

**The New** \_\_\_\_\_  
**INTERNATIONAL**

**August • 1942**

**NOTES OF THE MONTH**

***THE REVOLT IN INDIA***

*By Henry Judd*

***TOMORROW IN AMERICA***

*By Harry Allen*

**TROTSKY'S STRUGGLE . . . *By Max Shachtman***

**An Answer to the Stalinist Critics**

*By Leon Trotsky*

**SINGLE COPY 20c**

**ONE YEAR \$1.50**

## FOR THE RECORD!

*The Bound Volume Bargain  
of the Century!*

**NOW AVAILABLE!**

## LABOR ACTION

(Covering 1940 and 1941—All Copies)

## THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

(Also Covering 1940 and 1941)

**Both Together for \$4.00**

(Including Mailing)

**or \$2.50 for each Volume separately**

Send Orders to: **LABOR ACTION**  
**114 West 14th St.**  
**New York, N. Y.**

*Printed Index For*

## NEW INTERNATIONAL

VOLUMES VI AND VII



**APRIL 1940—DECEMBER 1941**

ARRANGED BY AUTHOR, COUNTRY AND SUBJECT



**Price Ten Cents . . . Order Now!**

*Limited Supply*

## THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

*A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism*

Vol. VIII

No. 7, Whole No. 66

Published monthly by NEW INTERNATIONAL Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. Telephone: CHelsea 2-9681. Subscription rates: \$1.50 per year; bundles, 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and foreign: \$1.75 per year; bundles, 16c for 5 and up. Entered as second-class matter July 10, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

*Editor: ALBERT GATES*

### TABLE OF CONTENTS:

#### Notes of the Month:

#### THE REVOLT IN INDIA

*By H. J.* ..... 195

#### Articles:

#### TOMORROW IN AMERICA

*By H. Allen* ..... 198

#### TROTSKY'S STRUGGLE AGAINST STALINISM

*By Max Shachtman* ..... 203

#### MYTH OF THE UNITED NATIONS

*By Henry Judd* ..... 205

#### A LABOR BASE FOR NEGRO STRUGGLE

*By Ria Stone* ..... 207

#### THE POLISH WORKERS HAVE THE FLOOR

*By J. W. Smith* ..... 211

#### WORLD WAR I IN RETROSPECT—III

*By H. Allen and R. Stone* ..... 212

NOTES FROM URUGUAY ..... 216

#### Archives of the Revolution:

#### AN ANSWER TO THE STALINIST CRITICS

*By Leon Trotsky* ..... 217

#### Books in Review:

#### MAKE-BELIEVE WAR?

*By Ben Hall* ..... 222

#### WIN THE WAR, WIN THE PEACE

*By R. Craine* ..... 223

## THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Requires the JULY, AUGUST and SEPTEMBER, all in the year 1941, copies of the magazine for binding purposes. We will appreciate your sending these copies to:

**THE NEW INTERNATIONAL**  
**114 West 14th Street** **New York City**

# THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME VIII

AUGUST, 1942

NUMBER 7

## NOTES OF THE MONTH

### The Revolt in India

Whatever may be the outcome of the civil disobedience and nationalist struggles in India—whether reactionary British imperialism succeeds in its effort to crush the movement by sheer brute force, or whether the crisis deepens and, extending itself to larger layers of the population (the proletarian and peasant masses), begins to assume the characteristics of a social revolution and a struggle for political power—whatever may be the outcome of the struggle, it is clear that this movement represents the first great revolutionary upheaval during the course of the Second World War.

Lenin, writing in 1916 of the Irish Easter Rebellion, vigorously aligned himself with this national insurrection against British imperialism and hailed the event as the first break in the imperialist slaughter, the first progressive act of the people directed against world imperialism. In precisely the same sense, revolutionary Marxists cannot but hail the first phase of the Indian Revolution as a major break in the development of the Second World War and a blow at the body of capitalist-imperialism. The fact that these events are occurring in the classic land of imperialism—the vast colonial sub-continent of India, with its 400,000,000 persons living under the backward régime of foreign imperialism, combined with Asiatic feudalism—only underscores one of the major differences between this and the First World War. *Namely, that in this war the rôle of the colonies and the colonial peoples, as stimulants of the socialist revolution, is infinitely greater and more impressive than the last time.* The repercussions of the Indian events among the colonial peoples in China, Africa, South America, etc., will further emphasize this point.

#### Nature of the Indian Events

What is occurring in India today? We are witnessing the latest stage in the unrolling of India's nationalist and revolutionary movement—a movement that has been progressing, in fits and spurts, since the Russian Revolution of 1917. Or, to state it more exactly, *the first, most elementary and initial stages of the bourgeois democratic phase of the Indian Revolution have begun.* The first confused and chaotic steps of the revolution, marred by a strong element of spontaneity and leaderlessness, are nevertheless significant and stamp the character and quality of the future movement. In this sense, the first events in India are vastly promising and hopeful.

In the first place, the Indian proletariat, a proletariat which has grown rapidly in size, weight in the national economy and experience since the last civil disobedience move-

ment of 1931-33, has come rapidly to the fore and has already played a leading rôle in the strikes that have rocked Bombay, Ahmedabad, Allahabad, Poona and all the leading industrial centers of the nation. The workers, side by side with the radical students and left petty bourgeoisie, have taken the movement out of the hands of the conservative bourgeois nationalist leadership (Gandhi-Nehru-Azad) for the time being at least, and are themselves carrying the torch of the national struggle.

In the second place, the spontaneity and dramatic character of the movement, as well as its All-India character, extending from one end of the country to the other, have revealed the depths of national anti-imperialist feeling, as well as a complete distrust and disgust with the cowardly vacillations of the bourgeois Congress leadership. The prompt and vigorous response of the masses in the key centers has shown their desire to struggle for independence now, no matter what the price. We are dealing here with a movement that has sunk the deepest possible roots and that intimately affects every worker and poor peasant in the country's 400,000,000 population.

And in the third place, this movement has begun, in the sense of proletarian, mass combativity, where all the others left off. Previously (1921, 1931, etc.) the Congress Party has embarked cautiously, step by step, on each new campaign. Anxious not to arouse the revolutionary sentiments of the masses, the Congress sought its base of operations among the merchants, clerks, students, professionals in the cities, and the small, land-holding farmers (*kisans*) in the rural areas. The working and peasant masses were sucked into the movement, so to speak, only as a final threat before the inevitable compromise and capitulation on the part of Congress to the British imperialists.

#### Workers in Lead

But today, in the arena of world capitalist crisis where the rôle of the colonial bourgeoisie becomes feebler and counter-revolutionary virtually from the start of the struggle, *it is the workers and poor peasants who fight the battles virtually from the start!* What a devastating answer to those critics and renegades from Marxism who deny the revolutionary capacities and leadership qualities of the working class! The British masters recognize this difference. This is why they precipitate such bloody clashes, why they seek to uproot and wipe out the movement at its inception, no matter how. If the movement continues, grows and takes more solid organizational form, the imperialists realize they will face tens of millions of militant, frenzied workers and peasants who will stop at nothing to gain their revolutionary independence. In a word, this movement has begun on a much higher and more advanced stage of the class struggle. The Indian proletariat is not merely challenging the foreign bourgeoisie; it is challenging its own native bourgeoisie for hegemony over the bourgeois democratic revolution! This is, in essence, the putting into practice of the theory of the permanent revolution. Only

this can account for the particularly violent and bloody aspects of this struggle from the start.

But it would be radically wrong to ignore and fail to analyze two great hindrances that lie in the revolutionary path to a workers' and peasants' India. We have in mind *inner* hindrances, rather than the obvious obstacles of British imperialist rule and authority, and the hovering threat of invasion by Japanese imperialism. Nevertheless, the successful surmounting of these *outer* obstacles depends upon the ability of the Indian masses to defeat these two enemies that stand in its path: (1) The colonial native capitalist class; (2) the Stalinists. These two forces, particularly the former, represent the gravest threat to the movement and must be openly fought.

The opposition of the native bourgeoisie (*politically* centered around the right-wing of the Congress) has already taken an overt form. This opposition consists of fear and terror regarding the violent and drastic nature of the struggle, and the leading participation of the masses. The *New York Times* reports the conspicuous absence of the traditional, middle aged, white-capped Gandhists from the demonstrating crowds. Merchants are reported to be re-opening their shops. The Associated Press reports: "Indian reporters close to the All-India Congress said its members, for the most part, still were standing apart from the rioting and that many were concerned over the bloody turn. . . ." (August 13). Bearing in mind that the composition of the Congress is overwhelmingly petty-bourgeois in character (small merchants, clerks, students, professionals, etc.) this report indirectly reflects the character of the present movement.

### **Bourgeois Pro-Japan?**

Yet, what was it that forced the hand of the Congress (the Indian bourgeoisie) and made it take steps that—*despite its desire*—precipitated the violent clashes? In our opinion, the causes are two: (1) The threat of Japanese invasion accompanied by a growing pro-Japanese sentiment among the population; (2) the insistence and unquenchable demand of the people that a national struggle should be launched immediately. It became necessary for Gandhi, political leader of the Indian bourgeoisie, to *act* or else be swept aside by other elements. In this respect the Mahatma is infinitely more shrewd and farsighted than the pitiful and cowardly Nehru!

The successes of Japanese imperialism have had an impressive effect upon the Indian capitalist class. Coupled with the defeats and astounding weaknesses of the British, the native bourgeoisie (or an influential section of it, even if we exclude those merchants and industrialists who are benefitting by large British war orders) has lost confidence in the ruling imperialist power. It sees the British Empire staggering and tottering under endless blows. Yet—being an abortive product of capitalism in its permanent decline—this native bourgeoisie is unable and unprepared to take over power. It is too small, too weak, too divided, too undernourished—a lightweight contender in the heavyweight struggle for power in India.

*But it does not wish to tie its fate to that of a doomed, bankrupt imperialist power—the British Empire.* Therefore, beyond a doubt, the Indian bourgeoisie is casting about for a new master to which it may subordinate itself; a new power before which it may lay its claim for junior partnership in the exploitation of the country. Obviously, that new power is the greatly expanded Japanese Empire! It is impossible to say whether a "deal" or tacit understanding has been reached

with Japanese imperialism, but it is clear that doubly-parasitic Indian capitalism is seriously pondering the question.

At the same time, the Congress bourgeois leadership has done everything in its power to sabotage and disorganize the struggle against imperialism:

(1) It conducted aimless, futile negotiations with the renegade socialist, Sir Stafford Cripps. The Cripps mission—now clearly seen as a gigantic hoax and stage-play perpetrated by Churchill—succeeded in out-maneuvering the Congress leadership before world opinion and spreading about the idea that the British *really* had offered something, which a divided India had rejected. "In the broader sense, Sir Stafford Cripps has had success. He has fixed the eyes of the world upon the realities of the Indian problem. He has enlightened the American people, who in the past have been woefully misled as to British policy. . . ." (*Great Britain and the East.*) Such are the cynical claims of an English imperialist journal.

Yet, as Congress President Azad stated in his letter to Cripps on April 11: "It seems that there has been a progressive deterioration in the British government's attitude as our negotiations proceeded. What we were told in our very first talk with you is now denied or explained away. You told me then that there would be a national government which would function as a cabinet. . . . The whole of this picture which you (at the first talk) sketched before us has now been completely shattered. . . ." A disappointed bourgeois, prepared to sell himself, but let down by the prospective purchaser at the last minute! It is no surprise that in the months that passed between the collapse of the Cripps mission and the outbreak of the present struggle, the Congress took not a step toward (a) organizationally preparing the masses; (b) working out a clear political and social program around which to build the struggle. Gandhi, Nehru, Azad and their conservative cohorts bear the responsibility for this.

(2) Up to the very last moment, every possible measure, gesture and step was taken to arrive at an agreement. The original resolution of Gandhi (written by him on July 15) calling for the national struggle was militant and aggressive in tone. It spoke of "our duty to wipe out our unemployment, to bridge the gulf between the rich and the poor, to banish communal strife, to excise the demon of untouchability. . . ." It spoke of a "workers' and peasants' republic." It demanded that the British government remove its troops, as well as the unwanted American troops. "It is a crying shame to bring foreign troops in, in spite of India's inexhaustible manpower, and it is proof of the immorality that British imperialism is."

But by the time that this resolution had reached the final stage and was adopted by the All-India Congress Committee (the day before the arrest of Gandhi and the leadership of the Congress), it had been watered down beyond recognition. Instead, feeble and watery protests; requests to serve the imperialist master ("I am England's best friend"—Gandhi); urgent pleading for last minute intervention from Roosevelt, Chiang Kai-shek and even (!) Ambassador Maisky! Frightened by the perspective and specter of a violent struggle, the Congress bourgeoisie recoiled in terror and sank back to a position of utter willingness to serve the foreign exploiter—if only for a few crumbs. But the workers spoke a different language! The native bourgeoisie can offer the people nothing; neither leadership, nor program, nor organization, nor hope for the future other than coming under the domination of another, equally perfidious imperialist power.

We have mentioned above another dangerous obstacle in

the path of the Indian people—the Communist Party of India (the Stalinists). Recently legalized by the Viceroy (what a coincidence!) these agents of the Russian régime are conducting an openly counter-revolutionary campaign among the workers and within the Congress. “We Indian Communists are trying our hardest to convince our fellow patriots that the course of action suggested by the Congress leadership does not lead to our freedom, but cuts our nation away from freedom’s battle, divides the progressive forces in Britain and India and only helps strengthen the obstinacy of the imperialists...” (Statement of the Indian Communist Party, Bombay.) While hundreds of their “fellow patriots” die under British gunfire, the Stalinists urge them to drop the struggle, accept the British offer and place themselves at the service of the United Nations. The fact that the students—who until recently were mainly influenced by the All-India Students Federation (a Stalinist-controlled movement)—are playing such a leading rôle in the movement will indicate the response given to these open agents of imperialism. Yet the Stalinists still represent a great threat to the masses. They will attempt to sow confusion from within, particularly among the trade union workers in the great industrial centers of Bombay, Cawnpore, Nagpur, Calcutta, etc. Aided by the British authorities, who will give them all the publicity and assistance they could possibly need, they will try to undermine the militancy of the workers and peasants in a hundred foul and insidious ways.

A gallery of notables, including Pearl Buck, Dorothy Thompson, Walter Lippmann and Raymond Clapper, have unhesitatingly spoken the mind of the American tribe of liberals on the “Indian Question.” Without exception they have “deplored” and “regretted” the violent effort of British imperialism to crush this progressive nationalist movement; all have spoken of the *necessity* to do this. Pearl Buck—that substantial and sincere friend of all the darker races—says that “Both England and India say they are agreed on freedom. The disagreement apparently is on timing and administration during the war.” The English terror is a misunderstanding on *timing!* Dorothy Thompson, the female schizophreniac of the *New York Post*, writes that “Mr. Gandhi had the choice of the *being a rebel* or a revolutionary. He has chosen to be a rebel.” Lest this confuse the reader, by being a “revolutionary” Miss Thompson means that Gandhi should forego India’s cause and support the United Nations. Walter Lippmann has repeated at length the familiar British propagandist arguments about Indian disunity, Hindu-Moslem discord, etc. All, all have—each in his particular manner—supported the whitewashing editorial policy of the bourgeois press.

But it took the Social-Democratic *New Leader* to reach a new low in social-patriotic treachery and insolence. Virtually an entire issue of the Rand School’s rag was devoted to a vulgar slandering of the Indian people and its nationalist leadership. Where *even* the bourgeois press hesitated before the extreme slander of labeling Gandhi and his group as “Japanese-Axis agents,” the decrepit old nags of the *New Leader* did not hesitate! Where the British authorities only went so far as to say that the Congress Party represents only a minority of the nation, the Social-Democrats did not flinch from publishing an article that attempted to “prove” that the Congress exploits the Indian masses, rather than the British *raj!* Let it never be said that Algernon Lee did not walk in where imperialists fear to tread! In this policy, of course, the American Social-Democrats are simply following the line of their associates in the British Labor Party—those notorious gentlemen who sit conspicuously with Churchill and applaud his every action and crime.

In the United States, let it be recorded for the future, only two working-class political organizations have come out unqualifiedly in support of the Indian people and their just demands. The Workers Party and the Socialist Workers Party have, in statements to the American proletariat, condemned the imperialist terror and stood by the side of India’s masses. In taking this elementary step of solidarity, the tradition of revolutionary internationalism and support to workers in all lands has been kept alive. But more than this is involved. In the first place, there are thousands of American troops in India—troops whose presence is greatly suspect to the Indian people. Thus, in a direct sense, the “Indian Question” is also an American question.

American imperialism for its own purposes is remaining apart from the issues, but this is only to keep its skirts clean enough to lend plausibility to an attempt to arbitrate the problem at a future date and in its own special interests. Such arbitration as may be attempted can have only one objective in mind—to keep the Indian people in bondage under a high-sounding but deceptive formula. (“We guarantee and underwrite your freedom after the war is over.”) America is involved in the question; America will become more deeply involved because this is a total and global war in which every major development cannot but *directly and immediately* influence all the component parts that make up the war.

### **Main Struggle Yet to Come**

We cannot emphasize too strongly the fact that the major struggles on the revolutionary road are yet to come in India. The August days are the prelude to the broader and more sweeping nationalist and class battles that will shake this sub-continent to its foundations. The movement cannot be killed; it can only be momentarily halted or pushed back a slight distance. The social forces at work, the effect of the war, the national aspirations of 400,000,000 people cannot be counteracted by the bayonets and bullets of a mere handful of white imperialist soldiers, aided by auxiliary mercenary troops. Even the isolated and sealed “Indian Army” will split wide open and will take sides as the inevitable movement rolls on.

The great task in India is *fundamentally* the same task that faces the proletariat in every country. That is, the creation of a mass revolutionary party to lead the people. A revolutionary party—the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India—already exists, but it does not yet influence broad masses of workers and peasants. Yet this party was formed in India during the course of the war, under the most difficult circumstances of British repression and illegality. The very fact that it could organize itself, pull itself together out of the many confused and contradictory Marxist elements that lie scattered all over the country and then, in a brilliant analytical and programmatic thesis (see *The NEW INTERNATIONAL*, March-April, 1942) clearly present the tasks of the Indian Revolution—this is a sign of growing maturity in the Indian proletariat. Now comes the enormously difficult task of finding a way to the workers and peasants, based upon the powerful ideas of the permanent revolution and the struggle for the seizure of political power. Nobody can say whether the Bolshevik-Leninists of India will succeed; everybody who knows these people understands that they will not flinch for a moment, that they will prove resourceful and courageous under fire. This must not be another Spain, where the proletariat failed. The Indian revolutionists, now in the midst of battle, will see to that!

H. J.

# Tomorrow in America

. . . If U. S. Imperialism Wins

The First World War ended in a victory of Anglo-American and French imperialism, the defeat of German and the emergence of the Bolshevik Revolution as the one beacon light of the masses.

Between the first and second world imperialist conflicts, German imperialism revived and under the leadership of Hitler is striving for world domination. The origins and cause of the Second World War demonstrate that the problems and difficulties of the capitalist nations were not resolved in the first war—indeed were accentuated to an extreme. The death battle now being fought is to establish, if possible, the unquestioned domination of the world by American or German imperialism, British imperialism having already become definitely subordinated to the United States. Whether or not a third imperialist holocaust will be visited upon society is contingent upon the consciousness or actions of the proletariat and all the oppressed peoples during the course of the war itself and after—toward the achievement of world socialism.

This article concerns itself with the hopes and plans of the American bourgeoisie in the event of an American victory in the war, indicating almost exclusively the domestic aspects of their policy.

