

April 1945

Fourth International

EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVES

By William Simmons

French Imperialism *By N. Marc*

Modern Welding and the Welder *By V. Grey*

Socialism Reaffirmed—II. *By Lily Roy*

The Arsenal of Marxism

The Lessons of Spain—The Last Warning

By LEON TROTSKY

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

Many letters from our subscribers attest to the high level maintained by FOURTH INTERNATIONAL in its Marxist analyses of world events. For instance, the article by the Editors in the February issue, "Civil War in Greece," brought forth considerable comment. We quote from a few letters.

D. D. of New York evaluates the article as follows: "The F.I. achieved new heights of excellence with the publication in the March issue of the article on Greece. Nowhere in the bourgeois press have I read anything to compare with the careful wealth of information contained in the article. The authors' presentation of the historical background of Greece, showing the inevitable logic of present-day happenings there, is a triumph of clear, concise, *knowing* writing."

M. P. of Rumson, N. J., comments about this same article: "I enjoyed this issue of the F.I., the article on Greece particularly. Everybody is so interested in the Greek events and this is good reading. My brother is in Greece, you know. He hasn't been able to write much, of course, and I was glad to read this article. After seeing what he has seen, he writes that now he can see the futility of one person trying to help the people."

A general appraisal of the magazine is given by D. H. of Wellesley, Mass.: "The thoughtful articles in the F.I. are very informative and give material elsewhere unavailable."

The following appreciation accompanied a new one-year subscription from L. K. of Chicago: "Thank you for sending FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for three months free of cost. I enjoy the well-written articles."

Praise of the March issue comes from A. S. of Washington, D. C.: "Congratulations on your March issue. The discussion on the Soviet Union and the Lily Roy book review gave me several hours of pleasure. Incidentally why didn't you complete the latter instead of continuing into the next issue? Meanwhile I hope you find the ways and means to increase the size of the magazine."

(The polemic by Lily Roy is a full size pamphlet and, because of space exigencies, it has to be published in installments.)

S. S. of New York also comments appreciatively about the March issue: "Just finished reading the March issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. It is *good*, starting with the 'Review of the Month' and

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 6 April 1945 No. 4 (Whole No. 53)

Published monthly by the
Fourth International Publishing Association

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

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

Managing Editor: E. R. FRANK

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	
Stalinist Betrayal in Greece	99
British Labor Leaders and Greece	101
A Monstrous War Lie	101
European Perspectives . . . <i>By William Simmons</i>	102
French Imperialism and World War II	
<i>By N. Marc</i>	106
Modern Welding and the Welder . . . <i>By V. Grey</i>	111
The Arsenal of Marxism	
The Lesson of Spain—The Last Warning	
<i>By Leon Trotsky</i>	115
Socialism Reaffirmed—II <i>By Lily Roy</i>	122
International Notes	126
The Red Army in Eastern Europe (Resolution)	127

Printed by Criterion Linotyping & Printing Co., Inc.

ending with the marvelous treatise, 'Socialism Reaffirmed,' by Lily Roy which is to be continued next month. I am looking forward to it. It is a perfect polemic against, and refutation of the 'Indian Burnham.' I am sure that all the readers of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL will find this

material very informative and very instructive. In fact, I think it is a 'must' reading. . . . P.S. The title 'Twenty Years of Stalinist Degeneration' must be a mistake."

(S. S. is correct. The title is a mistake. A correction appears in this issue.)

Subscription Blank

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

I am enclosing \$ Send me

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

() 6 months \$1.00

() 1 year \$2.00

Name

Address

City

A request from G. L. of Philadelphia shows an interest in the study of Dialectical Materialism: "I want FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for May, June and August of 1940. I am interested in the articles on Dialectical Materialism. If you have any other issues containing material on the subject, please send these too."

* * *

Our agent, Jack Pearson of St. Paul, reports an incident which resulted from sending the F.I. to a reader of THE MILITANT: "We are sending the F.I. to some of THE MILITANT subscribers and it has had some good results. One of the men brought the F.I. to work and after reading it passed it on to one of the other men. This was the January issue which contains the Convention Resolution on 'The United States and the Second World War.' This man thought the article was so good that he gave it to the boss in order to prove an argument he had with him. The boss was reading the article at lunch time. I have to pass through the office to get to my job so when the whistle blew I opened the door and there was the boss with his feet on the desk, reading the F.I. He usually goes out to see that the workers start work with the whistle, but this day he didn't go out until he had finished the article. Later in the day three of the other bosses were in the office and my boss argued with them on the basis of the article."

* * *

Newsstand sales for the New York area reached a new high with the February issue, according to a report from Sandy Robertson: "The steady rise in newsstand sales over the past few months attests to the fact that our theoretical organ is reaching an ever-widening audience. With the placing of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL on another newsstand on 14th Street and the doubling of the orders for three stands, we can say that every large newsstand on 42nd and 14th Streets now displays the F.I. The February issue, despite the fact that it was only on the stands a little over two weeks, had a whirlwind sale. One stand which takes 20 copies was completely sold out just a few days after the F.I. had come out. Another stand in the Bronx also had a record sale."

"The increased individual sales from our literature rack at 116 University Place, along with accelerated newsstand sales, necessitates an increase of the bundle order for New York."

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 6

APRIL 1945

NUMBER 4

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

*The Full Enormity of Stalinist Betrayal in Greece in the
Light of Factual Reports—How the English Labor
Bureaucrats Whitewashed Churchill's Role in
Greece—A Monstrous War Lie*

The Enormity of the Stalinist Betrayal in Greece

FACTS ABOUT GREEK EVENTS

While the complete story of the Greek civil war still remains to be told, more and more details are becoming known. And each new fact serves to make more graphic the full scope of the counter-revolutionary work perpetrated in Greece by the Allied imperialists and the full enormity of the Stalinist betrayal of the Greek masses. Let us briefly review the Greek events in the light of some recent factual accounts, especially the one provided by Leland Stowe in a series of articles which appeared beginning with February 14 in the *New York Post*.

In justification of their bestial intervention in Greece, the British imperialists, headed by Churchill, cite an alleged "well-organized" plot by the Stalinist-dominated EAM-ELAS to seize control of Athens and Greece as a whole. The seizure of power by the masses is precisely what the Stalinist traitors in Greece have worked might and main to avert. The real power in Greece was the ELAS. This is corroborated by Leland Stowe who writes as an observer on the scene and who reports that the ELAS "could easily have seized power between October 12 and 15, the time between German departure and British entry."

As a matter of fact, the very entry of the British into Greece was made possible by the ELAS, or more correctly, by its perfidious leadership. According to Stowe, this was admitted in so many words by a British Brigadier who served for 18 months as liaison officer in Greece and who told 30 American and British correspondents on October 18, 1944 that were it not for the ELAS the British "should never have been able to set foot in Greece."

MOUNTAIN BRIGADE

Long before the British set foot on Greece—thanks to the ELAS!—they organized the nucleus of the armed force with which they plan to keep the Greek masses in subjection. This nucleus was the Greek Mountain Brigade into which, as Leland Stowe writes, "only officers and soldiers with strong royalist or reactionary convictions were admitted." The Mountain Brigade was brought on Churchill's orders into Athens the moment that Lt. Gen. Scobie took military control of the city. Stowe goes on to relate:

Premier Papandreou promised ELAS that the Brigade would be disbanded, but a day or two later Papandreou retracted his promise.

He gave an EAM Minister a letter from Scobie which said Prime Minister Churchill would not permit the royalist Mountain Brigade to be disbanded.

This was a deliberate provocation. The ELAS leaders had previously agreed to disarm their followers. But they could not carry out this act of treachery in the face of such brazen provocation. The ELAS misleaders thereupon "asked governmental permission to stage an unarmed protest demonstration on Sunday, December 3."

Here is Stowe's account of what then transpired:

Late Saturday afternoon the government granted this permission. Saturday night Papandreou spent more than an hour with Scobie. Just before midnight Papandreou canceled permission for the demonstration and declared martial law. In Athens it's assumed that Scobie recommended this aboutface. British sources informed me that Scobie told Papandreou it was time to be severe with the EAM.

In other words, a calculated and cold-blooded trap was set for the deluded masses of Athens. For, as Stowe goes on to point out:

The EAM's demonstrators had long since gone to bed. They were mostly poor workers. They had no telephones. At midnight Saturday there was no physical way to call off the demonstration, already announced as permitted by the government.

An account by Frank Gervasi which appeared in February 10 issue of *Collier's* magazine informs us of what was done while the workers slept:

In the cold dawn of December 3, gray-uniformed Greek gendarmes, who for nearly four years had enforced "law and order" for their German masters, marched out of their headquarters . . . They carried rifles, machineguns and grenades but looked more like armed bus conductors than soldiers. They took up positions blocking the approaches to the hotel and to the Royal Palace and around the broad, long Constitution Square that slopes down from the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in a formal pattern of trees and shrubbery and empty concrete pavement for two city blocks in the capital's heart.

This was the ambush into which the unarmed demonstrators, among them women and children, walked unsuspecting.

EYEWITNESS TESTIMONY

The testimony of every eyewitness correspondent interviewed by Stowe was that the ELAS demonstrators had done no shooting whatsoever. "Only the police shot." And Stowe adds that "news photographs, taken by Dimitri Kassel of *Life* (magazine) show men, women and children being mowed down by police fire—without a weapon in their hands."

Rex Leeper, the British Ambassador, coolly denied that the police had shot first and then blandly went on to lie: "Grenades were thrown first by the ELAS. The Communists put their women and children in the front row, as they always do, to hide their armed men. They had their guns behind and were shooting."

This was how the British "democrats" deliberately precipitated a struggle which lasted 33 days and which took the toll of thousands of lives and more than \$200,000,000 in "property damage." Thus the truth is that the ELAS leaders, by their false and treacherous policy, left the Greek masses to be caught off-guard by a real conspiracy—the conspiracy of the British imperialists to impose the monarchy on Greece and to crush by brute force any attempt of the masses to establish a government of their own choosing.

Throughout the December struggle the Stalinist leaders sought one thing and one thing only: to effect a "peace"—at the expense of the workers. The face-saving formula for this "peace" was provided by the appointment of Archbishop Damaskinos as regent. The ELAS leaders thereupon agreed to withdraw from Athens and to disarm their followers.

In the meantime the British imperialists succeeded in their initial objective, namely: implanting a new army in Greece, as the main instrument of reaction. Incorporated in this army bearing the fancy label of "National Guard" is the Mountain Brigade. Intended originally as a nucleus, it is now actually serving this purpose.

COMPONENT PARTS OF THE NEW ARMY These royalists who had been recruited outside the country are reinforced by other royalists who remained behind to collaborate with the Nazis. Stowe reports that the "fanatically royalist X-ites" had received shipments of "several thousand tommyguns smuggled into Athens by the British a month before the Germans got out." These counter-revolutionary detachments were of course employed during the December battles against the Greek workers. They have likewise been incorporated into the British-sponsored "National Guard."

Included in the new army are the remnants of Gen. Zervas' EDES. As far back as December 1943 Foreign Minister Eden announced in Parliament that the British government would send arms only to Gen. Zervas. The weapons supplied by the British were employed by the EDES against the anti-Nazi fighters in Greece. This, too, is corroborated by Stowe who writes: "For two years prior to June 1944, EDES collaborated with the Germans and fought ELAS. Correspondents have seen German documents which prove EDES was on excellent terms with the Nazis until last summer." In the course of the December battles the EDES forces in Epirus were virtually wiped out by the ELAS. The British succeeded in evacuating a remnant of these troops, who now reappear as guardians of "law and order" under the British domination.

Side by side with this scum, as if to round out the picture, are to be found the notorious Security Battalions originally organized, outfitted and armed by the Nazis. "These battalions," reports Leland Stowe, "had arrested thousands of Greek patriots and delivered them to Nazi torture and execution. Thousands of witnesses to their Quisling role can be found in Athens today." When Scobie entered Athens he simply ordered these hirelings of the Gestapo to be confined to barracks. When the fighting broke out in Athens, thousands of them were thrown against the ELAS. Stowe writes: "Hundreds and probably several thousands of these same 'Security'

troops today have jobs in the new Greek national army being formed by Premier Plastiras."

THE SAME POLICE Supplementing the army is the police force—the same police that served the Germans; the same police that were used to slaughter the demonstrators on December 3. The city police and the provincial constabulary, reports Stowe, "have not been purged of Nazi collaborators—and never will be, according to present indications."

Today, the chief occupation of this same police—backed by the "new" army—is to conduct, in the words of Stowe, "a gigantic 'Red hunt' . . . openly encouraged by official British remarks and by British propaganda." Being checked are "the political affiliations and personal associations of all middle- and working-class people . . . The prisons overflowed with 'suspects.'"

According to the *Daily Worker*, April 2, which so fervently hailed the "peace" in Greece, "100,000 persons were arrested in Athens and Piraeus . . . Under the terrorism of spies, thousands in Athens and Piraeus shifted from one neighborhood to another."

Stowe flatly states that there is no freedom of the press in Greece today. "There was no free press under the Germans. There's no free press in Athens today, under the British." The above-cited report in the *Daily Worker* likewise states that the "EAM newspapers were not yet circulating legally."

THE REIGN OF TERROR Added to police terror are the "weapons of hunger and threatened joblessness," reports Stowe and he goes on to explain:

After the Athens fighting, employers refused to take back tens of thousands of their workers as a retaliation for ELAS resistance. Long lines of boycotted employes stood in front of shops, offices, or hotels day after day. The families of many were starving. There was work to do, but the men stood helplessly in line and went home, hungry and crushed, each night. Some of them had relatives in EAM or ELAS.

According to the *Daily Worker* report it appears that the Government initiated this policy and the private employers followed suit:

Following the hostilities in Greece, civil servants who sympathized with the EAM were discharged from the civil service. The big companies followed suit and fired employes suspected of EAM sympathies. After a few days, the small companies in Athens and Piraeus also adopted this policy. (*Daily Worker*, April 2.)

Leland Stowe is a supporter of the "democratic" imperialists and their war. To him the events in Greece represent simply a series of "tragic blunders" committed first and foremost by the British, abetted by Washington and the Kremlin. As a trained observer, however, he cannot help noticing that all these "blunders" fall into a definite pattern. He is alarmed lest this pattern be repeated further. He warns:

The Greek civil war threatens to set the pattern for postwar governments throughout the Balkans, in Italy and Belgium—possibly in Holland and France—and perhaps in eventual post-Franco Spain. The relative chances for free democratic choice in all these countries have been ominously foreshadowed in Athens.

The pattern of the Greek civil war is the pattern of the counter-revolution. It represents the real program of the Allied imperialists for Europe. It epitomizes the treachery and bankruptcy of the Stalinist-dominated "liberation movements." It underscores once again that the only road of salvation for the masses in Greece and all of Europe is the road of the Socialist revolution.

How the British Labor Leaders Whitewashed Churchill's Policy in Greece

FLUNKEYS OF IMPERIALISM In the course of the second World War the labor lackeys of imperialism have deported themselves with an impudence that puts in the shade even the conduct of their peers during the first World War. Among the most brazen today as in 1914-1918 are the British labor bureaucrats. Their actions bespeak a boundless contempt for the masses. They feel themselves completely immune. They permit themselves anything and everything. This was strikingly revealed at the time of the civil war in Greece.

The news of Churchill's bestial deeds in Greece sent a wave of revulsion through the ranks of the English workers. Laborite members of Parliament received sharp letters of protest. There was talk of engaging in strike action in sympathy and solidarity with the embattled Athenian workers.

The annual conference of the British Labor Party fell on December 13, that is, in the very midst of the battle of Athens. More than a score of unions presented resolutions condemning the policy of the British imperialists. Thereupon Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labor in Churchill's War Cabinet, got up to openly flaunt his own guilt. Said Bevin:

The steps which have been taken in Greece are not the decisions of Winston Churchill. They are the decisions of the Cabinet. I and my colleagues participated in these discussions over nearly four years . . . I say boldly that I am a party to these decisions, and looking back I cannot convince myself that any of these decisions were wrong.

This self-admitted criminal, boasting of his complicity in the butchery of the Greek workers, was not even hooted down. The assembled bureaucrats listened respectfully and the overwhelming majority voted to uphold the policy of Churchill-Bevin.

But that was only a part of the whole filthy job. It was likewise necessary to justify the bloodletting in the eyes of English workers as well as of world public opinion. This particular assignment fell to the lot of Bevin's colleague Sir Walter Citrine, knighted for his past services to British imperialism. In the capacity of General Secretary of the British Trade Union Congress, Citrine headed a Congress delegation to Greece. To do what? To completely whitewash the Churchill government. And as a necessary corollary, to besmirch in vilest manner possible the heroic Greek fighters.

CITRINE'S REPORT The Citrine Committee reported that the ELAS was nothing but a gang of murderers who had organized "brutal murders" of civilians; that "little actual fighting took place between them and the Germans. . . . Arms dropped by the British had been hoarded presumably for other purposes." The Citrine Committee swore that the ELAS did not at all represent the labor movement of Athens or Greece; reiterated that "ELAS was more concerned with returning to Athens to seize power than with fighting the Germans"; and expressed satisfaction over the timely and beneficent intervention of British troops, tanks and planes, failing which "there would have been a wholesale massacre in Athens."

That several thousand ELAS fighters were slaughtered was doubtless hardly worth mentioning inasmuch as the Citrine Committee found that "ELAS were the dirtiest fighters our troops had encountered." And so forth and so on. In brief, everyone of Churchill's vile lies was repeated, embellished and countersigned.

There is a scurvy footnote to all this. It was added by such veteran renegades from communism as Liston Oak and Max Eastman. Once upon a time both Oak and Eastman ranged themselves on the side of revolutionary workers against the imperialists and their lackeys. But times have changed and so have they. It is far more comfortable nowadays to beat the drums for the imperialist bandits. However, unlike the British bureaucrats, neither Oak nor Eastman have any power to betray the workers. They represent exactly nothing. Nevertheless they are eager to help out, if only in an advisory capacity, if only as publicity agents for Bevin-Citrine and Co. And so, they, too, have rushed—in the pages of the *New Leader*—to whitewash the British imperialists and to heap the vilest slander on the insurgent Greek workers.

A Monstrous War Lie

THEY DO NOT WANT PEACE The imperialists have accomplished in the second World War what they failed to attain in the war of 1914-1918, namely: they have succeeded in bringing about a clear-cut decision on the military arena. Germany, the dreaded rival of Anglo-American imperialism, lies vanquished. Yet the unequalled slaughter and destruction continues. Casualties multiply while more and more European cities are reduced to rubbish and the countryside is turned into wasteland. Additional millions are left homeless, famine conditions spread, epidemics threaten. The war continues. Why?

To justify this monstrous crime the "democratic" capitalists and all their apologists are circulating through the press, the radio and the pulpit one of their most staggering war lies. For some time now they have been saying that the hostilities must continue indefinitely—and must be followed up by a prolonged military occupation of Germany—because the Nazis plan to unfold a large-scale underground resistance movement.

How realizable is such a plan? The primary condition for any large-scale underground movement is that it receive the sympathy, if not the outright support, of the mass of the population. Wherever the masses remain indifferent, let alone hostile, underground movements cannot even take root. The German people have been the first and greatest sufferers from Nazi oppression. The moment that the apparatus of ruthlessness by means of which Hitler's regime maintains itself is shattered, the Nazis far from finding a cover among the masses will confront implacable foes everywhere. It will require, as in Italy, the intervention of Allied bayonets to safeguard these enemies of the people from the wrath of their erstwhile victims. As a matter of fact, in the German territories thus far occupied, the Allied military authorities have already sanctioned collaboration with Nazi functionaries—on the grounds that no other "qualified administrators" are available. These are the same gentlemen who talk about "rooting out" fascism, "reeducating the German people," etc. etc.

HITLERITE DEMAGOGY The current Allied propaganda is merely a variation of Hitlerite demagoguery. Whereas the Nazis preached the racial superiority of the Germans, the Allied imperialists are now propounding the racial degeneracy of Germans, who are all presumably predisposed to fascism, or some other form of totalitarianism.

