
Fourth International

AMERICAN LABOR AND THE WAR

By The Editors

Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay

By Leon Trotsky

The Sino-Japanese War

By Li Fu-Jen

The Dean of Canterbury's

"Soviet Power"

Military Methods in the Colonies

Burnham's Attorney Carries On

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 2

FEBRUARY 1941

NUMBER 2

The Murder of Krivitsky

By THE EDITORS

When Walter Krivitsky was found dead, the Washington police took possession of the three "suicide notes" and issued, after a long and inexplicable delay of nearly a day, the text of the letters, including a translation from the Russian of Krivitsky's "letter" to his wife and son. The police insisted on retaining possession of the originals but, again after some delay, released a photostat copy to Louis Waldman, attorney for Mrs. Krivitsky. For most of the week after Krivitsky's death, Mr. Waldman remained in Washington, vainly attempting to get Federal authorities to conduct an adequate investigation of the death of Krivitsky. When it became clear that the coroner was going to be permitted to issue a verdict of suicide without a further investigation, Mr. Waldman threw up his hands and returned to New York. He brought the photostat copy to Mrs. Krivitsky. She had seen the text issued by the Washington police and she began to read the photostat copy not so much, primarily, for the content, but to note carefully the handwriting. But out of the photostat copy there stared at her tremendous words which had not appeared in the text issued by the Washington police. Those words were: "SOVIET PEOPLE."

In the text issued by the police, the relevant sentences had read:

"Good people will help you, but not enemies. I think my sins are big."

The complete text, as it appears in the photostat copy of the original letter, reads:

"Good people will help you, but not enemies of the Soviet people. I think my sins are big."

There it was: Stalin's signature to the murder of Walter Krivitsky.

* * *

Let us pass by this "failure" of the police translator to include in the text issued to the press these words: "Soviet people." It was but one of a score of "failures" in the police investigation of Krivitsky's death. We need but remind the reader that the Washington police force is not the usual local police body: Washington is run by the federal government. With the Far Eastern crisis exploding and relations with the Kremlin the crucial question in that crisis, it was the perfect week for a GPU crime.

* * *

The thing worked out perfectly for Stalin. By the time the "omission" from the Krivitsky "letter" was discovered, the publicity on the case was over. By that time—Krivitsky was killed Monday and Mrs. Krivitsky did not make the discovery until Thursday—the Krivitsky story had been pushed off the front page and out of the papers by the Far Eastern crisis. And now, with Mrs. Krivitsky having issued the correct version of the letter, it could be published in the Soviet press as "proof" that all the other death-bed recantations of "sinners" and whitewashings of Stalin had been true, for here,

don't you see, is another such recantation and whitewashing, authoritatively verified by the Washington police as the last words of a suicide.

In each new crime, Stalin is driven to attempt to justify all his previous crimes. The world is skeptical of the truth and sincerity of the numerous recantations which have been "signed" by oppositionists? Stalin proves the truth and sincerity of these recantations by issuing tenfold more. From 1924 to 1927 such recantations come relatively infrequently. They are "proved" by an increase in their frequency and volume, from 1927 to 1936. Those are not believed? The entire cadre of Lenin's closest collaborators is paraded from 1936 to 1938 in the Moscow Frameup Trials, in the familiar ritual of recantations of their sins and whitewashings of Stalin.

But these are not Trotskyists? Then Trotskyists likewise must be made to recant. Rudolph Klement, secretary of the Fourth International, "writes" a letter from Paris to Trotsky, "breaking" with him and whitewashing Stalin, in July, 1938; just about the time this "letter" arrives to Trotsky in Mexico, the dismembered body of poor Klement is found in the Seine and mutely explains the "letter." Hence the murder of Trotsky must somehow be crammed into the pattern of recantations and whitewashings: the assassin Jacson "confesses" that he, too, "broke" with Trotsky, that "perhaps Stalin was right." And when Jacson's story is broken down in court by Trotsky's attorney, Albert Goldman, and when David Serrano, member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Mexico, and the Stalinist, David Alfaro Siqueiros, are held as the organizers of the previous (May 24, 1940) attempt on Trotsky, then Krivitsky must "testify" in the pattern of recantation and whitewashing.