*The length of the war, it goes without saying, will color the character of the world and the form of any peace, primarily in the sense that it will determine the degree of desperation to which both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat will be driven.* The duration of the war has been estimated by bourgeois spokesmen anywhere from five to fifteen years (Baruch) to forty (!) years (Ambassador Joseph P. Davies and Donald M. Nelson). Little wonder, then, that the ideas or proposals for peace (e.g., the Atlantic Charter) have been nebulous and platitudinous—since the bourgeoisie is sure only of its main objective—to maintain the capitalist set-up, and will decide its tactics, methods and slogans according to the concrete situation (militancy of the proletariat in the defeated countries, existence of revolutionary proletariat at home, existence of workers' states abroad, stage of colonial revolutions, etc.). Howsoever clouded in sonorous phrases of freedom and liberty, all proposals are definitely imperialist in their economic aspects and include a good big police club as an essential adjunct—since "justice" as the password is not sufficient to disguise exploitation as the practice.

Pope Pius XIII, in his broadcast from Vatican City, June 13, 1942, showed his clear understanding that any imperialist peace proposals are the equivalent of scraps of paper. Said he:

We well know how, in the present state of affairs, the formulation of specific proposals for a just and equitable peace would not have any well-founded probability of success. Indeed, every time that one speaks a word of peace, one runs the risk of offending one or the other side. . . . In fact, while one side bases its security on the results obtained, the other rests its hopes on future battles.

This statement is as true of political-economic conflict as it is of military battles. For the key imperialist nations, America and Germany, have an identical problem of imperialist expansion to resolve, with war today as the means toward that end.

The sharp, swift growth of the power of American monopoly capitalism prior to the war has exhibited itself clearly during the war itself. The centralization of capital (its inter-

national centralization in fact, e.g., the international cartels) has proceeded rapidly, with little business being forced to and through the wall. Big business (bankers, *et al.*), viewing the economic order through world eyes and not just national eyes, understands that an attempt at the greatest economic expansion in American history is in order, and is imperative if it is to exist and maintain its system. In other words, whatever propaganda and lip-service to bread, butter, milk and security, political freedom, etc., may indicate to the contrary, the American bourgeoisie must proceed in the post-war period to super-exploit the world's toilers in other lands, while continuing to exploit the American workers. For American imperialism, running true to form, it is as much a case of *expand or bust* as it is with German imperialism.

## "Planned" Super-Exploitation of World

American imperialism aims to dominate the entire world—and not simply the colonies or undeveloped areas—in the economic-political-military sense. More specifically, it intends to police and ration the world in order to maintain the capitalist world. "Feed the world," yes, that will be the task of American imperialism after the war, if proletarian revolution does not conquer; feed the world just enough to keep the people strong enough to work, but too weak to break through capitalism's weakened chains and reorganize the world on socialist foundations.

To police the world, to feed the world "in return for its labor" (*New York Times*, June 24), to develop the super-exploitation of the masses in Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America, etc., American imperialism will introduce more and more state-capitalist controls into the economic processes in relation to foreign trade and investment. International banks and cartels, dominated as they will be by American capital, will be closely linked with government boards of economic warfare (or welfare, as they may be called in the post-war period).

Such rigid supervision may produce a temporary "stabilization" for a period. But the process of such "stabilization" is two-fold. Either a revived or insurgent imperialism attempts to arise out of the defeated or subordinate powers to pit itself against American imperialism—or a revolutionary proletariat arises, equally seeking an outlet from American imperialism but not on the same terms, since it must carry out its struggle against all imperialisms. Through more intense use and development of the means of production, through further rationalization, through industrial revival of economically destroyed countries and through the industrialization of undeveloped areas, the weight and numbers of the industrial proletariat will be greatly increased (*relative to a native bourgeoisie which may be completely helpless*). The organization of the proletariat for its own ends takes place over all obstacles. The proletariat, despite all defeats, rises again and again, like Phoenix from the ashes, but wiser; and moves again on its historic road toward social emancipation. There is no peace, no cessation of struggle in this world—without the achievement of world socialism. The choices are as before: either rival imperialisms plunging the world into the Third Imperialist World War or the international socialist revolution.

The imperialist world of tomorrow is an utterly black one. The America of tomorrow, if it remains capitalist, is also an utterly black one\* — bureaucratic, militaristic, totalitarian. Those who dismiss the bureaucratic-militaristic-totalitarian trends of the war period as episodic and remediable in a post-war period are talking of a period which will never come under capitalism. The capitalist "tomorrow" about and for which liberals desperately speculate and plan is either only an interval between wars or an indefinitely protracted war.

### Government Regulation Protects Big Business

Accompanying state capitalist trends in regard to international affairs will be comparable developments in the domestic economy. The authoritative National Resources Planning Board, speaking through its director, C. W. Eliot, asserts that it will be necessary to maintain many of the economic controls made necessary by the war (*New York Times*, June 15). He is right. The war is only hastening the process of governmental interventions and controls over the economy of imperialism. While, possibly, some of the more obviously superfluous governmental agencies may be lopped off as the result of experience, the demands of any remaining arch-individualists of capitalism will fall on deaf ears. Capitalist anarchy, even and especially under a monopolistic capitalism, requires regulation through its political instrument, the state or government, in order to prevent utter chaos. To use the phrase of Herbert Hoover, "the economic measures necessary to win total war" which "are just plain fascist economics," will prove equally necessary in the post-war economy of American imperialism, whatever democratic political forms may exist to delude the masses as to the realities of life (because the masses will yet be strong enough to require delusion).

One Professor Cumberland may continue to demand that American capitalism "get rid of planners, government controls, high taxes, etc.," but the professor thinks of a world of *laissez-faire* capitalism that was on its way out years ago, and is now definitely through, with only lingering, passing manifestations of "rugged individualism" in American economy. Those frontiers have been crossed, never to return. Big business, *big, big business*, rules the roost and will continue to do so as long as capitalist society remains.

The war has only accelerated the process of centralization and concentration of industry and finance into the dominant hands of finance capital. The post-war period will not change but continue this development under more aggravated conditions: namely, social crisis; vast unemployment or its state capitalist equivalent, relief-unemployment or forced labor; demobilization of millions from the armed forces (though probably not all), etc. Even if the desire may be there to placate a distraught and ever-weakening middle class, no one has yet devised a way to turn back the clock of economic development for long. The reality today is that "twenty-four thousand small manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers might be

forced out of business by priorities orders and war needs by October 1" (Philip D. Reed, chief of the war industries branch of the War Production Board before the House of Representatives Small Business Committee, July 9). These small businesses will not return after the war. The National Association of Manufacturers' nine-point program for business and labor (*New York Times*, June 27) bluntly advises the government to "refuse to subsidize distressed industries." These smaller industries, struggling hopelessly in competition with the large, powerful concerns, are vanishing—and will continue to in accordance with the relentless course of a pyramiding and whirling economic structure that throws off its excess debris, once a part of the whole. This structure, this top, appears like a healthy organism while it spins; only when it topples does one observe that it is top-heavy (monopoly capitalism) and that it has tossed all else aside.

### Manufacturers Want Guaranteed Profits

Business and political leaders are aware that government intervention into business is unavoidable. Note the trends and tremendous increases in government subsidization and aid to capital. At least one-third of the nation lives in 4,500,000 tenement, rural shacks, hovels, etc. Nathan Straus, former administrator of the U.S. Housing Authority, proposes that the government subsidize a vast post-war housing program. Bonds would be sold to banks, private investors, etc. The "only cost" would be the *annual subsidies, which would last for sixty years*. Similarly, Germany guarantees the six per cent profits to its businessmen. This indeed is not "competition" with private business. The government does the job and hands over the interest-profit to business in view of the latter's "investment" and "risks" in government-guaranteed housing bonds. The Strauss housing proposal demonstrates the utter uselessness of private property instruments in the creation of social values and needs of the people. They are only vultures who gorge on six per cent interest-bearing bonds.

The manufacturers, like all true-blue business men, want their profits continued, in fact, *guaranteed*, in the post-war period. First, they insist upon refund of a substantial percentage of the excess profits taxes. Second, they generously permit themselves allowances for "reserves and contingency funds" though the cost of their machinery and fixed capital is already entered as part of their cost and therefore fully provided for. The crowning point, however, is the stipulation that post-war conditions are not to be allowed to endanger unfulfilled war contracts existing at the end of the war. These, according to the second point on the manufacturers program, shall be carried out by the government in any case. Heads I win, tails you lose.

While taking such elaborate precautions for their own self-protection after the war, the manufacturers stipulate that wages are only to be "as high as post-war conditions warrant." Evidently the manufacturers' eyes are on labor's demands. They don't like minimum wage requirements, preferring the keen competition of unemployed millions for jobs. As they so euphemistically put it in Point 5 of their nine-point program: "Labor and capital can prosper only when prices of goods and labor" result in an adequate encouragement of expansion of production. In other words, they won't assume the initiative in stimulating and expanding production unless they are "encouraged" (bribed) to do so by adequate profits obtained by chiseling down the wages of labor.

The manufacturers' aim is to relax the vigilance of labor

\*The black picture to be indicated, while amply demonstrable for economic trends, is far from consummated so far as trends in all other aspects are concerned. The intensity of the class struggle on the morrow, the degree of economic, social and political desperation in relation to the aspirations of labor, will determine the rapidity with which American capitalism will turn to extended, broad totalitarian methods and instruments to attempt to preserve itself as a class. It is, however, entirely legitimate and necessary for the revolutionary movement to take note of these unquestionable totalitarian trends of American capitalism and to prepare the proletariat for defense and offense. Further, it must be said that any plans of the imperialists to achieve an organization of their anarchic system of production and distribution will fail, as they failed following the First World War. This inevitable failure is rooted objectively in the contradictions of capitalist production and subjectively in the inevitable collisions of the proletariat with capitalist rule.

now and thus to create, if possible, a condition of extreme organizational weakness in labor in the post-war period. In this objective they have the assistance of the Westbrook Pegler of the Administration—Thurman Arnold—who delineates a post-war capitalist society flowing with milk and honey, in which there will be presumably plenty for labor. Arnold, therefore, accompanies his hosannas to a rosy capitalist future with persistent attacks on labor's efforts to protect itself by preserving its organizational strength.

### Government Controls Weaken Labor

The policy of the present Administration in respect to labor is increasingly to draw the labor organizations into dependence upon it. But the continued penetration of one or another governmental agency (e.g., WLB, OPA) into the processes or struggles of labor *versus* the employers contributes to devitalizing and corroding healthy, living unionism. The labor unions need to shake themselves loose from the grip of governmental domination and influence, or they will wittingly or unwittingly become the instruments of the imperialists. That is, unionism, if it is to live and develop, must proceed along independent class lines, including a politically independent rôle. Unionism which cannot move or make decisions without governmental approval, or constant government intervention of various agencies or description, can in the end result in a modified form of "corporate unionism."

The government is not a neutral agency. It represents capitalist interests and objectives. It presents a front of benevolent government toward some of its creations, such as the National Youth Administration, Works Progress Administration, CCC camps etc., where it is the employer of labor at wage standards far below normal rates. Yet, although not *expressly* forbidden in the case of NYA and WPA, the government makes it most clear that any attempts at strikes for the redress of grievances or the economic improvement of their lot meet with the strong disapproval of the government and will result in the removal of the workers from their jobs. Thus the government, presumably standing above the classes, functions in such bodies as an intimidatory or outright strike-breaking agency. The extension of this outlook and practice can be looked for in the next period as one or another of the departments of government become an employer-government instrument. Through such means are developed further the bureaucratic-authoritarian characteristics of the bourgeois ruling class and its state instrument, making it even more imperative for labor to endeavor to establish its independent identity and means of struggle for the future.

Moreover, when labor already—for reasons of "national defense" or "national unity" or any other cause—lets rest or gives up its most powerful weapon—the right to strike; when it leans or depends on Administration or government agencies for support of its needs—it first of all obviously weakens its fighting strength and powers of resistance to the employers' offensive. But equally significant and decisive in the long run, it (even if unwittingly or unwillingly) *makes it easier for the dominant imperialists to force upon labor a rôle of subservience to American internationalist-imperialist objectives*—the achievement of super-exploitation of, and super-profits from, the masses in other countries—in return for a few crumbs to American labor.

American imperialism may be able to and probably can yet afford an "appeasement" policy toward American labor, deciding definitely to "recognize" labor unionism provided

the latter limits its rôle and demands to more modest proportions. That is, American imperialism may decide to play American labor against the workers of the rest of the world, by giving American labor certain preferments, for the privilege of relative class peace, or the achievement, within limits, of class collaboration on an American scale, so long as American labor permits it to proceed unhindered to the super-exploitation of labor and the masses elsewhere. That is the manner in which "labor aristocracies" developed in the past decades. While there will not be again the comparatively affluent "labor aristocracy" of the past—based on a growing and forward-moving capitalism requiring this labor—it is conceivable, in fact probable, that an American imperialism, internationally dominant, may seek such a peace or understanding with the *officialdom* of American labor, and succeed in lulling sections of American labor to quiescence. To counterbalance this latter tendency or development, *American labor must begin to think in international terms of solidarity with all the oppressed and working peoples of the world.*

### American Labor and Super-Exploitation

Another section of the capitalist class thinks along the line of head-long collision with the American working class now and in the post-war period. F. C. Crawford, president of Thompson Products, Inc., speaking at the round table conference board of the War Labor Board (May 21), headlighted by the addresses of Herbert Hoover and Paul V. McNutt, lamented the "restrictions" imposed by labor unions on capital. Management, he declared, must find a way to put a greater number of *independent*, i.e., company unions, into the field to function on a national basis, "*Wagner Act or not.*" Professor Leo Wolman, erstwhile aide and adviser to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union of America, addressing this same conference, was concerned with whether labor unions will permit management to function properly in the post-war period in the operation and administration of industry.

However, the trend in economy and in politics is toward more governmental controls for essential capitalist aims and needs; and it is unlikely that the dissatisfied section of capital in relation to labor policy will succeed in replacing the present trends with one of open, head-on collision to smash labor unionism.

Roosevelt, the outstanding exponent of liberal bourgeois democracy from the days of the NRA till now, has understood the historical necessity for governmental, authoritarian controls or interventions into the affairs of labor and capital in order to preserve the capitalist order at all. Roosevelt realizes that a major historic function of the capitalist state is to control labor and regulate relations between the contending capitalist groups; in the process, the most powerful bourgeoisie, of course, emerges as the gainer and victor.

Imperialism inevitably breeds war, today's—and tomorrow's, with intervals of peace or "preparedness." The regimentation and militarization of both men and resources to a degree never before conceived is in character with the struggle of the imperialists to resolve their rivalries by military means. The Army and Navy authorities press for control of the productive forces of economy itself. They are not satisfied just to receive into their hands the tanks, guns, planes, etc., produced by labor in the factories. When it is observed that the Navy is the largest employer of labor in the United States today (*New York Times*, August 9), it is simple to comprehend why militarism and the militaristic concepts of life rapa-



ciously reach out for influence and domination in all walks of endeavor. Opposition within labor's ranks has until now been a major factor in preventing the extension of military influences more directly into civil affairs and the operations of industry (*New York Times*, June 27). But the House Defense Migration Committee charges and criticizes Donald M. Nelson, head of the War Production Board, for alleged "transfer of authority over procurement and production to the armed forces," contrary to Roosevelt's Executive Order of January 16 for civilian control and operations thereof. (*New York Times*, August 11). This charge or development signifies that the pressure, demands and needs of the Army and Navy military heads is proving more powerful than Executive Orders intended to stem the trends for military direction and control of industrial production.

At the same time, also, it must be noted how military concepts and controls already adversely and pertinently affect democratic and labor rights. Since certain plants are under military control the military authorities have used this pretext to deny to workers their constitutional rights to distribute leaflets and papers to aircraft and other workers. The extension of the powers of the military régime into industrial production will only result in military declarations against heretofore matter of course labor union activities, press and leaflet distributions by unions, political organizations, etc. Or, in another direction, witness the great difficulty or outright failure of members in the armed forces to receive their union publications from home. "You can't strike against the government"—a cry some labor knaves also have at is invoked to prevent strike action by dissatisfied workers—is a procedure and policy which militarists accept as divine right. The government's or state's main purpose is to serve as the executive committee of the ruling class as a whole—to keep labor in its place. The growing power of the military arm of the state in a period of *imperialist war of indefinite duration*, can only signify that the rôle of the government as *strikebreaker* (e.g., North American Aircraft) will be accentuated in the next period, particularly the utilization of the military régime for this purpose.

American imperialism is proceeding rapidly toward a militarized economy. For instance, the House voted an appropriation of forty-three billion dollars to the military, the greatest in American history, thus placing greatly increased power into the arms of the military régime. A mass army of ten to fifteen millions, perhaps more, is now in preparation for the present war. Conscription is scheduled to *remain a permanent institution after the war*. Legislation, for submission to Congress around January 1, is in preparation by Senator Wadsworth, (co-author of the present Selective Service (Conscription) Act. According to these plans, one million youth between the ages of 18 and 21 are to be trained yearly, with provision made for five years of reserve service for the conscripts. How extensive the permanent standing army and the military training program will be in the post-war period are still undecided. But the trend is obvious. Government bureaucracy on a tremendous scale, plus steady intertwining of military concepts and controls into the bureaucracy, are hastening the development of a bureaucratic-militarized economy of imperialism.

This development stands out more patently as one observes the budding plans for the conscription of the masses for industrial production. Paul V. McNutt, director of the War Manpower Division, has made this objective of the government amply clear, apparently only as a measure for this war. Babes in arms, the enfeebled and the aged alone will

find themselves exempt from either a conscripted military, industrial or agricultural force in this war, according to plans.

The régime of tomorrow, as required by the imperialist bourgeoisie, is a great governmental bureaucratic-military apparatus and régime. It would be foolish to state that all this is coming about at one fell swoop, or that every imperialist element consciously sees or desires such a development. But the steady penetration of the apparatus of government instruments, including the military, into civil and industrial spheres, must lead one to conclude that this trend is not accidental, but the course of an imperialism seeking measures to maintain an anarchic social-economic order from swifter inner corrosion and from blows from a militant working class. A totalitarian trend, far yet from being crassly fascist in form, and with the democratic trappings losing their original strength as time passes, best describes the direction of American imperialism for the post-war period.

### American "Democracy" and What It Means

Regimentation is making its way into the lives of the people, into their very homes. While this process has by no means reached the European stage, the parallel is nevertheless there. To prevent a sharply rising discontent and dissatisfaction with living costs and standards of the masses of people, while the bourgeois class reaps enormous profits and lives luxuriously, the government has introduced rationing cards on some consumer articles to insure *minimums* for the masses. Ceiling prices for many goods are also invoked for this purpose. But since they cannot actually satisfy the needs and demands of the masses with the adequate means of life or with living standards even closely commensurate with the efforts and contributions of labor, the bourgeoisie are forced to resort to direct and oblique measures of force to carry through their war objectives now, and to reinforce their economic structure. Thus come about and are observed the deprivation of civil and democratic rights of the people—directed first against easier victims—minority groups; then labor militants; and finally, generally.

Civil or democratic rights of the people, of the workers, are relative. The degree of economic prosperity of the country, even in peacetime; the intensity of the class struggle; the growing desperation of the classes trying to protect their interests—all affect the practices and life of civil rights. War, the extreme, most devastating, brutal and bloody expression of the conflicts between the rival bourgeoisie and also of the class struggle, cuts heavily into democratic rights, first as measures of "war expediency" and then as corollaries of the character and development of the imperialist post-war economy and government. No one will say that there have been wholesale deprivations of civil rights in this war so far. But not all actions may be regarded only as wartime measures. Examination of the 10,000 aliens who have been arrested so far would show that the arrests as a whole are baseless and intimidatory in purpose in respect to militant labor activities generally, and particularly by foreign-born or foreign-descent workers. Some may find it possible to regard the conviction of the members of the SWP and Teamsters Local 544 in Minneapolis as isolated and episodic. But this action, even before American entered the war, can be more correctly viewed as symptomatic of the aim of employers, government and class collaborationist-reactionary union officials to destroy the militant Minneapolis labor movement—objectively and partially subjectively pitted against the boss system.

