until the time of Trotsky's expulsion from the USSR and his arrival in Turkey, in February 1929. The first international conference of the Left Opposition took place in Paris in 1930.

The policy of the Opposition in relation to the Communist International, both in its entirety as well as its various sections, had remained the same since 1923. In one word it was—reform. Although expelled by the faction in power, the Trotskyist groups considered themselves part of the International, its left faction, exactly as in each country each group considered itself a faction of the national Communist Party. Their objective was to convince the party membership of the correctness of their views, to win over the majority, and to set the organization on the correct course. Toward the Bolshevik Party in the USSR the policy was essentially the same as toward any other section of the International. The name of the movement, *Opposition*, expressed and symbolized this policy.



A political document of a programmatic character, entitled *The International Left Opposition—Its Tasks and Methods*, was written by Trotsky in December 1932, immediately after his return to Prinkipo from Copenhagen, where he had had the opportunity of meeting about thirty of the most important leaders of the International Opposition. One chapter of this document was entitled "Faction—Not a Party." The perspective outlined there was the same as in the preceding years, namely, the reform of the Communist International and of each of its sections. Nevertheless, a warning was sounded:

"Such an historical catastrophe as the fall of the Soviet State would surely drag along the Third International. Similarly, a victory of fascism in Germany and the crushing of the German proletariat would hardly allow the Comintern to survive the consequences of its ruinous policy."

One of these two warnings was soon to become a terrible reality. On January 30, 1933, Hindenburg, the constitutional head of the Weimar Republic, elected with the votes of the Social Democracy, called on Hitler to form a new cabinet.

For three years the Left Opposition had sounded the alarm at the rise of German fascism. In a series of articles and pamphlets, which in their clarity and revolutionary passion rank among the best products of his pen, Trotsky revealed the nature of fascism, and showed the consequences of a fascist victory to the German workers, to the international labor movement, to the USSR, to Europe, and to the whole world. He also pointed to the means of combating this danger: the united front of the workers' parties, Communist and Social Democratic, for the active defense of workers' organizations against the Nazi vermin, a defensive struggle which, when successful, would become an offensive.

## The Collapse of the German Communist Party

The leaders of the two official workers' parties vied with each other in their impotence in the face of the fascist menace. The Social Democratic leadership desperately grasped at a democracy which, in the midst of economic chaos and the sharpened social and political conflicts, was disowning itself. The Stalinists acted in line with the "genial" theory of their leader, that it was first necessary to crush the Social Democrats before fighting fascism. They had made common cause with the Nazis in the famous plebiscite in Prussia in August 1931. When the fascist menace became imminent, they clamored with braggadocio "After them will be our turn!"

When Hitler formed his government on January 30, 1933, not all was lost. The workers' organizations were still intact. In the following weeks the Nazis acted very cautiously. In February, Trotsky stated in a conversation: "The situation in Germany is similar to that of a man at the bottom of an abyss facing a stone wall. To get out it is necessary to clutch at the rocks with bare and bloody hands. It is necessary to have courage and will, but it is possible. Not all is lost."

The official leadership of the workers' parties allowed the last chance to slip by. In the face of their passivity, Hitler became more brazen. He had never hoped to win such an easy victory. At the beginning of March, the crude provocation of the Reichstag fire allowed him to definitely entrench his regime. The workers' organizations were swept away.

Trotsky's reaction was not long in coming. He wrote an article entitled *The Tragedy of the German Proletariat*. It was dated March 14, 1933 and had as a sub-title, "The German Workers Will Rise, Stalinism—Never!" The gist of the article was that, in Germany, the Communist Party failed in its historic

mission, that it was doomed as a revolutionary organization. Thus, there was no choice but to give up the policy of its reform, and to proceed to build a new German Communist Party. When Trotsky wrote that Stalinism would not rise again, he meant Stalinism in Germany. As to the Communist parties in other lands, especially the Russian Bolshevik Party, and the Communist International viewed in its entirety, the line remained as before, that of reform.

In the weeks that followed other articles elaborated this position and answered the objections raised against it. In the ranks of the Left Opposition, these objections were minimal. They came mostly from certain comrades in the German section, the one most directly concerned. These objections remained secondary or sentimental in character: maybe it would be better to wait before speaking about a new party while the official one is under the blows of bloody repressions, etc. But the lesson of the events was so clear, that the need of a change in the old policy was not questioned seriously.

Yet when one's memory turns to that month of March 1933, it cannot be denied that the new policy was a surprise to the members of the Left Opposition. The daily activity of each of the sections was centered exclusively around the Communist Party; and to develop a new line, even if it were for only one of our sections, was to break with a tradition of ten years standing. The great authority of Trotsky made it possible to bring about the change in line rapidly and with cohesion. Without him, the lessons of the events in Germany would have surely been learned in our ranks, but after how many months of discussion?

The problem of the Third International in its totality could not fail to be posed. After the collapse of the German Communist Party, the executive committee of the International passed in April a resolution which declared that the policy followed by the German Communist Party "up to and at the time of Hitler's coup d'état was fully correct."

This is not astonishing: the executive committee under the orders of Stalin merely covered Stalin, who imposed his fatal political line on the German Communist Party. But the decisive fact was that all the sections of the International accepted the Moscow resolution and thus became equally responsible for the historical catastrophe in Germany. The members who denounced the line that had been followed, or merely questioned it, were expelled. The policy of reform was losing all reality.

On July 15, 1933, Trotsky, under the pen-name of G. Gurov, addressed to the sections of the Opposition an article entitled, *It is necessary to build anew Communist parties and an International*. Here the perspective of reform was definitely abandoned. After the lessons of the events, the turn was decisive: "Talk of 'reform' and the demand of readmission of the oppositionists into the official parties must be definitely given up, as utopian and reactionary," he wrote. And he took this opportunity to give general and valuable advice: "The most dangerous thing in politics is to become a prisoner of your own formula, which was appropriate yesterday, but is deprived of any content today."

On July 20th a second article entitled, "*It is no longer possible to stay in the same 'International' with Stalin, Manuilsky, Lozovsky and Co.*", answered possible arguments against the new position.

The change in policy coincided with the change in Trotsky's residence. On July 17th, he left Istanbul, and on the 24th he landed in Marseilles. Next day he settled himself near Saint-Palais on the Atlantic seaboard. It was a big change in his personal life. While on the island of Prinkipo, the arrival of a



visitor was a little event every four or six months; in France Trotsky was able in the following few weeks to meet with practically all leading members of the European opposition groups, and with quite a few from overseas.

When Trotsky landed in Marseilles, the translation of his first article on the need of a new International had hardly reached the leadership of the various sections. The leading Trotskyists of France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, etc., soon took the road to Saint-Palais, and there in Trotsky's study, or under the trees of the garden, participated in lengthy discussions. Opposition to the new orientation was practically non-existent. The turn to a new party in Germany three months before, had broken with a long tradition and opened new perspectives. The discussions did not deal so much with the need of a new International, but rather with the ways and means of bringing it about: how to build it, how to build new parties?

## The New International

A few voices raised the question: haven't we waited too long? Shouldn't we have recognized the need of a new International much sooner? To this Trotsky answered: "This is a question we may well leave to the historians." He was undoubtedly profoundly convinced that the change in the policy would have been incorrect several years sooner, but he refused to discuss this question because it was no longer of practical and immediate interest.

One question that took up a large share of the discussion was that of the USSR. It is worth while examining how it was posed then. The document of December 1932 that we have already mentioned, and which still followed the line of reform, had stated:

"Sharper and brighter is this question [of reform] in the USSR. The policy of the second party there would imply the policy of armed insurrection and a new revolution. The policy of the faction implies the line of inner reform of the party and the workers' state."

In the article of April 1933 which pointed out the need of a new party in Germany, but at the same time retained the policy of reform of the Communist International, Trotsky wrote:

"If the Stalinist bureaucracy will bring the USSR to collapse, then... it will be necessary to build a Fourth International."

