
July, 1941

Fourth International

DEFEND THE SOVIET UNION

Manifesto of the Socialist Workers Party

**The FBI-Gestapo Attack on the
Socialist Workers Party**

Class Relations in the USSR J. G. Wright
A Letter from Exile Leon Trotsky
Air Power Today James Cadman
Perspectives for Europe Marc Loris
Roosevelt's Two Fronts William F. Warde

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

The Nazi attack upon the Soviet Union resulted in a rude awakening for many people, not all of them fellow-travelers of the Stalinite regime. A large number of people suddenly realized that they had taken much too lightly the theories of Leon Trotsky and the Fourth International.

The result has been that we have for the last several weeks been receiving innumerable requests for old copies of our magazine containing analytical articles on the nature of the Soviet state and especially on the forces which drove Stalin into his short-lived pact with Hitler. Libraries and research groups have written us for back numbers and have asked us to supply them with copies of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**. Young students, interested in political matters, have come to our office to look through our files of material.

There must be thousands of politically developed workers in the United States hungry to know how they can link their instinctive determination to defend the achievements of the October revolution with a class-conscious resistance to imperialist war. These workers must be reached by our comrades in every part of the country. The time is short and the awakening of the masses must be swift.

* * *

Generally speaking, the task of eliciting prompt responses from our branches in the payment of current bills is completely "liquidated." Almost every city pays its bill for the current bundle as soon as the shipment arrives.

But there still remains the very valid question of old bills, accumulated before we underwent the Great Reform in our attitude toward financial responsibilities. We are now in a state where the mark which divides the good from the bad is the old debt.

Some cities put their noses to the grindstone and ground down their blemishes long ago, and have been careful not to mar the serenity of their countenances since then. Among them are: Allentown, Buffalo, Chicago, Detroit, Fresno, Hutchinson, Min-

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Published by the Fourth International Publishing Association

Volume II July 1941 No. 6 (Whole No. 13)

116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547.
Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 14c for 5 copies and up.
Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 18c for 5 copies and up.
Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.


Editorial Board:

JAMES P. CANNON JOSEPH HANSEN
WILLIAM F. WARDE FELIX MORROW

Business Manager:

LYDIA BEIDEL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The FBI-Gestapo Attack on the Socialist Workers Party,	by The Editors 163
Class Relations in the Soviet Union	By John G. Wright 166
Defend The Soviet Union—Manifesto of the Socialist Workers Party	170
The Development of Air Power, By James Cadman	173
Roosevelt Fights on Two Fronts,	By William F. Warde 177
Perspectives for Europe,	By Marc Loris 179
Bolshevism and the Struggle for Peace,	By Joachim Brust 182
FROM THE ARSENAL OF MARXISM	
A Letter from Exile in Alma-Ata,	By Leon Trotsky 186
The Blind Alley of Soviet Literature, By L. Yakovlev	188
An Apologist for Chinese Stalinism, By George Stern	190
MANAGER'S COLUMN	Inside Front Cover  267

neapolis, Newark, Plentywood, Portland, Quakertown, Reading, St. Louis, St. Paul and Youngstown.

Others have fallen into the dissolute habit of paying current accounts and hoping that the business office will fail to notice what went on in the past. These cities of course range from those who are simply waiting for the old debt to reach a nice round number to those whose behavior is downright scandalous. We heap them all together into one stigmatized pile and find: Akron, Baltimore, Boston, Cleveland, Flint, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, New Haven, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Rochester, San Diego, San Francisco and Texas. There is no time like the present to clear one's conscience.

It is hardly necessary for us to mention the extreme need this moment has brought for the continued publication and extended distribution of our literature. If all of our literary efforts in the last two decades had any objective at all, it certainly was to be able to speak with the loudest and clearest voice possible at such a moment as this. And that requires con-

scientious financial support to the Trotskyist press. We have never failed to get it before and we know that no city will rest until the debts owing to **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** have been completely wiped off the books.

* * *

From the international arena of war and class politics came an interesting news item this month, slowly and by a devious route via our German comrades strewn in exile across the continent of Europe.

The shocking news of the GPU assassination of Leon Trotsky finally made its way to the Isle of Man, lying off the Northwest coast of England, where the British democratically provide a detention camp for German and Austrian workers. Among those there detained were members of the Trotskyist organization of Germany.

Our comrades determined upon a memorial lecture to be delivered by one of them for any of the other prisoners who might be sufficient interested in revolutionary working class politics to attend.

When word got round among the others that such a gathering was to be organized, a number of other prisoners, members of other working class parties, requested that they be allowed to cooperate in the arrangements. They were immediately welcomed by our comrades and preparations went forward for a memorial meeting in honor of Leon Trotsky.

Almost six hundred inmates of the internment camp on the Isle of Man came together that evening. One of the followers of the Old Man spoke and a number of others, members of other working class groups, stood before their fellow-victims of imperialism and spoke in honor of the great revolutionary fighter who had died the victim of Stalin's murder machine.

The meeting, which had been planned as a simple lecture on the life and teachings of Leon Trotsky, became a memorial testimonial participated in by workers whose diverse political views could not blind them to one fact—that the greatest revolutionary in the world had been slain by Stalin.

TROTSKY'S LAST WORK

Manifesto of the
Fourth International
on the
Imperialist War
and the
Proletarian Revolution

48 Pages 5¢ per copy

Order from

Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place
New York City

If the number on your wrapper reads:

N 54 or F 13

your subscription expires with this issue. In order to avoid missing a single issue of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**, be sure to send in your renewal order immediately. \$2.00 for one year, \$3.00 for one year in combination with the Militant.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 2

JULY 1941

NUMBER 6

The FBI-Gestapo Attack on the Socialist Workers Party

By THE EDITORS

As we go to press, a Federal grand jury in St. Paul, Minnesota, convened by order of Acting U. S. Attorney General Francis Biddle, is preparing indictments against CIO unionists and leaders of the Socialist Workers Party on the crudely trumped-up charge of "seditious conspiracy" to "overthrow the government by force and violence." The grand jury was convened in great haste, three days after FBI agents, on June 27, raided the Socialist Workers Party headquarters in St. Paul and Minneapolis, seizing as "evidence" material to be found in almost any library—books by Marx, Lenin and Trotsky, copies of the party's weekly newspaper, THE MILITANT, copies of the monthly magazine, FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, red flags bearing the insignia of the party, photographs of Trotsky and Lenin, etc. etc.

The haste of the FBI produced an extremely clumsy job. The real aim of the prosecution was glaringly evident. The newspapers had been given no friendly tips on how to handle the story; for example, the first edition of the *St. Paul Dispatch* on June 28 came out with an eight column streamer: "U. S. To Prosecute Local 544-CIO." Nor was Acting Attorney General Biddle's formal announcement much more clever; he was at some pains to claim that "the prosecution is not in any sense an attack on organized labor nor is it an effort to interfere in a dispute between labor organizations"; but this pious disclaimer was nullified by his very next words:

"The principal Socialist Workers Party leaders against whom prosecution is being brought are also leaders of Local 544-CIO in Minneapolis. This prosecution is brought under the criminal code of the United States against persons who have been engaged in criminal seditious activities, and who are leaders of the Socialist Workers Party and have gained control of a legitimate labor union to use it for illegitimate purposes."

That the FBI's assault upon the Socialist Workers Party was but the red-herring to cover up the government's attack upon the CIO was immediately pointed out by the ranking officer of the CIO in Minneapolis, Frank Barnhart, regional director of the United Construction Workers Organizing Committee. He stated:

"The demonstrative Friday raid by the FBI on the headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party in the Twin Cities and the public announcement by the U. S. Department of Justice threatening indictments and inferring that leaders of Local 544-CIO are involved, is nothing but a smear campaign against the CIO.

"Unable to bend the workers to his will by the other vicious tactics which he has employed, Dan Tobin has persuaded Roosevelt to carry out this action in payment of his political debt to Tobin for past services rendered. It is deplorable that the

functions of the U. S. Department of Justice have been perverted in this reprehensible manner."

The CIO could make so devastating a charge against Roosevelt because the record supports its charge to the hilt.

Why Local 544 Joined the CIO

By a well-nigh unanimous vote of nearly 4,000 members at a regular membership meeting on June 9, the Minneapolis truck drivers union, Local 544, voted to disaffiliate from Tobin's reactionary AFL setup and to accept a charter from the United Construction Workers Organizing Committee of the CIO. In offering the charter, A. D. Lewis, president of the UCWOC and brother of John L. Lewis, declared it to be the first step in "a streamlined CIO organizing campaign among the motor transport and allied workers of the entire Midwest area," to bring them "into a modern, progressive industrial union."

The history of Local 544 makes clear why its membership so eagerly welcomed the invitation from the CIO. In the midst of the great strikes of 1934 which built this union, the strikers found themselves attacked in the employers' press by Daniel J. Tobin, head of the International to which 544 was affiliated! Tobin did not like the militant methods whereby the union was being built. A year later he expelled the union from his International and spent huge sums trying to smash it. He failed, and was compelled to permit its reaffiliation to the Teamsters International under the same militant leadership which he had sworn would never again lead a union in his organization.

Shortly afterward, in 1936, came a new conflict between Local 544 and Tobin. The Minneapolis union had taken the initiative in organizing the hitherto-unorganized over-the-road drivers of the entire Midwest area. Tobin looked with suspicion upon this over-the-road driver, a real proletarian type very different from the driver-salesmen who then constituted the bulk of Tobin's International.

Against stubborn resistance from Tobin, Local 544 led the movement which built the North Central Area Negotiating Committee covering over-the-road drivers in 12 states, and, after a few hard-fought strategic strikes, brought over 200,000 new members into the teamsters' movement when the area committee signed a closed-shop area-wide contract in the Fall of 1937. Tobin reconciled himself sourly to this role of Local 544—he had to appoint Farrell Dobbs, secretary-treasurer of Local 544 as International organizer in charge of this over-the-road area—only by his greed for the enormously enhanced revenue which came to him. From the first

he was scheming to assume dictatorial control of the area and to settle his long-standing accounts with Local 544.

As the country moved closer to war, Tobin felt his opportunity had come. In May, 1941, he issued a blast at the union in his personal organ, the *Teamsters Journal*, denouncing the "Trotskyists" in the Minnesota teamsters' movement. He followed that up by ordering the 544 leadership to stand trial before his International Executive Board at Washington the first week of June. There he demanded that the Local 544 leadership agree to his appointment of a dictator-receiver over the union, with absolute powers, including the power to expel anyone. When Local 544 refused to agree, Tobin proceeded to move in on the union, conniving with reactionary Republican Governor Stassen of Minnesota and the Minneapolis employers to hold up renewal of 544's contracts.

In the light of this record of the relationship between Local 544 and Tobin, it is no wonder that the 544 membership so enthusiastically accepted the CIO's invitation to become part of the progressive industrial union movement.

Roosevelt's First Move to Aid Tobin

Four days after the Local 544 membership meeting voted to join the CIO, President Roosevelt took the unprecedented step of publicly rebuking the CIO for chartering Local 544. On June 13, upon receipt of a complaint from Tobin about the defection of Local 544, the President's secretary, Stephen Early, made the following statement to the White House press conference:

"Mr. Tobin telegraphed from Indianapolis that it is apparent to him and to the other executives of his organization that because they have been and will continue to stand squarely behind the government, that all subversive organizations and all enemies of our government, including Bundists, Trotskyists and Stalinists, are opposed to them and seeking to destroy loyal trade unions which are supporting democracy.

"Mr. Tobin goes into considerable detail and states he is going to issue a statement from the Indianapolis office of the teamsters' union. When I advised the President of Tobin's representations this morning he asked me to immediately have the government departments and agencies interested in this matter notified and to point out to you that this is no time, in his opinion, for labor unions, local or national, to begin raiding one another for the purpose of getting memberships or for similar reasons." (New York Times, June 14, 1941).

The Tobin statement to which Early referred was issued simultaneously with the President's statement; it was a long diatribe against the Socialist Workers Party as being responsible for the withdrawal of Local 544 from the AFL. It said in part:

"The withdrawal from the international union by the Truck Drivers Union, Local 544, and one other small union, in Minneapolis, and their affiliation with the CIO is indeed a regrettable and dangerous condition. The officers of this local union . . . were requested to dissociate themselves from the radical Trotsky organization . . . We feel that while our country is in a dangerous position, those disturbers who believe in the policies of foreign, radical governments, or who are supporting the enemies of our government, must be in some way prevented from pursuing this dangerous course . . ." (New York Times, June 14, 1941).

Although Tobin's statement admitted that he was confronted with nothing less than "the withdrawal from the international union by the Truck Drivers Union, Local 544," he did not concede the union membership the right to withdraw. They "must be in some way prevented from pursuing this dangerous course," Tobin had said—and he tried *his* way to prevent them. Three hundred Tobin hoodlums poured into

Minneapolis and with knives, guns and clubs did their utmost to change the democratic vote of the 544 membership. These methods failed miserably. Local 544-CIO challenged Tobin to agree to Labor Board elections in every section of the industry to determine which union had the allegiance of the Minneapolis drivers. But elections would show Tobin in all his impotent nakedness; his imported agents refused to agree to elections. In panic and desperation Tobin again pressed Roosevelt to intervene—the raids and prosecution of Local 544-CIO and the Socialist Workers Party followed.

Why Roosevelt Sent the FBI Against 544

Why did Roosevelt go so far in aiding Tobin against the CIO? Roosevelt still seeks to parade as a friend of labor. The CIO was still reverberating with protests against Roosevelt's strikebreaking use of the Army when Roosevelt hurried the FBI into the Twin Cities. Even more crudely than in the aviation strike, the assault upon 544 was an anti-CIO move. In Inglewood, Roosevelt could point to the condemnation of the aviation strike by UAW-CIO top officials and President Philip Murray of the CIO (who, however, condemned the use of troops to break the strike). But in Minneapolis Local 544-CIO is backed in this fight by its international leadership. Only a few days before the raids Local 544 was warmly welcomed into the CIO by President Murray. What weighty reasons caused Roosevelt to make this openly anti-CIO move under these conditions?

A favor to Tobin, his closest labor lieutenant, was one of Roosevelt's motivations. Far more important, however, is the question of what kind of trade union movement Roosevelt wants. Under no circumstances does he want the docile, super-patriotic AFL to be still further weakened and the onrushing CIO to become the predominant trade union movement.

And in Minneapolis the AFL is in danger of being struck a mortal blow. The Teamsters is the biggest and most powerful unit in the AFL. Moreover it is the key to AFL control of the building trades field, as the CIO has ruefully discovered in its attempts, during the last two years, to enter that field.

If the CIO succeeds in maintaining Local 544-CIO against the employer-government-Tobin onslaught, it will be like a thread which will speedily unravel the fabric of Tobin's entire setup. The prestige of Local 544 as the builder of the over-the-road drivers' movement assures it, if it survives this onslaught, of the good-will of the 200,000 over-the-road drivers whom Local 544 brought into Tobin's Teamsters. Furthermore it is no secret that the uneasy truce which has prevailed between the AFL Teamsters and the CIO in key industrial centers would end with the CIO assimilating the really proletarian elements in the drivers' movement once a big break occurred anywhere in Tobin's domain.

At bottom, then, Roosevelt's Gestapo-FBI is defending the continued existence of the AFL against CIO hegemony of the labor movement, by this attack upon Local 544-CIO and the Socialist Workers Party.

Roosevelt Would Crush Militant Unionism

"Why," asked a CIO spokesman when Roosevelt rebuked the CIO for "raiding" the AFL Teamsters, "didn't the President come out against union-raiding when the AFL was actually raiding the CIO ranks at the Ford River Rouge plant?" The answer is obvious. At Ford's the AFL was fighting against militant unionism; whereas in Minneapolis the CIO is backing a militant union. The craven, whipped-cur attitude of the AFL bureaucrats harmonizes with Roosevelt's war policies, while the more militant, independent, progressive

character of the CIO has brought it into constant conflict with the administration.

Green, Woll and Tobin freely offer their services to Roosevelt as strikebreakers, disorganizers and police to track down and purge militant workers. They hope thus to ingratiate themselves with the Administration and the big employers and to be rewarded by official recognition as the acknowledged directors of the trade union movement. This degenerate policy is the ultimate logic of craft unionism, which can only be the official labor movement on condition that the vast masses remain unorganized.

On the other hand the CIO can prevail only as the representative of the organized great masses. And, springing from the dynamic, proletarian composition of the CIO and its industrial form of organization, is a general tendency to show far less enthusiasm for Roosevelt's war policies and to put up considerable opposition to his anti-labor measures and actions. The storm of CIO protest against Roosevelt's strikebreaking use of the Army, and the CIO solidarity with Local 544 in Minneapolis, testify to the qualitatively superior class independence and integrity of the CIO.

Tomorrow, it may well be, Roosevelt will abandon the AFL altogether, for its moral authority over the workers is rapidly vanishing; Roosevelt will then seek to back collaborators in the CIO who will do their utmost to render the CIO as house-broken as the AFL is today. When that happens, however, the same struggle that goes on today between the AFL and CIO will then be transferred into the CIO. All the progressive forces in the CIO will then have to conduct the same battle for democratic rights against a combination of employers, government and labor bureaucrats that Local 544-CIO is waging so heroically today.

In attacking Local 544, Roosevelt is attacking militant unionism. The government is on the brink of imperialist war. To wage that war, the Roosevelt regime must whip the workers into line *politically*—to support the war or else be silent. They must be whipped into line *economically*—cajoled or coerced to accept lower real wages, longer hours, worsened working conditions and living standards. When these twin tasks cannot be executed by acquiescent top union leaders like Tobin, the government itself must step in. That's what Roosevelt did in the North American Aviation strike; that's what his Gestapo-FBI is doing in the prosecutions against Local 544-CIO and the Socialist Workers Party.

We of the Socialist Workers Party proudly plead guilty to standing for the type of militant unionism exemplified by Local 544-CIO. We have always supported the policy of industrial unionism represented by the CIO against the craft unionism typified by the AFL. We have always advocated a policy of militant struggle, of expanding the trade unions to take in the vast masses of the workers, as the CIO is now doing. We have always condemned the policy of depending upon the benevolence of the bosses, of reliance upon arbitration, government labor boards or any other form of class collaboration. We have done our best to educate the workers in the spirit of independent class action to build their class organizations and gain their demands. Attorney General Biddle will not have to extort a confession from us to these "crimes." We shall proclaim them before the bar of working class public opinion and see to it that every serious worker understands that we are being persecuted for thus having aided the growth of the power of the labor movement.

Yes, we hailed the service rendered to the entire labor movement by the Local 544 delegation to last year's Teamsters convention (Tobin permits one to be held . . . every five

years!). Tobin tried to push through a constitutional clause empowering him to enforce compulsory arbitration upon every local. The Local 544 delegation organized and led the opposition in the convention that defeated Tobin's proposal. Had Tobin been victorious then, he would today be twice as useful to Roosevelt. Tobin and Roosevelt have good cause to hate Local 544.

We plead guilty to irreconcilable opposition to everything that Tobin stands for in the trade unions. What Roosevelt is now requiring of Tobin is indicated quite baldly in the June issue of the *Teamsters Journal* (as Tobin humorously entitles his personal organ). Tobin wrote:

"Business agents and salaried officers of unions are going to be held mainly responsible by the state and federal governments for the actions of their members as time goes on. In most instances paid representatives of local unions are in a position to stop trouble. In some few instances they are not strong enough to stop the rank and file, but in those instances where they fail or where they are unable to protect the rank and file from themselves, they should notify the International Office of such failure."

To "protect the rank and file from themselves"—that means to prevent the rank and file from asking for higher wages and better working conditions. Tobin went even further, at the Washington hearing, telling the Local 544 delegation that it might be necessary for the workers to give up their gains, "and possibly even their unions," for the duration of the war! We of the Socialist Workers Party will go far indeed to halt Tobin from carrying out that union-wrecking policy.