While some may pass over the more than 1,200 persons

thus far convicted or charged with "subversive" activities, draft violations, etc., one cannot ignore another more dangerous and symptomatic action in respect to labor's rights, free speech and a free press. This concerns the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court that local authorities have the power to impose prohibitive taxation upon members of religious sects distributing literature and soliciting contributions. The group in question is Jehovah's Witnesses. It is obvious how easy can be the extension and utilization of this decision against the labor and revolutionary press. As long as such a ruling prevails, labor publications are in constant danger of being wiped out through the medium of a financial subterfuge, thus nullifying the so-called constitutional guarantees for free speech and press. That a New Deal Supreme Court legalizes such a policy adds evidence to the inroads of totalitarian and authoritarian concepts in the life of the country.

### Regimentation and Crime

The regimentation of society develops sharply under circumstances of war and social crisis, and under conditions of monopoly capitalism with its socialization of production for capitalist ends. Discipline, the draft, regulations, food "passports" (ration cards), etc., are invoked by the bourgeoisie to conduct their war and maintain "law and order." Such discipline and regulation are handed down from above to the masses, who resent such orders and demands, and defy or evade them if the penalties or dangers are not too great. Quite different is the self-discipline and order maintained by the masses themselves when they realize that regulatory measures, no matter how extreme, are in their interests; and, in fact, are initiated and fostered by themselves. For example, in times of strikes and, on an historic landscape, social revolution, the workers are the first to proceed to establish discipline and order among themselves; set up their own "law and order" committees; arm themselves for defense and offense. They carry out no predatory acts, and where individual workers violate regulations, the workers efficiently discipline the violators. One does not observe systematic looting or crimes when workers have taken over and concern themselves with the group or social, and not individual, interests or objectives.

Contrariwise, under capitalist conditions in times of depression, mass unemployment and social crisis, there is observed a vast increase in restlessness and so-called crimes against property. The demoralization of human beings, rooted in economic insecurity, is taken for granted by the bourgeoisie in such periods. More police and court actions, perhaps an extra dole provision; and the capitalist class has "taken care" of the "crime wave." But war, witnessing employment at its peak, brings an attitude of lawlessness toward the social order in a different manner. As District Attorney F. S. Hogan of New York notes (*New York Times*, July 10): "Crimes" against property have decreased, due to relative prosperity. But in addition to the swift growth of the Black Market in rationed goods for consumers (and "Big-Time" Steel), there is a sharp increase in crimes of violence due to "tremendous" social and economic changes, causing "restlessness," etc.

Where such disillusionment and "restlessness" do not result in a social consciousness, such elements develop reactionary conceptions—each man for himself and the devil take the hindmost—and gangs or groups with such a philosophy. They become the material for fascist demagogues, even as a similar process of disillusionment and "lawless" outlook among de-

mobilized soldiers makes the latter prey to reactionary or fascist movements. Reactionaries and fascists will make use of such elements from the civil and armed sections to build a base for a broader fascist movement in the future. Such elements (individualistic, undisciplined and programless), it is to be noted, easily adapt themselves (Italy, Germany) to the program and organization of fascists. They carry out ruthlessly the demands of the fascist leaders and organizations against the workers or people, provided the fascist leadership at the same time permits them privileges—economic, social—and, apart from their duties, individual leeway. They are the material, also, from which anti-union "goon squads" are often formed. The present trends explain and contribute to the growth of such elements, and demonstrate that the mass base of fascism does not require importation from abroad, but can and does grow on native soil.

To attempt to regulate capitalist production and capital-labor relations, to maintain capitalism itself, the American bourgeoisie must rely in the coming period as never before on its increasingly powerful political superstructure, in peace as in wartime—despite the awesome costs of state rule today and its destructive and limiting effects on individual bourgeoisies.

### World Socialism or Total Imperialist Chaos

Monopoly capitalism endeavors to uproot the world for investment and expansion, convulsing the world with blood in its need to expand in order to live; and breeding state capitalism, which is at one and the same time the fullest and final expression of capitalism's economic-political development and its death agony. But state capitalism offers to the workers only a continuation, in even worse form and content, of exploitation, misery and destruction. Dread of the masses—the fear and knowledge that the latter are seeking a permanent and better solution to the dilemma, are uppermost in the minds of the bourgeoisie. Walter D. Fuller, chairman of the board of the National Association of Manufacturers, states explicitly (*New York Times*, May 21):

Unless democracy, liberty and free enterprise provide security and happiness for the people of this country, those principles might be abandoned after the war. . . . They are determined to have this better world of greater security one way or another, and if they don't get it through present principles they will look elsewhere.

"Present principles" for Fuller, of course, means bourgeois democracy. But the imperialist order cannot change its essential content and direction to include those who nostalgically seek a return to "the good old days" when capitalism could afford bourgeois democracy. Today the vanguard of the bourgeoisie "looks elsewhere"—to state capitalism to preserve the capitalist order—while the vanguard of the proletariat looks to socialism.

Only socialism, which rests its base on the highest techniques of production that capitalism has produced; and is unhindered by the profit motive, would permit of the free development of the means of production and distribution with the object of use.

Only socialism on a world scale can abolish imperialist war. Only socialism can bring self-discipline and self-development instead of bureaucratic regimentation. Only socialism can make administration the servants of men and the master of things—rather than the bureaucratic master of men and the servant of capitalist monopoly production. Only the socialist reorganization of society can be the answer and road open to the masses.

H. ALLEN

# Trotsky's Struggle Against Stalinism

On the Second Anniversary of the Assassination

No war that was lost, but could and should have been won, fails to produce an aftermath of criticism of the strategy and tactics employed, of recrimination, and sometimes of apostasy. So it has been with the war launched almost twenty years ago by Trotsky and his comrades in the effort to save the Russian Revolution from the degeneration that finally destroyed it.

If only Trotsky had made Lenin's Testament public in Time! If only he had attended Lenin's funeral in Moscow! If only he had arrested Stalin with a corporal's guard of Red Army men before he was driven out of the War Commissariat! If only he had made a bloc with Zinoviev from the very beginning (or—other version—if only he had never made a bloc with him)! If only he had formed a new party fifteen years ago, instead of nine years ago! If only he had possessed, or shown, some of Stalin's skill at "machine politics"! If only he had gotten along better with people! If only . . . !!!

If it were not for the fact that these lamentations come from self-styled friends of the cause Trotsky represented, and that they sometimes find an echo in the ranks of militants in the movement, they would not even be worth recording. But no; on second thought, they merit recording and commentary in any case, for there is much to be learned from a criticism of the critics.

The first thing that strikes the commentator on the criticisms of the way Trotsky conducted the struggle against Stalinism is the common characteristic that unites nearly all the critics. With few exceptions they are all people who have never had any experience in the work of the revolutionary political movement, and have only a book-knowledge about working class organization, based in most cases on the wrong books at that. If some critics differ from others in that they have spent more than ten minutes observing the movement from the outside or in that they have been direct participants in the movement, they are composed almost exclusively of the most mediocre kind of failures.

This apparently *ad hominem* argument might be set aside as unjust and therefore invalid if it were not that the political and "organizational" character of the critics is literally translated into their criticism, and gives it its literaristic, academic, abstract, unreal and erroneous character. They have never been able to understand why their comments appear so ludicrous and preposterous to the more experienced militants in the movement.

Timing is one of the most difficult aspects of that complicated art known as political struggle. To exaggerate, you could almost say that the art of politics is proper timing. With the best principles and program and intentions in the world, a party can break its neck if it takes the beginning of a process as its end, the peak of a process for its ebb, or its ebb for its flow. Proper timing is connected inseparably with proper focusing. If the time is ripe and the place is wrong, all is wrong. You must not start shooting in the valley when you want to take by surprise an enemy entrenched at the top of a mountain. You must not start fighting in one sphere if that means an immediate transfer of the struggle, for which you are unprepared, to another sphere, which is not prepared as a battlefield. Timing and focusing depend in turn upon the relationship of forces. To launch a battle when defeat is as-

sured in advance is seldom superior to the kind of warfare which consists in retreating at all times. It is permissible only when retreat would lead to complete demoralization or decimation of your forces, whereas a fight, even with defeat as the sure outcome, would offer the chance of keeping a diminished force intact for a later attack. The participant in the struggle must assimilate organically these, and a hundred other, vital "commonplaces." The literary observer of the struggle does not even think of them.

Should Trotsky have launched an open struggle against the Triumvirs (Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin) long before he actually did, while Lenin was still more or less active? Should he have appealed right off the bat to the rank and file against the leadership, instead of confining the dispute for so long to the narrow ranks of the party's upper stratum? There isn't a second-guesser, or any other kind of *besserwisser*, who hesitates to speak up boldly, twenty years later, and answer: Yes!

The problem involved was not, however, one so easily and simply disposed of. In the first place, to have expected anybody except a crystal gazer to perceive at that time that the bureaucracy would develop to the point it reached twenty years later would require a degree of unreality attainable only by the most foggy-minded. It would have been necessary, before anything else, to look forward to a long and unbroken line of defeats for the working class throughout the world, a long recession in the strength and morale of the international revolutionary movement on the basis of which the bureaucracy was able to arrive at its present position. There were no serious grounds in 1922-23 for such a perspective. In the second place, the bureaucracy at that time resembled its present-day successor in only the most general and superficial way. There *were* serious grounds to believe that what was involved was a deviation, an aberration, a deformity that could be cured without *too* much difficulty and not a full-fledged counter-revolutionary line. If Trotsky had not been merely the most far-sighted thinker of his time but a man gifted with supernatural powers of insight into the future, everyone would have regarded as utter insanity any effort by him to delineate the future of the bureaucracy as it was to develop twenty years later.

## Causes of the Reaction

What Trotsky had to fight against were the universally apparent signs of fatigue, of "revolution-weariness," among the population of the country. The people had undergone the most strenuous sufferings. Their nerves had been kept keyed to the highest pitch for several years. Their bodies had been steadily worn down. To the inferno of normal life under Czarism had been added three terrible years of the World War, then the convulsing strain of two revolutions, one right after the other, then years of the peculiar horrors of civil war, the exhausting rigors of "War Communism," the ghastly famine, the disappointing failure of the world revolution to triumph in the West. It is not so much that they finally began to break down under all this that deserves to be noted, but rather that they held out so long before breaking down, that they showed such marvelous powers of endurance, such vast reservoirs of revolutionary and idealistic confidence.

The powers of endurance of the masses are not so limitless as the capacity for wind-jamming by dilettantes. The change in the moods of the masses corresponded to the inauguration of what Trotsky so aptly called the period of social, political and ideological reaction in Russia. The new moods of the masses, in which all sorts of reactionary ideas were able to multiply and flourish, were not communicated to them by the Bolshevik Party. The masses communicated their moods to the party. Not even its immunity to the virus of degeneration was absolute, especially by 1922, when many of its best elements had already been killed off in the series of battles the party had led since 1917, and been replaced in large measure by bandwagon-climbers who became the ward-heelers and the voting blocs of the bureaucracy.

The first task, therefore, was to restore the domination of revolutionary ideas in the party, in order that it, in turn, could re-inculcate the masses with them. But the party itself was not a uniform, homogeneous aggregation. When the internal fight broke out, it was composed overwhelmingly of new recruits, new and untrained. Compared with the broad masses of workers, these recruits were still an élite; but compared with the trained and hardened older revolutionists, they were anything but an élite. Another section was composed of the "pre-October" Bolsheviks, but not much older in their party membership than early in 1917. And then there was the real élite, commonly known as the "Old Guard" of the party, who went back to the early years of the struggle against czarism, many of them as far back as the first revolution (in 1905) and even earlier.

Lenin attached the greatest importance to preserving the political and organizational integrity—and, to put it bluntly, the party leadership—of the Old Guard. He had no great illusions about it, and we, who have lived longer and seen more, have found no reason at all for illusions about it. Trotsky had no illusions about it; indeed, one of the reasons for his first clash with the bureaucracy was the warning he issued that the Old Guard might degenerate, as had old revolutionary generations before it. But with all its defects, all its weaknesses, there was no force in the country that compared with it even remotely—provided it was a force capable of preserving the revolution that you were looking for.

Trotsky should have appealed "directly" to the non-party masses against the "case-hardened" party, and "over its head"! How easily such a criticism rolls off the pen of the supercilious and superficial dilettante. But such a course would have been almost like appealing to a superstitious person to help persuade an erring scientist not to become a medicine man. The masses represented the *conservative pressure on the party*. It is no accident that one of the first public steps taken by the bureaucracy to weaken the revolutionary spirit of the party was the notorious "Lenin Levy," in which the doors of the already diluted party were thrown open to a flood of raw, ill-educated workers (and not a few ex-Menshevik and ex-SR intellectuals, and worse) who easily became the tools of the Stalinists in the work of smashing the Bolshevik Opposition.

Substantially the same can be said of the idea of precipitating a rank-and-file struggle from the very beginning. The first task of the intelligent and responsible revolutionist was to win the maximum possible support from the trained and *tested* cadre of the party, the party that was responsible for the revolution and stood at its head. Trotsky wisely set himself that task. It should not be imagined that this cadre was confined to a handful of leaders at the top. No, it embraced

thousands, and even tens of thousands. And in the first period of the struggle, despite the pretensions of the Stalinists that they represented the "Old Guard of Bolshevism," it is a fact that in addition to the revolutionary-minded student youth (largely composed of young proletarians studying in the party political schools) Trotsky rallied the support of hundreds of the most honored and firmest militants in the party. In 1925-26, when the Zinovievist opposition united with Trotsky and his comrades, this held true to an even greater extent. The Old Guard was to a large extent in the ranks of the army fighting the bureaucratic degeneration of the revolution. To have proceeded in accordance with the rules gratuitously provided by the light-minded critics would have meant vastly facilitating and accelerating the triumph of the bureaucracy.

### Call for a New Party

The experience of the masses can very seldom be anticipated, or substituted for by one's own experiences or convictions. The triumph of the bureaucracy in the party, and in the country in general, was required before a call could be issued seriously for a new party. The revolutionists had to be convinced that it was no longer possible to use the official party as a base, that it could no longer be reformed. It had to become clear in the eyes of the best militants that the official party had become nothing more—literally nothing more—than an ossified instrument of the counter-revolutionary bureaucracy. But above all, the call for the second party—that is, the formation of a new organization out of revolutionary forces *outside* of the official party as well as directed against it—had to wait until, unlike 1922-23, the revolutionary workers were outside the ranks of the Stalinized party. It had to wait, in other words, for a situation in which an appeal to the "mass" against the "party" was an appeal to the revolutionary, or potentially revolutionary, forces against the conservative or counter-revolutionary force—the official party. Whether Trotsky should have issued such a call on the day he did, sometime in 1933, after the German disaster, or a day or week or month or year earlier or later, is of pretty small importance, and of less interest. Important is the *basis* on which Trotsky proceeded; the *method* he employed in reaching a decision on such questions. And, with all the errors in judgment that he made—and they were more numerous and often much more serious and harmful to the cause than some of his newly-acquired idolators are willing to admit, since they believe that he must be presented not merely as a revolutionary genius but as an infallible archangel—his methods and the considerations of his dilettante or muddleheaded critics.

He lost the war, we said at the outset. But what Stalin won was the victory of the counter-revolution. What Trotsky preserved, even in defeat, was the indispensable, the imperishable. He was not allowed by Stalin to live to see his vindication; he did not succeed in reaching his goal. That is true. But he saved the honor of the revolution. He set up in himself a model of fortitude, of intransigence, of persistency, of superb selflessness, of revolutionary principle and revolutionary integrity. He handed over to the next generation an arsenal of political weapons, not merely intact, but greatly enriched by the most gifted mind of our time. And if all of that was salvaged after a defeat, what greater assurance is needed that the defeat was only for a day and that the coming victory will hold for good?

MAX SHACHTMAN.

# The Myth of the United Nations

According to its leading spokesmen, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin, the bloc of the United Nations consists of twenty-eight independent, democratic and freedom-loving nations solemnly bound together by mutual ideals and a mutual determination to wage victorious warfare against the fascist Axis bloc. Upon achieving the total destruction of this force for world evil and aggression, the United Nations will reconstruct a democratic world federation of peace and prosperity for all mankind, even educating the aggressive peoples to walk tranquilly in the paths of peace. As the Dean of Canterbury said recently: "This is a war between Supreme Evil and Supreme Good."

According to these same spokesmen—to whom all matters are simplicity itself, particularly matters of addition—if we base ourselves upon the latest available statistics and total up the population of these twenty-eight United Nations, we arrive at the figure of 1,423,500,000 contrasted to a total world population of 2,155,000,000. That is, 66 per cent of the people of the world belong to the United Nations, or, to put it differently, two out of three are for the victory of the Allied cause.

Unfortunately for the cause of the United Nations, such methods of oversimplification, blandly ignoring the *internal* conditions that exist among the various members of the United Nations, as well as their status with regard to world politics as a whole, can do little more than serve as a consoling mirage for the "democracies" in their games of political deception. We shall try to give a more accurate and scientific description of the United Nations, basing ourselves upon their internal régimes and their status in world economy, as well as their political relationships to the United Nations. For, in reality, just as the rival bloc of the Axis rests upon fraud, force and violence exercised through political, military and economic domination, so do the United Nations use—in their own way—the same weapons and methods in their struggle against the Axis.

The United Nations can be divided into five categories, if we base ourselves upon their political, social and economic status in the World War. These categories are listed in the order of their importance, weight and power within the imperialist bloc of the twenty-eight nations known as "United."

(1) The *colonial* countries. Inside this group we include (in alphabetical order) Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Nicaragua and Panama—a total of *ten*.

(2) The *semi-colonial* countries: China and Mexico—a total of *two*.

(3) The *Governments-in-Exile*: Free Belgium, Free Czechoslovakia, Free France, Free Greece, Free Holland, Free Luxemburg (yes, this country signed the United Nations pact!), Free Norway, Free Poland and Free Yugoslavia—a total of *nine*.

(4) The *semi-independent* countries (the British dominions) of Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the Union of South Africa—a total of *four*.

(5) The great, *independent* powers which run the United Nations: Great Britain, Soviet Russia and the United States—a total of *three*.

## The Colonial Countries

Some startling facts strike our attention immediately. The largest single category of the five listed above is the group of subservient colonies, each of which is under the total sway of one or another independent, imperialist power. The population of these ten colonies amounts to 430,000,000 enslaved workers and poor peasants who—let alone not possessing the most elementary forms of democratic liberties—*never had a word to say as to whether or not they desired to be included in the bloc of the United Nations!* India, a great nation of 385,000,000 alone, is represented in the pact by the "signature" of Sir Bajpai, a contemptible and unknown Hindu aristocrat who gained his noble title from His Britannic Majesty and his post from Lord Linlithgow, Viceroy of India. By what authority can this man pledge the politics and beliefs of India's masses? Does he speak with any more genuine authority than Hitler's Gauleiter in Norway, or Pétain in Vichy France? But India is only the most notorious and cynical example among the ten colonies of the United Nations.

Then there are the minute and backward regions of the Caribbean and Central America, long dominated by Wall Street banking, financial, public utility and trading interests. The plantation nations of Nicaragua, El Salvador, etc., run by the United Fruit Corp.; the sugar and hemp areas of Cuba and Haiti run by the National City Bank; the raw material regions of the belt that lies between the United States and South America proper—now more than ever in the grip of the great northern imperialism since the loss of their world markets, and the extension of warfare (in the form of U-boat struggles) to these island and watery territories. Each of these countries, ruled over by *compradore* militarists in the service of Wall Street (Batista, etc.) likewise failed to consult its millions of people, or to ask them the democratic question: Do you wish to throw your lot in with the United Nations?

## The Semi-Colonial Countries

In Mexico and China, the two semi-colonial countries of the United Nations bloc, an alliance between the stunted, semi-independent native bourgeoisie and the great powers of the United Nations has been formed. But in this alliance it is the strong, advanced imperialism that lays down the law to its weak allies, while the Chinese and Mexican workers and peasants have nothing to say. (For an analysis in detail of China's relation to the "democratic" camp, we refer to the June, 1942, issue of *The New International*, Section 2.)