In this campaign of vilification of a great people the cowardly liberals have gleefully come to the forefront. Hypocritical posturers like Max Lerner, one of the editors of the New York daily *PM*, take jaunts to Europe only to report that

the "future of democracy" appears quite dark in Germany, and that 90,000,000 Germans are—of course! of course!—to blame for this. Editors of the *New Republic* vie with their colleagues of the *Nation* in harping on the same theme. But the most original contribution to date must be credited to Alfred Kantorowicz, former foreign correspondent of *Vossische Zeitung*. This expert on Germany denies that the Nazis have any intention of waging "a long, desperate underground battle inside the Reich." They are too smart for that. They will instead carry on a large-scale *secret* struggle. By what means? By a tried and tested means. It is the secret tribunal of the Middle Ages, the *Vehmgericht*. The houses of those doomed by the *Vehm* were marked with a red cross. It was by these secret *Vehm* courts, the liberals are assured, that the Nazis really came to power after the first World War. No more, no less. The world, explains Kantorowicz, has unfortunately "failed to recognize the significance of the many vehmic murders which inevitably broke the democratic backbone of the country." (The *Nation*, February 10.) The Nazis real strategy is to repeat the same thing but "on a far greater scale." It is to this end that "Himmler has trained tens of thousands of his most reliable, fanatical Nazis."

"DEMOCRACY" HAS OUTLIVED ITS DAY Whether one derives fascism from psychology or the properties of race or from the Vehm courts, the end result is the same: thereby the truth

is hidden that it is capitalism that breeds fascism. And at the same time one hides the corollary, namely that bourgeois democracy is completely bankrupt and can never be stabilized, either in Europe or in the United States, in the epoch of the death agony of capitalism. The choice confronting the peoples of Germany and of all Europe today is not between fascism and bourgeois democracy, but between barbarism and Socialism.

The impending downfall of fascism in Germany will prove the most catastrophic event in modern history, catastrophic, that is, in its social consequences to the capitalist system. The advanced German proletariat will resume its struggle for a Socialist Germany. This will invest the unfolding European revolution with unconquerable power. The capitalist rulers of the world know and fear this. That is why they are prolonging the war. That is why they propose to keep indefinitely millions of troops on the soil of Germany. That is why they are spreading their latest monstrous lie.

European Perspectives

By WILLIAM SIMMONS

During the decades between the two world wars it was possible and necessary, at different intervals, to pose the questions: *Whither England? Whither the Soviet Union? Whither France?* etc. Now the question appearing immediately before mankind, and rising in ascending magnitude, is: *Whither Europe?*

No longer can any fundamental social question be decided for any one nation alone. The whole world is now much more integrated, more interrelated and more interdependent, not only economically, in terms of the world market, production and living; but also socially and politically. Redrawing of national state boundaries and division of spheres of influence among the stronger powers become complex social and political problems loaded with explosive possibilities. For Europe this holds true even in a more acute form and in a more immediate sense. Above all the European nations are now much more thoroughly integrated in regards to the question: Which system shall prevail?

This question includes the USSR. Whither Europe also decides whither the Soviet Union.

Outwardly the decision for Europe appears to be in the hands of the so-called "Big Three." Through the complexities of interrelations now existing this has become true to a certain extent. But only to a certain extent. There can be no denying the fact that immediate events will be, if not shaped, then at least strongly influenced by their attitude and actions.

Moreover, any serious consideration of European perspectives must take into account several important problems flowing from the above. First, the American imperialist preponderance in world affairs; its specific role in Europe as well as the contradictions arising therefrom. Secondly, we must take into account the role of the Stalin bureaucracy as ally of this world imperialist power, and its contradictions arising in face of the coming European revolutionary upheavals. Finally, connected directly with this is the question of which way the USSR: *Forward to socialism or backward to capitalist restoration?*

All are dialectically integrated. But so far as the outcome is concerned we must never forget that fundamentally the decisions remains in the hands of the European proletariat.

Allied imperialist policy in Europe pursues two basic objectives. The first and most important objective is to prevent the proletarian revolution and to preserve the capitalist system. The Kremlin has left no doubts that it is fully and completely committed to this. That much is borne out, if not clearly by its proclamations, then certainly by its actions. At the same time the imperialist policy also includes the objective of eliminating an adversary and crushing a capitalist competitor. In concrete terms it means the dismantling of Europe's workshop and the partitioning of Germany. For the European masses, however, this could not possibly have any other implications than that of being condemned to virtual starvation.

Kremlin's Role

Apparently the Kremlin supports also this second objective, even though its support may flow from its own particular set of motivations. But these two objectives are utterly contradictory. They present an inextricable dilemma. For every step taken toward the destruction of European capitalist competition will inevitably lead toward the strengthening of its revolutionary forces.

This may not be entirely unknown to the "Big Three," hence their determination to avoid issues of friction and their greater unity of purpose. No doubt this will be reflected likewise in increasing ruthlessness.

Despite irreconcilable antagonisms flowing from different property relations the main fears of the Allied imperialists of what they always considered as Kremlin duplicity have been allayed. They now feel assured that Stalin will not proceed to nationalize property in territories occupied by the Red Army.

They see that capitalist property relations have remained by and large undisturbed in Rumania, Bulgaria and Poland. But the boss of the Kremlin also understands the logic of class relations. He knows that any serious steps toward nationalization would immediately raise the dreaded specter of revolution. Committed as he is to the imperialist objectives, he could not possibly pursue such a double policy. He has now made it perfectly clear that he fears the European revolution more than he fears the Allied imperialists. Consequently any double policy on this score was equally precluded. Stalin had to choose between the one or the other because the issue now is—which system is to prevail. There is no middle ground. Stalin having said A must likewise say B. When he made his choice to oppose the revolution he had to accept also the imperialist partnership.

But this is not a partnership on equal terms. Nor does it have the relation of forces that appears to exist on the surface. For example, the credulous observer may get the impression that, owing to the Red Army victories, the Kremlin has moved into the commanding position and has become the most potent force on the European continent. This may be the way things appear to be. However, in the world of reality the United States is and remains the one dominant power. It remains such in relation to Europe as well.

Stalin once proclaimed the possibility of building socialism in one country, utterly disregarding the economic interdependence of nations and their dependence upon the world market. But contrary to the Bolshevik Party under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky, which because of this relationship sought its allies from the world proletariat, Stalin has made his alliance with the masters of world economy; first with Hitler, when the latter appeared the stronger, and now with the Allied imperialists. By making his choice against the revolution, against socialism in Europe, Stalin becomes their captive, committed to carry out their policy, subservient to them. Any action taken in this direction by the Kremlin oligarchy can only increase further its political dependency upon the world imperialists.

Growing Degeneracy

This increasing political dependency has developed in close material and ideological connection with the increasing weight of United States intervention in world affairs, and particularly in European affairs. It has developed also in close material and ideological connection with the growing degeneracy of the workers state. And, it is hardly necessary to add, that the progressive degeneration of the latter received its real impetus from the rise of reaction on a world scale as expressed by fascism and war. Such is the logic of this present day interrelation between the United States and Europe.

But as the interest of the Stalin bureaucracy approaches the interests of the imperialist masters, as summed up in the problem of crushing the revolution, we can be sure that to the same degree and at the same tempo the interests of this bureaucracy diverge increasingly from those of the Russian masses. Such is the dialectic interplay of class forces in motion.

This is what we mean when we say that Stalin's foreign policy springs from his internal policy; it is motivated by internal needs—the need of preserving the privileges and power of the bureaucracy. The Kremlin is concerned above all with the defense of these privileges. And the European revolution becomes a threat to these privileges just as much as it is a threat to the capitalist system. These privileges cannot be maintained in face of the European revolution. Conversely the delay or a serious setback of the revolution would mean a devastating

increase of bureaucratic degeneration in the USSR. It would elevate these privileges to a new and monstrous plane. What else could follow but a revival of class distinctions and of class antagonisms, the liquidation of planned economy and the restoration of capitalist property? It would mean the counter-revolution triumphant and carried out, as Trotsky once said, by a Russian type of fascism, far more savage than anything hitherto witnessed. And for the European masses such a defeat could imply only a return to virtual conditions of barbarism.

Victory of the European revolution, on the other hand, will give a gigantic impulse to regeneration of socialism in the USSR and will establish the Socialist United States of Europe. The conditioning factors of both are dialectically integrated. Both are socially and politically interdependent. Whither Europe also decides whither the Soviet Union.

Ancient empires have been torn apart by their own inner contradictions. Their cultures succumbed to so-called barbaric invasions and perished. But these empires existed in conditions of isolation within a backward world. Today no such isolation exists. At the present historically decisive turn, society cannot go backward to start all over again from the bottom up. It must proceed from and continue further on the basis already prepared by preceding developments.

Capitalist Bankruptcy

Capitalism, however, is utterly bankrupt and offers no way out at all. World War I signaled the beginning of its absolute decline and decay as a system. In Europe this was only the more accentuated. Simultaneously World War I also signaled the beginning of our revolutionary epoch. On this score enough has already been said in the columns of *FOURTH INTERNATIONAL*, and the facts are so conclusive, that there is no need of repeating. Only it would be well to recall Trotsky's comment, during the early 'twenties, concerning the blind alley of European capitalism resulting from the developing economic preponderance of the United States. "European capitalism," said Trotsky, "has become reactionary in the absolute sense of the term, that is, not only is it unable to lead the nations forward; but it is even incapable of maintaining for them living standards long ago attained. Precisely this constitutes the economic basis of our revolutionary epoch. Political ebbs and flows unfold on this basis without in any way altering it."

Political ebbs and flows have unfolded since then. And meanwhile Europe has gone through the experience of fascism, which came into being as a last desperate resort of capitalism to preserve its tottering structure and to prolong its system and its rule. At that stage already it could no longer live and operate under any kind of working class pressure exerted by workers' organizations. Capitalism could live only under a type of government which would destroy these organizations and wipe out utterly and completely all their past gains. It is needless to deny that under fascism and the conditions of World War II the greater part of Europe, with Germany as its nucleus, has experienced a further concentration and centralization of industry and finance. This has also brought about a higher intensity of mechanized mass production, more labor saving machinery and a higher productivity of labor. But there has been no further actual capitalist expansion; there has been no increase of Europe's wealth. On the contrary, the absolute decline, decay and destruction of capitalism has reached hitherto unprecedented proportions. The standard of living of the European masses has sunk frightfully. For capitalism itself this further process of concentration and centralization together with

the war has produced new contradictions speeding it onward from decline to complete doom.

In the first place, the restoration, or the redrawing, of national boundaries and the further dismemberments can prove only a greater obstacle than were the ancient and much narrower feudal boundaries. For in a world market ruled by mechanized mass production the multitude of small nations cannot survive as separate entities. Moreover, survival at all for the whole continent under victorious Allied imperialism could be only on a semi-colonial existence.

New Contradictions

In the second place, the situation which has prevailed in Europe during the last few years has altered considerably the relations of class forces in favor of the grave diggers of capitalism. Hitler has further proletarianized the whole of Europe. New and large segments of the middle class have been reduced to the ranks of the proletariat. Numerous farmers, peasants, artisans, tradesmen, white collar workers and professionals have been herded into mass production industries. With this the social weight of the proletarian class forces has increased enormously. That is the weight which will be felt in the course of events to come and it will make itself felt more powerfully than anything the imperialist masters can put forward.

All of this in the words of one celebrated newspaper reporter presents a picture in which 360,000,000 Europeans and 900,000,000 Asiatics are "compelled to think of what they do not have, of what they have never or rarely touched or tested—and why."

Historically capitalist production and its quantitative changes have already brought forth a qualitative difference. Production has steadily extended and expanded to satisfy the demands and necessities of so-called civilization from handicraft to manufacture and through the factory system to mechanized mass production. But production has now also become socialized organization of production despite the existing anarchy of production. A new and higher quality has appeared. The foundation has already been laid for socialization of ownership of the means of production and distribution. The foundation of the new society has evolved within the shell of the old.

This is the economic basis upon which the political superstructure rests. And in the final accounting the economic basis is of course decisive. Therefore the following question arises concerning the European perspectives: After the collapse of the fascist governmental system is it possible for capitalism to take up again where it left off before and continue its rule by democratic means, i.e., to re-establish a reign of bourgeois democracy? The answer must be—decidedly no! For it is important to remember that bourgeois democracy does not exist and thrive only on the illusions of the masses. It must be able also to offer and actually deliver something that is concrete and for the material benefit of the masses. In other words, it requires a stable economic basis.

Bourgeois democracy depends for its sustenance principally upon the ability of capitalism to live and operate while giving a minimum of material concessions to the class it holds in subjection. Only then can it grant the limited liberties necessary to hold the subjected class in check. Because of this very fact bourgeois democracy has reached its highest stage in the United States, whereas since world War I such remnants of it as did exist on the European continent, with the possible exception of the small Scandinavian nations, were unstable and lived constantly in the throes of crises and upheavals.

The Weimar Republic, for example, which in its time became the pattern for Europe, existed by and large only as an aftermath of the long reign of bourgeois democracy which had preceded it. It became a combination of equally unstable interim stages existing in variously changing forms, from a Social Democratic government to an outright Bonapartist police regime, and remaining in power only because the basically antagonistic class forces were still preparing and sparring for a decision. And remaining in power, it must be added, because of the failure and betrayals of the worker-parties' leaderships. It became a grotesque imitation of what had preceded before the first World War. It could solve none of the problems of the masses, or for that matter, of the capitalist system. It could only postpone them and finally succumb to fascism.

Is this to be repeated after World War II? Is it to be repeated when the problems of the European masses can no longer be postponed? Even to this extent society cannot now go backward to start all over again, nor do the workers begin history all over again each time that they face a crisis. They always learn some lessons from preceding events.

Imperialist Impasse

Or is this to be repeated on a lower level and in a more contracted form of a bourgeois democratic stage propped up by Allied imperialist bayonets? On what would this be sustained economically? Perhaps on relief from the United States? But remember the fact that American imperialism can maintain and fortify its world hegemony only by constantly limiting the rations of European capitalism in the world market, which will include the contraction of the European market itself. And besides, any relief from the United States, either in shipments of food or of certain machinery of production, will be purely incidental to its objective of destroying the European competitor.

That competitor is primarily Germany. And thus Germany becomes the key to the future European developments. This does not mean to say that events in other parts of the continent will await the outcome in Germany. Not at all. Upheavals start wherever economic and political necessity set masses into motion.

What happens in Germany, however, will not only reveal the final grand imperialist pattern for Europe but the developments ensuing from this pattern will be decisive for the whole continent. Germany is Europe's workshop. The period of fascism and war brought her to the very horns of the capitalist dilemma. Germany's bourgeoisie is in the deepest crisis. Her social forces are the most dynamic and the most convulsive. Her proletariat is the strongest and carries the decisive social weight.

What are the prospects in Germany for a bourgeois democratic stage? Not only are apparently all the bourgeois elements there completely identified with the Nazis, whose aggressive world policy made Germany such a dangerous Allied adversary; but it is now clear that the Allied imperialist policy, with the connivance of the Kremlin, contemplates a rule of Germany by naked military force. This policy implies also the dismantling of Germany's basic industries with control of others, including, of course, the appropriation of surplus values produced: a new and extended form of slave labor.

It seems possible therefore to conclude that in Europe, issuing from World War II, a bourgeois democratic system, even if more shortlived than the Weimar Republic, is precluded by objective conditions. Such regimes can, however, come into being here and there, at different intervals between Allied military regimes, as interim stages, as a by-product of a whole series of

revolutionary struggles, and on a level advancing ever closer to the revolutionary decision. The early beginnings of these are already in evidence in France, Italy, Yugoslavia and Poland, but they are bound to change again tomorrow or to pass away. Most likely some of these interim stages will exist only as puppets of, and enjoying actual support only from the Allied imperialist overlords. In and by themselves none of them can have any stability whatever, not even when flanked and buttressed by social reformist leaders.

And, of course, these interim stages will be possible only until the proletariat attains its stature of political maturity and its revolutionary vanguard gains the necessary mass influence.

The various liberation movements which have been carried over into the present stage, in one form or another, are themselves an expression of the lack of political maturity of the working class forces. In essence these movements were of similar make-up and had similar objectives. They constituted an alliance of antagonistic classes, united only in the struggle against the Nazi oppressor, not, however, against the capitalist system as such. For that would have been impossible within a movement embracing also those elements of the bourgeoisie who did not share in the profits of Nazi collaboration. In fact, if not entirely in methods, the "liberation" movements became replicas of the People's Fronts which had existed prior to the war. There is this essential difference, however, that the conditions under which the People's Fronts then came into power and succeeded in beheading the working class movement, are now definitely behind them.

"Liberation" Movements

For example, even at the early stage of the "liberation" movements class antagonisms developed within them and alongside of the struggle for liberation. And as the latter reached toward its culmination these antagonisms came more and more to the fore. With it the role of the working class forces became more pronounced. But the "liberation" movements could fulfill only a limited role, primarily with respect to the expulsion of the Nazis. That completed, and upon emerging from the underground, these movements must begin to dissolve into their component parts. Coming into the open, however, not only gave to these movements a far broader basis but it also produced a difference in quality.

The issue of the Nazi oppression having disappeared—and we do not in the least attempt to minimize its frightfully devastating toll in human lives and sufferings—brings forward the far more burning and far more fundamental issue of which system shall prevail—an issue which is made more acute by Allied imperialist intervention. The largely negative aspect of the struggle for national liberation, under the auspices of the Allied imperialists, gives way to the positive struggle for a new system under which the masses of the people can live—the struggle for a socialist system.

And with this the reformist parties, Stalinist and Social Democratic, which have gained steady influence, both in the underground and since, come face to face with their dilemma. Both parties being in the service of world imperialism are, of course, committed to the defense of the capitalist system which the masses by the logic of events must attempt to tear asunder. In defense of the capitalist system the leadership of both parties are compelled to use all their efforts, including open betrayal, toward continued collaboration with their national bourgeoisie, and with the victorious imperialists, regardless of the interests of the masses, and against these interests. Concrete evidence to

this effect has been furnished already by Greece. Additional evidence is gathering in Italy and in France where the reformist leaders encounter mounting difficulties in bridging the cleavage between the rank and file followers and the imperialist puppet regimes. As the cleavage inevitably deepens mass disillusionment and mass defection from the reformist leaders is bound to gather speed. And so, the qualitative difference arising out of the "liberation" movements acquiring a broader mass basis, will be expressed also in the rapid denouement of the reformist leaders.

Role of Stalinism

In no sense do the reformist parties reappear now in Europe with their past prestige intact, but rather with the onus of past defeats. In reality both parties declined and decayed with the capitalist system. Especially is this the case with the Stalinist party which must now become a partner in all of the Kremlin's counter-revolutionary plotting and conniving. Stalinism now begins where Social Democracy left off before the advent of fascism by being the "rottenest part of putrifying capitalist Europe."

From this putrifying corpse what can the social reformist leaders extract that can be for the material benefit of the masses? Are they not bound to fail at the very first really serious test?

If it is agreed that Germany is the key to the coming developments in Europe then this prognosis will appear only so much more conclusive.

Thirteen years ago we said that Germany was the key to the international situation. The question then posed was: victory of the proletariat or victory of fascism? But the curve of the proletarian revolutionary struggle inaugurated by October 1917 went downward, with the consummation of Social Democratic and Stalinist treachery, to its lowest depth to be engulfed by the fascist victory. Today these conditions are turning in the opposite direction. The European proletariat has begun the upward climb. The essential task is now the forging in the fires of the struggles already inaugurated a principled and determined revolutionary leadership—a task which can be undertaken only by the Fourth International.

Trotsky never tired of repeating that in spite of fascism the German workers will rise again; but they will not return to that policy which led them into the noose of Hitler. "They will carry out their revolution, surely, not to replace Hitler with a Hohenzollern or Stalin. . . . The wave of awakening hope, enthusiasm, will not stop at the hermetic borders of the USSR. . . . Revolution in the West will deprive the Kremlin oligarchy of its sole right to political existence."

A Correction

We regret that a typographical error was committed, on page 29 of the January 1945 issue of the *Fourth International*, in the first installment of Daniel Logan's article "On the European Situation and Our Tasks." The author wrote: "When it [the draft resolution] says that democracy is 'outlived in Europe today,' it does not mean 'today' in a general way as being the period we entered in 1914 . . ." and not "in 1944" as erroneously appears in the text. We likewise regret that owing to exigencies of space in our January and February issues the following items were omitted from the text of Logan's article: the date of writing—*October 1, 1944*—and six sub-titles, namely: "A Rescue That Failed," "The Problem of Democratic Demands," "The Question of the Republic in Italy," "The Danger of Ultra-Leftism," "The Socialist United States of Europe," and "Conclusion."—Ed.