Likewise we plead guilty to the fact that our Minneapolis branch gave its unreserved support to the policy of Local 544 in the recent municipal elections. We stand for an independent Labor Party, and Local 544 promoted such a party by backing a trade union ticket in the Minneapolis elections which took place shortly before the onslaught of Tobin and Roosevelt. That was another of Local 544's "crimes" in the eyes of Tobin, who does his utmost to keep the trade unions chained to the boss political parties.

Our Struggle Against the Imperialist War

There are other "crimes" that we share with Local 544. Minneapolis, capital of the Northwest, is the traditional center of opposition to imperialist war, now as in 1917. More than any other part of the country it is an obstacle to Roosevelt's war plans. And no more forthright voice has been raised there against those war plans than the *Northwest Organizer*, the widely-read weekly newspaper of Local 544. There, too, our party, campaigning unambiguously for our "Trotskyist Anti-War Candidate," polled nearly 9,000 votes in the last state election. Those thousands are a vanguard who can under favorable conditions draw great masses into struggle against the imperialist war. By this prosecution the Gestapo-FBI is attempting to behead that struggle before the favorable conditions develop as they are certain to develop.

Perhaps the greatest "crime" which we share with Local 544, in the eyes of the Gestapo-FBI, is that our opposition to the imperialist war is not an impotent pacifist opposition. The *Northwest Organizer* has not merely recognized, but has urged the workers to understand, the necessity of mastering the military arts in this military epoch. It has raised the demand for military training, financed by the government, but under control of the trade unions—the only form of military training which will give the workers the necessary education in the military arts without placing them under the control of a reactionary officers' caste and the imperialist war policies of

the Roosevelt regime. The Socialist Workers Party unreservedly supports this demand. The bourgeoisie and its government, who treat pacifists with indulgent contempt because they know that pacifism is no threat to the class rule of the bourgeoisie, take an entirely different attitude toward the demand for military training under control of the trade unions. In it they recognize a demand which strikes at the very foundations of ruling class oppression.

Yes, there is a profound logic in the fact that these persecutions and prosecutions are instigated by the Gestapo-FBI at this time and in this place and against the specifically-designated victims. What we have said should make this plain. And this must be understood if the fight against these outrages is to be waged successfully.

One further important point must be made about the *time*. This is the time when Roosevelt's war plans must be brutally carried forward several giant steps. Congressional authorization must be secured now for sending American soldiers abroad, and for violating the previous solemn pledge to keep conscripts only one year. A moment when Roosevelt must stifle opposition as much as possible. But this moment is something more. This is the time when the Communist Party, on behalf of its master, Stalin, has returned to support of Roosevelt. While the Communist Party is overnight transforming itself into an ultra-patriotic gang and showing its yellow colors, we Trotskyists remain true to our red banner, our revolutionary program, our fight against imperialist war, our struggle for socialism. Now it becomes crystal-clear to all militant workers that the only consistent opponents of the imperialist war are the Trotskyists. All the slanders of the Stalinists, all the Moscow frameups, have failed to confuse either the capitalist masters or the workers of the United States. Both know, especially at this moment, the real truth about the Trotskyists. They know that the followers of the martyred Trotsky are the banner-bearers of the revolutionary ideas and traditions of the great Bolshevik movement of Marx and Lenin. That is why Roosevelt wishes to outlaw our party as part of his war preparations.

The Trotskyists Hounded by All Tyrants

Only yesterday the government was still pretending that it would limit its prosecutions to "agents of foreign powers." That was the pretext for the blows at the Communist Party during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact. On more than one occasion, Dies Committee spokesmen and others of similar stripe have been at pains to assert that no "genuine American radicals" were going to be prosecuted. Well, gentlemen! Are any of you brazen or ignorant enough to assert that we Trotskyists are agents of a foreign power? Every politically literate person knows how untrue that is!

We Trotskyists are hounded by every government on this earth. Our comrades have died under the executioner's axe

in Hitler's domain. Franco has stood our co-thinkers up against the wall. Mussolini has tortured us to death in his concentration camps. The bonapartist regime of Petain is starving to death our comrades—refugees from Germany, Spain, Italy, etc., and imprisoning our French comrades; before Petain, the "democratic" French government outlawed and packed into concentration camps our comrades in France and Indo-China. Stalin, as the whole world knows, has murdered entire generations of our comrades. "Democratic" England has put our comrades, anti-fascist refugees, into concentration camps. The headman's axe of Chiang Kai-shek falls upon the third generation of Trotskyists who are undergoing unbelievable suffering to win China's independence from all imperialists.

So the United States is now to be added to this list! Such is the decision of Roosevelt, executed by his Gestapo-FBI. His name must not be missing, where the names of Hitler and Stalin are most outstanding.

As our tragically long list of martyrs throughout the world eloquently testifies, we Trotskyists cannot be terrorized by government prosecutions but will be tempered and tested in that fight. Our party has been built under the most adverse conditions over twelve years of struggle. We survived the terrible blows of world-wide working class defeats and the triumphs of reaction. We survived—and grew stronger. We survived the most terrible blow of all, Stalin's murder of Leon Trotsky—and grew stronger. We answer Roosevelt's persecution as we have answered Stalin's persecution: You can put some of us out of the way, but you can never kill our party, for it is based on the unconquerable ideas of Marx, Lenin and Trotsky, and you can never kill those ideas.

We shall not retreat an inch. We shall recant nothing. We shall fight to the last ditch and with all our strength.

Ours Is the Fight of All Labor

In our fight against these monstrous prosecutions, these Washington versions of the Moscow Trials, we are confident that we shall have the support of the progressive sections of the trade union movement and of all those who still retain any respect for democratic rights and civil liberties. In bearing the brunt of this attack, we are defending dearly-won rights of the entire labor movement. No matter what their political differences with our party and its program and activities, all workers must recognize that in this battle we are defending principles which we hold in common with the entire working class: the independence of the trade unions from government domination; the democratic rights of labor; the right of a political party of workers to advocate its pro-labor views. These are the broad interests of the labor movement which we are defending against federal prosecution. We pledge our solemn word to the American working class to defend these interests to the very end.

Class Relations in the Soviet Union

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

Although the military operations at the front are of extreme importance, the fate of the Soviet Union will not be decided on a purely military plane but on the arena of the class struggle.

It cannot be repeated too often that the greatest breach

in the defensive power of the USSR lies not so much in any salient which the Nazi armored divisions have driven through the Red Army's lines of defense as it does in the atomization, disorientation, demoralization and resulting passivity of the European labor movements. No matter how stubbornly and

heroically the Red Army resists the Nazi onslaught, if the world working class remains prostrate the end result will be not only the downfall of Stalin's regime but also of the remaining conquests of the October revolution. As Lenin and Trotsky warned time and again, the fate of the Soviet Union will be decided on the international arena.

The foreign policies of the Kremlin, carried out obediently and unquestioningly always and everywhere by the parties of the Third International, prepared the ground for Hitler's previous triumphs. Stalin's policy is once again clearing the way for Nazi successes. It is not accidental that from the Communist International there emanates today only the silence of the grave. Dimitrov, the "helmsman of the Comintern" has not dared to this day to open his mouth. When and if he is permitted to do so it will not be to rally the world masses to the policy of defense through revolutionary war. The Kremlin is once again staking everything on another alliance with imperialists, this time the camp of Anglo-American "democracies." A victory of Churchill and Roosevelt opens up only the perspective of a new and much worse edition of the Versailles Treaty. What appeal can this possibly have for the German masses? It only drives them into Hitler's hands. The German workers will begin to move only if the way out through socialism—through the Socialist United States of Europe—is opened for them. But this is the road which the Kremlin seeks to block at all costs. Stalinism is again dealing the greatest blows to the defense of the Soviet Union.

Stalin Fears the October Tradition

After having boasted for so many years of having "irrevocably" achieved the building of socialism in one country, after having announced that the very "threshold of Communism" had already been reached, the Kremlin now prohibits even a whisper about it. All references to socialism are carefully deleted from Moscow's official statements, in particular, from all appeals to the German soldiers. The "Manifesto" of the Communist Party in this country follows suit (*Daily Worker*, June 30). This curries favor with London and Washington but will not spur German soldiers to fraternize with the Red Army fighters.

There is also another reason for Stalinist reticence about socialism. The Kremlin's fear of the resurgence of the traditions, program and spirit of October surpasses its fear of the Nazi military might. This fear epitomizes the renegades from Bolshevism. This fear is expressed in everything the Kremlin says or does. It should be recalled that the Stalinists always have sworn that the great victories of the Civil War of 1918-1921 in which imperialist intervention was repelled on 22 fronts were primarily gained through the efforts of Stalin. But Molotov preferred to refer instead to the traditions of the Czarist triumph over Napoleon. He carefully evaded all references to those historical events with which Stalin is, according to the official myth, most closely associated. Was this perhaps done out of consideration for the modesty of the "Great Father of the Peoples"? No, it was done because the bureaucracy must at all costs prevent the banner of October and of the Civil War—the banner of Lenin and Trotsky—from being raised high again over the battlefields.

But the final decision in this sphere, as in so many others, does not rest with the Kremlin. It rests with the greatest internal bulwark of defense, the Soviet working class. With the aid of the international vanguard the Soviet workers must

and can summon the workers of the world to a revolutionary war.

The Soviet Proletariat

The Soviet working class today is ten to twelve times stronger numerically than were the workers in 1917 who led the Russian masses to the conquest of October and who defended them against the entire capitalist world in the greatest civil war in modern times. Thirty million Soviet workers now operate the modern industrial apparatus and inhabit the cities of one-sixth of the world.

In addition to quantitative differences there are profound qualitative differences between this numerically and productively more powerful working class and the workers under the Czar.

The abolition of private property and of the proprietors is sharply expressed in the social composition of modern Soviet cities. The world has never seen such urban centers before. For the first time in history, events will occur under war-time conditions in cities where no bourgeoisie exists. Nor is there an urban petty bourgeoisie in the proper sense of the term. The proletariat constitutes the overwhelming majority of the urban population with a thin crust of the bureaucracy at the top, and a thinner stratum of the Stalinist underworld at the bottom. Even in Moscow, Leningrad and other capital cities of the Federated Republics and autonomous regions the same thing holds true. The bureaucracy in these capital cities constitutes but a minority. Only in the cities of the occupied areas (Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia) are there still sizeable remnants of the old ruling classes and a middle class of any proportion. But the cities in Soviet Union proper have no middle class. All the petty bourgeois tendencies are concentrated within the ranks of the bureaucracy itself, and in the villages. This means that the counter-revolution faces an unprecedented task in the cities, i.e., the decisive centers, the counter-revolution lacks a genuine *class* base and will have either to improvise it or to import it. On the other hand, this provides the revolution with class resources never before at its disposal.

Although the bulk of the workers stems from the land and was absorbed into industry during the first two Five Year Plans, the Soviet working class is far more homogeneous, despite its relative youth, than the Russian workers were in 1917, or the workers in any advanced capitalist countries are today. Trotsky estimated that at the outbreak of the February 1917 revolution, about 40 per cent of the Russian proletarian was of recent petty bourgeois origin, consisting predominantly of those who went into industry to avoid military service. Among the workers today not more than ten per cent are recent recruits from rural areas; moreover, they are extremely young and therefore tend to become proletarianized much more rapidly and readily than older peasants. The other workers who originally came from the villages have already behind them from five to ten years of proletarianization.

Contrast Between Bourgeoisie and Kremlin

The bourgeoisie possesses many means for intensifying differentiation within the ranks of workers. The bourgeoisie of any given nation can create a stable labor aristocracy; a social ladder, as it were, with gradations between the various skilled workers, and between the skilled and the unskilled. In addition, through the functioning of its educational, religious and state organs, the bourgeoisie is able to divide the

workers along racial and religious lines. It is able to maintain its own political agencies within the working class from the outright bourgeois parties down to the various varieties of reformism.

In contrast to this the Kremlin bureaucracy, which lacks a genuine class function, has not been able really to stratify the Soviet workers. Not that it hasn't sought to create a labor aristocracy and to create all possible divisions among the workers.

But the Kremlin, while successful in creating an unbridgeable gulf between the privileged bureaucracy and the rest of the population has not been successful, despite all its efforts, in its attempts to foster any broad and stable labor aristocracy as a basis of support. What happened instead was this: the Stalinist aristocrats of labor—the Stakhanovists—became incorporated with the bureaucracy itself, replacing in many instances the older generations of revolutionists who became bureaucratized during and after the period of the NEP and who were by and large removed during the purges (1935-1938).

Furthermore, the marked tendency in recent years has been to drive down the living standards of all workers, both skilled and unskilled. This has acted to fuse the various sections of the working class in a common hatred against the rapacious and oppressive bureaucracy.

The living standards of all workers must now inevitably fall still lower. The working day, which was fixed at eight hours and a six-day week by the vicious decrees of June 21, 1940 has now been hiked to nine, ten and eleven hours a week. A dispatch from Moscow dated June 27, 1941, announces a decree which makes "obligatory overtime work from one to three hours daily, both for all workers and office employes." (*Daily Worker*, June 28). This means a legal working day of 11 hours and more.

New Conflicts Between Workers And Bureaucrats

The vast majority of the Soviet workers will undoubtedly strain every ounce of energy to supply the fighters at the front. But their efforts come at all points into conflict with the irresponsible administration. The contradiction between the bureaucratic method of management and the demands of defense instead of weakening will intensify literally with every hour of war. For instance, the transportation facilities, already overstrained in peacetime, must now be used primarily to supply the front. How will the plants be supplied?

The already monstrous physical strain upon the workers must presently reach the breaking point. The bureaucracy apparently realizes this, and has offered a special inducement in the form of an increase in pay for overtime. The decree specifies that "remuneration for obligatory overtime (is) one and a half times the regular rates." What will the workers be able to purchase with their increased wages in the face of scarcity and skyrocketing prices? Nevertheless, the "raise" is highly symptomatic. *It is the first time in years that the Kremlin has deemed it advisable to make any sort of concession to the workers.* It is a tacit admission of the rising tide of opposition.

To continue functioning, Soviet industry requires entirely different incentives and entirely different methods of management. Initiative on the part of the masses is now more indispensable than ever before. The struggle for rational working conditions and for the revival of workers' democracy coincides at all points with the life and death needs of Soviet enterprises and of the Red Army. The bureaucracy bars the

way. The traditions of October and of the Civil War—the program of Lenin and Trotsky—point the only way out. Will the Soviet workers take this road which is dictated by necessity? They have no other.

To be sure, there exists as yet no organized and independent political force within the ranks of Soviet labor. But it ought not be forgotten that there still remain many millions in the land who participated directly or indirectly in the October revolution and who passed through the years of the Civil War. There are other thousands who have not forgotten the lessons of the struggle of the Left Opposition from 1923 to 1929, a struggle which reached the masses. In Stalin's jails and concentration camps now sit many who are capable of providing the necessary leadership and of working and fighting shoulder to shoulder with the masses, the Red Army ranks and with the new leaders now being tempered at the front, in the factories, the collective farms and among the youth.

The traditions and methods of the great historical experiences of the Soviet masses will revive under the pressure of this gravest crisis. Once revived they will sweep the land with a speed and power beyond that of any *Panzer* divisions the imperialist world could muster. The very fact that Stalin chooses to keep so rigid a silence on the subject of October is in itself evidence that the bureaucracy already senses its approaching death.

The Soviet Peasantry

What will the peasants do? They still constitute the great majority of the Soviet population. Has this social force, next in importance only to the proletariat, been irretrievably lost to the revolution because of the criminal policies of Stalinism? Or will they again as in 1917 and in the Civil War follow the lead of the revolutionary workers?

The differentiation within the peasantry—its heterogeneity—contrary to Stalin's empty boasts of yesterday—does not fundamentally differ from that in capitalist countries. In general, the agricultural population is divided into the same main classes as exist in capitalist countries—the rural bourgeoisie (landlords, large scale farmers), the rural petty bourgeoisie (the well-to-do-farmers, the individual proprietors), and the rural proletariat (the agricultural laborers).

Although the Czarist landlords have been abolished along with the old rural bourgeoisie, there nevertheless remains in Soviet agriculture a clearly delineated rural petty bourgeoisie in the shape of the *kolkhoz* (collective farm) aristocracy. Among the so-called "millionaire *kolkhozi*" are even to be observed personages who strikingly resemble large scale farmers, i. e., rural *bourgeois*. In other words capitalist tendencies, far from having been abolished in agriculture, have merely been driven inside the collectives, and have luxuriated there. The capitalist tendencies in the collectives are further reinforced by some three million individual homesteads which have survived. In addition there are almost two million artisans most of whom are organized into cooperatives, with special privileges, tax exemptions, etc. granted them in January of this year. As the scarcity of foodstuffs and necessities becomes more and more acute, all the individualistic tendencies in agriculture will intensify. This is one of the main reservoirs of the counter-revolution. With the aid of Hitler or other imperialists, these elements might well be able to turn the hatred of all the peasants against Stalin into channels leading to capitalist restoration.

The camp of the revolution, however, possesses this advantage: Hitler has really little to offer the peasants. The

mask of "liberator" sits poorly on a conqueror, all the more so an invader who comes to pillage after first sowing destruction and death. Phrases and promises, even threats and violence, will carry little weight with the great masses of the peasantry. They have had their fill of this diet from Stalin.

The most backward and superstitious peasant is capable of reasoning. He is cognizant of the superiority of tractors and scientific large scale farming. Besides there has been an acute shortage of horses since the days of forced collectivization when all cattle were slaughtered. How will the crops be raised?

Once the peasant is convinced that the fruits of his labor will not be devoured by bureaucratic blood suckers or fascist despoilers—nothing will swerve him from his support of the resurgent revolution. Once the peasant is convinced that he is free to choose whether he wishes to cultivate his own land or to participate as a full-fledged and genuine shareholder in a collective farm, he will fight tooth and nail against the counter-revolution both from within and without. Once the peasant is convinced that the nationalized economy will be so planned as to take his vital needs into account he will readily lay down his life in defense of it.

He will be further impelled to this choice by the fact that even his present scanty ration is directly threatened by the Nazis. All history teaches that the bitterest struggles are waged over the scantiest rations. Whatever territories Hitler may succeed in overrunning temporarily, he will have to hold with armies of occupation. It took more than 500,000 German soldiers to hold the Ukraine during the last war, when the Kaiser's Germany had the support of the old Ukrainian and Russian ruling classes. The results were very disappointing to the Kaiser. Hitler may well experience even a greater disappointment.

Success for the counter-revolution can come only in the event that the proletariat fails to advance its own class program, and follows blindly Stalin's policy. The majority of the peasants who are members of the collectives or employees of Machine Tractor Stations, Sovkhozi (state farms), etc., are really agricultural laborers. Their interests coincide most closely with the interests of the urban workers. They will rally to the program of October; no other program can win them over, least of all the nationalist demagogy of the Kremlin.

The Soviet Youth

A crucial role in deciding the fate of the USSR is destined for its youth, the primary reservoir of the revolution. The giant Soviet proletariat is young not only in point of formation but also in actual age. A decisive section consists of young men and women under 27. Among the staunchest fighters in the Red Army are those young soldiers who received their training under the old command—the legendary heroes of the Civil War, the idols of the people, who modernized and mechanized the troops, developed the air force, introduced parachute troops and many other innovations, and whom Stalin murdered.

The bureaucrats stand in greater fear of the youth than of any other single section of the population. The *Komsomol* (the Russian Y.C.L.) has been purged more frequently and savagely than any other branch of the apparatus. Five years ago, shortly before the staging of the first Moscow Frameup Trial in 1936, the *Komsomol* was dissolved as a political organization for fear lest it develop into an opposition political party. The ideas and program of Trotskyism (Bolshevism)

have from the outset met their maximum response and sympathy precisely among the Soviet youth.

