

June 1940

Fourth International

The Monthly Magazine of the Socialist Workers Party

MASS SLAUGHTER

A New Stage in the War

An Editorial

LEON TROTSKY

Balance Sheet of the Finnish Events

- FBI and the Unions *Farrell Dobbs*
Pathology of Renegacy *James P. Cannon*
Presidential Campaign *George Novack*
Lenin and Luxemburg *Walter Held*
"Science"—Burnham's Style *Jarvis Gerland*

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

Our appeal in the May issue of *Fourth International* for new subscriptions, which must be obtained in order to secure second class mailing rights, was met by all the branches with an enthusiastic drive that has poured subs into our office.

From coast to coast comrades have written in telling us about their plans to answer the challenge of the deserters who stole the *New International*. At forums, street meetings, house to house campaigns, and socials, a special campaign for subscriptions is being conducted. Additional newsstands are being contacted in order to widen the distribution of the magazine.

Many of the branches are concentrating on *contacts* for subscriptions, as this is an especially fruitful field.

Complete lists of expired subscriptions have been sent to all literature agents and a good proportion of the subscriptions which have come in since our drive was launched were obtained by following up these lists.

During the first two weeks of the drive a total of 181 subscriptions were sent in. This remarkable response demonstrates in workers' language what our branches think of *Fourth International*. The number of subs according to branches follows:

New York City is in the lead with 35 subs. Arthur Wood, the new literature agent has shown that New York City can really produce and that there are big possibilities for increasing the circulation of the magazine. He reports all the literature agents have swung into action with remarkable enthusiasm.

Boston is second with 17 subscriptions. Good work! Johnny T., the literature agent, is certainly placing Boston on the record, not only for *Fourth International* but also for the *Socialist Appeal*.

Chicago is third with 16 subscriptions. Almost neck and neck with Boston. Sam R. is organizing the drive for the party press in Chicago.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Published by the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party

Volume I

June 1940

No. 2 (Whole No. 2)

Published monthly by the SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up. 2nd class mailing rights applied for.

Editorial Board:

JAMES P. CANNON
ALBERT GOLDMAN
JOSEPH HANSEN
GEORGE NOVACK
FELIX MORROW

General Manager:
MICHAEL CORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

EDITORIAL COMMENT	35
FBI AND THE UNIONS by Farrell Dobbs	39
BALANCE SHEET OF THE FINNISH EVENTS by Leon Trotsky	41
THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN by George Novack	45
ONCE AGAIN — LENIN AND LUXEMBURG by Walter Held	47
THE PATHOLOGY OF RENEGACY by James P. Cannon	52
"SCIENCE"—BURNHAM'S STYLE by Jarvis Gerland	55
THE SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVE AND THE WAR by SP	58
FROM THE ARSENAL OF MARXISM The Groupings in the Communist Opposition	60
ORGANS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL Inside Back Cover	
MANAGER'S COLUMN Inside Front Cover	

167

St. Paul came within one subscription of tying Chicago. Ethel C. sent 15 subscriptions. Very fine work!

Minneapolis was nosed out by *St. Paul* by a narrow margin. C. Johnson sent 14 subscriptions. With the fine record of Minneapolis in the past, the other branches may expect real competition for the next report.

Los Angeles during the first week was a total blank. Then 12 subscriptions came in one batch. "We are starting a vigorous campaign for *Fourth International* subscriptions," writes Rose M. "Hope to send you more soon."

San Francisco sent 8 subscriptions. The literature agent here is Clair H. A special hand to the comrades there for their payment on the back bill. San Francisco is making a determined effort to clear up its account. An example for the other branches!

Toledo sent in 5 subscriptions. This is a fine showing, since the comrades there are largely unemployed and workers whose pay envelopes are constantly affected by plant shut-downs.

St. Louis comes in for special mention, too, with 6 subscriptions.

Among the smaller branches

which are faced with special problems that make their work unusually difficult, and which nevertheless have got off to a fine start in sending subscriptions we list: *San Diego, Quakertown, Indianapolis, Pittsburgh,* and *Lynn*.

Phil. T. of Illinois sent us the following letter enclosing a \$2 money order: "I do not know if my subscription has run out. However, I am enclosing \$2 for a renewal to help along. What the opposition has done about the old magazine, to my mind, is a dirty trick. They sent me one issue—and this renewal is my answer."

And from *Sacred Heart, Minnesota*, we received the following reaction to the appearance of *Fourth International*: "The formation of the 'third camp' was not entirely a surprise to us. But it certainly was beyond us to believe that these turncoats would stoop to common, ordinary, cheap thievery such as they did with the *New International*. Now that this conceited clique has written itself out of our party, these left demagogues can keep busy digging their own graves." \$3.00 was enclosed for a combination subscription to *Fourth International* and the *Socialist Appeal*

Bundle orders remained about

the same during the month. *St. Paul*, however, in addition to their fine showing in securing subscriptions, doubled their bundle order from 20 to 40 a month. A real live-wire branch!

Reading, Penn., also increased its bundle order.

Again we emphasize the need for prompt payment of bundle orders. Unless bundles are paid for immediately upon their receipt the financial burden is increased enormously. Every literature agent should make it a special point of revolutionary duty to see that these payments are sent in without the least delay. In view of the extraordinarily fine response in the sub drive we are not going to list any of the branches which are in the delinquent list. But watch out for next month!

A special problem is the payment of back bundle orders. Some branches have even allowed their bills to accumulate until they have reached a discouraging total. But with extra effort, especially if it is combined with prompt payment of the current bundle orders, these back balances can be liquidated. All branches faced with this problem should communicate to the manager their plan for liquidating these debts.

* * *

Our foreign mailings are becoming increasingly difficult. Censorship, vicious war laws, grave penalties for even being on the mailing list of our magazine makes the problem of getting *Fourth International* into the foreign countries especially difficult. We are asking you for help. Each month we must send out *Fourth International* in hundreds of bundles which require a minimum of 25c a bundle for mailing. Unless we receive extra contributions for this special problem we will be unable to get *Fourth International* to our comrades and sympathizers in the belligerent countries. The importance of getting our magazine there is obvious. Please help immediately by sending in as many quarters as possible.

* * *

And keep that drive steamed up for subscriptions!

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

The Monthly Magazine of the Socialist Workers Party

VOLUME I

JUNE 1940

NUMBER 2

Editorial Comment

The Stage of Mass Slaughter

CAPITALISM IN ITS DEATH AGONY is now visiting upon society one of the most terrible of all its scourges—mass slaughter. The millions of toilers who were herded into the German imperialist army have been hurled against the fortifications of Belgium and Holland. The millions of toilers who were herded into the Allied imperialist armies have been thrown head on to meet the offensive. Mussolini waits but the signal to plunge the Italian workers into the blood bath. And in the Pacific, the Japanese and American imperialists glare at each other over the rich colonial booty at stake.

The second World War which opened with but relatively minor military activity led many superficial observers in the bourgeois press and elsewhere to conclude that this war was completely *different* from all previous wars. They even went so far—whether through design or stupidity—as to confound Stalin's invasion of Finland, for example, with the major struggles that were then still in the offing, and they utilized this "strangeness" and the Finnish events to whip up a great hue and cry against the Soviet Union in the hope that the warring camps would turn in that direction. Events themselves have now shown that this war is different from the last one only in its increased violence, its swifter tempo, and its more profound involvement of the masses.

On the technical side, the imperialist armies are in every respect armed with greater destructive capacity than in the last war, particularly in the air. In the last war the development of the air force received its first great impetus. Now the war has become "three dimensional." The air force in conjunction with tanks and armored cars has given war a swiftness and destructiveness hitherto unknown. Great swarms of planes drone over the populace. The loads of bombs they drop are followed by mechanized troops who destroy railways, buildings, homes. Hitler in this respect exercises a dominating position, one of the consequences of the first World War, for the Allied capitalists at the close of that conflict stripped the German military machine, thus compelling the German capitalists to implement a new one, completely modern in every respect. Its enormous striking ability already demonstrated in the Polish events and in Scandinavia, has done much to counteract Britain's traditional naval power, especially where the fleet is used in conjunction with land forces. It has given the German imperialists an immense advantage which Hitler has utilized to the utmost.

Events have succeeded each other with a rapidity that bears out all the Marxist predictions concerning the tempo of the second World War. Having thrown up safeguards on his eastern flank by putting his signature to a pact with Stalin and by crushing Poland, Hitler turned to his northern flank and invaded Scandinavia. The Allies attempted to meet the Germans on the battlefield of Norway only to suffer a disastrous defeat that had immediate repercussions in the British government and which led to the downfall of the Chamberlain cabinet. With both flanks thus taken care of, free to turn his major forces to the Western Front, Hitler followed up his military victory in Scandinavia by launching an attack through the Low Countries.

Now millions of men, as in the last World War, are marching at the command of their imperialist rulers into the withering fire of each other's weapons. In all the warring nations every available man has been conscripted into the army; and those at home, the old men, the children, the women, are being sent into the factories where the decrees of the military dictatorship are backed by the threat of the death penalty.

The last war was ended by the masses themselves. The new war has assembled them again, armed them, and has now begun to loose upon them the horrors which led to their revolt once before. Still in reserve are the threatened mass bombings and mass gas attacks. All that is required to turn these horrors loose upon the people is a single word from Hitler, Reynaud, or Churchill.

In order to crush each other, the imperialists are compelled to call up such forces, so deeply to involve the masses, to hound and harry them, that in the end, no longer able to endure the suffering inflicted upon them, they rise up and destroy the very capitalism which set them in motion. The violence and extent of the struggle now going on is a measure of the certainty of the socialist revolutions which will end the second World War.

Booty in the Far East

The Netherlands, caught between the contending powers will inevitably be desolated. Upon the same day that Hitler advanced into the Low Countries, two members of the Dutch Cabinet fled to London in a seaplane which they had commandeered, the Foreign Minister Dr. Van Kleffens, and the Colonial Minister C. J. M. Welter. Not only the Dutch government, but possibly other governments of the Allies will have to seek refuge before the dynamic expansive force of the German military machine is spent. But aside from the

immediate military objectives, the crushing of the Netherlands places at stake not so much the gold reserve at The Hague or the corporate holdings in Rotterdam, as the super-exploited and fabulously rich Dutch East Indies.

These islands, lying between Australia on the one side and the Philippines and French Indo-China on the other, export 53 percent of the world's pepper, 37 percent of the world's rubber, 16 percent of the world's copra, and 3 percent of the world's oil palm products. Of the strategic war materials they possess valuable deposits of tin and oil. This wealth under the domination of the Dutch enabled the Netherlands to retain its status as a creditor nation to the present day.

Long before Hitler launched his offensive across the Dutch border, the question of the Far East had been posed among the imperialist bandits. In 1938 the Netherlands spent \$11,800,000 in the United States for war planes to be shipped to the East Indies and in 1939, \$10,600,000. In June of last year the commanders of the French forces in the Far East met at Singapore in conference with the general staffs of the British colonies and dominions in the Orient. This conference discussed "defense" measures in regard to Japanese "designs."

The two imperialist powers most vitally interested in this booty are the United States and Japan. The naval wing of the Japanese government has long advocated a program of expansion toward the south—the direction of the Philippines, French Indo-China, British Burma, above all the Dutch East Indies, for these islands were held by the weakest of the European powers possessing colonies within easy striking distance. While the Japanese army waged an imperialist war of conquest in China, the navy looked on enviously and under cover of secrecy carried out an enormous program of expansion for the fleet. One of the reasons for the attempt to stabilize the present Japanese seizures in China may be ascribed to these ambitions for expansion into the rich islands south of Japan.

When Japan gave notice of her direct interest in the Far East—during Hitler's invasion of Scandinavia—the Hague government promptly replied that it would not accept protection for its possessions. This was merely a diplomatic answer which in any other sphere than diplomacy would be called sheer bluff. This is proved by the fact that Secretary Hull immediately issued a statement setting out the claims of the United States in the Far East. (The United States Rubber Company in particular has large holdings there).

These declarations were followed by a highly significant statement by Rear Admiral J. K. Taussig in testifying before the Senate committee on naval affairs on April 22:

"I cannot see how we can ultimately prevent being drawn into war on account of the Far Eastern situation. We would be warranted in using economic and financial means and, if necessary force, to preserve the integrity of China."

This statement is completed by the following words taken from his testimony before the same committee: "The area of greatest concern to the United States at the present time is the Far East. . . . We need be under no delusions as to the aims and policies of Japan. . . . I'm confident if the Netherlands thought Japan was going into the East Indies they would ask for all the help they could get."

The United States fleet is concentrating somewhere west

of Hawaii. The air bases at Anchorage, Alaska, just north of the Japanese islands, are undergoing intensive expansion. The Japanese government has replied to these warlike moves of the Roosevelt regime by renewed declarations of her concern in the Far East, and her determination to "maintain the status quo," that is, freeze out the other imperialist nations while she grabs the booty.

What concerns the American worker is the direct threat that Roosevelt will plunge this country into the second World War by a conflict with Japan over the colonies in the Far East. American imperialism, the most powerful and arrogant of all the bandits in the world market will brook no opposition in its drive to dominate the entire earth. The curtain may well rise in the very near future in the Far East with the United States locked in titanic battle with Japan over the Dutch colonies.

What of the colonial peoples over whose exploitation the imperialists are warring? In the colonial peoples the toilers of the world who have been dragooned into the armies will find genuine allies. In French Indo-China, despite the brutal rule of General George Catroux, who has suppressed all political opposition, there is a strong underground movement struggling for freedom from the unbearable yoke of French rule. In India the rumblings of revolt against the ruthless British rule are every day growing more audible. Despite all the maddened fury of capitalism in its death agony, its days are clearly numbered. The colonies required by capitalism in order to exist and armed by capitalism in order to fight off enemy imperialists, will themselves prove in the front ranks of those oppressed toilers who finally dispatch the dying capitalist system.

Deeper into the Vortex

The external forces drawing the United States deeper into the world war have been greatly intensified by the successive defeats of the Allies, and by the threat of the Japanese imperialists to take over the Dutch East Indies. Roosevelt's secret commitments to the Allies apparently at first called for military participation only in the Far East, participation on the Western Front being limited to supplying food and war materials. But this estimation hinged upon a sure Allied victory against Hitler, the prospects of which are none too bright at the moment. If the Allies should finally face a defeat, then Wall Street will be compelled to send over its expeditionary forces as it did in the last war. Every defeat of the Allies hence hastens the day the American worker will be sent overseas.

The internal forces pushing the United States deeper into the vortex likewise have been greatly intensified during the last period. The depression of the past months which has occasioned the American capitalists so much worry can be counteracted temporarily only by involvement in the war on a far greater scale than up to now. Last September the business index on the way up from the depths of the 1937 depression crossed the estimated normal. In February it again crossed estimated normal on the way down. Since 1887 there has been only one instance of the business index having remained above estimated normal such a short time. That instance was in 1895, just prior to the Spanish-American war. Considering that American economy is at a much higher stage now, this violent fluctuation can only be in-

terpreted as an indication of the decline of economy as a whole. Neither "overstocked inventories" nor "cutting down of exports"—the explanations put out by the bourgeois press for popular consumption can account for this depression. Expanding inventories are a normal aspect of expanding industrial activity, especially in a war situation when industries increase their inventories in expectation of huge profits and because of shipping hazards. As for export trade, this is in no wise commensurable in importance with the domestic market as a factor affecting production. The simple fact that exports for March, which marked further decline of industrial production as a whole, also marked *the greatest amount of exports in any March since 1930*, shows that American economy is suffering from a most terrible internal sickness. Exports in March according to the government figures exceeded imports by an amount greater than that of any March since 1921.

Thus it is absolutely clear that if peace were declared tomorrow, American industrial production would be faced with the sharpest and most disastrous decline in all its history, a decline which would be far deeper than that experienced in 1929-1932. It is this prospect which will make so much easier the repeal of the cash and carry clause in the Neutrality Act and thus constitute another factor making Wall Street's participation in the second World War on a tremendous scale inevitable.

In anticipation of United States entry, there has been a marked increase in steel orders in the past weeks which will most likely be recorded with an upswing in the business index—whether this will be only temporary it is impossible to say. The index is now linked directly with the development of war—its fluctuations measure the degree of American involvement in the conflict and the closeness of full military participation.

Converting the Masses into Cannon-Fodder

As is well known, the capitalists do not go out on the battlefields themselves. They trick or force the masses into fighting for them. They prefer, naturally, that the masses fight voluntarily; hence there has been a barrage of propaganda loosed in the bourgeois press for "national unity," that is, carrying out docilely the will of the imperialist government.

In Great Britain, France, and the United States this campaign has reached huge proportions. It is impossible to pick up a single newspaper in which the editorial columns and the news reports themselves do not hammer on the "need" for "national unity." Labor is asked to give up all its hard won gains for the sake of "national unity." Vicious laws limiting free speech have been established in France and England. A censorship clamped down on all publications. The death penalty is invoked for "seditious activity," that is, opposition to the war. Labor is in effect, gagged and chained. It has only one privilege—to carry out the boss's orders or to die for his interests. Naturally the capitalists continue to take their profits, in war time at enormously accelerated rate; but that is precisely the purpose of "national unity"—to stifle the working class, to safeguard the profit system.

In France, whose "democratic institutions" are now being held up as intimately bound with American traditions which must be saved at all cost, "national unity" has been imposed so severely that it takes a keen eye indeed to distinguish the difference between conditions in France and Germany. Since similar restrictions have been outlined in the notorious M-Day Plans for imposition in the United States the day war is declared by the President, a brief resumé of what happened to labor in France under "national unity" can provide something for the American trade unionist to think about.

As soon as the war started in France, every able-bodied man in the country between the ages of 18 and 49 was called into the army—6,000,000 men. Later 1,500,000 were returned to jobs that were labelled "strategic" by government officials. These same officials have the right at any time to shift any man from the army back into a factory or vice versa. All those men who were exempted because of age or infirmities are subject, however, to military jurisdiction and to being called up at any time.

At one stroke, the prevailing wage and hour laws which labor had gained through militant struggles, were wiped out and working hours raised to 60 a week. In "defense" factories, 72 hours a week may prevail. No increased overtime pay is allowed until 60 hours have been worked, and out of all overtime paid, 40 percent is deducted immediately as a special tax. There are "safeguards" however. The daily working hours must not exceed 11 for men or 10 for women and children "*except in extraordinary circumstances.*" There are no other "safeguards."

On February 28 a decree was announced which specifically forbade farmers, rural workers and peasants to seek different work elsewhere. On the same day another decree mobilized *all women* for war work, compelling them to register for compulsory employment in factories or wherever the government might designate.

On top of this, living conditions have been lowered enormously. Direct taxes eat up most of the pay which is nominally given the worker. In England, there are meatless days, and it is now planned to issue ration cards.