The problem was: how to discard the policy of reform of the Bolshevik Party and at the same time retain the perspective of reforming the workers' state? How to proclaim the Fourth International before the Stalinist bureaucracy has led the USSR to its collapse?

The problem of the USSR was the greatest obstacle in Trotsky's mind before reaching the conclusion that there remained no other alternative than to form a Fourth International. Shortly before his article of July 15, he said in a conversation at Prinkipo: "Since April, we have been for reform in all countries except Germany, where we are for a new party. Now we can take a symmetrical position, i.e., in favor of a new party in every country except the USSR where we will be for reform of the Bolshevik Party." (This position, as far as I know, was never put into writing.) But it was clear to his listeners that his ideas on this matter were only in the process of formation and that they had not yet reached their conclusion.

The solution of this problem is, as is well known now, the distinction between a social revolution and a political revolution. This solution was already outlined in the first documents, in July, which speak about the need of a new International.

On the other hand, in the summer of 1933, the discussions around the nature of the USSR were numerous: not only was Stalinism bankrupt in Germany, but the first economic expe-

riences of Hitler, Roosevelt, as well as the Italian corporate state, gave rise on all sides to theories of "State capitalism."

Trotsky then clarified his position toward the USSR in a long article entitled, *The Class Nature of the Soviet State*, dated October 1, 1933. This article definitely eliminates the perspective of a peaceful removal of the bureaucracy, and clarifies the formulas used in the July documents on the new International. In the main this is the position we have maintained to the present. (On the question of an historical analogy with Thermidor, a correction was made in February 1935.)

Another question required a good deal of attention in the discussions at Saint-Palais: that of our relation toward other organizations. The Left Opposition had its attention focused exclusively on the various Communist parties. Our organization was made up, with a few rare exceptions, only of expelled members of Communist parties or Young Communist leagues. All our activity was subordinated to the perspective of reform. As early as June 15, 1933, that is, before the turn toward a New International, Trotsky addressed to the sections of the Left Opposition an article, *Left Socialist Organizations and Our Tasks*, in which he pointed out a new field of activity: The victory of German Fascism had brought a crisis to the Social Democracy. The Comintern was losing its powers of attraction. We could expect that the centrist organizations of the left would turn toward us. It was therefore necessary to turn our attention and our efforts in this direction.

In fact, the whole political atmosphere, our orientation toward a new International, the arrival of Trotsky in France, actually attracted toward us the eyes of organizations which, in different periods and under different circumstances, had broken with the Second and Third Internationals. Numerous were the visits in Saint-Palais of leaders of these organizations (German S.A.P., English I.L.P., Dutch O.S.P. and R.S.P., etc.). The Dutch party of Sneevliet (R.S.P.) declared itself ready to join our ranks immediately.

The excitement provoked by the shameful bankruptcy of the two Internationals in Germany was so great that not less than fourteen organizations, belonging to neither of the two Internationals, decided to unite. Nevertheless, they were far from having a common program. To complain about the old official organizations in articles and speeches is one thing. To undertake to build a new International is another. Our organization decided to participate in the conference of the fourteen groups held in Paris at the end of August 1933. Our policy was clear: to draw our conclusions from events to the end, to propose our program of creating a new International, to denounce those who wanted to remain equivocal and ambiguous. Together with a few organizations which recognized the immediate necessity of a new International (S.A.P., R.S.P., O.S.P.), our organization signed a programmatic document known under the name of *Declaration of the Four*. Some months later the S.A.P. was to deny its signature.

The conference in Paris proved to be the maximum effort of which the centrist groups were capable. It remained without results. All the perspectives gradually revealed themselves to be empty, unrealistic, with the exception of one: to create a new International. The formal founding of the Fourth International took place five years later, in 1938.

Eleven years have passed since that summer of 1933 when the Fourth International was conceived. Its progress has been slow, always too slow for our hopes. It was born amidst the defeats provoked by the old official organizations of the working class. While a defeat will stir the best elements of the vanguard to examine its causes and to build a better organization, its effect on the class as a whole is one of disorientation,

discouragement and passivity. It takes years and years to eradicate its marks; a new generation which has not known cynicism must raise its head.

We have found in our path the putrid corpse of the Comintern, an organization which has utilized the immense prestige of the victorious Russian Revolution precisely to disorientate, disorganize and crush, where necessary, the revolutionary emancipation of the working class.

Following defeats in a series of countries, a catastrophe has descended upon the peoples—a new world war. For five years

now, hundreds of millions of men have been confronted with the terrors of war, but today the sound of the cannon can no longer drown out the melody of revolt. Throughout all Europe fists are clenching. Tomorrow tens and hundreds of millions will rise to demand an accounting from the old order, which generated oppression, misery and wars. Gaining consciousness of their strength, they will cast aside their false leaders, the perfidious agents of the enemy. They will need a stainless banner. There is only one: ours, the banner of the Fourth International, of the World Party of the Socialist Revolution.

# With Trotsky in Mexico

By CHARLES CORNELL

When the Stalinists succeeded in persuading the Norwegian government to deny L. D. Trotsky the right to remain in that country, he appealed to every nation in the world for admission. Mexico was the only country that answered his plea favorably.

Why Mexico? The answer lay, not in some abstract principle of bourgeois justice or democracy, but in very real political and economic factors. The national revolution which began in 1910 and overthrew the dictator Diaz had gone through many stages, but the reforms envisioned by the revolutionary masses remained, for the most part, unrealized. Land was still held by a handful of wealthy landowners. The *campesinos*—agrarian workers and farmers—were landless. Foreign imperialists continued to plunder the country of its oil and mineral wealth.

Soon after he was elected President in 1934, Lazaro Cardenas broke up the reactionary camarilla that had dominated the country under President Calles and gave new impetus to the aims of the national revolution. He initiated a program of social reforms, began an attack on imperialist interests and commenced re-distribution of the land to the *campesinos*.

In order to counterbalance the bitter opposition of the reactionary elements to the reforms, Cardenas needed the support of the Mexican masses. He was aware of the sympathetic attitude the workers had toward the Russian Revolution and its leaders, Lenin and Trotsky. He was aware that Trotsky, an enemy of all imperialists, a man who had fought for the oppressed throughout the world, was held high in the esteem of the Mexican masses. Knowing that a friendly gesture toward the great revolutionist would be warmly welcomed by the masses, Cardenas granted Trotsky's request for asylum in 1937.

## Preparation for the Assassination

Upon Trotsky's arrival in Mexico the Stalinist and Stalinist-controlled press immediately began a campaign of vilification directed toward the demand for his expulsion. Their lying accusations linked Trotsky with whatever reactionary group or foreign power happened for the time to be in disfavor with the Kremlin. And at all times and under all conditions, they accused him of interfering in Mexican politics. At one time this campaign became so intense that Cardenas intervened and in an interview published in *La Prensa*, declared that Trotsky, a man of honor, had scrupulously kept his promise not to interfere in Mexican politics.

While the press campaign attempted to create a hostile atmosphere, the GPU organized the physical assault. GPU executioners of the Spanish revolution, among them the notorious

Sormenti, were sent to Mexico. From January 1940 on, as the war spread over Europe and the Mexican elections approached, we more and more frequently received reports of GPU agents arriving. Stalin hoped that in the maelstrom of world events and the disturbances accompanying a Mexican presidential election, the murder of Trotsky would pass with slight notice.

The tempo of the slander campaign in the Stalinist press was accelerated. Not an issue of an organ controlled by them was printed without some slanderous article or vicious cartoon about the Old Man. However, this campaign had no effect outside their own ranks. The other papers retained an objective tone and continued to print everything Trotsky released for publication.