Even in its spontaneous forms the resistance of the youth to the regime was marked by its militant spirit. For example, the official press was compelled to admit that it was the young workers and members of the *Komsomol* who were in the forefront of resistance to the Ukases of June 26, 1940 which lengthened the working day to eight hours (and six days), and chained the workers to their jobs like medieval serfs.

The most astonishing thing is that this militancy characterizes even striplings. When the decrees were adopted drafting children and youngsters from fourteen to seventeen into large scale industry, mines and railways, the bureaucracy insisted on paying them only one-third of the prevailing wages. But these bureaucrats reckoned without the children. *They forced the Kremlin to change its mind and to grant them very substantial increases.*

Article 19 of Order No. 1 issued by the Labor Reserves Administration in October, 1940 fixed the following wage scale:

"It is hereby established that one-third of the revenues accruing from the fulfillment of orders as well as work done... during their period of training for industry is allotted to the state budget; one third is to remain at the disposal of the Director... and one-third is to be given into the hands of those fulfilling the work." (*Pravda*, October 5, 1940. Our emphasis). The children began work on December 1, 1940. Eight weeks later, their wages were increased to 80 per cent of the prevailing rates for those sixteen to seventeen and to 50 per cent for those fifteen and under (*Pravda*, February 5, 1941). Noteworthy, indeed, is the fact that the initiative compelling this "concession" came from below, that is, from the most defenseless section of the working class, the child laborers. More than a million of these children are already in industry. Let us recall that the original party of Bolshevism under Czarist illegality was a party of very young workers.

The Stalinist Bureaucracy

The chief obstacle in the path of successful defense is the Stalinist bureaucracy. Although all data relating to this malignant and monstrous growth upon the organism of the first workers' state in history are a most closely guarded secret, it is nevertheless possible to estimate its numerical strength as somewhere in the neighborhood of ten per cent of the entire population, i.e., from 10 to 15 million, approximately twice the size of the former ruling classes and their retinue in Czarist Russia.

In point of social origin and composition this bureaucracy is no monolith but a sort of crude patchwork. The oldest generation of those who either supported Stalin or capitulated to him after Lenin's death, has been annihilated physically. Hardly more than a few hundred survivors still remain, most of whom are in jail. The next generation, brought up and trained in the school of Stalinism and in utter ignorance of Bolshevism, its history, its traditions, its leaders, its methods, and its program, was likewise decimated during the purges before and after the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact (1935-1938). The "bloodless" purges of 1940—after the Finnish invasion—completed the devastation of its ranks. The incumbent bureaucracy now largely consists of callow recruits.

Among them are many sons and daughters of the former ruling classes, the progeny of former landlords, former capitalists, bourgeois intellectuals, Czarist generals, functionaries, etc. Another large tier is composed of Stakhanovists, most of

whom are of very recent peasant origin and background. Fewest are those with proletarian background and origin.

In the coming events, the bureaucracy will not be able to play an independent role. The final differentiation in its ranks will occur along class lines. There already exists an embryonic Fascist wing, typified by such individuals as Butenko, who, it will be recalled, deserted to Mussolini. Hitler no doubt hopes there are many more Butenkos who will desert to him.

The days of this bureaucracy, as it is now constituted, are numbered. The war submits it to the final test.

Stalin's regime now stands stripped of all its trappings and masks, naked before the world in its true despicable reactionary colors under conditions which make secrecy or camouflage no longer possible.

"There are no Munichers in the Soviet Union!" screams the *Daily Worker* in one more hysterical attempt to hide all the abominations and crimes of Stalinism. The Moscow Frameups, all the purges, the beheading of the Red Army, the destruction of the entire generation of Bolsheviks who made the October revolution and fought to victory in the Civil War, and, the crowning crime of all, the murder of Leon Trotsky—all this, these hirelings of the GPU are trying to palm off as measures indispensable for the defense of the Soviet Union.

What these scoundrels are really saying is this: *that it is impossible for Stalin any longer to produce scapegoats for his own crimes.* Yes, the Soviet masses and the whole world will now fix the responsibility for every breach in the lifelines of Soviet defense where it really belongs—upon the Judas-Cain in the Kremlin.

Why Stalin Must Fall

Stalin's regime—which has stifled all initiative, every living voice and every creative tendency in Soviet society—must crumble if only for the reason that initiative and creative ability are most indispensable precisely in war-time. Wherever this initiative arises it will come into mortal conflict with the bureaucracy.

The initial impetus against the regime may come from the beheaded Red Army which is in direst and most immediate need to free itself from the dead hand of the totalitarian "leadership." The Kremlin has not the ability nor the policy for preserving the morale of the soldiers; it cannot keep the

front properly supplied and equipped. The Kremlin and its flunkies put their own prestige and power above all other considerations.

Moscow's official war communiques reveal the panic in the Kremlin which seeps through in its frantic attempts to paint up the officer-corps, to instill it with confidence, and, especially, bolster up its prestige. It is the lieutenants, majors, colonels, who are singled out for acclaim. If a rank-and-file Red soldier receives brief mention, it is only to mention his unquestionable readiness to shed his life-blood under any and all conditions. Yet it is precisely the initiative and the spirit of daring of the rank-and-file soldier and of the lowest command which will prove most decisive on the military arena. The Kremlin has done everything in its power to destroy this. Only a revolutionary war can release the vast creative forces latent in the masses at the front as well as behind the lines.

We proceed from the knowledge that the strangled revolution still lives in the USSR. Every day of war will refresh the memories of those who fought in Trotsky's Red Army. Their sons and daughters, too, have not forgotten.

But war speeds up in the extreme all processes, not only those of regeneration but also those of degeneration. It is a race for time between the still living forces of October and the march of the German imperialist war machine whose path is being cleared more by the corrupt and degenerate regime than by its own military might. Stalin is staking everything on the assistance of Churchill and Roosevelt. No force is too reactionary for Stalin if only he can temporarily summon it to his aid. His latest ally is the Russian Orthodox Church in the person of the Acting Patriarch Sergei, Primate of the All-Russian Orthodox Church and Metropolitan of Moscow. Pray on, gentlemen!

We, however, stake everything on the real defense of the USSR—revolutionary war. We stake everything on the resurgence of the October spirit and the traditions of the Civil War.

The strength of the resistance of the Soviet Union is not, as Hitler calculates, identical with the strength of resistance of Stalin's regime. The revolution once arisen will prove unconquerable. It will rise—as it has risen in the past—from the shambles of the most terrible defeats—and lift high once again the great and glorious banner of struggle and victory—the unconquerable banner of the October revolution and of the Civil War—the banner of Lenin and Trotsky.

DEFEND THE SOVIET UNION

Manifesto of the Socialist Workers Party

The Soviet Union is in mortal danger! Under the most adverse conditions the Soviet masses are heroically defending the Workers' State against imperialist invasion. The Second World War, which could have been prevented only by victorious socialist revolution and destruction of world capitalism, menaces the very existence of the isolated Workers' State. All the warnings of Lenin and Trotsky have come true.

German imperialism seeks to overthrow the October revolution and to restore the capitalist system in its degenerate fascist form. This is the essential meaning of Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union. Every worker who realizes the significant

of this attack will have no hesitation in accepting the slogan of our party:

Defend the Soviet Union at all costs and under all circumstances against imperialist attack!

The Russian working class in October, 1917, established a government of Soviets which took the land from the landlords and gave it to the peasants, and took the banks, industries and railroads from the capitalists and placed them—*as nationalized property*—under the management and control of the workers. Thereby the Soviets abolished the system of

private property which permits a handful of capitalists to own the wealth of a country and to exploit the vast majority of the people. This achievement of the October revolution is the greatest advance ever made by any people. It proved, beyond any refutation, that the working class is capable of taking its destiny into its own hands. The unprecedented development of this nationalized property proved for all time the superiority of socialist methods of production over capitalist anarchy.

The productive forces were nationalized by the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky. Those Soviets no longer exist. They have been destroyed by the Kremlin bureaucracy, which has usurped all political power. But the productive forces are today still not in the hands of private owners. This means that, in spite of the damage done to the revolution by Stalin and his Kremlin clique, the essential conquest of that revolution survives.

It is this nationalized property that we call upon the workers of the world to defend against every enemy. It is this nationalized property which the capitalists of Germany, represented by Hitler, are out to seize and transform into capitalist property. Today, therefore, the main enemy of the Soviet workers is German imperialism. Against this enemy must be pitted every worker conscious of the tremendous advance which the October revolution made in the progress of mankind. Every blow of the Red Army against German imperialism is a blow for the socialist future of mankind. It is the duty of every worker to aid the Red Army to victory.

What We Do Not Defend

The Soviet Union and Stalin's regime are not at all identical. The October revolution was not made for the bureaucrats who have usurped the seats of power. In defending the Soviet Union, we do not defend these usurpers. Stalin and his clique have brought the Soviet Union to a point where Hitler feels confident that he can in a short time conquer it. Within the Soviet Union the Stalinist bureaucracy has destroyed every form of workers' democracy established under Lenin and Trotsky. The Cain in the Kremlin has murdered the best, the most devoted and most capable Bolshevik leaders of the Soviet workers, and at this very moment keeps imprisoned in his dungeons hundreds of thousands of revolutionary workers upon whom he now perpetrates the last indignity of all—he prevents them from defending the Soviet Union arms in hand. Outside the Soviet Union, Stalin strangled the Chinese revolution and led the whole European labor movement to catastrophic defeats. Thus the Soviet Union was deprived of its only reliable allies.

By his pact with Hitler, his collaboration with the Nazis in dismembering Poland, his 1939 attack on Finland, and his leaving Hitler free to master Europe, Stalin has alienated from the Soviet Union the sympathies of tens of millions of workers.

Not for one moment do we suspend our struggle against the Kremlin dictator and the bureaucracy which he represents. For the fact is already evident, and will become more so with each day, that the Soviet workers must rid themselves of this bureaucracy and re-establish workers' democracy in order to assure victory against the Nazi armies. The overthrow of Stalin by the workers is demanded by the needs of the struggle to save the Soviet Union. We are confident that the Russian workers who made three revolutions in the space of twelve years—1905, February 1917, October 1917—will

rise again to the level of their great revolutionary traditions.

Stalin must be overthrown—but only by the working class. His overthrow by Hitler would mean restoration of capitalism. For the sake of the Soviet Union and of the World Socialist Revolution, the workers' struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy must be subordinated to the struggle against the main enemy—the armies of Hitler Germany. Everything that we say or do must have as its primary object the victory of the Red Army.

The Soviet Union can be best understood as a great trade union fallen into the hands of corrupt and degenerate leaders. Our struggle against Stalinism is a struggle within the labor movement. Against the bosses we preserve the unity of the class front, we stand shoulder to shoulder with all workers. The Soviet Union is a Workers' State, although degenerated because of Stalinist rule. Just as we support strikes against the bosses even though the union conducting the strike is under the control of Stalinists, so do we support the Soviet Union against imperialism. Despite imprisonment and repression, our comrades in the Soviet Union, the hounded Trotskyists, will prove to the Soviet masses that the Trotskyists are the best fighters against the capitalist enemy.

Defense of the USSR Against Its Capitalist Allies

Churchill has indicated that he will consummate some form of military alliance with the Kremlin. When the United States reaches the "shooting war" stage, Roosevelt will likewise enter into a formal alliance.

The Soviet Union is now compelled by sad necessity to seek these alliances. That is necessitated by the isolation and weakness of the Soviet Union. What, however, shall be the attitude of the working class toward the Soviet Union's capitalist allies? The Communist International today evades answering the fundamental question; tomorrow it will answer it as in the period of the Franco-Soviet pact—calling upon the workers to support the imperialist war of the "democracies."

We warn the workers: the "democratic" ally is just as hostile to the nationalized property of the Soviet Union as is the fascist enemy. Roosevelt and Churchill will seek two things at the same time: the defeat of their German imperialist rival, *and also* to prevent the Soviet Union from strengthening itself through victory. Even at the cost of weakening their fight against their imperialist rival, Roosevelt and Churchill will try to hold down the world working class, including the Soviet Union.

The chief contradiction in modern society, we have said since 1917, is between the Soviet Union and the imperialist world. That still holds true. Special circumstances now, as during the time of the Stalin-Laval pact, bring about an alliance between the Soviet Union and capitalist countries. Not the least of these circumstances is that Stalin's reactionary policy lessens capitalist fears of the revolutionary role of the Soviet Union and weakens the effect of the example of the October revolution. But only for the time being is the fundamental antagonism between the Soviet Union and Anglo-American imperialism relegated to the background.

The fundamental antagonism remains and will come to the fore precisely if the "democracies" begin to win. Only a week ago the sober spokesman of American monopoly, the *New York Times*, said about the Soviet Union: "The democracies, having got rid of dictatorship in Germany, would hardly support dictatorship elsewhere." The *Times* has not

unsaid this vicious threat, any more than Churchill unsaid his enmity to the Soviet Union. Kerensky, the representative of Russian "democratic" capitalism, hails the democracies for agreeing to "help" the Soviet Union; "a victory of the democracies," he says, "would end in the collapse of the Soviet regime"—that is, in the restoration of capitalism. The Vatican announces it is training priests for work in Russia in case of a "change"—which it anticipates whether the fascist or the democratic imperialisms become masters of Europe. Irreconcilable proletarian opposition to the imperialist allies of the Soviet Union offers the only guarantee that the workers will be on guard to save the Soviet Union from destruction at the hands of the victorious "democracies."

Even during the course of the war, Churchill and Roosevelt, in the name of greater efficiency in the prosecution of the war, may attempt to intervene in the economic life of the Soviet Union. The already grave economic crisis in the Soviet Union—caused by capitalist encirclement and the uncontrolled mismanagement of the bureaucrats—will grow ever more profound under the stress of war. The Kremlin bureaucracy will tend to yield to close collaboration with the "economic experts" of Roosevelt and Churchill. For their "services" the capitalists will demand immediate payment in the form of economic concessions which would undermine the nationalized property. It is unquestionable, we repeat, that the "democracies" are just as anxious to destroy nationalized property as is Hitler.

Hitler understands very well that the fundamental antagonism of modern society is between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world. While alluding to an alleged agreement between Britain and the Soviet Union as one of his pretexts for the invasion, Hitler's main war-cry is that he is saving Europe from Bolshevism. While preparing for the contingency of waging a full-length war against a Soviet-British alliance, Hitler is also exploring the possibility that he will secure a free hand against the USSR. It is plain that he has hopes of forcing a peace in the west during the course of his war against the Red Army.

Hitler's role as guardian of Europe against Bolshevism brought him rich dividends from Chamberlain. The party of Chamberlain is still at the helm in England. The main driving force in Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union was undoubtedly the wheat, oil and other raw materials which he needs for a long war. But he also hopes that his anti-Bolshevik slogans will again win him an understanding with his imperialist rivals.

Thus far Churchill, representing at present the most important section of British imperialism, has rejected the perspective of negotiating a peace. Churchill and Roosevelt fear Hitler more than Stalin. However, the powerful groups of imperialists in England and here who are anxious to make peace with Hitler will now redouble their efforts to win the British and American governments to their program.

Appeasement gains mightily from Hitler's assault on the Red Army, for the basic motivation of the appeasers is a belief in capitalist solidarity against the workers of the world. The real fight against the appeasers is not aided by those who line up with the capitalist war-mongers. Those who subordinate the working class to the governments of the "democracies" make it that much easier for the Roosevelts and Churchills to come to an agreement with the appeasers without any fear of a vigilant and independent working class movement.

On guard against the capitalist allies of the Soviet Union! That is the only possible position of the real defenders of the

Soviet Union: irreconcilable opposition to all the imperialist powers, whether "allies" or enemies.

For Revolutionary War

To rally the utmost energies of the Soviet masses, to rally around the Soviet Union the masses of all countries, to arouse in the German proletariat the determination at all costs to undermine and sabotage the Nazi war machine—these tasks of the hour require a policy in the Bolshevik spirit of Lenin and Trotsky, tribunes of the people summoning the whole world to revolt. Nothing could be further from this than the statement of Molotov upon the outbreak of hostilities.

It could have emanated from the most conservative capitalist regime in the world. There is in it not a word of appeal to the world masses; nor a word about socialism or the traditions of the October revolution. Molotov seeks to inspire the Soviet masses by reminding them that "This is not the first time that our people have had to deal with the attack of an arrogant foe." That is true. Enshrined forever in the hearts of the working class are the successes of Trotsky's Red Army in beating back on twenty-two fronts the armies of the imperialist world. But that is not the tradition that Molotov is talking about! His tradition now is "our people's reply was war for the fatherland"—against Napoleon! In this avoidance of the traditions of the October revolution, Molotov reveals the character of the Kremlin regime, its fear of the masses and their revolutionary heritage.

In everything it does the Stalinist bureaucracy indicates its lack of trust in and fear of the great masses. It is to the capitalist masters that the Kremlin looks for aid. In his policy Stalin finds a place for the masses only as so many pawns whom he can yield to the bourgeois masters as payment for collaboration. The Soviet broadcasts of Churchill's speech omitted Churchill's anti-Communist statements; Stalin is already dressing up the leader of British imperialism.

The Kremlin bureaucracy is interested only in maintaining its privileges, at no matter what cost to the Soviet and world masses. Stalin gave Hitler everything that he could, so long as these concessions did not directly involve the surrender of the power and position of the bureaucracy.

In the light of his fundamental policy, Stalin surely will not carry on this war as it ought to be carried on—as a war in which the Soviet Union, though taking advantage of all aid from Hitler's imperialist enemies, plays the independent role of a Workers' State, rallies the world masses to the banner of socialism, calls upon the working masses of Germany to overthrow Hitler and capitalism and to join in an alliance with the Soviet Union. Stalin represents the antithesis to such a revolutionary policy, he has crushed that policy wherever he could, inside and outside the Soviet Union. He has murdered its best representative, Leon Trotsky.

Workers and peasants of the Soviet Union! We appeal to you in the name of our martyred leader, Comrade Trotsky. His voice would now be urging you on to revolutionary war against Hitler. This was the hour of danger which Trotsky was destined to turn into the hour of proletarian triumph—but his noble and heroic mind was crushed by Stalin's pickaxe. Since he has been denied the happiness of participating in your decisive battles and final victory, let Trotsky henceforth participate invisibly in your struggle. Let his voice, stilled by Stalin but living on in the movement which bears his name, advise you in your struggle for a better world. Avenge his death by destroying Hitler, overthrowing the Cain in the Kremlin, and reviving the Soviet democracy which in

the heroic years of the October revolution made possible the victory over imperialist intervention.

Revolutionary workers of America! In the defense of the Soviet Union, clarity is necessary above all.

The Communist Party

What has been happening in the Soviet Union may be unknown to you, but you have evidence at hand to show you that Stalinism is incapable of leading the defense of the Soviet Union. You have the evidence of the Stalinist organ, the *Daily Worker*. Until after the invasion began, the *Daily Worker* had not one word to say to warn and arouse the workers about the danger of a Nazi attack. On the contrary, it branded "the extravaganzas now being dressed up as news" of a crisis between Germany and the Soviet Union as "Wall Street" lies "designed to give the impression that the Soviet Union is 'weak' and that it is 'isolated.'" Stalin's vainglorious boasting about the great gains resulting from the Stalin-Hitler pact, and his pretense that the pact was forced upon Hitler by the might of the Red Army, dictated the *Daily Worker's* conspiracy of silence about the terrible danger confronting the Soviet Union. Moreover the *Daily Worker's* editors—believing that Stalin would enter into still another agreement with Hitler—denounced the reports of impending Nazi-Soviet war as designed "to discredit such further steps for the advancement of peace and for the safeguarding of Soviet neutrality that the Soviet Union may take." This lying and stupid policy, dictated by the Kremlin, left the members of the Communist Party more unprepared for the terrible news than any other group of the population.