In addition to this the workers in Great Britain are subject to a "forced loan plan," a plan evolved by J. M. Keynes, a British bourgeois economist, which strikes directly at the income of the workers under guise of a compulsory "loan."

These dictatorial laws which prevail in "democratic" France and England, are now scheduled for the United States. The Keynes plan in a somewhat modified form has been proposed by Jerome N. Frank, chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Frank's plan, he believes, would raise almost immediately \$20,000,000,000 for armaments. Frank's proposal would compel a high proportion of *every* income to be paid directly to the government. This payment would be considered partly as a "loan," partly as a direct tax.

When "national unity" is imposed in this country under the name of the M-Day Plans, the American worker will find that the war and military dictatorship has moved across the Atlantic. Prices of the elementary necessities such as food, clothing, housing, will skyrocket as in the

last war, but all labor's rights to organize and to strike for higher wages to meet these costs will be wiped out as in France and Great Britain.

"National unity" means nothing but suffering for the masses, their conversion into cannon fodder. For the capitalists "national unity" means unlimited opportunity to profiteer.

The Dilemma Facing the Masses

There are two sentiments which almost every worker feels in this country, a hatred of war, and a hatred of Hitler. Both these sentiments are progressive. Their hatred of Hitler reflects Hitler's crushing of the labor movement in Germany, and his brutal suppression of all the national minorities within the Third Reich. Almost every worker longs ardently for the smashing of Hitler. Their hatred of war reflects the realization of the worker that imperialist war is waged only at his cost and only for the profit of the capitalist rulers.

In the United States the masses express their hatred of war by a desire for isolation, for staying away from the European conflict, for keeping out of war. They express their hatred for Hitler through acquiescence in Washington's demand for "adequate defense measures."

Clever demagogues exploit both of these progressive sentiments. The isolationist sentiment is seized upon by the Stalinists to implement the present foreign policy of the Kremlin. In the United States the Stalinist opposition to the war is pure demagoguery. Occasionally they run a short article attacking Hitler in order to give a semblance of respectability to their line; but so far as the real opposition to war is concerned, they are no better than the bourgeois isolationists who likewise are "against war," that is, against it until they get a sizeable following whom they can send overseas to the battlefields by unfurling the stars and stripes at the proper moment. The Stalinist policy follows Moscow orders so closely that they are unable to attract the huge following which is actually opposed to war. The Stalinists have been exposed so many times, they are so completely bankrupt, that it is common knowledge this fake anti-war line is only a temporary maneuver which will change again tomorrow should Stalin shift his allegiance from Hitler to the Allies.

The anti-war sentiment is very widespread throughout the country. The most recent Gallup poll lists 34 percent of the voters as not only opposing war but opposing further help to England and France. If "help for the Allies short of war" is disregarded, sentiment is almost unanimous in opposition to war. Such a powerful sentiment is almost certain to affect the presidential elections in view of the possibility of Allied defeat. If both the Republican and Democratic candidates avoid the war issue, or straddle it with ambiguous phrases, an Independent Labor Party with a militant anti-war program could profoundly affect the course of traditional politics in the United States and make Wall Street's aim of plunging the country into the war immeasurably more difficult.

How to Defeat Hitler

Those demagogues of every stripe—social democrats, labor fakers, bourgeois politicians, who advocate support-

ing the Allied imperialists as a means of crushing Hitler, are nothing more than agents of Wall Street. They used the same arguments in the last war in order to gull the masses into supporting the Allies against the Kaiser. The "war to end wars" brought nothing but another war on a far more violent and destructive scale. The fight to "make the world safe for democracy" brought nothing but the Fascist and Nazi dictatorships, and now military dictatorships in France, Great Britain and the United States.

These old rotted slogans of the bourgeois demagogues about "democracy," the enemy "madman" who is "responsible for the war," and "people incapable of choosing good rulers" cannot delude the masses for long. The experience of the last World War will help them immeasurably in seeing through the fraud. They will soon understand that supporting the Allies cannot rid the world of dictators such as Hitler, who are simply products of capitalism in its death-agony. They will soon understand that only by smashing the entire capitalist system itself can the world be forever rid of these monsters who march the people into one war after another.

The masses will then understand that to destroy the capitalist system it is necessary first and above all to oppose the capitalists of our own country, to first settle accounts with Wall Street. The first socialist revolution anywhere in the world will be followed almost immediately by a socialist revolution in Germany. The workers there, upon learning of a success elsewhere, will immediately take heart, and know that Hitler lied when he told them that the workers of the other nations supported their own capitalists and marched willingly against the Germans. In the explosion that will follow the news of the first socialist revolution in consequence of this war as the October revolution was a consequence of the last war, Hitler will be cast into the junk heap along with his fellowkind of the democratic countries.

Marxism in United States—

"The United States had Marxists in the past, it is true, but they were a strange type of Marxist, or rather, three strange types. In the first place, there were the émigrés cast out of Europe, who did what they could but could not find any response; in the second place, isolated American groups like the De Leonists, who in the course of events, and because of their own mistakes, turned themselves into sects; in the third place, dilettantes attracted by the October Revolution and sympathetic to Marxism as an exotic teaching that had little to do with the United States. Their day is over. Now dawns the new epoch of an independent class movement of the proletariat and at the same time of—genuine Marxism. In this, too, America will in a few jumps catch up with Europe and outdistance it. Progressive technique and a progressive social structure will pave their own way in the sphere of doctrine. The best theoreticians of Marxism will appear on American soil. Marx will become the mentor of the advanced American workers."

—Leon Trotsky, "Essay on Karl Marx" in
The Living Thoughts of Karl Marx.

FBI And The Unions

By FARRELL DOBBS

THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT is today the victim of the most thorough-going governmental attack since the days of the Palmer raids. This assault, carefully planned and conducted in a most deliberate manner, daily becomes broader in scope and the methods utilized become more brazen. Its purpose is to prepare the American workers for docile submission to regimentation in industry and service in the military machine when Roosevelt, acting for Wall Street, plunges the United States into World War II.

The ground for the campaign was prepared by Congressman Martin Dies and his "Committee on Un-American Activities." He is now preparing to go back over the same ground and plow a little deeper. A pretense was made at investigation of fascist groups. Dies now announces that this phase of the work of his Committee has been satisfactorily cleaned up. Few people are so naive as to accept this statement at face value. The truth is that Dies has made a few motions in this direction for the record and that he is now prepared to get down to serious business in the attacks on the workers' organizations. According to his own announcement, these are his intentions in the next stage of the campaign.

The task of the Dies Committee is to stir up public suspicion toward union leaders and militant rank and filers through a mud-throwing campaign. The real job is to be done by Roosevelt's political police, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is the spearhead of the entire anti-union drive. Thurman Arnold, head of the anti-trust division of the United States Department of Justice, is Roosevelt's number one hatchet-man in the courtrooms. It is their ambition to make full preparations for M-Day, which is the War Department's name for the day on which the American worker will be compelled to go to war.

Present-day appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation are roughly fifteen times as large as they were in 1917, the year of United States entry into World War I. The FBI operates in all fields, finding grounds on whatever slender pretext for federal jurisdiction in labor cases. When this is not possible, the FBI gives full aid to the local police and courts.

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, testified before the House Appropriations Committee in November, 1939, that the FBI has organized a "general intelligence division" which has compiled extensive records of individuals, groups and organizations engaged in what he calls "subversive activity." All of these are earmarked for arrests in mass when Roosevelt plunges the country into war. The immediate objective of the government is to cull out of the trade union movement in advance of the war as many of the militant elements as possible. By this action they aim to terrorize the workers, and especially the working class leaders, so that there will be a minimum of resistance to the war plan. The record of government action against the unions shows what Roosevelt-Arnold-Hoover consider as "subversive activities" and just who they intend to terrorize.

The social outlook of J. Edgar Hoover is quite aptly characterized by his speech at the meeting of the International Association of Chiefs of Police in July, 1935, in which he termed as "enemies of society" even those who are advocates of the prison parole system. This federal fink-herder wrote Chairman Matson of the National Labor Relations Board in November 28, 1939, complaining that a Board field examiner was speaking in favor of a pardon for an imprisoned labor leader. The case in question was one in which the FBI had no jurisdiction, but Hoover is interested in keeping all labor leaders in jail no matter how they are put there.

The FBI has on several occasions sent out public requests that it be given notice of all working class meetings, parades and demonstrations so that they may have snoopers present. There have already been cases, for example, the Minneapolis WPA strike, where they sent agents-provocateur as well as snoopers. They have requested the trade unions to advise them of any "known subversive elements." This is their not too subtle method of trying to make stool-pigeons out of the workers.

Industrial mishaps of whatever nature are today followed immediately by noisy FBI investigations of "sabotage." When an old scow capsized in the Hudson River, Hoover thought it was the work of enemies of the U.S. government. These are dress rehearsals for the spy scare. It is only a short step from this to the branding of strikes as "industrial sabotage" and the prosecution of strike leaders as "agents of foreign powers."

Thurman Arnold, during the early stages of his "anti-trust" campaign, sent a letter to the Indianapolis Central Labor Union of the AFL, setting forth a list of what he called unquestionable violations of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. These boil down in their essence to a demand for docile acceptance by the workers of all employer methods and practices which Arnold can force down the throats of the trade-unionists. Federal grand juries have returned wide-scale indictments against trade unions and trade union officials on charges of "criminal conspiracy in constraint of trade," "interference with inter-state commerce" and any other charge which the FBI can dig up which will give Arnold an opportunity to wield the axe upon the trade union movement through the courts.

The Sherman Anti-Trust Law was enacted by Congress in 1890 as a result of the pressure from the workers and farmers who demanded that the huge trusts and monopolies be curbed by the government. It was first used, not against the trusts, but against the American Railway Union in 1894. Thereafter, the courts often invoked it against the unions, acting under pressure from the employers. The worker-farmer revolt against this practice became so strong that in 1914 Congress passed the Clayton Act specifically exempting labor from the "conspiracy" charge which the courts were justifying on the basis of the Sherman Law.

Today, under the "great liberal" Roosevelt, who is the real head of the FBI, the Department of Justice and its anti-trust division, the old practices are again revived. Workers are already in the federal prisons as a result of this drive. Others are under heavy bond pending appeal of convictions to higher courts; still others are now on trial or are under bond awaiting trial. A considerable number are under probation to federal officers with jail sentences hanging over their heads.

The first union victory in the fight against the "anti-trust" campaign was recorded on May 6 when a Federal District Court ordered a verdict of acquittal in a case against the Washington, D. C. local union of the AFL Teamsters. According to the latest reports Roosevelt-Arnold-Hoover were "undecided" whether an appeal would be taken to a higher court in a further attempt to jail these trade unionists.

The workers have little fear of the city police or any other local police agency against whose acts of violence they have had to defend themselves in strikes. Above all, they have little or no confidence in the cop as being in any way their friend. It is different with the FBI. There is much confusion in the minds of the workers on this point. Roosevelt understands this and is taking full advantage of the fact.

A feeling of awe towards all federal authority is drilled into the minds of the workers during their school days and then carefully nurtured by clever propaganda throughout their adult life. This is the primary advantage of the FBI as an instrument for the campaign against the unions. There has been a careful special buildup to augment the standing of the FBI in the eyes of the workers. The highly dramatized campaign against Dillinger, Machine-gun Kelly, etc., provided the stage for the buildup. A series of movie plays glorifying the "G-Men" has reinforced the drive. News reels of the "G-Men" in training, accompanied by the inevitable sadist speech by J. Edgar Hoover, have been a powerful supplement. The radio has contributed its share through the "Gang Busters" serial and through numerous other devices. These factors have been a big help to Roosevelt in his anti-union drive.

The methods employed by the FBI in arresting workers and bringing them to trial are deliberately calculated to create the general public impression that they are dangerous characters. The most popular hour for the arrest of trade unionists by the FBI is between 3 A.M. and 5 A.M. in the morning. The daily press is often tipped off in advance of the arrest so that they may obtain pictures of the "G-Men" herding the workers off to jail handcuffed and fastened together by a chain. Put in jail and still half asleep, the workers are given the old tough-cop—good-cop act. The first "G-Man" who talks to them acts very hard-boiled; a little later another "G-Man" comes in who pretends to be friendly and wants to "help" the worker. If he doesn't get a "confession" he then tells the worker hair-raising stories about what happens to those arrested by the FBI who do not "tell all." A companion action to this phase of the program is the frequent searching of workers' homes without even so much as the formality of a warrant.

Bail bond for workers arrested by the FBI has been

uniformly high and, not satisfied with this, the FBI has in many cases interfered with the efforts of the unions to secure bond. And, once presented, the bond is submitted to a super-technical scrutiny; if any technicality can be found to justify the action, the bond is rejected. Another popular practice of the FBI is to prevent the arrested worker from establishing contact with a lawyer until the last minute before he is arraigned for hearing, so that he has little time to confer with his counsel to prepare a defense.

A good example of FBI methods is the case of the arrests and convictions of seven officers of local unions of the AFL Teamsters in Federal court at Sioux City, Iowa. In this case the FBI made minute measurements of a stretch of highway at the boundary between Minnesota and Iowa in order to establish jurisdiction for the Federal Court. High bail was set for the accused workers and all manner of interference was put in the way of their efforts to obtain the bail bond. Almost a year and a half had elapsed since the time of the alleged unlawful act. During this period the FBI had taken all of the time it considered necessary to prepare its case. The seven trade unionists were rushed to trial without opportunity to prepare adequate defense. One defendant had less than 48 hours from the time he was first able to see a lawyer until he was brought to trial. The men were all sentenced to two years in a Federal penitentiary and are now under bond pending an appeal to the higher court.

A part of the whole plan is for the FBI, both by example and by direct collaboration, to stir up similar actions by the local police and prosecuting attorney. A chain of inter-related actions against the workers is thus set in motion, both by the federal cops and the local cops. One agency supplements the other. A typical example of this is the case of Republican presidential aspirant Thomas E. Dewey's attempt to smear the Building Service Employees International Union of the AFL through the George Scalise case. The Building Service workers do not need the help of the cops-and-robbers minded Dewey to administrate their union. However, Dewey insists that they shall have his full interference whether they want it or not. During the second day of the proceedings of the union convention just held at Atlantic City, Dewey's henchmen broke into a session, placed four officials of the union under technical custody and disrupted the meeting so badly that it was necessary to adjourn. When W. L. McFetridge, one of the four, was later elected to succeed Scalise as president of the union, the *New York Daily News* came out on May 8 with the headline: "Man Sought by Dewey Heads Scalise Union." A swarm of FBI agents snooped around the convention headquarters, eavesdropping on conversations and spreading malicious gossip among the delegates.

There has been a veritable epidemic of seizures of the books and records of trade unions by the FBI and local police and prosecuting attorneys. In all parts of the country bosses serving on federal and county grand juries have been eagerly poking their long noses into the records of the unions that have been brought into the grand jury room.

The employers are rapidly falling into step with Roosevelt's anti-union drive on their own initiative and by their own methods, to say nothing of the whole-hearted cooperation they give to the FBI and the local cops. Damage suits

are instituted against the trade unions at every opportunity. Finks are planted in the unions to institute suits for accounting and then the union records are dragged into court and pried into by attorneys and accountants, hired and paid for by the employers' association.

The boldness of the drive against the leading officials of trade unions demonstrates Roosevelt's urgent desire to get the job done. It is also unmistakable evidence of his contempt for those very leaders who give him their unconditional support. The next item on the Roosevelt-Arnold-Hoover agenda will be a sweeping follow-up campaign directed against a much broader strata of the trade union movement.

Some trade unionists seek reasons to consider Roosevelt innocent of any complicity in this campaign. They point out that he did not appoint Thurman Arnold to the post of attorney-general when Frank Murphy was elevated to the United States Supreme Court. They credit Roosevelt when the Department of Justice does not always get the full appropriation which it requests. But they are only deceiving themselves and others. These little incidents do not affect the general line. Make no mistake about it. Roosevelt is the head man of this anti-union drive.

The AFL is at present bearing the main brunt of this attack. But this does not mean that the CIO can afford to remain silent or hope to escape it. Fines and sentences have

already been imposed upon leaders of the CIO Fur Workers Union. This is only a beginning. There seems to be a general belief in the CIO that it is safe to stand aside and permit the AFL to stand up as best it can against these attacks. This attitude is obviously motivated by factional considerations resulting from the struggle inside the trade union movement. Such a policy will in the end bring grave consequences to the CIO movement. Even in the AFL, although additional unions are constantly falling into the line of fire, there is a strong tendency on the part of those unions not involved to ignore the whole matter more or less. They will pay heavily for this ostrich policy.

The trade union movement is confronted by a vital threat to its very existence. Roosevelt is preparing to sterilize the unions. There are many willing hands to help him. The failure of the movement to defend itself can only intensify the attack and result in the unions becoming tied hand and foot by the government. Then they will be unable to perform their natural functions as independent organizations of the workers.

The carefully planned anti-union drive of the government must be met head-on. The defense of the unions must be just as carefully and thoroughly worked out as the attack. Facts must be recognized. Every section of the movement is affected. The independence of the labor movement is at stake. A powerful united campaign of defense must be launched with the full participation of all trade unionists.

Balance Sheet of the Finnish Events

By LEGN TROTSKY

They Couldn't Foresee

"WE" FORESAW the alliance with Hitler — write Shachtman and Burnham — but the seizure of Eastern Poland? the invasion of Finland? — no, "we" couldn't foresee these events. Such completely improbable and utterly unexpected events necessitate, they insist, a complete upheaval in our politics. These politicians labored under the impression apparently that Stalin needed an alliance with Hitler in order to roll Easter eggs with him. They "foresaw" the alliance (when? where?) but couldn't foresee what it was for and why.

They recognize the right of the workers' state to maneuver between the imperialist camps and to conclude agreements with one against another. These agreements should, obviously, have as their goal the defense of the workers' state, the acquisition of economic, strategical and other advantages, and, if circumstances permit, the extension of the base of the workers' state. The degenerated workers' state attempts to gain these ends with its own bureaucratic methods, which at every step come into conflict with the interests of the world proletariat. But exactly what is so unexpected and so unpredictable about the Kremlin's attempt to get as much as it could from its alliance with Hitler?

If our ill-starred politicians failed to foresee "this" it is only because they fail to think a single question seriously through to the end. During the protracted negotiations with the Anglo-French delegation in the summer of 1939, the Kremlin openly demanded military control over the Baltic

states. Because England and France refused to grant him this control, Stalin broke off negotiations. This alone clearly indicated that an agreement with Hitler would secure Stalin at least control over the Baltic states. Politically mature people the world over approached the matter from precisely this standpoint, asking themselves: Just how will Stalin accomplish this task? Will he resort to military force? And so on. The course of events depended, however, a great deal more on Hitler than on Stalin. Generally speaking, concrete events cannot be predicted. But the main direction of the events as they actually unfolded contained nothing essentially new.