Stalin is irrevocably the prisoner of this fantastic formula. He must repeat it and repeat it and repeat it. Human psychology must be transformed to fit Stalin's pattern, otherwise the long series of murders becomes known for what it is. If a hundred instances are not conclusive, then Stalin will provide a thousand instances, ten thousand instances. . . .

Hence Stalin's signature to the murder of Krivitsky.

* * *

The *Daily Worker*, Communist Party organ, takes up where the assassin and forger left off. The reference to the "Soviet people" had not yet been discovered by Mrs. Krivitsky when the *Daily Worker* (February 12) wrote its editorial explaining why Krivitsky died; without that reference the sentence about "sins" might not have been comprehensible to the ordinary mortal; but the *Daily Worker* is not edited by ordinary mortals. They wrote:

"Krivitsky tells the last chapter of the story with the words: 'I think my sins are big.'"

"The truth was told in these words by a petty adventurer . . . Krivitsky was a petty tool, but his use

was big. He began to understand his role and he tried to tell why he 'had to go.' . . . That he became sick of his role is understandable even when one knows the type of tool he was."

You do not believe in Stalin's school of psychology? Then, for such skeptics, the same issue of the *Daily Worker* supplies additional evidence. An article by Sender Garlin (lately returned from Moscow) says:

"Krivitsky left three letters, containing intimate personal details, clearly proving his plan to end his own life . . ."

The "intimate personal details" are characterized by Krivitsky's wife, by his friends and attorney, as what the GPU *could* easily collect in the course of its pursuit of Krivitsky—his strong love for his wife and son, the fact that the child was well-behaved and rather pale—and nothing else. But in any event who is Garlin and the *Daily Worker*, to assert whether or not these "intimate, personal details" are true or not? Has Garlin read numerous GPU reports on Krivit-

sky's life and habits, that Garlin is so certain that the details are well-planted in the "letters"? Garlin's article is but another one of those instances in which the vainglorious boastings of the GPU show its hand in the murder.

* * *

Although we were political opponents of Krivitsky—he left the Stalinist agency of imperialism only to become an adherent of the Social Democratic agency of imperialism—we were ready to do anything in our power to save him. We had in common with him at least this: we were ready to join hands with him to rid the labor movement of terrorist methods of struggle against opponents. His death should emphasize again the necessity for all sections of the labor movement to join in common struggle against the GPU. Had all sections of the labor movement joined to arouse labor opinion when Trotsky was murdered, perhaps Krivitsky would not be dead today. Hereafter there must be a clear understanding that the struggle against the GPU is the common task of the entire labor movement.

American Labor and the War

By THE EDITORS

Bourgeois Democracy: Fraud Plus Force

What is bourgeois democracy and how does it manage to maintain itself? Capitalist democracy, answer its upholders, is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. It must survive and be supported because it is the only form of government responsive and responsible to the will of the masses.

This is a pernicious lie, say the Marxists. There cannot be any full realization or further development of democratic freedom under capitalism. Bourgeois democracy is a screen behind which a small group of bankers and big business men dictate national policies. Roosevelt's administration, which claims to be democratic, is really the representative of these piratic plutocrats who exploit and tyrannize the working masses. Capitalist democracy rests upon fraud and force. The fable that the regime at Washington consults and fulfills the wishes of the American people is in itself an essential part of this elaborate mechanism of deceit.

These truths have been newly demonstrated by the conduct of the present rulers of this Republic in the past six months. According to the knights of bourgeois democracy, during the presidential campaign the candidates of all parties are supposed to present critical issues to the nation, bring forward all relevant information, state their program and honestly discuss their differences so that the electorate can then make its free and informed choice among them.

Let us skip over the limitations that make a mockery of this idealized democratic process. Everyone knows that because of poll taxes and other restrictions only part of the people vote, that the twin capitalist parties control all the main avenues for reaching the masses (the press, radio, halls, etcetera), that they collect millions from their wealthy masters and spend them to bamboozle the public and buy elections, that in many states the minority parties are kept off the ballot.