If we total together the population of the colonies and semi-colonies (and this act has every scientific legitimacy from the view-point of the similarity of their general condition and relation to world economy as a whole) we arrive at the figure of 896,000,000 people—that is, 63 per cent of the entire United Nations population of 1,423,500,000! Or, to put it differently—in precise political terms—*two out of three of the United Nations are in the category of colonial slaves, without a vestige of political or economic freedom, and living under a native or foreign dictatorial rule*. We challenge the most ardent patriot of the "democratic" war camp to prove otherwise about the twelve colonies and semi-colonies whose formal signatures can be found to the pact!

Any serious and detailed study of the nine so-called "Governments-in-Exile" (residing in London, with frequent visits to Washington) could not fail to prove the fact that they represent ousted, discredited and corrupt cliques without any real support in their own countries because they proved to be so treacherously ineffectual against the Nazi invasions. *Politically*, these governments have but two objectives: their restoration to power on the bayonets of the United Nations; rendering military service in various forms to the United Nations. *Programatically*, they have never offered anything worthy of serious consideration to the peoples of the occupied territories.

### The Governments-in-Exile

The Free French clique of monarchist de Gaulle, whose odor is so foul that Washington fears to give it full recognition lest sympathy of the French people be further alienated from the Allied cause. In his recently announced program for the French people, de Gaulle proclaimed as point one on his agenda: *the full restoration of the pre-war French Empire!* This is not a Free French program, but the objective of the battered and mauled French imperialist bourgeoisie, whose most badly beaten section is headed by de Gaulle.

The Free Belgium clique of discredited social democrats (Paul Spaak & Co.), allied with liberals, does not possess a higher caliber. Carrying on its ancient exploitation of the African peoples of the Belgian Congo, it has steadfastly refused to make any concessions to these millions of Negroes. The Belgian capitalist-imperialist class has simply transferred its *rentier* headquarters from Brussels to London and conducts its former business as usual! With regard to the people of Belgium, this government-in-exile recently announced that it aims at restoring a "modified" monarchy (under Leopold?) in post-war Belgium. Thus, the second leading exile group of "democrats" is permeated with the stink of reactionary monarchism.

The Free Czechoslovakia clique of Benes and his fellow-Czech business men, who openly proclaim their eagerness to restore the old Czechoslovakia as part of the new, second Versailles "peace." This monstrosity of World War I—resting upon a denial of national freedom to the Slavic and Germanic minorities—was, as Trotsky put it, a sink of national oppression and a breeding ground for imperialist rivalries. Yet the imperialist designs of the United Nations demand its restoration, by any artificial means whatsoever.

The Free Greece clique of King George, notorious Balkan despot and admirer of fascist methodology. This monarch, who placed Dictator Metaxas in power, is despised by his own people for his denial to them of all basic liberties. It was through no accident that Greece achieved its reputation of being the "leading" dictatorship of the European powder-keg.

The Free Holland clique of Queen Wilhelmina, who now demand as their price for adherence to the cause of the United Nations, the return to Dutch rule of the 45,000,000 Dutch East Indians of Java, Sumatra, Bali, etc. Holland—a nation whose bourgeoisie has neither home nor colony—will turn in the hour of its liberation to men like the late Henricus Sneevliet, who did not flee on the first available airplane, but stayed on to continue the revolutionary struggle among the workers.

The Free Luxemburg clique of degenerates and comic-opera royalists, who yearn for the bygone days when wealthy American women, in search of notoriety and title, danced, drank and gambled in the numerous casinos of their ridicu-

lous "country." These monarchists, too, now prate about "democracy." They have no doubt "reformed"!

The Free Norway clique of liberal shipowners and Labor Party reformists—all vying with one another as worshippers of ancient King Haakon—who dream of a return to those days when socialism "grew slowly, but inevitably," and trade union coffers were well filled. This group of exiled social-democrats has no more life to it—in so far as the struggles of the Norwegian workers are concerned—than do the various groups of German social-democrats who preceded them into London exile.

The Free Poland clique of Sikorsky and his trained crew of anti-Semites, militarists and Polish national-fascists have, beyond doubt, the lowest reputation among all the "governments-in-exile." They openly announce their intention of re-establishing the former tyranny of Pilsudski-Paderewski, based upon the rule of the Polish landowners. Their anti-Semitism is so blatant that even the Hitler gang have given it respectful recognition in their propaganda work among the Polish people.

The Free Yugoslavia clique of King Peter and his court advisers (bearing every resemblance to the drunken Rumanian gang of King Carol and Lupescu), whose program is to revive that other monstrosity of the first Versailles, in which Croat and Slav minorities were oppressed by the central government at Belgrade. The main talent and qualification offered by the "boy King" for gaining American support to achieve this goal seems to be his admiration for Artie Shaw's swing style!

Thus the nine "governments-in-exile"! Ridden with imperialism, corrupted with feudal-monarchism, poisoned with anti-Semitism, dominated by militarism!

### The Semi-Independent Countries (British Dominions)

"Canada remained distinctly the most important foreign country for direct investment by United States business enterprises. The value of investments there has remained virtually unchanged at about \$2,000,000,000." (*New York Times*, August 1.)

The position of the four so-called "white dominions" as semi-independent nations, moving within the orbit of Anglo-American imperialism, is fairly well known and needs no extensive analysis. In the September, 1941, and June, 1942, issues of *The New International* material relating to this subject can be found. It is clear, for example, that the very existence of New Zealand and Australia depends upon American military strength, while Canada is under the sway of American economy (far more than British)—with South Africa still remaining a substantial stronghold of Great Britain. These dominions cannot claim the rank of fully matured and independent nations. All important and decisive decisions are made for them, not by them. Their uneven, agrarian and pastoral economies are firmly tied to the great imperialist powers; their internal development (even from the elementary aspect of population!) has virtually ceased. They are what Lenin called "dependent allies."

Furthermore, the two most important dominions—Canada and the Union of South Africa—are seriously shaken and hampered in their war effectiveness by internal minority problems—the French-Canadians and the Boers in Africa. Both these tendencies, strongly tainted with reaction in one case, and pro-Axis loyalties in the other, could explode with relative ease in the face of the United Nations. Certainly they are problems that have advanced not one step toward solution during this war.

Thus we see that, in reality, the four above mentioned categories of the United Nations bloc (comprising twenty-five out of the twenty-eight nations!) rest upon a dubious and shaky foundation. In reality it is obvious that only the fifth category—the *great independent powers*—counts. It is the intra-imperialist alliance (based upon a momentary harmony of basic war aims) that exists between these great powers (United States, Great Britain and Soviet Russia) that binds and holds the United Nations together, with militarism preventing its bursting at the seams.

Again, we shall not write here of the inter-relationships, conflicts and rivalries that exist among these three dominant nations. This is another matter—one that has been described at length in many previous issues of *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*. But the parallel that strikes our eye between this top group of the United Nations and the top group of the Axis is too important to be ignored. Bearing in mind that parallels are *not* identities, nevertheless we proceed from the Marxist premise that fascist imperialism and “democratic” imperialism—both stemming from capitalist society—are alike in all decisive aspects.

(1) Like the United Nations bloc, the Axis bloc is composed of colonies, semi-independent states, etc., with three great imperialist powers (Germany, Italy and Japan) overlording the bloc as a whole. The former United Nations, now occupied colonies of Malaya, Indo-China, Burma, etc.; the “original” Axis colonies of Libya, Korea; the semi-independent states of Vichy France, Norway, Sweden, etc.—all of these nations correspond to similar categories within the United Nations.

(2) Each of the three leading powers within the Axis have surrounding “dependent allies,” satellites and colonies—similar to United Nations fashion. Germany has the conquered nations of Europe; Italy has Albania, Greece, Libya; Japan has the oppressed sections of its Greater East Asian Empire. Can we draw any serious distinction between the British-occupied island of Madagascar and the German-occupied island

of Crete; or the “voluntary” signer of the Axis pact—Thailand (Siam)—and the “voluntary” signer of the United Nations pact—Cuba?

(3) Each imperialist bloc and warring camp has its puppet governments and its “governments-in-exile.” To balance off the nine governments in exile we have described above, the Axis has corresponding puppet régimes such as the Nanking government of puppet Wang Chin-wei, the so-called “Indian National Provisional Government” of Bose, located in Tokyo, and the various Quisling régimes that dot Europe, with Vichy France foremost of all. Again, is there a serious distinction—particularly if we use as our criterion: *do these governments genuinely and democratically represent the people in whose name they speak?*

(4) Each imperialist bloc retains its followers and keeps its “allies” in line through an organized system of force and militarist violence (or the threat of it), political treachery and tyranny and economic strangulation. Our liberal friends—who specialize in drawing subtle distinctions between the two-year-old military occupation of Norway and the 200-year-old military occupation of India—cry out in protest at this parallel: “But this is true of the Axis only.”

No. It is true of Britain in India; of America and Britain in China; of Stalinist Russia in the Baltics and Poland (when it held those areas); of America in Cuba, Nicaragua and Panama; of the Free Belgians in the Congo, etc. It is true, in a word, of every oppressing power, for that is the nature and essence of capitalist-imperialism.

In the truest sense of the word, this is a world war which has dragged into its orbit every power and country of the globe. It is the first all-embracing world war of history. Furthermore—and more significant—the war is proceeding between two great blocs of imperialist powers, equally reactionary in the historic sense, and equally predatory in attempting to achieve their objective of a planetary re-division. *As a matter of fact, if you total up the countries and colonies dominated by the Axis, it is also twenty-eight!*

HENRY JUDD.

## A Labor Base for Negro Struggles

Thirteen million Negroes in America have never known three of the “Four Freedoms” which America is supposedly spreading to the rest of the world. “Freedom from want” is a mockery to Negroes when they are last to be hired and first to be fired; when so many usually obtain only domestic work of short duration; when their wages are the lowest and their rents and food prices the highest. “Freedom from fear” is a myth to Negroes when they have no recourse against the “righteous” Southern citizenry who periodically find excuses to hold lynching parties; against the Northern citizenry who magnify every petty theft into a crime wave; or against those military police whose trigger fingers itch to soil a Negro soldier’s uniform with blood.

“Freedom of speech” is meaningless to millions of Negroes who are kept in enforced ignorance and illiteracy by the most meager educational facilities in the South, and who are thrust to the most crowded schools in the North, so that throughout the country, 2,700,000 Negroes (or more than twenty per cent of the total Negro population) have had no schooling beyond the fourth grade. “Freedom of religion” is the only one of the “four freedoms” for the Negro which the ruling class has encouraged. The latter has hoped to keep Negroes satisfied by

sky-pilots, saturated with spirituals, shouting for peace and security in another world and therefore content with their misery in this world.

### MOW-Democratic Rights Movement

The March on Washington (MOW) movement had its origins in 1941 when the production demands of “national defense” made it obvious to Negroes that Jim Crow discrimination was responsible for their failure to get jobs and training in “defense” industries. Starting out mainly as a “defense” jobs movement, the MOW, with the entrance of the United States into the “war for democracy” has taken on the character of a general fight for democratic rights for Negroes, and the jobs demand has become one among many other demands.

The MOW, like the Garveyite movement of the First World War, arises at a time when Negroes are conscious of the discrepancy between the professed aims of the ruling class to spread democracy abroad and the actual denial of democracy at home. But unlike the Garveyite movement, with its emphasis on black solidarity over the world, *the MOW is an authentic native American movement, stemming from the American*

*Negro masses and directed toward the goal of democratic rights for Negroes in America. At the same time, as was evident from the huge Madison Square Garden rally in New York on June 16, the Negro masses recognize their solidarity with the colonial masses—a solidarity not unrelated to the fact that the colonials are also predominantly colored. From this "color" solidarity, however, can develop a conscious realization that it is not color and race which decide the differences between oppressors and oppressed. As the war proceeds, the Negroes will discover more and more that Japanese imperialism has been, and is, as harsh and brutal in colored China, Korea and the Philippines as white imperialism has been, and is, in China, India, Africa and the West Indies. They will then begin to see the struggle of the Negro masses toward freedom from oppression in America as part of a world-wide struggle of all the oppressed peoples.*

The MOW, unlike the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Urban League, is partly under working class leadership and professes to be a mass movement of Negroes. A. Phillip Randolph, national director and foremost leader of the movement, is president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and has a long record in the organized labor movement. Thus, when the Negro masses hail Randolph as their leader, it is an expression, however unconscious, of their need for working class leadership. At the same time, of course, and with Randolph's sanction, dozens of so-called Negro leaders have also climbed on the bandwagon of the MOW. "Reverends," YMCA directors and men and women whom the Negroes look up to because they have achieved government posts—all these take note of the potential militancy of the Negro masses and seek to direct it into safe channels. These "leaders," as was obvious from the Madison Square Garden rally, trail behind, rather than lead the Negro masses. These "leaders" continually reiterate: "This is a mass movement!" because without the masses they are nothing!

The leaders of the MOW, while calling upon the masses of Negroes to join in the movement and make it their own, fear that the masses may respond so overwhelmingly that they can no longer be held in bounds. This fear is shown by the unwillingness of the leaders to call for a real March on Washington, and their restriction of the demonstrations of Negro strength to local rallies. The leaders, reformist in outlook, continue to rely strongly upon petitions to the President and on negotiations with the Administration, which it is hoped will produce more effective executive orders proclaiming an end to discrimination.

### **Negro Masses Ready for Action**

The Negro masses, on the other hand, experience daily the futility of executive orders. For one of these the MOW leaders already "postponed" a March on Washington in June, 1941. Indeed, the limitations of Executive Order 8802 have been admitted by Mark Ethridge, a member of the Fair Employment Practices Committee created by the order. Said Ethridge: "I believe it is perfectly apparent that Executive Order 8802 is a war order, and not a social document. . . . Had I conceived it to be, I would not have accepted membership on the committee." In other words, the Executive Order was calculated to serve only two purposes: one, to extort blood, sweat and toil from the Negro masses for the imperialist war; and, two, to pacify their resentment and obtain their support. It was in no sense a recognition of the justice of Negro demands.

The masses also saw their leaders given a first-class run-around in Washington when these leaders went there to negotiate in the Waller case. They cannot help but wonder, therefore, why mass actions of a more militant character are not called for by their leaders. They believe they have shown their leaders, e.g., at the Madison Square Garden rally and at the Chicago Coliseum rally, that they are ready to participate in a national March on Washington. They feel rightly that such a dramatic demonstration of their strength would be a direct action which would go far to upset the *status quo*.

Nevertheless, the reformist leaders of the MOW, instead of relying upon the masses in action, still rely upon the "new capitalists," presumably congregated in the Roosevelt Administration, attempting to distinguish them from the "reactionary capitalists" and ignoring the fact that all capitalists are bound together by a class determination to keep all workers, Negro and white, at the bottom of the social ladder. Randolph has even gone so far as to renounce any intentions of an actual March on Washington, claiming that from its very inception the MOW used the idea of a march only as a threat, an empty threat which it apparently never intended to carry out. Under such circumstances, it is no wonder that questions arise not only in the minds of the expectant and hopeful Negro masses but also among the so-called right wing elements among the Negroes who saw no reason for the existence of the MOW from its start. The Pittsburgh Courier, for example, in an editorial on August 8, asks wherein a March on Washington Movement which does not intend a March on Washington differs from the NAACP and the National Urban League as lobbying pressure groups.

### **MOW Needs Active Base**

Clearly, the MOW leaders will continue to regard the movement not as a movement for action but only as a propaganda pressure group. Wary of jeopardizing the friendliest of relations with the Administration, they are therefore sensitive to and helpless in the face of pressure from it. *Whatever gains the MOW can achieve for the Negroes within the confines of capitalism will come only if the movement has a mass base and a leadership which is ready and willing to carry out the mandates of the masses for actions of a militant mass character.* Since the present leadership of the MOW is not one which can be depended upon to give militant leadership, it is all the more necessary for the ranks in the local MOW committees, not only to take a more active part but to insist upon their democratic rights internally and their serious participation in the formulation of decisions on actions and policy. They must insist that membership meetings be not simply rallies for entertainment, for handing out information, for rubber-stamping decisions already made by the executive committees, or for referring new proposals. Serious discussion and recommendations by the ranks of policies and actions are entirely possible and need not await directives from above.

The Negro masses have the spirit and will to struggle, to march and to picket for their rights and demands. In St. Louis, organized by the local MOW Committee, Negro workers marched on the small arms plants to protest the firing of 150 Negro workers. In Cleveland, members of the Future Outlook League picketed several plants refusing to employ Negro labor. In Akron, members of the same league have picketed the Federal Employment Service office for jobs. Where such actions have taken place, it is obvious that working class Negroes, intent on jobs, are in the forefront of the movement for economic and democratic rights for Negroes.



*It is the Negro proletariat which will prove and is proving to be the most dependable and militant fighters for Negro rights.*

At present, however, most of the active members of the MOW committees in various cities are from the middle class and professionals in the Negro community. Not sufficient working class Negroes have as yet taken their place, nationally and locally, in the committees. Until they make their impression through active participation and direction of the MOW it will be easier for the reformist and vacillating leadership to restrain and curb this movement from more militant mass actions. Moreover, so long as the active membership of the MOW committee remains dominantly middle class it will lack the necessary strength which can come only from Negroes in the labor movement.

### **Negro's Future with Organized Labor**

The development of mass production industries in the United States and the entrance of hundreds of thousands of Negro workers into these industries has proceeded since the First World War. Incorporation of all these workers into the labor unions, regardless of race, color or creed, has been a matter of historical imperativeness if workers are to defend themselves against increasing exploitation. Especially with the development of the CIO, more workers in the mass production industries are learning that the economic class requirements of workers are achieved only through class solidarity of all workers, Negro and white. Today, according to available reports, there are half a million Negroes in the labor unions—CIO, AFL and railroad brotherhoods. The relation of the Negroes to the CIO was recently stated succinctly by Willard S. Townsend, president of the United Transport Service Employees of America (UTSEA-CIO) and first Negro member of the CIO's executive council. Townsend declared: *"Since the majority of Negroes in the world are workers, their only escape from economic bondage and social disfranchisement is through organized labor. The CIO has provided this specific avenue of escape."*

The St. Louis CIO Council's support of the recent struggle of the Negro and white sharecroppers in Southeast Missouri is a classic example of organized labor actively following a policy of non-discrimination and equality to build working class solidarity and a militant union movement. *The CIO unions, in their general policy of non-discrimination, are building a working class movement which stands as a symbol of the most fruitful methods whereby Jim Crow discrimination can be attacked.* By bringing the Negro workers into the unions, specific grievances of the Negroes related to the basic problem of economic existence are better resolved and/or put more on the same basis as the problems of their fellow white workers and union brothers. Moreover, the basis is laid for attacking the problem of social and political discrimination through class action and working class leadership, not only within industry but also within the Negro community.

The Negro community has begun to shift its view regarding the importance of unionism, although prejudices still remain among Negroes because of their bitter experiences in the past, as well as today, with Jim Crow craft unions. Likewise, as is clear from instances such as the recent Detroit strike, where four white workers refused to work alongside Negro workers, it has not been possible to erase from the minds of white workers in a few years the poisonous prejudices indoctrinated by the capitalist class for so many generations.

Recognition of the fact that the Negro's future lies with organized labor points the need for Negro labor committees (or similar bodies, whatever their form or name), not as mass movements, but as educational mediums supplementing the labor unions. Such committees would (1) carry out union and workers' education among the Negro workers in and outside the unions and in the Negro community; (2) encourage Negro workers to join unions; (3) strive to break down Jim Crow prejudices of white workers in the shop and in the unions wherever it exists. Negro labor educational committees of this character will work more effectively and have a more consistent and militant stand when they include revolutionary workers who see the historical importance of the labor union movement; who realize clearly the class origins of Jim Crow; who will at no time sacrifice union and Negro rights to imperialist war demands; and who can develop Negro workers to a realization of the ultimate revolutionary action which must be carried out to smash Jim Crow in its entirety.

### **MOW Movement Needs Labor Base**

The MOW movement, unlike the organized labor movement, does not have a class character. It is not oriented around the struggle of the Negro workers alone, but has its base in the Negro people as Negroes. It has arisen because the Negroes in America, while primarily workers, still have a special problem of fighting for their democratic rights as one of the largest oppressed minorities in the world. The movement is not interracial or non-racial in character but has been and is intentionally an all-Negro movement, excluding whites from participation and calling upon only a few whites for support. Considering the oppression of Negroes as Negroes, and considering also their desire to prove their independent strength, this restriction, while radically wrong, is at least understandable.