## The May 24th Assault

On the morning of May 24, 1940, around four o'clock in the morning, David Alfaro Siqueiros led a group of about fifteen GPU gunmen in a machine-gun assault directed at Trotsky's bedroom. They gained entrance to the courtyard through some ruse, and after establishing machine-guns to cover the doors to the guards' rooms, they fired hundreds of rounds of bullets through a shuttered window and a closed door, covering Trotsky's bed with deadly cross-fire. It was done with mathematical precision. No one could have remained alive on the beds. Somehow L.D. and Natalia got on the floor in a corner of the room at the first sound of firing and stayed there until it was over. Trotsky's amazingly quick action and the murderers' reliance on a mechanical solution to their assignment saved his life.

Our comrade, Bob Sheldon Harte, the guard on duty at the time of the assault, was taken away by the assailants. They murdered Bob—in true GPU style, a bullet through the base of his brain and one in the temple.

Immediately after the machine-gun attack the Stalinist press accused Trotsky of organizing the assault himself! They asserted that a crime against the country had been committed and that it must not go unpunished. They demanded that Trotsky be driven out of the country. This campaign met with as little success as those they had carried on previously. A short time later the Stalinist agents, discovered and arrested by the police, admitted in court their complicity in the attempt.

Although the attackers were Mexicans and some of them well-known artists, they were severely condemned by the Mexican people. The Mexican press expressed its sympathy for Trotsky and decried the difficulties from which he suffered. Magazines carried many articles and stories defending Trotsky and castigating the GPU.

Gunsmoke from the attack had barely lifted from the patio, empty machine-gun shells were still on the floor of his study, when L.D. began uncovering the identity of the attackers. In characteristic manner he put all of his energy into the task. He reviewed and analyzed the Stalinist publications for the preceding period. This review of Stalinist literary activity, supplemented by information from friends, enabled him to establish almost immediately that Siqueiros was one of the Stalinists implicated. As investigations proceeded, he proved to the satisfaction of every honest person, the GPU's guilt.

## Jacson Appears

In the period immediately following the May attack the sinister figure of Jacson, known only as Sylvia Ageloff's husband, was first seen at the house. She was in Mexico City at the time and on occasion visited the house. On a trip to Europe, while she was a member of the Socialist Workers Party, she had met Trotsky. During a visit to France in 1937 she became acquainted with Jacson and subsequently married him.

Hearing that Trotsky's friends, the Rosmers, were leaving, Jacson volunteered through Sylvia to take them to Vera Cruz in his car. The morning that he came to get them was the first time he was ever seen at the house. He never became intimate with members of the household. He always remained at a distance.

Following this initial appearance he and Sylvia had tea with Trotsky and Natalia a few times. On one occasion he stated that he was writing an article and would like Trotsky's comments on it. L.D. was always anxious to aid in the development of a person who appeared to be approaching the movement. Naturally, he granted the request.

On August 17, Jacson came to the house in the afternoon, for the first time unaccompanied by Sylvia. He asked Trotsky to read the draft of his article. L.D. took him into his study, looked over the article and made some suggestions for its improvement.

Jacson left. His rehearsal was over. He knew the location of the tables and chairs in the Old Man's study. His plan could now be perfected to the last detail.

## The Assassination

Jacson returned on August 20, 1940 at 5:30 in the afternoon. Trotsky was in the patio. After a few remarks, he led Jacson into his study. Trotsky sat down at his work table and began to read the article Jacson had brought. Jacson laid his raincoat on a small table in back of Trotsky's chair and took a seat to the rear of Trotsky. He was within easy reach of his concealed weapon. While the Old Man was looking at the article, Jacson reached into his raincoat, took hold of the pick-axe with both hands and struck with all his might at Trotsky's head.

He expected the blow to first stun and then kill the Old Man. But Trotsky struggled, shielding his head from further blows. Jacson, fearing failure, struck blindly at L.D.'s head. Trotsky's cry brought Natalia and the guard.

Trotsky's resistance prevented Jacson from escaping and made certain that the crime would be traced without question to the GPU. Even while the mortal wound began to paralyze his body he thought the problem out carefully. "Don't let them kill Jacson. He must talk," he admonished us.

Trotsky was taken to the Cruz Verde hospital where the most prominent surgeons in Mexico did everything possible to save his life. For over twenty-four hours after the blow was struck, fearful despair alternated with desperate hope.

On August 21, at 7:45 P.M. he breathed his last. Stalin's pick-axe had found its mark. The greatest revolutionist of our day lay dead.

\* \* \*

## Trotsky's Habits of Work

One must understand Trotsky's passionate devotion to the cause of the oppressed to appreciate the full import of his work. He hated the injustices and indignities forced on man with his whole being. His polemics against political opponents are not at all the brilliant stylistic exercises which his petty-bourgeois critics make them out to be. Nor did he dash them off with the literary glibness which they attribute to him. Trotsky's powerful and incisive writing merely reflects his ardent convictions in the struggle for the liberation of mankind. The barbs of his sharp pen were completely at one with his hatred of all that degraded humanity. The style was truly the man. He did not write with facility at all; his polished writing was the result of strenuous and lengthy application.

Although the Old Man considered himself a slow writer, his literary output was prodigious. A shelf five feet long could be filled with his published works prior to 1918 alone. The secretary who was with him in Prinkipo relates that he finished the three volumes of the *History of the Russian Revolution* in thirteen months. His writings testify not only to the extraordinary fertility of his brain, but to his remarkable self-discipline.

Knowing that his time was limited, that Stalin's order for his death would be executed before he had contributed all he could in the task of preparing the Fourth International, Trotsky worked indefatigably. It was a race against time in which he spared nothing of his tremendous energy.

As was characteristic of him in all things, he sought for preciseness of expression and scientific exactitude in his writing. After the Russian stenographer had transcribed his first draft L.D. would make corrections and revisions, cutting and pasting the manuscript until it was a long and continuous sheet. Part or all of the work was often revised and re-typed several times, before he was satisfied with the final draft.

This preciseness was apparent in everything he did, even in his relaxation. Making the most of conditions imposed upon him by necessity, he had taken up the hobby of raising chickens and rabbits, since they could be kept in the restricted area of the high-walled yard. The chore of caring for them he performed, too, with method and precision. The feed was prepared according to the most scientific formula he could obtain. The amount of food was carefully measured. He inspected the animals regularly for any signs of sickness or parasites. The chicken yards and pens were kept scrupulously clean. It was obvious that he enjoyed this diversion from his sedentary tasks.

L.D., a master of self-discipline, bent every minute of his time to his will. Not a moment was wasted. He arose early, at about six in the morning, performed the chores in the yard, returned to his study and worked until breakfast. After breakfast he dictated letters and went on with his writing. Shortly before the noon meal he again took care of the animals. Unless some particularly urgent piece of work pressed for attention, he rested for an hour after lunch in accordance with the doctor's instructions. Sometimes at three in the afternoon a visitor would come and L.D. would spend an hour or so with him. Longer visits were infrequent, for his time was too limited.

Having fed and tended the chickens and rabbits in the evening he returned either to his study or, if dinner were ready, directly to the dining room. Dinner was usually a lively meal

during which L.D. engaged everyone in conversation and joked with members of the household.

On many such occasions he would relate some occurrence or anecdote. I recall one following the May attack. Col. Salazar, head of the Mexican secret police, had brought two of us back from jail, where they had tried to exact "confessions" of complicity in the assault from us. L.D. was, naturally, angry and indignant. Col. Salazar, L. D. told us, had tried to apologize and explain the act by saying that they had "only tried to uncover every possibility, to unravel every thread." L.D. replied to the Colonel, "But this time, Colonel, you happened to have a thread fastened to my coat!"

Most of his time was spent within the structure L.D. often referred to as "the jail"; the routine of the day being repeated monotonously. On occasion, but less frequently as reports of a GPU concentration in Mexico reached us, he went on "picnics." These were actually expeditions to gather cactus for L.D.'s collection. He especially admired this odd Mexican plant and as was typical of him, aspired to make his collection as nearly complete in its many varieties as possible.