French Imperialism and World War II.

By N. MARC

Translated by Miriam Carter from the April-May 1944 issue of *Quatrième Internationale*, theoretical organ of the European Executive Committee of the Fourth International.

The shifting of the world economic axis from Europe to America, which took place after the war of 1914-18, shattered the foundation of all the European imperialist powers, victors and vanquished alike.

Between the two wars the atrophy of French economy and the stagnation of production became intensified and the resulting social paroxysms more and more violent, while the possibilities of concessions narrowed and financial ruin became widespread. The decay of the capitalist system, its incurable crisis manifested itself in the retardation of the productive forces and the instability of social relations. The war laid completely bare this advanced stage of decomposition.

The swift defeat of France and the occupation of the metropolitan center and later of the colonies, disclosed the contradictions which had been revealed and analyzed by the revolutionary Marxists immediately following the first imperialist war. "The appearance is that *France*, of all the countries, has grown most in power," states the *Resolution on the Versailles Treaty*, adopted by the Fourth Congress of the Communist International in 1922. "But in reality," it goes on to add, "the economic basis of France, with her small and steadily diminishing population, her enormous domestic and foreign debt, and her dependence on England, does not provide an adequate foundation for her greed for imperialist expansion. So far as her political power is concerned, she is thwarted by England's mastery of all the important naval bases, and by the oil monopoly held by England and the United States. In the domain of economy, the enrichment of France with the iron mines given her by the Treaty of Versailles, loses its value inasmuch as the supplementary and indispensable coal mines of the Ruhr Basin remain in German hands. The hopes of restoring shattered French finances by means of German reparations have proved illusory. When the impracticability of the Treaty of Versailles becomes apparent, certain sections of French heavy industry will consciously bring on the depreciation of the franc in order to unload the costs of the war on the shoulders of the French proletariat."

These lines written in 1922 present, in brief but piercing analysis, the essential factors which have dominated the economic and political life of imperialist France in the interval between the two wars, as well as the fundamental characteristics of the political configuration of French imperialism in its present state of collapse. Ever since 1914 each imperialism has sought to throw the economic collapse with which it was threatened onto the shoulders of the others.

From this point of view, "victory" settled nothing at all, just as another such "victory" today will settle nothing. It is

necessary to find a way out from the chronic crisis, the stagnation prevailing in industry (despite the development of some of its branches), the disorganization of agriculture and the collapse of economy as a whole. The solution lies not in the "victory" of one gang of imperialist bandits over another gang, but only in the overthrow of rotting capitalism by the proletarian revolution. The living example of France is a perfect demonstration that the crisis of imperialism is not conjunctural but organic. The imperialist appetite of France proved greater than the resources by means of which she had hoped to find a solution for her own economic crackup. The twenty years of unstable equilibrium which ensued have demonstrated that this immense edifice rested, as the Russian fable says, on chicken legs.

To avert financial ruin, the imperialist oligarchy tried to unload its debts on the shoulders of the working class and peasantry. The franc originally worth 20 sous became a franc of 12 sous under Poincaré, and of 8 sous under Auriol, and then the declining value of the franc opened the flood gates to rising prices.

After a few spasmodic spurts and the "windfall" in the shape of reconstruction of the devastated areas, industry wallowed in the stagnant waters of the crisis from 1930 on. The road of artificial revival through war preparations was closed to it. First because French imperialism, faithful to its tradition, never ventured to invest its gold, even in part, (as America did); secondly, because it could not follow the German example, since it had not crushed the working class. Unstable and tottering, it entered the second imperialist war in a state of complete disorganization.

Causes of the Defeat of French Imperialism

The fact that in the interval between the two wars the relationship of forces between German and French imperialism became altered to the point where France was beaten and defeated almost without a struggle while German imperialism was able to withstand the weight of the largest coalition in history, has given birth, even among the vanguard, to a series of false analyses relating both to the character of French imperialism as well as the very root of the problem, that of imperialism itself. Did not the defeat and the occupation constitute "clear evidence that France had ceased to be an imperialist power, since she had lost—apparently at least—the control over her economy as well as political control both in the metropolitan center and in the colonies?" To pose the problem this way is to render the concept of imperialism empty of all content, and to reduce it to an abstraction.

Lenin defined imperialism as "capitalism in that stage of development in which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital has established itself; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of

the world among the international trusts has begun; in which the division of all territories of the globe among the great capitalist powers has been completed."

What place does France occupy in this stage of development, and what are its characteristics?

France has long been under the "dominance of monopolies and finance capital," and has long ago shown signs of an over-ripe imperialism, manifesting itself precisely in the tremendous export of capital. France practised international usury before America, and on a scale comparable only to that of America.

"Unlike British colonial imperialism," wrote Lenin, "French imperialism might be termed usury imperialism. In regard to Germany, we have a third type; the German colonies are inconsiderable, and German capital is evenly divided between Europe and (South) America."

These different characteristics have brought about different results: French industry has never developed to the point reached by German and English industry. The famous French motto "balance between agriculture and industry" has signified not only the flight of capital because of the lack of coal and oil which constitute the basis of all complete industrialization, but also a precocious maturity, and the search for profitable investments in more backward countries.

Different Results

The French industrial apparatus is obviously inferior to the German, whose pivot is the Ruhr coal mining area; and to the British industry which rests on the collieries of Central and Western England. But even British imperialism has not spread such a web of obligations and credits over Europe as has French imperialism.

The export of English capital has had for its arena of exploitation the richest and vastest colonial empire. While English industry is also stagnating and rotting, its equilibrium is maintained by its reserves, by an empire enlarged despite its centrifugal tendencies, and by a navy which only yesterday was unrivaled.

German imperialism has followed a different road. Its "recovery" was made possible not only because of the inability of French imperialism to benefit by its victory, but above all because of a formidable industrial apparatus which was freed from all domestic debt by means of complete ruination of the petty bourgeoisie (total depreciation of the mark in 1923); which then resumed operation by absorbing American capital, and which attained a very high level of production through the crushing of the working class and its subjection under the heel of fascism.

The character of French imperialism—usury imperialism as Lenin called it—rendered it more vulnerable to its rivals and deprived it of the means of surmounting, even superficially, its organic crisis.

Its victory of 1919 did not provide the possibilities for reconstructing its economy, and French imperialism could never accomplish this. The task of rescuing France from decay rests with the working class. The only solution that the beaten and reactionary bourgeoisie could conceive was to erect a Chinese Wall, that is to say the Maginot line, for the defense of its counting-houses, and to continue to send its capital abroad in the form of liquid assets. But even this road was made perilous by the disorganization of the world market and the collapse of the Versailles system.

"The export of capital," writes Lenin, "one of the most essential economic bases of imperialism, still more completely

isolates the *rentiers* from production and sets the seal of parasitism on the whole country that lives by the exploitation of the labor of several overseas countries and colonies."

England suffered less from the danger of its credits because these were primarily invested in the colonial field. The case of French imperialism was different: of 45 billions of gold francs exported abroad, 25 percent were lent to Russia, 13 percent to Turkey, 23 percent to other European countries, while 9 percent went to the colonies, 13 percent to Latin America. More than half of these loans were wiped out after the loss of the Russian market and the permanent disorganization of the world market.

Nevertheless, by bleeding the colonies and exploiting the metropolis, France was able, after 1919, to throw new sums into world circulation; and while the results were less "happy" (the annual return on investments and loans dropped from 9 billions before 1914 to 4 billions before 1939), French imperialism completely retained its character of European usurer. More strikingly than anywhere else, capitalism revealed itself here as an insurmountable brake on the progress of a country and its productive forces.

Upon plunging into the crisis of 1930 the country became mired in the crisis, powerless to emerge. The "economic policy" of 1936-39 is a monument of irreconcilable contradictions. The promises of "raising the purchasing power" were accompanied by a frenzied rise of prices; the skeleton of the "Third Republic" was cracking at all its joints, while the bourgeoisie kept hesitating whether to plunge boldly down the fascist road, and the proletariat, curbed by a traitorous leadership, marked time.

The economic breakdown showed even to the blind how incapable the bourgeoisie was of pulling itself out of the mire. In the period preceding the current war the index of production showed a clear decline even in comparison to the pre-1914 level. Taking 1913 with the index of 100, the production index, which was 57 in 1919, climbed back to the 1913 level in 1924, reached its peak in 1930 with 140, only to drop to a critical average of 92 in 1938.

Agriculture, paralyzed by American, Russian, Balkan and even colonial competition, backward in its production methods and handicapped by the "scissors" between industrial and agricultural prices, provoked an exodus from the countryside (the rural population fell from 54 percent to 48 percent without any effective counter-balance in urban industrialization) and an increase in uncultivated land (8 percent of the arable area).

An economy in stagnation, disorganized finances, permanent social crisis, and an absolute incapacity to find a way out—such was the picture of France under the financial oligarchy.

Repercussions of the War on French Economy: a) Industry

The war has still further disoriented French economy and has changed the classic channels of her foreign trade. On the eve of the war France was self-sufficient only in eight out of 44 raw materials; prior to the outbreak of the war in 1939 French industry could only provide 10 percent of 24 vital materials. On the eve of the war 40.3 percent of the imports came from Europe, 22 percent from Africa, 18.5 percent from America, 17.5 percent from Asia and the Pacific. The exports listed in accordance with their destination were as follows: 54 percent to Europe, 25 percent to Africa, 12.4 percent to America, 7.1 percent to Asia and the Pacific.

The integration of France into the continental war economy

acted to accentuate even more the atrophy of her industry. The production index, which fell to 50 in 1941 (with 1938 equals 100), went up only 8 points in two years. The only branch that really remained in operation is heavy industry—primarily iron mining. The exhaustion of reserve stocks, and the brutal restriction of consumption kept the other industries at a very low level of production. The loss of oil, of cotton and of copper (from America), of wool (from Australia), of jute and of tin created very precarious conditions for industries not working directly for the war.

But it is not here that we must seek the true cause of the stagnation; the blockade and the loss of raw materials did nothing but *accentuate* the process which had begun after the war of 1914-18. Suffice it to cite, for example, the case of the metallurgical industry. Despite the conquest of the Moselle basin, which *doubled* the capacity for the extraction of iron ore, the production of iron and steel kept steadily declining before the war: from 9.7 million tons in 1929 to 7.9 million in 1937 and 6.2 in 1938. Before 1939 there were never more than 50 percent of the 209 blast furnaces in use, while the larger part of the ore was sent to Germany.

Parallel with the disorganization of the economy and the pauperization there has been accentuated the process which began long ago, the process of the extreme concentration of capital. The "State" gave powerful impetus to this process which is characteristic of all the great imperialist nations. At the same time as a theatrical hullabaloo was started about "support to the French artisan and small industry," the law on the concentration of business enterprises, (December 17, 1941) fostered the aggression of the pirates of large-scale industry and led to the systematic elimination and pauperization of the middle classes*.

"French economy is tending to become a capitalism made up of great units," said the bourgeois economist Perroux before the war. The redistribution of the corporation stocks and the growing share which German imperialism has arrogated to itself (the word "collaboration" translated into economic terms) does not fundamentally change this process. The "victorious allies" of tomorrow would take the place of the ousted imperialism, but the process would continue in the same channel.

Another important fact—and this a direct result of the war—is the removal of labor-power: more than 700,000 workers have been sent to Germany, of whom 400,000 were skilled. If one adds the 250,000 "converted" prisoners who work in Germany, the number of French workers in the Reich is over one million. (French economy has in addition lost, since the war, more than a million able-bodied men who are now prisoners.) The depleted working class has been "filled out" by the integration in production of women and youth, and at the same time by lengthening the work-week.

In this situation heavy industry is prospering more than ever. Its plants have been reevaluated (paying debts with devaluated francs) and it has realized tremendous profits thanks to the abundance of capital put into circulation by the state in financing the war and thanks to the dividends. This has permitted not only the buying up of smaller enterprises paralyzed by the lack of raw materials, but also a gigantic hoarding

*The industries are organized along the lines of the great German cartels (Reichverein). To illustrate we cite the example of the automobile industry: today it is organized in four cartels: Delahaye plus Bernard, Unic, Simca, and Laffly; Saurer bought up by Hotchkiss plus Peugeot; Ford plus Panhard and Berliet; and finally the group of giants, Renault plus Citroen.

(aided by the state which gathers together a large part of the visible profits).

"Immense sums are accumulating in the hands of the capitalists," Bertrand de Jouvenel, the bourgeois economist, wrote recently. "With the state, that great consumer, creating the means of payment in accordance with its needs and the needs of those to whom it is indebted, the distributed profits have risen to unheard-of levels . . . The reserves of the capitalists have become even greater in proportion as the distribution of income between the capitalists and the workers has been profoundly modified—at the workers' expense—by the *rigorous freezing of real wages.*"

Monopolist Fakery

The fakery of the "socialist state" of the great monopolists is thus exploded by the admission of the bourgeois economists themselves. Professor Laufenburger wrote: "France is the only European country where the wage level is so considerably lower than the official price level, which itself is far lower than the real cost of living."

The myth of a planned economy under the bourgeoisie, contained in the formula "stabilization of prices, money and wages," reveals itself in reality as rising prices, inflation, freezing of wages. The fact that while 15 billions in paper money are put in circulation monthly, the franc still maintains a relatively stable international value is not only due to the fact that at the same time other currencies are undergoing an inflation, but above all and principally to the fact that the working class, with frozen wages, carries the main burden of the inflation, while profits become more and more monstrous and prices rise continually. Based on prices *far below the actual cost of living*, the official index of retail prices nevertheless shows a figure of 260 in 1943 (1938 equals 100) while wages for the same period were 150 (1938 equals 100).

The French bureaucracy and the police jealously guard the patriotic task of making the working class pay for the war and for the defeat and for "the immense sums accumulating in the hands of the capitalists."

Under these conditions of rationing, poverty, financial instability and inflation, the gangrenous black market is an absolutely natural phenomenon; the "planned economy" of the bourgeoisie creates perfect conditions not for checking, but for developing the black market. Only workers' control of production and distribution could do away with these inequalities.

Superficially the agricultural situation presents a different picture. While the decline of agricultural production in essential grains such as wheat and corn has been as much as 40 to 80 percent, the swollen price level has created great "liquid assets" in the country and a serious hoarding. But this hoarding is more vulnerable than any other, not so much because of the future devaluation of the franc but because of the impossibility of exchanging the agricultural products for industrial products and thus bringing about an improvement both in agricultural methods and in the level of production.

On the contrary, the lack of industrial products (machines, fertilizers) and the using up of the existing chattel and materiel will accentuate the collapse of prices when the markets reopen and the peasantry which is now permitted to "shift for itself," will be faced with the perspective of a debt even heavier than the pre-1940 one.

The above-described redistribution of corporation stocks in the metropolitan center is occurring in the same way in Algiers and all the "French" colonies where the English and American

imperialists are taking an active part in the exploitation. After the capture of the preferential shares of the Moroccan railway they turned their primary interest towards phosphates, lead and manganese. Pierpoint Morgan participates actively in the affairs of the Algerian railways, while England now largely controls the Algerian exports. Even the reconstitution of the "empire" will bring French imperialism a heavy "Allied" mortgage.

Repercussions: b) Finances, the Large Banks and the Budget

The immense sums of capital which French imperialism threw into world circulation and which assured first rank position to the French finance capitalists, clearly have not been lost. While certain positions will be liquidated after the war, the accumulation of interest continues, nevertheless, all over the surface of the earth. But the "French holdings" frozen in America represent margins of credits (costs of the war) rather than promise of future profits.

In Europe, certain annuities continue to arrive in France. Bulgaria, for example, pays in tobacco the annuities on her debt and her quota of the Turkish debt (a financial swindle of 50 years standing). The old investments continue to bring in some very meager amounts, but remain always as credits . . . "potential ones."

Hoarding, that is to say accumulation of wealth lifted by a parasitic economy from the riches of the colonies and from the "pick of the basket" represented by the interests on credits extracted from backward countries, is today slowing down. A new hoarding is to be seen in the metropolitan center, the base of which is the national debt with the state, as we have seen, throwing huge sums of paper money into circulation. The new treasure hoarders are the rising generation of showy adventurers and marauders, pirates of industry, war contractors, and kings of the black market. No one can estimate how great this hidden hoarding is, which illustrates the "French virtue" of thrift. These sums will be converted tomorrow into gold chains for the little kings and princelings of the Balkans—if the revolution does not arrive to sweep out this rotten regime.

Besides this hidden hoarding, a visible hoarding is taking place. The intensity of this accumulation can be determined by observing the changes in the public debt. The latter rose to 432 billion francs in August 1939 and reached 1320 billions in December 1943, or an increase of 888 billions on the basis of which the advances of banks issuing notes rose to about 400 billions. Approximately 500 billions invested in Treasury bonds constitute what they call short term debts, and are reused by the State. The hoarded savings-reserves in the banks have risen to about 220 billion francs (of which 60 percent are in the six great banks that dominate the French financial market).

What are these savings actually worth? The answer depends on the future value of the franc, that is on the growth of inflation. But the continual increase in paper money and Treasury bonds is only an index of the profound economic disorder and of the irremediable decay of the antiquated commercial and financial system.

One sole fact comforts the French imperialists, namely, that this decay is not limited to France but is universal. Indeed, the French figures are not very far removed from the general tendency. The increase in paper money circulation and the swelling of the debt can be seen also in Germany as well as in America or in England, as this table shows:

Country	Currency Circulation (1939=100)	Public Debt (1939=100)
Germany	335	670
England	188	230
U. S. A.	270	334
France	332	209

Everywhere the future is mortgaged, and their only hope is that they can make the international proletariat understand that it "must" pay the piper. The increase in taxes, in issuance of paper money (inflation), and in the debt are the means by which greater and greater budgets, required by the imperialist war, are maintained.

After the last war, French imperialism found itself faced with a budgetary deficit of 35 billions (undepreciated) francs and a public debt of 170 billions (undepreciated) francs, or 1005 billions in current francs. At the end of 1943 the domestic debt alone rose to 1320 billions (and only for France, to say nothing of the mortgages taken by de Gaulle), and this debt is rising each day. Of 360 billions of annual national income, the state was absorbing 250 billions by 1942! "One can see to what a level the margin available for private needs is reduced." (Laufenburger.)

The monopolistic and "planning" state has become an immense machine for bleeding the country white. Taxes follow an ascending curve, and the mass of paper money increases ceaselessly, the French financial wreckage each day becomes a more unbearable burden on the shoulders of the working class and of the layers of the pauperized petty bourgeoisie.

The 1939 budget—budget of war and famine, which had been led up to by more than five years of misery-decreeing laws—reached an outlay of 137 billions. In 1942 the outlay reached 256.5 billions and in 1944—454 billions!

The picture of the French budget is that of a gaping hole which capitalism can fill only by a still more monstrous exploitation of the proletariat. The "new order" is only the old capitalist disorder which brings with it nothing but misery and hunger.

Political Situation of French Imperialism

The French bourgeoisie entered the second imperialist war side by side with English imperialism, tied to it in common defense of the booty acquired through previous partitions of the globe.

But since the beginning, French imperialism has not known how to get rid of her "ally" who "confiscated the victory of 1918," imprisoned her in the Mediterranean, and prevented her (with the agreement of America) from totally plundering the Ruhr; besides, an infinite number of common ties of piracy and interests put their seal on this alliance and kept it from dissolving at the first shock. The course of the war reenforced the tendency toward a rupture, and a fairly homogeneous imperialist bloc was formed on the platform of "non-resistance" and agreement with German imperialism. This bloc, supported by a large section of the French imperialist oligarchy, became crystallized as a result of the defeat.

Directly following the military catastrophe, the politics of this bloc was expressed first of all by support to that pair of lackeys Petain-Darlan, precisely in order to maintain a *balance* between German and English imperialism. Petain's was a "legal" government desired by the French imperialists so that, taking advantage of the war, they might crush the working class, reconstruct under the screen of a semi-neutrality the economy of

a debilitated country, and find in their close bonds with the "empire" an agreeable solution, propped up sub-rosa by American imperialism. The entry of American imperialism into the war ground this fragile construction of 1940 between the millstones of Germany and England.