However, if the MOW is to develop, it will discover that white workers and their organizations are the staunchest allies of the Negro working masses and can provide the most solid and valuable assistance. Once white workers comprehend more fully the class necessity for combatting Jim Crow, they will not forget the lesson, since their own existence and working class solidarity depend upon it.

White liberals, on the other hand, whom the MOW has called upon for support—have no real stake in the Negro struggle but their fickle humanitarian sympathies. Even more patently, the white bourgeois politicians, e.g., Willkie and Dewey, who have expressed themselves as deploring the Negro's miserable lot, have only the stake of election day politics to make them "friends of the Negro people." The Negro masses will do well to see that the MOW movement finds its allies, not among such fair weather white liberals and bourgeois politicians, but among the white working class elements. Here again, the active participation of the Negro proletariat in the movement would be an important factor. Recognizing the necessity of working class solidarity and experiencing daily its effectiveness in militant mass actions, they must point the need for widening the support of the MOW so as to include working class organizations.

### **MOW Struggle and "National Unity"**

The MOW, unlike the Stalinist front National Negro Congress, which crassly subordinates the Negro struggle to the imperialist war, tends to have as its primary purpose the Negro's fight for democratic rights. The Stalinists characterize the

MOW as subversive and defeatist because it does not make support of the imperialist war its main objective. The MOW, through Randolph, has in turn, exposed a Negro "Victory" rally held by the Stalinists as a "typical Communist front movement" which "wants to make the Negro forget all his grievances.

Today the National Negro Congress, in its June, 1942, statement, urges, for example, that job discrimination be abolished in war industries *only* "to beat the Axis." It urges the prosecution of lynchers *only* as "traitors to our war effort." The statement also exposes as "selfish" those who put the just demands and long overdue rights of the Negroes before the Stalinist "victory" program of an American war offensive and a second front. After the Waller legal lynching, the National Negro Congress issued a statement in which it "calls upon its councils and friends to hold immediately *win-the-war rallies* to protest against the outrageous injustice of which Odell Waller was a victim." These examples are illustrative of the depraved and cynical attitude which the Stalinists hold toward the struggle of the masses, Negro and white, when it affects Kremlin interests.

While the opposition of the MOW to the Stalinist front organizations is real and explicit, the political differences of the two become obscured by the fact that the leaders of the MOW also support the war. The slogan of the movement—"Winning Democracy for the Negro is Winning the War for Democracy"—is an attempt to straddle the war issue by the "Double V" conception of victory at home and victory abroad. But as the war pressure increases and "national unity" appears to be threatened by a struggle for Negro rights, the MOW leaders reiterate more vociferously and repeatedly their patriotism and loyalty. They increase their sales pressure on the skeptical Negro masses to accept the theory that the Allied powers are really fighting for democracy and that the future freedom of the oppressed Negro masses lies with the victory of the "democratic" imperialists rather than in independent mass actions. Even after the Roosevelt Administration had refused to intervene in the Waller case, and it was admitted by Randolph that "the President and the government have failed us," the MOW issues its petition for democratic rights "in the interests of national unity" and of "victory of the United Nations."

The Negro masses, on the other hand, by their fundamental distrust of the war, show, however inarticulately, that they distrust a social order which conducts a "war for democracy" abroad while denying democracy at home. To the extent that the MOW permits itself to be dissuaded by imperialist war and "national unity" considerations from emphasizing and carrying out struggles for the rights of the Negroes, it will lose the support of the Negro masses. On the other hand, if the MOW receives its impetus and direction from the Negro proletarian masses, who find themselves more frequently forced to carry out militant actions despite the exigencies of "national unity" and the imperialist war demands, it will be able to achieve more permanent and important gains for the Negroes.

### **MOW Movement—and Politics**

The March on Washington movement also has a political character which is not usually recognized. That this should be the case is understandable, since a rising mass movement cannot avoid taking cognizance of the fact that the state or the governmental power is the force that oppresses it. The

call for a March on Washington was implicitly a realization of the fact that the government is a concentration of the oppressive forces within the country. The way in which the call for a March on Washington captured the imagination of the Negro masses in 1941 is evidence that they feel this need for action against the political powers. That the reformist and middle class leaders of the MOW have time after time "postponed" such a march is also evidence that they fear the political consequences and implications of the March on Washington action. The government, suspecting the possible political developments, made desperate and successful efforts to circumvent a march in 1941.

### **"Good" and "Bad" Politicians**

At the same time, as is shown by its refusal to intercede for Waller, the government is not yet ready to appease the Negro masses by granting certain demands which they make. When Odell Waller, tried and condemned by a poll-tax jury, walked to his death in the electric chair, the Negroes became even more bitterly disillusioned with American "democracy" and its war. But there are those in the ruling class, especially the Southern Bourbons, who feel that if you appease the masses in their struggles, they will not be content with one "concession" when so much cries out for change. That is why these men are willing to pay the price of disillusioning the Negro masses now, hoping that the rejection of their demands without any signs of yielding will also discourage the masses from further struggle. Governor Darden of Virginia, for example, was influenced in his refusal to commute Waller's sentence by a fear that "perhaps the Negroes would celebrate the victory by crowding the streets!"

More obviously, the political slant of the MOW is seen in its efforts to get the Negroes out to vote in the November elections for those candidates who express themselves as on the side of the Negroes. Here again the Negroes are attempting to distinguish between "good" and "bad" bourgeois candidates, ignoring the fact that the difference between the two is mainly that one flatters the Negroes into the hope that he can do something for them in office, while, the other, more harsh and adamant, makes no claim to either interest or sympathy with Negroes.

The political "leadership" of the MOW today, and indeed the Negro masses in general tend to favor Negro candidates for legislative election and Negro appointees as their representatives in the Administration, irrespective of their political view or parties. It is understandable that the Negroes as a large minority should demand and attempt to achieve proportional representation as their democratic right. But the Negroes must be wary of regarding every man of their own race, especially those whom the ruling class favors by appointment, as having more than the most superficial color identity with them. A demand for mere color representation can and has resulted in the simple expedient of the Administration's placing a colored face among the white faces who have been practicing Jim Crow. Such colored "representatives" are merely placed in administrative posts to allay the Negro's rising resentment in one connection or another. Utilized for this purpose have been Judge Hastie, Negro adviser to the Secretary of War, and Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Negro adviser to the War Production Board and director of the Negro division of the War Manpower Board. When the Negro masses began to stir over the Fort Bragg "riots" of the fall of 1941, Judge Hastie was put on the air to reassure them. But the

promises he made didn't prevent the Alexandria "pogroms" of the winter of 1942, the Fort Dix killings and similar occurrences in Army camps all over the country. Similarly, Weaver has been accused by a Negro unionist of "using the good graces of his office" to turn the attention of the FEPC and the public away from the Colt Co. (Hartford, Conn.), known for its discriminatory policy toward Negro workers.

That the government knows the usefulness of Negro administrators to help it maintain its oppressive rule is implied by the recent proposal to set up a government bureau on all Negro affairs. It is patently ludicrous that such a bureau would be for policy-making in a Negro self-rule sense when Negroes are interwoven in and are an organic part of all phases of American society. Hence, this proposal for a catch-all bureau has rightly been characterized by the NAACP as a technique for making Negroes wards of the government in the same way that the Indians have been. That this bureau would presumably be staffed largely by Negroes does not change the intent or effect of the proposal one whit. Whether Negroes take their orders directly from the white Jim Crow ruling class or from the colored henchmen or colleagues of this class, the Negro's lot will remain the same under the existing social order.

### Democratic Rights Through Socialism

From the foregoing it is clear that there are two movements of unquestioned significance in the modern period to the Negro masses and therefore to all labor. One is the entry of thousands of Negroes into the labor unions, especially the 400,000 in the CIO unions. The other is the March on Washington which stems from and proceeds at present among the Negroes as a whole. The surer and more significant movement is that of the Negroes within the labor movement, a process not yet completed but taking its course as a necessary and normal development of American labor and economy. The MOW, on the other hand, obtains much of its strength

from the fact that a "national emergency" exists in the United States, requiring special numbers of workers in war production. For this reason, the MOW may find such gains as it may make vitiated by the exigencies of the critical post-war situation. Nevertheless, despite this limitation and those indicated earlier—viz., its middle class composition, the vacillations of the leaders due to their political ideologies, its amorphous organization—the MOW can today and for the next period serve the interests of the Negro masses if it becomes a Negro workers' movement. Infiltration of proletarian elements will strengthen and help to change the leadership and propel the movement into militant actions.

*Whether the MOW movement proves transitory or develops into a broad and relatively permanent movement for Negro democratic and economic rights will depend upon whether it will develop a leadership which seeks its main support in the organized labor movement and whether the Negro masses in the labor movement are ready to enter into and actively support this general movement for Negro rights as a supplement to their economic and class activities within the unions themselves.*

Negro working class leaders will be first to realize, and more courageous to state, that the Negro masses are right in their fundamental distrust of the imperialist war for democracy. Working alongside of their white fellow workers, they will see that the workers must all unite to fight for the rights of any section of their class. Also, in time, these "New Negroes" will be quickest to understand, act upon, and lead others to act upon, the basis of revolutionary principles.

When workers refuse to be divided they will be moving toward the overthrow of the whole system of social exploitation. And only when the system is overthrown will the Negroes, like the colonials with whom they have much in common, achieve even their democratic rights. To achieve their democratic rights, the Negroes, under revolutionary working class leadership of Negroes and whites, must achieve the socialist revolution.

RIA STONE.

## The Polish Workers Have the Floor

(This interesting supplementary epilogue to Comrade Smith's article in last month's issue arrived too late for inclusion. We gladly publish it now reminding our readers that it should be read in connection with the main body of the article, which appeared in July. —Editor.)

It is a nice thing to learn from the past. But let us now learn a little from the present too and listen to the voice of the workers among the oppressed peoples. For it is not true that their voice cannot be heard at all. It sounds seldom and weakly, at least here in the United States, whither the reports on the illegal movement in the oppressed countries come mostly through the governments in exile. It is naturally to their interest not to mention such voices.

In January, 1940, a conference of illegal Polish groups decided to make public a manifesto to the peoples of the world. This manifesto appeared later in America too in an English translation (*Underground Poland Speaks—Manifesto to the Peoples of the World*, published by the American Friends of the Polish Democracy). But the translation has been falsified. From it have been omitted the sentences that speak of international proletarian solidarity, and most of the sharp attacks

against Stalin are replaced by periods. We quote, however, from the Polish edition (*Manifest do Ludow Swiata*, Ksiegarnia Polska M. I. Kolin, Ltd., London). The manifesto begins:

The leadership of the movement of the toiling masses of Poland complies with the will of the delegates to a conference who represented more than 2,000 groups of organized workers, peasants and intellectual workers, expresses its international solidarity with the social and political demands of the proletariat, and in the name of the Polish people it turns to all the peoples of Europe with the call to common struggle against Hitlerite-totalitarian tyranny....

Thus, these participants in the struggle for national independence are organized in an independent movement of the toiling people and their first words are concerned with international proletarian solidarity. They fight primarily against Hitlerite imperialism, but not *only* against it. Listen to what the manifesto, after it has eloquently depicted the terror of the German occupation, has to say about Stalin:

In the performance of the outrageous depredation, Hitler found an ally not only in Italian fascism... but also in the degenerated child of the Russian Revolution, in Stalinist Bolshevism.... In the territories occupied by him Stalin performs the same work of destruction as Hitler. Tens of thousands of Polish inhabitants are in the Soviet prisons. More

than 100,000 persons were sent to Siberia, where they toil at highway and forest work under conditions which drive them to suicide... Workers, peasants and intellectuals were thus sent away, whether they were of Polish, Jewish, White-Russian or Ukrainian nationality. In their place, a Russian population is being settled in order to form the props of Moscow in these territories.

Thus, an anti-Stalinist workers' group that acknowledges international proletarian solidarity. To whom does it appeal?

We know that the spirit of resistance and of the struggle for liberation has awakened in all the countries oppressed by the fascist-Hitlerite invasion. Every report, every expression of revolutionary thought and of the secret preparations for the overthrow of the régime of occupation, arouses a joyful echo among us. We feel the bonds that link the oppressed and the peoples fighting for their liberation... This community will be transformed in the course of the struggle against the common foe into a league... that will make possible the birth of a free Europe after the war on new fundamental principles: the free with the free, the equal with the equals...

Much is unclearly expressed, but a *new* Europe is demanded, not Versailles, and no "*revanche*." The persons who wrote that have gone through the most terrible atrocities of national oppression Europe has known in modern times, compared with which Czarism, with all its gallows, was a paradise. Nevertheless, they have not fallen into chauvinism.

We appeal to you, peoples of Germany, Italy and the Soviet state, whom the spirit of the Prussian and the Muscovite tyranny seeks to give the rôle of executioner of our freedom we speak to you not in order to arouse compassion, but in order to show that even under the most dreadful persecution we have not betrayed the banner of the freedom of the peoples and liberty for all.

The manifesto calls to struggle for national independence, for the liberation of Poland. But the slogan is not "for our freedom," but "for our and your freedom."

Nobody can stand on the sidelines. The toiling peoples of the whole world must unite in the struggle against the new tyranny under the slogan, "For your freedom and ours," which was the slogan of the Polish rebels and revolutionists for a whole century and which accompanies us today, too, in the struggle for freedom, equality and independence.

The manifesto contains much that is weak and unclear. It delimits itself very inadequately from the imperialists of their own camp; and it contains no explicit criticism of Polish fascism. Nevertheless, it is proof that the national liberation struggle can be conducted without falling into nationalism. Nevertheless, it is proof that the workers are better aware of their special rôle in the liberation struggle than some super-clever people in America believe.

Even more clearly speaks another document which seems to come from the same circles: It is an illegal leaflet of November, 1940, which protests against the setting up of the ghetto in Warsaw and which was pasted upon its newly-erected walls. The class struggle note sounds more strongly here, without thereby weakening the struggle for national liberation.

We are not moved by the fate of the Polish and Jewish bourgeoisie. Money smooths the road for them... in the dreadful persecution it always finds holes through which it can crawl. No good future awaits these strata, just as no future awaits those who are used to living on their knees... The Polish toiling masses who are driven from pillar to post, the Jewish toiling masses who are incarcerated behind the ghetto walls, the ever more enslaved masses of all Poland see before them the perspective of the great bloody struggle for an independent Poland of the toiling people—a Poland that will realize the great ideal of freedom, justice and equality of all nations. *The victory in this struggle will not be brought to us by any army that appears in our land, not by any pacts and treaties—it will be won only by the revolutionary movement of the popular masses of Poland, in brotherhood with other peoples of Europe who fight on the fronts of the underground movement against fascism and all manifestations of totalitarianism and tyranny...* So long as the love of freedom lives among the Polish and Jewish working masses, the ghetto walls will remain nothing but an artificial partition which will crumble into dust along with fascism itself... *But not in order that the Polish and Jewish capitalists shall once more conclude a pact upon its ruins, and put the liberating people of Poland in the chains of explanation and oppression again.* Where these walls now stand... the walls of the workers' homes of free Warsaw will stand. The vision of this new capital, the vision of the independent Poland of the working people which will abolish all oppression and transform our land into the great fatherland of freedom, will fortify us in the severest trials...

J. W. SMITH.

## World War I in Retrospect — III

(The June NEW INTERNATIONAL article dealt with the strength of the European working class movement before the First World Imperialist War, at the same time analyzing the inherent political and theoretical weaknesses which imply its later collapse. The consequent betrayal by the socialist and labor leadership was described in the July issue. We now enter upon the stage of reviving militancy and internationalism which foreshadow the Russian Revolution.)

So the war raged on. The "short war" quickly lengthened from days and weeks into months and years and "military experts" from all walks of life came to view its devastation and duration as "indefinite."

In France, "the party, most of whose members were mobilized, had lost its best forces. The locals and federations no longer met. Political life was suspended. For a year it was a veritable eclipse of socialism." The treason of the socialist leaders had "led to the collapse of the entire party. Those who remained clear-visioned and faithful to socialism could not make their voices heard; all civil liberties were suppressed, meetings were forbidden, the censor blanked in the newspapers every expression of a point of view different from the official and governmental point of view."\*

\*From Boris Souvarine's account of "French Socialism during the War" in *The American Labor Year Book*, 1919-20.

### Three "Socialist" Congresses

As several months of the war pass, repercussions in the organizations of the Second International and the labor movement of Europe begin to appear. A Socialist Congress is called by the neutral countries for December, 1914, to be convened in Copenhagen. The executive body of the French CGT, by a vote of 22 to 20, decides to take no notice of the invitation to participate. Pierre Monatte and Francis Merrheim (president of the Union des Métaux) protest this act of sabotage of the international solidarity of labor and demonstrate their protest by resigning from the executive committee of the CGT.

With only 16 delegates representing the neutral Scandinavian countries and Holland, the Congress is convened in January, 1915, and passes a resolution calling for peace. The French syndicalists, now up to their ears in support of the imperialist war, have the effrontery to call the Scandinavians cowards and hypocrites, saying that their voices are those of eunuchs because they are not directly involved in war.

A few weeks later, on February 14, 1915, a conference of "socialists" is held at London, a conference, however, which permits as participants only the socialists whose countries are

on the side of the Allied Powers. The British government actually encourages (and perhaps was the initial stimulus for) its convocation. By excluding socialist representation from Triple Alliance countries and even from neutral countries, such a conference could only aim at reinforcement of patriotism in the name of socialism. Moreover, the London conference is strictly a get-together sponsored and directed from the top. The rank and file of the Socialist Parties are not even informed about this conference, much less asked for opinions or advices on its character and purpose.

Resolutions are adopted by the London conference: *The conference notes the imperialist causes of the war. But, it asserts, the invasion of Belgium and France menaced national independence; a victory of the German imperialists would mean the end of democracy and liberty in Europe. Hence, the conference resolutions conclude: Support Allied imperialism now and, at the end of the imperialist war, the Socialist (Second) International will have the duty of uniting the International to suppress secret diplomacy; to work for disarmament; and to create an organ of arbitration to prevent wars thereafter.*

### London Conference of the International

It is to be noted that the London conference, even aside from its illusions or belief in the "war for democracy" and hence its support of its own imperialism, has no working class perspective for the post-war period. It adopts proposals entirely predicated on a continuation of bourgeois rule following the war. Moreover, the proposals adopted for the amelioration of war dangers have been demonstrated to be completely illusory and utopian. Disarmament by agreement of imperialist powers who must arm to the teeth to protect what they already possess and endeavor to increase further their imperialist control at one another's expense! Arbitration when wars today begin unproclaimed, and so forth.

Even more appalling from a revolutionary standpoint, coming from a conference which calls itself socialist, is the lack of a revolutionary perspective to bring an end to the war. The London conference does not envisage the goal of socialist or workers' power and a socialist economic and political program for the post-war period. The Socialist Party (Second International), then as now, was not really convinced ideologically of the validity of the socialist solution to the evils of capitalism and to the scourge of imperialist war. It did not consciously develop the will to struggle toward the socialist assumption of power and the socialist reorganization of society. That is the empirical way and it always results in unworkable or unimportant palliatives or proposals to reform the beast of imperialism. Whatever the intentions of the conciliationists and reformists, the results are uniformly devastating to workers. The first "World War Democracy," with the help and sponsorship of the socialists and labor capitulators, labored only for the victory of the Allied imperialists ("democracies") and thus could only produce the Versailles Treaty. Today, the Norman Thomasites, with their post-war councils and their "Youth for Democracy" leagues, prove themselves legitimate heirs to the imperialist-blood-stained legacy of the social-patriots of the First World War. The proletarian revolution is not in their calculations any more than the Russian October was in the program or expectations of the Second International and syndicalist patriots.