Because of the degeneration of the workers' state, the Soviet Union turned out at the threshold of the second imperialist war to be far weaker than it need have been. Stalin's agreement with Hitler had as its objective the securing of the USSR from a German assault and, generally, securing the USSR from being drawn into a major war. While seizing Poland, Hitler had to protect himself on the East. Stalin was compelled, with Hitler's permission, to invade Eastern Poland in order to avail himself of some supplementary guarantees against Hitler on the Western boundary of the USSR. As a result of these events, however, the USSR acquired a common frontier with Germany, and by virtue of this very fact the danger from a victorious Germany became much more direct, while Stalin's dependence on Hitler was greatly increased.

The episode of the partitioning of Poland had its devel-

opment and sequel in the Scandinavian arena. Hitler could not have failed to give some intimation to his "friend" Stalin that he planned to seize the Scandinavian countries. Stalin could not have failed to break into a cold sweat. After all, this signified complete German domination of the Baltic Sea, of Finland, and hence constituted a direct threat to Leningrad. Once again Stalin had to seek supplementary guarantees against his ally, this time in Finland. However, he met with serious resistance there. The "military excursion" dragged on. Meanwhile Scandinavia threatened to become the arena of major warfare. Hitler, who had completed his preparations for the blow against Denmark and Norway, demanded that Stalin conclude an early peace. Stalin had to cut his plans short, and renounce sovietizing Finland. These are the salient features of the course of events in the European Northwest.

Small Nations in the Imperialist War

Under the conditions of World War, to approach the question of the fate of small states from the standpoint of "national independence," "neutrality," etc., is to remain in the sphere of imperialist mythology. The struggle involves world domination. The question of the existence of the USSR will be solved in passing. This problem which today remains in the background, will at a certain moment come to the forefront. So far as the small and second rate states are concerned, they are already today pawns in the hands of the great powers. The sole freedom they still retain, and this only to a limited extent, is the freedom of choosing between masters.

Two governments struggle for a while in Norway: The government of the Norwegian Nazis, covered by the German troops in the South, and the old social-democratic government with their King in the North. Should the Norwegian workers have supported the "democratic" camp against the fascist? Following the analogy with Spain, it might at first glance appear as if this question should be answered in the affirmative. In reality this would be the crudest kind of blunder. In Spain there was an isolated civil war; the intervention of foreign imperialist powers, however important in itself, nevertheless remained of secondary character. What is involved in Norway is the direct and immediate clash between two imperialist camps in whose hands the warring Norwegian governments are only auxiliary tools. On the world arena we support neither the camp of the Allies nor the camp of Germany. Consequently we have not the slightest reason or justification for supporting either one of their temporary tools within Norway itself.

The very same approach must be applied to Finland. From the standpoint of the strategy of the world proletariat, Finnish resistance was no more an act of independent national defense than is the resistance of Norway. This was best demonstrated by the Finnish government itself which preferred to cease all resistance rather than have Finland completely transformed into a military base of England, France and the United States. Secondary factors like the national independence of Finland or Norway, the defense of democracy, etc., however important in themselves, are now intertwined in the struggle of infinitely more powerful world forces and are completely subordinate to them. We

must discount these secondary factors and determine our policy in accordance with the basic factors.

The programmatic theses of the Fourth International on the war gave an exhaustive answer to this question six years ago. The theses state: "The idea of national defense especially if it coincides with the idea of the defense of democracy, can most readily be utilized to dupe the workers of small and neutral countries (Switzerland, in particular Belgium, the Scandinavian countries. . .)." And further on: "Only petty-bourgeois blockheads (like Robert Grimm) from a god-forsaken Swiss village could seriously believe that the World War into which he will be drawn is a means for defending the independence of Switzerland." Other petty-bourgeois equally stupid imagined that world war is a means for defending Finland, that it is possible to determine proletarian *strategy* on the basis of a *tactical* episode such as the invasion of Finland by the Red Army.

Georgia and Finland

Just as during strikes directed against big capitalists, the workers often bankrupt in passing highly respectable petty-bourgeois concerns, so in a military struggle against imperialism, or in seeking military guarantees against imperialism, the workers' state—even completely healthy and revolutionary—may find itself compelled to violate the independence of this or that small state. Tears over the ruthlessness of the class struggle on either the domestic or the international arena may properly be shed by democratic Philistines but not by proletarian revolutionists.

The Soviet Republic in 1921 forcefully sovietized Georgia which constituted an open gateway for imperialist assault in the Caucasus. From the standpoint of the principles of national self-determination, a good deal might have been said in objection to such sovietization. From the standpoint of extending the arena of the socialist revolution, military intervention in a peasant country was more than a dubious act. From the standpoint of the self-defense of the workers' state surrounded by enemies, forceful sovietization was justified: The safeguarding of the socialist revolution comes before formal democratic principles.

World imperialism for a long time utilized the question of violence in Georgia as the rallying cry in mobilizing world public opinion against the Soviets. The Second International took the lead in this campaign. The Entente aimed at the preparation of a possible new military intervention against the Soviets.

In exactly the same way as in the case of Georgia, the world bourgeoisie utilized the invasion of Finland in mobilizing public opinion against the USSR. The social-democracy in this case too came out as the vanguard of democratic imperialism. The unhappy "third camp" of the stampeding petty-bourgeois brings up the rear.

Along with the striking similarity between these two instances of military intervention there is, however, a profound difference—the present USSR is far from being the Soviet Republic of 1921. The 1934 theses of the Fourth International on War declare: "The monstrous development of Soviet bureaucratism and the wretched living conditions of the toilers have extremely reduced the attractive power of the USSR for the world working class." The Soviet-Finnish war revealed graphically and completely that

within gunshot of Leningrad, the cradle of the October revolution, the present regime of the USSR is incapable of exercising an attractive force. Yet it does not follow from this that the USSR must be surrendered to the imperialists but only that the USSR must be torn out of the hands of the bureaucracy.

"Where Is the Civil War?"

"But where is the Civil War in Finland which you promised?" demand the leaders of the former opposition, who have now become the leaders of the "third camp." I promised nothing. I only analyzed one of the possible variants of the further development of the Soviet-Finnish conflict. The seizure of isolated bases in Finland was as probable as the complete occupation of Finland. The seizure of bases presupposed maintaining the bourgeois regime throughout the rest of the country. Occupation presupposed a social overturn which would be impossible without involving the workers and poorer farmers in civil war. The initial diplomatic negotiations between Moscow and Helsinki indicated an attempt to solve the question in the way it was solved with the other Baltic states. Finland's resistance compelled the Kremlin to seek its ends through military measures. Stalin could justify the war before the broadest masses only by sovietizing Finland. The appointment of the Kuusinen government indicated that the fate awaiting Finland was not that of the Baltic states but that of Poland, where Stalin—no matter what the amateur columnists of the "third camp" scribble—found himself compelled to provoke civil war and to overthrow property relations.

I specified several times that *if* the war in Finland was not submerged in a general war, and *if* Stalin was not compelled to retreat before a threat from the outside, then he would be forced to carry through the sovietizing of Finland. This task by itself was much more difficult than the sovietizing of Eastern Poland. More difficult from a *military* standpoint, for Finland happened to be better prepared. More difficult from a *national* standpoint, for Finland possesses a long tradition of struggle for national independence from Russia, whereas the Ukrainians and the White Russians were fighting against Poland. More difficult from a *social* standpoint, for the Finnish bourgeoisie had in its own way solved the pre-capitalist agrarian problem through the creation of an agricultural petty-bourgeoisie. Nevertheless the military victory of Stalin over Finland would unquestionably have made fully possible an overthrow of property relations with more or less assistance from the Finnish workers and small farmers.

Why then didn't Stalin carry out this plan? Because a colossal mobilization of bourgeois public opinion began against the USSR. Because England and France seriously posed the question of military intervention. Finally—last but not least in importance—because Hitler could wait no longer. The appearance of English and French troops in Finland would have meant a direct threat to Hitler's Scandinavian plans which were based on conspiracy and surprise. Caught in the vise of a twofold danger—on one side from the Allies and from the other, Hitler—Stalin renounced sovietizing Finland, limiting himself to the seizure of isolated strategical positions.

The partisans of the "third camp" (the camp of the

stamped petty-bourgeois) now piece together the following construction: Trotsky deduced the civil war in Finland from the class nature of the USSR; inasmuch as no civil war occurred, that signifies the USSR is not a workers' state. In reality there was no necessity whatever for logically "deducing" a possible civil war in Finland from a sociological definition of the USSR—it was sufficient to base oneself on the experience in Eastern Poland. The overturn in property relations which was accomplished there could have been achieved only by the state that issued from the October revolution. This overturn was forced upon the Kremlin oligarchy through its struggle for self-preservation under specific conditions. There was not the slightest ground for doubting that *under analogous conditions* it would find itself compelled to repeat the very same operation in Finland. That was all I pointed out. But conditions changed during the course of the struggle. War, like revolution, often develops abrupt turns. With the cessation of military operations on the part of the Red Army, naturally there could be no talk of the unfolding of civil war in Finland.

Every historical prognosis is always conditional, and the more concrete the prognosis, the more conditional it is. A prognosis is not a promissory note which can be cashed on a given date. Prognosis outlines only the definite trends of the development. But along with these trends a different order of forces and tendencies operate, which at a certain moment begin to predominate. All those who seek exact predictions of concrete events should consult the astrologists. Marxist prognosis aids only in orientation. I made reservations several times as to the conditionality of my prognosis as *one* of several possible variants. To clutch now, as the rock of salvation, at the tenth rate historical fact that the fate of Finland was temporarily determined on the pattern of Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia rather than the pattern of Eastern Poland can occur only to sterile scholastics or—the leaders of the "third camp."

The Defense of the Soviet Union

Stalin's assault upon Finland was not of course *solely* an act in defense of the USSR. The politics of the Soviet Union is guided by the Bonapartist bureaucracy. This bureaucracy is first and foremost concerned with its power, its prestige, its revenues. It defends itself much better than it defends the USSR. It defends itself at the expense of the USSR and at the expense of the world proletariat. This was revealed only too clearly throughout the entire development of the Soviet-Finnish conflict. We cannot therefore either directly or indirectly take upon ourselves even a shadow of responsibility for the invasion of Finland which represents only a single link in the chain of the politics of the Bonapartist bureaucracy.

It is one thing to solidarize with Stalin, defend his policy, assume responsibility for it—as does the triply infamous Comintern—it is another thing to explain to the world working class that no matter what crimes Stalin may be guilty of we cannot permit world imperialism to crush the Soviet Union, reestablish capitalism, and convert the land of the October revolution into a colony. This explanation likewise furnishes the basis for our defense of the USSR.

The attempt of the conjunctural defeatists, i.e., the adventurers in defeatism, to extricate themselves from their difficulty by promising that in the event the Allies intervene they will change their defeatist policy to a defensist one is a contemptible evasion. It is in general not easy to determine one's policies according to a stop watch, especially under wartime conditions. In the critical days of the Soviet-Finnish war, as has now become known—the Allied general staffs reached the conclusion that serious and quick aid to Finland could come only through destroying the Murmansk railway by bombing it from the air. From the point of view of strategy this was quite correct. The question of intervention or non-intervention by the Allied air forces hung by a hair. From the same hair apparently, the principled position of the "third camp" also dangled. But from the very beginning we considered that it was necessary to determine one's position in accordance with the basic class camps in the war. This is much more reliable.

No Surrender to the Enemy of Positions Already Won

The policy of defeatism is not punishment of a given government for this or that crime it has committed but a conclusion from the class relationships. The Marxist line of conduct in war is not based on abstract moral and sentimental considerations but on the social appraisal of a regime in its reciprocal relations with other regimes. We supported Abyssinia not because the Negus was politically or "morally" superior to Mussolini but because the defense of a backward country against colonial oppression deals a blow to imperialism, which is the main enemy of the world working class. We defend the USSR independently of the policy of the Moscow Negus for two fundamental reasons. First, the defeat of the USSR would supply imperialism with new colossal resources and could prolong for many years the death agony of capitalist society. Secondly, the social foundations of the USSR, cleansed of the parasitic bureaucracy are capable of assuring unbounded economic and cultural progress, while the capitalist foundations disclose no possibilities except further decay.

What unmasks the noisy critics most of all is that they continued to consider the USSR a workers' state at a time when Stalin was destroying the Bolshevik party; when he was strangling the proletarian revolution in Spain; when he was betraying the world revolution in the name of "People's Fronts" and "collective security." Under all these conditions they recognized the necessity of defending the USSR as a workers' state! But no sooner did this same Stalin invade "democratic" Finland, no sooner did bourgeois public opinion of the imperialist democracies—which covered up and approved all Stalins' crimes against the communists, the workers and the peasants—raise a howl to the skies, than our innovators immediately declared: "Yes, this is intolerable!" And following Roosevelt they declared a moral embargo against the Soviet Union.

Educated witch-doctor Burnham's reasoning on the theme that by defending the USSR we *thereby* defend Hitler, is a neat little specimen of petty-bourgeois fatheadness which seeks to force contradictory reality into the

framework of a two-dimensional syllogism. By defending the Soviet Republic after the Brest-Litovsk peace did the workers support Hohenzollern? Yes or no? The programmatic theses of the Fourth International on war which deal in detail with this question, establish categorically that agreements between a soviet state and this or that imperialist state do not place any restrictions upon the revolutionary party of that state. The interests of the world revolution stand above an isolated diplomatic combination, however justifiable the latter may be in and of itself. By defending the USSR we struggle far more seriously against Stalin, as well as Hitler, than do Burnham and Co.

It is true, Burnham and Shachtman do not stand alone. Leon Jouhaux, the notorious agent of French capitalism, also waxes indignant over the fact that the "Trotskyists defend the USSR." Who should be indignant if not he! But our attitude toward the USSR is the same as our attitude towards the CGT (General Confederation of Labor): we defend it against the bourgeoisie despite the fact that the Confederation is headed by scoundrels like Leon Jouhaux who deceive and betray the workers at every step. The Russian Mensheviks likewise are howling: "The Fourth International is in a Blind Alley!" because the Fourth International still continues to recognize the USSR as a workers' state. These gentlemen themselves are members of the Second International, which is led by such eminent traitors as the typical bourgeois mayor Huysmans, and Leon Blum, who betrayed an exceptionally favorable revolutionary situation in June 1936 and thereby made possible the present war. The Mensheviks recognize the parties of the Second International as *workers'* parties but refuse to recognize the Soviet Union as a *workers'* state on the ground that at its head stand bureaucratic traitors. This falsehood reeks with brazenness and cynicism. Stalin, Molotov, and the rest, as a social layer are no better and no worse than the Blums, Jouhaux, Citrines, Thomases, etc. The difference between them is only this, that Stalin and Co. exploit and cripple the viable economic foundation of socialist development, while the Blums cling to the thoroughly rotted foundation of capitalist society.

The workers' state must be taken as it has emerged from the merciless laboratory of history and not as it is imagined by a "socialist" professor, reflectively exploring his nose with his finger. It is the duty of revolutionists to defend every conquest of the working class even though it may be distorted by the pressure of hostile forces. Those who cannot defend old positions will never conquer new ones.

April 25, 1940

No "Third" Ideology—

"Since there can be no talk of an independent ideology being developed by the masses of the workers in the process of their movement then *the only choice is*: Either bourgeois, or Socialist ideology. There is no middle course (for humanity has not created a 'third' ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or above-class ideology). Hence, to belittle Socialist ideology *in any way, to deviate from it in the slightest degree* means strengthening bourgeois ideology."—Lenin in "What Is to Be Done?"

The Presidential Campaign

By GEORGE NOVACK

REACTION AT HOME and war abroad—these sinister presences dominate the current Presidential campaign in the United States. They are organically interlinked, forming two sides of a single historical process. Domestic reaction has been fed by the world imperialist crisis now ripened into armed combat. This conflict is in turn aggravated by the constant intervention of Roosevelt's government in world affairs in line with its own imperialist policy.

Like every bourgeois-liberal regime in this epoch of capitalist decay, the Democratic administration contained within itself from the beginning the most vicious reactionary tendencies. There nestled under the benevolent wing of the New Deal, not only liberal bourgeois reformists, but party bosses like Hague of New Jersey and Southern Bourbons like Joe Robinson and Garner, together with such direct representatives of Big Banking and Business as Giannini of the Bank of America, Moffet, Vice-President of Rockefeller's Standard Oil Trust of New Jersey, and Bernard Baruch. These undisguised reactionaries were not hangers-on, but confidants of the President and directors of his administration.

During his first term the severe consequences of the crisis coupled with the pressure of the masses compelled and enabled Roosevelt to hold these reactionary elements in check. Foreign policy at Washington was likewise subordinated to Roosevelt's program of internal reforms.

Today all this has changed. Reaction rides high at Washington while the relatively passive, pacific, and limited diplomatic policy of the New Deal era has been discarded in favor of a far-flung offensive on behalf of America's monied masters.

The Advance of Reaction

In the early days of Roosevelt's rule the reactionary forces within and without the administration were obliged to lay low, awaiting an opportunity to knife the New Deal, and especially its concessions to the lower orders. They tasted first-blood in the Supreme Court decisions outlawing the NRA and other New Deal enactments. From these legal entrenchments they sallied forth to finish the job.

The capitalist assault against the reformist tendencies, and through them against the working masses, pressed forward until it completely conquered Roosevelt himself. Roosevelt's desertion of the New Deal was a great political triumph for conservative capitalism. But this alone could not satisfy a crisis-ridden ruling class. The imperialist bourgeoisie demanded positive action from their executive in the White House both on the domestic and the international fronts. The successful prosecution of the War Deal required, not only that Roosevelt drop the New Deal and all struggle against the economic royalists, but that he take charge of the drive against the workers in preparation for entrance into the conflict. Thus Roosevelt's anti-labor actions form an integral part of his present imperialist policy.

The reactionary edge of the War Deal has been felt in

all spheres of American life, but most keenly by the workers and unemployed. The official agitation against "enemy aliens" and "foreign agents" has gone hand in hand with an anti-labor campaign unparalleled since the last war. The right to strike, particularly "against the government," has been denied. Department of Justice agents infest the labor movement, spying upon and persecuting trade union and unemployed leaders. The anti-trust laws, designed to break up capitalist monopolies, have been invoked to smash the building trades and other unions. Appropriations for unemployed relief are diverted to grease the military machine. Jobless youth are solicited to join the army. And this is but a small part of the whole story.

The War Deal's official sanction and support has lent encouragement to every form of reaction within the country. The strength of this reaction today in Congress is indicated by the overwhelming majority given by the House of Representatives on April 18 to the Walter-Logan Bill which subjects the rulings of 130 Federal bureaus and agencies to court review. This measure, instigated by the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, the war-profiteering monster that pays sub-standard wages to its workers, is designed to emasculate such labor legislation as the Wages and Hours and the National Labor Relations Acts. A motion to exempt these acts from the purview of the Bill was defeated by a 73 to 24 vote.