The Communist Party is not an independent revolutionary party which boldly speaks out in the interests of the international working class. On the contrary, it is merely the supine agent of the Kremlin bureaucrats. Precisely now, when one of the main duties of a genuine revolutionary party is to speak out and warn the workers of England and America to be on guard against the capitalist "allies" of the Soviet Union, the Stalinist parties are beginning to shift their line toward open support of the imperialist war waged by these capitalists. The instructions they will receive from the Kremlin will be in the spirit of the "editing" of Churchill's speech by the Moscow broadcasters: to dress up the "democratic" imperialists as progressive friends of the Soviet Union. The Stalinist parties tomorrow will "discover" that the imperialist war is no longer imperialist. They will drop their pseudo-militancy

in the trade unions. They will sing Roosevelt's praises again as loudly as they did in 1936. They will, in a word, do their utmost to deliver the workers bound hand and foot to Churchill and Roosevelt, as Stalin's cynical payment to the imperialists for an alliance.

The Main Tasks of the American Working Class

Every worker must defend the Soviet Union as a *class* duty. The revolutionary worker cannot accept the corrupt and opportunistic line of the Stalinists. He defends the nationalized property of the Soviet Union and not the Kremlin bureaucrats. He defends the Soviet Union because capitalism has been overthrown there. He can under no circumstances support the imperialist war of Britain and the United States, no more than he would support the imperialist war of Nazi Germany. The revolutionary worker understands that if Churchill and Roosevelt find themselves allied to the Soviet Union that does not change by one iota the reactionary character of the war that Churchill and Roosevelt are waging.

The workers must fight fascism to the death—but the imperialist war of Britain and the United States is not a war against fascism, it is a war against their imperialist rivals. The only way the workers can fight against fascism is to take the power and establish a Workers and Farmers Government in the United States. Only such a socialist government would be a real ally of the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile the method to defend the Soviet Union is to continue the class struggle against the imperialists. Defend the workers' rights against government strikebreaking! Build the power of the working class until it becomes the governmental power. That is the best service which the American workers can render to their brothers in the Soviet Union.

Defend the Soviet Union! Defend the conquests of the October revolution!

Down with the Stalinist bureaucracy that weakens the Soviet Union!

Revolutionary war to the death against fascism!

Against all the imperialists in this war!

On guard against the capitalist allies of the Soviet Union!

For a Workers and Farmers Government, the only reliable ally of the Soviet Union!

Long live the world socialist revolution!

June 23, 1941

The Development of Air Power

By JAMES CADMAN

As the Roosevelt Administration gears gigantic forces of manpower and machinery to its goal of producing and operating 56,000 planes annually, it is ironical to recall that not the least factor in the revolutionary development of air power since 1918 was the hope of the general staffs to limit warfare to a small army. Air power and mechanized divisions, they dreamed, would make possible a small and "safe" military force, manned by professionals instead of draftees, and immune from the mutinies and revolutions which "infect" mass armies. What has actually happened is that air power,

like mechanized divisions, depends on the masses now even more than warfare depended on them in 1914-19.

The significance of air power today can best be understood by sketchily tracing its development since 1914.

The machines in use in the World War were restricted almost entirely to aerial observation, scouting and reconnaissance, and individual combats. The first machines in use were cumbersome and slow, rarely surpassing 80 M.P.H. Aerial enthusiasts in the high commands on both sides are few in number and their ideas were frowned upon by the "brass

hats" (as they frowned upon the ancestor of today's mechanized division, the original tank). That air bombing had a future began to be understood generally toward the close of the war. Although bombing attacks over London and Paris were costly to the Germans, they succeeded to a slight degree in hampering war production, as did Allied attacks over the industrial Rhine Valley in 1918. This was because air-defenses and air-raid shelters were still unknown and the bombers had little trouble in reaching their targets (although hitting them was another matter).

Only a fraction of the fighting forces were either in the flying or ground personnel of the air arm.

The place of aircraft in the total productive capacity of the nation was also limited. At the Armistice less than 10 per cent of America's war production and less than seven per cent of the workers in war industries were engaged in the production of aircraft. The statistics for the other great powers in this respect show a similar situation.

With the end of the war in November, 1918, while diplomats and spokesmen talked about unending peace, the military men in every land began to critically examine the campaign of 1914-18 in order to plan ahead for the next conflagration.

The four desperate years of struggle in which the entrenched mass armies had incurred ghastly casualties in attempts to end the deadlock had ended in revolutions and mutinies in the armed forces of victor and vanquished alike. The attempts of military men to search for new theories and new weapons were motivated by the desire to prevent the repetition of types of warfare in which the entire nation was involved and which could end only in the danger of revolution by a war-weary proletariat. The theory of "limited warfare" and the "professional army" propounded by Liddell Hart in England, De Gaulle in France, Von Seeckt in Germany, were aimed at avoiding the dangers of mass armies. Many military experts eventually came to believe that the air power, with its great range and its potential striking power, was the answer to their problem.

The Theory of General Douhet

Probably the greatest champion of this mode of warfare was the Italian General Giulio Douhet, whose theories were propounded between 1921 and his death in 1930. Filled with revulsion at the disaster at Caporetto, which he attributed to Bolshevik propaganda, and at the meager successes of the Italian armies in the war, Douhet decided that only air power could bring wars to a speedy conclusion and avoid stalemate. The independent air arm would be the principal weapon, the army and the navy being subordinated to it. A strong air power by striking without warning could disrupt and demolish the entire industrial structure of its foe. Douhet spoke in glowing terms of entire industrial areas and cities being wiped out, of entire enemy air forces being caught and destroyed on the ground.

After several weeks of such pounding any foe would be rendered helpless and all this could be accomplished merely by building and maintaining a huge air force. He expressed a wholehearted contempt for anti-aircraft defenses and even a greater contempt for civilian morale which he believed could be cracked in a very short time. He figured out mathematically the destructive power of bombs and poison gas and how under sustained bombardment not even large cities could survive. While taking into account large losses to the attackers he believed that each succeeding assault would see

a diminished loss as the opposition became weaker and more sporadic.

The writings of Douhet aroused discussion and thought in air-minded circles everywhere. The British General Golovine attempted to refute Douhet by altogether underestimating air power. He stated that civilian morale, if high, could hold out indefinitely and, indeed, that air attacks alone could never bring about the defeat of a great power. A strong anti-aircraft defense, he believed, would make the success of an air assault highly doubtful. On this point he certainly showed far more perspective than did Douhet. He was less proficient in his discussion of the technical aspect of air power, for example claiming that planes must be built to specialize in certain fields rather than combine several different abilities. Recent events in air war in Europe have shown him to be entirely wrong.

In this country Douhet had his counterparts in General William Mitchell and, more recently, Major Al Williams. These two, although not so extreme in their opinions as Douhet, placed unbounded faith in air power and championed an independent air force which was to be the main weapon of the state. Williams actually argued that the Abyssinian Campaign in 1936 was a vindication of Douhet's theory—completely overlooking the fact that Ethiopia lacked every modern weapon of war and was completely devoid of any air defenses or airplanes.

The Battle of Military Experts

In every country between 1918 and recent times, the potentialities of air warfare were the subject of heated discussion among military authorities. In America General Mitchell was court-martialed as a result of his lack of tact and discretion in criticizing the "brass hats." In Germany the *Marine Rundschau* as late as May 1928 opposed large heavily armored bombers or fighters preferring small and fast machines with small armament. Cannons mounted in planes were ridiculed by this famous German military publication. In Britain the *Royal Air Force Quarterly* and the *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution* couldn't as yet conceive of a war of movement. They thought that although air power must be coordinated with ground units, the air force, even in the heat of battle, must concentrate more on accuracy of fire (on trenches or similarly fixed objectives) rather than large scale air bombardment.

Speculation concerning air power versus sea power was no less rife. The destruction in 1921 of the obsolete German battleship "Ostfriesland" by American bombers led by Mitchell in practice maneuvers off the Jersey coast, raised the hopes of the champions of air power, nor could their joy be lessened in any way even when it was pointed out to them that the "Ostfriesland" was antiquated and not being manned, offered no resistance nor attempted to flee.

From all this maze of discussion and argument, some conclusions were generally agreed upon. That air power could no longer be relegated to an insignificant position in the war machine was undeniable. Everyone agreed that air power had, to a certain degree, diminished the chances for a static war, that it could reach over and beyond the fighting front, that the home front was rendered more vulnerable than ever. On the sea, the dispute between sea and air power remained bitter and undecided, although some naval enthusiasts conceded a certain threat in torpedo planes and bombs and acknowledged the value of planes in scouting, reconnaissance and patrolling. On land, proponents of the small "professional army" such as De Gaulle in France and Von Seeckt in Ger-

many, supported coordination between mechanized and aerial units and conceived of air power crippling the home front and strafing and harassing enemy infantry while the mechanized divisions attacked. During all this time the technical development of military aircraft was forging ahead at a great rate. Bombers and fighters became larger, faster, more heavily armed and armored and their flying range increased tremendously.

The pace of bomber development was more rapid than that of any other craft. Experts in 1918 couldn't visualize many changes in the huge, clumsy, craft of that year, with their all too short range and their slow speed. It didn't seem that planes having to carry great bomb loads could be changed to any great measure. Yet within a decade after the war, bomber speed was rapidly overhauling that of fighters. The growth of their speed, armament, and bomb-carrying capacity soon made the bomber the principal unit in aerial strategy. Air defense was not lagging behind, however, and anti-aircraft guns were making great strides in caliber, mobility, and range. It was in Germany that the greatest technical progress was being made. Even during the period prior to Hitler's accession to power, the great Heinkel, Henschel, Junkers, Dornier and Messerschmitt factories were being retooled and overhauled for mass production. Study and research in German scientific laboratories were being carried on to a greater extent than anywhere else.

In America, emphasis was rather on quality. American factories prided themselves in turning out models of unequalled workmanship. The American naval air arm under the command of Rear-Admiral Moffet first developed the art of dive-bombing, and in accuracy of fire and quality of machines and pilots the American naval air force was (and still is) unrivalled anywhere. The G.H.Q. (army) air force, however, encumbered as it was with obsolete machines and too many different types of craft (making standardization and efficiency impossible) never came up to the standards of the navy during this period.

The Laboratory of Spain

The Spanish Civil War provided the first real testing ground and experimental laboratory for all the different theories, ideas, and types of aircraft which had come into being since the termination of World War I.

Almost all the great powers were represented in the air forces of Fascist and Loyalist Spain, some to a greater and some to a lesser degree. If the Spanish Civil War proved nothing else, it certainly proved that Douhet was wrong in belittling civilian morale. The ceaseless poundings which heroic Madrid and Barcelona, both sadly deficient in anti-aircraft protection, underwent for three years without being either destroyed or forced to capitulate, relegated at least some of Douhet's theories to the scrapheap. The Spanish war, however, confirmed the value of air power on the battlefield. The unending punishment which Loyalist troops were forced to endure from Franco's fighters and bombers played no little role in weakening their defenses. Countless Loyalist attacks on the Ebro were halted and turned back by Fascist warcraft which strafed Loyalist troops, bombed munitions depots, bridges and railroads, and scattered supply columns. The vulnerability to air attack of unprotected ground units was also ably demonstrated by the Loyalists in March, 1937, when Russian planes routed Italian motorized columns at Guadalajara. Every other type of aerial operation was tested and developed during the course of the war. Thus, for the first

time, aerial transport was introduced into warfare when Axis transport planes flew regiments of Franco's Moors from Morocco.

In scouting, reconnaissance and artillery spotting aircraft confirmed the already high reputation which they had gained even in the last war in the performance of these duties. Anti-aircraft fire on the Loyalist side, meager as it was, was nevertheless effective enough to prove the fallaciousness of Douhet's contempt for anti-aircraft defense. Low caliber rapid-fire guns, such as the German 37 mm. and the 20 mm. Swiss Oerlikon were extremely valuable against low-flying planes while the Swedish Bofors 88 mm. and the German Flak 88 mm. proved effective up to 20,000 feet.

Many of the ideas concerning aerial and ground coordination which had been taught in American staff schools even before the Spanish war were confirmed, as was the value of the new high-powered bombers with fighter protection. American military men were interested chiefly in what manner the Germans would put to use the knowledge they had gained. The Americans were not yet certain that the Spanish Civil War, which they considered a minor war on a small scale, could provide an indication of what the next war would be like.

They reasoned that Franco, even with air superiority, was unable to achieve a break-through for more than three years, a fact which puzzles them to this day. Bourgeois military critics can not conceive that the morale of the Spanish workers and peasants was the only factor to which Loyalist resistance must be attributed. Knowing as they do that Franco's material superiority was proportionately far greater than was that of the Nazis in the battle of France, the resistance of the Loyalists has constantly dumbfounded them. Nor do they understand how the counter-revolutionary repressions of the Stalino-bourgeois regimes of Caballero and Negrin finally undermined Loyalist morale.

Air Power in World War II

The German victory over Franco saw aerial power at its apex. The success of the *Luftwaffe* can not, however, be said to vindicate Douhet. It proved that overwhelming airpower combined with overwhelming land power can win a total victory. Airpower disrupted the French war effort by bombing factories, destroying communications and playing havoc with the French troop concentrations by bombing and strafing them. As to whether or not overwhelming air power can by itself win wars, the great "Battle of Britain" in the fall of 1940, in which Nazi air armadas sustained severe losses in vain attempts to smash Britain, proved that air power by itself is not the deciding factor in military operations. Air power is a vital factor in the war effort and plays an important role but only in conjunction with the other parts of the war machine.

The value of air power is that its destructive range is far greater than that of any other arm. It can surmount the fighting front; it cannot be checked by any fortification or coast defense guns; it alone can bring the war to the enemy's home front. However, the air force is not necessarily an offensive arm. The R.A.F. over Britain played a defensive role in the Fall of 1940 and over Dunkerque. An air force can aid defending ground units in disrupting an advancing foe by harassing him in the same way that the French were harassed in the Battle of Flanders and so bringing their advance to a halt.

It must be sharply emphasized that all of the victories

of air power till now have been won in the face of inferior air power. German air power in France met insignificant resistance in flying to and from its targets. If, however, two powers evenly matched on land and air clash, land and air war would probably degenerate as in World War I into a deadlock with both sides depending on their economic and industrial capacity to gain victory. Air fighting would be expensive both in men and machines; long range bombing is ineffective in the teeth of adequate air defenses (long range German attacks on Scapa Flow and the Shetlands failed badly).

As to the technical developments in aircraft, it suffices to say that they have been prodigious but that they will probably move at a slower rate now than before due to the terrific strain that modern war places on the industrial machine of each country.

The greatest controversy in military circles at present is "air power vs. sea power." Since it is generally conceded that bombers can sink almost any but the heaviest ships, the issue comes down to "bombers vs. battleships." In summing up all the arguments pro and con, it can rightfully be said that air power has not rendered sea power obsolete and the question of whether or not planes can sink battleships is still a moot one. Each country will continue to strain its industrial resources to build as large a navy as possible.

The Norwegian campaign, Dunkerque, the Mediterranean battles, and Greece, where sea power and air power have been pitted against one another, indicate that warships with adequate aerial escort, or warships without adequate aerial escort but on the open sea where they can use their maneuverability and speed to the fullest extent, can repel air assault. On the other hand, warships without aerial support, located in narrow bodies of water, cannot successfully resist air attacks: off Norway, and around Crete and Greece, British sea power was defeated. Yet in the narrow Mediterranean and in the narrower channel off Dunkerque, British sea power, when supplemented adequately by air power, successfully withstood the *Luftwaffe*. What this proves is that air power constitutes a grave threat to the naval arm, but that both the naval and air arms supplementing one another make a powerful team. It proves also that no single weapon can win a war but only a total effort comprising the entire economy of the state in one coordinated machine—totalitarian war.

Roosevelt's Air Power Program

By 1943 Roosevelt plans to produce 56,000 planes annually. When we observe that after seven years of total industrial organization, Germany is now producing only 36,000-48,000 planes annually, we can see just how gigantic is Roosevelt's program. It will require not only total production of all of America's present aircraft capacity (including auto facilities) but at least 30 new plants and three new engine plants.

Washington expects to produce 12,000 pilots annually till 1945. The position of pilot (Second Lieutenant) is confined to those with two years of college. Physical and mental requirements are stiffer than in any other air force but will certainly be lowered as the need becomes greater.

The War Department expects to train 36,000 radio operators, 3,600 navigators and 40,000 ground crew men annually by 1942. At least two-thirds of the total air force personnel are members of the maintenance and ground staffs and here, as everywhere else in modern warfare, the industrialized nature of the modern war economy is evident.

What strategical problems face the American air force?

In his "timetable speech" of some months ago Roosevelt gave it as his opinion that America was wide open to air bombardment because San Francisco was 18 hours from Manila, Brazil nine hours from Dakar, New York seven hours from the Azores, etc. Aerial experts guffawed in the privacy of the War and Navy Departments.

What are the facts? Sporadic long distance bombing attacks are wholly ineffective. Aircraft having to carry enough fuel to make a long return trip have to carry a diminished bomb load and thus their capacity to do damage is lessened. Such attacks at most would have only a nuisance value and would constitute no threat. Also, long distance bombing planes, coming over a great expanse of water, must cope with weather conditions (which are usually bad on the open sea). The military experts are correct in saying that only planes operating from bases on the Western Hemisphere itself could do any real damage.

As far as defense against invasion is concerned, the consensus of American aerial opinion is that any invasion attempt could be prevented by America's high-powered long distance bombers based on islands in both oceans and in South America. Such aircraft, ranging out to sea, could disorganize invading transport convoys and inflict heavy casualties on an attacking fleet. Ostensibly in order to facilitate this bases have been secured from Great Britain in the West Indies and in Newfoundland and are being constructed on Greenland, in South America and in the Hawaiian and Philippine Islands. Contracts for such types of planes have already been awarded to several aircraft factories and are already in the process of production.

However, take this official account with a grain of salt. The British bases are being taken over not merely for this purpose but also as the first partitioning of the British Empire and to be used to dominate South America. The planes can be used for other purposes as well.

The point is that American participation in the war is not a whit retarded by proof, no matter how overwhelming, that Roosevelt's "timetable" is false. American imperialism is being "attacked" already wherever German imperialism advances anywhere in the world. The strategical problems of America air power are world-wide in scope.

The active naval air force, spearhead of an American expeditionary force, will by 1945 consist of 72 squadrons (15-20 planes each) based on 18 aircraft carriers. In view of the great menace of undersea warfare and in order to aid in convoying, the navy is also considering using merchant vessels as auxiliary aircraft carriers, each carrying several planes. Such vessels would be of immense value in escorting convoys and in hunting German sea raiders. The army air force is also being expanded and standardized rapidly and is following the German example by being trained to operate in coordination with ground forces.

The air force is at present divided into two units, the army and the navy. Both are under the command of their respective high commands and function independently of one another. The practicability of this system has been questioned because of alleged inefficiency. An independent air force, such as the Nazi and Soviet, it is claimed, avoids disputes as to jurisdiction which are so common between the American army and navy. It must be pointed out, however, that both German and Soviet war power is built around their great armies, for neither has a navy of any significance. In nations with both land and sea power such as Japan, England and the United States, some division in the air force is required. There will probably be a compromise like the British system: an inde-

pendent air ministry supervising both a military and a naval air arm.

The Role of the Industrial Proletariat

The role that the industrial proletariat plays in the modern air force corresponds to the central role it plays in modern war in general.