Another significant episode takes place with the injection of the Russian Bolsheviks into the proceedings. Maxim Litvinoff forces his way into the conference, declaring his protest at the decisions being taken and proclaiming the non-participation of the Bolsheviks in this social-patriotic gathering. Upon behalf of the Bolsheviks, he demands that Emile Vandervelde of Belgium and Jules Guesde and M. Sembat of France quit their cabinet posts; and finally, that the Belgian and French Socialist Parties clearly renounce the national blocs (popular fronts) which support "national unity." (Incredible as it may seem, this is the same Maxim Litvinoff who has been the leading exponent of Stalin's popular front conceptions. At present Soviet ambassador to the United States, he is noted for his espousal of collective security between the Allied governments to encircle Germany and for the Stalin-Laval pact between Russia and France in 1934.)

The revolutionary socialist elements thus indicate to the Allied "socialists" their emphatic opposition to the abandonment of principled policy and demonstrate their unflinching resistance to the growing crimes of Russian czarism, which is participating in the Allied "democratic" cause. These revolutionaries also extend the hand of solidarity to the revolutionary social-democrats of Germany and Austria—Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and others.

To the London conference of social-patriots, the Central Powers social-patriots have only one answer—a similar conference of Central Powers "socialists" scheduled for April, 1915. Thus the "socialists" in each camp align themselves on opposing imperialist fronts, maligning the name of true socialism, which stands for international class solidarity.

### Labor Militancy Begins to Revive

Resistance to the war develops slowly and with difficulty. After nine months of war, the French Federation of Metal Workers is able to issue a May Day statement in respect to the war. Since the war, its official organ, the *Union des Métaux*, had been unable to appear because of lack of funds. The journal relates facts and information suppressed by others. It discusses the capitulation of the CGT. *It reports the appeal of the German workers (April 4, 1915) for peace and socialism—an appeal which the CGT had ignored.* Moreover, the publication refuses to print material in support of the London conference on the ground that this so-called socialist conference was sponsored by the Allied governments to promote their war objectives.

Merrheim's protests and that of his Metal Workers Union cause a stir among workers wherever the actions become known. To intimidate others who might be inspired by Merrheim's action to follow suit, rumors are circulated that he has been placed under arrest.

The Socialist Party press continues publication all the while. Permission for its continued publication is obvious in view of its crass pro-war position. Nevertheless, it is obvious from the columns of the paper that the leadership is far from being in good repute with the rank and file. Space is continuously devoted to an effort to explain and justify to the ranks their desertion by their leaders. These justifications become harder to find after Jules Guesde and M. Sembat enter the war cabinet on August 28, 1914.

At the same time, the Socialist Party is constantly under attack from the right nationalists. The latter accuse them of having hindered the war efforts by their earlier proposals for peace. The embarrassing predicament of the Socialist Party is evidently that all of those who differ with the domi-

nant ruling group or administration are not principled but tactical and secondary. (Witness the attacks today on the America Firsters, who were the bourgeois isolationists, by the war-made Rooseveltians, who were the bourgeois interventionists.) By their failure to maintain a consistent stand against war, the social patriots are open to attack from the right for having impeded preparedness before the war. *From the left, of course, the real basis for attack on the French socialists (and other Second Internationalists of that stripe) is that they deserted the proletarian cause and proletarian opposition to war and went over bag and baggage into the camp of the imperialists.*

Next René Nicod enters a protest against the war. His protest is answered by his mobilization into the armed forces.

*As the human waste and futility of imperialist war become increasingly evident, the ranks of the Socialist Party begin to become more vocal in their discontent and criticism.* The locals begin to meet again. The flag of opposition is raised when, in June, 1915, the Federation of the Haute-Vienne adopts a critical resolution which asks for immediate moves toward the establishment of peace. The resolution which cites the action of Liebknecht in Germany and recalls the resolutions of the pre-war international congresses, serves as a rallying point of oppositionists to the war in the next period.

The women and youth have also begun to move in an oppositionist direction. In March, 1915, the Women's Socialist Conference is held and a youth conference takes place in April, 1915. Both conferences take positive stands against the war. Significantly, both conferences have delegates from the Central Powers, the Allied Powers and the neutral countries. At these conferences are present delegates who are soon to become adherents of the Third (Communist) International. These elements find themselves combatting two other trends: one, a pacifist outlook toward the war; two, a centrist outlook and proposals.

The regroupments in the labor and socialist movements begin to take clearer shape. Over the opposition of Jouhaux (leader of the CGT), a conference of syndicalists is called by a vote of 19 to 10; Jouhaux finally relenting upon the understanding that the conference be limited to one day. His hope is clearly to render the opposition helpless by making discussions brief and unimpassioned. The conference adopts a resolution to achieve understanding with the workers' organizations in the belligerent countries. Jouhaux endeavors to minimize the differences between himself and the oppositionists by making an appeal for a "just peace." By incorporating this proposal in his resolution, he aims to split away or dissuade anti-war oppositionists from support of the more specific and concrete left wing stand on the war. The resolution introduced by Merrheim and representing the left wing contains as its central concepts: "THIS IS NOT OUR WAR!" and "THIS IS ENOUGH!" His resolution receives 27 votes.

It will be noted that *the CGT and the French socialists (and similar elements in other countries) issued calls for a "just peace" from time to time. But all these calls were empty and meaningless, whatever their intent, because they did not ring out clear and straight on the fundamental aspects that alone could strike root and evoke response from the workers. They did not include a denunciation of the imperialist war and of the imperialist governments on both sides. They did not state clearly and boldly that this was not our war. And they did not assert precisely and unambiguously that the class struggle and its conscious continuation, in times of war as in peace, was the fundamental principle.*

The bureau of the Second International had not met since the beginning of the war. Even after the bureau's office had been moved to The Hague (neutral territory), the French socialists refused to attend, despite special arrangements made for them to meet at a different time and not with the Germans. So deep had social chauvinism penetrated the body of official French socialism.

However, Grimm, the Swiss socialist, makes his way to Paris, and reports on the socialist groups of the left that are in existence in Italy, Switzerland and Germany. Plans are discussed and made for regularizing connections among the anti-war socialists. Morgari, the Italian socialist, insists upon the convocation of an international gathering. Emile Vandervelde, right wing socialist who had entered the Belgian cabinet and was a strong supporter of the Allies, resists the proposal and says he will fight against the convocation of such a conference. But the opponents of the imperialist war are determined. The Italian Socialist Party, which had remained fundamentally on an internationalist course during the war, takes the initiative in calling the international congress. Zimmerwald approaches the first beacon light of the reviving spirit, militancy and internationalism of the working class out of the war morass and spiritual collapse of the masses.

The Second International had collapsed. Capitulation to the imperialist war had rendered this certain. Elementary lessons of the theories of socialism had been forgotten or disregarded by the officialdom of the Second International and the respective parties and by the theoryless elements in the labor organizations.

#### **Opponents to War Convene at Zimmerwald**

History, revolutionary history, had to be made again. Zimmerwald was to prove the first firm step in the consolidation of a small group of revolutionary internationalists, who understood thoroughly that the years ahead were stormy—representing essentially either times of war, reaction and misery for the masses (with brief interludes of relative peace) or social revolution, the effort of the proletariat to come into its own.

A preliminary conference for Zimmerwald is held in July, 1915. Present are representatives from the Italian and Swiss socialists, Axelrod from the Russian Mensheviks and Zinoviev from the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks want to exclude wavering non-revolutionary elements from the pending Zimmerwald conference. Others want to bid for support from the centrist groups. Lenin, from the left, asks for uncompromising opposition and condemnations of the social chauvinists. Repudiating their defense of the fatherland, he offers in its place a program of revolutionary action.

Opposition to the war gains momentum, and proof that Zimmerwald is not an isolated phenomenon is found in the fact that *two weeks before the Zimmerwald gathering, thirty members of the social democrats in the German Reichstag refuse to vote for the war credits and leave the Chamber.*

The Zimmerwald Conference is held in secrecy. Delegates good-humoredly remark that half a century after the founding of the First International, it is yet possible to hold all the internationalist delegates in four stage coaches. But, remarks Trotsky, they were not skeptical and looked forward to their work at Zimmerwald.

Conspicuously absent at Zimmerwald are Jules Guesde, M. Sembat, Renaudel and J. Longuet, all of France; Emile Vandervelde of Belgium, Plekhanoff of Russia, Karl Kautsky and Eduard Bernstein of Germany, and Adler of Austria. History records that, having surrendered ignominiously to social patriotism and social chauvinism and having aban-

done or totally disregarded the principles of socialism and the working class movement, never again did these once significant figures of the international socialist and labor movement return to the revolutionary road.

The British government refuses passports to members of the British Independent Labor Party and the British Socialist Party—among them Ramsay Macdonald, who was opposed to the First World War, although he later turned renegade to the cause of socialism. Karl Liebknecht manages to send a message from Germany where he had been imprisoned for revolutionary agitation against the war. Delegates are present from the Russian social-democracy and social revolutionaries, and likewise from Italy, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Sweden, Norway and Holland. The French syndicalists of the left are represented by Merrheim. The representative of the French SP is Bouderon. Both men are mainly pacifist in outlook.

### Lenin Calls for Struggle Against War

The conference lasts from September 5 to 8, 1915. A joint statement representing the French and German opposition to the war is issued and characterizes the war as imperialist and NOT OUR WAR.

All sessions of the conference are animated, even stormy. Lenin, who holds the extreme left position, regards the majority of the other delegates as pacifist in their outlook toward the war. On several questions he is a minority of one, even within the group of the Zimmerwald left. It is Lenin's conviction that the delegates should make a complete break with centrism and the centrists who wished to reform the Second International. He believes that the foundations of a Third International should be laid.

Trotsky is close to the Zimmerwald left on all decisive questions but is not formally a member of it. He endeavors to play the rôle of conciliator between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks. Rakovsky, later the leader of the Rumanian Bolsheviks and member of the ECCI, takes a centrist position on this occasion, hoping for the reformation of the Second International.

On the thirty-five delegates at Zimmerwald, Lenin can count on only seven or eight. His left resolution on the war is opposed most violently by the German, French and Italian delegates. In accordance with the procedure of the conference, the left draft resolution is not presented since only twelve delegates vote for its presentation and nineteen against.

Lenin finally accepts the majority resolution which is restrained in its criticism of the centrists in the hope that this group can still be reformed into a genuine socialist international movement. *The resolution calls for a policy of irreconcilable class struggle, but does not specify the forms which the struggle should take.* It does not insist that the socialists in the parliaments should refuse to vote war credits; it does not demand that the socialists in war cabinets should quit the ministries of national unity and national defense; it does not call for open opposition in the Parliaments to the war; it does not call for legal and underground propaganda against the war nor for street demonstrations and strikes in protest against the war. While accepting the resolution, Lenin nevertheless emphasizes that it is futile to call for peace without revolutionary struggle.

The Zimmerwald Conference sets up a permanent enlarged executive committee to plan further action and struggle. (This committee is dissolved in March, 1919, at the founding congress of the Third International.)

Following Zimmerwald, the CAP (*Commission Adminis-*

*trative Permanente*) of the French Socialist Party passes a resolution repudiating the Zimmerwald Conference and movement. However, the middle of the road opposition to the majority (Longuet, etc.) begins to grow. The British ILP prints the resolution adopted at Zimmerwald. The bureau of the Second International vigorously fights the Zimmerwald decisions and resolutions.

Thus, Zimmerwald stands—repudiated by the social-patriots for its first efforts at resuming international class solidarity, and criticized by the left wing for its failure to adopt the revolutionary consequences of its anti-war position. Nevertheless, it marks the beginning of encouraging and serious responses from anti-war elements, especially the youth. Through this conference, impetus is given to the anti-war elements in Germany, in France, in Russia and elsewhere.

### The Russian Revolution Approaches

The Spartacists of Germany begin to enlarge upon their activities. The French CGT, confronted with rising disillusionment and dissatisfaction among the workers, finds itself forced to organize a campaign of self-defense against the accusations of having accepted and endorsed the imperialist war and also of having been against the resumption of international relations between labor. One notes a revival of the pacifists. The intellectuals begin to study the causes, the roots of the war. At the same time, working conditions become more intolerable. Women especially suffer from low wages and long hours. The CGT majority, in an attempt to revive its lost prestige among the workers, offers to plead the case of the workers with the government, claiming special powers because they have private access to government officials. This proposal to make the demands of the metal workers a football in the game of palace politics is refused by Merrheim.

What next? With the commencement of the war, the state power of the bourgeoisie in the respective countries became stronger. At the moment, it alone appeared the stable force in society, as chaos spread everywhere. The labor and socialist movements had surrendered at the outset to social patriotism and national unity, betraying the interests and losing the confidence of the masses whom they led. Failing to see in vigorous class opposition to the imperialist war the real opportunity for labor and all the oppressed, they had become mere adjuncts in the imperialist state power.

From the course of the war, from the behavior of the labor and socialist officialdom and from the reaction of the masses, this much is clear: Before the commencement of war, at the moment of its outbreak, during the war itself—at all these times, the problem of "what must be done" revolves about the question of the relation of the working class movement to the state, to the governing powers and to the imperialist class they represent. Imperialist war, the most critical and cruel expression of the class struggle in society, even more than the interludes of peace under capitalism, poses before the working class the need of socialism. More clear than at any other time is the necessity for the working class to achieve state power in order to bring an end to imperialist power and to lay the foundations for lasting peace through the new social order of socialism. This lesson had yet to be understood and applied during the First World War. It is first applied by the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party under the leadership of Lenin. But before the emergence of this event, which really raises aloft the flag of world socialism, two years more of blood are to drench the earth.

H. ALLEN AND R. STONE.

# Notes from Uruguay

The document published below, printed originally in *Contra La Corriente*, organ of the Uruguayan Fourth Internationalists, is of interest as an expression of revolutionary developments and needs of South America.

Several months ago there occurred in Uruguay a military *coup d'état*, organized by Baldomir, now head of the government, and supported by Washington. America is primarily interested in the strategically located naval and air bases of Uruguay—bases which control the entrance and exit of the great La Plata River and its rich basin region.—Editor.

The political successes which made Baldomir dictator and the conditions resulting therefrom have exposed the decay of the political parties of our country, along with their false principles.

The corrupt Battle group, tired of an "opposition" that bore intolerable fruit both for the political organization and for the pockets of its leaders, hurried to place itself unconditionally at the service of its former greatest enemy. Now we have Battle-Berreta & Co., sitting at ease in the seats of the state council, once more the same tyranny it was yesterday.

The Avanzar "leftists," who since 1933 sought protection under Grauert, have already forgotten their hatred resulting from the assassination and have quietly gone over to the ranks of the assassins.

The Independent Nationalists, with "dignity" and in a manner as picturesque as it was cautious, refused to integrate themselves into the Council of Notables, but promised solemnly not to obstruct the democratic labors (?) of the government. This proved to be implicitly an open demonstration of confidence in Baldomir and his henchmen. Besides, it left the door open for collaboration with the government at a fitting time and in a suitable manner.

The misnamed Communist Party, in accordance with the new tactic of support to the national bourgeois alliance, plays the sad and at the same time infamous rôle of Baldomir's servants—so far as Baldomir permits them.

In the Opposition we find the Socialist Party, the Social Democratic group and the Civil Union.

The Socialist Party, confused because Baldomir did not try a *coup d'état* when Frugoni wanted one, have declared themselves in opposition. But in all that party's history there has never been an opposition so weak and halting. *El Sol* has not abandoned its plaintive tone in addressing Baldomir, and the party leader, Cardozo, joined one of the governmental councils, which however little it desires to, must acknowledge the authority of Baldomir and his "Notables."

The Social Democrats maintain opposition to Baldomir and his clique but, like the Socialist Party, don't wish to see beyond their noses. With a superficiality that is astonishing, its leadership ignores the reality of international politics. Neither does it strike them as peculiar that the *coup d'état* was a vital necessity for the United States, in assuring its warlike plans in the Rio de la Plata.

For the Social Democrats and for the Socialists, a *coup d'état* is an isolated act, disconnected from the world scene, with no other objective than the personal ambitions of Baldomir to remain in power, and aided by the intransigence of the reactionary landlords. But neither of them are merely

making an error. Their apparently short-sighted and unbalanced position is due to their policy.

Quijano, the former anti-imperialist, adopted the theory of the "lesser evil" and decided to support one of the imperialist powers at war, preferring not to get mixed up with the United States in this ugly dictatorship. With respect to Frugoni, according to whom Roosevelt is greater than Marx, he does not want to get too deeply into what might be a dangerous position. People should not mistake him for a revolutionist.

Although apparently separated by their positions and opposed in their interests, the so-called democratic parties are content to be intimately bound together in a common cause—that of serving North American capitalism.

What moves the Battle supporters to put themselves under the dictator's heel, and what makes the Independents and Catholics continue to live in hope, without offering serious resistance, is the same thing that shuts the mouth of the "Opposition." It is what lies behind Baldomir, aiding his *coup d'état*—the power of the great democracy to the North, a country with which none of the parties wants to be in bad.

And why all this? Simply because all of them—collaborators and "oppositionists" alike—are bourgeois and it is the capitalist bourgeoisie of Wall Street that keeps Baldomir in power. The bourgeoisie understand one another quite well and ahead, very much ahead, of ideological interests they place the class interests that unite them, putting aside differences and antagonisms when their bourgeois privileges are in danger. And rightfully, the international bourgeoisie is concerned about the victory of its allies.

We have seen the various roads and somersaults taken by the bourgeois parties of our country, especially since 1933. Agreements and compromises between white and colored succeeded one another, according to their interests. The present situation is only a repetition of 1933. They line up with yesterday's enemies and thrust aside friends who now bother them. New changes will come, according to the development of international events.

Followers of Herrelista, independent nationalists and social democrats, supporters of Charion, Aceveda, Baldomir and Catholics—all are bourgeois who have their disagreements in normal or semi-normal times, but always cease disputing and reach an understanding and unification so as to increase profits and exploit the working class.

## **Bourgeois Parties Reactionary**

While the Socialist Party cannot be said to be a bourgeois party, according to its constitution, its base of proprietors, merchants and professionals make it much closer to the bourgeoisie than to the working class. And having, as it does, a blind faith in Roosevelt, the spokesman of the North American capitalists, we cannot understand why it opposes Baldomir, also an instrument—although on a smaller scale—of the Wall Street magnates.

The political parties and factions among us that are known as reactionary—although all bourgeois parties are reactionary—are the followers of Herrera, Charlon, etc. At present they are in open opposition to the government simply because they have been removed from the positions of privilege already won or to be won. . . .



Yesterday the followers of Herrera were Anglophiles, when a good price for beef was arranged in England. The newly-born "democrat," Guani, and Baldomir, Serrato & Co., who now pretend to lead the struggle against fascism, formerly repudiated the heroic battle of the Spanish people, a genuine anti-fascist struggle, and condoned the brutal aggression of Mussolini against Ethiopia at the League of Nations.

The truth is that the bourgeoisie goes fascist when it suits its interests. Just as soon as they agree among themselves, they abandon their democratic masks for fascist masks, according to convenience.

The revolutionary Workers Party must bring together the workers. Right now the working class has no party which represents and defends its interests. All the bourgeois parties, as we have said, be they "democratic" or reactionary, are defenders of the masters of the bourgeois government and the open or concealed dictators.

The Socialist Party, throughout its practical existence, has completely ignored the working class and has not grounded itself in its struggles and problems.

The Communist Party exists solely because of the Bolshevik Party and the glorious Russian Revolution, as well as the creation of the first workers' state. Like all the Communist Parties, it remains alive thanks only to the financial support of Russia. But as a workers' party it no longer exists, due to the treacherous and stupid leadership which has given up

one proletarian conquest after the other and has made out of the workers' movement a disgraceful farce benefiting only the "Stalinists," who run a race, pretending to go along with the wishes of the workers.

It has therefore become necessary to join together in a Workers Party—genuinely revolutionary and for the workers. A party that will unite the workers, refusing pacts with the bourgeoisie, and join with the thinking students, whose rebelliousness is not only a consequence of their conditions as students.

The Fourth International, growing up out of the ruins of the Second and Third Internationals, has joined together in Europe and America the advanced workers who have rejected the "socialists" and "communists" responsible for distorting the doctrines of Karl Marx, disfiguring the revolutionary program and surrendering themselves to the ruling class.