Oppressed on all sides by this growing capitalist reaction, the workers in the key industries are casting about for ways and means to combat it. In defending themselves, they constantly clash with the official and unofficial agencies of the capitalists and their state apparatus. They begin to see that the President, his party, and the courts are not impartial referees but direct agents of their own bosses.

The Struggle Within the Democratic Party

This sharpening class conflict is reflected within the directing circles of the reigning Democratic Party. The ultra-conservative wing headed by Vice-President Garner, an elderly tight-fisted banker and machine politician from Texas, sees in the mounting reactionary tide its chance to regain complete control of the party apparatus from the centrist leaders grouped around Roosevelt. Garner has officially announced his candidacy for the Democratic nomination.

The left wing of the Democratic Party is led by John L. Lewis, President of the United Mine Workers and the CIO. Sensing the discontent of the working masses, Lewis has several times declared that the New Deal failed to fulfill its promises to labor. He threatened to bolt from the Democratic Party and organize a third party in case the Democrats did not adopt a program and candidate at its forthcoming convention satisfactory to the CIO. However seriously Lewis meant these words, they reflect the worker's disillusionment with Roosevelt and their desire to break loose from the political domination of the capitalist parties.

The acute struggles between these two opposing tendencies, expressed in Lewis' diatribes against "the Garner

Democrats," betokens an impending split in the Democratic ranks.

Roosevelt's Role

In the Democratic Party Roosevelt occupies an intermediate position between two extreme factions, the right wing openly representing Big Business and the left wing officially representing the bulk of organized labor. Roosevelt has functioned as supreme arbiter in the conflicts between these antagonistic factions in his party and between these antagonistic social forces within the nation. His prestige and political power has been derived from his success in performing this function.

Roosevelt's position at any given moment and on any specific issue has been a resultant of the pressures exerted upon him by these opposing camps and is a measure of their relative strength. Today capitalist reaction is on the offensive; the workers are on the defensive. But the triumph of the conservative wing at the convention may drive the workers away from the Democrats. Roosevelt is anxious to keep these forces united and avoid a deep rupture in the ranks of his political organization.

The Return of the Republican Party

Immediately after the Democratic victory in the past Presidential elections, we wrote in the *Socialist Appeal* (December 1936): "Those who predict the death and disappearance of the Grand Old Party are burying a lively corpse. Not only is the Republican Party still supported by forty percent of the electorate . . . it has a genuine political reason for existence: it is by tradition and capacity the most direct and dependable political representative of the ruling class in our society. Like a seasoned actor, ousted by his former understudy, the Grand Old Party is but waiting in the wings, hoping that the leading man now in the spotlight will break his neck so that he can replace him as of yore. A new crisis will again put the Republicans in a position to make a real bid for power."

So it has come to be. Thanks to the bankruptcy of the New Deal, the Republican Party, routed in 1936, has been so strengthened by the reaction that its candidate may win the Presidency. It will probably win enough seats to control Congress. The most likely Republican candidate is Thomas E. Dewey, a megaphone of conservative opinion and a conscienceless careerist utterly devoted to the monied masters behind him. Nevertheless, he is a strong contender for the Presidency and stands an excellent chance of election, especially with disruption in the Democratic ranks.

A Third Term for Roosevelt?

The bitter struggle within the Democratic Party and the prospect of a Republican victory promote the agitation for a third term for Roosevelt in defiance of American political tradition. According to his paladins, Roosevelt alone can hold together the diverse elements within the Democratic coalition and insure victory for the Democrats, even though opposed by Dewey, the strongest of the Republican candidates. These arguments carry conviction to the political bosses in the principal states who are interested above all in the profits of office. Among the supporters of the third-term

movement we find such corrupt chieftains as Boss Hague of New Jersey and Kelley of Chicago.

For popular consumption it is claimed that Roosevelt alone is experienced and dependable enough to lead the nation in the present world crisis.

The main source of strength for the third term, however, comes from the war-mongers. Roosevelt is the preferred candidate of all those who want to go to war quickly, thoroughly, and without prolonged debate. The current indecision of the American ruling class concerning the date and method of its entry into the war is expressed in the struggle now going on between the "Isolationist" and "Interventionist" tendencies. This question has cut through party lines and is leading to a new regrouping of forces. Dewey in his pre-convention speeches has solicited the support of the first group. Roosevelt is drawing around himself the second.

The character of Roosevelt's political entourage is crystallized in the person of James Cromwell, husband of Doris Duke, tobacco heiress, reputed to be "the world's richest girl." After having written a treatise entitled: "In Defense of Capitalism" and having contributed fifty thousand dollars to the 1936 Democratic campaign fund, Cromwell was appointed by Roosevelt as American Minister to Canada. Upon arriving in belligerent Canada, Cromwell brashly declared the sympathy of the United States with the Allied Powers and its intention to support them to the limit.

Cromwell has been chosen, it has just been announced by Boss Hague, to run for Senator in New Jersey. His running mate for Governor on Hague's Democratic ticket will be Charles Edison, Secretary of the Navy in Roosevelt's cabinet. Here is a perfect picture of the forces in the Democratic war-party. Roosevelt, Hague, Cromwell, Edison—the President, the state boss, the super-rich, the head of the navy.

Finally, the personal motive cannot be ignored. Roosevelt would like another term to rehabilitate his reputation damaged by the debacle of the New Deal. He wants to prosecute the War Deal to its end. Vain, vigorous, self-confident, he fancies himself a man of destiny sent to be the savior of American capitalism in its hour of need. Like Woodrow Wilson, he dreams of settling the fate of humanity by America's armed might. By dictating the peace settlement he hopes to inscribe his name on history's pages in indelible ink. At the least, reluctant to relinquish power, he wishes to choose his successor and keep a hand upon the course of events.

For an Independent Labor Party!

Whether or not Roosevelt runs for a third term, whether the Democratic Party suffers a split or remains intact, which capitalist party governs for the next four years, are political questions of secondary importance. These are matters that primarily concern the internal politics of the ruling class. Far greater factors than Presidents or parties govern the march of events these days and determine the nature of national policies. "America's 60 Families" are committed by their economic necessities and political perspectives to participate, sooner or later, in the inter-imperialist gang-war in order to assert their domination over the world.

With Roosevelt or without him, the War Deal will develop to its inevitable end.

The one power capable of checking the mad rush of American imperialism toward war is the might of the organized working class. In this situation the political decisions of the CIO leaders, who stand at the head of the most dynamic section of that class, assume world-historical significance. Lewis' threat to break with the Democrats and launch a third party cannot be taken too seriously in view of his past record of compromise on this issue, his social-patriotic and conservative political outlook, the proximity of the war, the pressure of the government, and the technical difficulties involved.

At the same time the most advanced workers in the industrial unions are exerting counter-pressure upon Lewis to lead the way toward independent political action. The American workers, they feel, need a fighting political party

of their own as much as they need their own economic organizations. The need, the urge for a Labor Party is there. The immediate task of the militants in the mass movement is to give a clear, forcible organized expression to this inchoate sentiment.

The experience of the American Labor Party in New York and the Farmer-Labor outfit in Minnesota shows that a labor party by itself will not solve the problems of the American workers. What decides these vital questions is the character of the program, the leadership, the struggle of the party itself. But the formation of a genuine and independent national Labor Party with its own candidates in the coming campaign, whatever its immediate fortunes, would be as great a step forward for the proletarians of the United States as was the organization of the CIO. Only in this way can the American workers derive positive benefit out of the Presidential elections.

Once Again—Lenin and Luxemburg

By WALTER HELD

A Word About the Biographer

"PAUL FROELICH," states the publisher's blurb, "is a disciple of Rosa Luxemburg and one of her comrades-in-arms. For fifteen years he took his stand at the front which she directed. . . . He knows her work as no one else does. There is no one better qualified to write her biography."¹

The "disciples and comrades-in-arms" of Rosa Luxemburg's great Russian contemporary and co-fighter, Lenin, provide the theme for one of the most lamentable chapters in the history of mankind. The question naturally arises: can the verdict be much different for the epigones of the great Polish internationalist, who devoted her life to the German labor movement?

We do not refer here to such erstwhile comrades-in-arms of Rosa's as the Piecks and the Eberleins, who, in the service of the sinister Kremlin misanthrope play a role which no expression in the language of mankind is capable of adequately characterizing. The same verdict also applies to such former comrades-in-arms of Rosa's in the days of the Spartakusbund as her "qualified biographer" Paul Froelich and others of his intellectual ilk such as Jacob Walcher, Heinrich Brandler, August Thalheimer, etc.

"Her name and that of Karl Liebknecht have been abused as a banner under which to transport contraband," we read in Froelich's book.

Precisely! This fate Rosa shares with many other great revolutionaries and advanced thinkers in history. The contraband with which Rosa's epigones at the head of the German S.A.P. (Socialist Labor Party), Jacob Walcher and Paul Froelich, have set sail is reducible to a few formulas which, moreover, camouflage their smuggling activities only in the most recent period: The acceptance and support of the criminal Stalinist People's Front policy; the defense of the Negrin government and its under-cover Stalinist

agents, the Spanish Noskes and Eberts, against revolutionary criticism; and finally, that swamp of inverted social patriotism—the hope for a victory of British-French imperialism over German imperialism. There can be no doubt as to the verdict Rosa Luxemburg herself would have pronounced upon this "qualified biographer, disciple and comrade-in-arms" and his colleagues.

Is There a Decisive Contrast Between Lenin and Luxemburg?

Froelich's present political position constitutes, at the same time, an insurmountable barrier for him when he seeks to evaluate questions connected with Rosa Luxemburg's personal role. This is true above all in regard to that question which is implicit, so to speak, in any historical examination of Rosa Luxemburg's personal role—why did Rosa and the German Left Wing led by her fail to build a party equal to that of the Russian Bolsheviks, a party which could have led the German revolution to victory?

Paul Froelich is in no way capable of illuminating this question but only of obscuring it completely. What other purpose save that of confusing the issue is served when Froelich at this late date, more than two decades after the victory of the Russian and the defeat of the German (and the international) revolution, trifles with the differences between Lenin and Luxemburg over the role and the building of the revolutionary party? Or when he seeks to steer an eclectic middle course between their views? Or when he pictures matters as if Lenin himself revised and recognized as "exaggerated" such views on this question as he developed in his writings "What to Do?" and "One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward"?

Froelich, for instance, speaks of Lenin's "old ultra-centralist conceptions," and of the "symptomatic role" of the Leninist organizational concepts and then ends up with the following utterly Philistine contention:

"All of Lenin's political views before 1917 display un-

¹ *Rosa Luxemburg: Gedanke und Tat*. By Paul Froelich. Editions Nouvelles Internationales. Paris, 1939.

mistakable (!) Blanquist hangovers and a much too accentuated voluntarism which he naturally quickly discarded once he confronted concrete situations."

What is unmistakable in all this is the pince-nez through which the Menshevik Philistine views Lenin. Lenin's victory as a practical politician cannot be denied even by the Menshevik empiricist—it is not possible to blot out the October insurrection from the annals of history—but he returns to his Menshevik prejudices the moment he touches the October insurrection in its anticipatory theoretical form. The apparent contradictions are resolved by him in a typically Philistine fashion: Lenin was victorious not because of his theoretical conceptions but despite them; while Rosa on the other hand, despite her obviously correct conceptions suffered a grave defeat. Everything is stood on its head!

Lenin was far from considering the theoretical views of Bolshevism as outlived or exaggerated.² On the contrary, in his pamphlet, "Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder"—which appeared three years after the October revolution—Lenin saw precisely in these "theoretical over-accentuations" one of the chief causes for the victory of the Bolsheviks.

In the second chapter of this pamphlet Lenin explains: "The experience of the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia has clearly shown to those who are unable to think or who have not had occasion to ponder over this question, that absolute centralization and the strictest discipline of the proletariat are one of the basic conditions for victory over the bourgeoisie. This has often been discussed. But far from enough thought has been given to the question as to what it means and under what conditions it is possible. . . . Only the history of Bolshevism during the whole period of its existence can satisfactorily explain why it was able to build up and maintain under most difficult conditions the iron discipline necessary for the victory of the proletariat."

He then once again formulates in plain and unmistakable terms the relationship between the leadership, the party, and the masses: "The political strategy and tactics carried out by the political leadership of the party and realized through the activity of the party as a whole must be correctly based, that is, based on Marxist theory."

But the activity of the party does not, of course, take place in a vacuum: "The broadest masses must be con-

vinced by their own experience that the political strategy and tactics of the party are correct."

Such a conception is, to be sure, far removed from the Luxemburgist view that the conscious initiative of the party leadership in the formation of tactics plays only a subordinate role. But it has nothing whatever in common with Blanquism or voluntarism. Lenin explains the practical policy of the Bolsheviks between February and October 1917:

"The Bolsheviks began their victorious struggle against the parliamentary, in reality bourgeois republic and against the Mensheviks very cautiously and, contrary to the views now often met with in Europe and America, the preparations for it were by no means a simple matter. The Bolsheviks did *not* call for the overthrow of the government at the beginning of the period indicated, but explained that it was impossible to overthrow it until the composition and the mood of the Soviets had been changed. We did not proclaim a boycott of the bourgeois parliament, of the Constituent Assembly but declared officially that a bourgeois republic with a Constituent Assembly is better than one without a Constituent Assembly, but that a Workers' and Peasants' republic, a Soviet republic, is better than any bourgeois-democratic-parliamentary republic. Without such careful, thorough, elaborate and prolonged preparation we could not have obtained victory in November 1917 nor have maintained this victory."

Lenin directed his pamphlet in the first place toward the movement in Germany. He consciously counterposed the "cautious" policy of the Bolsheviks to the neck-breaking policy of the Spartakusbund and the young Communist party. Unfortunately, Lenin's book fell upon arid soil. The "Little Triumvirate" in the leadership of the Comintern (Zinoviev, Radek, Bukharin) drove the German party into the adventure of the "March Action" and the German leadership—with the exception of Paul Levi and Clara Zetkin—was blind enough to permit itself to be pushed into this putschist adventure.

The theoretical justification of this genuinely "Blanquist" and "voluntarist" action was undertaken by none other than the sage Marxist, Paul Froelich. And by way of compensation, Lenin's pamphlet was submitted subsequently to purely social democratic interpretation at the hands of these self-same "theoreticians of the offensive" (Thalheimer-Froelich). All the more imperative is it to understand Lenin's real meaning today.

Luxemburg's "Theory of Spontaneity"

Paul Froelich is of course quite right in denying the existence of a Luxemburg theory of spontaneity in the sense in which such a theory is ascribed to her by the epigones of Lenin. She did not count upon the automatic collapse of capitalism. She did not in any way deny the role of consciousness in history nor the need for the party. All this is incontrovertible and can be proved by scores of quotations from her writings as well as by her whole life, which was devoted to the education of the proletariat and the development of its revolutionary action. But she did confine the task of the party to agitation and propaganda. The rest she left to the masses. As against the Leninist formulation of the task—organize the revolution—she

² The contention that Lenin revised his own views is usually based on the preface which he wrote for a collection of his essays, "Twelve Years," in 1907. This preface states: "The basic mistake of all those who today polemicize against 'What to Do?' consists in this, that they tear it completely out of a context which belongs to a distinct social milieu, a specific and long since outstripped period in the development of our party. . . . Whoever speaks today of the fact that *Iskra* (in 1901 and 1902) exaggerated the idea of the organization of professional revolutionists, can just as easily blame the Japanese now, after the Russo-Japanese war, for exaggerating the strength of Russian military power, for making exaggerated efforts in the struggle against this power. The Japanese were naturally duty-bound to mobilize against a possible maximum of Russian power, in order to achieve victory. Unfortunately, many judge from the outside, without seeing that the idea of the organization of professional revolutionists has achieved a complete victory *already, today*. However, this victory would have been impossible if at that time this idea had not been pushed into the foreground, if it had not been preached to people who stood like obstacles in its way, precisely in 'exaggerated' form. . . ."

One must first forget completely how to read in order to be able to derive from these lines a revision of the views of *Iskra* in 1901 and 1902. According to Lenin it was not *Iskra* that erred in "exaggerating" the idea of the organization of professional revolutionists, but those who in 1907 spoke of *Iskra's* exaggerations, that is, at a time when the *Iskra* idea had already achieved a complete victory, a victory which would have been impossible without these "exaggerations." If it was nonsense to speak of *Iskra's* exaggerations in 1907, because *Iskra's* views had already been victorious—unfortunately only in relation to Russia—then it is much greater nonsense to speak of such exaggerations today (1939) when this idea has *not yet triumphed* and when the future of the entire movement depends upon the realization of this idea on a world scale.

stands much closer to the position of the Menshevik slogan (the slogan of the revolutionary Mensheviks of 1905, not that of the government Mensheviks of 1917)—unleash the revolution.

Lenin sees the task as that of creating the party, which subordinates itself to the historic process. Rosa views the historic process itself as creating the organization and even its tactics. Froelich reminds us that Lenin often used to jest about the Luxemburg idea of process creating the organization. But once again the error, it would appear, was on Lenin's side. "He was led to discover himself that organization forms in their transformations are subordinate to the process of development of the movement as a whole."

As if it were Lenin who wished to create the party in a vacuum! As if it were Lenin who denied the reciprocal influences between the party and the historic process! All he did was to pose this relationship in a way diametrically opposite to that of Rosa Luxemburg. The organization and the tactics are created not by the process but by those people who achieve an understanding of the process by means of Marxist theory and who subordinate themselves to the process through the elaboration of a plan based upon their understanding. Permit me to illustrate this thought with an example from natural science.

The power latent in a waterfall may be transformed into electricity. But not every person without more ado is capable of accomplishing this feat. Scientific education and training are indispensable. On the other hand, the scientifically trained engineers are naturally constrained to draft their plans according to the given natural conditions. What can be said, however, of a man, who, because of this, jeers at engineering science and praises instead the "elementary force of water which produces electricity"? We should be entirely justified in laughing him out of court. Nor is it otherwise with the social process. It was for this and no other reason that Lenin used to jest about the conception of "organization as process" which was counterposed to his conception.

The Spartacus Uprising

Since Froelich, in evaluating the political views as a whole of the two great workers' leaders "before 1917," tends to charge Lenin with the errors rather than Luxemburg, I was somewhat curious as to his evaluation of Rosa's political mistake of January 1919, so catastrophic for the German movement.

His explanation is both startling and fantastic: "The truth is, there was no Spartacus uprising."

When the attorneys for the defense, for instance at the Ledebour trial, adopted such a viewpoint and placed the juridical responsibility for the January 1919 events in Berlin on the enemy, that was naturally quite justified and even objectively correct. However, for a historian and politician, who wants to learn something from events, such an answer is completely inadequate.