The problem of "civilian morale" is largely the problem of the industrial proletariat. There has been much written about the high morale of the British workers, who are now rounding out a year under bombardment. The morale of the Spanish workers and peasants remains, however, the most significant example of what can be endured—if the masses have utter faith in their cause. Can democratic capitalism provide such a faith? The lessons of France indicate otherwise.

Morale is the negative aspect of the central role of the industrial proletariat in air warfare. Its positive role is even more impressive. Production is the most important factor during active air force operations, when losses in machines are bound to be grave; losses, together with the terrific strain on each machine, make the average life of aircraft during active fighting hardly more than several weeks. Consequently machines and air force personnel must be replaced at a great rate, more factories and airdromes must be built, etc., etc.

More than two-thirds of the actual flying personnel will be gunners, bombardiers, navigators and radiomen—the most

skilled sections of the industrial proletariat. Each plane requires a ground crew of three to five workers.—tractormen, bomb racking experts, fuel pump men, armorers, engine mechanics, map men, radio operators, meteorologists, teletype operators, telephone operators, etc. Here again the industrial proletariat plays the outstanding role.

And this does not yet account for the skilled and unskilled workers required to build and operate the plane and engine factories, provide the fuel, the airdromes, the munitions and the armament which each plane carries, etc.

It is estimated by the experts that the production and maintenance of 56,000 planes annually will require almost one million workers engaged in every type of industry.

Thus we see that a military arm which was conceived originally as a means of fighting a "limited" and a "quick" war carried on by professional soldiers and pilots, has actually developed into the opposite—a military arm which demands total war. Aerial warfare, independent of the will of the ruling class, has made necessary the most complete integration of the entire economy with the war machine. That means that the "Bolshevik propaganda" which Douhet hoped to render impotent can play an even more decisive role now than in 1918.

(This is the second of comrade Cadman's articles on the status of warfare today. The first, "The New American Army," dealing with the changes made necessary by "Blitzkrieg" methods, appeared in the June, 1941, FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.)

Roosevelt Fights on Two Fronts

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

In order to wage their wars, the capitalist rulers require the collaboration of all classes no less than the complete coordination of national economy. The democratic imperialists first seek to obtain this national unity by persuasion and deceit. When these methods prove unsuccessful or insufficient, they use more forceful measures to crush internal opposition to their policies.

Totalitarian regimes have great advantages over the "democracies" precisely in this respect. Fascist governments "unify" the nation by smashing all organizations independent of their state, beginning with the revolutionary organizations of the working class and ending with religious institutions. Having concentrated all power within the state and made its apparatus obedient to the dictates of a single sovereign, the fascist regimes are enabled to move swiftly and decisively against their external foes.

Confronted with the blitzkrieg tactics of their foreign totalitarian adversaries and beset by the struggle of the working masses at home, the heads of the imperialist democracies find themselves obliged to move toward totalitarian methods in preparing and waging war. They adopt such methods piece-meal. First Blum became Premier and beheaded the rising revolution; then his successor, Daladier, put down the French workers by driving them back to the factories at the bayonet-point and depriving them of their gains. The French example also shows that, instead of winning national unity by such methods, the "democrats" succeeded only in further estranging the workers from the parliamentary regime, demoralized them and discouraged their resistance and were thereby responsible for the downfall of the Third Republic and the loss of national independence to Hitler.

The rulers of Great Britain have employed slightly dif-

ferent tactics; they are still in the stage of using the Blums. They have secured a measure of social peace by bringing Bevin and other trade-union and Labor Party leaders into the war cabinet and making them responsible for the conduct of the war and the good behavior of the workers. Churchill and his Conservative colleagues have thus far kept the British workers in line through the services of labor lieutenants of capitalism.

Now the government at Washington is confronted with the same problem of instituting social peace. Roosevelt has been wrestling night and day with the two-fold task of crushing opposition at home in order to crush the enemies abroad. This capitalist Commander-in-Chief recognizes that the job of suppressing working class opposition stands first in order of importance and he has been behaving accordingly.

The "Unlimited Emergency" Speech

May 27th the President decreed an "unlimited national emergency." His speech was universally received as a virtual declaration of war against the Axis powers. So far as Washington is concerned, "it's all over now but the shooting." Only a fool could console himself any longer with the pacifist illusion that any possibility exists of our escaping involvement in the war. Roosevelt made this painfully plain to the whole world.

He also openly announced the existence of a military alliance with the British Empire and Chungking. This Washington-London-Chungking Axis has evidently concluded broad plans for joint military, diplomatic and economic action, which are unknown to all except the highest officials. Woodrow Wilson demanded that democratic governments act

according to "open covenants, openly arrived at." His Democratic successor as war-president proceeds according to the old rules of ruling class intrigue, "secret agreements, privately negotiated." And, according to the Constitution, the Senate of the U. S. is supposed to ratify all treaties!

It was no accident that Roosevelt delivered his address in the presence of the governing board of the Pan-American Union and the Canadian minister. He thereby sought to promote Western Hemisphere unity under the domination of the dollar. His speech was less an appeal for voluntary harmony than a blunt notice to the South American countries that Washington was ready to use armed force against any recalcitrants who refused to do its bidding.

Up to this point, the U. S. had played a secondary role in the war. In this speech Roosevelt openly assumed command of the world struggle against the Nazi combination. Henceforward, England steps back into secondary rank, while China, the South American countries, and the various European governments-in-exile act as satellites of Washington which, under the terms of the lease-lend bill, will finance and supply them for the price of dictating their policies.

Roosevelt proclaimed the doctrine of the "freedom of the seas" as a pretext for intervention in the conflict. The U. S. Navy is ready to seize such island outposts between the Americas and Europe as Greenland, Iceland, the Azores, Cape Verde Islands, even though these belong to neutral countries. This is only the beginning of operations involving the Navy in all seven seas and military action on every continent. Although his speech was pointed at Germany, it likewise embraced Japan. From the beginning of our entrance, the war will very likely extend from Singapore to Iceland. This can no longer be a local or limited war. It is a total world war, involving everybody, everywhere.

Roosevelt dealt with his internal opposition in his speech as well as his external enemies. He branded the opponents of war "enemies of democracy" and "echoes of Axis bureaus of propaganda." While in one sentence he boasted of the solidarity of the people and the overwhelming majority behind his policy, in the next he demanded unconditional loyalty. In reality, the people have given Roosevelt no such vote of confidence. He is simply trying to use his official authority to terrorize and suppress all opposition to his robbers' war.

Roosevelt centered his attack upon his *loyal* opposition in the camp of the isolationist imperialists: the Lindbergh-Wheeler-LaFollette-group. Loyal and impotent. How absurd and impotent was the isolationists' "struggle" for peace before and after the President's personal declaration of war! The "America First" Committee beseeched everyone to write and wire Roosevelt at the White House to repudiate the belligerent speeches of his cabinet members, Stimson, Knox, Hull, Wickard, which he had himself inspired! In like manner, Chamberlain used to appeal from the fire-breathing Goebbels and Rosenberg to the milder, peace-loving Hitler. When the Russian peasants used to appeal from the oppressive landlords to the benevolent Czar, they had at least the excuse of ignorance. The isolationist leaders, however, are fully aware of Roosevelt's determination to fight.

The collapse of the isolationist attempt to preserve peace shows how impossible it is to stop war within the framework of the bourgeois system or under the leadership of its supporters. The struggle against war and for peace cannot be separated or conducted apart from the struggle of the working class against the capitalist system which breeds war the way a decomposing carcass breeds maggots.

At the very moment the President was summoning the

nation to defend democracy, he was engaged in trampling upon democracy. Neither Congress nor the people gave Roosevelt any authority to declare war. Like any other personal dictator, he simply usurped this power. He counts upon confronting the nation with an accomplished act of war in the form of a belligerent "incident" and then forcing a formal declaration of war through Congress. Hitler and the Mikado are not the only rulers who can wage undeclared war.

Roosevelt's edict decreeing an unlimited national emergency invests him with unlimited powers. Again, neither Congress nor the people gave him such sweeping dictatorial powers. He simply took them. The Democrat in the White House cares no more for democratic methods than the Czars who also ruled by ukase.

Roosevelt moves in this autocratic fashion because he dares not submit a full accounting of his actions or his imperialist program to the American people whose will he is supposed to be executing. The latest Gallup Poll shows that 80 per cent of the people are opposed to entering the war. That's why Wall Street's War-Lord has to sneak into the war behind the backs of the people without their endorsement or consent.

If, as Roosevelt contended, this is a struggle in defense of democracy, why does he enter it in so undemocratic a manner? The question of war or peace is too important to be decided by any one individual. It should be decided by the American people as a whole. The right to vote on this life and death question is certainly an elementary democratic right.

Roosevelt, however, has consistently refused to permit the people to have the slightest say in this matter. During the last Presidential campaign, when the electorate did have some power of decision, this hypocritical and lying capitalist politician posed as a Prince of Peace and promised American fathers and mothers that their boys would never have to fight in any foreign war. He has now extended the lines of domestic defense so far from our shores that by his definition there can no longer be any foreign wars. By such sleight-of-hand tricks does Roosevelt drag the country into war.

The materialistic motives behind Roosevelt's program obtruded at several points in his address. "Freedom to trade is essential to our economic life. We do not eat all the food we can produce; we do not burn all the oil we can pump, and we do not use all the goods we can manufacture." Roosevelt did not stop to ask why this was so, nor why it must necessarily continue when there are so many undernourished and impoverished people within our own borders. Nor did he add the vital point that our monopolists cannot invest at home all the capital they accumulate from the toil of the people. He was primarily concerned, not with breaking down the barriers which prevent the American masses from increasing their consumption, but with the barriers which prevent American capitalists from extending their sphere of exploitation throughout the universe.

Roosevelt's Onslaught Against the Workers

The bourgeoisie, as we have said, always conduct their struggles on two fronts; one abroad, the other at home. So, in addition to threatening the Axis powers, Roosevelt also threatened war against organized labor. He warned the workers that they would have to yield the strike weapon and resort to compulsory arbitration in their disputes with employers. In one breath the President declared we must fight for democracy; in the next breath he demanded that the workers give

up the very democratic rights they are supposed to be fighting for. Roosevelt rightly remarked that under fascism "trade unions would become historical relics and collective bargaining a joke." But his own ban on strikes would have exactly these consequences. Roosevelt is doing the work of reaction before any foreign fascist force lands on our shores.

Roosevelt's decree forbidding strikes "in defense industries"—and all industries are today becoming war industries—would deprive labor of its main weapon against boss aggression. The right to strike is a democratic right which the American workers have won for themselves by generations of struggle. It is part of the law of the land. In forbidding strikes, Roosevelt is acting not as a defender of democracy but as an agent of profiteering employers.

The Ford workers would still be without a union and dominated by Harry Bennett's thugs if they had been unable to strike. The mine workers would have a dollar a day less in their pay envelopes. Workers the country over would be helpless to cope with the speedily rising cost of living. Roosevelt contrasted the free labor of the U.S. with the slave labor of totalitarian countries. But it is precisely in totalitarian countries such as Germany and Italy that the government forbids all strikes and enforces compulsory arbitration upon capital and labor.

Two weeks later Roosevelt passed from words to action against the workers. In his capacity as President and Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces, Roosevelt ordered troops to break up the picket line at the North American Aviation Plant in Inglewood, California.

What crime had the striking aircraft workers committed? Their union negotiators were asking for a 75 cent basic hourly rate compared with the prevailing 50 cent rate, and a ten cent an hour boost in higher-skilled classifications. Their pickets carried placards reading, "We can't feed our families on 50 cents an hour." These workers were asking for a tiny slice of the tremendous profits being made by this General Motor subsidiary.

Instead of exerting pressure upon the North American officials to grant these reasonable demands, the President, the Secretary of Labor, the Defense Mediation Board, the OPM together with AFL and CIO leaders had called upon the workers to return to work. When the strikers held their picket lines firm, the government at Washington mobilized the full forces of its entire machinery to break the strike. Roosevelt personally directed the movements of the troops, telephoning instructions to their commander, Col. Branshaw. After the strike had been smashed, Roosevelt was, according to his secretary, "delighted" at the results.

At Roosevelt's instigation, the head of the Selective Service System issued an order requiring draft boards to re-classify for military service all registrants who, because of

striking, were not working on the jobs for which they had been given deferred status. This order gave local draft-boards, which are mainly staffed by business men, a powerful weapon for breaking strikes, punishing and terrorizing militant workers. The same day Democrats and Republicans united in Congress to vote a \$10,000,000,000 appropriation for the army which expressly withheld all funds from corporations dealing with strikers and picketers.

With the White House, the Cabinet, the Army, the Navy, the Mediation Board, the OPM, the Selective Service System and Congress acting in unison against the workers, the Roosevelt regime now stands forth as the nation's No. 1 Strike-breaker.

Roosevelt demanded billions to fight foreign fascism. He first used naval "convoys" to run strikebreakers into the San Francisco shipyards. He first sent troops against American workers. The President could have provided no plainer proof of Trotsky's statement in his last Manifesto that: "The bourgeoisie invariably and unswervingly follows the rule: The main enemy is in one's own country."

Desperation in Washington

Roosevelt's acts of war against the workers indicate not confidence but a state of panic in ruling circles. The commanding staff of the American plutocracy feels weak in the face of its external and internal antagonists. Despite Roosevelt's boasts of national unity and strength, the bourgeoisie, divided and hesitant, are striking out blindly in desperation. They feel that their *lebensraum* is beginning to contract. They no longer rely upon peaceful methods to solve their internal problems. Yet the very measures of force by which Roosevelt endeavors to enforce national unity results in further alienating the workers from his regime. The United States of America approaches war with the class struggle raging furiously from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

In his speech Roosevelt painted a terrible prospect of the Nazi "Shape of Things to Come." The American workers will never lie down before fascism—and they have already shown that they do not propose to accept Roosevelt's reactionary "Shape of Things to Come" without an all-out fight. "We can't lose democracy by struggling to save it," declared Roosevelt. The organized workers have interpreted this remark according to their own class intelligence by refusing to abandon the rights and liberties they already enjoy.

In their struggles to save democracy and free trade-unionism at home, the American workers can count upon the leadership, the membership and the fighting program of our party.

Perspectives for Europe

By MARC LORIS

During the first imperialist world war German troops in the west occupied Belgium and one-sixth of France's territory, besides a number of countries in Central Europe and the Balkans. But the existence of a front and its constant shifts imparted a precarious character to the German conquests. A large portion of the civil population had been evacuated and

there was hardly any agricultural or industrial productivity in the invaded countries.

In the second imperialist war the military collapse of France created a markedly different situation. Hitler's rule now extends, more or less directly, over more than two hundred million non-Germans. In spite of profound differences

in the various occupied countries the common oppression compels the relationships within the classes and between the classes to follow parallel lines in each of the occupied countries.

Collapse of the Native Fascists

Upon his arrival in each one of the invaded countries Hitler found fascist parties in the image of his own. This was one of the clearest characteristics of the decomposition of bourgeois "democracy." During its advance, German militarism was able to make a judicious use of these groups for its own military and political ends. After a year of Hitlerite control in Europe, however, the evolution of these different national fascisms is an important factor in the determination of our future perspectives.

It was in Norway that the German general staff received the most active and the most immediate assistance from the "Fifth Column." This was the only country in which the fascist party found itself placed directly in power after the invasion. And this is also the country in which German rule has undoubtedly encountered the most difficulties. The Gestapo chief, Himmler, recently discovered that Quisling's party, because of its growing unpopularity, was far from being an adequately flexible instrument of German rule, and he reduced its powers.

The same process may be observed in all the invaded countries: the stagnation or the disintegration of the national fascist groups. The pro-German fascist party of the Sudeten is falling to pieces. In Bohemia the men who had hailed Hitler's arrival now keep far away from anything German. The national-socialist party in Denmark has split up into a multitude of cliques contending for the favors of the German authorities. Mussert's fascist party in Holland is stagnating, and no great confidence is placed in it by the invaders. The Flemish intellectuals in whom Hitler had set his hopes have disappointed him. In France Doriot has gathered a few former Stalinist leaders around him, but his party is making hardly any progress.

Rumania presents one of the most striking examples. For years there had been a powerful pro-Nazi party there, savagely anti-British. The entry of German troops into this semi-allied, semi-conquered country was followed at once by the violent disintegration of the fascist party. The most radical wing published a manifesto proclaiming that only an English victory could free Rumania. The party was drowned in blood. The present government of General Antonescu is not propped up on an indigenous fascism, but is merely a bonapartism maintained by the German army.

These are the signs of currents within the petty-bourgeoisie, in the cities and in the countryside. In all the invaded countries Hitler has, of course, found men to perform his chores. Upon arriving the German generals commandeered a certain number of horses, cattle, swine, politicians and journalists. But as mass movements the various national fascisms are destined to decay. Every day Hitler's "New Order" reveals more clearly what it is—the old capitalist disorder, with its oppression, hunger, and misery. The petty-bourgeoisie is now going over to the other side; the pendulum is changing its direction. This phenomenon, which is very important and is still in its initial stages, is creating very favorable conditions for the shipwreck of German imperialism, but can lead to nothing by itself, if workers' action does not intervene.

As a whole the big bourgeoisie is moving in the opposite direction to the petty-bourgeoisie. More and more it is organ-

izing and systematizing "collaboration." It is trying to save whatever it can of its profits and privileges. It seizes the slightest opportunity for collaboration that Hitler feels like offering it.

And with the continuation of the war Hitler must make greater and greater use of the productive machinery of the invaded countries. The capitalists of these countries ask for nothing but amity with the German generals in order to feed the war machine of the Third Reich. They may of course dream of better conditions, but this does not prevent them from profiting as much as they can out of the present situation. What a lesson for the workers, whose struggles were always paralyzed by the bourgeoisie and its agents in the name of "national welfare"!

The most typical example of the behavior of the bourgeoisie is that of France. The French bourgeoisie, one of the feeblest and most decrepit, has already taken advantage of the defeat in order to plunge the country into the blackest reaction and find a language in common with the conqueror more easily. For the humiliations it received the bourgeoisie seeks compensation through the repressions of its own people. From Germany it is seeking, by means of more and more abject servility, nothing but a pardon for its alliance with Great Britain in order to save what it can of its right to exploit the French workers and the colonial peoples.

Collaboration has been extended to the economic, military, and political domain. To a large extent French industry is working for the German war machine. The men at Vichy are now gambling on a German victory and the defeat of their former ally.

This policy moreover has made Petain's bonapartism rest upon a new point of support, the French fleet. The abruptness of the military debacle had left the fleet intact, in all its prestige and power. It had maintained its cohesion and stability considerably more than the army, which is the explanation of Admiral Darlan's ascent to power. And in fact the French fleet was one of the most precious trump-cards in the hands of the Vichy men. Let us help Germany with our fleet, which she needs—thought Darlan—and we'll be able to save something of France's position in Europe. The traditional animosity of naval officers towards England made the game easy. All this has helped give Petain's regime a special complexion—made it in a certain sense a "naval bonapartism."

The French bourgeoisie merely offers the clearest example of what the summits of the bourgeoisie in the various occupied countries are tending towards. In the face of such slavishness the Nazis are already dreaming of "unifying" Europe and counterposing it as a continent to the rest of the world, in order to attain their imperialist goals. Nazism succeeded (with the not inconsiderable help of the social-democratic and Stalinist leaders!) in bolstering up Germany with the national idea for imperialist ends.

Hitler Cannot "Unify" Europe

Is it possible to believe that Hitler will succeed in crushing internal opposition within the conquered countries, as in Germany he successively vanquished the radical wing of his own party, then the summits of the Reichswehr, and finally the various religious oppositions? A categorical answer may be given this question: No! In Germany Hitler was served by the national sentiment, but throughout all the countries of Europe now this sentiment is rebounding against him with tenfold force.