Despite this virtual monopoly of the material means for influencing public opinion, the representatives of the capitalist parties dare not divulge their real policies to the people. For, if they told the whole truth about their intentions, they

know that the alarmed electorate would repudiate them and turn elsewhere for leadership.

So they are compelled to lie systematically and cynically, to mask their aims, to say one thing and do another, to shadow-box over minor matters and to slur over their fundamental unanimity on major issues. Thus do the Democrats and Republicans work together to dupe the people.

Consider the President. Knowing how the masses fear another imperialist adventure, he posed as a prince of peace throughout the campaign. Three weeks before election he stated: "We will not participate in foreign wars." He boasted that, unlike the dictators, he was unafraid to consult the will of the people and be guided by it.

No sooner were the elections over than Roosevelt and his associates began to unfold their real policy and purposes. They dropped all pretenses to neutrality, scrapped the paper promise: "short of war," and stepped forth as a full-fledged military ally of the British Empire in its struggle against Germany and Italy.

Through the "lend-lease" War Powers Bill Roosevelt demanded dictatorial powers which would enable him to use the military forces and resources of the United States for any imperialist purpose anywhere in the world, when and as he so ordains.

Roosevelt must have planned these moves before November. Yet he deliberately refrained from disclosing them to the American people until after the election.

Such methods of deception are not new. Woodrow Wilson, Roosevelt's predecessor as Democratic Party war-president, was returned to office in 1916 in precisely the same way. In the biography of Claude Kitchin, Democratic Leader of the House, published in 1937, it was revealed that Wilson was anxious to enter the war against Germany as early as February, 1916. But the Democratic leaders prevailed upon him to delay until after the elections. "During the presidential campaign that followed, while the country was ringing with the slogan: 'He kept us out of war,' Kitchin and his circle were saying among themselves: 'We kept *him* out of war.'"

* See "Claude Kitchin and the Wilson War Policies," by A. M. Arnett, p. 192; Little, Brown & Co., 1937.

Nor is all the duplicity on the side of Roosevelt. Willkie, his Republican opponent, accused Roosevelt of leading the nation blindfolded into war and plotting to assume dictatorial powers. But the moment Roosevelt actually launched these plans, Willkie abandoned his opposition, endorsed the President's proposals, visited the White House, flew to England, and, like the Republicans Knox and Stimson before him, became an integral cog in the imperialist war machine.

What did that bulwark of democracy, Congress, do? It agreed to abdicate. Like the British House of Commons and the French Chamber of Deputies, this "representative" institution collapsed in the first hour of crisis and assigned its powers to a super-Boss in the White House who can hereafter rule by decree unencumbered by any popular check upon his imperialist war aims.

Such is bourgeois democracy in the United States today, not in theory but in fact, not in the pages of the *Nation* and *New Republic*, but in real life. Deceitful, impotent, imperialist through and through. Not the servant of the people but the agency of the monopolists.

The Force Behind the Fraud

Fraud is one of the means by which capitalist democracy keeps itself in power; force is the other. Roosevelt camouflages himself as a preserver of peace and a democrat in order the better to wage war and inaugurate a military dictatorship. He is preparing to use force on a scale unprecedented in world history.

This force will be exerted along two different lines, both serving the same aim of reinforcing the power and extending the privileges of America's monopolists. In the first place, the United States is being converted into an arsenal to crush all the competitors of American imperialism and to conquer the world for our monied masters. This policy involves war against Germany, Italy, and Japan, the subjugation of colonial peoples in South America and elsewhere, the smothering of every revolutionary movement, and eventually the erasing of the Soviet Union.

The prosecution of this ambitious program of world conquest above all requires a docile working class at home. Where deceit fails to convince the workers that the imperialist program is likewise theirs, the government makes ready to apply more and more violent methods of persuasion. New watchdogs over labor, the Home Guards, are being trained to replace the National Guard. Congress requires all aliens to register. Efforts are launched to have everyone fingerprinted. Conscription gives the army control over all men from 21 to 36. As during the last war period, a flood of anti-labor legislation is being ground out in the state legislatures: revival of "criminal syndicalism" statutes, laws aimed ostensibly against the Communist Party but broad enough to use against all workers' organizations, "anti-sabotage" laws under which all strike activities can be crushed, etcetera. In short, all kinds of moves are being made to regiment the trade unions, to curb their independent activity, to deprive them of any real power to protect and promote the interests of the workers. The government's ultimate aim is to obtain effective control over the lives, livelihoods and liberties of every citizen and thus to forestall any effective opposition to its utterly reactionary foreign and domestic policies. The freedom of the people is the first victim in this second crusade to make the world safe for democracy.