It is of course true "that the January struggles were prepared by the leadership of the counter-revolution with circumspection and determination and were provoked by them with great cunning." But in so doing, the counter-revolution was only performing its function for which to be sure

it can be blamed by a jurist but not by a historian without running the risk of appearing ridiculous.

The question is: Why was Spartacus so completely taken in by the provocation?

For this is precisely what actually happened. In other words, the Spartacus uprising did indeed take place; not even Froelich can deny this. It appears to be his view even today that Spartacus was correct in acting as it did. Thus we read in Froelich's book:

"Rosa Luxemburg and with her, the leadership of the Communist party, could not agree to the demand made by Radek: Themselves to call upon the fighting workers to retreat, to discontinue the struggle. She could not agree, all the more so since the Communist party in January 1919 was not nearly so firm, nor its cadres so consolidated as were those of the Bolshevik party when the latter in a similar situation in July 1917 succeeded in guiding a dangerous retreat to a favorable conclusion. The German Communist party could not assume the leadership alone either for offensive or for retreat."

A masterly philosophy! Since the Communist party was not yet a Communist party, therefore it could not act like a Communist party! And yet, as old Hegel remarked, it is impossible to become something without being something. Only by acting on the basis of its understanding, regardless of its temporary numerical strength, can the party enforce discipline in its own ranks and eventually be regarded as authoritative by the masses. Not to mention the fact that the superiority of the Bolshevik party established here by Froelich himself should at least have led him to consider whether or not this superiority was made possible precisely by the entire Leninist conception "before 1917" with its "unmistakable Blanquist and voluntarist features."

The Bolsheviks too were subjected, between February and October, to provocation by the government as well as to revolutionary impatience and the impetuous will to action of a small, advanced section of the masses. Moreover, the situation of January 1919 in Berlin, from the standpoint of the *general maturity of the revolution*, is comparable to the April days of 1917 in St. Petersburg rather than to the July days. But what did the Bolsheviks do when in the mass demonstrations toward the end of April in connection with the Milyukov crisis the slogan was raised of "Down with the Provisional Government!" and when isolated groups of ultra-left Bolsheviks (among whom provocateurs also plied their profession) declared themselves prepared to overthrow the government? The Bolshevik Central Committee submitted to the Soviets' veto of the demonstrations and declared in a resolution that the slogan "Down with the Provisional Government!" was incorrect, because "without a solid (that is, conscious and organized) majority of the people on the side of the revolutionary proletariat such a slogan is either an empty phrase or leads to attempts of an adventuristic character."³

By avoiding the pitfall of provocation and by holding in check the revolutionary impatience of the minority—that is, keeping it within political channels, the Bolsheviks succeeded in achieving their conception, namely, controlling and leading the entire mass movement. In this way the Bolsheviks, at the end of the eighth month of the revolution,

³ Leon Trotsky: *History of the Russian Revolution*, Vol. I, p. 354-355.

were able to deliver a living child into this world. Spartacus, on the other hand, in accordance with its conception, disclaimed the task of controlling and leading the mass movement; fell victim to the revolutionary dilettantism of the left U.S.P.D. leaders of the Ledebour type; and, consequently, delivered into this world, at the end of the second month of the revolution, only an abortion.

Froelich and his fraternity naturally have at hand plausible explanations for all sorts of abortions and defeats: "That the first period of the revolution did nevertheless terminate with a heavy and in the long run decisive defeat, is due not so much to the many mistakes committed by the revolutionary front as to the fact that these mistakes sprang from an unprecedentedly difficult situation."

Of course! Of course! If both the organization and the tactics are created by the process, then it is only just and fair to attribute all the mistakes to the situation rather than to the human minds which conceived them. One is enabled to prattle endlessly without ever feeling the need for action. In this way the lessons of every defeat escape examination. What would you say of an obstetrician who, after twenty years of practice filled with nothing but abortions, declared smugly of them that they resulted from unprecedentedly difficult processes of birth; and then proceeded with stoic calm to continue the work of destruction without so much as an attempt to perfect his knowledge of obstetrics? In point of fact, this is precisely the historic function of politicians of Froelich's ilk. So long as the revolution lives, they do everything within their empirical eclecticism to lay it low; then, at its grave, they explain the death "Marxistically" and "objectively."

Conditions have thus reached such a state that we can say with certainty today: The coming revolution will take place under circumstances that will make the objective resistance to all previous revolutions appear, in comparison, like child's play. This makes it all the more imperative for us to ground ourselves in the science of revolution and to prevent these quacks from carrying on their pernicious practice!

To round out the picture, we must also mention that towards the end of his book Froelich raises in his own mind the following doubt: Wasn't there after all a decisive difference between Lenin and Luxemburg? He finds that Rosa's politics in the January Days were not free from inner contradictions, and he poses this question: Did she lack the necessary physical strength for the execution of this task, exhausted as she was by her prolonged imprisonment? Or "did this great leader who, as a theoretician and strategist of the class struggle moved with such unswerving inner firmness, fail to reach that ultimate perfection of the leader of an army who, disregarding all shifting moods, knows just how to decide realistically when the critical moment is reached and how to push through such a decision—that perfection in the leader of the revolutionary army which became flesh and blood in the person of Lenin? The question cannot be solved. . . ."

The very manner of posing the question reveals once again the soul of a Philistine. After he has disposed of the ideological opposition between the two great revolutionists by means of rationalization, the problem reappears for him again on the plane of personalities and their character-

istics, a level on which it "cannot be solved" and on which even an eventual solution—without the ideological differences having been cleared up previously—could not possibly bring us one inch towards a real understanding.

Luxemburg's Theory of the Accumulation of Capital

After having been compelled by Froelich's method of presentation to engage in a polemic not only against her biographer but against Rosa Luxemburg herself, we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of defending her main theoretical work against the superficial interpretation of the man who "knows her work as no one else does."

In connection with his rather primitive presentation of Luxemburg's theory of accumulation, Froelich makes the following truly astounding statements (especially astounding since they emanate from the administrator of her literary estate):

"After Rosa's death Bukharin published a critique of her theory of accumulation. As has already been mentioned, he actually succeeded in uncovering several weaknesses in Luxemburg's argumentation. In various sections of her book Rosa put forward the obviously false contention that the accumulation of capital is the hoarding of money-capital; that this is what the capitalists are concerned about. In reality the formation of money-capital is only an intermediary feature of the process of accumulation. The end-phase of every period of accumulation is reached with the investment of capital in production itself in the form of new means of production and of wages for the increased labor power. Perhaps it is this error in her thinking—so hard to understand in Rosa's case—which led her to overestimate the intermediary role of money in the realization of surplus value and furthermore, to regard as impossible the direct exchange of accumulating values between the producers of means of production and means of consumption (!)."

It is hard to understand why Froelich is not better acquainted with Rosa's works and why, instead of defending Rosa here against the demagogic distortion of her argumentation by Bukharin, he fell victim to the presentation of his party friend, Fritz Sternberg.

Nowhere does Rosa postulate the formation of money-capital as the ultimate aim of production (she is, indeed, preoccupied with the problem of accumulation, that is, of reproduction on a progressively increasing scale!). Nor does it occur to her to seek a solution in the source of the money used as the medium in the process of exchange between the producers of the production goods industry and the producers of the consumption goods industry. To be sure, in accord with Marx she is of the opinion that surplus value must shed its natural form and take on the pure exchange form before it can once again be shaped into productive capital. Most surprising is Froelich's attempt to solve the difficulty (or part of the difficulty) by means of "direct exchange" between the producers of the production goods industry and the producers of the consumption goods industry. Especially surprising is this in view of his reference on the very same page to the "laconic" reply Rosa made to Otto Bauer who in his day operated like Froelich:

"It is impossible to obtain copper mine stocks with a

carload of unsaleable candles, or to establish a machine factory with a warehouse full of unmarketable galoshes."

However, let us hear what Rosa Luxemburg herself has to say, in order to show how far she was from confusing the accumulation of capital with the hoarding of money-capital or of even contending that "this is what the capitalists are concerned about." Just the contrary. She states expressly:

"The transformation of surplus value into the money form is the essential economic prerequisite of capitalist accumulation, *even though it is not an essential element of actual reproduction*. Between production and reproduction, two metamorphoses therefore occur of the surplus product: the shedding of the use form *and the assumption of the natural form corresponding to the purposes of accumulation*." (my emphasis—W.H.)

Far from designating the pursuit of money-capital as the ultimate goal of capitalist activity, Rosa specifically quotes the view of Marx that such hoarding of money-capital "is only simple accumulation of wealth, which is not an element of actual reproduction." And still more precisely: "The accumulation of wealth is not production at all and therefore not even an increment of production to begin with."

Again, Rosa formulates the problem as follows: "For purposes of accumulation, part of the surplus value is not consumed by the capitalist, but is transformed into capital for the purpose of progressively expanding production. The question then arises: Whence come the buyers of this surplus product which the capitalists themselves do not consume and which the workers are even less able to consume, since their own consumption is covered completely by a given variable capital? Whence the demand for accumulated surplus value, or, as Marx puts it: Where does the money come from to pay for the accumulated surplus value?"⁴

But instead of seeking the solution where her biographer (following Bukharin) has her seek it, namely, in the supplementary creation of money, she regards Marx's manner of posing the question as oblique and continues along the following trend of thought:

"In relation to money as a medium of circulation we must here, in observing the process of reproduction as a whole, assume that capitalist society always has at its disposal the amount of money required for its process of circulation or else is able to create substitutes for it. What must be explained, however, are the great social acts of exchange called forth by real economic needs. That capitalist surplus value, before it can be accumulated, must pass through the money form cannot be left out of consideration. For, as Marx himself says on another occasion: Money on the one side gives birth to progressively expanding reproduction, on the other side its possibility exists *without* money, since money in itself is not an element of actual reproduction."⁵

If Bukharin, who was well acquainted with all these quotations, accused Rosa of transforming a "normal capitalist" into a medieval money-changer and usurer, into Pushkin's "greedy knight," and in the best case, a "money capitalist," then this does not at all "follow altogether logic-

ally from Rosa Luxemburg's arguments,"⁶ but rather from hair-raising and demagogic distortion.

Rosa does not at all dispute that the capitalists are "fanatics in their zeal for expanding production." She merely asks what it is that enables the capitalists to realize their fanaticism. And here almost all of Rosa Luxemburg's critics, Bukharin included, commit the absurdity of drawing the conclusion from the Marxist schema of progressively expanding reproduction at the end of the second volume of *Capital*, that accumulation of capital for capitalism as a whole in society, along with a continual rise in the consumption of the workers as well as the capitalists, is possible without limitation within a system of pure capitalism. In this manner, the whole historic necessity of socialism disappears and Bukharin tops off this absurdity by assuming hypothetically the possibility of a statified capitalism "in which there are no crises."⁷

Today reality shows us, however, that it is precisely a capitalism with the greatest amount of statification (Germany, Italy, Japan) which is most sharply subordinate to the dynamics of the process and, consequently, dependent upon permanent expansion, upon permanent "extension of its living space," in order to escape the permanent crisis.

Is Rosa's Theory of Accumulation the Basis of Her Inadequate Conception of the Party?

I have gone into the question of the theory of accumulation also because a Dutch comrade, Peters, in his article entitled "The Spontaneity of Rosa Luxemburg and the Conscious Goal of Lenin"⁸ tries to deduce Rosa Luxemburg's inadequate conception of the tasks of the party from her theory of accumulation. His proof rests on the contention that Rosa Luxemburg expected an "automatic" and "mechanical" end of capitalism.

As against this, suffice it to point out that even in the preface to her book she expresses the hope that her work will be a contribution "of some significance for the practical struggle against imperialism," just as in her *Antikritik* she designates it as the task of the social consciousness embodied in the socialist proletariat "to intervene as an active factor in the blind interplay of forces."⁹

When Comrade Peters believes that he can refute Rosa's theory of accumulation by quoting Lenin's phrase to the effect that there are no absolutely hopeless situations and that the capitalists can always find a way out, I am afraid that he is over-simplifying matters. Lenin's dictum applies to *politics*, where the capitalists—as long as the proletariat does not prevent them—can always find a way out. It does not apply to economics—to the laws of which the capitalists as well as the workers are subordinate. With Marx we conceive of the economic development of society as a natural historic process whose product, socially, the individual always remains, no matter how much he may raise himself above it subjectively. To conclude from a phrase of Lenin's which in its context is absolutely correct, that the capitalist, personifying society, as such "will always find a way out," in order to realize reproduction on a progressively expanding scale, is patently absurd.

⁶ N. Bukharin: *Der Imperialismus und die Akkumulation des Kapitals*, p. 21.

⁷ Bukharin: *Op. Cit.*, p. 84.

⁸ *De Enige Weg*, No. 16.

⁹ Rosa Luxemburg: *Gesammelte Werke*, Vol. VI., p. 479.

⁴ Rosa Luxemburg: *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals*, p. 115.

⁵ *Op. Cit.*, p. 127.

When Comrade Peters maintains that "history has already furnished proof which cannot be obscured by anyone (!) that the collapse of capitalism does not take place in the economic sense, that is, the impossibility of retaining the capitalist process of circulation and therefore the impossibility of realizing surplus value," we cannot go along with him. On the contrary, current history has presented us with an example of a tremendous collapse of the capitalist process of circulation (of the world market and of world trade). In the course of the 1929-1933 crisis world trade dropped to 25 per cent of its volume at the conjunctural peak and has not since then recovered appreciably. The unlimited possibility of realizing surplus value does not seem to be doing so well either: While the total value of world trade in 1929 amounted to 66 billion dollars, between 1932 and 1934 it fell to 23 billion, that is, almost one-third of its former value. Accumulation, progressively expanding reproduction, became impossible for world capitalism as a whole several decades ago. That is precisely why we speak of the "stage of decline and decay" of capitalism. The first World War was itself an expression of this decay, and the present World War likewise, except to a far greater degree. It is precisely because of the impossibility of realizing unlimited accumulated surplus value and the impossibility for world capitalism in society as a whole to place it in the process of production that the struggle among the capitalists takes on the form of a permanent world war which—if revolution does not intervene—must lead to the decline of our whole civilization (including, naturally, modern capitalism as well).

Comrade Peters complains that in my article, "The German Left Wing and Bolshevism,"¹⁰ I did not, "despite my correct conclusions," plumb the "true wellspring" of the differences between Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg, precisely because I failed to deduce her inadequate conception of the tasks of the party from her theory of accumulation. Just how inconsequential that is may be gleaned from an example in this very same issue of *Enige Weg*. In connection with the sixtieth birthday of Comrade Trotsky, *Enige Weg* publishes a lengthy biographical article and develops quite correctly the point of view that Trotsky in his conception of the building of the party before 1917—which was simi-

¹⁰ *New International*, February 1939.

lar to that of Rosa Luxemburg—was incorrect, but that his theory of the permanent revolution, on the other hand, which he defended against Lenin, was brilliantly confirmed by events themselves. What would Comrade Peters say of a presentation deducing the differences between Lenin and Trotsky before 1917 from the "source" and the "true well-spring" of Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution?

On the contrary, Trotsky was set apart from Menshevism precisely by his theory and through it he came to Bolshevism. In like manner we may say that it was precisely her deep insight into the essence of the capitalist process of accumulation and her premonition of the coming catastrophes which separated Rosa Luxemburg from the reformist majority of the German social democracy and its illusions. Comrade Peters is also on the wrong track in contending that the recognition of Rosa's "theory of collapse" leads to the "opportunist swamp." Just the contrary is true. It was precisely her opponents on this question, the "orthodox" defenders of the Marxist schemas of reproduction, who drew therefrom the conclusion of the unlimited possibility of accumulation—Tougan-Baranovsky, Bulgakov, Otto Bauer, Hilferding, Kautsky, Bukharin—and they, without exception, landed in the camp of opportunism and reformism.

Rosa Luxemburg and the Fourth International

To conclude: We must oppose every attempt to slur over the opposition between Lenin and Luxemburg; every attempt to find a compromise between their views, to reduce everything to conciliatory "historically objective" formulas. We accept without reservation Lenin's "ultra-centralist," "bureaucratic," "Blanquist," and "voluntarist" conceptions. But on the other hand, we must not exaggerate our criticism of Luxemburg to the point where we "throw out the child along with the bathwater," to the point where we deny her progressive sides. To do that would be giving direct aid to the epigones of Luxemburg who base themselves exclusively upon her weak sides and distort these into a caricature. Rosa Luxemburg, too, has left a theoretical heritage which the Fourth International must take into custody.

The Pathology of Renegacy

By JAMES P. CANNON

RECENTLY I have been reading some popular accounts of the scientific work of the pioneer microbe hunters. It is extremely interesting to follow their patient and unrelenting pursuit of the tiny agents of human disease, the obscure germs working in the dark unknown to the victims. They finally tracked them down and brought them to view wriggling on a glass slide under the microscope. Thus, one after another, the microbes of tuberculosis, syphilis, diphtheria, and other devastating sicknesses were identified and their life habits exposed. Only after this, could the cures be prescribed.

In my week-end reading I alternated some of the chap-

ters of *The Microbe Hunters*, which I read for pleasure and instruction, with an examination of some of the latest effusions of numerous fugitives from Marxism, which I read without pleasure in the line of duty. Both readings, however, could properly be classified under the same head: the study of harmful bacteria. Like the human organism, the revolutionary labor movement, a social organism, must be guarded against infections. A fighter in the cause of socialism is obliged to take notice of what is said and done by its enemies, especially those enemies who pretend to be its friends. Such are those deserters who invite the revolutionary workers to pass over with them into the camp of

democratic imperialism under guise of "reconsidering" socialism and Marxism. Such are those who, in the name of morality and truth, serve the social system founded on lies. The operations of these hypocritical morality-fakers, who seek to spread pessimism and demoralization in the workers' movement, are of interest to us in the same way that malignant disease germs are of interest to people who want to safeguard the public health.

The death agony of capitalism not only repels some enlightened individuals of the bourgeois class who foresee its inevitable downfall and identify themselves with the proletarian struggle for socialism; it also attracts to its side a peculiar species of supporters, ex-socialists and ex-radicals—deserters from the workers' movement—who have become converted to a fanatical belief in the indestructibility of the capitalist world order and who do everything they can to shield it from the revolutionary blows of the proletariat. In recent years, parallel with the feverish advance of capitalist decay, these anomalous conversions have increased and multiplied, particularly among the 'camp followers of the workers' movement. Overwhelmed by the violent social convulsions which characterize our epoch, not a few intellectuals who once sympathized with the workers' movement, and even some of its former representatives, have been seized with capitulatory panic and insist upon communicating it to others. Mistaking their visceral disturbances for the processes of profound thought, they seek to translate their own personal demoralization into a "way of life" for the masses.