At the time of its historic rise the bourgeoisie was able to

build up great modern nations and make all the provincial particularisms vanish, but it was only able to realize this because its dominion also meant a formidable economic expansion and a vast accumulation of new wealth. Even as a conqueror Hitler can bring the peoples nothing but stagnation and poverty. All dreams about unifying the continent must disappear before this reality. The Nazis' imperialist nationalism exacerbates, and will exacerbate more and more, all the suffocated nationalisms surrounding it. It is chimerical to imagine a stable hegemony of German imperialism over a unified Europe, even in case of a military victory.

The Coming European Revolution

Whether the struggle begins in Germany or elsewhere the decisive blows against Hitler can come only from the workers. On the first day of the rebellion they are the ones who will constitute the most determined vanguard. From the very first step in the collapse of the Nazi system they will create their instruments of battle, actions committees, the first form of soviets.

The national bourgeoisie will not hesitate to collaborate with the Nazis in an attempt to re-establish "order." The petty-bourgeoisie will be what it has been in all the modern revolutions, an auxiliary force. No doubt it will give particularly enthusiastic support to the workers, at any rate during the first stage; but it is fundamentally incapable of maintaining the direction of the struggle, or even of sharing in this direction on an equal footing with the proletariat.

To put an end to Hitler a workers' rank and file is needed. The proletarian revolution is what is on the order of the day for Europe. All hopes for a particular "national revolt" in which the proletariat and the petty-bourgeoisie will share the leadership are futile. Even more absurd is the notion of a victorious struggle on the part of the petty-bourgeoisie "supported" by the proletariat.

The primacy of the workers in the struggle, and the appearance of embryonic soviets in the very first stages, do not imply, of course, that the proletarian revolution will be completed by the day after tomorrow. There will be a more or less protracted period of dual power. The soviets will become aware of their power and of their role, which is that of a new government. Above all the revolutionary party will need time to consolidate its ranks and conquer the majority of the working class before finishing off the bourgeois regime.

National Emancipation and Proletarian Revolution

This general strategic perspective still does not resolve the tactical problems posed by the Nazi occupation of Europe. The national bourgeoisie in the various countries is thinking only of meriting by its servility the good-will of the conqueror. In the face of Nazi violence and plunder a savage hatred of the oppressor is growing from month to month in all the other strata of the population. On pain of suicide, the revolutionary party cannot forget this fundamental fact which is now dominating the life of all Europe. We give full recognition to the right of national self-determination and are prepared to defend it as an elementary right of democracy.

This recognition, however, has no effect on the fact that this right is trodden underfoot by both camps in this war and will hardly be respected in case of an imperialist "peace." Capitalism in its agony can meet this democratic demand less and less. Only socialism can give nations the complete right

to independence and put an end to every national oppression. To speak of the right to national self-determination and keep silent concerning the only means of its realization, that is, the proletarian revolution, is to repeat a shallow phrase, disseminate illusions, and deceive the workers.

The Versailles peace gave birth to a certain number of independent states, but in reality they were nothing but the satellites of the victorious great imperialist powers. To the exploitation of their own proletariat they added the oppression of national minorities (Slovaks in Czechoslovakia, Ukrainians and White Russians in Poland, Croats in Yugoslavia, etc.). There can be no doubt that an imperialist peace, whichever camp is victorious, will realize the right of national independence in an even more caricatural form. In present-day Europe the revolutionary party cannot fail to support all manifestations of national resistance to Nazi oppression, but its active participation in the struggle by no means signifies that it must strengthen any chauvinist tendencies and tolerate any illusions about tomorrow's reality.

It is a particularly serious error to imagine that the struggle against national oppression creates any special conditions in which the proletariat must abandon its own aims and confuse itself with the petty-bourgeoisie (and sometimes the big bourgeoisie as well) within the unity of the "nation." National emancipation is by no means a "specialty" of the petty-bourgeoisie. On the contrary, the latter can no give anything but utopian solutions, especially in our epoch (pacifism, an improved League of Nations, etc.). If the proletariat takes up tasks of national emancipation in its own hands (as it must do now in many countries of Europe) it is only in order to solve them by means of its own methods, the only ones capable of ensuring success, and to integrate national resistance in its general perspective of the total overturn of bourgeois society.

The national opposition of the peoples of Europe imparts a thoroughly unstable character to the dominion of German imperialism. But at the same time it forms a screen in front of the fundamental tasks of our epoch: the socialist transformation of society, the only thing capable of putting a stop to national oppression. This twofold character is what conditions the activity of Marxists. They must support any national resistance to the extent that it represents a real struggle, but they can and must do it without mingling any chauvinist phraseology with their propaganda, without giving birth to illusions concerning the realization of national independence, without ever losing sight of the general aims of their struggle.

Besides, the battle is hopeless when limited to one country. The task of the revolutionary party is not to confine the struggle against German imperialism within narrow national boundaries, but to integrate it in the resistance of all the European peoples to the common bondage. Hitler has already plunged the German workers into this bondage. The Marxists must possess slogans constantly tending to broaden the arena of struggle, to generalize it, and spread it throughout all of Europe, including Germany, and not limit it, split it up and partition it off under different national banners. This is their rallying cry: Down with the Nazi regime! Long live the Socialist United States of Europe!

The European masses must carry on their struggle under terribly difficult and abruptly altered conditions. For years the reformists and their allies laughed at the Trotskyists who were trying to transplant the methods of Russian Bolshevism to Western Europe. What a bitter lesson our opponents have had! Czarist Russia now appears, if not actually a paradise, at any rate a purgatory compared with the hell Europe has

become. Famine is hovering over the continent which only yesterday led the world. Workers cease their labor in order to demand more abundant food rations. This is a new form of struggle for wages in debased Europe. Demonstrations of starving housewives can only multiply. In the midst of misery and oppression every "economic" struggle at once assumes a political character. The task of the Marxists is not to impose on the masses any particular form of struggle they might "prefer," but in reality to deepen, broaden, and systematize all manifestations of resistance, bring to them a spirit of organization and open up a broad perspective.

The Petty-Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat

National oppression forces broad strata of the petty-bourgeoisie to enter the political arena. Left to itself the petty-bourgeoisie is quite incapable of ensuring the overthrow of the Nazi regime. Its great majority is at present going over to the side of British imperialism. In France this movement supports General de Gaulle, who has no other program but a military struggle against Germany at the side of England. The activity of his adherents in France consists primarily in espionage on behalf of England and the recruiting of young men for the "free" French forces. The Marxist party has nothing in common with such a program and with such methods. For us the success of the revolution does not depend on the victory or on the defeat of one imperialist camp or another, but on the revolutionary training of tested fighters and on the formation of the cadres of an intransigent party. This is the fundamental task. The sympathy for England now spreading in the occupied countries is the elementary initial form of resistance to Nazi oppression (and in France to the national bourgeoisie as well). The task of the Marxists is not to adapt themselves to this (completely sterile) sentiment, but to foresee the forms of struggle which are coming and to prepare for them.

The petty-bourgeoisie makes its appearance on the stage with its own specific weapons. Cases of individual terrorism have already occurred throughout Europe. In Poland, Norway, and France some excessively cynical adherents of an understanding with Hitler have been disposed of. There has been no lack of assassinations of German officers. All this can only multiply. The revolutionary party can do nothing but repeat all the classical arguments of Marxism against individual terrorism—they still retain their full value. Exceedingly symptomatic of the state of mind of the petty-bourgeois masses, sometimes amazingly heroic, individual attempts at assassination can lead to nothing except the sacrifice of lives

which would be of incalculable value if they were to find a better use. The duty of the Marxists is to direct the devotion of the adherents of terror into the path of preparation of the mass struggle. Meanwhile the physical struggle can even now take other forms besides individual acts of terror. In Norway, for example, riots between groups of local fascists and the population are not rare. An analogous situation may occur elsewhere. In such cases the Marxists must primarily organize and systematize the spontaneous forms of struggle, constitute detachments of militia, connect their activity with the population, etc.

Together with terrorism, sabotage has also appeared in enslaved and degraded Europe. Sabotage is not a specifically proletarian weapon but, rather, peculiar to the petty-bourgeoisie. All the Marxist arguments concerning the ineffectuality of individual terrorism also apply to the destruction of such and such a military or economic objective by an individual or a small isolated group. However, certain forms of sabotage may be found combined with popular resistance. In the factories slowing up of production or the debasement of quality may appear whenever Nazi oppression becomes too brutal. The revolutionary party cannot fail to support and enlarge every form of struggle to the extent that it is intimately bound up with the masses.

* * *

After what will shortly be two years of war, after sensational victories, no perspective of solution on the strictly military plane has appeared. The generals can only offer humanity larger and larger theatres of war. Even more directly than in the last war it is the social factor that will decide. It is in following this line that it is necessary to outline our perspective, and it is with this perspective that we must align all our tasks.

Throughout Europe the proletariat is now submerged in the troubled waters of chauvinism. But the socialist solution, so remote today, obscured by nationalisms of all shades, tomorrow will be placed on the order of the day at once. It is necessary to explain patiently to the advanced workers the lessons of yesterday, the situation today and the tasks of tomorrow. It is necessary to gather together the cadres of the party of the revolution. But this preparation is neither possible nor worthwhile except by participating in all forms of mass resistance to misery and oppression, by working to organize this resistance, to co-ordinate and broaden it. It is a task demanding the greatest efforts. But they are worth it, for tomorrow they will bear fruits a hundredfold.

Reprinted from the June issue of La Vérité.

Bolshevism and the Struggle for Peace

By JOACHIM BRUST

The following article was written before the latest flip-flop of the Communist Party. The article remains important, however, to demonstrate two propositions: (1) That the "anti-war" line of the Communist Party during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact was a pacifist counterfeit and not a genuine policy of struggle against imperialist war; (2) That the Stalinist "anti-

war" line had nothing in common with the Lenin-Trotsky policy of struggle against imperialist war.—THE EDITORS.

Stripped of all verbiage the current Stalinist "struggle" against war comes down to this: the war is an imperialist war; in the center of the struggle must be placed the "struggle for peace,"—a "People's Peace." There are many workers who

sincerely oppose the war and who incline to accept the Stalinist line as one of genuine struggle. The Stalinists try to pass it off as the program of Lenin. Nothing could be more false.

But did not Lenin characterize the last war as imperialist? Didn't he forecast that other imperialist wars would follow? Of course he did. It is impossible to conduct a struggle against war without understanding its character and without designating it correctly. This war is an imperialist war. It does not at all follow, however, that any one who calls the war imperialist is thereby automatically engaged in a life-and-death struggle against it. There are people today who concede that the war is imperialist and yet support the "democratic" imperialists.

Like every problem, the problem of fighting war has two sides—the negative and the positive. It is least difficult to understand the negative or passive side of any given problem. For example, the Stalinists recognized—on paper—that Nazism was a grave danger to the German labor movement. So did the Socialists. Both called—again, on paper—for a struggle against the Nazis. In other words, so far as the *negative* aspect of Fascism was concerned, they were in agreement; but neither side was capable of advancing or carrying through a *positive* program of struggle against Hitler. As a result, the German workers who followed these two political machines were caught off guard and crushed by the Nazis.

Now, important as it is, the characterization of the war as imperialist constitutes only one side—the negative or passive side—of the struggle against the imperialist war. It is not hard for demagogues to utilize it for their own ends.

The formula: "This is an imperialist war" is acceptable, not only to many isolationists, petty bourgeois "anti-imperialists" and pacifists, but also to fascists. Hitler and Mussolini seize many opportunities to proclaim loudly that this is an imperialist war—on the part, that is, of Churchill and Roosevelt.

It cannot be repeated too often: the recognition of the character of the war as imperialist far from guarantees a real struggle against it.

It should not be forgotten that the reactionary—*imperialist*—character of the war of 1914-1918 was recognized long in advance of its actual outbreak not only by Lenin and the Bolsheviks but by the entire Second International. At several international Congresses—Stuttgart in 1907, Basle in 1912—resolutions and manifestoes against the impending imperialist war were passed by overwhelming majorities. The German Socialist Party, the pillar of the Second International, adopted a special resolution against imperialism at the Chemnitz Convention in 1912. It was introduced by Kautsky's henchman Haase and passed by all votes against 3, with 2 abstentions. This did not at all prevent the German Socialist leadership from displaying even greater unanimity in supporting the war.

They betrayed the struggle. They proceeded to deny that World War I was imperialist. Kautsky declared brazenly when the hostilities began that the war was different from the one that had long been forecast by the International.

What facilitated this betrayal was the fact that the *positive* program of the Second International like that of the Stalinists today did not go beyond a "struggle for peace."

Prominent social patriots, Bernstein, Vandervelde, etc., posed throughout the war as "internationalists" and fighters for peace. The notorious Scheidemann, Noske's colleague and one of the murderers of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, wrote an entire pamphlet in praise of peace, "Long Live Peace!" ("*Es Lebe der Frieden!*"). Still worse, pacifism—this most virulent political poison—infected the ranks of the labor

movement at the time to such an extent that with the exception of Lenin and his friends the oppositional wing of the internationalists did not go beyond a "struggle for peace."

Lenin's Fight Against the "Peace" Slogan

This historical fact is recorded in the pages of "Against the Stream," which was written during the last war by Lenin and Zinoviev and which expresses the line of Bolshevism. In an article dated December, 1914, Zinoviev wrote:

"Even among those socialists who have not deserted to the camp of the chauvinists and who wish to remain socialists and to fulfill their duty . . . there is as yet far from a complete and unanimous acceptance of the slogan of civil war (i. e., turn the imperialist war into a civil war). A new slogan is being frequently advanced in the ranks of these socialists. In the opinion of these comrades the slogan for the workers at the present time must be the demand for peace above everything else. It is alleged that the workers of all countries can now unite on this slogan. It (the slogan of peace) is concrete and clear, and the masses can easily be rallied to it. Furthermore, this slogan, they maintain, is revolutionary because the demand will be for a *democratic* peace, i. e., a peace without annexations and indemnities, a peace with disarmament, a peace drafted under the supervision of people's representatives, and so on. And finally, they say, this slogan is also eminently practical because it can be advocated legally with socialist motivations even under the existing restrictions of free speech and free press; and because it cannot fail to attract the masses of non-proletarian population who suffer under the burdens of war. *Such a position seems to us to be absolutely false.*" ("Against the Stream," Fourth Russian Edition, 1925, p. 34-35).

Is there a single semi-serious argument advanced by the *Daily Worker* in favor of a "People's Peace" which goes beyond the "peace" socialists' position summarized by Zinoviev?

In the eyes of Lenin, this slogan of "peace" was absolutely false.

The participants of Zimmerwald made attempts time and again to force the slogan of peace to the forefront. Lenin fought this irreconcilably.

In a circular letter issued to the Zimmerwald Groups on September 27, 1915, it had been stated that in the event the war continued much longer it would be the duty of all internationalists "to carry out the decision of the Zimmerwald Conference by inviting the working class to unite its forces and to fight actively for peace." The circular had further insisted that there must be a "concrete and detailed formulation of the proletariat's international point of view with regard to various peace proposals, and peace programs." "The continuation of the war," explained the document, "will also create new situations toward which we shall have to define our attitude if we do not wish to betray or renounce our aim, namely, the carrying out of a unified action for peace."

In his reply to this circular letter, Lenin warned:

"Any struggle for peace which is not connected with a revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat is really a pacifist phrase of the bourgeoisie which is either sentimental or which deceives the people. We cannot and must not pose as 'statesmen' and compose 'detailed' programs of peace. On the contrary we must explain to the masses that *without* developing a revolutionary class struggle any hopes for a democratic peace *without* annexations, violence, robbery, are a deception . . . The masses must not be lulled with hopes that peace may be attained without the overthrow of imperialism." (*Pravda*, Sept. 6, 1925, English text in *The Bolsheviks and the World War*, Hoover Library Publication No. 15. p. 366).

These lines were written more than twenty-five years ago.

They seem to have been written yesterday and directed against Browder-Minor and Co. who now pose—on orders from the Kremlin—as “statesmen” and who compose “detailed” programs of a “People’s Peace,” and are in this way deceiving their followers.

The slightest yielding to pacifist illusions makes a real struggle against the war all the more difficult. In submitting proposals for the Kienthal Conference, Lenin wrote in February 1916:

“The ‘peace program’ of socialists as well as their program of ‘struggle for the cessation of war’ must proceed from an exposure of the lie concerning ‘democratic peace,’ of the peaceful aspirations of the belligerents, etc., the peace program which the demagogic ministers, the bourgeois pacifists, the social chauvinists and the Kautskyans of all countries address to the peoples at present. Any ‘peace program’ is a deception of the people and a hypocrisy if it is not based first of all upon an explanation to the masses of the necessity for a revolution and of the support, co-operation and development of the revolutionary mass struggle . . .” (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Third Russian Edition, vol. XIX, page 61).

The “Peace” Arguments Against The Bolsheviks

The decades of relatively peaceful evolution of capitalism on the continent of Europe prior to the first world war took their toll—as has been stated—even among the most advanced sections of the European vanguard, represented in the majorities of Zimmerwald and Kienthal. The slogan of transforming the imperialist conflict into a war for social emancipation appeared in their eyes as “unrealistic.” Living on memories of the past they were unable to accept Lenin’s analysis, namely, that the first imperialist war would either end in the overthrow of capitalism on the world arena or usher in an entire epoch of recurring imperialist conflicts.

The most imposing argument was that the Bolsheviks erred in “ignoring” the mass movement and mass desire for peace. What Lenin proposed, however, was not to ignore this movement but to utilize the yearning of the masses for peace in order to educate them politically concerning the only way out of imperialist war. The revolutionists, taught Lenin, participate in any and all mass movements in favor of peace in order to advocate *their own* program and point the road to revolutionary action and solution.

Not only the Kautskyans (the social pacifists), but the majority of those who participated in Zimmerwald and Kienthal, merely posed the “demand” of peace, and left unanswered the question of *who* would achieve this peace, and *how* it would be done. To them it was merely a question of ending a particular war. The real problem, however, was and remains that of ending imperialism and all the wars which must necessarily arise from imperialism.

It was Kautsky who erected an entire theoretical system on the foundation of pacifist illusions. Kautsky’s theory of “super-imperialism” argued that a long and uninterrupted period of peace was possible under capitalism. The imperialists, he claimed, after emerging from the war—with the aid of the Second International—would see the error of their ways, arrive at an agreement among themselves, parcel out the world among the super-trusts, etc. This new world order would function under compulsory courts of arbitration (the League of Nations!); there would be general disarmament; secret diplomacy would be abolished, economic crises and all other evils curbed. The task was to patch up capitalism as best the socialists could (and did!) and thus, according to

Kautsky’s pious wishes, gradually and painlessly bring about the introduction of socialism. What a miserable Utopia!

The betrayal of the Second International was justified by Kautsky on the grounds that the International was an instrument of peace and not war.

In a pamphlet, “Internationalism and War,” he advanced the formula that in time of war it was necessary to wage a struggle for peace, reserving the continuation of the class struggle exclusively for peace-times (“*Kampf fuer Frieden, Klassenkampf in Frieden*”).

Kautsky’s ideas were drawn to their logical conclusion by Max Adler, an Austro-Marxist, who wrote a pamphlet “Principles or Romanticism” (“*Prinzip oder Romantik*”) in which he declared:

“The entire internationalism of the social democracy must and will remain a Utopia unless it makes the idea of peace the central point of its program of domestic and foreign policy . . . Socialism after the war will either become organized international pacifism or it will cease to exist altogether.”

“The idea of peace must become our central slogan!” (“*Die Friedensidee Zum Mittelpunkt!*”) Kautsky-Adler first unfolded this banner. Today the Stalinists are trying to deceive the workers by passing off this program of social-pacifism as the line of Lenin!