From this moment (end of 1941, beginning of 1942) the Petain government was reduced to the level of simple clerk at the head of the bureaucratic and police apparatus in the metropolitan center, with de Gaulle as clerk at the head of the "empire." The first was supported by German bayonets, the second by English and American bayonets. The French financial oligarchy used both clerks equally without coming out for one or the other, while waiting for the rearrangement of the French imperialist puzzle, and the dressing up of a "legal" government, that is to say, a government enjoying its full support.

The "French state" of Vichy is the product of a senile and vile bourgeoisie; it is the least costly solution for French imperialism. Despite the tribute it pays to German imperialism, despite the blood-letting of the working class, despite the using up of the reserve stocks, despite the meddling of German imperialism, French imperialism is the partner who gets the greatest profits from a country bled white and disintegrating, and in short who has maintained in spite of all reversals the skeleton framework of its power: that is, control of the bureaucratic administrative and police apparatus and the right of supervising its economic set-up.

French finance capital has maintained even after the defeat, the control of the State and its framework.

The two clerks, Petain and de Gaulle, serve one and the same master. One example among thousands will illustrate this perfectly: it is the example of the franc. The stabilization of the franc in Algiers at 200 francs to the pound (15 percent devaluation compared to the franc of 1939) is the same parity as set up in France. The monetary tokens which circulate in both the metropolitan center and the colonies, seem to have an osmotic nature which evens them out, as water finds its level in two communicating vessels. French holdings are frozen in certain places (countries outside Europe where de Gaulle is not recognized) but European accounts nourish French economy as they did in the past, and French capitalism receives its dividends even if the occupier is there. The stock market values—the French "sentinels"—of Suez or Renault are quoted by the ready-reckoners in Algiers and London. The French franc is still "healthy." French imperialism has not lost its control over it.

Conclusions

The example of France is only one aspect of the decay reached by world imperialism.

The war has definitely relegated French imperialism to the ranks of secondary powers, destined "to facilitate the establishment of a new European equilibrium dictated by the imperialist victors." (*Theses on the Liquidation of the Second Imperialist War*, adopted by the European Conference of the Fourth International.)

The artificial "realignment" brought about in the colonial territories of North Africa under the name of the "National Committee of Liberation," to which the Soviet bureaucracy has just given its full support by the entry into it of two representatives of the Stalinist party, has absolutely no real base.

It is made possible only by "the prolongation and spreading of the conflict which has allowed certain forces of vanquished French imperialism to get back on their feet and to be thrown

back into the whirlpool struggle, thanks to the inter-play of imperialist antagonisms, thanks to the present necessities of war and to the political exigencies of an eventual capitalist peace." (*Idem.*)

On the other hand the abject Petain regime is only the sign of decrepitude of a senile imperialism, long since ripe for the proletarian revolution. The stagnation of industry, the decay of agriculture, the financial ruin are only the picture of an over-ripe maturity: private property and national frontiers have become absolute brakes on the progress of the productive forces. "The integration of France in the area controlled by Germany" is nothing but a union of two ruined economies which can find a semblance of equilibrium only in working toward the destruction of the continent.

Contrariwise, the 20 years which preceded the war showed the inability of the English and American imperialisms to "organize" capitalist disorder. Five years of war have led to the bankruptcy of German imperialist "organization." The lesson is plain: imperialism is incapable of unifying Europe.

Only socialism, the proletarian revolution, can outline a harmonious development for all the peoples of Europe. After five years of the second imperialist war the question of a change in the system is posed today in an incomparably more imperious and urgent fashion than after the war of 1914. The whole world is moving towards a great revolutionary explosion where the question of the victory of capitalist barbarism or of the proletarian revolution will be posed point-blank.

The International Communists fight against all annexations, for the right of the self-determination of peoples. But dying capitalism in its death agony cannot even realize this elementary demand. Only socialism can give independence to the peoples and put an end to all national oppression.

Only the struggle against the occupying imperialism and French imperialism and the French employers and the French policeman can guarantee true independence.

If for the Internationalist Communists of Germany the first task is the overthrow of German imperialism and the liberation of all occupied or annexed countries, then the task of the internationalists of France remains that of implacable struggle against French imperialism, conducted simultaneously with the struggle against the occupier, under the slogans of the proletarian revolution and transformation of the imperialist war into civil war.

To speak today of a so-called "national insurrection" which would be prepared together with the bourgeoisie and under the benevolent eye of the brigands of Washington and London, is to speak as an imposter and a traitor. The task of the struggle against imperialism is that of accomplishing the socialist revolution.

"Fascism and the series of imperialist wars," wrote Leon Trotsky in August 1940, just before he was assassinated, "constitute the terrible school in which the proletariat has to free itself of opportunist, democratic and adventurist parties, has to hammer out and train the revolutionary vanguard and in this way prepare for the solving of the task (the proletarian revolution) apart from which there is not and cannot be any salvation for the development of mankind."

A Correction

The article of Leon Trotsky in our March issue was published under the wrong title: "Twenty Years of Stalinist Degeneration." The original and correct title reads: "Does the Soviet Government Still Continue to Follow the Principles Adopted Twenty Years Ago?"—Ed.

Modern Welding and the Welder

By V. GREY

I. A Dialectical Process

When I was a school kid, there was a sentence in Brigham and McFarland's big geography book that held real charm for me. I read it again and again, and unconsciously memorized it: "A man can stand within the shortest distance of the hottest bonfire, but he seeks the shade of a tree to escape the heat which has traveled 93 million miles."

On entering the factory workshop I was confronted by a far more amazing example of the same phenomenon. I saw a man guide a six thousand degree flame—a temperature comparable to that of the sun itself estimated at 11,000° F.—across a piece of metal with a little three thousand degree pool of molten iron under the flame, that cooled each moment, as the flame traveled on, to a solid red heat of 1200 degrees, and then more slowly to "normal." And all this time, if he was working on sheet metal, he used his bare hands, bracing himself with one hand on the metal only a few inches from this terrific heat. This seeming paradox need only to be clearly stated to be grasped. The quantity of heat is one thing while its quality is something else again. For example, a cupful of boiling water will make hardly more than a dent in a 25 pound cake of ice. But place this ice in a tub of lukewarm water and it will quickly disappear.

Welding is a miracle of modern industry. But it remains a miracle only if you look at it as it appears by itself, formally that is, without looking at its origin and development. The present welding process is the result of a long, contradictory growth. In its own self it is contradiction strikingly exemplified. It shows every minute of the day in the shop how quantitative changes lead to qualitative changes. All processes in nature and society reveal this same basic law, and have their own dialectic. In welding this law is manifested more clearly and more rapidly.

The welder sees, in the space of a moment or two, a change take place from hard steel to molten steel, back to hard steel again. He sees that a certain amount of heat will change steel to a condition opposite to its "normal" hard state, and a certain degree of cooling will reestablish the first condition. However, he soon learns that too much heat will burn the liquid mass, making it as useless a commodity as burnt soup. Also that under certain conditions with heavier metals (casting, brazing work, etc.) the metal is ruined if it cools too rapidly. It will then crystalize, become brittle and useless.

The furnace man sees the above changes, too. But not with the hair-raising rapidity that they appear to the welder. Moreover, the welder sees still another change peculiar to his own craft take place. As the metal melts and hardens again, he sees a three way fusion. The two metal pieces and his filler rod are constantly becoming one.

And not just in the sense that boards nailed together become one piece—e.g. a box. To the welder the two steel "boards" really do become a single piece of steel. Let him but make a mistake—welding the wrong pieces—and the swing of a sledgehammer soon proves that there has been a qualitative change, but not the one desired.

A welder quickly learns the dialectic interconnection of cold

and heat. He may rest his hand on the cold steel a few inches from his weld. Presently, the burning goes into his hand, and he takes it quickly away. The weld heats the rest of the metal by itself cooling. For a long time it has been known that nothing can heat without something else cooling, and vice versa. But here the welder sees and feels a startling example of this. It becomes clear that heating and cooling are polar opposites, inseparably bound to each other.

Let us review briefly the historical setting of the welder and his craft. Welding by fire heat, that is, forging, has been known to man as long as written history, and perhaps earlier. Swords and shields were beaten out by ancient hammers at the forge. Thousands of years ago the smiths learned, for instance, how to beat the hand guard onto the sword after both were heated to a "straw" or white heat.

Century after century, through "natural production," slave society, feudalism and modern times, this method continued. Long after the birth of modern industry, after steel-making itself had surrendered to science and mass production, welding, as we know it now, was still unknown.

Large foundries occasionally poured molten iron into the holes of an imperfect casting, hoping to make a good fusion. But it was hit-or-miss, and pretty expensive too. Clumsy fire-welding methods along the lines of the blacksmiths were tried. The capitalist approaches new industry as an extension of the old. Thus, the first autos look like buggies with bicycle wheels. The modern forms usually come into being as a surprise to the capitalistic "modernist."

Of course, soldering, with copper and lead, had been used for some time. But this was mainly in the fine jewel work, pipe repair, etc. And no small flame was dreamed of that would melt metals so hard as iron (lead melts at 600° F; iron and steel at 2200 to 2700° F.)

Torch welding, that *sine qua non* of the aircraft industry, was first introduced in England in 1888. It was first put to practical use a little later in Belgium. But it was still nearly a generation before either electric or gas welding came into general use in mass production.

First of all, the process itself ran into obstacles. The first torch used hydrogen gas for fuel—and oxygen to speed or intensify, neutralize the flame. These two gases were often obtained by breaking up the water molecule into its component hydrogen and oxygen, by an electrical process. Now just as water insists on changing into steam at a certain point, so oxygen and hydrogen will, at a certain temperature, combine again to form steam.

You might think from this that the obstacle was that the welded piece would be sprayed by water instead of fire. But it wasn't that. There is still another qualitative change involved. The steam formed at the nozzle becomes superheated in the flame itself, and thereupon decomposes once again into oxygen and hydrogen. And instead of a blended flame of the two, there is "induced the presence of free oxygen," which oxidizes the metal—rusts it. This rust gets into the weld itself and weakens it.

This can only be overcome by a large amount of hydrogen—four or five volumes to one of oxygen, which is very wasteful. This problem was soon solved with the invention of acetylene gas—a gas composed of carbon and hydrogen.

The temperature of the flame at the tip caused by combustion of the carbon with the oxygen is so high (6600° F) that it is impossible for water in the form of steam to exist. Steam dissociates between 2000-4000° F. (*Modern Welding*, V. W. Page.)

And here oxygen does another intricate somersault to come up waving the handkerchief in hydrogen's face, just as smooth as you please.

The oxygen which would combine with the hydrogen and form water, if the temperature was sufficiently low, assists in the combustion of the carbon of the acetylene. The hydrogen passes away and does not combine with the oxygen of the air until it has left the high temperature zone of the welding flame. (*Idem*)

Acetylene Torch

Besides melting and fusing metals, the acetylene torch has another use that both acetylene and electric welders as well as special operators, called "burners," employ. It can be used to cut the thickest steel plate there is. Up to several inches of thickness can be cut as smoothly as the best buzz-saw cuts wood—and nearly as fast.

With the acetylene torch a plate is heated red hot at the beginning of the place to cut. Then a more forceful jet of oxygen is played through the torch nozzle, and part of the red hot metal is blown away. As the operator moves the torch from one point to another, this becomes a simultaneously repeated and continuous operation. And the steel is perfectly cut along the line of the flame's track.

How is this done? Everyone knows that in the course of time, steel crumbles away into rust. It does this by uniting with the oxygen in the air. But when steel is red hot, and a stream of pure oxygen is directed on it, it unites with the air (rusts) thousands of times faster than ordinarily, and falls away into a sort of molten dust.

Thus, one of nature's dialectics becomes a new dialectic in the hand of man, speeding up nature a thousand fold, yielding a qualitatively different—and to man, superior—result. However, it is only fair to add in defense of nature that our conception of the "natural" rate of oxidation, or even the "natural" state of iron, is limited to this particular geological epoch on this particular planet, and on a particular part of the planet (its outer crust).

Electric arc welding, something like the lightning whose flash it resembles, owes its existence to the interaction between positive and negative electricity—and more especially, in the need of the negative, under certain conditions, to reach out through space itself to find the positive.

But where lightning forms an arc a mile or two long, extending from a negatively charged rain cloud to a temporary positive charge in the earth, the end of the electric welding rod is just an eighth of an inch, more or less, from its work, and takes infinitely less electrons and ions to make it travel. The analogy with lightning must not of course be taken too far. There are great differences in the composition of the welder's arc flame and the lightning. But the relationship of positive and negative is the same. The arc flame is one of the hottest produced by man 6400-7300° F. and the resulting work makes the magic forge of Vulcan look feeble by comparison.

The arc welder touches the welding rod to the steel he wants to weld, and instantaneously, as it seems, there is formed a little

pool of molten metal. In the time it takes to blink, the steel heats up to around 2700° F. The old time blacksmiths learned that the iron must first become red hot—then straw-colored, then white, before it reached the dazzling melting point. Where did these changes disappear to? The cherry-red, the straw-color and the white hot metal? Are there perhaps 2700 parts to a blink? Here the swift quantitative change in heat itself represents a qualitative departure from the "normal." And the only way the iron proves to the welder that it really is iron, is by going through this color series in reverse, when the weld is cooling. (A slower process than heating, in arc welding.)

And, of course, while heat is performing these amazing feats, the metal, too, is revealing its contradictory nature. Mild steel, on passing beyond 2600° F. becomes a liquid. Steel, the symbol of toughness, is then softer than butter. It has turned into its opposite. It contains within itself the possibility of changing into its opposite—like everything in the universe. The welding operation only hastens and directs the process.

The discovery of arc welding is often credited to Dr. Elihu Thompson, an American inventor of the last century. But his special merit was the "resistance system" and the resistance method of welding, which uses the positive and negative current in direct attachment to the metal. The metal heats up as a "short circuit" does, and fuses together. But no flaming arc is used. Spot welding is a good example of this type.

Nicholas de Berardos and Stanislas Olzemanski of Petrograd, discovered the carbon electrode in 1885. They found that by running a positive charge of electricity through a stick of carbon at a low voltage and a high, amperage, and a negative charge through the work from the same circuit, an operator could maintain an arc of great heat intensity. In this process the operator would have the insulated holder with the carbon stick in one hand, and a filler rod in the other, which he played into the arc where the heat would melt both it and the parent metal into a good fusion. This method, discovered in the country of the Czars, flourished greatest in the countries of the capitalists, England and the United States, particularly from 1890 to 1915.

Slavianov, another Russian, perfected the use of an uncoated metallic bar electrode, which made its own arc and supplied the filler material simultaneously. It was at one and the same time the tool and the raw material. And it was probably the first known "bare rod welding."

It remained for a citizen of Gothenberg, Sweden, Oscar Kjelberg, to finish paving the road for modern arc welding. He invented the "coated electrode" in 1907. This was easier and faster to work with. And in a sense it brought the same qualitative improvement over the bare rod that acetylene gas did over hydrogen. It eliminated the element of super-rapid rusting during the process, which weakens the weld.

Molten steel, when exposed to the air, oxidizes very quickly. The problem was somehow to find a way of keeping the air away from the cooling metal. The solution was to put the "air" on the rod itself, much in the same way cold steel is protected from rust by painting "rust" over it. That is, prepared oxides—"slag"—are coated over the rod, and melting as the rod melted, the pool of molten steel is constantly covered with this slag which, being lighter, always stays on top. The whole weld soon cools, and the welder chips off the slag, revealing a strong new weld, completely free from rust.

Each of these successive improvements was, of course, also a simplification. And though the basis for modern welding was well founded by 1907, still further improvements were made from year to year. At this stage welding was mainly conceived

as a method of repair. And it wasn't even used as a general repair medium in this country until around the time of the First World War. So at that time the operator often was the owner of his own welding machine or repair shop. He trundled a whole acetylene generating apparatus around with his oxygen tank, instead of the easily portable modern equipment which is taken to the tops of the highest buildings and the shores of deep harbors for under-water burning and electric welding!

Mass production did not summon the welder from the repair shop, or his apparatus from its more intricate and fussy stage

until around 1920, and even then only as a curtain-raiser of what was to come. But with improvements and streamlining, with better adaptations for intensifying labor, welding finally became part and parcel of the factory itself, not just the repair shop.

So there is a change in the character of the work. This change was brought on by the change in the character of the process that does the work (the welding process itself) as well as by the desire of each capitalist to increase labor productivity ahead of his competitors.

II. The Dialectic Recognizes the Welder

Welding entered the factory alongside of the Taylor and Bedaux systems, alongside the assembly line and the conveyor belt system. No longer is it alone in the repair shop, the property and tool of the same individual. It is now used by thousands. It has become part of mass production.

And yet, according to Professor Bardtke, author of theoretical books on welding, less than forty years ago, some European arc welders looked upon it as a secret trade. They tried to imitate the guild masters of the middle ages. With such a technique, with such a bizarre craft, they thought this could be done. But in vain!

Modern industry, which really gave birth to this infant prodigy, would not let it play for long in the puddles of the past. It might have been a "little accident," with any one of a dozen penniless inventors its probable father. But it is closely cherished from the womb from which it sprang, and called to order by its legal father, Capital. It must live in the family of Capital, and obey Capital's rules. It must be a machine, not merely a skill. It must grow into a big machine. It must work only in association with other machines. And it, too, must take the name of Capital.

As the welding process developed, however, and its effectiveness increased, the worker's understanding of the process decreased. This is an absolute law, under capitalism. The more complex the machine, the simpler the labor process attached to it.

Less than a decade ago, a man would go to the Coyne school, or some other training place, plunk down a couple of hundred dollars and spend a minimum of six weeks full time learning a little of the theory and practice of the trade. Today a school girl can learn enough about welding in a couple of evenings to be an aircraft welder, and often in a week or so of spare time be able to take the Navy test to be a ship welder.

Not long ago the welder was a craftsman, something like an old time machinist who carried more tools than the modern machine-shop worker ever sees. He had tools for every possible operation he might have to do. A set of his own copper tips for acetylene welding, two or three kinds of goggles, all kinds of leather protective clothing for arc welding, hammers, chisels, his own hood, etc.—to say nothing of his most prized possession, an understanding of heats and metals, and how to weld them. Very often he owned his own repair shop. And he was something of a mechanic as well. He could weld and repair anything from a bicycle fender to a brass chain. And naturally a dozen repairs or so were his quota for the day.

Today, one detail operation—the same weld, on the same kind of metal, making the same kind of joint over and over, thousands of times, is the rule, while all-around welding is the exception. In manufacturing light ammunition boxes, (for example, the machinegun type) the ends may be touched for a

moment with torch or rod, and a man is expected to make seventy-five to a hundred per hour.

The attention to detail, the sense of craft superiority, the conscientiousness, the slow pace, and even arrogant attitude, have gone. Today they all are replaced with a slam-bang, give-it-a-blast-and-to-hell-with-it attitude. The welder is now a mass production worker.

And yet, in 1920, a handbook on welding by V. W. Page contained the following words: "It is intended to drive home the very important fact that the welder and not the equipment, is the most important factor in the welding process." How surprised and pleased this author, and the employers to whom he said this, must be today—now that this proposition is reversed.

Modern industry created the skill. And modern industry then destroyed it. The possibility for its destruction existed at the time of its creation. Even as it was coming into being, it began passing away. Employing the best contributions of industrial technique, it needed a master of technique at the beginning. But the swift development of improvements, etc., soon brought the machine to the factory, leaving the expert far behind in his little shop.

Now the man, like the machine, corresponds to the needs of Capital. Speed, not skill, is the measure of his ability. In the matter of keeping his job, or in making more money by piecework, it is entirely a question of how many and how much he does. The maintenance welder in the same shop, who knows the trade inside out and fixes anything from a half inch pipe to a 50 ton press, usually makes no more money than the rest. If he tried to put on the airs that welders used to, he'd be laughed out of the locker room.

On the auto assembly lines (where welding was long ago reduced to simple labor) the worker can have no consciousness of welding even in the sense of watching to see if the two pieces are fused together, much less watching the process of heating and cooling with the fascination of an eager student. No, he has no time! All he is conscious of is reach, strain and sweat—a sudden arc or gas flash—hold it a second, reach over to the other side, or underneath—do it again and again. Then the belt brings the next body, he repeats the process and multiplies by the thousand. At the end of the day he feels exactly like any other production line worker—worn out.

The modern welder has neither time, energy, nor curiosity to be interested in what he does. The owner of industry has him by the back of the neck, shoving his head into the work, using up his eyes and muscles and ruining his lungs too fast for him to use his brain. The young girl who stands on one leg all day long as she operates the spot welder with the other, the piece worker who burns fifty pounds of rods a day—how can they know what they are doing—or want to know? They care

no more about it than for the vagaries of the moon, or the swing of Pleiades.