He never undertook anything half-heartedly and his cactus collecting was no exception. On one occasion we accompanied some friends to Tamazunchale, a distance of about 380 kilometres from Coyoacan, in hopes of finding a special variety of cactus. We were unsuccessful, but on the way down L.D. had noticed some "viznagas" nearer to Mexico City. He decided, despite the fact that we reached the spot long after dark, to stop and collect a carful. It was a balmy night; L.D. was in a cheerful mood; he moved briskly about the little group digging cactus by the light from the headlamps of the cars.

This wholeheartedness permeated his entire activity. It was visible in his soldierly bearing, in his lively stride, in his punctuality. Whether it was a meal, a trip or a meeting, he insisted that it begin on time. I recall a conference held in his study with some friends from New York at which some of the guards came in late. After the first one arrived, L.D. got up and locked the door, putting the key in his pocket. Each time one of the latecomers knocked at the door L.D. arose from his chair, walked to the door and let the guard in. It was a most effective demonstration.

\* \* \*

## Trotsky's Relations with Mexico

Before granting Trotsky permission to enter the country, Cardenas had requested that Trotsky pledge himself not to intervene in internal Mexican politics. Trotsky agreed to this stipulation and strictly adhered to it, to the last. Many reactionary elements, both in the United States and Mexico manufactured out of whole cloth lies attempting to prove Trotsky's close relations with Cardenas. Numerous absurd and utterly false articles appeared in Catholic organs stating that Cardenas never made a move without first consulting the "Red Demon of Coyoacan." The intent of such articles was to create the impression that the country was racing towards "atheism" and "bolshhevik" revolution.

Trotsky did indeed hold Cardenas high in his appreciation, because of all the "democratic" politicians in the world who espoused the right of asylum for political exiles, Cardenas was the only one who lived up to the principle. However, Trotsky neither saw Cardenas nor anyone representing him, nor did he communicate with him except in matters pertaining to the security of the household.

Remaining true to his promise not to intervene in the political life of Mexico did not, however, prevent Trotsky from

following systematically and carefully the political developments in the country. One might say Mexico was no exception, for he followed the news of every country with avid interest. Conversations with friends, artists, intellectuals, workers and *campesinos*—with people from the varied social categories he encountered—supplemented and rounded out the news he gleaned from the press and gave him a profoundly intimate understanding of Mexican life.

His knowledge of Mexico and his sympathy for the struggle of the workers and *campesinos* against the imperialists and *hacendados* made it possible for him to engage a worker around the house in an intimate conversation or to discuss land reforms in the simplest terms with the *campesino* he met on a walk.

He believed that a revolutionist was characterized by his attitude towards colonial people and their struggle for freedom.

Any expression of chauvinism, any reflection, no matter how veiled, of the typical bourgeois attitude towards colonial people aroused L.D.'s anger and brought down wrath on the head of the offender. One striking example of this sensitivity occurs to me. A letter was once received from a petty-bourgeois radical who was at the time a member of the Socialist Workers Party. This comrade, by the way, considered himself an authority on colonial problems. In the letter a comrade's inability to visit the Old Man was explained as resulting from a delay at the border "due to typical Mexican stupidity." Trotsky read the letter, underlined the phrase in blue and placed large red exclamation marks in the margin. He gave it to me with the statement that I should reply to this characterization of the Mexicans as being monstrously false and flowing from an arrogant Yankee imperialist attitude!

## Mexican People Appreciated Trotsky

Instinctively, the Mexicans were aware of Trotsky's devotion to their cause. The Mexican people admired Trotsky as one who had fought in the forefront of the struggle for the liberation of all oppressed people. They knew that, although he hadn't participated in Mexican politics, he was in sympathy with their struggle against the imperialists who robbed their country.

Some of them were able to pay homage to the revolutionary hero while his body was lying in state. An endless, profoundly sorrowful procession of people, almost as varied and colorful as the masses to whom Trotsky had dedicated his life, filed by the bier. There were dark-skinned, barefoot Indian women carrying babies in their shawls. Fair-skinned, well-dressed intellectuals. Students from the university. Huarache-clad urban workers, the soil of their day's work still on their knotty brown hands and blue overalls. Bronzed, quiet *campesinos* in their white outfits and bright serapes. Around a hundred thousand paused, hat in hand before the coffin, a moment in silent tribute to the revolutionist who had unceasingly fought for the liberation of the oppressed.

Mexican custom provides another moving gesture of honor to the dead—standing guard at the casket. Comrades, friends and special delegations took turns under the direction of the Mexican section of the Fourth International.

Fastened on the wall above the bier was a banner inscribed with Trotsky's last words translated into Spanish: "I am sure of the victory of the Fourth International. Go forward!"

Just before the funeral procession, Natalia came to the room and stayed alone by the casket for a long time. As she walked from the room a cry arose spontaneously from the crowd—"Trotsky lives on! Death to Stalin!"

In her dispatch to the *Jewish Day* in New York, Jean Jaffe described the funeral:

"The funeral procession was gigantic. When the flower bedecked casket slowly passed through the streets, the roofs and windows were black with people.

"On the way to the cemetery, from time to time the cry was echoed '*Trotsky lives! Down with Stalin, down with the GPU!*'

"The Mexicans at the cemetery were still. They are used to heroic deaths of revolutionary martyrs and each death is a sign for them that the struggle goes on from generation to generation, from man to man . . ."

The Mexicans truly accepted Trotsky as one of their revolutionary martyrs. *Corridos* were written around his life.

A *corrido* is a popular ballad lamenting the death and recounting the accomplishments of a public figure. The poet gives the prevalent impressions and reactions of the masses towards the hero's life work and the circumstances surrounding his death. They are printed on large, colored leaflets and vendors sell them on the streets for five centavos. The number written and the extent of their sale is a measure of the masses' appreciation for a hero. Many were written about Trotsky and sold in the largest numbers.

In the almost crude and unpolished jingle of the popular

ballad it is evident that the masses knew by whom the murder was committed: a verse from a *corrido* points unerringly to the Kremlin:

Stalin and the assassin  
in frank cooperation  
carried their crime with precision  
to its final destination.

And they knew for whom Trotsky fought. Another verse from the same ballad sings their unadorned admiration:

Expelled from his country  
he wandered through many nations;  
always fighting bitterly  
to combat oppressions.

These simple verses reflect more eloquently than the most polished prose the warmth the masses had in their hearts for Trotsky. His passion for the oppressed was reciprocated with deep feeling. Trotsky's leadership in the struggle was appreciated by all those whom it aroused to fight oppression in every country. He was cherished and loved by them in his lifetime and his name will forever live in their hearts as an inspiration spurring them on to the final victory, to the establishment of the socialist society which alone can mean a free humanity.

## From the Arsenal of Marxism

# Five Years of the Comintern

By LEON TROTSKY

Leon Trotsky was the co-founder and co-builder with Lenin of the Communist International. In 1924 the State Publishing House issued in the U.S.S.R. a volume containing the manifestoes, speeches, theses, articles, resolutions and other writings of Trotsky in the five year period covering the first four congresses of the Communist International. We print below the introduction that Trotsky wrote to this edition. A two volume edition of this highly important body of documents is now in preparation by the Pioneer Publishers. The English translation is by John G. Wright.—Ed.

\* \* \*

The half-decade of the existence of the Communist International falls into two periods, divided by the Third World Congress. During its first two years the Comintern still remains wholly and exclusively under the aegis of the imperialist war. Revolutionary perspectives are drawn directly from the consequences of the war. It is deemed as virtually self-evident that the constantly rising and intensifying political ferment of the masses, growing out of the social convulsions of the war, must lead directly to the conquest of power by the proletariat. This evaluation of the course of developments found its expression in the Manifestoes of the First and Second World Congresses which are included in this volume. The principled evaluation of the post-war situation given in these documents wholly retains its force to this day. But the tempo of development proved to be different.

War did not lead directly to the victory of the proletariat in Western Europe. It is all too obvious today just what was lacking for victory in 1919 and 1920: a revolutionary party was lacking.