Contrast Between Leninism and Stalinism

In his theses on the war adopted by the Bolsheviks at the Berne Conference in September, 1914, Lenin wrote:

“Pacifism and an abstract preaching of peace are some of the ways to fool the working class. Under capitalism, particularly in its imperialist stage, wars become inevitable . . . At present, the peace propaganda, which is not accompanied by an appeal to the revolutionary activities of the masses, is only apt to disseminate illusions, to demoralize the proletariat by an insinuation of confidence in the humanitarianism of the bourgeoisie and by making it a toy in the hands of secret diplomacy of the belligerent countries. In particular the idea that a democratic peace is possible without a number of revolutions is absolutely false.” (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Third Russian Edition, vol. XVIII pp. 127-128).

Lenin repeated this central idea in dozens of articles: “The idea that a democratic peace is possible without a number of revolutions is absolutely false.”

The original and most fervent proponents of this absolutely false idea during the last war were the followers of Kautsky, the chief proponents of this same false idea today are the Stalinists.

In a certain sense it is possible to explain “objectively” the treachery of the Kautskyans. Just before the first World War engulfed mankind, capitalism seemed to be at the peak of its powers, far from senile, bourgeois democracy and its parliamentary institutions appeared well night eternal. On the continent of Europe no major wars had been fought for more than forty years—since the Franco-Prussian war of 1871. It was this that made it possible to dupe the masses with the illusion that the first imperialist slaughter would really be the last one (the “war to end all wars”). It was this that provided the bankrupts of the Second International with a semblance of “realism.”

But what can be said for the position of the Stalinists?

Kautsky maintained that the imperialists could remain indefinitely at peace; Stalin amplified this Utopia to read that the imperialists can be not only at peace among themselves but also at peace with the Soviet Union. It would be possible

to proceed with the building of "socialism in one country" without any direct danger of war. Stalin expressed the assurance many times that the Soviet Union could remain at peace (this was when he still used to talk for publication).

In an interview with Eugene Lyons (N.Y. *Telegram*, November 24, 1930) Stalin said: "It is possible, and the best proof is that they have lived peacefully side by side since the conclusion of our civil war and the intervention period."

In an interview with Walter Duranty (N. Y. *Times*, December 1, 1930) Stalin reaffirmed his previous declaration, "They have not fought for ten years which means they can coexist."

Just as the temporary equilibrium between the imperialist powers in the decades prior to the first war was interpreted by the Kautskyans as "proof" of the possibility of a prolonged and stable equilibrium of imperialism, so Stalin translated the temporary equilibrium between the Soviet Union and its imperialist environment to mean that a stable peace was possible, if only the maneuvers of the Kremlin were cynical and unscrupulous enough. It is precisely because Stalinism left the grounds of Marxism-Leninism in its theory of "socialism in one country" that the Kremlin's "struggle" against war assumed from the beginning one kind or another of pacifist masquerade. The reactionary nature of Stalinism was clearly revealed by the behind-the-scenes participation of the Comintern in impotent and perfidious movements for peace. First this was done in the guise of "Anti-Imperialist Leagues." Then came the "Peace Congresses" (Amsterdam-Pleyel, etc).

What was Lenin's attitude toward "Peace Congresses," and "peace mobilizations"? Didn't the Soviet Government under Lenin participate in "disarmament" negotiations, etc? Did Lenin change his views on this subject after the termination of the Civil War and the establishment of the temporary equilibrium between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world?

There exists an important historical document which provides irrefutable evidence on this point. In his letter of instructions to the Bolshevik delegation to the Peace Congress at the Hague in December 1922, Lenin wrote:

"It seems to me that if we will have at the Hague Conference a few people able to make speeches in one or another language against war, the most important thing they can accomplish is to refute the idea that the participants in the Conference are opponents of war, or that they understand how war may and can burst upon them at the most unexpected moment, or that they have the least knowledge of the means to employ against war, or that they are in any way capable of adopting an intelligent and sensible path of struggle against the war." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Third Russian Edition, vol. XXVII, page 375).

Thus, after the war, Lenin's line remained the same as it was during the war: Bolsheviks must utilize every opportunity to advance *their own* line against all pacifist illusions. The participation of Bolsheviks in any "Peace Congress" or "peace mobilization" should be only for the purpose of exposing its utter futility and fraud.

Stalin's policy has been just the opposite. He has clutched at every illusion of pacifism, no matter how discredited, in order to "struggle" for peace. In an interview with Duranty (N. Y. *Times*, December 25, 1933) Stalin said: "If the League (of Nations) is even the tiniest bump somewhat to slow down the drive toward war and help peace... we shall support the League despite its colossal deficiencies."

After Hitler's assumption of power, the League of Na-

tions was depicted by Stalinism not as the "tiniest bump" but as a bulwark of peace. And each pact that Stalin made with the "democratic" imperialists was hailed as a great blow against war and fascism, as any participant in the defunct "Leagues Against War and Fascism" will readily recall.

The complete bankruptcy of the policy of "People's Fronts" brought about the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact and the outbreak of the Second World War, which will embroil the Soviet Union sooner or later. It was in good measure as a cover for the alliance with Hitler that the Kremlin resurrected the slogan of "opposing" the imperialist war. Essentially, however, the current line of the Kremlin is the latest adaptation of Stalino-pacifism to wartime conditions and the alliance with the Nazis. It is as far removed from Bolshevism as was Kautsky's line in the last war.

* * *

The Bolshevik Way Out

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky did not simply "think up" their ideas. Every principle in their teachings has been dictated by the actual course of history and of the class struggle in society. Every principle reflects and expresses the historical needs of the working class. The genius of these great thinkers, teachers and leaders of the working class was expressed in this, that they were able to discover, formulate and apply the laws of this struggle and its development in advance of its crucial stages. They were the ones who supplied living answers to the burning issues. In this is the secret of the power of Bolshevism (Marxism-Leninism-Trotskyism).

Every program other than that of Bolshevism has led and can lead mankind only to disaster and defeat. This has been verified time and again, especially by the events of the last two decades. Of all the defeats suffered in recent years, by far the gravest is the Second World War which has been unleashed by the imperialists only thanks to the policies of Stalinism and of the Second International. The payment for these policies is now being exacted in terms of the incredible destruction of material wealth and the productive forces, in terms of the lives of tens of millions of workers and peasants, their wives and children. Bolshevism alone points the way out.

During the first World War, Bolshevism proved itself the only tendency in the world labor movement capable of conducting a genuine struggle against war. The true meaning of this struggle can never be blotted out from the annals of history. Without that struggle the victory of October could have never been gained in Russia in 1917.

It is impossible to conduct a struggle today without thoroughly learning and assimilating the lessons of the struggle waged by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. The Third International under Stalin has trampled every one of these lessons underfoot.

The Bolsheviks did not merely oppose the war. Nor did they confine their struggle to attacks on the social patriots, the open supporters of both warring imperialist camps. One of the great lessons of this struggle is that the fight against social patriotism is inseparable from the fight against social pacifism, and every variety of the program of "struggle for peace."

From the Arsenal of Marxism

A Letter from Exile in Alma-Ata

By LEON TROTSKY

The following letter, written by Leon Trotsky while in exile in Alma-Ata, is published now for the first time in any language. It was written on June 2, 1928 (it is undated but the internal evidence provides the date) and was of course forbidden publication in the Soviet Union. In typewritten copies it circulated as part of the Opposition political literature in the struggle against Stalinism. The letter illumines the conditions of the struggle at that time,

especially the ruthless and vile persecution of Trotsky's own family and his closest collaborators.

It was written at a time when Stalin was consummating his "left course," that is, was breaking with the Right Wing of Bukharin-Rykov-Tomsky — with whom he had been in a bloc since 1925 — and was launching the program of industrialization, the main features of which he borrowed from the program of the Opposition and proceeded

to distort in his typical manner. As against the illusions (and weariness of the struggle) of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Pyatakov, Antonov-Ovseeenko, Krestinsky, Safarov and others, who welcomed the "left course," Trotsky and his collaborators, notably Rakovsky, warned that there could be no correct policy without party and Soviet democracy. Perhaps the most significant sections are the passages on the relation between policy and workers' democracy.—THE EDITORS.

Dear Comrade,

I have recently received letters from many comrades each complaining that there have been no replies from me. My son has been similarly accused. These charges are all due to "misunderstandings" in the post-office. Not a single letter, not a single postcard, not one telegram has been received to which we did not reply either immediately, or, at the latest, on the very next day. There are many, many addresses to which we write without first waiting for a communication the moment news comes of the address of any new arrival (in exile). Consequently, if any comrade receives no reply to his letter it simply means either that his letter did not reach us or that our reply did not reach his address. To characterize the condition of postal communications it is only necessary to state that I received yesterday, i.e., on June 1st, a letter from my daughter in Moscow which she mailed on March 20. The remarkable thing is that letters arrive quite promptly from certain points, for example, from Rakovsky in Astrakhan, Preobrazhensky in Uralsk, Sosnovsky in Barnaul. On the other hand, there are other points whence letters either do not arrive at all, or come after a great delay, and, furthermore, not all of them. Thus, for example, I have not received to this day a single letter from comrade Radek. From Vrachev, the first letter dated May 12 was delivered yesterday; yet he informs me that he has already written me two letters, both sent by registered mail, with a return receipt requested and prepaid. I did not receive these two letters. Comrade Vrachev is thus entitled to demand payment from the post-office for the loss of registered mail. Other comrades should make systematic use of this method.

* * *

Some comrades make reference to a letter of Radek's with which I am entirely unacquainted and in which he reportedly solidarizes with the resolution of the ECCI on the Chinese question. I believe there must be some misunderstanding here. While the resolutions—on the English and French questions—constitute a very oblique and muddled turn to the *left*, and by virtue of this represent the beginning of a movement in our direction, the resolution on the Chinese question is false from beginning to end and represents a direct continuation, development and deepening of the policy of the bloc of four classes, the subordination of the Communist Party to the Kuomintang, speculations on the Left Kuomintang, with the inevitable supplement of such opportunist

policy by something in the spirit of the Canton putsch. In my opinion this question is absolutely decisive for our entire international orientation. At issue is the guidance of a revolution in a land with 400-million people. The current resolution of the ECCI prepares for the destruction of the Third Chinese Revolution as inevitably as the pro-Kuomintang course assured the collapse of the Second Chinese Revolution of 1925-1928. Moreover, there is the question of the revolution in India on the one side, and the revolution in Japan on the other. It is necessary to think out these questions to the end.

So far as the "left course" is concerned, a part of its historical mission has already been fulfilled because it has aided in bringing about the natural evolution of the Zinoviev group. Safarov used to be in opposition to Zinoviev and Kamenev from the left. But this Safarov-leftism had only one historic design: to show the masters of the situation that he, Safarov, is ready to growl at and bite us far more decisively than are "opportunists" like Zinoviev and Kamenev. There are, as Saltykov used to say, the little people of the plaything industry; they wanted to play at the game of opposition, to amuse themselves with pranks on the apparatus of the dictatorship, and against their own will they were sucked into a great whirlpool. Small wonder that they now blow out bubbles of theory and hysterically lash out with all their extremities guided by the one and only desire: to remain on the surface, and if possible to prosper again. They began by saying that it was necessary to accept a Brest-Litovsk peace, that is, to deceive the party. And by a stroke of luck, the left course suddenly turned up. "Look! Look!" say these little people of the plaything industry, "That's just what we said a long time ago." They did do a lot of talking but it was about something just the opposite, i.e., not about a left course but a Brest peace, three months ago, at most six months ago. We have lost Pyatakov, Antonov-Ovseeenko, Krestinsky, people who turned rotten long ago—for the Zinovievite tops constituted a Fronde of dignitaries who under the pressure of Petrograd workers and a squeeze from our side went much further than they ever intended. Now they have returned to the manglers they left behind them. However, hundreds of Petrograd workers did not follow their former leaders but remained with us. This fully justifies the bloc*—both in its making and breaking.

* The 1926-27 bloc between Trotskyists and Zinoviev-Kamenev.

I shall not dwell on the essence of the issue of the "left course" because I have already written concerning this in great detail in several letters to a number of comrades. Here I want only to add that in these letters I touched all too inadequately on the question of the methods of leadership—in the party, the state, the trade unions. This is quite correctly pointed out by comrade Rakovsky in a letter which I received yesterday. Comrade Rakovsky advances to the forefront the idea that a correct political line is inconceivable without the correct methods for elaborating and realizing it. Even if on this or that question, under the influence of this or that pressure, the apparatus-leadership should stumble onto the tracks of a correct line, there still are no guarantees that this line will be actually carried out.

"Under the conditions of the dictatorship of the party," writes comrade Rakovsky, "a gigantic power is concentrated in the hands of the leadership, such power as was never known to any political organization in history, and therefore the observance of communist and proletarian methods of leadership become all the more indispensable inasmuch as every deviation from them, every falseness, is immediately reflected in the entire working class and the entire revolution. The leadership has become accustomed gradually to extend the negative attitude of the proletarian dictatorship toward bourgeois pseudo-democracy to those elementary guarantees of conscious democracy on which the party subsists and by means of which it is alone possible to lead the working class and the state."

On the other hand, under the proletarian dictatorship in which, as has been said, unprecedentedly vast power is concentrated in the hands of the leadership, the summits, the violation of this spirit of democracy becomes the greatest and gravest evil. Lenin had already warned that our workers' state had become infected with "bureaucratic deformations." The danger of the party's being infected by it disturbed his thoughts up to the last moments of his life. He used to speak often of what should be the relations between the leadership of the party and the trade unions, and the toilers generally ("gears," "communicators"). Let us recall his indignant protests against certain manifestations of rudeness ("fist-play,"* etc.), and against the individual failings of leaders, which to a superficial view are insignificant. Lenin's indignation is best understood if one takes into consideration that what he had in mind was to preserve within the party just the opposite methods of leadership. In the same connection should be understood his warm advocacy of culture—the struggle against Asiatic morals—and finally his intentions in creating the Central Control Commission.

"When Lenin was alive," continues comrade Rakovsky, "the party apparatus did not wield one-tenth of the power it now possesses, and therefore everything that Lenin feared has now become tens of times more dangerous. The party apparatus has become infected with the bureaucratic deformations of the state apparatus, and there have been added to all this the deformations elaborated by the false bourgeois parliamentary democracy. As a result, a leadership has arisen which instead of a conscious party democracy fosters: 1) fabrications of the theories of Leninism adapted for the purpose of entrenching the party bureaucracy; 2) abuse of power, which with respect to communists and workers under the conditions of dictatorship cannot fail to assume monstrous proportions;

3) fraudulent tampering with the entire party electoral machinery; 4) utilization of methods during discussion periods of which bourgeois-fascist authorities could be proud but never a proletarian party (strong-arm squads, hecklers who disrupt meetings, speakers torn from the platform, etc.); 5) the absence of comradely bonds and conscientiousness in personal relations, etc., etc."

It is from this that Rakovsky deduces all those monstrous trials* which have in recent months finally come out into the open (the Shakhti case, the Artemovsk case, the Smolensk case, and so on). Those will invariably and always make mistakes who approach isolated economic measures separate and apart from the political process and political activity as a whole. Comrade Rakovsky very appropriately reminds us that politics is concentrated economics.

Bourgeois Evaluations of Stalin's Role

You have of course noticed that our press refrains almost entirely from printing the reactions of the European and American press to the events inside our party. This alone should lead one to gather that these reactions are not suited to the style of the new course. On this score I now possess not only conjectures but printed evidence, graphic in the extreme. A comrade has sent me a page clipped from the February 1 issue of *The Nation*, an American periodical. After briefly summarizing the latest events in our country, this most prominent left-democratic journal says:

"This action brings to the front the question: Who represents the continuation of the Bolshevik program in Russia and who the inevitable reaction from it? To the American readers it has seemed as if Lenin and Trotsky represented the same thing and the conservative press and statesmen have arrived at the same conclusion. Thus, the *New York Times* found a chief cause for rejoicing on New Year's Day in the successful elimination of Trotsky from the Communist Party, declaring flatly that 'the ousted Opposition stood for the perpetuation of the ideas and conditions that have cut off Russia from Western civilization.' Most of the great European newspapers wrote similarly. Sir Austen Chamberlain during the Geneva Conference was quoted as saying that England could not enter into conversations with Russia for the simple reason that 'Trotsky has not yet been shot against a wall.' He must be pleased by Trotsky's banishment... At any rate, the mouthpieces of reaction in Europe are one in their conclusion that Trotsky and not Stalin is their chief Communist enemy." (*The Nation*, February 1, 1928.)

The Nation, we see, considers inevitable the reaction against Bolshevism, or Thermidor (the article is entitled "Russia's Thermidor?"). In conclusion, it states flatly:

"No doubt Stalin's tendency to depart from the rigorous Bolshevik program must be defended as a concession to the will of a majority of the people."

Pravda sometimes tries (it has tried this before) to quote isolated voices in the social democratic press who pick up our criticism just as they are now picking up the official "self-criticism" as *Pravda* itself admits. As if genuine class lines were determined by the petty intrigues of the social democratic press which tries to warm its hands on our disagreements by picking now from this end, now from the other. The basic line of the social democracy is determined by the fundamental interests of bourgeois society. But the social democracy is able to play the role of the last prop of the bourgeois regime precisely because it is not at all identical

* Ordjonokidze, a member of the Polburo, had slapped a young comrade in a fit of anger. Lenin proposed that Ordjonokidze be expelled from the party for a period of years.

* The first show-trials, 1927-1928, prerunners of the Moscow frameup trials of 1936-1938.

with fascism, as is sweepingly asserted in the Soviet press, but on the contrary is able on all *non-fundamental* questions to play with all the colors of the rainbow. Social democracy can utilize an opportunity to roar against reaction and slap genuine revolutionists (so long as they remain in the minority) approvingly on the back, and swallow swords and fire, in a word, fulfill its function as the extreme left wing of bourgeois society. That is why it is necessary to *know how to read* the social democratic press. It is necessary to distinguish the basic line (basic for the bourgeoisie) from all the verbal political charlatanism which is basic for the social democracy itself for it thrives thereon.

As regards the solid capitalist press, it has no reasons for playing hide and seek on questions concerning the communists and the proletariat. That is why the article from *The Nation* is of interest to us not only in and of itself but also for the reactions it quotes from the world of imperialist politics. Now, here we have a serious and not accidental or episodic verification of the class line. It is all the less accidental because more than a year ago the organ of the Council of French Heavy Industry evaluated in absolutely the same way the internal tendencies in our party and our country. Moreover this was done not in a newspaper but in a bulletin intended for a comparatively narrow circle of the initiated.

The Plight of His Family

That is all for the time being on questions of politics. Our personal situation is on the whole satisfactory despite the persistent malaria which besieges Natalia Ivanovna much more cruelly than it does me. We hope to get rid of it by moving up higher, into the mountains. The preparations for moving were begun in May, but no apartments were available at the time, and the month of May itself brought only cold and rain. But now we have already moved to the mountains, the place is eight versts from the center of the city. There are many gardens here and it is cooler here than below in the valley. Our youngest son has been living with us for more than a month. Our daughter-in-law (the wife of our older son) arrived from Moscow more than a week ago, so that our family has greatly grown. Unfortunately things are not favorable in the rest of our family. One of my two daughters, Nina, is gravely ill with galloping consumption. I telegraphed Professor Gautier and a few days ago received his reply: "Galloping type. Incurable." My daughter is 26 years old, she has two babies, her husband Nevelson is in exile. From the hospital my daughter wrote me on March 20 that she wished to "liquidate" her illness in order to return to her job, but her temperature was high. Had I received this letter in time I could have telegraphed her and our friends to have her stay in the hospital. But the letter she mailed on March 20 was delivered to me only on June 1st—it was in transit for

73 days, i.e., it remained for more than two months in the pocket of a Deribas or an Agranov or some other scoundrel corrupted by impunity. My oldest daughter Zina—she is 27—has also been "running a temperature" for the last two, three years. I should like very much to have her here but she is now taking care of her sister. Both of my daughters have of course been expelled from the party and removed from their jobs, although my older daughter who used to be in charge of a party school in Crimea had been transferred a year ago to a purely technical post. In a word, these gentlemen are diligently occupying themselves with my family after they smashed my secretariat.