"Within the Capitalist system," wrote Karl Marx, "all methods for raising the social productiveness of labor are brought about at the cost of the individual laborer; all means for the development of production transform themselves into the means of domination over, and exploitation of, the producers. They mutilate the laborer into a fragment of a man, degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, destroy every remnant of charm in his work, and turn it into a hated toil."

Marx never heard of electric or acetylene welding. But the above words of his state the law of the welder's development—or degeneration—so clearly, that not a syllable need be altered. With the greatly increased concentration of capital the law set down by Marx is only more rapid and more relentless in its self-enforcement.

The Last Five Years

The death knell pealed out for the skilled welders' monopoly in the United States only five years ago. Capitalism, in its death agony, producing far more for destruction than it ever could for consumption, required added millions of "skilled" workers. To fight a total war, the so-called "defense" schools were started. Soon everybody and his sister became welders.

The old-timers had vague apprehensions when they saw youths of every description coming into the trade by the thousands. "Well," they consoled themselves, "there's work for everybody now. But after the war no company's going to hire a woman welder. They're not good enough," etc. Be that as it may, women are often proving superior to men in detail work, especially acetylene welding. And there is no reason to suppose the corporations will go back to the archaic days of the all-around welder. Everything points the other way.

"But what's the difference how simple or complex the work is? It's still good pay, isn't it? Welders are still among the highest paid workers, aren't they?" This extremely superficial attitude is our "old friend, common sense" speaking. Even in the ship yards where the welder usually gets the highest pay checks, the real wages have been systematically decreased. And decreased proportionately more than real wages of most unskilled industrial labor. Here is a case of a thing being "high" and "low" at the same time.

The ship welders in most parts of the country got \$1.12 to \$1.25 an hour before the war, and 45 to 50 dollars for a forty hour week. Anyone who remembers the tough conditions of the 'thirties will readily agree that this income made many a bank clerk green with envy. Today there has been no real increase over this. Not even the meager fifteen percent of the Little Steel formula! Even on the assumption that prices have only gone up fifteen percent—the real wages have been lowered.

Of course, ship welders make 75 to 100 dollars a week. Of course. But how? By working twenty to thirty hours overtime. Then the "take home wages," that drooling phrase of the Capitalist—are increased. True, there is far more overtime in ship building than in an average trade today. But the life-blood of the worker has been drained out that much more for Capital—and the worker's use to himself and future use to the capitalist is impaired. He will be ready for the doctors and the scrap heap earlier than ordinarily.

Most medical authorities used to agree on this. But now in the age of the corporation doctor things have changed a little, and they toss the worker a horse pill, with sugar, salt and vitamins in it. And this is supposed to nourish the body, and

revitalize it, eliminating the need for any serious medical care for deterioration, etc. While it may look this way on the surface for an 11 or even a 12 hour day, nevertheless a quantitative change goes on under the surface. Lengthen the day a little more—16 hours, say—and a qualitative change is visible. Lengthen it to 24 hours a day, and we will be the first to admit that soon neither doctors nor vitamin pills will be needed at all!

Ship welding is harder to rationalize than auto or aircraft welding. So the ship welder still feels—even today—that he is a "welder" to the extent that he has some consciousness of what he's doing. The smallest ship—even a "tug"—is quite a project, and what with iron workers, fitters and helpers pulling the plates together to fit, the welder can take his time. He can watch a gang work, and step in to "tack" a joint together when the fitter beckons to him. This "take-it-easy" arrangement for the tackwelder is naturally copied by the "production welder" on the same job, who welds up the seams after the plates are tacked together. But while ships haven't been hung up on a conveyor belt yet, they still have succumbed to production line methods to a great extent during this war. The Kaiser yards have turned out a freighter in two and a half days. This is a tremendous increase over the production in the last war.

How is it done? A good half of the shipbuilding isn't done at the drydock at all, any more. Whole sides and sections of the ship are built in "yards" that may be miles inland. Some of the smaller parts for the Kaiser ships, for instance, are made thousands of miles away. While it is wasteful to transport ship parts across the dry land of a continent, and the large parts across states, it is also a measure of the speed-up in building when you consider that they make a bigger profit this way than formerly.

In the "yards" where they make these parts, and even sections, of ships, the welder has the same experience as his brother of the factory. Only because the welding is more steady the capitalist finds a little different method for keeping the worker's nose to the grindstone.

A Popular Method

For example, here is one popular method: all the machines are placed together in a long row, or several rows. The welder may be out of sight, inside a hatch, a "forepeak," or otherwise covered up, doing some kind of cramped work. But he leaves a sign on the machine he's using, a sign on which his clock number is painted. And it's a very simple matter for the foreman to go up and down the line of machines, look at the indicators and see who's "laying down" on the job.

The old time welder would turn over in his grave at this—that is, if he were already in his grave. So fast has this process unfolded that like as not, the "old timer" is among the very boys and girls so spied on and exploited.

Even in the ship yard proper, things by no means are at a standstill. A couple of summers ago, for example, the Sunday rotogravures ran a picture of West Coast welders working on deck seams. And they had huge beach umbrellas to protect them from the California sun. This Babylonian luxury, unheard of for a workingman, must have shocked the Puritan soul of the Capitalist. But not for long! A machine has now been developed which will weld flat surface seams automatically, and of course without benefit of umbrella.

However, the bloated capitalist is not entirely complacent as he surveys the handiwork of his system. True, wages are lower, labor more productive and intensive—and profits higher.

But as the skilled labor becomes unskilled, it becomes harder and harder to play off the skilled against the unskilled. It is harder to kid one section of workers that they are an aristocracy when the strain in their muscles and the figures on their pay-checks repeatedly disprove it. The worker turns into his opposite in more ways than one.

"Motion is the mode of existence of matter" said Engels. Welding is just one spectacular confirmation of this proposition. And a reflection of this takes place in the brain of the welding operator. A reflection that is clear and conscious to the extent that he is able to grasp and understand the process, and its many sides.

These mental reflections in their turn—the attitudes of the worker—have been influenced by the interaction of the welding process and the dynamic development of that process. Twenty years ago, the welder was the master of the process understanding it to one degree or another. Now, with one change after another increasing the scope of welding, the process has mastered him.

Skilled labor has been transformed into its opposite, unskilled. The craftsman has become the worker. But this worker is still not the end result of a process. Other qualitative changes are brewing. For this individual who wields man-made lightning

and holds the heat of a miniature sun within his arm's radius, is no brother to the ox nor is he a chemical reaction like the compounds he works with.

The dialectic of history affects him, but not automatically. For he brings into history the element of consciousness which in its interaction with these forces of change has also a dialectic of its own. He resists the change at first, at times takes reactionary attitudes, holdovers from the aristocratic past. He may cling to ideas of craft superiority with the lingering hope of a better future than the rest. But consciousness will absorb this lesson, too.

This explains the reactionary strikes some of the welders have engaged in—against Negroes, etc., and their outlived "welders associations." But already, and even in the last strongholds of the craftsman, we see men and women, white and colored, working side-by-side, organized into industrial unions.

We may conclude that even these negative attitudes will be negated—not simply crossed out—but transformed into their opposite. A series of swift quantitative changes in the events of the future will lead to an equally abrupt qualitative change in thought and action. At present these thoughts resemble the negative electrons of the sky, gathering vapor around themselves to help make the storm.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

The Lessons of Spain— The Last Warning

By LEON TROTSKY

Spain served, in the period immediately preceding the second imperialist war, as a testing ground of the contending classes, their respective parties and programs in the epoch of the death agony of capitalism. The Spanish Civil War disclosed most graphically that there is no road of salvation for mankind except through the methods and program of the proletarian revolution. Any other policy is that of defeat and betrayal. This, too, was just as graphically disclosed in the role of the Spanish Stalinists, Socialists, Anarchists and Centrists. The "People's Front" was the mechanism through which the betrayal and defeat of the Spanish revolution was effected. Stalinism served as the driving force. Today in the face of the unfolding European revolution, the Kremlin, in agreement and close collaboration with Anglo-American imperialism, is seeking in essence to repeat on a continental scale its hangman's role in Spain. The very mechanism remains the same—that of "People's Fronts," masquerading under various labels, particularly that of "National Liberation Front." It is hardly necessary to dwell at length on the paramount importance to the revolutionary vanguard of the experience and lessons of the Spanish Civil War. We reprint below an article written by Leon Trotsky in December 1937 in which this experience and these lessons are brilliantly and succinctly summarized. The Russian text originally appeared in the *Bulletin of the Russian Opposition* Nos. 62-63, February 1938. An English version was published in the weekly *Socialist Appeal*, Nos. 2 & 3, January 8 and 15, 1938. This translation has been checked against the Russian original and revised by John G. Wright.—Ed.

All General Staffs are studying closely military operations in Ethiopia, in Spain, in the Far East in preparation for the great future war. The battles of the Spanish proletariat, heat

lightning flashes of the coming world revolution, should be no less attentively studied by the revolutionary staffs. Under this condition and this condition alone will the coming events not take us unawares.

Three conceptions fought—with unequal forces—in the so-called republican camp; namely: Menshevism, Bolshevism and Anarchism. As regards the bourgeois republican parties, they were without either independent ideas or independent political significance and were able to maintain themselves only by climbing on the backs of reformists and anarchists. Moreover, it is no exaggeration to say that the leaders of Spanish anarcho-syndicalism did everything to repudiate their doctrine and virtually reduce its significance to zero. Actually two doctrines in the so-called republican camp fought—Menshevism and Bolshevism.

According to the Socialists and Stalinists, i.e. the Mensheviks of the first and second mobilization, the Spanish revolution was called upon to solve only its "democratic" tasks, for which a united front with the "democratic" bourgeoisie was indispensable. From this point of view any and all attempts of the proletariat to go beyond the limits of bourgeois democracy are not only premature but fatal. Furthermore, on the order of the day stands not the revolution but the struggle against the insurgent Franco. Fascism is "reaction." Against "reaction" it is necessary to unite all forces of "progress." Menshevism, itself a branch of bourgeois thought, does not have and does not

wish to have any inkling of the fact that fascism is not feudal but bourgeois reaction; that a successful fight against bourgeois reaction can be waged only with the forces and methods of the proletarian revolution.

The Bolshevik point of view, definitely expressed only by the young section of the Fourth International, takes the theory of permanent revolution as its starting point, namely: that even purely democratic problems, like the liquidation of semi-feudal land-ownership, cannot be solved without the conquest of power by the proletariat; but this in turn places the socialist revolution on the agenda. Moreover, during the very first stages of the revolution, the Spanish workers themselves posed practically not merely democratic problems but also purely socialist ones. The demand not to transgress the bounds of bourgeois democracy signifies in practice not a defense of the democratic revolution but a repudiation of it. Only through an overturn in agrarian relations could the peasantry, the great mass of the population, have been transformed into a powerful bulwark against fascism. But the land-owners are indissolubly bound up with the commercial-industrial bourgeoisie and bourgeois intelligentsia dependent on them. The party of the proletariat was thus faced with a choice between going with the peasant masses or with the liberal bourgeoisie. The peasantry and the liberal bourgeoisie could have been included in a coalition only with one objective in mind; to help the bourgeoisie deceive the peasantry and thus isolate the workers. The agrarian revolution could have been accomplished only *against* the bourgeoisie, and therefore only through measures of the dictatorship of the proletariat. There is no third, interim regime.

From the standpoint of theory what is most astonishing about Stalin's Spanish policy is the utter disregard for the ABC of Leninism. After a delay of several decades—and what decades!—the Comintern has fully restored all rights to the doctrine of Menshevism. More than that: the Comintern has contrived to render this doctrine more “consistent” and by that token more absurd. In Czarist Russia, on the threshold of 1905, the formula of “purely democratic revolution” had behind it in any case immeasurably more arguments than in 1937 in Spain. It is hardly astonishing that in modern Spain “the liberal labor policy” of Menshevism has been converted into the reactionary anti-labor policy of Stalinism. At the same time the doctrine of the Mensheviks, this caricature of Marxism has been converted into a caricature of itself.

“Theory” of the People's Front

However, it would be naive to think that the politics of the Comintern in Spain stems from a “mistake” in theory. Stalinism is not guided by Marxist theory, or for that matter by any theory at all, but by the empirical interests of the Soviet bureaucracy. In their intimate circles the Soviet cynics mock Dimitrov's “philosophy” of the People's Front. But they have at their disposal for deceiving the masses large cadres of propagators of this holy formula, sincere ones and cheats, simpletons and charlatans. Louis Fischer with his ignorance and smugness, with his provincial rationalism and congenital deafness to revolution, is the most repulsive representative of this unattractive brotherhood. “The union of progressive forces!” “The triumph of the idea of the People's Front!” “The assault of the Trotskyists on the unity of the anti-fascist ranks!” . . . Who will believe that the *Communist Manifesto* was written 90 years ago?

The theoreticians of the People's Front do not essentially go beyond the first rule of arithmetic, that is, addition: “Communists” plus Socialists plus Anarchists plus liberals add up

to a total which is greater than their respective isolated numbers. Such is all their wisdom. However, arithmetic alone does not suffice here. One needs in addition at least mechanics. The law of the parallelogram of forces applies to politics as well. In such a parallelogram the resultant, we know, is the shorter the more the component forces diverge from each other. When political allies tend to pull in opposite directions, the resultant may prove equal to zero. A bloc of divergent political groups of the working class is sometimes completely indispensable for the solution of common practical problems. In certain historical circumstances, such a bloc is capable of attracting to itself the oppressed petty-bourgeois masses whose interests are close to the interests of the proletariat. The joint force of such a bloc can prove far stronger than the force of each of its component parts. On the contrary, the political alliance between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, whose interests in the present epoch diverge upon basic questions at an angle of 180 degrees, is, as a general rule, capable of only paralyzing the revolutionary force of the proletariat.

Civil war, where the force of naked coercion is hardly effective, demands of its participants the spirit of supreme self-abnegation. The workers and peasants are capable of assuring victory only if they wage a struggle for their own emancipation. Under these conditions, to subordinate the proletariat to the leadership of the bourgeoisie means beforehand to assure its defeat in the civil war.

These simple truths are least of all the products of pure theoretical analysis. On the contrary, they represent the unassailable deduction from the entire experience of history, beginning at least with 1848. The modern history of bourgeois society is filled with all sorts of the “People's Front,” i. e. the most diverse political combinations for the deception of the toilers. The Spanish experience is only a new and tragic link in this chain of crimes and betrayals.

Alliance with the Bourgeoisie's Shadow

Politically most striking is the fact that the Spanish People's Front lacked in reality even a parallelogram of forces. The bourgeoisie's place was occupied by its shadow. Through the medium of the Stalinists, Socialists and Anarchists, the Spanish bourgeoisie subordinated the proletariat to itself without even bothering to participate in the People's Front. The overwhelming majority of the exploiters of all political shades openly went over into the camp of Franco. Without any theory of “permanent revolution,” the Spanish bourgeoisie understood from the outset that the revolutionary mass movement, no matter how it starts, is directed against private ownership of land and the means of production, and that it is utterly impossible to cope with this movement by democratic measures. Therefore, only insignificant splinters from the possessing classes remained in the republican camp: Messrs: Azana, Companys, and the like—political attorneys of the bourgeoisie but not the bourgeoisie itself. Having staked everything on a military dictatorship, the possessing classes were able at the same time to make use of their political representatives of *yesterday* in order to paralyze, disorganize and afterward strangle the socialist movement of the masses in “republican” territory.

Without in the slightest degree representing the Spanish bourgeoisie, the Left Republicans still less represented the workers and peasants. They represented no one but themselves. However, thanks to their allies: the Socialists, Stalinists and Anarchists, these political phantoms played the decisive role in the revolution. How? Very simply. By incarnating the prin-

ciples of the "democratic revolution," i. e. the inviolability of private property.

The reasons for the rise of the Spanish People's Front and its inner mechanics are perfectly clear. The task of the retired leaders of the bourgeoisie's left wing consisted in checking the revolution of the masses and thus in regaining for themselves the lost confidence of the exploiters: "Why do you need Franco if we, the Republicans, can do the same thing?" The interests of Azana and Companys fully coincided at this central point with the interests of Stalin who needed to gain the confidence of the French and British bourgeoisie by proving to them in action his ability to preserve "order" against "anarchy." Stalin needed Azana and Companys as a cover before the workers: Stalin himself, of course, is for socialism, but one must take care not to repel the republican bourgeoisie! Azana and Companys needed Stalin as an experienced executioner, with the authority of a revolutionist. Failing this, so insignificant a crew never could nor would have dared to attack the workers.

The classic reformists of the Second International, long ago derailed by the course of the class struggle, began to feel a new tide of confidence, thanks to the support of Moscow. This support, incidentally, was not given to all reformists but only to those most reactionary. Caballero represented that face of the Socialist Party which was turned toward the workers' aristocracy. Negrin and Prieto always looked towards the bourgeoisie. Negrin won over Caballero with the help of Moscow. The Left Socialists and Anarchists, the captives of the People's Front, tried, it is true, to save whatever could be saved of democracy. But in as much as they dared not mobilize the masses against the gendarmes of the People's Front, their efforts at the end were reduced to plaints and wails. The Stalinists were thus in alliance with the extreme right, avowedly bourgeois, wing of the Socialist Party. They directed their repressions against the left: The POUM, the Anarchists, the "left" Socialists, i. e. against the centrist groupings who reflected even in a most remote degree, the pressure of the revolutionary masses.

This political fact, very significant in itself, provides at the same time a measure of the degeneration of the Comintern in the last few years. I once defined Stalinism as *bureaucratic centrism*, and events have brought a series of corroborations of the correctness of this definition. But it is obviously obsolete today. The interests of the Bonapartist bureaucracy can no longer be reconciled with centrist hesitation, vacillation and half-wayers. In search of reconciliation with the bourgeoisie, the Stalinist clique is capable of entering an alliance only with the most conservative groupings among the international labor aristocracy. This has acted to fix definitively the counter-revolutionary character of Stalinism on the international arena.

Counter-Revolutionary Superiorities of Stalinism

This brings us right up to the solution of the enigma of how and why the "Communist" Party of Spain, so insignificant numerically and with a leadership so poor in caliber, proved capable of gathering into its hands all levers of power, in face of the incomparably more powerful organizations of the Socialists and Anarchists. The usual explanation that the Stalinists simply bartered Soviet weapons for power is far too superficial. In return for munitions Moscow received Spanish gold. According to the laws of the capitalist market, this covers everything. How then did Stalin contrive to get power into the bargain? The customary answer is that, the Soviet government having raised its authority in the eyes of the masses by furnishing military

supplies, demanded as a condition of its "collaboration" drastic measures against revolutionists and thus removed dangerous opponents from its path. All this is quite indisputable but it is only one aspect of the matter, and the least important at that. Despite the "authority" created by Soviet shipments, the Spanish Communist Party remained a small minority and met with ever-growing hatred on the part of the workers. On the other hand, it was not enough for Moscow to set conditions: Valencia had to accede to them. This is the nub of the matter. Not only Zamora, Companys and Negrin but also Caballero, during his incumbency as Premier, were all more or less ready to accede to the demands of Moscow. Why? Because these gentlemen themselves wished to keep the revolution within bourgeois limits. Neither the Socialists nor the Anarchists seriously opposed the Stalinist program. They feared a break with the bourgeoisie. They were deathly afraid of every revolutionary onslaught of the workers.

Stalin with his munitions and with his counter-revolutionary ultimatum was a savior for all these groups. He guaranteed them, so they hoped, military victory over Franco and at the same time he freed them from responsibility for the course of the revolution. They hastened to put their socialist and anarchist masks into the closet in the hope of making use of them again after Moscow reestablished bourgeois democracy for them. As the finishing touch to their comfort, these gentleman could henceforth justify their betrayal to the workers by the necessity of military agreement with Stalin. Stalin on his part justified his counter-revolutionary politics by the necessity of maintaining an alliance with the republican bourgeoisie.