Young Communist parties began to take shape, and even then only in rough outline, at a moment when the powerful post-war mass ferment was already beginning to ebb. The March 1921 events in Germany graphically disclose the contradiction between the then existing situation and the policy of the Communist International: Communist parties, or at least their left wings, seek impetuously to unleash an offensive at a time when the many-millioned masses, after the initial defeats, sullenly take stock of the post-war situation and watchfully observe the Communist parties. At the Third World Congress Lenin formulates this threatening divergence between the line of the development of the masses and the tactical line of the Communist parties; and with a firm hand he assures a decisive turn in the policy of the International. At the present time, when we are far enough away from the Third Congress in order to appraise it correctly in retrospect, it can be said that the turn made by the Third Congress was of as great importance to the Communist International as the Brest-Litovsk turn was for the Soviet Republic. Had the Third International continued mechanically to follow the path, one of whose stages was marked by the March events in Germany, there would have been perhaps left only splinters of Communist parties within a year or two.

With the Third Congress, a new stage begins: the parties take into account that they have yet to win over the masses, and that the assault must be preceded by a more or less protracted period of preparatory work. There opens up the zone of the united front, that is, the tactic of fusing the masses on the basis of transitional demands. The speeches and articles in the second part of this volume are devoted to this "new stage."

This second period in the development of the Communist International, which invariably extended the influence of all its chief sections on the working masses, runs into the mighty revolutionary flood tide in Germany in the latter part of 1923. Europe is once again shaken by wild convulsions, at whose focus stands the Ruhr. The question of power is once again posed in Germany in all its nakedness and acuteness. But the bourgeoisie survived this time as well. A third chapter opens in the development of the Communist International. The subject for the work of the Fifth World Congress is to define the main political peculiarities and tactical tasks of this new period.

\* \* \*

### The 1923 Defeat of Germany

Why did the German revolution fail to lead to victory? The causes for this lie wholly in tactics and not in the objective conditions. We have here a truly classic example of a revolutionary situation that was let slip. From the moment of the Ruhr occupation, and all the more so from the moment when the bankruptcy of passive resistance became evident, it was imperative for the Communist Party to steer a firm and resolute course toward the conquest of power. Only a courageous tactical turn could have unified the German proletariat in the struggle for power. If at the Third Congress and in part at the Fourth Congress we told the German comrades: "You will win the masses only on the basis of taking a leading part in their struggle for transitional demands," then by the middle of 1923 the question became posed differently: After all that the German proletariat had gone through in recent years, it could be led into the decisive battle only in the event that it became convinced that this time the issue was posed, as the Germans say, *auf's Ganze* (i.e. that it was not a question of this or that partial task, but of the fundamental one); and that the Communist Party was ready to march into battle and was capable of securing victory. But the [German] Communist Party executed this turn without the necessary assurance and after an extreme delay. Both the Rights and the Lefts, despite their sharp struggle against each other evinced up to September-October a rather fatalistic attitude toward the process of the development of the revolution. At a time when the entire objective situation demanded of the party that it undertake a decisive blow, the party did not act to organize the revolution but kept waiting for it. "The revolution is not made on schedule," replied the Rights and the Lefts, confusing the revolution as a whole with one of its specific stages, i.e. the uprising for the seizure of power. My article, "Can the Revolution Be Made on Schedule?" was devoted to this question. The article summarizes the interminable discussions and polemics which had previously taken place. True, in the month of October a sharp break occurred in the party's policy. But it was already too late. In the course of 1923 the working masses realized or sensed that the moment of decisive struggle was approaching. However, they did not see the necessary resolution and self-confidence on the side of the Communist Party. And when the latter began its feverish preparations for an uprising, it immediately lost its balance and also its ties with the masses. Approximately the same thing

happened as in the case of a rider who, after slowly approaching a high barrier, at the last moment, with a convulsive movement digs his spurs into the horse's flanks. Were the horse to leap over the barrier, it would in all likelihood break its legs. As matters turned out, it stopped at the barrier, and then shied aside. Such are the mechanics of the cruellest defeat of the German Communist Party and the whole International in November of last year [1923].

When a sharp shift in the reciprocal relation of forces became delineated, when the legalized fascists moved to the forefront while the Communists found themselves driven underground, some comrades hastened to announce that "we overestimated the situation; the revolution hasn't matured as yet." Naturally, nothing is simpler than this sort of strategy: first to muff the revolution and then to proclaim it as not yet mature. In reality, however, the revolution failed to lead to victory not because it generally "had not matured" but because the decisive link—the leadership—dropped out of the chain at the decisive moment. "Our" mistake does not lie in "our" having overestimated the conditions of revolution, but in "our" having underestimated them, in our inability to understand in time the need of an abrupt and bold tactical turn: from the struggle for the masses to—the struggle for power. Our mistake lies in this, that "we" continued for several weeks to repeat old banalities to the effect that "the revolution is not made on schedule," and in this way let slip all time-intervals.

Did the Communist Party have the majority of the workers behind it in the latter part of last year? It is hard to say what the result would have been had we taken a poll at the time. Such questions are not decided by polls. They are decided by the dynamics of the movement. Despite the fact that a very considerable number of workers still remained in the ranks of the Social Democracy, only an insignificant minority of them was ready to take a hostile, and even then a rather passively hostile position toward the overturn. The majority of the Social Democratic as well as non-party workers sensed keenly the oppressive impasse of the bourgeois-democratic regime and awaited the overturn. Their complete and final trust and sympathy could have been won only in the course of the overturn itself. All the talk about the terrible strength of reaction, the many hundred thousands of the Black Reichswehr, etc., proved to be mere monstrous exaggeration, of which there was no doubt from the outset in the minds of people with revolutionary sense. Only the official Reichswehr represented a genuine force. But it was too small numerically and would have been inevitably swept away by the onset of millions.

Side by side with the masses already firmly won over by the Communist Party, far broader masses were gravitating toward it during the months of crisis, awaiting from it a signal for battle and leadership in battle. After failing to receive this, they began to move away from the Communists just as spontaneously as they had previously been flocking toward them. It is precisely this that explains the sharp shift in the relation of forces which enabled Seeckt to capture the field of political struggle almost without resistance. Meanwhile fatalistically inclined politicians, observing Seeckt's swift successes, proclaimed: "You see, the proletariat doesn't want to struggle." In reality, the German proletariat after the experience of the revolutionary half-decade did not want simply a struggle; it wanted that struggle which would at last bring victory. Not finding the necessary leadership it avoided the struggle. Thereby it only showed that the lessons of 1918-1921 had become deeply imbedded in its memory.

The German Communist Party led 3,600,000 workers to the



ballot boxes. How many did it lose on the way? It is hard to answer this question. But the results of numerous partial elections to the Landtag, the municipalities and so on testify that the Communist Party participated in an already extremely weakened condition in the recent elections to the Reichstag. And despite all this it still obtained 3,600,000 votes! "Look," we are told, "the German Communist Party is being severely criticized, and yet it represents a huge force!" But, after all, the whole gist of the matter lies in this, that 3,600,000 votes in May 1924, i.e. after the spontaneous ebb of the masses, after the intrenchment of the bourgeois regime, testify that the Communist Party was the decisive force in the latter part of last year, but unfortunately this was not understood and utilized in time. Those who even today refuse to grasp that the defeat rose directly out of an underestimation, more precisely, out of an untimely evaluation of the exceptional revolutionary situation of last year,—those who persist in so doing incur the risk of learning nothing and, therefore, of refusing to recognize the revolution a second time when it knocks again at the doors.