They have discovered, on the eve of the explosion of bankrupt capitalism in a new world war, that the revolutionary struggle for socialism is not worth while. Boiled down to its essentials, and stripped of its hypocritical pretensions and moralistic vaporings, this is the message of all of them, including the uncouth and not very intellectual rookie in the legion of renegacy, the repentant ex-communist, Benjamin Gitlow.

The fight for socialism is a hard fight, and they are not the first to desert it. Nor are they able, despite their frantic search for novelty, to discover or say anything new. As for their theories, they are nothing but a warmed-over hash of the old revisionism and standardized bourgeois criticism, mixed with the conceptions of the pre-Marxian utopians, who deduced their socialistic schemes from moral considerations divorced from the real process of historical development. As for their actions, the neo-renegades follow in the footsteps of their masters, the social-democrats of 1914. Their psychological motivation is the same: an inexplicable confidence in the durability of capitalism when it is cracking at every seam, and a disbelief in the power of the masses when they are gathering their forces for colossal efforts.

But the American would-be saviors of democratic capitalism are different from the social-democrats of 1914 in two respects. First, the latter were more decent; they waited for the entry of their governments into the war before they rushed to their support. The traitors of 1940 are deliberately preparing in advance to summon the submerged and cruelly exploited millions in the mass production hells, the unemployed, the sharecroppers and the Negroes to pour out their blood on the battlefields in defense of American democracy. That is the political meaning of all their

moralistic fulminations against "totalitarianism." Secondly, the social patriots of 1914 represented great mass organizations of the workers which they in part had helped to build. Their little brothers of 1940 represent nothing and nobody but themselves. The measure of their seriousness and their social value is indicated by the fact that they could not create even a small organization under conditions of the free democracy which they recommend so highly.

They are all isolated individuals, yet each one of them considers his disillusionment with the proletarian revolution an important public event and continually makes all kinds of elaborate explanations of how it came to pass. On the eve of the real beginning of capitalism's second world war, which will crush out the lives of millions and tens of millions of human beings, they write about themselves, their disappointments and reactions as though these were the most interesting and important subjects in the world. Well aware of their own shabbiness, they feel the need of self-justification and public approval. They are uneasy of conscience and seek to stifle it by shouting imprecations at those who have remained faithful to the banner they have deserted. They give every explanation of their motivation but the real one—the fact that they have no confidence in the socialist future of humanity and no stomach for the struggle to achieve it.

Isolated from the workers' movement and only conditionally accepted by the real masters of bourgeois society, they constitute a little coterie of their own, a sort of apostates' fraternity, engaged in log-rolling and back-scratching for each other, and fore-gathering in that house of ill-fame known as the "New Leader." Conscious of the fact that they are practicing fraud, they insist on their "morality," as every confidence man wants to be known as "Honest John." Each of them, separately, is "reconsidering," reevaluating, and revising Marxism, and collectively they hold discussions and symposia on the various individual revelations—only to discover that they all add up to the same zero.

After each discussion the fact remains that there is no way out for humanity on the capitalist road. The continued private ownership of socially operated industry and the artificial national barriers between competitive states can yield not progress any more, but only stagnation and decay, ever more devastating economic crises and civilization-devouring wars. In one country after another rotting capitalism turns to its last reserve—fascism. Wars have become totalitarian, and the so-called democratic countries at war are transformed into military camps under dictatorial rule. Capitalism in its death crisis is incompatible with peace, or security, or—if the democratic gentlemen will permit me—democracy. The revolutionary overthrow of capitalism is a burning historic necessity. This prognosis of Marx remains unassailable, asserting itself ever stronger after each new experience.

Capitalism had landed in a blind alley already thirty years ago. The first World War gave violent notice of this fact at the cost of more than ten million dead and twenty million wounded. Capitalism, after the war, could not save itself. It is incontestable that the social patriots at the head of the German labor movement, who believed in the viability of capitalism after its authentic representatives had lost all faith and all authority, saved the tottering structure of

German capitalism. They prolonged its life artificially until it slipped into fascism and then plunged into the second World War. The revisionists and reformists of all shades never tire of repeating that the world revolution envisaged by Lenin and Trotsky after the war did not materialize on schedule, and imagine that this refutes the Marxist thesis. They conveniently overlook the services which the reformist leaders of the German socialist and labor movement rendered to German capitalism. And they never think of mentioning the fact that these worthy German democrats utilized the most reactionary military forces to drown the developing workers' revolution in the blood of thousands of its best sons.

The first World War and its aftermath produced revolutions in Russia and Hungary, revolutionary situations in Germany and Italy and a mighty upsurge of the labor movement throughout the entire world. In the two decades since the defeat of the German revolution there was the grandiose revolutionary upheaval in China, the British general strike, the revolution in Spain and the great wave of sit-down strikes which signaled a revolutionary situation in France. There has been no lack of revolutionary situations in the past twenty-five years. The thesis of Lenin and the early Comintern proved to be infinitely more realistic than that of the skeptics, pessimists and traitors who are ready to believe in anything except the power of the masses to take their destiny into their own hands and reshape the world on socialist lines. Capitalism long ago lost all capacity to survive by its own resources. Its firmest bases of support are provided by the reformists and revisionists in the labor movement, who do not understand that capitalism is historically doomed and do not believe in the capacity of the workers to accomplish their historic mission.

Stalinism which is not Marxist but revisionist, not communism but its mortal enemy, plays fundamentally the same role in the international labor movement as the social-democracy. The Stalinist betrayal brought even more devastating results because it was able to exploit the tremendous authority of the Russian revolution with the advanced workers who had broken with social-democracy and its perfidious twin, anarcho-syndicalism. The deceptiveness of Stalinism was a mighty power for the demoralization of the vanguard labor movement of the whole world. The phenomenon of a degenerated and traitorous bureaucracy, operating in the name of a workers' state which symbolized the Russian revolution in the minds of millions of militant workers throughout the world, was unique in history. It worked all the more destructively because it was not understood; and in part because it did not understand itself, working blindly in the service of alien class forces.

In politics and theory Stalinism introduced nothing new; it simply took over the baggage of the reformists and revisionists of social-democracy. Even in methods it invented nothing. Stalin only borrowed, adapted and intensified enormously the methods of the bourgeois world and its reformist agents in the struggle against the proletariat. Misrepresentation and falsification? These are the stock in trade of the ruling class and its agents; a society founded on class exploitation could not live without them. Stalin did not originate the newspaper lie or any other lie. He simply took over the art of lying and adapted it to his purposes. Frame-

ups against revolutionary opponents? Kerensky and his gang, the Mensheviks and social revolutionists, set the pattern in their characterization of Lenin and Trotsky as the mercenary agents of the Kaiser. The murder of revolutionists in the name of socialism? Noske and Scheidemann and similar champions of democracy began this ghastly business. Stalin originated nothing. He only copied and developed the arts of deception, violence and perfidy to an unprecedented degree.

The social basis of the renegacy of Stalinism is fundamentally the same as that of social-democracy—a privileged stratum which seeks to serve its interests against the interests of the great mass. The psychological source of the politics of Stalinism is likewise identical with that of all the other renegades—a terribly exaggerated estimate of the strength and durability of world capitalism and a lack of confidence in the world revolution. Acting on this falsely motivated and at bottom unrealistic premise, Stalinism dealt its heaviest blows against the world proletariat just at the time when the bankruptcy of capitalism was engendering revolutionary situations in one country after another.

It is an ironical circumstance that revulsion against Stalinism has been instrumental in leading a whole school of its opponents to a position which, from a class point of view, is on the same level as that of the Stalinists. Seeing in Stalinism the incarnation of all things evil and fighting it to the point of phobia, they arrive at a prescription for the proletariat which is no better and not fundamentally different from that of Stalinism. Stalin recommends to the workers of the world a reconciliation with their exploiters at home in behalf of a fictitious socialism in the Soviet Union. The professional anti-Stalinists recommend an alliance against Communism with the masters of America in the name of a fictitious democracy which can't even tell a hungry worker where he can get a job or show a dispossessed sharecropper where he can find a roof to shelter his family from the elements.

All opportunists and renegades—Stalinist and anti-Stalinist—have common traits. They see only the power of the present-day and bow down before it. The fact that rich American capitalism is caught in the insoluble crisis of the world system and cannot escape from it; that it is already past the peak of its development and has also entered into decline and decay; that the all-powerful American proletariat must and will take the road of social revolution in order to save itself—these pitiful skeptics don't believe in that. They don't believe in anything but defeat.

Renegacy is not a doctrine, not a new idea, it is a disease. The reconsiderers and revisers of Marxism cannot teach the advanced workers anything and do not seriously try. They have no program to substitute for the scientific program of Marxism. Farthest from their minds is any plan to organize a movement to lead an attack on capitalism. Their function, insofar as they have one, is simply to spread skepticism in the ranks of the workers' movement and undermine its morale.

In order to save themselves and all humanity from the chaos breaking over the world with the death agony of capitalism, the advanced workers must know the road to the socialist future and take it resolutely. The richest gift

of the scientific socialism of Marx and Engels to the proletarian vanguard is the knowledge that the downfall of the capitalist order and the victory of the proletariat are alike historically necessary and inevitable. It is the assurance that the historic process works unceasingly on the side of the proletarian revolution which gives to the conscious movement of the workers' vanguard its confidence, its morale. The disciples of Marx who fight for socialism, not as a utopian scheme but as the realization of a historic necessity—it is they alone, as experience has already shown, who never doubt the future, who keep their heads and persevere in the face of temporary set-backs and defeats. The Marxist doctrine is the greatest treasure of the proletariat precisely because it shows the way. Marxism is for the workers' movement what military theory, maps, superior equipment and realistic confidence are to an army. The struggle against Marxism, now more than ever, serves only to undermine the

confidence and paralyze the striking power of the proletariat. The defense of Marxism against any and all opponents and critics, remains the most progressive and revolutionary of all tasks.

To be sure, the latest American crop of revisionists and traitors to socialism don't amount to much at the present time. They are only disillusioned individuals who are trying to spread their demoralization to others. But they talk a lot; and later, speaking with the authority of former socialists, they might get a hearing and help to disorient some workers from the path of resolute struggle. It is that possibility, rather than their present importance, that justifies and necessitates a brutal struggle against them. The smallest infection should be treated with antiseptic. So taught the pioneers of scientific medicine who discovered disease germs and the way to fight them. The revolutionary labor movement must guard its health by the same method.

"Science"—Burnham's Style

By JARVIS GERLAND

UPON REJECTING the position of the Fourth International on the class nature of the Soviet State, Burnham passed, whether he willed it or not, to a general offensive against the very foundations of Marxism. Such an offensive suffers from old age, but Burnham in his article "Science and Style" proposes to "modernize" it with the aid of "science."

It is not with pleasure that one undertakes discussing this article. The repugnance which must be overcome in order to read it, is soon replaced by boredom—these platitudes, chewed over so many times, do not improve with age. The article contains nothing which has not been said again and again by all the hecklers of Marxism, professionals and amateurs. The most hackneyed arguments, the most worn out comparisons, all these rags which are scattered throughout the small town newspapers even, are assembled here and presented as the latest conquest of science by a mind emancipated from a' superstition. It is true that he has not yet dared to present a few tatters in all their filth; we see only their fringes. Many arguments stop short and do not yet present all that is in reserve. With vulgarity and conceit is mixed a strong dose of hypocrisy. Burnham declares for instance, in his attack against Trotsky, "I have been scrupulously fair in presenting here your central argument." This "scrupulous fairness" as we shall see presently, has the same value as that of his predecessors—it strongly resembles unscrupulous unfairness.

One of the first propositions which the document attributes to Trotsky is the following: "From dialectical materialism *it follows that* Marxian sociology, in particular the Marxian theory of the state, is true." The expression "it follows that" is emphasized by Burnham himself who does not wish to leave the least doubt about his affirmation. In order to justify the attribution of such an assertion to his opponent, there is indeed in the page from which the above sentence is taken, the little word "thus." It is rather thin. As for the "proofs" announced with such grandiloquence

by Burnham ("Evidence, argument, proof: these only are my weapons.") his "scruples" have permitted him to dispense with them.

In truth, such a proposition is foreign to the spirit and the letter of Marxism. Did Marx deduce "Capital" from a few logical or metaphysical principles pegged at the head of the first chapter? Did he begin his work with nothing more than an abstract exposition of his dialectical and materialist "principles"? If this were so, why then did he spend his time in research among thousands of economic publications of the entire world in order to amass a formidable erudition? Burnham attributes to Trotsky, just as gratuitously, a second analogous affirmation: "From the Marxian theory of the state, *it follows that* Russia is a workers' state." If this were true, why did the Left Opposition lose its time in analyzing the social, economic, and political conditions of the U.S.S.R. beginning with 1923? We have produced, it seems to me, a rather large number of documents and books on this subject. If our method were that which Burnham imputes—so "scrupulously"—we should have been content to state our conclusions in a few lines, if necessary in the form of a polished syllogism.

But there is more. Marxism has already refuted expressly this interpretation of its method. Burnham has the right, if he wishes, to view Engels as an outmoded reactionary preacher (this sweeping accusation is launched, by the way, without the slightest evidence), but perhaps he will recognize him as a faithful interpreter of Marx's thought. Yet, Engels, answering the Burnham of his day, one shaped in a grander style, Eugene Dühring, had occasion to examine, more than seventy years ago, precisely the accusation which the Dühring of today presents as a product of the most recent science. Engels quotes* a long passage from the writings of the German professor, which in the profoundness of its science and the beauty of its style as well as in its scrupulous fairness rivals Burnham's document. Dühring

*Anti-Dühring, Part I, beginning of Chapter XIII.

accused Marx of having deduced the necessity of the expropriation of the expropriators from a logical law, the negation of the negation. Engels had no trouble in refuting this absurdity; he simply quoted the passage where Marx analyzes this problem.

Why does Burnham serve us this ancient warmed-up hash? It is because he and Dühring have the same conception of logic, and both of them in an identical manner attribute this conception to Marxism. Their thought does not extend beyond a very formal idea of the dialectic, and it is this dialectic which they annihilate! We present them with a living being, they kill it and then cry out: "We told you so, it's nothing but a corpse!"

They conceive of logic as consisting above all of some principles *outside* of and *prior* to knowledge. From these principles follows knowledge. This is what Burnham develops when, in his document, he speaks about the function of logic. To him it is reduced to a form from which thought cannot escape. Separated from the content of knowledge, logic can play nothing but a negative role. Form becomes a simple barrier; principles, the hand-rail. Burnham tells us that logic is rather useless. We agree with him insofar as such logic is concerned, that is, his, not ours.

Dialectic logic is not the banks between which flows the river of knowledge. It penetrates knowledge itself in all its various depths. It cannot live except in this current, it does not exist except in it. If you force logic out of the current it negates itself and withers into a few limiting, abstract, and sterile principles. Far from dominating knowledge from the outside, it recreates itself incessantly in it. "The form of thought merits being revived more than any other form," Hegel once remarked. The Philistines often reduce Hegel's method to the monotonous application of a three part schema: thesis, antithesis, synthesis. In this caricature they reveal nothing but the conception which they themselves are incapable of passing beyond: For Hegel, every sphere of reality gives a specifically determined character to the contradiction and to the synthesis. Under an often mystical form, he expresses here a profound materialist conception. The dialectic is not reducible to a few isolated laws; this happens to be not one of the least difficulties in its systematization.

Far from molding itself into a form imposed from the outside or from expressing its limits in such a form, thought has its mode of development conditioned by its content. The conception of something outside of and prior to knowledge is precisely *scholasticism* in its most essential feature. Burnham cannot free himself from this conception and in quest of the most recent modernism it is to this dust-laden bin that he turns when he advocates replacing Hegel by Russell and the dialectic by symbolic logic.

Symbolic logic is the generic name for a collection of works which have developed largely since the end of the first third of the last century.

I shall indicate here only the general conclusions of this school without entering into a detailed technical analysis, although I have at hand dozens upon dozens of quotations from the German, Anglo-Saxon, and French mathematicians and logicians beginning from the middle of the last century. As for Burnham himself he does nothing in de-

scribing this tendency but pronounce some very flattering but purely subjective adjectives.

The artisans of this movement are for the most part mathematicians and semi-mathematicians. Its essential features are the use of symbols analogous to those of algebra in order to represent the content of thought—concepts, or relations—and the deductive inter-linking of these symbols according to a few formal rules in order to determine all the possible, that is, not-contradictory affirmations. This logical calculus does nothing but push to the extreme a deep-rooted tendency of mathematics since their origin: the deductive form according to the laws of formal logic and the continuous reduction of the number of axioms which serve as the point of departure. That is why, precisely because this constitutes nothing but an exacerbation of one of its tendencies, mathematics would run a great risk in confining itself entirely to this road: the risk of losing its life. All the great mathematicians, including those who are addicted to symbolic logic, agree on this point, and many of them recognize even in their own domain nothing beyond a very restricted value in symbolic logic. It seems, however, that it has definitely acquired the right of existence in this field, and so far as *mathematics* is concerned, it represents a conquest, only relative, it is true, of science.

If we enter the field of *logic*, the situation changes completely. Here the role of symbolic logic becomes completely retrogressive.

All the logicians of this school start from the three "fundamental laws" of thought* "from which we can no more depart than we can jump over our own shadow"—the principles of identity, of contradiction, and of the excluded middle. The adepts of symbolic logic do not hazard a discussion upon these principles, or even making precise their content. Often they adopt them in silence, under cover of defining an algebraic symbol. If they discuss their entrance into the system, it is only in order to paste up the label "obvious" (Russell and Whitehead in particular). How poor, hide-bound and reactionary such a conception appears in comparison with that of a Hegel! This can be seen merely by reading (Burnham need not recoil in fright, it is not him I offer this advice) those pages where Hegel, at the beginning of the second book of his *Great Logic* (*Science of Logic*) examines the famous principles, demonstrating their limits and their contradictions. In these ten or fifteen pages there is more science—real science and not fruitless formalism—than in the entire three thick volumes of *Principia Mathematica*.

Once the three "fundamental laws" of thought are admitted as governing the game, nothing remains but to determine, through operative rules which have an algebraic form, all the not-contradictory combinations which follow. The objective of logical calculus could thus be defined in its entire generality: to establish all the affirmations compatible with the three fundamental principles of thought. Science finds itself reduced to a vast formalism. Nothing remains after this except a secondary task: to see whether all the combinations determined as possible also exist in nature. But if all the possibilities do not exist, existence never fails

*A small unorthodox current during these last years has systematically developed the rejection of the principle of the excluded middle. We reserve for later examination this tendency which Burnham does not even mention.

to find a pigeon-hole in the immense texture of possibilities.