Only from this broader point of view can we get a clear picture of the angelic toleration which such knights of right and freedom as Azana, Negrin, Companys, Caballero, Garcia Oliver and others showed towards the crimes of the GPU. If they had no other choice, as they affirm, it was not at all because they had no means of paying for airplanes and tanks other than with the heads of the revolutionists and the rights of the workers, but because their own "purely democratic" i. e. anti-socialist program, could be realized by no other measures save terror. When the workers and peasants enter on the path of *their* revolution, i. e. when they seize factories and estates, drive out the old owners, conquer power in the provinces, then the bourgeois counter-revolution—democratic, Stalinist, or Fascist alike—has no other means of checking this movement except through bloody coercion, supplemented by lies and deceit. The superiority of the Stalinist clique on this road consisted in its ability to apply instantly measures which were beyond the capacity of Azana, Companys, Negrin and their left allies.

Stalin Confirms in His Own Way the Correctness of the Theory of Permanent Revolution

Two irreconcilable programs thus fought on the territory of republican Spain. On the one hand, the program of saving *at any cost* private property from the proletariat and saving—in so far as possible—democracy from Franco; on the other hand, the program of abolishing private property through the conquest of power by the proletariat. The first program expressed the interests of capitalism through the medium of the labor aristocracy, the top petty-bourgeois circles and especially the Soviet bureaucracy. The second program translated into the language of Marxism the tendencies of the revolutionary mass movement, not fully conscious but powerful. Unfortunately for the revolution, between the handful of Bolsheviks and the rev-

olutionary proletariat, stood the counter-revolutionary wall of the People's Front.

The policy of the People's Front was in its turn, not at all determined by the blackmail of Stalin as a supplier of arms. There was, of course, no lack of blackmail. But the reason for the success of this blackmail was inherent in the inner conditions of the revolution itself. Throughout the six years its social setting was the growing onslaught of the masses against the regime of semi-feudal and bourgeois property. The need of defending this property by the most extreme measures threw the bourgeoisie into the embrace of Franco. The republican government had promised the bourgeoisie to defend property by "democratic" measures but revealed, especially in July 1936, its complete bankruptcy. When the situation on the property front became even more threatening than on the military front, the democrats of all colors, including the Anarchists, bowed before Stalin; and he found no other methods in his own arsenal than the methods of Franco.

The hounding of "Trotskyists," POUMists, revolutionary Anarchists and left Socialists; the filthy slander, the false documents, the tortures in Stalinist offices, the murders from ambush—without all this the bourgeois regime, under the republican flag, could not have lasted even two months. The GPU proved to be the master of the situation only because it defended more consistently than the others, i. e. with the greatest baseness and bloodthirstiness, the interests of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

In the struggle against the socialist revolution the "democrat" Kerensky at first sought support in the military dictatorship of Kornilov and later tried to enter Petrograd in the baggage-train of the monarchist general Krasnov. On the other hand, the Bolsheviks were compelled in order to carry the democratic revolution through to the end, to overthrow the government of "democratic" charlatans and babblers. In the process they put an end thereby to every kind of attempt at military (or "fascist") dictatorship.

The Spanish revolution once again demonstrates that it is impossible to defend democracy against the revolutionary masses otherwise than through the methods of fascist reaction. And conversely, it is impossible to conduct a genuine struggle against fascism otherwise than through the methods of the proletarian revolution. Stalin waged war against "Trotskyism" (proletarian revolution), destroying democracy by the Bonapartist measures of the GPU. This overthrows once again and once and for all the old Menshevik theory, adopted by the Comintern, in accordance to which the democratic and socialist revolutions are transformed into two independent historical chapters, separated from each other in point of time. The work of the Moscow executioners confirms in its own way, the correctness of the theory of permanent revolution.

Role of the Anarchists

The Anarchists had no independent position of any kind in the Spanish revolution. All they did was waver between Bolshevism and Menshevism. More precisely: the Anarchist workers instinctively yearned to enter the Bolshevik road (July 1936, May days of 1937) while their leaders, on the contrary, with all their might drove the masses into the camp of the People's Front, i. e. of the bourgeois regime.

The Anarchists revealed a fatal lack of understanding of the laws of the revolution and its tasks by seeking to limit themselves to their own trade unions, that is to organizations permeated with the routine of peaceful times; and by ignoring what went on outside the framework of the trade unions, among

the masses, among the political parties and in the government apparatus. Had the Anarchists been revolutionists, they would first of all have called for the creation of Soviets, which unite the representatives of all the toilers of city and country, including the most oppressed strata who never joined the trade unions. The revolutionary workers would have naturally occupied the dominant position in these Soviets. The Stalinists would have remained an insignificant minority. The proletariat would have convinced itself of its own invincible strength. The apparatus of the bourgeois state would have hung suspended in the air. One strong blow would have sufficed to pulverize this apparatus. The Socialist revolution would have received a powerful impetus. The French proletariat would not for long have permitted Leon Blum to blockade the proletarian revolution beyond the Pyrenees. Neither could the Moscow bureaucracy have permitted itself such a luxury. The most difficult questions would have been solved as they arose.

Instead of this the Anarcho-Syndicalists, seeking to hide from "politics" in the trade unions, turned out to be, to the great surprise of the whole world and themselves, a fifth wheel in the cart of bourgeois democracy. But not for long: a fifth wheel is superfluous. After Garcia Oliver and Co. helped Stalin and his henchmen to take power away from the workers, the Anarchists themselves were driven out of the government of the People's Front. Even then they found nothing better to do than to run behind the chariot of the victor and assure him of their devotion. The fear of the petty bourgeois before the big bourgeois, of the petty bureaucrat before the big bureaucrat, they covered up by jachrymose speeches about the holiness of the united front (between a victim and the executioners) and about the inadmissibility of every kind of dictatorship, including their own. "After all, we could have taken power in July 1936 . . ." "After all, we could have taken power in May 1937 . . ." The Anarchists begged Negrin-Stalin to recognize and reward their treachery to the revolution. A revolting picture!

In and of itself this self-justification that "we did not seize power not because we were unable but because we did not wish to, because we were against every kind of dictatorship" and the like, contains an irrevocable condemnation of Anarchism as an utterly anti-revolutionary doctrine. To renounce the conquest of power is voluntarily to leave the power with those who wield it, i. e. the exploiters. The essence of every revolution consisted and consists in this, that it puts a new class in power, thus enabling it to realize its own program in life. It is impossible to wage war and to eschew victory. It is impossible to lead the masses towards insurrection without preparing for the conquest of power. No one could have prevented the Anarchists after the conquest of power from establishing the sort of regime they deem necessary, assuming, of course, that their program is realizable. But the Anarchist leaders themselves lost faith in it. They hid from power not because they are against "every kind of dictatorship"—in actuality, grumbling and whining, they supported and support the dictatorship of Negrin-Stalin—but because they completely lost their principles and courage, if they ever had any. They were afraid of Stalin. They were afraid of Negrin. They were afraid of France and England. More than anything these phrasemongers feared the revolutionary masses.

The renunciation of conquest of power inevitably throws every workers' organization into the swamp of reformism and turns it into a plaything of the bourgeoisie: it cannot be otherwise in view of the class structure of society. In opposing the goal, the conquest of power, the Anarchists could not in the end fail to oppose the means: the revolution. The leaders of

the CNT and FAI helped the bourgeoisie not only to hold on to the shadow of power in July 1936, but to reestablish bit by bit what the bourgeoisie had lost at one stroke. In May 1937, they sabotaged the uprising of the workers and thereby saved the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Thus Anarchism which wished merely to be anti-political proved in reality to be anti-revolutionary, and in the more critical moments—counter-revolutionary.

The Anarchist theoreticians, who after the great test of 1931-37, continue to repeat the old reactionary nonsense about Kronstadt and who affirm that "Stalinism is the inevitable result of Marxism and Bolshevism," simply demonstrate by this that they are forever dead for the revolution. You say that Marxism is in itself depraved and Stalinism is its legitimate progeny? But why do we, revolutionary Marxists, engage in mortal combat with Stalinism throughout the world? Why does the Stalinist gang see in Trotskyism its chief enemy? Why does every approach to our views or our methods of action (Durruti, Andres Nin, Landau and others) compel the gangsters of Stalinism to resort to bloody reprisals? Why, on the other hand, did the leaders of Spanish Anarchism serve, during the time of the Moscow and Madrid crimes of the GPU, as ministers under Caballero-Negrin, i.e. as servants of the bourgeoisie and Stalin? Why even now under the pretext of fighting fascism, do the Anarchists remain voluntary captives of Stalin-Negrin, i.e. of the executioners of the revolution who have demonstrated their incapacity to fight fascism? By hiding behind Kronstadt and Makhno, the attorneys of Anarchism will deceive nobody. In the Kronstadt episode and in the struggle with Makhno we defended the proletarian revolution from the peasant counter-revolution. The Spanish Anarchists defended and continue to defend bourgeois counter-revolution from the proletarian revolution. No sophistry will delete from the annals of history the fact that Anarchism and Stalinism in the Spanish revolution were on one side of the barricades while the working masses with the revolutionary Marxists were on the other. Such is the truth which will forever remain in the consciousness of the proletariat!

Role of the POUM

The record of the POUM is not much better. In point of theory, it tried, to be sure, to base itself on the formula of the permanent revolution (that is why the Stalinists called the POUMists Trotskyists). But the revolution is not satisfied with theoretical avowals. Instead of mobilizing the masses against the reformist leaders, including the Anarchists, the POUM tried to convince these gentlemen of the superiorities of socialism over capitalism. This tuning fork gave the pitch to all the articles and speeches of the POUM leaders. In order not to quarrel with the Anarchist leaders they did not form their own nuclei and in general did not conduct any kind of work inside the CNT. Evading sharp conflicts, they did not carry on revolutionary work in the republican army. They built instead "their own" trade unions and "their own" militia which guarded "their own" institutions or occupied "their own" section of the front. By isolating the revolutionary vanguard from the class, the POUM rendered the vanguard impotent and left the class without leadership. Politically the POUM remained throughout far closer to the People's Front, for whose left wing it provided the cover, than to Bolshevism. That the POUM nevertheless fell victim to bloody and base repressions was due to the fact that the People's Front could not fulfil its mission, namely: to stifle the socialist revolution—except by cutting off, piece by piece, its own left flank.

Contrary to its own intentions, the POUM proved to be, in the final analysis, the chief obstacle on the road to the creation of a revolutionary party. The platonic or diplomatic partisans of the Fourth International who, like Sneevliet, the leader of the Dutch Revolutionary Socialist Party, demonstratively supported the POUM in its half-way measures, its indecisiveness and evasiveness, in short, in its centrism, took upon themselves the greatest responsibility. Revolution abhors centrism. Revolution exposes and annihilates centrism. In passing, revolution discredits the friends and attorneys of centrism. That is one of the most important lessons of the Spanish revolution.

The Problem of Arming

The Socialists and Anarchists who seek to justify their capitulation to Stalin by the necessity of paying for Moscow's weapons with principles and conscience simply lie and lie unskillfully. Of course, many of them would have preferred to disentangle themselves without murders and frame-ups. But every goal demands corresponding means. Beginning with April 1931, i.e. long before the military intervention of Moscow, the Socialists and Anarchists did everything in their power to check the proletarian revolution. Stalin taught them how to carry this work to its conclusion. They became Stalin's criminal accomplices only because they were his political co-thinkers.

Had the Anarchist leaders in the least resembled revolutionists, they would have answered the first piece of blackmail from Moscow not only by continuing the socialist offensive but by exposing Stalin's counter-revolutionary conditions before the world working class. They would have thus forced the Moscow bureaucracy to choose openly between the Socialist revolution and the dictatorship of Franco. The Thermidorian bureaucracy fears and hates revolution. But it also fears being strangled in a fascist ring. Besides, it depends on the workers. All indications are that Moscow would have been forced to supply arms and, possibly, at more reasonable prices.

But the world does not revolve round Stalinist Moscow. During a year and a half of civil war the Spanish war industry could and should have been strengthened and developed by converting a number of civilian plants to war production. This work was not carried out only because Stalin and his Spanish allies equally feared the initiative of the workers' organizations. A strong war industry would have become a powerful instrument in the hands of the workers. The leaders of the People's Front preferred to depend on Moscow.

It is precisely on this question that the perfidious role of the "People's Front" was very strikingly revealed. It thrust upon the workers' organizations the responsibility for the treacherous deals of the bourgeoisie with Stalin. Insofar as the Anarchists remained in the minority they could not, of course, immediately hinder the ruling block from assuming whatever obligations they pleased toward Moscow and the masters of Moscow: London and Paris. But without ceasing to be the best fighters on the front, they could and should have openly demarcated themselves from the betrayals and betrayers; they could and should have explained the real situation to the masses; mobilized them against the bourgeois government; augmented their own forces from day to day in order in the end to conquer power and with it the Moscow arms.

And what if Moscow, in the absence of a People's Front, should have refused to give arms altogether? And what, we answer to this, if the Soviet Union did not exist altogether in the world? Revolutions have been victorious up to this time not at all thanks to high and mighty foreign patrons who supplied them with arms. As a rule, counter-revolution enjoyed foreign

patronage. Must we recall the experience of the intervention of French, English, American, Japanese and other armies against the Soviets? The proletariat of Russia won over domestic reaction and foreign interventionists without military support from the outside. Revolutions succeed, in the first place, with the help of a bold social program which gives to the masses the possibility of seizing weapons that are on their territory, and disorganizing the army of the enemy. The Red Army seized French, English and American military supplies and drove the foreign expeditionary corps into the sea. Has this really been already forgotten?

If the armed workers and peasants, *i.e.* at the head of the so-called "republican" Spain, were headed by revolutionists and not cowardly agents of the bourgeoisie, the problem of arming would not in general have played a paramount role. The army of Franco, including the colonial Riffs and the soldiers of Mussolini, was not at all immune to revolutionary contagion. Surrounded on all sides by the conflagration of the Socialist uprising, the soldiers of fascism would have proved to be an insignificant magnitude. Not arms and not military "geniuses" were lacking in Madrid and Barcelona; what was lacking was a revolutionary party!

Conditions for Victory

The conditions for victory of the masses in a civil war against the army of exploiters are very simple in their essence.

1. The fighters of a revolutionary army must be clearly aware of the fact that they are fighting for their full social liberation and not for the reestablishment of the old ("democratic") forms of exploitation.

2. The workers and peasants in the rear of the revolutionary army as well as in the rear of the enemy must know and understand the same thing.

3. The propaganda on their own front as well as on the enemy front and in both rears must be completely permeated with the spirit of social revolution. The slogan: "First Victory, Then Reforms," is the slogan of all oppressors and exploiters from the Biblical kings down to Stalin.

4. Politics are determined by those classes and strata who participate in the struggle. The revolutionary masses must have a state apparatus which directly and immediately expresses their will. Only the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies can act as such an apparatus.

5. The revolutionary army must not only proclaim but immediately realize in life the more pressing measures of social revolution in the provinces won by them: The expropriation of provisions, manufactured articles and other stores on hand and the transfer of these to the needy; the redivision of shelter and housing in the interests of the toilers and especially of the families of the fighters; the expropriation of the land and agricultural inventory in the interests of the peasants; the establishment of workers' control and the Soviet power in place of the former bureaucracy.

6. Enemies of the socialist revolution, *i.e.* exploiting elements and their agents, even if masquerading as "democrats," "republicans," "Socialists" and "Anarchists" must be mercilessly driven out from the army.

7. At the head of each military unit must be placed commissars possessing the irreproachable authority of revolutionists and warriors.

8. In every military unit there must be a firmly-welded nucleus of the most self-sacrificing fighters, recommended by the workers' organizations. The members of this nucleus have but one privilege, namely: to be the first under fire.

9. The commanding corps of necessity includes at first many alien and unreliable elements among the personnel. Their testing, retesting and sifting must be carried through on the basis of combat experience, recommendations of commissars and testimonials of rank and file fighters. Coincident with this there must proceed an intense training of commanders drawn from the ranks of revolutionary workers.

10. The strategy of civil war must couple the rules of military art with the tasks of the social revolution. Not only in propaganda but in military operations it is necessary to take into account the social composition of the various military units of the enemy (bourgeois volunteers, mobilized peasants, or, as in Franco's case, colonial slaves); and in choosing lines of operation it is necessary to rigorously take into consideration the social structure of the corresponding territories (industrial regions, peasant regions, revolutionary or reactionary alike, regions of oppressed nationalities, etc.). In brief, revolutionary policy dominates over strategy.

11. Both the revolutionary government and the executive committee of the workers and peasants must know how to win the complete confidence of the army and of the toiling population.

12. Foreign policy must have as its main objective the awakening of the revolutionary consciousness of the workers, the exploited peasants and oppressed nationalities of the whole world.

Stalin Guaranteed the Conditions of Defeat

The conditions for victory, as we see, are perfectly plain. In their aggregate they bear the name of the socialist revolution. Not a single one of these conditions obtained in Spain. The basic reason is—the absence of a revolutionary party. Stalin tried, it is true, to transfer to the soil of Spain, the outward practices of Bolshevism: the Politburo, commissars, nuclei, GPU, etc. But he empties this form of its social content. He renounced the Bolshevik program and with it the Soviets as the necessary form for the revolutionary initiative of the masses. He placed the technique of Bolshevism at the service of bourgeois property. In his bureaucratic narrow-mindedness he imagined that "commissars" by themselves could guarantee victory. But the commissars of private property proved capable only of guaranteeing defeat.

The Spanish proletariat displayed first-rate military qualities. In its specific gravity in the country's economic life, in its political and cultural level, the Spanish proletariat stood in the first day of the revolution not below but above the Russian proletariat at the beginning of 1917. On the road to its victory, its own organizations stood as the chief obstacles. The commanding clique of Stalinists, in accordance with their counter-revolutionary function, consisted of hirelings, careerists, declassed elements and, generally, all types of social refuse. The representatives of other labor organizations—flabby reformists, Anarchist phrasemongers, helpless centrists of the POUM—grumbled, groaned, wavered, maneuvered, but in the end adapted themselves to the Stalinists. As a result of their joint activity the camp of social revolution—workers and peasants—proved to be subordinated to the bourgeoisie, or more correctly to its shadow. It was rendered nameless, spiritless and bled white. There was no lack of heroism on the part of the masses, nor of courage on the part of individual revolutionists. But the masses were left to their own resources while revolutionists remained disunited, without a program, without a plan of action. The "republican" military commanders were more concerned with crushing the social revolution than with scoring

military victories. The soldiers lost confidence in their commanders, the masses—in the government; the peasants stepped aside, the workers became exhausted, defeat followed defeat, demoralization grew apace. All this was not difficult to foresee from the beginning of the civil war. By setting itself the task of rescuing the capitalist regime, the People's Front doomed itself to military defeat. By turning Bolshevism on its head, Stalin succeeded completely in fulfilling the role of the grave digger of the revolution.

It ought to be added that the Spanish experience once again demonstrates that Stalin failed completely to understand either the October Revolution or the Russian Civil War. His slow-moving provincial mind lagged hopelessly behind the tempestuous march of events in 1917-1921. In those of his speeches and articles in 1917 where he expressed his own ideas, his later Thermidorian "doctrine" is fully implanted. In this sense Stalin in Spain in 1937 is the continuator of Stalin of the March 1917 Conference of the Bolsheviks. But in 1917 he only feared the revolutionary workers; whereas in 1937 he strangled them. The opportunist had become the executioner.

"Civil War in the Rear"

But, after all, victory over the governments of Caballero and Negrin would have necessitated a civil war in the rear of the Republican army!—the democratic philistine exclaims with horror. As if separate and apart from this in Republican Spain no civil war has ever existed, and at that the basest and most perfidious one—the war of the proprietors and exploiters against the workers and peasants. This uninterrupted war finds expression in the arrests and murders of revolutionists, the crushing of the mass movement, the disarming of the workers, the arming of bourgeois police, the abandoning of workers' detachments without arms and without help on the front and, finally, in the artificial restriction of the development of war industry. Each of these acts is a cruel blow to the front, direct military treason, dictated by the class interests of the bourgeoisie. But "democratic" philistines—including Stalinists, Socialists and Anarchists—regard the civil war of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, even in areas most closely adjoining the front, as a natural and inescapable war, having as its tasks the safeguarding of the "unity of the People's Front." On the other hand, the civil war of the proletariat against the "republican" counter-revolution is, in the eyes of the self-same philistine, a criminal, Fascist, Trotskyist war, disrupting . . . "the unity of the anti-fascist forces." Scores of Norman Thomases, Major Atlees, Otto Bauers, Zyromskys, Malraux and such petty peddlers of lies like Duranty and Louis Fischer spread this slavish wisdom throughout our planet. Meanwhile the government of the "People's Front" moves from Madrid to Valencia, from Valencia—to Barcelona.