\* \* \*

## The New Situation

The circumstance that the German Communist Party has drastically renovated its leading organs is quite in the order of things. The party together with the working class expected and wanted battle and hoped for victory—but was given instead a defeat without a battle. It is only natural that the party should turn its back on the old leadership. There is only a limited significance today to the question of whether the left wing could have coped with the task had it been in power last year. Frankly speaking, we do not think so. We have already remarked that despite their sharp factional struggle, the left wing shared on the basic question—the seizure of power—the amorphous, semi-fatalistic, waiting policy of the then Central Committee. But the mere fact that the left wing was in opposition made it the natural heir of party power after the party turned its back on the old Central Committee. At present the leadership is in the hands of the left wing. This is a new fact in the development of the German party. It is necessary to take this fact into account, to proceed from it as the starting point. It is necessary to do everything possible in order to help the new leading body of the party to cope with its task. And for this it is first of all necessary to see the dangers clearly. The first possible danger might arise from an insufficiently serious attitude toward last year's defeat: an attitude that nothing out of ordinary has happened, just a slight delay; the revolutionary situation will soon repeat itself; we proceed as before—toward the decisive assault. This is wrong! Last year's crisis signified a colossal expenditure of revolutionary energy by the proletariat. The proletariat needs time in order to digest last year's tragic defeat, a defeat without a decisive battle, a defeat without even an attempt at a decisive battle. It needs time in order to orient itself once again in a revolutionary way in an objective situation. This does not mean, of course, that a long number of years are required. But weeks will not suffice for it. And it would constitute the greatest danger if the strategic line of our German party were now impatiently cut across the processes which are taking place at present in the German proletariat as a consequence of last year's defeat.

In the last analysis what decides, as we know, is economics. Those small economic successes which have been attained in the last few months by the German bourgeoisie are in themselves the inescapable result of the weakening of the revolutionary

process, a certain—very superficial and shaky—strengthening of bourgeois "law and order" and so on. But the reestablishment of any kind of stable capitalist equilibrium in Germany has not been brought appreciably closer than was the case from July to November of last year. At all events the road to this equilibrium traverses such mighty conflicts between labor and capital and is obstructed with such difficulties on the part of France that the German proletariat is still assured a revolutionary economic foundation for an indefinitely long period ahead. However, those partial processes which occur in the foundation—either temporary aggravations or, on the contrary, temporary mitigations of the crisis and its auxiliary manifestations—are in no case matters of indifference to us. If a relatively well-fed and thriving proletariat is always very sensitive even to a slight worsening of its position, then the long-suffering, long-famished and exhausted proletariat of Germany is sensitive even to the slightest improvement of its living conditions. This undoubtedly explains the strengthening—again, very unstable—of the ranks of the German Social Democracy and the trade union bureaucracy which is now to be observed. Today more than ever before we are obliged to follow attentively the alterations of the trade and industrial conjuncture in Germany and its reflections on the living standards of the German worker.

It is economics that decides, but only in the last analysis. Of more direct significance are those political-psychological processes which are now taking place within the German proletariat and which likewise have an inner logic of their own. The party received 3,600,000 votes at the elections: a marvelous proletarian core! But the vacillating elements have moved away from us. Meanwhile, a direct revolutionary situation is always characterized by the influx of the vacillating elements to us. A great many worker Social Democrats, we may assume, said to themselves during the elections: "We know perfectly well that our leaders are case-hardened scoundrels, but whom can we vote for? The Communists promised to take power, but proved unable to do it and only helped reaction.\* Are we then to follow the Nazis?" And with revulsion in their hearts they cast their votes for the Social Democrats. The school of bourgeois reaction, we may hope, will quite quickly enough compel the German proletariat in its overwhelming majority to assimilate a revolutionary orientation, this time more definitively and firmly. It is necessary to assist this process in every way. It is necessary to speed it up. But it is altogether impossible to leap over its inevitable stages. To picture the situation as if nothing extraordinary has happened, as if only a slight hitch has taken place, etc., would be false to the core, and would threaten the greatest blunders of the strategic order. What has taken place is no superficial hitch, but an enormous defeat. Its meaning must be assimilated by the proletarian vanguard. Resting on this lesson, the vanguard must speed up the process of the grouping of proletarian forces around the 3,600,000. The revolutionary flood tide, then the ebb, and then a new flood tide—these processes have their own inner logic and their own tempo. Revolutions not only unfold, we repeat, revolutions are organized. But it is possible to organize revolution only on the basis of its own internal development. To ignore the critical, watchful, skeptical moods among wide circles of the proletariat after what has happened is to head for a new defeat. Even the best revolutionary party cannot arbitrarily call forth a new revolution a day after a defeat, no more than the best obstetrician is able to call forth births every three or every five

\* This is the most telling argument of the Social Democratic adventurers and rascals.—L. T.

months. The fact that last year's revolutionary birth pangs proved false ones, does not alter matters. The German proletariat must pass through a stage of restoring and gathering its forces for the new revolutionary culmination, before the Communist Party, having appraised the situation, can issue the signal for a new assault. But on the other hand, we know that no less a danger would threaten if at a new turn, the Communist Party were again to fail to recognize a revolutionary situation and thereby again prove impotent to utilize it to the end.

Two of the greatest lessons mark the history of the German Communist Party: March 1921 and November 1923. In the first case, the party mistook its own impatience for a mature revolutionary situation; in the second case, it was unable to recognize a mature revolutionary situation and let it slip. These are the extreme dangers from the "left" and the "right"—the limits between which the policy of the proletarian party generally passes in our epoch. We shall continue to hope firmly that enriched by battles, defeats and experience the German Communist Party will succeed in the not so distant future in guiding its ship between the "March" Scylla and the "November" Charybdis and will secure to the German proletariat what the latter has so honestly earned: victory!

\* \* \*

## Political Trends in Europe

At a time when in Germany itself the last parliamentary elections, under the influence of last year's danger, have given the bourgeois concentration a new impulse to the right—but within the framework of parliamentarianism and not of fascist dictatorship—in the rest of Europe and in America the shift of the ruling political groupings is proceeding in the direction of "conciliationism." In England and Denmark the bourgeoisie rules through the medium of the parties of the Second International. The victory of the left bloc in France signifies either an open or slightly masked (most likely open) participation of the Socialists in the government. Italian Fascism is taking to the road of parliamentary "regulation" of its policy. In the United States the conciliationist illusions are being mobilized under the banner of the "Third Party." In Japan, the opposition parties won the elections.

When a ship has lost its rudder, it is sometimes necessary to keep its left and right engines running alternately: the ship moves in zigzags, a great amount of energy is expended, but the ship keeps moving. Such at the present time is the steering device of the capitalist states of Europe. The bourgeoisie is compelled to alternate fascist and social-democratic methods. Fascism was and remains strongest in those countries where the proletariat came closest to power, but was unable to take it or hold it: Italy, Germany, Hungary, etc. On the contrary, conciliationist tendencies begin to gain preponderance to the extent that the bourgeoisie begins to sense less directly the threat of the proletarian overturn. If the bourgeoisie feels itself strong enough not to require the direct activities of the fascist gangs, then, on the other hand, it does not feel strong enough to get along without a Menshevik covering.

In the era of the Fourth Congress of the Comintern, which passed entirely under the aegis of capitalist offensive and fascist reaction, we wrote that if the German revolution did not grow directly out of the situation existing at the time and did not thereby give a new direction to the entire political development of Europe, then one could expect with complete assurance the replacement of the fascist chapter by a conciliationist chapter, in particular, the coming of a labor government to power

in England, and that of the left bloc in France. At the time this forecast seemed to some to be the sowing of . . . conciliationist illusions. There are people who succeed in being revolutionists only by keeping their eyes shut.