Insofar as thought furnishes reality with frames constructed outside and independent of it, symbolic logic appears as a vast *scholasticism*. This does not constitute an increase in the power of reason, but its abasement and its humiliation. Russell's science of combinations in particular, has in view rendering human intellect absolutely useless in everything concerning logic and mathematics. Before Russell another logician of the same type, Stanley Jevons, constructed a kind of piano equipped with twenty-one keys which classified, selected and rejected the various combinations of terms and finally indicated the not-contradictory propositions. Is it necessary to add that this neo-scholasticism heads in the opposite direction from that of the development of human thought? Science does not force nature into a system of previously established compartments. Knowledge is activity and struggle; not passive contemplation, but a passionate discourse between man and nature. Thus, where man declares unity and continuity, nature answers with plurality and discontinuity; where he says plurality, it replies with unity. Knowledge does not advance except by this unceasing dialectic. Thought, insofar as it is penetration, invention, and extension, appears essentially as action, movement, and a going beyond itself, and is in no wise reducible to the degrading automatism of a system of tabulated labels and levers.

The adepts of logical algebra frequently flaunt a revolutionary air through hurling anathema upon Aristotle's logic. But even here their progress is quite relative. Aristotle's logic consisted of the classification of a certain number of the forms of thought, exactly as he catalogued some hundreds of birds according to external observations. As for symbolic logic, it starts from a few principles and deduces from them all the not-contradictory combinations. But this does not lead it much further. Thus the German mathematician, Hilbert, rediscovered after arduous calculation, the fifteen forms of the syllogism which Aristotle had already enumerated. Through its blind adoption of the three principles of departure, symbolic logic remains a part of formal logic, the most developed and the most systematic it is true, but dated 2,300 years after Aristotle!

An illustration is in order. Let us consider the propositions of Aristotelian logic as bricks with regular and well-defined forms. The syllogism is the simplest possible construction with three bricks: two bricks juxtaposed and a third lying on top of them. Every perfect example of reasoning is extended by the repetition of this elementary arrangement in exactly the same way a mason erects a wall. Aristotle's logic is a catalog of the various mosaics which appear in the human mind. Symbolic logic takes upon itself a different task, that of deducing by reasoning all the arrangements possible to a given shape of brick. In this sense it goes beyond Aristotle's logic. But it retains the brickwork with its three relations, that is, the three "fundamental laws" of thought. The dialectic abandons brickwork and follows the movement of a living reality. It does not take as its point of departure a form imposed *a priori* but much more fundamental properties of matter such as resistance, elasticity, cohesion. In passing, it shows that the form and the dimensions of the bricks themselves are in the last analysis determined by their essential properties,

exactly as Hegel demonstrated that the "three laws" of formal logic represent a certain stage in the development of thought.

Formal logic is above all the logic of *definition* and *classification*. Its importance in many domains is not to be denied, particularly in the beginnings of science. Its laws are valid for the *immutable* and *distinct* entities. Yet, all modern science directs human knowledge in another direction: the *development* and *inter-connection* of things. The Hegelian dialectic gave to these fundamental things their logical expression. That is why the name of Hegel will be preserved in the annals of science, whereas that of many others will be forgotten. Symbolic logic indeed systematizes Aristotelian logic, yet it rests absolutely upon the same basis: immobility and the absolute disconnection of categories. It remains thus considerably in the rear of problems which the dialectic posed and to which it has brought the first solutions. Every progressive work in logic must start from the Hegelian logic in order to cleanse it of its mysticism and to develop it. Because of profound social causes, this task is deeply repugnant to contemporary science. Hegel's logic was an offspring of the French revolution. Socialism will lift the dialectic to new heights.

We have examined the problem of symbolic logic as the only point in which Burnham's document presents any novelty. On all the other questions Marxist literature is already sufficiently rich.

The criticism which Burnham makes of the dialectic is indeed not new: it is the first exercise to which one must habituate himself in order to enter upon the career of a renegade from Marxism.* Feeling where the shoe pinches, Burnham attempts to deny this frequently made affirmation. He tries to demonstrate that the acceptance or the rejection of the dialectic does not in any way affect the validity of the revolutionary teachings of Marxism. Thus he invokes in support of this thesis the fact that the Stalinists "also believe" in the dialectic. Transposed to the field of philosophy, this is the identification of Stalinism with Bolshevism. It is not less superficial and reactionary here than under its political form. Stalinism has remained attached to the dialectic verbally as it has to many formulas of Bolshevism. But in reality it has substituted for it a mercenary *sophistry* fit only for the justification of all their crimes. When Burnham, as a good Philistine identifies one with the other, he devotes himself to the same reactionary task as Norman Thomas. The fact alone that the Bonapartist bureaucracy covers its gross empiricism with phrases wrenched from a doctrine which is radically opposed to it should be a supplementary reason for considering it as a caste and not as a class which expresses its culture in a completed form.

If he follows an old route, Burnham nevertheless has an innovation in what he proposes to substitute for the dialectic. The critics of Marxism have generally grasped at Kant—it is the safest stock in the philosophic stock exchange. Some of them have recently sought refuge in pragmatism. Burnham, the most modern and the most "scientific" of them all, discovers symbolic logic. The choice is not any the

*See my article, "The Algebra of Revolution," in the May issue of *Fourth International*.

happier; it clearly reveals a well-known fact: formal logic retains a power over petty-bourgeois thought which all its vicissitudes have been unable to touch. Insofar as it con-

stitutes a new illustration of this fact, Burnham's document possesses a scientific value which its author did not foresee. *March 17, 1940*

South African Native and the War

By SP

THE BEGINNING of the second World War raises a number of important questions for revolutionists in South Africa, where the overwhelming majority of the workers are colonial slaves, deprived of civic and political rights. The revolutionary *tactics* that are suitable for European countries or for North America cannot be applied mechanically to South Africa, but must be modified and adapted to the present level of political consciousness of the masses and the circumstances of their daily lives.

South Africa has, in common with other members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, declared war on Germany, but so far the war has been economic rather than military. The harbours of the Dominion are closed to German shipping and all trade between the two countries has been prohibited, but as yet no military detachments have been sent to the actual theater of war. The main reason for this is to be found in the historic conflict between British finance capital and the semi-feudal Dutch agricultural community, a conflict which, instead of gradually disappearing with the lapse of time, as British liberals hoped it would when they passed the South Africa Act in 1909, has become increasingly bitter as a result of the growing contradictions of capitalism. The outbreak of war therefore found the white population divided into two camps—one in favour of joining in the war on the side of Britain, and the other in favour of neutrality, hostile towards Britain, benevolent towards Germany. It was only by promising that no South African soldiers should be sent abroad that Smuts was able to obtain a parliamentary majority in favour of war.

Superficial thinkers might be tempted to conclude that the revolutionary party need not concern itself with this purely nominal state of war, especially as in any case the Natives are not allowed to join the army. There is absolutely no justification for this conclusion. Even if the present state of affairs continues, the Bantu will be profoundly affected by the war, and it will be the duty of the revolutionaries to explain what is happening to them and show them the true road to freedom. But it is reasonably certain that the present state of affairs will not continue. Just as British imperialism was able to persuade a divided South Africa to declare war, so it will be able to demand more concrete assistance when it begins to be hard pressed. Already there is evidence in support of this view. A Cabinet Minister has been sent to London for the duration of the war (not just to give the British Government *moral* support, we may be sure), and military preparations are going forward on a scale that is altogether unwarranted by the theory that South Africa will play a purely passive role.

If this expectation is justified, it is probable that recruiting offices will be opened for the enrollment of Colored men (non-Europeans of mixed descent), but it is certain that no natives will be accepted in the army, unless indeed the for-

tones of war turn so strongly against Britain that the native policy of South Africa has to be abandoned for the time being. One of the official reasons for excluding the natives from the armed forces is that they are inferior to the Europeans in intelligence and mechanical aptitude, that they could not possibly master the art of shooting with a modern rifle. It has even been claimed that the average Bantu cannot shut one eye, and is therefore unable to take accurate aim. Another reason sometimes given is that the Bantu is very much like a child, impetuous and courageous enough when aroused, but incapable of submitting to the arduous discipline required of the soldier in modern warfare. Such "reasons" are, of course, the sheerest hypocrisy. The alleged lack of "intelligence" is solely due to the fact that the majority of natives receive no education whatsoever, and even the education that is provided for the minority is inferior both in quantity and in quality. As for the lie about mechanical aptitude, we need only point to the fact that hundreds of Europeans daily entrust their lives to native chauffeurs. It can hardly be denied that the automobile is a much more complicated mechanism than the service rifle. Again, the claim that the natives are childish and incapable of submitting to discipline is loudly belied by the facts. In the gold mines of the Transvaal they are subjected to what is virtually military discipline, yet it is never suggested that their "childishness" makes them unsuited for mine work.

The truth is that the Bantu are excluded from the army not because they make poor soldiers but because the ruling class is afraid they might turn their weapons against their oppressors. The exploiters have not yet forgotten the long succession of fierce wars in which the natives, armed only with spears and leather shields, sought to stem the advancing tide of European invasion. They have not forgotten how, in one of the Zulu wars, a British force was surprised by a native army and massacred almost to a man. They have not forgotten how, in what is now Southern Rhodesia, the Matabele took advantage of the confusion created by the Jameson Raid in 1896 and slaughtered the white men who had robbed them of their land. They may console themselves with the reflection that in the course of the reprisals that followed, the natives were so "stupid" that in close range fighting they raised the sights of their rifles in order to make them shoot lower, but they know perfectly well that if the Bantu were properly trained in the use of a rifle he would handle it as well as any other soldier, and would use it to better effect because he would be fighting a real war for liberation, and not a war for some meaningless abstraction such as "democracy."

But if the Bantu is excluded from the fighting forces, this does not mean that he will not be affected by the war, that he will not be expected to contribute his share to the

defense of "his" country. In the first World War a native labor battalion was sent to France to do all the heavy and dirty work that was beneath the dignity of "civilized" soldiers. (The customary pretence that class distinctions vanish on the field of battle applied, in the case of the South African forces, only to white men.) And the same thing will happen in the present war. Natives will be called upon to risk their lives in defense of the bosses who continue to exploit them in war-time as well.

But it is not only those who are sent to dig trenches, carry ammunition and clean latrines who will suffer in this war. Already a number of employers have reduced the wages of their Bantu workers on the ground that the war has reduced their profits, and that they can no longer afford to pay even the old miserable wages. And this process will go on with increasing momentum as the costs of the war mount higher and higher. As in every other country, it is the workers who will pay for the war.

You will ask: is the Bantu going to accept all this without a struggle? Will he not see through the fraud and thereupon organize his forces to fight for his own rights instead of for the profits of his oppressors? At the present time there are several important factors operating to obstruct the development of the class struggle. The vast majority of the Bantu do not yet comprehend the true nature of their oppression. First, the concept of class is almost inextricably confused with the concept of race. The Bantu does not say: the boss is grinding me under his heel because he is making a profit out of me and wants to go on making a profit, but: the boss is grinding me under his heel because he despises me as a black man. He is so keenly aware of the contempt and brutality with which he is treated that he is unable to see clearly the profit motive behind this treatment. Naturally the bosses have taken good care to foster this confusion of class with race, by political, economic and social discrimination against the Bantu as such, and by bribing the white workers with wages that enable them to live on a far higher standard than that of the natives. The comparative luxury in which the white worker lives helps to blind the Bantu to the fact that both are being exploited. All he sees is that the white worker is much better off than he is himself, and he not unnaturally draws the conclusion that the reason is to be found in the color of his skin.

Secondly, and as a direct consequence of this, the native is easily misled into thinking that anyone with a black skin who claims to speak on his behalf is worthy of his attention and respect. Feeling despised and rejected as a black man, he naturally falls into the error of thinking that the interests of all black men are identical, and fails to see that his so-called leaders have been bribed by the bosses to keep him in ignorance. Conversely, any white man who seeks to bring revolutionary ideas to the Bantu is regarded with the gravest suspicion simply because he is a member of the oppressing race.

And thirdly, the oppression to which the Bantu is subject has been applied so rigorously and systematically, and over such a long period of time, that it has bred an attitude of hopeless resignation. The last serious revolt against the bosses was 33 years ago, the Zulu Rebellion of 1906.

There are various supplementary factors that have contributed to stifling militancy. First among these we may

mention the extremely scattered nature of the rural population. As we said in our previous article, the density of the rural population in the Union as a whole is only 14.07 per square mile, and since there are 3 million natives in the Reserves, that means that the population per square mile of European-owned land is not more than 7 or 8. This, together with the extreme poverty of the Bantu and the pass system, makes it very hard to organize the mass movement which is so essential to the development of class consciousness among the natives.

The Government is well aware of the danger of allowing the natives to form their own organizations, and as part of its native policy it has consistently sought to exclude the Bantu from large scale employment in industry. They can be hired as unskilled or casual laborers, but it is well known that these are much more difficult to organize than skilled workers, especially when the situation is complicated by artificially fostered race antagonisms. It is true that in the mines there is large scale employment of natives, and that they are herded into mine compounds where they might have an opportunity to organize. But the compound managers and the police keep a careful watch over subversive activities. And besides, the well-trying principle of "divide and rule" is consistently practised here. Men belonging to tribes which in the past have warred with each other are placed in the same compound, and the hardships from which they all suffer find natural expression in faction fights or miniature tribal warfare. Thus the militancy that should be directed against the class enemy is dissipated in useless quarrels between different sections of the exploited class.

Finally, religion contributes powerfully to prevent the development of class consciousness. Every native school in South Africa is a church school, and this means that it is practically impossible for a black man to receive an elementary education without at the same time being corrupted and corroded by superstitions that serve the purposes of the exploiting class. He is taught that resignation is a duty, and threatened with hell fire if he neglects that duty. And here again the imperial principle of "divide and rule" is fully employed. The natives are encouraged to organize their own churches, and so successful has this policy been that there are no fewer than 900 Bantu Christian sects in South Africa. It must be highly gratifying to the exploiters to see natives refusing to associate with each other because they differ on the interpretation of some phrase in the Bible!

We turn now to the credit side of the ledger. The war will change all this. For the war intensifies, and will, as it becomes more ferocious, intensify to an incalculable extent, the contradictions that have not yet penetrated the consciousness of the African masses. As long as life continues in the same way, as long as nothing interrupts the daily routine of drudgery, suffering and starvation, the uneducated masses do not readily ask why they should continue to live in this way, and therefore do not discover that they need not live in this way. But war brings rapid and convulsive changes in the routine of life, and as far as the toiling masses are concerned, those changes are invariably for the worse. It is then that questions are asked, and the voice of the revolutionist has a chance of being heard. Already the Government is aware of this danger and is trying to forestall the dreaded development of class consciousness

among the natives. Thus *Umteteli*, one of the bourgeois-owned Bantu newspapers, printed in its issue of October 7 the following "advice to all Africans":

"*Umteteli* desires to reiterate its recent appeal to all African leaders and their followers to remain calm and on the side of law and order during the present difficult times.

"As we have pointed out in the recent past, in war time rumormongers manage to create alarm by spreading false stories among the African people. These are often widely believed.

"Those who have influence with the people are therefore asked to co-operate with all European authorities in making it clear that there is no occasion for any alarm whatever: that, as will appear from our newspaper columns, the war is proceeding 6-7000 miles away favorably to Britain and France, and that South Africa is absolutely safe under the protection of the British Navy."

And in similar strain the Secretary for Native Affairs, addressing a gathering of native chiefs and leaders, urged them to remain calm, and told them that the best service the Bantu could render to "his" country was to keep on working steadily in the mines and on the farms.

The object of all this is as plain as daylight. The bosses would like their slaves to remain in permanent ignorance of the fact that there is a war, but since that is impossible they would like them to know as little as possible and ask as few questions as possible. And in particular they must not listen to any unauthorized explanations of the war, that is, to a Marxist explanation. Otherwise why this insistent urge to remain calm? Is it likely that ignorant and uneducated Africans will get excited about a war that is taking place more than 6000 miles away in which they are told they will not be asked to participate? No, the fear of the ruling class is that the Bantu will discover the real meaning of the war.

And discover it he will. When he asks why Britain and France are fighting Germany, and is told that it is to save

democracy, to prevent the "brutal" Germans from seizing "his" country and enslaving him, he will wonder why the "gentle" British and Dutch should choose just this time to rain still more and heavier blows on his back. And with the help of revolutionary instruction he will discover that it is not his war at all, that it is really a war between two equally brutal imperialisms for the right to enslave him. He will be reminded that after the Germans were driven out of South-West Africa, Smuts sent airplanes to slaughter the Bondelswarts tribe, which had revolted against a tax that made it impossible for them to live. Once he begins to open his eyes and look at things for himself, the rapidity of his education will make the slaveowners tremble.

And when his eyes are opened, what is he to do? Is he simply to wait for the end of the conflict in the hope that it will end in the defeat by the workers of both sets of imperialist exploiters? Certainly not. He cannot at the outset turn imperialist war into a civil war, if only because he has no weapons in his hand. But that does not mean that he has no methods of struggle at his disposal, or that he should leave the revolutionary task to those who have the guns at present. It must be carefully explained to him that the struggles of the revolutionists in Europe are very much his concern, and that he can help those struggles by carrying on an independent struggle against his oppressors in South Africa. For every revolt in a colonial country increases the difficulties of imperialism and facilitates the task of the revolutionary proletariat in Europe.

In short, the war creates a magnificent opportunity to teach the Bantu people the meaning of their own lives and sufferings, to assist in the organization of a mass revolt against the imperialist exploiters, and thereby to make a necessary contribution towards the achievement of the ultimate goal of humanity—World Socialism.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

The Groupings in the Communist Opposition *

Dear Friends:

I am still deprived of the possibility of working systematically. As yet I am far from adequately acquainted with the publications of the European oppositional groups. I am therefore compelled to postpone until later a general evaluation of the tendencies within the Opposition. We are headed toward such difficult times that every actual and even every potential co-thinker should be prized by us. It would be an impermissible mistake to repel a single co-thinker, all the more so a group of co-thinkers because of a careless evaluation, biased criticism or any exaggeration of the differences in opinion.

Nevertheless, I believe it is absolutely indispensable to submit a few general considerations which are in my opinion decisive in evaluating this or that group or tendency within the Opposition.

The Opposition is now taking shape on the basis of a prin-

ciple **ideological differentiation** and not of mass activity. This corresponds to the character of the present period. Similar processes occurred in the ranks of the Russian Social-Democracy during the years of the counter-revolution and among the world Social-Democracies during the war time. Mass activity as a rule submerges secondary and episodic differences of opinion and aids the fusion of friendly and close tendencies. Ideological groupings in periods of stagnation or ebb, on the contrary, always tend sharply towards differentiation, splits, internal struggles. We cannot jump out of the period in which we live. We must pass through it. A clear, precise ideological differentiation is unquestionably necessary. It supplies the foundation for future successes.