If, as facts bear witness, only the socialist revolution is capable of crushing fascism, then on the other hand a successful uprising of the proletariat is conceivable only when the ruling classes are caught in the vise of greatest difficulties. However, the democratic philistines invoke precisely these difficulties as proof of the impermissibility of the proletarian uprising. Were the proletariat to wait for the democratic philistines to tell them the hour of their liberation, they would remain slaves forever. To teach the workers to recognize reactionary philistines under all their masks and to despise them regardless of the mask is the first and paramount duty of a revolutionist!

The dictatorship of the Stalinists over the republican camp is not long-lived in its essence. Should the defeats stemming

from the politics of the People's Front once more impel the Spanish proletariat to a revolutionary assault, this time successfully, the Stalinist clique will be swept away with an iron broom. But should Stalin—as is unfortunately the likelihood—succeed in bringing the work of a grave digger of the revolution to its conclusion, he will not even in this case earn thanks. The Spanish bourgeoisie needed him as executioner, but it has no need for him at all as patron or tutor. London and Paris on the one hand and Berlin and Rome on the other are in its eyes considerably far more solvent firms than Moscow. It is possible that Stalin himself wants to cover his traces in Spain before the final catastrophe; he thus hopes to unload the responsibility for the defeat on his closest allies. After this Litvinov will solicit Franco for the reestablishment of diplomatic relations. All this we have seen more than once.

However, even a complete military victory of the so-called republican army over General Franco would not signify the triumph of "democracy." The workers and peasants have twice placed bourgeois republicans and their left agents in power: in April 1931 and in February 1936. Both times the heroes of the People's Front surrendered the victory of the people to the most reactionary and the most serious representatives of the bourgeoisie. A third victory, gained by the generals of the People's Front, would signify their inevitable agreement with the fascist bourgeoisie on the bones of the workers and peasants. Such a regime will be nothing but a different form of military dictatorship perhaps without a monarchy and without the open domination of the Catholic Church.

Finally, it is possible that the partial victories of the republicans will be utilized by the "disinterested" Anglo-French intermediaries in order to reconcile the fighting camps. It is not difficult to understand that in the event of such a variant the final remnants of the democracy will be throttled in the fraternal embrace of the generals Miaja—the Communist!—and Franco—the fascist! Let me repeat once again: victory will go either to the socialist revolution or to fascism.

It is not excluded, by the way, that tragedy might at the last moment cede its place to farce. When the heroes of the People's Front have to flee their last capital they might before embarking on steamers and airplanes, perhaps proclaim a series of "socialist" reforms in order to leave a "good memory" with the people. But nothing will avail. The workers of the world will remember with hatred and contempt the parties that ruined the heroic revolution.

The tragic experience of Spain is a terrible—perhaps final—warning before still greater events, a warning addressed to all the advanced workers of the world. "Revolutions," as Marx said, "are the locomotives of history." They move faster than the thought of semi-revolutionary or quarter-revolutionary parties. Whoever lags behind falls under the wheels of the locomotive, and therewith—and this is the chief danger—the locomotive itself is also not infrequently wrecked. It is necessary to think out the problem of the revolution to the end, to its ultimate concrete conclusions. It is necessary to adjust policy to the basic laws of the revolution, *i.e.* to the movement of the embattled classes and not the prejudices or fears of the superficial petty-bourgeois groups who call themselves "people's" fronts, and every other kind of front. During revolution the line of least resistance is the line of greatest disaster. To fear "isolation" from the bourgeoisie is to incur isolation from the masses. Adaptation to the conservative prejudices of the labor aristocracy is the betrayal of the workers and the revolution. An excess of "caution" is the most baneful lack of caution. This is the chief lesson of the destruction of the most honest political

organization in Spain, namely, the centrist POUM. The parties and groups of the London Bureau obviously either do not wish or are incapable of drawing the necessary conclusions from the last warning of history. By this token they doom themselves.

By way of compensation a new generation of revolutionists is now being educated by the lessons of the defeats. It has in action verified the ignominious reputation of the Second International. It has plumbed the depths of the Third International's

downfall. It has learned how to judge the Anarchists, not by their words but by their deeds. It is a great inestimable school, paid for with the blood of countless fighters! The revolutionary cadres are now gathering only under the banner of the Fourth International. Born amid the roar of defeats, the Fourth International will lead the toilers to victory.

December 17, 1937

Coyoacan, Mexico

Socialism Reaffirmed—II.

By LILY ROY

(Continued from last issue)

Now, Mr. Masani cannot conjure away this fundamental fact by blandly saying that the Nazi state is a "third 'something,'" a new kind of state which he prefers not to call fascist but "totalitarian" and which he seeks to contrast with the capitalist state. We cannot help saying categorically that his alleged contrast is a piece of sheer terminological jugglery. To contrast the fascist state with the capitalist is to contrast a variant within a species with the species itself. For the essential fact about the fascist state is that it is only a particular form of the capitalist state, the form that it takes in the era of general capitalist decline. The fascist state is but the capitalist state rid of its democratic trappings. It is the capitalist state with the gloves off.

To define a state as capitalist or proletarian is to define it according to its nature, that is, its class nature. Of which class is it the instrument? The interests of which class does it protect and serve? These are the questions such a definition answers. To define a state as totalitarian is to define it not by its nature, but by its form; e.g. is it democratic or dictatorial? It will be plain to the reader, as it must have been plain to Mr. Masani, that the state of any given class can take any particular form, whether the state be capitalist or proletarian. Surely, Mr. Masani, you know this well. If you do, then why this fraudulent contrast? If you don't, then please stop making dissertations on the subject.

Reconciling the Irreconcilable

There is, as it happens, a very good reason why Mr. Masani indulges in the piece of verbal dexterity we have noted in his discussion of the subject of the state. The reason is that it is necessary for his whole case to prove that the Nazi state and the Soviet state are states of the same nature. Unless he can prove this contention, the entire managerial thesis which we referred to in the first section of this brochure and which Mr. Masani takes over from James Burnham wholesale and retail, falls to the ground. For the very basis of the Burnham argument is that the Russian and the German states are states of the same nature, "managerial states."

Let us then enquire whether this averment is true. In order to discover this let us examine briefly the Burnham-Masani definition of this new kind of state. Here is how Mr. Masani puts the matter:

As defined by Burnham, a managerial state is neither a capitalist nor a socialist state, but one in which the bureaucrats who run the administration and the managers who run industry hold power. The similarity between the managerial state and the socialist state is that in both private property in the instruments of production, distribution and exchange is either abolished or defunctionalized and all industry and economic enterprises are owned or controlled by the state. The

difference between the managerial state and the socialist state is that in a socialist state the state itself belongs to the community or the common people while in the managerial state the state and its "nationalized economy" are not controlled by the people but by a small clique of bureaucrats or managers who constitute the dictatorship.

Doesn't it all sound clear and persuasive until it is analyzed? Take Germany for a beginning. Is "private property in the means of production, distribution and exchange" abolished in contemporary Germany? Not even Mr. Masani would dare aver that! Is it then defunctionalized? Are the Krupps and Von Bohlens and the rest, the armament kings and industrial and banking magnates of Germany, defunctionalized? That is to say, have they been left with their private property only to be deprived of their profits (for profit-making is as we have seen, the one specific function of the capitalist)? Have they, Mr. Masani? or have they not? If Mr. Masani would only read his *Economist* for the right facts instead of the wrong opinions, he will find that the one thing that the Fascist state did was to restore the profitability of these very industries. Something is indeed going wrong with Mr. Masani's "managerial state"—at least in Germany.

As to the other aspect of the matter—are "all industry and economic enterprises" in Germany owned by the state? Not even Mr. Masani would dare aver that. Then are they controlled by the state? For the sake of limiting the argument let us allow to Mr. Masani that this is even so. But—and this is the nub of the question—if they are indeed controlled by the state, then, in whose interests does the state control them? Yes, Mr. Masani; in the interests of whom, i.e. of which class? Mr. Masani cannot get away with phrases like "the interests of the community or the nation," for the nation is an arena of the class struggle and the state is an instrument in the class struggle. Mr. Masani knows this well as also the fact, since he quotes Lenin, that Lenin proved in his *State and Revolution* that the state is the coercive apparatus of the exploiting class for keeping in subjection the exploited class. The exploiting class in Germany is the capitalist class, and the exploited class the working class—this we have seen. Accordingly the Nazi state is the state of the German capitalist class. And if the German Nazi state indeed controls "all industry and economic enterprises," then it exercises this control in the interests of the German capitalist class. And that precisely is why German capitalist private property has not been abolished by the state or defunctionalized by it. For no class, Mr. Masani, not even your trustee capitalists, will use its state power to legislate itself out of existence. There never has been such a case in history, and there never will be. For classes act along the line of their interests and not against them.

The Nazi state is thus not "a new kind of state" at all: it

is the old capitalist state in a new brown uniform. What then of the Soviet Union? Let us say at once that if you would only cut out the two phrases "or defunctionalized" and "or controlled" from the Burnham-Masani definition of their managerial state, then the definition would be an exact description of contemporary Soviet reality. The contemporary Soviet state is certainly one in which "the bureaucrats who run the administration and the managers who run industry hold power," in which "private property in the instruments of production . . . is abolished," in which not "all" but the decisive sections of "industry and economic enterprises are owned . . . by the state," and in which "the state and its 'nationalized economy' are not controlled by the people but by a small clique of bureaucrats or managers." All this certainly prevails in the Soviet Union today; and the Soviet Union is certainly "a new kind of state." But—and that is the whole point—it is also a state whose *class nature* bears not the slightest resemblance to the Nazi state.

The Soviet state is based on the violent overthrow of the capitalist class; the Nazi state on the violent defense of it. The Soviet state is based on the abolition of capitalist private property; the Nazi state on the protection of it. The Soviet state is based on the state ownership of the means of industrial production, banking and foreign trade; the Nazi state on its private ownership. In other words, between the two is the whole wide unbridgeable gulf that was dug by the October Revolution. How then can you assimilate them? You cannot—not even with the managerial thesis.

Nevertheless, the managerial thesis does seek to assimilate them. And it does so not by an honest analysis of reality but by a little trick of language designed to obscure a heavy shift in meaning. According to Burnham-Masani, in the managerial state private property is "abolished or defunctionalized" and the means of production are "owned or controlled" by the state. According to them, further, private property is abolished in Russia and defunctionalized in Germany, while industry is owned by the state in Russia and controlled by the state in Germany. And according to them, still further, there is no essential difference between the two. For, as Mr. Masani repeatedly insists, "what matters most today is not ownership so much as control of the instruments of production." So, to defunctionalize private property is as good as to abolish it. But is it? Certainly not, if the defunctionalization meant here is the same as the defunctionalization through trusteeship or Nazidom that we have analysed fully previously—for this defunctionalization of the capitalist by Mr. Masani proved to be nothing but the confirmation of the capitalist in his specific function. If the defunctionalization meant here, however, is something else, then all we can say is that Mr. Masani has not even hinted at it, still less explained it. It is the same with control and ownership. By their juxtaposition Mr. Masani suggests that control by the Nazi state is as good as ownership by the Soviet state. But is it? Certainly not. For the control of the Nazi state is exercised on behalf of the capitalist class, as we have seen, while the ownership of the Soviet state was established by the destruction of the capitalists.

It is plain from the foregoing that the Burnham-Masani attempt to assimilate the inassimilable has failed, and that the managerial definition, if it covers anything honestly, covers only the degenerate workers state which is the contemporary Soviet Union. There is, however, a deep-going reason for the attempt by Mr. Masani to take over Burnham's attempt to equate what cannot be equated. The reason is that, if you can only prove that the Nazi state and the Soviet state are of one and the same nature, then it would follow that the whole social process

which brought the Soviet state into existence was and is unnecessary. The Soviet state was brought into being by carrying the class struggle to the point of insurrection and civil war, as a means to the political overthrow of the capitalist class, the establishment of the workers dictatorship and the abolition of capitalist private property through its vesting in the new state. That was the process by which the only new kind of state that followed on the capitalist state on our planet was brought into existence. But if the new kind of state which was thus brought into being is no different in nature from the Nazi state which was brought into existence not by revolution but in fact by the counter-revolution—i. e. not by the victorious uprising of the workers against the capitalists but by the bloody suppression of the workers by the capitalists, not by the abolition of private property but in order to protect it—then it is easy to urge, as Mr. Masani expressly urges in his book, that the carrying forward of the class struggle, the establishment of the workers dictatorship and the "nationalization" of the decisive means of production are simply unnecessary for the bringing to birth of this new kind of state and that a little "love and cooperation" (such as the Nazis displayed, no doubt) is all that is necessary for the achievement of this object. Hence the subtle sophistries of the managerial thesis.

Mr. Masani would, no doubt, retort that he does not depend merely on the managerial thesis but also on Russian fact. We shall not reply that theory is not produced in a vacuum, that indeed it is fact which has tattered his fine-spun theory; we shall, instead, follow him into the realms of Russian experience in which he delights to dwell, in order to discover whether even on the facts he alleges the conclusions he makes are warranted. We shall do so—and after that we shall leave Mr. Masani alone.

Nearly two-thirds of Mr. Masani's book is concerned with Russia. He has, you see, visited Russia twice—which was just once too often, since he passed from hope on the first occasion to disillusionment on the second, and thereby also from socialism to renegadism. However that may be, he impresses us that he discovered on his second visit what he has plainly discovered but lately from books and what indeed he could have discovered easily long before 1937 from Trotsky's books, namely, that Stalinist Russia is drifting away from October back towards capitalism. From all of which he draws the grand conclusion—socialism has failed and Marxism must be revised.

The question arises: Has socialism failed? Which raises the further question: What is socialism? To this last question we shall not answer with a quotation from one of the classical authorities on the subject, namely, Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky. We shall instead proceed on Mr. Masani's own statement that "the socialist society was to be *classless, democratic and international*" (his italics). We shall proceed on this statement; but we shall also take leave to remind him that the term "democratic" can really apply not to the stage of socialism but to the transition stage prior to it.

[The socialist society is, as we shall demonstrate, stateless insofar as "state" connotes a coercive apparatus of class rule. To apply to it the term "democratic" is therefore wrong; for democracy itself is a form of government, i. e. a form of class rule. We thus have, for instance, bourgeois democracy and proletarian democracy. Bourgeois democracy, whatever the claims made for it and whatever the illusions created by the universal franchise and parliamentary systems, is in the ultimate analysis democracy only for the capitalist class which rules over the other classes it exploits. Proletarian democracy is similarly democracy for the proletariat, and connotes the *political* rule of the working class. But this rule, it is to be stressed, is on the one hand not a rule of exploiters over the ex-

plotted—the proletariat cannot exploit itself—and on the other not the rule of the minority over the majority but of the majority over the minority. Proletarian democracy is thus the widest form of democracy possible in history, for, beyond it, there can be no question of class rule at all, and therefore of any form of government.]

Why has there to be a transition stage? Because socialism is the end product of a whole social process of which the proletarian revolution and the creation of the workers state are only the beginning. You do not go to bed under capitalism one night, sleep through a revolution of which you are not even a spectator, but, of course, a subsequent admirer, and wake next morning in a socialist society to sing, and Mr. Masani says he sang, following Wordsworth:

“Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
But to be young was very heaven.”

No, Mr. Masani, that is not how it is. On the contrary, a process occupying a whole historical epoch is involved in the bringing to being of the socialist society. To begin with it is necessary to bring into being the essential pre-requisite of the socialist society, the workers state. And since, as you yourself have pointed out rightly, the socialist society is an international society, its political prerequisite is the international revolution resulting in the international workers state. This international revolution will, by reason of the uneven development of capitalism, take the form of an interlinked series of revolutions in various countries, the totality of which will constitute the international proletarian revolution. This process will itself occupy a whole historical era, the era which began with the Russian revolution of 1917, the era which Lenin termed the era of proletarian revolution and revolutionary wars.

Transition to Socialism

It is plain that in this era the workers state, or rather states, will have many repressive functions by reason of the necessity of protecting the revolution against remnants of the old propertied classes from within, and against foreign capitalist attack. It is also plain, however, that even at this stage the workers state will also be considerably engaged in the administration of things, *viz.* the state property. And it is worth noting that from the beginning the workers state shows this substantial difference from the capitalist state, which is basically a coercive apparatus and only in a very minor sense an apparatus for the administration of things, *e. g.* the Post Office.

When the international revolution is completed and the world proletarian state comes into existence, the era of proletarian revolution and revolutionary wars gives way to the era of socialist development. On the basis of the world proletarian dictatorship, which itself arises on the basis of the already existing capitalist-created world economy, a planned and unified world economy will be brought into being, and not merely the productive forces (as under capitalism) but also production itself will be developed to levels hitherto unknown.

In this period, it is plain, the workers state will necessarily lose a considerable proportion of its repressive functions, for the entire army and the apparatus of diplomacy will have become unnecessary, as also some proportion of the police inasmuch as the threat of counter-revolution from the expropriated classes will have become insignificant. The state will now substantially be concerned with the administration of things rather than the government of men. Substantially, but not completely. For in this period distribution will still be to an appreciable extent according to *work* (payment according to work) and not according to need. And since this economic differentiation will be flowing not from the natural inequality of human being and

human being but from the artificial inequality induced by *relative and diminishing* scarcity, the state will still be necessary, though to a rapidly diminishing extent, as a coercive apparatus.

As production increases, however, as the material things on which human life and civilization are based are produced in increasing abundance, the very need for distribution according to work progressively disappears and the actual possibility of distribution according to need comes into existence. “To each according to his need”—that part of the slogan descriptive of communist society is progressively realized. And as the possibility of distribution according to need grows, *pari passu*, [with equal pace] the need for the apparatus of force, the “state,” which protects the earlier form of distribution also disappears. That is to say, “the state withers away” completely. And since, in the meantime, as Mr. Masani himself concedes, human nature itself will have undergone a transformation; and since also, by reason of technical development and the vast extension of leisure, work itself will have become a pleasant pastime instead of a laborious task; mankind will have learned to work for society according to ability. The other half also of the slogan descriptive of communist society will thus have been translated into reality—“from each according to his ability.” And this self-acting society of associated producers will also be classless inasmuch as its members will have no differential relation to the means of production, distribution and exchange. Property will no longer belong to the state, which is the instrument of a class, but to the community, which is now classless; and the state itself, if the term be permissible for an apparatus of the nature that it will be, will be concerned not with the government of men but the administration of things.

That is the socialist society of the classic conception, and that, also according to the classic conception, is how it comes into being. Can we then proceed to “reconsider” Marxism on the footing that socialism has been tried and found wanting? We cannot; for, to begin with, it has not been tried at all.

To which Mr. Masani would probably reply: this is, no doubt, all very interesting; but didn't Lenin and Trotsky, when they “made the Revolution of October 1917” (we quote Mr. Masani) declare “that they would, along with Czarism, abolish capitalism and usher in the socialist society?” And doesn't Stalin claim today that he has built it there already? It is true that Lenin and Trotsky did say so—rightly; and it is also true that Stalin claims so—only wrongly. But what did Lenin and Trotsky mean when they said the revolution would “usher in” the socialist society? This becomes clear from another remark of Mr. Masani's, *viz.* that according to Lenin and Trotsky, the Russian Revolution “was to be the forerunner of the World Revolution.” In other words, the Russian Revolution was but the curtain-raiser or first act in the drama of the international proletarian revolution which would bring into being the world proletarian state which would usher in the socialist society. That is what Lenin and Trotsky meant, and that is what you will find they always taught if you read the *whole* of Lenin and Trotsky instead of an odd scrap or two torn out of their context. And that precisely is why Stalin is wrong when he says he has built “Socialism” in Russia, or even when he says that you can build socialism in Russia alone. The theory of “socialism in one country,” centrist Stalin's eclectic product, is false to the core and indeed a contradiction in terms; for, as Mr. Masani himself has pointed out for the benefit of the world in general and of Stalinist falsifiers in particular, the socialist society is not national but international.