Let us, however, cite the verbatim quotations. In an article, "Political Perspectives" published in *Izvestia*, November 30, 1922, I polemicized against the simplified, non-Marxist, mechanistic view of political development which allegedly must fatally lead through the automatic strengthening of Fascism and Communism to the victory of the proletariat. In this article it is stated:

"Back on June 16 [1921] in my speech at a session of the enlarged ECCI I developed the idea that if revolutionary events in Europe and France did not erupt first, then the entire parliamentary-political life of France would inevitably begin crystallizing around the axis of the left bloc' in contrast to the currently dominant 'national' bloc. In the one and a half years that have elapsed the revolution has not taken place. And whoever has been following the life of France will hardly deny that—with the exception of the Communist and revolutionary syndicalists—her policy is actually proceeding along the path of preparing the replacement of the national bloc by the left bloc. True, France remains wholly under the aegis of capitalist offensive, interminable threats addressed to Germany, and so on. But parallel with this there is a growing confusion among bourgeois classes, especially among the intermediate ones, who are in dread of tomorrow, who are disillusioned with the policy of 'reparations', who are striving to mitigate the financial crisis by cutting down on the expenditures for imperialism, who have hopes of restoring relations with Russia, etc., etc. These moods also seize a considerable section of the working class through the medium of reformist Socialists and syndicalists. The continued offensive of French capitalism and French reaction thus in no way contradicts the fact that the French bourgeoisie is clearly preparing a new orientation for itself."

And further in the same article we wrote:

"In England the situation is no less instructive. The domination of the liberal-conservative coalition has been replaced owing to recent elections by purely conservative rule. An obvious step to the 'right'! But, on the other hand, precisely the results of the last elections testify to the fact that bourgeois-conciliationist England has already fully prepared a new orientation for herself in the event of a further aggravation of contradictions and growing difficulties (and both are inevitable) . . . Are there serious grounds for thinking that the present conservative regime will lead directly to the dictatorship of the proletariat in England? We do not see any such grounds. On the contrary, we assume that the insoluble economic, colonial and international contradictions of the British empire today will provide considerable nourishment for the plebian-middle class opposition in the guise of the so-called Labor Party. According to every indication, in England, more than in any other country on our globe, the working class before arriving at the dictatorship will have to pass through a stage of a 'labor' government in the person of the reformist-pacifist Labor Party, which at the last elections already received some four and a quarter million votes."

"But doesn't this imply that you hold the standpoint of a mitigation of political contradictions? But, after all, this is outright opportunism!" objected those comrades who are able to protect themselves against opportunist temptations only by turning their backs on them. As if to foresee a new temporary rise of conciliationist illusions is tantamount to sharing them to any degree whatever! It is of course much simpler not to foresee anything, restricting oneself to a repetition of sacramental formulas. But there is no need whatever to continue the

dispute nowadays. Events have supplied the verification of the prognosis: we have MacDonald's government in England, the Stauning ministry in Denmark, the victory of the left bloc in France, and of the opposition parties in Japan, while on the political horizon of the United States there looms the symbolic figure of LaFollette, quite a hopeless figure to be sure.

The elections in France supply the final verification for still another dispute: concerning the influence of the French Socialist Party. As is well known, this "party" is almost without an organization. Its official press is extremely wretched and hardly read by anybody. Proceeding from these incontestable facts some comrades were inclined to evaluate the Socialist Party as an insignificant magnitude. This consoling but false viewpoint found accidental expression even in certain official documents of the Comintern. In reality it is false to the core to evaluate the political influence of the French Socialists on the basis of their organization or the circulation of their press. The Socialist Party represents an apparatus for attracting workers into the camp of the "radical" bourgeoisie. The more backward or the more privileged elements of the working class have need neither for organization nor for a party press. They do not enter into the party or the trade unions; they vote for the Socialists and read the yellow press. The relation between the number of party members, the number of subscribers to the party press and the number of voters among the Socialists is not at all the same as among the Communists. We had the occasion to express ourselves more than once on this score. Let us again adduce verbatim citations. Back on March 2, 1922 we wrote in *Pravda*:

"If we take into consideration the fact that the Communist Party numbers 130,000 members while the Socialists have 30,000, then the enormous successes of the Communist idea in France become quite obvious. However, if we take into account the relation of these figures to the numerical strength of the working class as a whole, the existence of reformist trade unions and anti-Communist tendencies within the revolutionary trade unions, then the question of the hegemony of the Communist Party in the workers' movement confronts us as a very difficult task, which is far from solved by our numerical preponderance over the Dissidents (Socialists). Under certain conditions the latter may prove a far more significant counter-revolutionary factor within the working class than might appear if one were to judge solely by the weakness of their organization, the insignificant circulation and ideological content of their organ, *Populaire*."

Quite recently we had occasion to return to this same question. At the beginning of this year, one of the documents referred to the Socialist Party as "moribund" and stated that only a "few workers" would vote for it, etc., etc. In this connection I wrote on January 7 of this year as follows:

"It is far too facile to speak of the French Socialist Party as moribund and to say that only 'a few workers' could vote for it. This is an illusion. The French Socialist Party is an electoral organization of a considerable section of passive and semi-passive working masses. If among Communists the proportion between those who are organized and those who vote is, say, one to ten, or one to twenty; then among the Socialists this proportion may prove to be one to fifty or one to a hundred. Our task in election campaigns consists to a large measure in splitting away a considerable section of the passive workers' mass who awaken only during elections. And in order to achieve this one must not underestimate the enemy."

The recent French elections confirmed wholly and completely the foregoing views. The Communists with a far stronger party organization and party press obtained considerably fewer

votes than the Socialists. Even the arithmetical proportions turned out approximately as they had been tentatively indicated. . . . Nevertheless the fact that our party received about 900,000 votes represents a serious success, especially if we take into account the swift growth of our influence in the suburbs of Paris!

There is every reason to expect today that the entry of the Socialist Party into the left bloc and thereby its participation in the government will create favorable conditions for the growth of the political influence of the Communists, as the only party free of any sort of political obligations toward the bourgeois regime.

\* \* \*

## Policies in the U. S.

In America the conciliationist illusions of the petty bourgeoisie, primarily the farmers, and the petty-bourgeois illusions of the proletariat take the form of the Third Party. The latter is being mobilized at the present moment around Senator LaFollette, or, more correctly, around his name, for the Senator himself, almost 70 years old, has not yet found the time to leave the ranks of the Republican Party. All this, by the way, is quite in the nature of things. But truly amazing is the position of certain leaders of the American Communist Party who propose to summon the party to vote for LaFollette, hoping in this way to secure for Communists influence on the farmers. More than this, they cite the example of Russian Bolshevism which allegedly won over the peasantry by means of this sort of politics. In addition, of course, there is no lack of variations on the idea which has already lost all semblance of sense, namely, that "underestimation" of the peasantry is the basic trait of Menshevism. The history of Marxism and Bolshevism in Russia is first of all the history of a struggle against Narodnikism (Populism) and S.R.'ism. This struggle provided the premise for the fight against Menshevism and it had as its fundamental task, the task of assuring the *proletarian character of the party*. Decades of struggle against petty bourgeois Narodnikism enabled Bolshevism at the decisive moment, i.e. the moment of open struggle for power, to destroy the S.R.'s with a single blow, taking possession of their agrarian program and drawing the peasant masses behind the party. This political expropriation of the S.R.'s was the necessary premise for the economic expropriation of the landlords and the bourgeoisie. It is quite self-evident that the path which certain American comrades are ready to follow has nothing in common with the paths of Bolshevism. For a young and weak Communist Party, lacking in revolutionary temper, to play the role of solicitor and gatherer of "progressive voters" for the Republican Senator LaFollette is to head toward the political dissolution of the party in the petty bourgeoisie. After all, opportunism expresses itself not only in moods of gradualism but also in political impatience: it frequently seeks to reap where it has not sown, to realize successes which do not correspond to its influence. Underestimation of the basic task—the development and strengthening of the proletarian character of the party—here is the basic trait of opportunism! Insufficient faith in the powers of the proletariat is the source of the fantastic leaps in the chase after the farmers which may cost the Communist Party its head. That the Communist Party must attentively follow the needs and moods of the farmers, utilizing the current crisis politically in order to extend its influence to the countryside—this is quite self-evident. But it cannot accompany the farmers and the petty bourgeoisie generally through all their political stages and zigzags, it cannot voluntarily pass through

all the illusions and disillusion, dragging after LaFollette in order to expose him later on. In the last analysis the mass of the farmers will follow the Communist Party into battle against the bourgeoisie only in the event that they are convinced that this party represents a force capable of tearing the power from the bourgeoisie. And the Communist Party can become such a force in action, and consequently also in the eyes of the farmers only as the vanguard of the proletariat and not as the tail of the Third Party.