The general line of the Comintern leadership has more than once been defined by us as **centrism**. It is self-evident that centrism, moreover a centrism equipped with an arsenal of repressions, must drive into opposition not only all consistent proletarian elements but also the more consistent opportunists.

Opportunism in the Communist movement expresses itself as an urge to reestablish under present-day conditions the pre-war Social-Democracy. This is most graphically revealed in Germany. The present Social-Democracy is infinitely far from being the party of Bebel. But history testifies to the fact that Bebel's party became transformed into the present Social Democracy—which

*The following letter, written shortly after he was exiled from Russia to Turkey, is one of Trotsky's first political documents concerning the internal problems of the Trotskyist Oppositional movement.

The Opposition had not yet been formally established on a world scale. In many countries various individuals, groups, and tendencies professed "sympathy." It was precisely in order to clarify the basis for political collaboration in the Left Opposition that Comrade Trotsky wrote the letter.

means that Bebel's party had already become completely inadequate in the pre-war era. All the more hopeless are any attempts to resurrect Bebel's party or even a left wing of that party in the present conditions. Yet, insofar as I am able to judge, Brandler, Thalheimer and their friends direct their efforts primarily toward this end. Souvarine in France gravitates less consistently but nonetheless apparently in the same direction.

There are, in my opinion, three classic questions which provide a decisive criterion for appraising the tendencies of world communism. These questions are:

- (1). The policy of the Anglo-Russian Committee.
- (2). The course of the Chinese Revolution.
- (3). The economic policy of the USSR in connection with the theory of socialism in one country.

Some comrades may perhaps feel astonished that I do not mention here the questions of party regime. I do so not through oversight but very deliberately. A party regime has no independent self-sufficient meaning. A party regime is a derivative magnitude in relation to party policy. The struggle against Stalinist bureaucratism evokes sympathy among the most heterogeneous elements. The Mensheviks too are not averse to applauding at this or that attack directed by us against the bureaucracy. This provides the basis incidentally for the stupid charlatanism of the Stalinists who try to make out our position as close to the position of the Mensheviks. For a Marxist, democracy within a party as well as within a country is never an abstraction. Democracy is always conditioned by the struggle of living class forces. Opportunist elements, one and all, understand by the term "bureaucratism" nothing else but revolutionary centralism. It is self-evident that they cannot be our co-thinkers. Apparent solidarity has for its basis here only ideological confusion or, what is far more frequent, malicious imputation.

(1). On the question of the **Anglo-Russian Committee** I have had occasion to write a great deal. I do not know just what has been published abroad. I am informed that rumors have been spread abroad that I had presumably opposed the breaking up of the Anglo-Russian Committee and agreed to it only as a concession to Zinoviev and Kamenev. Just the contrary is true. The Stalinist policy in the Anglo-Russian question will forever remain as a classic model of the politics of centrism shifting to the right, holding the stirrups for avowed fakers and being rewarded by them with a kick in the mouth. The Chinese and Russian questions because of the peculiar conditions in China and Russia present great difficulties to European communists. It is otherwise with respect to the question of the political bloc with the heads of the English trade unions. Here we confront the fundamental problem of **European politics**. The Stalinist course in this question constitutes the most flagrant, the most cynical, and the most disastrous trampling under foot of the fundamentals of Bolshevism and the theoretical ABC of Marxism. The experiment of the Anglo-Russian Committee reduced to almost zero the educational value of the great 1926 strikes and retarded the development of the English working class movement for a number of years to come. Any one failing at this late date to understand this is no Marxist, no revolutionary politician of the proletariat. It is of no moment in my opinion that such an individual protests against Stalinist bureaucratism. The opportunist course of the Anglo-Russian Committee was possible only through waging a struggle against the genuine revolutionary elements of the working class. And this in its turn was inconceivable except through suppressions and repressions, especially in a party with so revolutionary a past as the Bolshevik party.

(2). On the **Chinese question** I have also written a great deal in the last few years. I may perhaps succeed in publishing what I have written in a special volume. The study of the problems of the Chinese revolution is an indispensable condition for the education of the Opposition and for the ideological differentiation in its ranks. Those elements that have not yet taken a clearly defined position upon this question reveal thereby a nationalist narrow-mindedness which is itself an infallible symptom of opportunism.

(3). Finally, the **Russian question**. Due to the conditions created by the October revolution, three classic tendencies of socialism: (a) the Marxist tendency; (b) the centrist tendency; and (c) the opportunist tendency are most clearly and graphically expressed, that is, filled with irrefutable social content, under the Soviet conditions. In the USSR we see the **right wing** inter-twined with the skilled intelligentsia and the small proprietors; the center

balancing itself between the classes on the tight-rope of the apparatus; and the left wing representing the vanguard of the proletarian vanguard in the epoch of reaction. By this I do not of course mean to say that the left wing has been immune from error or that we can dispense with serious and open internal criticism. But this criticism must have a clear class basis, namely, one of the above-mentioned three historical tendencies. Any attempt to deny the existence of these tendencies and their class character, any attempt to rise above them will inevitably terminate in a pitiful debacle. This road is most frequently taken by right wing elements who have not yet definitely crystallized or who do not wish to frighten their own left wing prematurely.

Brandler and Thalheimer, so far as I know, during all these years have held that the policy of the Central Committee of the CPSU on economic questions was absolutely correct. That is how matters stood prior to the Stalinist left zigzag. In the nature of things they must now sympathize with the policy which was most openly conducted in 1924-1927, and which is represented today by the wing of Rykov, Bukharin and the rest. Souvarine apparently likewise tends in this direction.

Naturally I cannot here raise the economic question of the USSR in its full scope. What is stated in our platform remains wholly valid. We could only profit if the Right Opposition were to give a clear and precise criticism of our platform on this question. To facilitate this work for them, I shall here outline a few basic considerations.

The right-wingers consider that the present difficulties could be surmounted if more play were given to individual peasant economy. I do not undertake to deny this. Placing a stake on the **capitalist farmer** (the Europeanized or Americanized "kulak") will indubitably bear its fruits, but these will be capitalist fruits which would at one of the very next stages lead to the political collapse of the Soviet power. Reliance upon the capitalist farmer in 1924-1926 passed through only its initial stages. Yet it led to bolstering in the extreme the self-confidence of the urban and rural petty-bourgeoisie; it led to their capturing many of the rank and file soviets; it raised the power and the self-confidence of the bureaucracy; increased the pressure on the workers, and brought the complete crushing of party democracy. Those who are incapable of understanding the inter-relationship between these factors can in general understand nothing in revolutionary politics. The course toward the capitalist farmer is absolutely incompatible with the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is necessary to choose.

Let us however take the purely economic aspect of the question. Between industry and peasant economy there is a dialectic inter-action. But the motor force is industry, which is an infinitely more dynamic beginning. The peasant needs manufactured goods in exchange for bread. The democratic revolution under the leadership of the Bolsheviks gave the peasant land. The socialist revolution under the same leadership still gives the peasant less goods and at a higher price than did capitalism in its day.

Precisely for this reason the socialist revolution in contrast to its democratic base is endangered. To the scarcity of manufactured goods the peasant replies with a passive agricultural strike—he does not bring to the market the grain already in his possession nor does he increase the area sowed. The right wing considers that it is necessary to allow more play for the capitalist tendencies in the village; to take less from the village and to lower the tempo of industrial development. But this implies that the quantity of agricultural products on the market would increase while the quantity of the manufactured goods decreases still further. The disproportion between them which is at the bottom of the present economic crisis would be further aggravated. A possible way out would be exporting the farmer's grain and in return importing finished European products for the farmer, i.e., the richer peasants. In other words, this means instead of a **smychka** (working alliance) between the cooperative peasant economy and the socialist industry the establishment of a **smychka** between exporting farmer economy and world capitalism. The state is transformed not into the builder of socialist economy but into an intermediary between domestic and world capitalism. There cannot be any doubt that these two partners would quickly elbow this intermediary aside, beginning of course with the monopoly of foreign trade. For, a free development of farmer economy, receiving from abroad everything it requires in return for grain exports, presupposes free commodity exchange and not foreign commerce monopolized by the state.

The right-wingers sometimes say that Stalin has applied the platform of the Opposition and demonstrated its inadequacy. Certainly, Stalin became frightened when he bumped his empirical forehead against the consequence of the "farmer" (kulak) course which he so blandly pursued in 1924-1927. Certainly, in making a leap to the left, Stalin utilized segments of the Opposition platform. The platform of the Opposition excludes above all a line towards a self-sufficing isolated economy. It is absurd to try to divorce Soviet economy from the world market by a stone wall. The fate of Soviet economy will be decided by the general tempo of its development (including that of agriculture) and not at all by the degree of its "independence" from the world division of labor. All economic plans of the Stalinist leadership have up to now been erected on the lowering of foreign commerce in the next five to ten years. This cannot be called anything but petty-bourgeois cretinism. Such a posing of the problem has nothing in common with the Opposition. On the contrary it flows wholly from the theory of socialism in one country.

Stalin's drive to raise industrialization brings him apparently closer to the Opposition. But only apparently. Socialist industrialization presupposes a great and thoroughly thought-out plan in which the direction of internal development is intimately bound with an ever-increasing utilization of the world market, along with the irreconcilable preservation of the monopoly of foreign trade. Only along this road is it possible—not to liquidate, nor to eliminate, but to mitigate the contradictions of socialist development in a capitalist encirclement; to reinforce the economic power of the Soviet republic, improve the economic relations between the city and the village and intrench the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Stalinist policy of empirical zigzags only worsens the situations.

These are the three basic criteria for the internal differentiation of the Opposition. These three criteria are taken from the life of three countries. Naturally, each of the other countries has problems of its own, and the attitude towards them will determine the position of each individual group and every individual communist. Some of these new questions may tomorrow come to the forefront and make all the others recede to the background. But today the three foregoing questions appear to me to be decisive. Without taking a clear and definitive position on these questions it is impossible to find any place for oneself among the basic groupings of communism.

That is all I have to say now on the questions you pose. Should it prove that owing to my inadequate acquaintance with the available literature I have incorrectly interpreted the position of Brandler, Souvarine, and their co-thinkers, then I shall of course make haste to introduce any correction into my appraisal made necessary by such facts and documents as are called to my attention.

March 31, 1929

How the Party Was Steeled---

"It is not yet sufficiently known abroad that Bolshevism grew, took shape, and became steeled in long years of struggle against petty-bourgeois revolutionaries, which smacks of, or borrows something from, anarchism, and which in all essentials falls short of the conditions and requirements of a sustained proletarian class struggle. For Marxists it is well established theoretically—and the experience of all European revolutions and revolutionary movements has fully confirmed it—that the small proprietor, the small master (a social type that is represented in many European countries on a wide, mass scale), who under capitalism suffers constant oppression and, very often, an incredibly acute and rapid deterioration in his condition of life, ending in ruin, easily goes to revolutionary extremes, but is incapable of perseverance, organization, discipline and steadfastness. The petty-bourgeois, "driven to frenzy" by the horrors of capitalism, is a social phenomenon which, like anarchism, is characteristic of all capitalist countries. The instability of such revolutionariness, its barrenness, its liability to become swiftly transformed into submission, apathy, fantasy, and even a 'frenzied' infatuation with one or another bourgeois 'fad'—all this is a matter of common knowledge. But a theoretical, abstract recognition of these truths does not at all free revolutionary parties from old mistakes, which always crop up at unexpected moments, in a somewhat new form, in hitherto unknown vestments or surroundings, in peculiar—more or less peculiar—circumstances."

— Lenin in "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder.

READ • For lively labor news
• For letters from workers

READ • For real defense of the U.S.S.R.
• For Marxist writing in this era

READ • For the latest articles by Leon Trotsky
• For world news of the 4th International

The SOCIALIST APPEAL

The only Marxist Labor Paper in America—Out Every Thursday

At central newsstands in your city—Or send your subscription to:

SOCIALIST APPEAL

116 University Place

New York, N. Y.

(Rates: \$2.00 per year; \$3.00 per year combined with *Fourth International*)

Organs of the Fourth International

GREAT BRITAIN

THE MILITANT. Pioneer Publishing Association, 79 Gipsy Road, London, S.E. 27. A monthly legal paper published by the official section of the Fourth International in Great Britain, the Militant Labor League.

This publication opposes the imperialist war, condemns Stalinism, and stands for unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against capitalism.

AUSTRALIA

THE MILITANT. A bi-weekly published by the Communist League of Australia, Section of the Fourth International.

The Australian section announces that *The Militant* will be issued as a weekly within the near future. Recent issues are campaigning against conscription and carry the official releases of the Fourth International in opposition to war. A number of public declarations of former prominent members of the Communist Party have been printed, announcing their adherence to the Fourth International.

CANADA

SOCIALIST ACTION. A monthly published at Montreal by the Socialist Workers League of Canada, Section of the Fourth International.

The May issue analyzes the Federal Elections and carries a May Day manifesto as well as an editorial in defense of the Soviet Union.

SOUTH AFRICA

SOCIALIST ACTION. Published by the South African Section of the Fourth International in the English language and Afrikaans.

No copies have been received since last September due to the British war measures. The August number carried an anti-war manifesto.

ARGENTINA

LA NUEVA INTERNACIONAL. A monthly published by the Grupo Obrero Revolucionaria, affiliated with the Fourth International.

LA NUEVA INTERNACIONAL follows the Marxist line of opposition to the second World War. Its latest issues analyze the USSR and call for its defense against imperialist attack.

URUGUAY

CONTRA LA CORRIENTE. A monthly published by the Uruguayan members of the Fourth International.

SWITZERLAND

DER EINZIGE WEG. A monthly published by the Swiss Section of the Fourth International.

FRANCE

L'ETINCELLE. Published by our comrades in France, now organized as the *Committee of the Fourth International*. It is a monthly agitational paper appearing illegally in Paris, with five provincial editions.

BULLETIN DE LA QUATRIEME INTERNATIONALE. A bi-monthly discussion organ. The latest issues have carried discussion material on the Russian question.

L'Etincelle carries agitational material and inside news from the proletarians at the front.

GERMANY

UNSER WORT. A bi-monthly published in exile by the German Section of the Fourth International.

This paper has an international circulation and from the point of view of content is one of the best organs of the International. The last issue contains articles on the exile of Fritz Thyssen, ex-Nazi tycoon, a polemic with refugee liberals who support Anglo-French imperialism, and other material unobtainable elsewhere.

BELGIUM

LA LUTTE OUVRIERE. A weekly published by the Revolutionary Socialist Party, Section of the Fourth International.

This paper was banned by the government upon the outbreak of war.

L'ACTION SOCIALISTE. Replaced *La Lutte Ouvriere* but was banned also by the government.

The Belgian section now publishes mimeographed material regularly.

SCANDINAVIA

OKTOBRE. Published by the Norwegian Section of the Fourth International.

KLASSEKAMPF. Published by the Danish section of the Fourth International.

Both these papers have been suppressed since the Nazi invasion of these two countries.

MEXICO

LA LUCHA OBRERA. A popular newspaper published by the Partido Obrero Internacionalista (International Workers Party), Section of the Fourth International.

CLAVE. A monthly theoretical magazine published by the Mexican Section of the Fourth International.

Clave enjoys wide circulation in all the Spanish-speaking countries. The March number carries an excellent editorial on the further degeneration of the Stalinist party in Mexico as manifested in the recent Stalinist purge in Mexico.

BOLIVIA

BOLETINO. Published by the Bolivian Section of the Fourth International.

CHINA

THE SPARK. A legal magazine published monthly by the Communist League of China, Section of the Fourth International. An illegal monthly advocating the program of the Fourth International is also published in China.

U.S.S.R.

BULLETIN OF THE OPPOSITION. A monthly published by the Russian Section of the Fourth International in exile.

It carries the original articles and pamphlets of L. D. Trotsky, the outstanding theoretician of the Fourth International.

HOLLAND

DE ENIGE WEG. A monthly published by the Dutch Section of the Fourth International.

No copies have been received in the United States since October.

PUERTO RICO

CHISPA. Published by the Bolshevik-Leninist League of Puerto Rico, affiliated with the Fourth International.

BRAZIL

The Brazilian Section of the Fourth International has been suppressed by the government. All their publications are distributed in illegal form.

UNITED STATES

THE SOCIALIST APPEAL. A weekly newspaper published by the Socialist Workers Party, Section of the Fourth International.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. A monthly theoretical magazine published by the Socialist Workers Party, Section of the Fourth International.

A drive is now being conducted by the Socialist Workers Party to make the *Socialist Appeal* a twice-weekly.

Subscriptions to any of the above publications of the Fourth International will be accepted by the Business Manager of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, 116 University Place, New York City.

If the number on your wrapper reads:

N 43, or F 2,

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

Friends of the Fourth International

We know you have enjoyed reading this international magazine.
We know you are anxious that it penetrate to the far corners of the globe,
spreading the message of Bolshevism to an ever-widening audience.

Fourth International is read in:

IRELAND	INDIA	SOUTH AFRICA	CUBA
HOLLAND	EGYPT	NEW ZEALAND	PUERTO RICO
SWITZERLAND	JAPAN	AUSTRALIA	COSTA RICA
FRANCE	URUGUAY	MEXICO	PANAMA
ENGLAND	PHILIPPINES	CANADA	BRAZIL
SCOTLAND	CHILE	PALESTINE	BOLIVIA

In many of these countries it is discriminated against by the
censors and penetrates only through the most circuitous routes.

Fourth International is banned, and penalties imposed upon recipients, in the
following countries — reaching our readers, but only with the greatest difficulty:

RUSSIA	LITHUANIA	BELGIUM	ARGENTINA
GERMANY	CHINA	NORWAY	SPAIN
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	INDO-CHINA	SWEDEN	GREECE
POLAND	ITALY	DENMARK	

Will you help us continue this service to our
international friends and comrades, who today
find it virtually impossible to contribute to the up-
keep of the magazine they prize above all others?

"Fourth International" dispatches hundreds upon hundreds of bundles each
month, each one of which involves a cost of approximately 25 cents. The
magazine finds the financial burden of this vital service weighing more and
more heavily upon its shoulders, and each month it becomes increasingly
difficult to send the foreign bundles for lack of adequate postage.

**AID OUR INTERNATIONAL COMRADES BY PLEDGING THE
COST OF DISPATCHING ONE OR MORE BUNDLES!**

You may select a particular country whose bundle or bundles you desire to be given
preference. Make a monthly pledge to cover a foreign shipment, and know that each
and every 25c piece pledged means a prized bundle on its way to eager foreign
sympathizers and members of the Fourth International.

PLEDGE NOW, BY FILLING OUT THIS COUPON!

I want to assure mailing of (number) bundle
(amount) each month. bundles to (country), and pledge

My name is

Address City State

I enclose \$..... for the month of

I enclose \$..... for (3 months) (6 months) (1 year)