Powerful parties of the Fourth International are slowly forming in the countries of America. They seek to unite behind them the majority of the proletariat. In Uruguay there already exists the basis for the creation of a Revolutionary Workers Party (Fourth International) which will finally lead the Uruguayan working class to power.

This is the party that will emerge victorious out of this war, the party that embraces all the militant workers and revolutionists of our country.

## **ARCHIVES OF THE REVOLUTION** Documents Relating to the History and Doctrines of Revolutionary Marxism

# An Answer to the Stalinist Critics

The following speech was delivered by Trotsky at the Seventh Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in November, 1926. To cover up their theoretical and political degeneration, the Stalinists laid down a violent barrage of attacks upon Trotsky, the leader of the Left Opposition. In answer to his internationalist criticism of the Stalinist theory of "socialism in a single country," the bureaucracy denounced him for an alleged "social-democratic deviation." Trotsky's masterful polemical reply at the Seventh Plenum was, of course, never given wide circulation in the official communist movement, appearing only in the esoteric *International Press Correspondence*. It is reprinted here for the first time in any American publication.—Editor.

Comrades! The resolution accuses the Opposition including me, of a social democratic deviation. I have thought over all the points of contention which have divided us, the minority of the CC from the majority during the period just past, that is, the period in which the designation "Opposition bloc" has been in use. I must place on record that the points of contention, and our standpoint with respect to the point of contention, offer no basis for the accusation of a "social democratic deviation."

The question upon which we have disagreed most, comrades, is that which asks which danger threatens us during the present epoch: the danger that our state industry remains backward, or that it rushes too hastily forward. The Opposition—in which I am included—has proved that the real danger threatening us is that our state industry may remain be-

hind the development of the national economy as a whole. We have pointed out that the policy being pursued in the distribution of national income involves the further growth of the disproportion. For some reason or other this has been named "pessimism." Comrades, arithmetic knows neither pessimism nor optimism, neither discouragement nor capitulation. Figures are figures. If you examine the control figures of our planned economics you will find that these figures show the disproportion, or more exactly expressed, the shortage of industrial goods, to have reached the amount of 380 million roubles last year, while this year the figure will be 500 million, that is, the original figures of the planning commission show the disproportion to have increased by 25 per cent. Comrade Rykov states in his thesis that we might hope (merely hope) that the disproportion will not increase this year. What justification is there for this "hope"? The fact is that the harvest is not so favorable as we all expected. Were I to follow in the false tracks of our critics, I might say that Comrade Rykov's theses welcome the fact that the unfavorable conditions obtaining at harvest time detracted from crops which were otherwise not bad, since, had the harvest been greater, the result would have been a greater disproportion. (Comrade Rykov: "I am of a different opinion.") The figures speak for themselves. (A voice: "Why did you not take part in the discussion on Comrade Rykov's report?") Comrade Kamenev has here told you why he did not. Because I could not have added anything to this special economic report, in the form of amendments or arguments, that we had not brought forward at the April plenum. The amendments and

other proposals submitted by me and other comrades to the April plenum remain in full force today. But the economic experience gained since April is obviously too small to give us room for hope that at the present stage the comrades present at this conference will be convinced. To bring up these points of contention again, before the actual course of economic life has tested them, would arouse useless discussion. These questions will be more acceptable to the party when they can be answered by the statistics based on the latest experience; for objective economic experience does not decide whether figures are optimistic or pessimistic, but solely whether they are right or wrong. I believe our standpoint on the disproportion has been right.

We have disagreed on the *rate of our industrialization*, and I have been among those comrades who have pointed out that the present rate is insufficient, and that precisely this insufficient speed in industrialization imparts the greatest importance to the differentiation process going on in the villages. To be sure, it is no catastrophe that the kulak raises his head or—this is the other aspect of the same subject—that the poorer peasantry no longer preponderates. These are some of the serious accompaniments of the period of transition. They are unhealthy signs. It need not be said that they give no cause for "alarm." But they are phenomena which must be correctly estimated. And I have been among those comrades who have maintained that the process of differentiation of the village may assume a dangerous form if industry lags behind, that is, if the disproportion increases. The Opposition maintains that it is our duty to lessen the disproportion year by year. I see nothing social democratic in this.

We have insisted that the differentiation of the village demands a more elastic taxation policy with respect to the various strata of the peasantry, a reduction of taxation for the poorer middle strata of the peasantry, and increased taxation for the well to do middle strata, and an energetic pressure upon the kulak, especially in his relations to trading capital. We have proposed that 40 per cent of the poor peasantry should be freed from taxation altogether. Are we right or not? I believe that we are right; you believe we are wrong. But what is "social democratic" about this is a mystery to me (laughter).

### Question of the Peasantry

We have asserted that the increasing differentiation among the peasantry, taking place under the conditions imposed by the backwardness of our industry, brings with it the necessity of double safeguards in the field of politics, that is, we were entirely unable to agree with the *extension of the franchise* with respect to the kulak, the employer and exploiter, if only on a small scale. We raised the alarm when the election inspectorates extended the suffrage among the petty bourgeoisie. Were we right or not? You consider that our alarm was "exaggerated." Well, even assuming that it was, there is nothing social democratic about it.

We demanded and proposed that the course being taken by the agricultural cooperatives toward the "highly productive middle farmer," under which name we generally find the kulak, should be severely condemned. We proposed that the tendency of the credit cooperatives toward the side of the well to do peasantry should be condemned. I cannot comprehend, comrades, what you find "social democratic" in this.

There have been differences of opinion in the question of wages. In substance these differences consist of our being of the opinion that at the given stage of development of our in-

dustry and economics, and at our present level of economics, the wage question must not be settled on the assumption that the worker must first increase the productivity of labor, which will then raise the wages, but that the contrary must be the rule, that is, a rise in wages, however modest, must be the prerequisite for an increased productivity of labor. (A voice: "And where is the money coming from?") This may be right or it may not, but it is not "social democratic."

We have pointed out the connection between various well known aspects of our inner party life and the growth of bureaucracy. I believe there is nothing "social democratic" about this either.

We have further opposed an overestimation of the economic elements of the capitalist stabilization and the underestimation of its political elements. If we inquire, for instance: What does the economic stabilization consist of in England at the present time? then it appears that England is going to ruin, that its trade balance is adverse, that its foreign trade returns are falling off, that its production is declining. This is the "economic stabilization" of England. But to whom is bourgeois England clinging? Not to Baldwin, not to Thomas, but to Purcell. Purcellism is the pseudonym of the present "stabilization" in England. We are therefore of the opinion that it is fundamentally wrong, in consideration of the working masses who carried out the general strike, to combine either directly or indirectly with Purcell. This is the reason why we have demanded the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee. I see nothing "social democratic" in this.

We have insisted upon a fresh revision of our trade union statutes, upon which subject I reported to the CC. A revision of those statutes from which the word "Profintern" was struck out last year and replaced by "International Trade Union Association," under which it is impossible to understand anything else than "Amsterdam." I am glad to say that this revision of last year's revision has been accomplished, and the word "Profintern" has been rejected in our trade union statutes. But why was our uneasiness on the subject "social democratic?" That, comrades, is something which I entirely fail to understand.

I should like, as briefly as possible, to enumerate the main points of the differences of opinion, which have arisen of late. Our standpoint in the questions concerned has been that we have observed the dangers likely to threaten the class line of the party and of the workers' state under the conditions imposed by a long continuance of the NEP, and our encirclement by international capitalism. But these differences of opinion, and the standpoint adopted by us in the defense of our opinions, cannot be construed into a "social democratic deviation" by the most complicated logical or even scholastic methods.

### Past Differences

It has therefore been found necessary to leave these actual and serious differences of opinion, engendered by the given epoch of our economic and political development, and to go back into the past in order to construe differences in the conception of the "character of our revolution" in general—not in the given period of our revolution, not with regard to the given concrete task, but with regard to the character of the revolution in general, or as expressed in the theses, the revolution "in itself," the revolution "in its substance." When a German speaks of a thing "in itself," he is using a metaphysical term placing the revolution outside of all connection with the real world around it; it is abstracted from yesterday and

tomorrow, and regarded as a "substance" from which everything will proceed. Now, then, in the question of the actual "substance" of revolution, I have been found guilty, in the ninth year of our revolution, of having denied the socialist character of our revolution! No more and no less! I discovered this for the first time in this resolution itself. If the comrade find it necessary for some reason to construct a resolution on quotations from my writings—and the main portion of the resolution, pushing into the foreground the theory of original sin ("Trotskyism"), is built upon quotations from my writings between 1917 and 1922—then it would at least be advisable to select the essential from all I have written on the character of our revolution.

You will excuse me, comrades, but it is no pleasure to have to set aside the actual subject and to retail where and when I wrote this or that. But this resolution, in substantiating the "social democratic" deviation, refers to passages from my writings, and I am obliged to give the information. In 1922 I was commissioned by the party to write the book, *Terrorism and Communism*, against Kautsky, against the characterization of our revolution by Kautsky as a non-proletarian and non-socialist revolution. A large number of editions of this book were distributed both at home and abroad by the Comintern. The book met with no hostile reception among our nearest comrades, nor from Lenin. This book is not quoted in the resolution.

In 1922 I was commissioned by the Political Bureau to write the book entitled *Between Imperialism and Revolution*." In this book I utilized the special experience gained in Georgia, in the form of a refutation of the standpoint of those international social democrats who were using the Georgian rising as material against us, for the purpose of subjecting to a fresh examination the main questions of that proletarian revolution which has a right to tear down not only petty bourgeois prejudices, but also petty bourgeois institutions.

### At Comintern Congresses

At the third congress of the Comintern I gave a report, on behalf of the CC, declaring in substance that we had entered on an epoch of unstable balance. I opposed Comrade Bucharin, who at that time was of the opinion that we should pass through an uninterrupted series of revolutions and crises until the victory of socialism in the whole world, and that there would not and could not be any "stabilization." At the time Comrade Bucharin accused me of a Right deviation (perhaps social democratic too?). In full agreement with Lenin I defended at the third congress the theses which I had formulated. The import of the theses was that we, despite the slower speed of the revolution, would pass successfully through this epoch by developing the socialist elements of our economics.

At the fourth world congress in 1923 I was commissioned by the CC to follow Lenin with a report on the NEP. What did I prove? I proved that the NEP merely signifies a change in the forms and methods of socialist development. And now, instead of taking these works of mine, which may have been good or bad, but were at least fundamental, and in which, on behalf of the party, I defined the character of our revolution in the years between 1920 and 1923, you seize upon a few little passages, each only two or three lines, out of a preface and a postscript written at the same period.

I repeat that none of the passages quoted is from a fundamental work. These four little quotations (1917 to 1922)

form the sole foundation for the accusation that I deny the socialist character of our revolution. The structure of the accusation thus being completed, every imaginable original sin is added to it, even the sin of the Opposition of 1925. The demand for a more rapid industrialization and the proposal to increase the taxation of the kulaks, all arise from these four passages. (A voice: "Form no fractions!")

Comrades, I regret having to take your time, but I must quote a few more passages—I could adduce hundreds—in confirmation of all that the resolution ascribes to me. First of all I must draw your attention to the fact that the four quotations upon which the theory of my original sin is based, have all been taken from writings of mine between 1917 and 1922. Everything that I have said since appears to have been swept away by the wind. Nobody knows whether I subsequently regarded our revolution as socialist or not. Today, at the end of 1926, the present standpoint of the so-called Opposition in the leading questions of economics and politics is sought in passages from my personal writings between 1917 and 1922, and not even in passages from my chief works, but in works written for some quite chance occasion. I shall return to these quotations and answer for every one of them. But first permit me to adduce some quotations of a more essential character, written at the same period:

For instance, the following is an extract from my speech at the conference of the Moscow Trade Union Council on October 28, 1921, after the introduction of the NEP:

We have reorganized our economic policy in anticipation of a slow development of our economics. We reckon with the possibility that the revolution in Europe, though developing and growing, is developing more slowly than we expected. The bourgeoisie has proved more tenacious. Even in our own country we are obliged to reckon with a slower transition to socialism, for we are surrounded by capitalist countries. We must concentrate our forces on the largest and best equipped undertakings. At the same time we must not forget that the taxation in kind among the peasantry, and the increase of leased undertakings form a basis for the development of the economics of commodities, for the accumulation of capital, and for the rise of a new bourgeoisie. At the same time the socialist economy will be built up on the narrower but firmer basis of big industry.

At a members' meeting of the CP of the SU, on November 10 of the same year, in the Moscow district of Sokolniki, I stated:

What have we now? We have now the process of socialist revolution, in the first place in a state and in the second place in a state which is the most backward of all, both economically and culturally, and surrounded on all sides by capitalist countries.

What conclusion did I draw from this? Did I propose capitulation? I proposed the following:

It is our task to make socialism prove its advances. The peasants will be the judge who pronounces on the advantages or drawbacks of the socialist state. We are competing with capitalism in the peasant market....

What is the present basis for our conviction that we shall be victorious? There are many reasons justifying our belief. These lie both in the international situation and in the development of the Communist Party; in the fact that we retain the power in our hands, and in the fact that we permit free trade solely within the limits which we deem necessary.

This, comrades, was said in 1921, and not in 1926!

In my report at the IV World Congress (directed against Otto Bauer, to whom my relationship has now been discovered) I spoke as follows:

Our main weapon in the economic struggle, as based on the market, is state power. Only shortsighted reformists are unable to grasp the importance of this instrument. The bourgeoisie knows it well. That is proved by its whole history.

Other tools in the hands of the proletariat are: the possession of the most important productive forces of the country, of all economic traffic, of all mines, of the undertakings working up raw materials. These are subject to the immediate economic control of the working class. At the same time the working class owns the land and the peasant gives hundreds of millions of poods of grain for it every year, in the form of taxation in kind.

The frontiers of the country are in the hands of the workers' state; foreign goods, and foreign capital, can only be imported into the country to the extent approved by the workers' state.

These are the instruments and means for building up socialism.

In a booklet published by me in 1923 under the title of *Questions of Daily Life*, you may read on this subject:

What has the working class actually attained and secured by its struggle up to now?

1. The dictatorship of the proletariat (with the aid of the workers' and peasants' state led by the Communist Party).

2. The Red Army as the material support of the proletarian dictatorship.

3. The socialization of the most important means of production, without which the dictatorship of the proletariat would be an empty form, without meaning.

4. The monopoly of foreign trade, a necessary premise for the building up of socialism in a country surrounded by capitalism.

These four elements, irrevocably gained, form the steel framework of our work. Thanks to this framework, every further economic or cultural success which we achieve—provided it is a real and not a supposed success—will necessarily become a constituent part of our socialist structure.

This same booklet contains another and even more definite formulation:

The easier the revolutionary upheaval has been—relatively speaking—to the Russian proletariat, the more difficult is its task of establishing the socialist state of society. But the framework of our new social life, welded by the revolution, supported by four fundamental pillars (see beginning of chapter) imparts to every sincere and sensibly directed effort in economics and culture and objectively socialist character. In the bourgeois state of society the worker, unconsciously and unintentionally, enriches the bourgeoisie more and more the better he works. In the Soviet state the good and conscientious worker, without thinking of it or troubling himself about it (if he is a non-political worker), performs socialist work and increases the means of the working class. This is the actual import of the October revolution and in this sense the New Economic Policy brings no change whatever.

### **Toward Capitalism or Socialism?**

I could prolong this chain of quotations indefinitely, for I never have and never could characterize our revolution differently. I shall confine myself, however, to one more passage, from a book quoted by Comrade Stalin (*Toward Capitalism or Socialism?*). This book was published for the first time in 1925 and was printed originally as feuilleton in the *Pravda*. The editors of our central organ have never drawn my attention to any heresies in this book with respect to the character of our revolution. This year the second edition of the book was issued. It has been translated into different languages by the Comintern and it is the first time that I hear that it gives a false idea of our economic development. Comrade Stalin has read you a few lines picked out arbitrarily in order to show that this is "unclearly formulated." I am thus obliged to read a somewhat longer passage, in order to prove that the idea in question is quite clearly formulated. The following is stated in the preface, devoted to a criticism of our bourgeois and social democratic critics, above all, Kautsky and Otto Bauer. Here you may read:

These judgments (formed by the enemies of our economics) assume two forms: in the first place they assert that in building up socialist economics we are ruining the country; but in the second place they assert that in developing the forces of production we are really returning to capitalism.

The former of these two criticisms is characteristic of the mentality of the bourgeoisie. The second is peculiar to social democracy, that is, to the bourgeois mentality socialistically veiled. There is no strict boundary between these two descriptions of criticism, and very frequently interchange of arguments between them, without either of them noticing that he is using his neighbor's weapon, in the enthusiasm of the old way against "communist barbarity."

The present booklet hopes to serve the object of showing the unprejudiced reader that both are deceivers—both the openly big bourgeois and the petty bourgeois masquerading as socialist. They lie when they say that the Bolsheviks have ruined Russia... They lie when they say that the development of productive forces is the road to capitalism; the rôle played by state economics in industry, in transport and traffic service, trade, finance and credit does not lessen with the growth of productive forces, but on the contrary increases within the collective economics of the country. Facts and figures prove this beyond all doubt.

In agriculture the matter is much more complicated. To a Marxist there is nothing unexpected in this. The transition from the "atomized" individual farming system of agriculture to socialist agriculture is only conceivable after a number of steps have been surmounted in technics, economics and cultivation. The fundamental premise for this transition is that the power remain in the hands of the class anxious to lead society to socialism, and becoming increasingly capable of influencing the peasant population by means of state industry, by means of technical improvements in agriculture, and thereby furnishing the prerequisites for the collectivization of agricultural work.

The draft of the resolution on the Opposition states that Trotsky's standpoint closely approaches that of Otto Bauer, who had said that: "In Russia, where the proletariat represents only a small minority of the nation, the proletariat can only maintain its rule temporarily, and is bound to lose it again as soon as the peasant majority of the nation has become culturally mature enough to take over the rule itself."

In the first place, comrades, who could entertain the idea that so absurd a formulation could occur to any one of us? Whatever is to be understood by: "as soon as the peasant majority of the nation has become culturally mature enough"? What does this mean? What are we to understand by "culture"? Under capitalist conditions the peasantry have no independent culture. As far as culture is concerned, the peasantry may mature under the influence of the proletariat or of the bourgeoisie. These are the only two possibilities existing for the cultural advance of the peasantry. To a Marxist, the idea that the "culturally matured" peasantry, having overthrown the proletariat, could take over power on its own account, is a wildly prejudiced absurdity. The experience of two revolutions has taught us that the peasantry, should it come into conflict with the proletariat and overthrow the proletarian power, simply forms a bridge—through Bonapartism—for the bourgeoisie. An independent peasant state founded neither on proletarian nor bourgeois culture is impossible. This whole construction of Otto Bauer's collapses into a lamentable petty bourgeois absurdity.

We are told that we have not believed in the establishment of socialism. And at the same time we are accused of wanting to pillage the peasantry (not the kulaks, but the peasantry!).

I think, comrades, that these are not words out of our dictionary at all. The communists cannot propose to the workers' state to "plunder" the peasantry, and it is precisely with the peasantry that we are concerned. A proposal to free 40 per cent of the poor peasantry from all taxation, and to lay these taxes upon the kulak, may be right or it may be wrong, but it can never be interpreted as a proposal to "plunder" the peasantry.

I ask you: If we have no faith in the establishment of socialism in our country, or (as is said of me) we propose that the European revolution be passively awaited, then why do we propose to "plunder" the peasantry? To what end? That

is incomprehensible. We are of the opinion that industrialization—the basis of socialization—is proceeding too slowly, and that this places the peasantry at a disadvantage. If, let us say, the quantity of agricultural products put upon the market this year be 20 per cent more than last—I take these figures with a reservation—and at the same time the grain price has sunk by 18 per cent and the prices of various industrial products have risen by 16 per cent, as has been the case, then the peasant gains less than when his crops are poorer and the retail prices for industrial products lower. The acceleration of industrialization, made possible to a great extent by the increased taxation of the kulak, will result in the production of a larger quantity of goods, reducing the retail prices, to the advantage of the workers and of the greater part of the peasantry.