The rapidity with which a false starting position leads to the crudest political mistakes is demonstrated by a document emanating from the so-called Organizing Committee set up in order to convene in June a congress of the Third Party for the purpose of nominating LaFollette as candidate for the post of president. The chairman of this committee is one of the leaders of the Farmer-Labor Party of the state of Minnesota; its secretary is a Communist, assigned to this work by the Communist Party. And now this Communist has lent his signature to a Manifesto which in appealing to the "progressive voters" declares that the aim of the movement is to attain "national political unity"; and which in defending itself against charges that the campaign is under the control of the Communists, declares that the Communists comprise an insignificant minority and that even were they to try to seize the leadership they could never succeed inasmuch as the "party" aims to obtain constructive legislation and not any utopias. And for these middle class abominations the Communist Party assumes responsibility before the eyes of the working class! In the name of what? In the name of this, that the inspirers of this monstrous opportunism, who are thoroughly imbued with skepticism toward the American proletariat, are impatiently seeking to transfer the party's center of gravity into a farmer milieu that is being shaken by the agrarian crisis. By underwriting, even if with reservations, the worst illusions of the petty bourgeoisie, it is not at all difficult to create for oneself the illusion of wielding influencing over the petty bourgeoisie. To think that Bolshevism consists of this is to understand nothing about Bolshevism.\*

\*The Executive Committee of the Communist International naturally rejected this policy which is so false to the core and so extremely dangerous. The decision of the ECCI was quite opportune. A few days following its adoption, Senator LaFollette came out with a rabid attack on the Communists and plausibly declared that he wanted to have nothing to do with any undertaking with which these rascals, this Red spawn of Beelzebub and of Moscow were connected. Let us hope that this lesson will not prove unfruitful for certain super-clever strategists.—L.T., June 4, 1924.

**Ready for Delivery Now**  
Bound Volume  
of  
**FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**  
for  
1943

Price \$4.50

Order Now From  
BUSINESS MANAGER  
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL  
116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

It is hard to forecast how long the present zone of conciliationism will endure. But at all events, there cannot even be talk of bourgeois Europe's ability to restore economic equilibrium both within itself as well as with the United States. In relation to the problem of reparations there is being made, to be sure, a larg-scale attempt for a conciliationist solution. The coming of the left bloc to power in France adds strength to this attempt. But the fundamental contradiction of the entire problem still remains: in order to pay, Germany must export; in order to pay a great deal Germany must export a great deal; but German exports are a threat to those of England and France. In order to regain the possibility of a victorious struggle on the European market, which has been extremely narrowed down, the German bourgeoisie would have to overcome gigantic internal difficulties, and this, in its turn, cannot fail to be accompanied by a new aggravation of the class struggle. On the other hand, France herself has monstrous debts which she has not begun to pay. In order to begin paying, France must intensify her exports, i.e. increase England's difficulties in the field of foreign trade. Meanwhile England herself has barely reached 75 percent of her pre-war exports. In the face of the basic economic, political and military problems the conciliationist government of MacDonald discloses its bankruptcy to a far greater degree than might have been expected. Needless to say matters will not be much better in the case of the left bloc government in France. Europe's impasse, which is now being camouflaged by international and internal deals, will once again disclose itself in its revolutionary essence. Without doubt, the Communist Parties will prove better prepared for that moment. The recent parliamentary elections in a number of countries show that Communism already represents a mighty historical force and that this force is growing!

May 20, 1924

Read these historic documents:  
**SOCIALISM ON TRIAL**

By JAMES P. CANNON

112 pages —:— Indexed —:— 10 cents

**IN DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM**

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

95 pages —:— 10 cents

**DEFENSE POLICY IN THE  
MINNEAPOLIS TRIAL**

1—A Criticism by Grandizo Munis

2—An Answer by James P. Cannon

64 pages —:— 20 cents

**WHY WE ARE IN PRISON**

Farewell speeches of the defendants

56 pages —:— 10 cents

**PIONEER PUBLISHERS**

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

# Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

## IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM

*(Against the Petty-Bourgeois Opposition)*

Trotsky's last works, contained in this invaluable volume, are among the most lucid expositions of the Marxist methods of thinking and the Bolshevik principles of organization. Presenting the Fourth International's analysis of the Soviet Union and the reasons for the defense of the U.S.S.R. against imperialist attack, Trotsky wrote these articles and letters which stand out as the most brilliant Marxist polemic against the petty-bourgeois revisionists who broke away from the Socialist Workers' Party in 1939-40.

240 pages, cloth \$2.00, paper \$1.50

## THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AFTER LENIN

This volume written in Trotsky's customary brilliant style clearly explains the programmatic issues that brought about the split in the Communist International. Included in this volume is Trotsky's criticism of the official program of the Communist International adopted at its Sixth World Congress (1928). It was around the counter-program put forth in this criticism that the Trotskyist Opposition rallied. It is one of the basic documents of the Fourth International.

327 pages, cloth \$2.00

## Just published FASCISM—

● What it is ● How to fight it!

*with an introduction by E. R. Frank*

This pamphlet includes sections of the writings of Leon Trotsky on fascism, under what conditions it is organized, what classes support it, who controls the fascist movement, the aims—and purposes of—fascism and how the working class can organize to crush it.

The pamphlet also includes a timely introduction on the significance and purpose of the recent trial of fascists in Washington and the problem of fascism in the United States.

48 pages, paper \$1.15

## STALINISM AND BOLSHEVISM

This great essay by Trotsky lays bare the fraudulent contention that Stalinism and Bolshevism are the same or that Stalinism grew out of "errors" inherent in Bolshevism.

40 pages, paper \$1.10

## LESSONS OF OCTOBER

The most concise exposition ever written of Lenin's strategy in the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 and the opposition it encountered among some of the other leaders of the Russian Communist Party. Trotsky relates his analysis of the 1917 victory in Russia to the 1923 defeats in Germany and Bulgaria.

125 pages, cloth \$1.00, paper \$.75

## WHITHER FRANCE

Trotsky's writings on the French political and economic crisis from 1934 to 1936 which culminated in the great mass strike of May-June 1936. It includes the article—which the Blum government tried to suppress—urging the French workers to form Committees of Action leading to Soviets of workers and peasants.

160 pages, cloth \$1.00, paper \$.75

## IN DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

*A Compilation: 1927-1937*

A collection of writings and speeches intended to establish the *reality* of the author's standpoint. From them the reader can judge the extent to which Trotsky's real position corresponds to the real interests of the working class movement in general, and specifically, to the interests of the Soviet Union and its unconditional defense against imperialist attack.

40 pages, paper \$1.10

## THEIR MORALS AND OURS

The first systematic exposition of the Marxist conception of the relation between means and ends as a dialectical interrelation. A revealing contrast of the anti-working class morals of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals with the Bolshevik morals which they condemn.

48 pages, paper \$2.00

## WAR AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

A fundamental document on the war—the product of capitalism—and the only program capable of eliminating it, the program of Revolutionary Socialism. The draft thesis of the International Communist League (precursor of the Fourth International) adopted by the International Secretariat in 1934.

36 pages, paper \$1.10

# PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

Just Published!

This book, appearing four years after the death of Leon Trotsky, testifies to the vitality of the movement founded upon the ideas of the great revolutionary Marxist. The volume is a history of the origin and development of Trotskyism in the United States. James P. Cannon, the author, is the founder of the American Trotskyist organization.

**Cloth \$2.75, paper \$2.00**

The  
**HISTORY  
of  
AMERICAN  
TROTSKYISM**

*report of a  
participant*

by *James P. Cannon*

**PIONEER PUBLISHERS N.Y.**

**PIONEER PUBLISHERS**

116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.