You doubtless recall that my best collaborator Glazman, a splendid party member, was driven to commit suicide by vile persecutions as far back as 1924. The crime remained of course unpunished. Now the three remaining collaborators are being cruelly persecuted. They all went with me—as did Glazman—through the entire civil war. Sermuks and Poznanski decided on their own responsibility to go to Central Asia in order to be with me. Sermuks was arrested here on the second day after his arrival. They kept him in a cellar for about a week, allowing him 25 kopeks a day from his own funds and then shipped him to Moscow whence he was exiled to the province of Komi. Poznanski was arrested in Tashkent and exiled to Kotlas. Butov remains sitting in jail to this day . . .

I warmly shake your hand,

Leon Trotsky.

P. S. Have gone through the Draft Program of the C. I. What a wretched document. There is no unity of thought, no firmness in structure, all the walls have yawning revisionist cracks, the roof is full of holes . . . what a sorry edifice! At the same time it is all plastered and painted up with "cheerful" revolutionary colors—all our remarks have been taken into consideration not in essence but merely for purposes of camouflage.

The first Bukharinist draft has been rejected precisely on account of its narrow national construction (see our "documents" in *Pravda* for January 15, 1928). And now *Pravda* is boasting that the new construction is strictly internationalist "not like the social democrats," and that "we" take our point of departure from world economy and not national economy. There too is a forgery of what we said. But the essence is not there—only one patch upon another. I am writing a detailed criticism for the Sixth Congress and making an attempt to keep them from adopting this fatal document. *

* The detailed criticism referred to is the "Criticism of the Draft Program of the Comintern" published in English under the title, "The Third International After Lenin," Pioneer Publishers, New York, 1936.

The Blind Alley of Soviet Literature

By L. YAKOVLEV

The press of the Kremlin is again sounding the alarm. A terrible situation prevails on the literary and dramatic fronts. Every possible variation is now being played on the following theme: Soviet literature has failed to provide in the recent period any models of strong personalities capable of arousing

either love or the desire for emulation and capable of serving as examples for the youth to follow. The outstanding Soviet writers—Michael Sholokhov, A. Tolstoy, A. Fadeyev, Valentin Katayev, K. Fedin, Marietta Shaginyan, Lidya Seifulina, L. Leonov and others "seem to sense failure on the soil

of modern subjects and shy away from depicting the new individual. They undertake journeys into the past, into the Seventeenth or Eighteenth centuries, they spend years on topics dealing with the Civil War of which they were contemporaries,* but they are incapable of portraying the modern Red warrior, the modern patriot, the modern hero." (*Literaturnaya Gazetta*, No. 6, February 9, 1941).

The flight of Soviet writers from current subjects has assumed truly catastrophic proportions during the last three years. From among the vast quantity of books published in the USSR for that period, it was hard to compile a list of fifty volumes devoted to current and vital themes. And even among these books, a major portion—twenty—are devoted wholly or in part to the Northern areas, the conquest of the North, and the life of the peoples of the North. "Were some future historian to decide to restore the history of our times from the artistic literature, from the prose writings of the last three years, he would find himself obliged to say that the chief concern of the country in those years was—the conquest of the North," P. Pavlenko and F. Levin declared, not without irony, in their report, "The Soviet Man as Portrayed in Contemporary Prose" which was delivered before a special meeting of the party organization, the Union of Soviet Writers (*Literaturnaya Gazetta*, Feb. 4 and Feb. 9, 1941).

Works devoted to the conquest of the North and to historical topics allow the writer a little elbow room. To be sure, even here he must pick his way very cautiously to avoid dangerous submarine reefs. But here at least he can choose a topic to his own liking and give free play to his imagination in describing human conflict. It is otherwise with contemporary subjects. After all, what kind of conflicts dare the authors write about in a society which is officially without classes and where socialism has already been achieved?

What Authors Are Urged to Describe

But there are conflicts to write about, the authors are now assured. "Among us there is even taking shape a special theory of non-conflict, of a life as easy as breathing, and of conflicts being something outdated. A view is unfolding that conflicts belong to past epochs and to previous periods; that in the classless society, which we have created, conflicts disappear and are replaced by accidental or ephemeral misunderstandings, easily to be explained away by the author, involving no great hardships either for the writer or his characters, and, let us confess, without any interest at all for the reader . . . It seems ages since we have read about an individual involved in genuine living conflicts," avow Levin and Pavlenko.

These reporters declare the supply of conflicts in Soviet reality is more than ample. Conflicts are to be encountered at every step: in factories, "in connection with the development of the Stakhanovist movement there have appeared new forms of opposition to it"; and in the collectivized village, where "the problem of wealth and poverty has assumed a different form . . . these conflicts in the day-to-day struggle of the Soviet village for socialism are as plentiful as you please." In the day-to-day life, in the family and outside, everywhere

and always there are conflicts—with the sole exception of Soviet literature in which no reflection of them is to be found.

"The peculiar little theory" that acute social conflict is neither necessary nor possible in contemporary Soviet society, and that sharp conflicts can only harm the country and tend to distort reality has led to a literature depicting Soviet society only from the positive and "constructive" aspects, thus rendering it lifeless, unreal and excruciatingly boring. Soviet heroes, insofar as they too can only be constructive and positive, are schematic and hollow. When it comes to the portrayal of party secretaries, the situation becomes intolerable. These are not human beings but some sort of automatons, mechanized virtue. They are incapable of living through any emotions or experiences, they know everything, they appear at the most difficult moments and always, like good fairies, save the situation.

"What is the reason," demand the reporters, "for the fact that during the last three years in which our country has been living in an extraordinarily complex environment and has achieved grandiose successes in all spheres of the construction of socialism, there is not to be found in our books the people who created all this, the people who could be called the true heroes of our time? Why do most books deal with the so-called border topics, and touch only by indirection and by hints on the basic and paramount questions of our life? Why are there no strong passions, no deep sweep of human activity in conditions of a cruel struggle for the building of a communist society? Why are there no sincere human feelings, no tears, no laughter, no genuine human suffering? Why do all the difficulties of growth become transformed into a mirage, something abstract, something lifeless and completely impalpable?" keep asking reporters Levin and Pavlenko.

Pertinent Questions—But Unanswered

These are pertinent questions. But this struggle against schematism in the portrayal of Soviet reality and the struggle against falsely embellishing this reality, this "struggle" was proclaimed long, long ago. Yet the situation today instead of improving has obviously grown much worse. Serious questions are always posed during periods of great crises when it is impossible to keep silent any longer. But they can be posed only within the limits set by the Soviet authorities. Above all, it is impermissible to give any answers which in the least correspond with the truth.

A few years ago, after the last great Moscow Frameup Trial (the Bukharin-Rykov *et al* Trial in 1938), the social atmosphere was so poisoned by interminable arrests, denunciations, slander and permanent purging, that the Stalinist leadership was compelled to sound a retreat. The very same "*Literaturnaya Gazetta*" (*Literary Gazette*) then very pertinently posed in its columns the question of exposing the denunciators and slanderers. The writers were assigned a special task—to drive the slanderers into the open. A few talented writers took this for good coin and responded by writing comedies in which they truthfully and ably portrayed a very tiny corner of Soviet reality.

M. Zoschenko in "Dangerous Connections" exposed a typical gentleman equipped with a party book and an adequate stock of unscrupulousness to undermine honest people in order to make a career for himself and to satisfy all his personal and rather low needs. Zoschenko, a talented writer, was able to cope with his theme but precisely because of this he aroused dissatisfaction and the play was stigmatized as "a political blunder on the part of the author." The slight-

* But even this is qualified with the remark that "in works dealing with the civil war there is to be found more the spirit of rationalization rather than that of living and realistic narrative." After all, it is no simple task to provide a realistic depiction of the civil war without once mentioning the name of Leon Trotsky or other legendary heroes of the Red Army and always portraying Stalin as a genius.

est vestige of truth strikes home too closely. It points too directly to the real source of all slander—the Kremlin itself.

Another talented writer, Nikolai Virta, also wrote a comedy: "Slander or The Mad Days of Anton Ivanovich." This comedy also very capably exposed the mechanics of slander as perpetrated by a careerist Propoteyev (what an un-earthly name!). This character makes a brilliant career in the course of a single year: from a petty functionary he rises in twelve months to the armchair of a director. He has already slandered twenty people in his department. They were all driven out, "covered with mud and filth." Propoteyev keeps himself informed of all the affairs and moods of his fellow employes. He keeps a sort of unwritten file. For example, he knows that employe Kainov had hanging in his home in 1923 "for a period of 62 days, a portrait of the most vicious enemy of the people," he is aware that his colleague Anton Ivanovich who holds a responsible post "wavered on the question of the general line," etc., etc. Virta succeeds in making Propoteyev and all other characters so real and convincing that the play was immediately recognized as—politically harmful and a "great personal and creative failure for the author."

The blind alley in which Soviet literature finds itself is expressed most graphically in the major field of plays for the theater. Modern Soviet plays have disappeared from the repertoire. A play of contemporary setting is looked upon as something akin to "a delayed time bomb." . . . It is difficult

to recognize it immediately, and no one can tell just when and how it will explode: whether the ticket office will remain empty, or whether the play itself will be a failure, or whether the critics will condemn it. And so the general tendency is to steer clear of all sin and to draw closer not even to classical productions but to plays which are shamefacedly called semi-classical, like "Madame Sans Gene," "The Ideal Husband," "Gentlemen," etc. (*Sovietskoye Isskustvo*, No. 3, 1941.)

And who is in the last analysis responsible for this flight from current themes? Everybody is busy finding explanations. Some writers pound their own breasts and repent of "indifference toward reality." Others blame the directors who block the road to "young" and "bold" playwrights . . . The directors are really to blame for everything . . . Remove these "snipers" and everything will be remedied, declare many writers. There is even a note to be heard of sincere perplexity.

The matter is of course not so simple. It is not at all a question of directors, or individual writers or any other isolated individuals. It is a question of the system of the degenerated regime which must ruthlessly stifle and gag all talent, all manifestations of original and creative thought and which must encourage sycophants and subserver.

The self-imposed and mass migration of Soviet writers to the regions of the North and to the topics of the past supplies a "literary" gauge of the intensity of the crisis in the Soviet Union.

An Apologist For Chinese Stalinism

By GEORGE STERN

Among the many correspondents reporting Far Eastern affairs for the American public, Edgar Snow occupies a special position. He is probably one of the ablest propagandists for Stalinism who still commands a general hearing. He maintains this position by cannily assuming an attitude of "independence" and "realistic" objectivity. His technique is simple: he allows himself the luxury of criticism on a minor scale—a sentence here and there casting aspersions on, say the American Stalinists as contrasted to the Chinese Communist Party. Or he will on occasion permit himself a shrewdly cynical shrug with respect to the aims, activities, and policies of the Kremlin in this or that particular situation.

These little digressive tricks have earned him, often, the suspicion of the Stalinist brethren in this country. His last book, for example, "Red Star Over China" was actually banned from sale in the Workers' Bookshop in New York although it undoubtedly was, for that particular time (1937-38), the ablest apology for Stalinist politics in China that had appeared anywhere. After the book had gone through five editions, Snow actually emended his work to eliminate or soften some of the objectionable side remarks and it was duly taken off the local Stalinist index.

But wherever and whenever it is a matter of basic policy, Snow hews to the line with a care and a precision worthy of an Anna Louise Strong or, perhaps more aptly, of a Walter Duranty. In this new book, Snow turns telling journalistic guns on Chiang Kai-shek, the Kuomintang, Japan, the United States, and Britain. Only Stalin, the Soviet Union and the Chinese Stalinists are spared. With a great array of facts,

marshalled like an air armada and unloosed in waves of verbal Stuka dives, Snow shows the responsibility borne by the Kuomintang and by U. S. and British imperialism for the present situation in China and the Far East generally. In his own way he draws upon the lessons of recent history to show how Chiang and the Kuomintang and the rulers in Washington and London have largely made the bed they are lying in. But nowhere does he breathe a word of the historic responsibilities of Moscow and the Comintern for the imperialist holocaust in the world and the more immediate failures of effective resistance in China. This is the kind of "selective" criticism which gives Snow away.

Snow presents himself as one of those "despised petty bourgeois journalists" who are too honest with themselves to espouse any cause too actively. But it is precisely as a despicable petty bourgeois journalist that he best serves his chosen masters. The present book* was prepared and written during the period of developing strain in the Kuomintang-Stalinist united front in China. Snow as an "independent" observer is able to arraign Chiang Kai-shek and the Kuomintang in a manner and with a freedom that the Stalinists are unwilling to adopt themselves.

A Devastating Picture of the Kuomintang

It is in this portion of his book, however, that Snow makes a useful contribution of facts. He devotes many pages

* THE BATTLE FOR ASIA, By Edgar Snow, N. Y., 1941.

to detailing the corruption of the Kuomintang bureaucracy, the criminal ineptitude of the war leadership, the many needless failures and sacrifices due to the Kuomintang's preoccupation with its own power, with the interests of the landlords, bankers and merchants, its fear of the masses ever greater than its fear of the Japanese invaders. For American readers who might actually be deluded into thinking of Chiang Kai-shek's regime as "democratic," Snow gives a detailed picture of the regime as it actually is—a military-bureaucratic structure which lies like a dead weight upon the people and hamstringing their fight for freedom. And even in this Snow imposes a curious limitation upon himself. Referring to an officialdom which has reaped huge personal wealth out of the misery of the people in the midst of the war, Snow remarks: "If I here refrain from speaking in more detail it is not because of lack of evidence but because—to be candid—it is difficult to do so without gratuitously injuring a cause which on the whole richly deserves the help of the world."

In this Snow sums up his own attitude and, by refraction, the attitude of the Stalinists. The Kuomintang leadership, representative of the backward and strangling landlord-banker-merchant system, is, he declares, actually jeopardizing the fight against the Japanese imperialists. If it continues as at present, he believes, it may even hand final victory over to the Japanese. Yet there is no word to be had from Snow of active political struggle against this incubus. Its transformation is to be part of the "maturing" complexity of the Chinese situation. And this transformation is to be effected, as far as the Stalinists are concerned, merely by their own contrasting example of rectitude and concern for the people. The rest, he unconsciously admits, depends upon some change in Soviet foreign policy. The struggle against the Kuomintang would take more active form, he indicates, only if the Kuomintang actually should become part of some future anti-Soviet combination of powers—something Snow admits is a possibility.

His Picture of the Stalinists

Meanwhile in the districts under their control, to which Snow again takes us on one of his admiring visits, we get a picture of Stalinists pursuing a kind of semi-populist policy among the peasants. Honesty in administration and modified land and tax reforms are sufficient—together with Japanese brutality—to assure the roving Stalinist forces a degree of popular support which the Kuomintang can seldom muster. One gets, even in Snow's hyperbole, a sense of magnificent revolutionary material, totally devoted and self-sacrificing men and women and youths, in whom great future hopes reside. Snow suggests—and with some justice—that common armed struggle over a period of many years of great hardship establishes a comradeship in this party which is probably without duplicate anywhere in the Comintern.

There is also an unintended hint that the Chinese Stalinist leaders do not encourage their followers to preoccupy themselves too deeply with events in their movement abroad. "In other countries (Snow writes) the pros and cons of the Moscow trials and the purges obscured much more urgent (?) issues in the internal politics of every Communist party. It seemed to me the Chinese took the claims and counter-claims with a grain of salt. Anyway they were too occupied with

their own problems of survival to worry too much about events in Moscow beyond their knowledge or control."

One can see the Chinese Stalinist leaders, veterans of a hundred purges and counter-purges and dizzy Comintern zig-zags, telling their raw fighting recruits: "Don't bother about that stuff. It's no concern of ours. We have our problem here—to fight Japan. Stalin is right—take our word for it."

Naturally Snow himself expresses no opinion on such an "extraneous" matter as the Moscow trials. Similarly with the Spanish experience. Snow makes reference on several occasions to the Spanish civil war, which contained such fateful lessons for the Chinese. The defeat of the Spanish workers was due only to the overwhelming military superiority of the Fascists and the "betrayal" of the French and British "democrats"—the Comintern's criminal policy of strangling the workers' revolution, of course, had nothing to do with it for Snow. That little matter goes unmentioned. Yet here lies the nub of all the hopes that exist for the future of China's liberation struggle.

The Same Fatally False Theory as Before

Snow presents faithfully the "theory" basic to Stalinist strategy in China as follows:

"The Communists have always maintained that only a democratic republic can accomplish the 'bourgeois-democratic' tasks of the revolution—attainment of national independence and the liquidation of remnant feudalism. Only a democratic republic could guarantee to the peasantry and the working class the right to organize and win their internal demands. And only a democratic republic, they believe, can enable the workers and peasants to take the leadership of the government in a *peaceful* transition—the Chinese Communists believe in this 'possibility'—toward Socialism."

Here we have the same theoretical formula, the same strategic approach which destroyed the Chinese revolutionary movement in 1927 and encompassed the defeat of the workers in Spain ten years later. In the hands of the Stalinists any present-day popular movement in China would be led down the same path to fresh catastrophes.

For while the Stalinists have "always maintained" that bourgeois democracy could solve their tasks, this counter-revolutionary idea has nothing whatever in common with the fundamental principles of Lenin, of Bolshevism. The October Revolution in Russia in 1917 proved that only the proletarian dictatorship, wresting power from the bourgeoisie, could actually accomplish the unfinished bourgeois democratic tasks. Every other proof since then has, tragically, been a negative proof. For every movement led along any other path has been led to defeat. And the accumulation of these defeats produced the Second World War and, now, the imperialist attack on the Soviet Union.

The Chinese Stalinists, leading a mildly reformist peasant movement, careful at every crucial point not to offend the class interests represented by the Kuomintang, cannot effectively lead a national liberation movement. Their total divorce from the proletariat in the big cities, now under Japanese occupation, creates the conditions for ultimate conflict between the peasants and the workers instead of their unity under a common banner of struggle. This a "despised petty bourgeois journalist" like Snow cannot understand. Events will teach him, if he is still capable of learning.

BUILD YOUR MARXIST LIBRARY NOW!

The Communist party has revived the policy of the "People's Front." Do you know the story of how the "People's Front" destroyed the labor movement of Europe?

Every class-conscious worker must read:
WHITHER FRANCE, by Leon Trotsky, 160 p. (paper cover)

List price—50c

Sale price--35c

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SPAIN, by Felix Morrow, 202 p. (paper cover)

List price—50c

Sale price--35c

These two works are also available in cloth binding:

Combined list price—\$1.75

Special Combination

Offer--\$1

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York City

NOW, more than any time before
YOU MUST READ EVERY ISSUE

Fourth International

Monthly Magazine

Six months for \$1.00

One year for \$2.00

THE MILITANT

Weekly organ of the Socialist Workers Party

Six months for \$1.00

One year for \$2.00

SPECIAL COMBINATION:

One year of both for \$3.00



Send your subscription now to
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
116 University Place New York City

A TIMELY PAMPHLET

Why We Defend The Soviet Union

A complete and lucid presentation of the theory of the revolutionary defense of the Soviet Union.

By ALBERT GOLDMAN

A limited number still available at 5c each



PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York City