### Struggle of Two Tendencies

It is possible that you do not agree with this. But nobody can deny that it is a system of views on the development of our economics. How can you assert that we do not believe in the possibility of socialist development, and yet at the same time that we demand the plundering of the mujik? With what object? For what purpose? Nobody can explain this. Again, I have often asked myself why the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee can be supposed to imply a call to leave the trade unions? And why does the non-entry into the Amsterdam International not constitute an appeal to the workers not to join the Amsterdam trade unions? (A voice: "That will be explained to you!") I have never received an answer to this question, and never will. (A voice: "You will get your answer.") Neither shall I receive a reply to the question of how we contrive to disbelieve in the realization of socialism and yet endeavor to "plunder" the peasantry.

The book of mine from which I last quoted speaks in detail of the importance of the correct distribution of our national income, since our economic development is proceeding amidst the struggle of two tendencies: the socialist and the capitalist tendency.

The issue of the struggle depends on the rate of development of these tendencies. In other words, should state industry develop more slowly than agriculture; should the opposite poles of capitalist farmer "on top" and proletariat "at bottom" separate more widely and rapidly in the course of development—then the process would of course lead to the restoration of capitalism.

But our enemies may do their best to prove the inevitability of this possibility. Even if they go about it much more skillfully than the unfortunate Kautsky (or MacDonald), they will burn their fingers. Is the possibility just indicated entirely excluded? Theoretically it is not. If the ruling party were to commit one error after another, both in politics and economics, if it should thus hamper the development of industry now so promising, and if it were to relinquish control of the political and economic development of the peasantry, then, of course, the cause of socialism in our country would be lost. But we have not the slightest reason to adopt such premises for our prognosis. How to lose power, how to throw away the achievements of the proletariat, and how to work for capitalism, these are points which were made brilliantly clear by Kautsky and his friends to the international proletariat after November 9, 1918. Nobody needs to add anything on this subject.

Our tasks, our aims, and our methods are very different. What we want to show is the way to maintain and firmly establish the power once seized and the way in which the proletarian form of state is to be given the economic content of socialism.

The whole content of this book (A voice: "There is nothing about the coöperatives in it!")—I shall come to the coöperatives—the whole content of this book is devoted to the subject of how the proletarian form of state is to be given the economic content of socialism. It may be said (insinuations

have already been made in this direction): Yes, you believed that we were moving toward socialism so long as the process of reconstruction was going on, and so long as industry developed at a speed of 45 or 35 per cent year, but now that we have arrived at a crisis of foundation capital and you see the difficulties of extending foundation capital, you have been seized with a so-called "panic."

I cannot quote the whole of the chapter on: "The Rate of Development, Its Material Possibilities and Its Limits." It points out the four elements characterizing the advantages of our system over capitalism and draws the following conclusion:

Taken all in all, these four advantages—properly applied—will enable us to increase the coefficient of our industrial growth, not only to double the per cent of the pre-war period, but to triple this, or even more.

If I am not mistaken, the coefficient of our industrial growth will amount, according to the plans, to 18 per cent. In this there are, of course, still reconstruction elements. But in any case the extremely rough statistical prognosis which I made as an example eighteen months ago coincides fairly well with our actual speed this year.

LEON TROTSKY.



## Lenin on National Revolution

"To imagine that a social revolution is conceivable without revolts of small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without the revolutionary outbursts of the petty bourgeoisie, with all its prejudices, without the movement of non-class-conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against the oppression of the landlords, the church, the monarchy, the foreign yoke, etc.—to imagine that is tantamount to repudiating social revolution. Only those who imagine that in one place an army will line up and say, 'We are for socialism' and in another place another army will say, 'We are for imperialism' and believe that this will be the social revolution, only those who hold such a ridiculously pedantic opinion could vilify the Irish Rebellion (Easter Day Rebellion) by calling it a 'putsch.'

"Whoever expects a 'pure' social revolution will never live to see it. Such a person pays lip service to revolution without understanding what revolution is."

("The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up," *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX)



## Our Next Issue

The *Militant* has finally taken note of the criticism we made of Cannonite policy toward China in an article of Max Shachtman in *The New Internationalist* two months ago. So has the *Fourth International*, theoretical organ of the Cannonites. Brought in neither case is the reply to us written by John G. Wright, author of the article which originally presented the SWP point of view and which was the cause of Shachtman's criticism. In the case of the *Militant* the reply is written by Morrison; in the case of the *Fourth International* the reply is written by Morrow. The reason for Wright's strange disappearance from the scene will be elucidated in the course of an article answering Morrison and Morrow, scheduled for publication in our next issue.

## Make-Believe War?

**AMERICA'S STRATEGY IN WORLD POLITICS,**

By Nicholas J. Spykman, New York, N. Y.

According to Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill, we are engaged in a war of liberty, equality, justice, etc., plus the Atlantic Charter. But Professor Nicholas J. Spykman, author of *America's Strategy in World Politics*, knows differently and says so:

Because man loves peace, it is always the opponent who is the aggressor and, because he prefers decency it is always the enemy who fights unfairly and with cruel and dastardly means. National struggles inevitably become conflicts between good and evil, crusades against sin and the devil. Modern wars can be fought successfully only in an atmosphere of unreality and make-believe.

It is not Spykman's aim to dispense with the jargon of jingoism, for the make-believe world is necessary for the common herd. Nor does he support the war any the less. Quite the contrary; he insists that the Axis must be defeated. He is concerned primarily with clearing away the ideological rubbish that clutters up our thinking so that the makers of imperialist policy may not stumble over their own refuse.

The merit of this book consists in a forthright and cynically truthful statement of the real political aspirations of U.S. imperialism in war and in peace. It is precisely this that is objectionable to our super-patriots in whose dream world democracy fights for justice and fascism for evil.

"...by taking for granted that our moral standards are no better than Hitler's, we are also surrendering our ability to win the war," writes Malcolm Cowley in the *New Republic* in criticism of Spykman. However true this may be, it offers no reply to the author: this and similar difficulties are not weaknesses in Spykman's logic but are the insurmountable contradictions of democratic imperialism.

We are in this war for two related reasons, says Spykman. In the first place we must defeat the Axis in order to avoid encirclement of the Western Hemisphere and in the second place we must guarantee that in the peace that follows, the U.S. will emerge indisputably as the dominant power in the world.

The main portion of the book, obviously written before the entry of the United States into the war, is concerned with the first half of this aim and consists of a devastating reply to that isolationist mode of thought which believes that the Western Hemisphere can remain intact regardless of the outcome of wars in Europe and Asia. The conclusion that he reaches is that although the United States might be able militarily to defend the quarter sphere up to the bulge of Brazil in the event of an Axis victory, economically it would be so shut off from foreign markets and sources of raw materials that it would suffer a sharp decline in economic and military power. But it is Spykman's line of reasoning that is of more interest to us than his conclusions.

Spykman effectively explodes the theory that events are naturally leading toward a free, democratic union of all the American states in opposition to all possible totalitarian aggressors. There are as many internal divisions among the American states as there are among the nations of Europe; dictatorship is at least as welcome as democracy; the economy

of the Southern countries, especially Argentina, meshes in more closely with that of Europe; and above all the chief Latin American states hate and fear the United States as much as any of the totalitarian powers and can be expected to try to play one side off against the other.

Spykman makes clear exactly what is involved in Pan-Americanism:

Nothing short of a single hemisphere economy with centralized control of international trade could provide the possibility of defense against the economic power of a victorious Germany. No American state would, however, be willing voluntarily to make the changes necessary to create such a regional economy. It could be achieved only by the same process which is now being used to transform the national economies of Europe into a Greater Germany co-prosperity sphere. Only the conquest of the hemisphere by the United States and the ruthless destruction of existing regional economies could bring the necessary integration.

Or, "faced by the planned economies of two national socialist régimes in the continents across the ocean, there can be a chance of economic survival in the Western Hemisphere only if we surrender individual freedom of action within the state and national freedom as between the states." Has there been a clearer statement of the rôle which a fascist United States would play on the American continents?

If Spykman discards this as a desirable line of development it is not out of any moralistic considerations but because he believes that even such a fascist Pan Americanism would be unable to cope with a victorious Germany. He implies that this tack would be unnecessary for a victorious U.S. But Spykman admits that the period of peace that follows this war will only be a temporary armistice and in any event will be the stage for warfare carried on by economic and political means. The Federation of British Industries, for example, has announced that it intends to follow the pre-war emergency trade policies, part of which was the struggle against the U.S. for the South American market through bi-lateral trade agreements. Totalitarian control by the U.S. over South America may not in itself compensate for an Axis victory but it would be a handy instrument in a post-war world of intense economic warfare.

The United States must avoid the errors of the period that followed the last war. This time it must aggressively step into foreign politics and insure a "balance of powers." What Spykman means by a balance of powers becomes clear enough... that no power other than the United States shall be free to exercise its strength on a world scale, thus making the United States super-arbiter of the world.

He rejects the idea of a joint British-American hegemony in the world.

It is undoubtedly true that immediately after the armistices, the United States and Great Britain could exercise great power through control of the seas, particularly if they had previously destroyed Japanese sea power. But it is highly problematical whether American-British hegemony could be translated into a permanent form of world organization and it would be a mistake to assume that this program would appeal to any but a limited number of Anglo-Saxons as an ideal substitute for German-Japanese hegemony.

Such a set-up would only throw Germany, Russia and China together, he maintains, and tend to upset the balance. Moreover, Spykman makes abundantly clear that all is not so well between the U.S. and Britain. We will take over their possessions in the Western Hemisphere. Britain is in conflict with us in South America. Its agreement with Japan following the last war was one of the serious threats to our power in the world. Above all, the United States must oppose any form of unity in Europe.

If the peace objective of the United States is the creation of a united Europe, she is fighting on the wrong side. All out aid to Hitler would be the quickest way to achieve an integrated transatlantic zone.

The policy that Britain pursued on the continent must become the policy of the United States in the world. It must seek such a balance of power that will prevent any one or two powers from dominating either Europe or Asia. We must not err in taking the principle of self-determination too seriously, implies Spykman, and his manipulation and remanipulation of the states of Europe is a sight to behold.

In carrying out this policy his main proposals are:

1. *Protect Japan.* "Twice in one generation we have come to the aid of Great Britain in order that the small off-shore island might not have to face a single gigantic military state in control of the opposite coast of the mainland. If the balance of power in the Far East is to be preserved in the future as well as in the present, the United States will have to adopt a similar protective policy toward Japan. The present inconsistency in American policy will have to be removed."

2. *To restore Germany.* The big problem on the continent of Europe will be to ward off the power that Russia will represent if the Axis is defeated. A strong Germany, plus a large buffer state between the two is the answer, says Spykman. "Strange as it may seem at this moment, it is quite conceivable that the British government would not relish the idea of a Germany so completely defeated that it could not defend itself against the invasion of victorious Russian armies. It is even conceivable that Washington might become convinced of the cogency of the British argument that asks for the continued existence of a powerful Germany. A Russian state from the Urals to the North Sea can be no great improvement over a German state from the North Sea to the Urals."

*Is this clear? Here we are at war with Japan and Germany. A Sterling professor of international relations at Yale University informs us that when the war is over we must revivify and protect our former enemies against our former friends!* But, the anxious patriot may inquire, is not this more or less the policy that was followed after the last war and didn't it lead to a bigger and better World War? Spykman, unlike Roosevelt and Churchill, who promise a period of peace and justice, replies:

Basically the new order will not differ from the old and international society will continue to operate with the same fundamental power patterns.

This program does not promise the end of international strife. It accepts the fact that there will always be conflict and that war will remain a necessary instrument in the preservation of a balance of power.

Professor Spykman has been widely commended for his "realism." This realism foresees a drive for totalitarianism on the Western Hemisphere in the event of an Axis victory. In the event of an Axis defeat, the reconstitution of Japan and Germany and the domination of the world by the United States; continuous economic, political and finally, military warfare to maintain this "balance of power."

What seems to be realism consists at bottom of a profound ignorance of the rôle played by the masses in the post-war period and to be played in the course of and after this war.

The United Nations have already learned to their sorrow how impotent they are in the Far East without the support of the oppressed millions. Edgar Snow, Lin Yutang and others appeal to the democratic imperialist governments to demonstrate that they really are fighting for democracy by giving real freedom to India, Africa and China. This is to advise slaveholders to free their slaves the better to fight to keep them.

Divorced as they are from reality, however, these sentimentalists show more insight than the would-be Machiavellian adviser to imperialism. They, at least, recognize the decisive rôle of the masses today.

Not so with Spykman. In all of his book of more than 400 pages he refers not once to the possibilities of a revolution of the masses anywhere in the world and its possible effects on the balance of powers. At a time when the volcano that is India is about to explode beneath Great Britain he develops a line of thought predicated on the most abject submission on the part of the masses. Discussing the many "errors" of the democratic imperialist powers he writes:

"Equally serious had been the failure to save the Spanish Republic. Fascist Spain, which owed her victory to Germany and Italy, controls the most strategic zones on the coast line of the continental triangle." In this simple statement one discovers the bankruptcy of his whole line of thought.

It was no more an error for the democratic camp to allow a fascist victory in Spain than it was (and will be from Spykman's point of view) to allow post-war Germany to rise again. What was at stake for England and France was no mere strategic outpost but nothing less than the European revolution. A crushing defeat for Franco by the Spanish masses could have no other result than the completion of the Spanish Revolution—the seizure of power by the proletariat. The French working class, still marching forward, would have followed and the European revolution would have forged ahead.

Since the last war there have been no end of revolutionary movements: The Russian Revolution, the Finnish, Hungarian, Chinese and German revolutions, the mutiny in the French fleet, British shop stewards movement, etc. But our realist has literally nothing to say about these movements and those to come and how they will affect his policies, thus demonstrating that our historian does not know his history.

BEN HALL.

## Win the War, Win the Peace

STRATEGY FOR DEMOCRACY, by J. Donald Kingsley and David W. Petegorsky. Longman, Green & Co., publishers, New York, N. Y. 342 pages, \$3.00.

"Strategy for Democracy" is advertised as a guide to democratic action and an outline of the policy which will guarantee the winning of the peace as well as the war. It purports to be a clarification of what our war aims should be, and how we should achieve these. According to the authors, neither Roosevelt's eight-point program nor the Roosevelt-Churchill Atlantic Charter can be considered adequate.

This book, the authors state, is in a sense a by-product of the Antioch Conference held last year and contains contributions by a number of participants at this conference, the point of view of whom the authors do not necessarily endorse.

Kingsley and Petegorsky attempt to set the tone of the book by a discussion of the economic order of capitalism. I say attempt because, as will be shown later, the other contributors ignore what these two prove, namely, that the capitalist system is finished and should give way to another economic order.

The analysis of the capitalist orders made by these two authors, though very sketchy and inadequate, leads them at

least to the following conclusions: (1) Capitalism has entered the stage of monopoly, and "free competition" has been replaced by "monopolistic competition"; (2) capital has become concentrated in the hands of relatively few monopolists and the relationship between the classes has become intensified; (3) capitalism has reached the stage where monopoly in the ownership of the means of production is a fetter upon production; (4) capitalist competition is the cause of war, and (5) monopoly capitalism and democracy are incompatible, as demonstrated by the rise of fascism. All these factors make necessary a program of transition to a new economic society, collective democracy, so that capitalist chaos and waste can be eliminated and democracy be given a new lease on life.

Kingsley and Petegorsky contend that the alternative is between fascism and collective democracy (why not socialism?). For elucidation of this point, they print a section by Mordecai Ezekiel financial expert in the Roosevelt Administration) who starts out on the assumption that the object of production, regardless of the form of the society, is consumption. He overlooks the fact that under capitalism it is the owners of capital who decide the object of production, and that is not consumption but the creation of profits. That is the nub of the whole problem. To produce for use today presupposes the abolition of private ownership of the means of production. Without collective ownership, planned economy is an impossibility.

#### NEW ORDER BY EXPERTS

Ezekiel proposes a system of planned economy based on capitalism in which the productive forces will be expanded, profits and payrolls will rise, and there will be no unemployment. Kingsley and Petegorsky do not indicate how they square that with their view that "the source of the world crisis is the widespread reactionary attempt to confine the progressive forces of industrialism within a bastille of archaic economic and social relations. So difficult is such confinement that it can be accomplished only by the most violent means and then for no more than a brief period of time. In the long run the bastille itself must be destroyed and its place taken either by a more repressive structure, as in the case of fascism, or by institutions which will liberate the potentials in the machine process. These are the real alternatives; not the preservation of the bastille."

Another section of the book deals with the winning of the war. The authors contend that the war will not be won militarily alone, but that political weapons in terms of what victorious democracy will offer to the vanquished countries is necessary. "If democracy is to succeed in waging total war against totalitarianism, it must similarly present to the victims of fascism a body of ideas and a record of achievement that will create in those countries where fascism has triumphed an enormous fifth column for democracy. We must present them, in terms of peace aims, the vision of a world that will inspire them to revolt against the crushing yoke of tyranny." Bravo!

We leave aside here the fact that the above is precisely what capitalist democracy has been unable to do in this war and we consider what this vision is that is to inspire the millions of oppressed in Europe, Asia and Africa to act as a fifth column for the United Nations. This section is covered by Pierre Cot, who as Minister of Air and Commerce for the Popular Front Government in France, knows from first-hand experience how to preserve and extend democracy!

It is Mr. Cot's task to draw up a plan for international organization after the war. He rejects the old League of Nations. It failed in its purpose for a number of reasons, the

most interesting of which is that the great democracies failed to support it adequately. In place of the League, Mr. Cot proposes another world organization, to be run more democratically than its predecessor and to be administered by the same great democracies which allowed the former organization to go to pot! The victims of fascism will certainly be inspired to know that the new set-up will create a police force because keeping order in Europe will be "primarily a military and police problem."

As for the colonial peoples, Mr. Cot offers them the prospect of being administered by the international organization. "All colonial areas not immediately able to assume self-government would have to be governed either directly or through a system of mandates by the world organization." Mr. Cot, of course, neglects to mention who will decide whether colonial and backward areas are capable of governing themselves.

The masses of India are today demonstrating how they feel about such promises, and to what extent they are willing to entrust their self-government to the judgment of the victorious democracies.

Max Werner, the so-called military expert, discusses the military machine and concludes that the only way of solving Europe's military problems is by the "creation of an international military police power that has for its tasks the prevention of revenge on the part of the defeated fascist forces and the defense of democracy." It is obvious that Mr. Werner does not have much faith in the ability of the "fifth column of democracy" to fulfill this task.

#### MORE GENERALITIES FOR SALE

In conclusion, Petegorsky and Kingsley tell their readers how to achieve the new collective democracy—through the organization of a progressive movement which will embrace the Negroes, the poor farm population, the middle class, and will be based on the organized forces of labor, the trade unions. They say that in the United States there is no large, influential radical party capable of achieving this. A political differentiation based on class divisions has started to mature, and it is necessary to heighten it. This will be the job of the progressive movement. Everything is said about this movement—everything except what its program will be. Will it aim to plan economy on the basis of capitalism, will it aim to overthrow the "bastille" of capitalism? Of this there is no indication.

After all is said and done, we are no further ahead than we were at the beginning.

Kingsley and Petegorsky say that capitalism is the cause of war—and publish a program for peace based on the continued existence of capitalism. They want a program to inspire revolt in the fascist countries and offer precisely what the masses of these countries fear in the event of their defeat—namely, military and police domination by the victors. They want to enlist the support of the colonial peoples and offer them international administration and open door policy. They say capitalism produces only chaos and that the choice is between fascism and collective democracy, and present a program (via one of the contributors) of planned economy based on capitalism. They say capitalism is the cause of fascism and yet they propose a movement with no program other than "progressive," which says nothing about combatting capitalism. This movement supposedly is to usher in the new collective democracy, but we are left in the dark as to how this is to be achieved.

All this is called "Strategy for Democracy." A better name would be "Straddling for Democracy." R. CRAINE.