So far so good. But we are sorry to have to state that even with the term “international” Mr. Masani plays still another

of his favorite verbal tricks. "The socialist society," says Mr. Masani to begin with, and rightly, "was to be . . . international." This on page 11. We turn to page 12, and we find him saying of his experiences in Russia in 1927: "There was no mistaking . . . the spirit of fraternity, of international solidarity and of good fellowship that prevailed." And on page 14, regarding what he found in Russia in 1937: "Gone was the spirit of international brotherhood." Do you see the trick: the use of the same term with a complete shift in meaning? At the beginning he was talking of an international society, i. e. a society which was international in its political and economic basis. At the end, he is talking of a society which is international in *spirit* and in *outlook*. And because Russia has lost the latter spirit and outlook, we are asked to conclude that the former society, which never came into existence, has failed. Only Mr. Masani can prove so profoundly futurist a thesis: the failure of a society which has not yet come into existence.

Let us now turn to Mr. Masani's specific revisions. Mr. Masani informs us:

There are at least four major assumptions of Marxism,—there may be more—which, I believe, need to be reconsidered. The first of these is that the abolition of private property and its nationalization will *automatically* bring in economic democracy and a classless society. It has now been shown in Russia that it need do nothing of the sort. (Masani's italics.)

Please note Mr. Masani's own italicized word—"automatically." Note it, because no Marxist has ever held the position which Mr. Masani here attributes to Marxism in order to revise it. What Marxism teaches is, on the one hand, that the abolition of private property and its vesting in the workers state is the necessary prerequisite for bringing in (through a long process, occupying a whole era, as we have seen) "economic democracy" and the classless society; and on the other, that the abolition of private property and its *socialization* will signify the coming into being of "economic democracy" and the classless society. In other words, "nationalization" by the workers state is a stage, and a *necessary* stage, on the road to socialization; and just as socialization itself signifies the absence of classes, nationalization signifies not their absence but precisely their presence. Nationalization is the act of vesting in the state; socialization is the process of vesting in the community. You cannot vest in the community if classes exist; for, in that case, whatever you may term it in form, it will in fact be a vesting in the dominant class. You vest in the state precisely because classes exist; and statification is the method by which the working class takes into its hands the property of which it has expropriated the capitalists. This is not to bring in the classless society; it is to create the prerequisite for bringing it into being: prerequisite, because, without the abolition of private property, you cannot free the productive forces of society from the fetters of private profit which obstructs that further development of them which is essential to the building of socialism.

And what has Russia proved on *this* point? Precisely what Marxists anticipated: that the productive forces of society, when freed from the fetters of private property (which is but a means to private profit), are rendered capable of unprecedented development. We shall not here set out to describe Russian achievements in this sphere, for Mr. Masani admits them: admits them, however, with a qualification with which it is necessary for us to deal. Mr. Masani says:

. . . the Soviet regime has . . . big achievements to its credit. It has industrialized the country, put agriculture on a sounder footing, increased material prosperity and spread literacy at a pace which other

countries have hitherto found impossible of achievement. But there is nothing, specifically socialist about these achievements. These are the objectives of all efficient capitalist and Fascist states.

There you are: the old game of verbal trickery once more. "There is nothing specifically socialist about these *achievements*. These are the *objectives* of all efficient capitalist and Fascist states." Between "achievements" and "objectives" Mr. Masani, is the whole wide difference between dreaming and doing. The capitalist state, which protects private property, dreams of doing these things, but cannot. The workers state, which abolishes private property, *does* them. Why? Because only the workers state can. *Only* the workers state, because it has removed the capitalist fetters on the productive forces.

From the "reconsideration" of "nationalization" by the workers state, Mr. Masani passes to the reconsideration of the workers state itself. Here are his own words:

The second Marxist assumption that needs reviewing is that the Dictatorship of the Proletariat (that is, of the Communist Party on behalf of the proletariat) is a possible and indeed a necessary transition stage to socialism. The theory was that having served its purpose the dictatorship would evaporate, and indeed, as Lenin following Engels put it, "the state will then wither away." . . . In Russia where it is claimed by the Soviet Government that a classless society has already been achieved, that Government shows not the slightest tendency to relax its complete stranglehold on individual liberty of every kind, much less to "wither away."

Let us look at this passage a little closely. It starts with a definition of the proletarian dictatorship: "the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, *that is*, of the Communist Party on behalf of the proletariat." We are sorry to have to say so, but Mr. Masani is once again at his old game of setting up a false idol in order to knock it down. Marxism does say that the proletarian dictatorship is a necessary (and not merely possible) stage on the road to socialism. Marxism does say that; and we shall in due course show why. But Marxism does *not* say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the Communist Party on behalf of the proletariat. That, Mr. Masani, is your definition; and a false one at that.

That is not all. Mr. Masani goes on to say, in the above passage, that in Russia where it is *claimed* by the Soviet Government that a classless society exists, the state shows no signs of withering. This, in fact, is the reason why he wishes to reconsider the whole question of the proletarian dictatorship. But, Mr. Masani, when you seek to reconsider theory you must do so not on *claims* but on *facts*. And the fact is that, as you have yourself shown in your book, *the Soviet Government's claim is false*. The Soviet society is *not* a classless society; and if you are honest about theory, that is the *fact* on which you must proceed and not on claims which you yourself know to be false. That is the *scientific* approach to the question, as distinguished from the *propagandist* approach.

Let us then look into the question honestly for Mr. Masani's benefit. What is the dictatorship of the proletariat? It is precisely what it states it is: the rule of the working *class* over other classes. This dictatorship the working class exercises through its state, the workers state: the state which it sets up to administer its collective affairs and to manage and defend its collective property. This state it controls politically through the Soviets, *i. e.* the democratic organs of working class struggle and rule. In other words, the proletarian dictatorship connotes, among other things, also proletarian democracy. Should proletarian democracy be undermined or overthrown, the proletariat would lose its *political* control over the state.

But this loss of political control does not, by itself, suffice to exhaust the dictatorship of its class content. For, the dicta-

torship of the proletariat connotes not only the proletarian democracy but also, primarily, a specific set of property relations. So long as these property relations remain intact, the state remains a workers state, though a degenerate one.

And this is the position in the Soviet Union today. The administrative and managerial personnel whom the toilers, through their Soviets, appointed to administer the state and to

manage the state property, have shaken themselves free of the toilers, and indeed converted the Soviets, the trade unions and the Communist Party itself from instruments of the working class into instruments of their own bureaucratic rule. In other words, the bureaucracy has *politically* expropriated the working class.

[To Be Continued]

International Notes

India

The Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India and Ceylon, official section of the *Fourth International*, held its first All-India Conference in September 20-25, 1944. This conference convened as scheduled "somewhere in India" despite the bestial repressions and conditions of illegality imposed upon our Indian co-thinkers by the British despots whose colonial rule is comparable to the regime of the Nazis.

The First Representative Conference marks a great forward step in the development of the Indian Trotskyists whose unified organization was formed in May 1942 at a conference representing the Revolutionary Socialist League of Bengal, the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of the United Provinces and Behar, the Lanka Sama Samaja Party of Ceylon, and other Trotskyist groups. (Documents relating to the 1942 Founding Conference were published in *Fourth International* for March, April and October 1942.)

In reporting the work of the All-Indian Conference, the editors of *Permanent Revolution*, theoretical organ of the Indian party, note with well-merited pride that:

"Representatives from every unit of the Party in India and Ceylon attended, despite all the difficulties. What these units are, none will expect us to announce. Suffice it to say, therefore, that the attendance reflected the All-India character of the organization even at its present stage of development."

The three main questions on the conference agenda were: 1) The Political Situation in India; 2) The International Situation; and 3) Party Organization.

On the Indian question the Conference adopted a comprehensive resolution, the text of which was published in the October 1944 *Fourth International*. This resolution, "reviews the impact of the war on the Indian economy and on the different social classes in India, outlines the changes and development in the attitude of the Indian bourgeoisie to British imperialism during the war, analyzes the course and consequences of the August (1942) struggle and the causes of its failure, examines the meaning and significance of the terms offered to British imperialism by Ghandiji since his release, characterizes the nature and role of the major political parties in India, estimates the likely effect of a Congress-Government settlement on the major political parties and on the mass mood and mass trends, and finally, on the basis of these, defines the political tasks of the Party in the period immediately ahead." (*Permanent Revolution*, October-December 1944.)

The majority of the Conference adopted a separate resolution on "The Pakistan Slogan" and also discussed a "Report on Separatist Tendencies in India" which the Conference decided not to adopt but "to circulate for further discussion and investigation."

With regard to the international situation, the Conference adopted two resolutions, one on the Soviet Union and the other relating to China. The Russian resolution takes into account the altered military situation and the consequent need for the revolutionists to adjust their tactics, and advocates "the intensified prosecution of the class struggle (in the non-Soviet territories occupied by the Red Army) regardless of the military consequences to the Red Army." The resolution further points out the danger of capitalist restoration in the USSR which is implicit in the Kremlin's policy of utilizing the Red Army as a police agency for the protection of capitalist property in the non-Soviet areas.

The second resolution on "China in the World War" represents a departure from the position expounded by the *Fourth International*. It declares that "by reasons of the interlocking of the Sino-Japanese War with the Second Imperialist World War, the subordination of Chungking's struggle to the reactionary war of the Anglo-American imperialists, and the conversion of the Chungking regime into the channel of Anglo-American economic penetration and political control, the Chungking-led war against Japan has been denuded of its progressive content and cannot therefore be supported by proletarian revolutionaries." (*Idem.*) The resolution does not deny that the "war of Chungking China against Japan" is *progressive*, but it maintains that this "progressive war" has become transformed into a "subordinate element of no great importance in the all-embracing general imperialist conflict in the Pacific." This is precisely what must be proved. But the facts and arguments adduced in the resolution scarcely do so. For example, one of the arguments advanced to demonstrate the complete subordination of China's war to Anglo-American control is the "creation of the Stilwell Command." However, the incident of the Stilwell ouster could be utilized with far more justification to demonstrate just the contrary. Nor is the issue settled by citing the reactionary character of Chiang Kai-shek's regime and its subservience to the Allies. What is decisive is not the character of the Chungking regime—which has not essentially altered throughout the struggle—but the actual degree of independence retained by China in her progressive war against the Japanese imperialists.

Up to now it has been—and remains—the position of the *Fourth International* that China's war has retained sufficient independence from the imperialists, despite the latter's aim to "interlock" and completely dominate the struggle. We see as yet no valid reasons for any change in policy.

On the organization question, as the editors of *Permanent Revolution* report, the Conference "first reviewed the past on the basis of a report presented by the Provisional Central Committee. It then adopted a comprehensive resolution, entitled 'Organizational Tasks of the Party in the Present Period,' in which the present conditions of the Party was analyzed and its organizational policy in the period ahead defined."

In conclusion they correctly state the following:

"That a young party, working underground in conditions of the most thoroughgoing imperialist repression, should have succeeded in holding a Conference of this nature is a testimony not only to its vitality but also to its adherence to the principles of democratic centralism and to its determination to carry through its historic task of building that revolutionary party of the Indian proletariat on whose timely creation the success of the Indian Revolution depends."

Cuba

In December 1944 the Fourth Congress of the CTC (Cuban Workers' Federation), the Cuban trade unions' central organization, took place in Havana. In August 1943 *Fourth International* had reported to its readers on the Third Congress of the CTC.

Between the two congresses many things had happened. During the electoral campaign for the presidency, in the first half of 1944, the Stalinists conducted the most rabid campaign for Batista's candidate against the bourgeois-liberal Grau San Martin, accusing him of being connected with the Cuban and Spanish fascists.

Grau San Martin was elected by a large popular vote against Batista's straw-man. Many believed that the wind of defeat would blow away the Stalinists. However, strong political realities saved them.

Grau was confronted with the problems of power. He had made his peace with Washington, and his task, from now on, was to make the workers forget the demagogic promises he had made during the electoral campaign. That campaign against the rotten regime of Batista, had unloosed many hopes and aspirations among the Cuban people. Tied to Washington and Wall Street, Grau could hardly do anything to satisfy them. He had to look around for reactionary

props, and, as a matter of course, the Stalinists came in very handy for that. Thus, a "holy alliance" came to the world.

In the past the struggle between the Stalinists and the "autenticos" (members of Grau's party), among whom there are many workers, had been bitter. In the struggle the "autenticos" had found faithful allies in our Cuban co-thinkers, the Workers' Revolutionary Party. The Stalinists had not stopped at physical attacks against the "autenticos", and had killed quite a few of their leaders, including Sandalio Junco, a trade union

leader who was very popular among Cuban workers.

However, political realities are stronger than anything else, and Grau needed the Stalinists as badly as they needed him. Some go-betweens, discredited Stalinist stooges inside the "autentico" party, laid the groundwork, and the alliance soon was realized. The first public manifestation was the Fourth Congress of the CTC.

At that Congress any and every voice of opposition was stifled by the coalition between the Grau government and the Stalinists. A good part

of the "autentico" trade unionists, suddenly betrayed to the Stalinists by their own leaders and unable to make their voice heard at the congress, manifested their opposition and their disgust either by walking out, or abstaining from voting.

It is high time for the Cuban workers to draw the balance of their support of the bourgeois-liberal Grau San Martin. Nothing good can be expected from that quarter. They have to organize themselves on a class basis. That road is the road of our Cuban comrades, of their Workers' Revolutionary Party.

The Red Army in Eastern Europe

For the information of our readers we reprint below the text of the resolution adopted by the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India and Ceylon, Indian section of the Fourth International, at its First Representative Conference, September 20-25, 1944.

* * *

The Red Army which is entering Eastern Europe is continuing its progressive task of destroying the German war machine which is today the spearhead of armed imperialist intervention against the USSR. Further, in these territories, the destruction of the German military administration and its civil satellites, and particularly the entry of the Red Army, will give a powerful impetus to the revolutionary movement. For these reasons, proletarian revolutionaries will not in any way modify *the unconditional support* given hitherto to the Red Army in its actions against the forces of imperialism, as the Red Army leaves Russian territory in pursuit of the German army.

The entry of the Red Army into these territories will release latent forces and give such an impetus to the revolutionary movement as to create a pre-revolutionary situation in Eastern Europe, the heightening of which is of inestimable importance for world revolutionary perspectives. The reactionary Soviet bureaucracy is bound to come into conflict from the beginning with the revolutionary movement, and to seek to suppress it in its own interests. Indeed, the increasingly reactionary foreign policies of the Kremlin and its open disavowal of the intention to change the social order in any territory invaded, the pacts and alliances made with Allied imperialism, in particular the agreement to hand over systematically to the capitalist provisional government all reconquered territory in Czechoslovakia, and finally the plans to join the Allied imperialists in policing the postwar world, are consistent with counter-revolutionary actions on the widest scale in the case that a wide revolutionary upsurge follows the liberation of Eastern Europe from the Nazi yoke. The military defense of the Soviet Union is for us subordinate to the needs of the international revolution. The struggle of the workers in Eastern Europe in the coming period calls for our *fullest support*, regardless of the effect of the latter on the military defense of the Soviet Union (which we continue to support), since there can be no question in the present pre-revolutionary situation of "partial economic struggles" of the workers which do not have revolutionary perspectives.

In the case that the workers' struggles in Eastern Europe reach revolutionary heights, the precise actions of the Soviet bureaucracy cannot be specified beforehand, but it is certain that the Red Army will be brought into conflict with the devel-

oping revolution, either to crush it completely or to bureaucratize the social conquests made.

If the state power in the invaded territories is maintained by the Soviet bureaucracy, and bourgeois property relations are maintained unchanged, as at the moment in Rumania (a policy tantamount to the Red Army acting as the instrument of the Anglo-American imperialists), the main task in these territories will be, not the defense of the Soviet Union, but the intensified prosecution of the class struggle regardless of the military consequences to the Red Army. The progressive degeneration of the workers' state during the war, and the growing dependence of the Soviet bureaucracy on Anglo-American imperialism, as reflected in its increasingly reactionary foreign policies and declarations, do not in any way change our policy of support of the military defense of the Soviet Union. But the actual importance of this task is completely subordinate to the needs of the advancing European revolution, of which the struggles of the East European workers in the present pre-revolutionary situation are but the prelude.

The prolonged military occupation by the Red Army of the territories invaded would compel the Soviet bureaucracy to gear the capitalist economies of the occupied territories more and more completely with the socialist economy of the Soviet Union. Sooner or later it will be faced with the unpostponable necessity to carry through the expropriation of the landowners and the statification of the means of production. This will be so, not because the bureaucracy remains true to the socialist program, but because, despite the pressure of Anglo-American imperialism, it is not capable of sharing its power and privileges with the old ruling classes of the occupied territory. Inasmuch as Stalin's Bonapartist dictatorship is based not on private property but on state property, the holding of power by the bureaucracy should, in the nature of the case, result in the abolition of private property, so as thus to bring the regime of the territories concerned into accord with the regime of the USSR. Should the bureaucracy under these circumstances continue to maintain bourgeois property relations in these areas, a possibility made extremely probable due to the increasing dependence, as a result of the war, of the Soviet bureaucracy on Anglo-American imperialism, this failure would have a deep-going principled character and become a starting-point for a new chapter in the history of the Soviet regime; and consequently a starting-point for a new appraisal on our part of the nature of the Soviet Union. That is to say, should the bureaucracy continue to maintain bourgeois property relations under these circumstances, this would be the starting-point of the capitalist overturn in the Soviet Union.

Books on Socialism and the Labor Movement

Books and Pamphlets by Leon Trotsky

IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM240 pages, cloth	2.00
THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AFTER LENIN357 pages, cloth	2.00
FASCISM 48 pages, paper	.15
LESSONS OF OCTOBER125 pages, cloth	1.00
WHITHER FRANCE160 pages, cloth	1.00
STALINISM AND BOLSHEVISM	40 pages, paper	.10
IN DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET UNION 40 pages, paper	.10
THEIR MORALS AND OURS	.. 48 pages, paper	.20
WAR AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL 36 pages, paper	.10
LEON SEDOFF 32 pages, paper	.10

Documents of the Fourth International

FOUNDING CONFERENCE OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL	..127 pages, paper	.25
MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL ON THE IMPERIALIST WAR AND THE PROLE- TARIAN REVOLUTION 24 pages, paper	.05
MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL TO THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS OF INDIA 24 pages, paper	.05

Pamphlets on the Negro Struggle

THE STRUGGLE FOR NEGRO EQUALITY by John Saunders and Albert Parker 48 pages, paper	.10
NEGROES IN THE POST-WAR WORLD by Albert Parker 16 pages, paper	.05

Pamphlets on the Minneapolis Trial

SOCIALISM ON TRIAL by James P. Cannon112 pages, paper	.10
IN DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM by Albert Goldman 95 pages, paper	.10
WHO ARE THE 18 PRISONERS IN THE MINNE- APOLIS LABOR CASE? 32 pages, paper	.10
WHY WE ARE IN PRISON 56 pages, paper	.10
DEFENSE POLICY IN THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIAL by Grandizo Munis and James P. Cannon 64 pages, paper	.20

Books and Pamphlets by James P. Cannon

THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN TROTSKYISM280 pages, cloth	2.75
THE STRUGGLE FOR A PROLETARIAN PARTY320 pages, cloth	2.00
SOCIALISM ON TRIAL112 pages, paper	.10
THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION	.. 30 pages, paper	.10
END OF THE COMINTERN 36 pages, paper	.10
MEMORIAL ADDRESS "TO THE MEMORY OF THE OLD MAN" 16 pages, paper	.05

Pamphlets by Albert Goldman

IN DEFENSE OF SOCIALISM	.. 95 pages, paper	.10
THE ASSASSINATION OF LEON TROTSKY 74 pages, paper	.15

Other Books on Socialism and the Labor Movement

AMERICAN WORKERS NEED A LABOR PARTY by Joseph Hansen 48 pages, paper	.15
FASCISM AND BIG BUSINESS by Daniel Guerin376 pages, paper	1.00
MARITIME by Frederick J. Lang182 pages, paper	1.00
YOUR STANDARD OF LIVING by C. Charles 32 pages, paper	.05
TRADE UNION PROBLEMS by Farrell Dobbs 44 pages, paper	.10
WARTIME CRIMES OF BIG BUSINESS by George Breitman 16 pages, paper	.05
FROM LENIN TO STALIN by Victor Serge112 pages, paper	.50
RUSSIA 20 YEARS AFTER by Victor Serge310 pages, cloth	2.50
REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN SPAIN by Felix Morrow208 pages, paper	.50
THE CASE OF LEON TROTSKY The Dewey Commission640 pages, paper	2.00
WHY DID THEY CONFESS? 30 pages, paper	.10

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.