The bloodthirsty reactionaries and profiteering plutocrats determining the administration's policies will stop at nothing. They see in the war program and the approaching military dictatorship their golden opportunity to place the workers in chains.

But the American working class is a tough lion to cage. The labor movement in the United States is far stronger than it was during the last war, or even five years ago. For the first time the majority of workers in the basic industries (auto, steel, rubber, mining, aircraft, aluminum, utilities, trucking, electrical manufacturing, maritime) are unionized. Over ten million workers are organized within the CIO, AFL, and the Railroad Brotherhoods. With their families, friends and supporters these millions constitute the most powerful force in the country and the strongest labor movement in the whole capitalist world. In view of the leading role of the United States in world affairs, it is no exaggeration to say that this working class now holds the fate of humanity in its hands.

This working force is the motor of American economy. That economy couldn't operate a day, an hour, a minute without this labor power. The owners and operators of our system are well aware of this fact. Every stir among their workers, every demand they make, every strike, serves to remind them of it.

The Labor Lieutenants of Capitalism

If the organized workers become fully conscious of their combined power and learn to use it in their own interests, no power inside this country or outside could stand up against them. Instead of the bosses dictating terms to the workers, they could, as they should, dictate terms to the bosses. Even today, in scattered strike situations, detachments of workers demonstrate their invincibility. They sweep forward against the bosses, against administration "trouble-shooters," against military men, and even against their own top leaders, to win their demands.

The employers feel the enormous power of the workers and often assess it more accurately than the workers or their leaders. The bosses know that, by themselves, they cannot curb labor nor deny its demands. From all sides now the employers are summoning allies to their aid: government officials, defense commissioners, arbitrators, preachers of patriotism, army officers and, most important of all today, their lieutenants in the ranks of labor itself: Green, Hillman, Murray, Tobin, Lewis, and their staffs.

The function of these labor lieutenants and their policy of class collaboration is to lower the self-confidence of organized labor, to underestimate its strength, to keep it from independent class action, and to weaken its will to struggle and to win.

Our Perspective: Great Class Battles

What lies immediately ahead? There are those who call themselves revolutionists and who, on the basis of a mechanical analogy with 1914-1918, take it for granted that, during the first period of American participation in this war, capitalist reaction and governmental repression will succeed in cowering the American masses. We categorically reject that perspective as false and pernicious. Individuals and parties with that perspective overestimate the power of the plutocracy and its state, and underestimate the vigor and fighting qualities of the American proletariat. They ignore the real relationship of forces in the present situation and do not comprehend the basic tendencies at work within American society.

Deeply contradictory processes are developing on the basis of the imperialist preparations for war. While the capitalist leaders are plotting their wars abroad and domestic dictatorship, the working class is being vitalized by the war boom. The war economy, contrary to the desires of the big industrialists, tends to strengthen the unions. Strategic new sectors of industry, such as the aircraft plants, are being invaded by the unions. The fortresses of Ford and Bethlehem

Steel are being besieged. As the plutocrats anticipate super-profits, the workers are becoming ever bolder in *their* demands.

These opposing class forces are coming into sharper conflict. A new wave of unionization is in progress, a new strike wave is developing. Owing to the war crisis, these unfolding economic battles will be fought under conditions of sharper tension than ever before. The imperialist bourgeoisie and its agents cannot afford independence on the part of the working class. That's why they need a president armed with extraordinary powers; that's why they need preachers of patriotic sacrifice; that's why they need Home Guards as strike-breakers.

"But the vast struggles you anticipate did not occur in Europe," some people will be sure to object. These defeatists forget that circumstances alter cases. The objective and subjective conditions of the class struggle on this side of the Atlantic differ from those on the other. Neither France nor Great Britain experienced a war boom on the colossal scale projected by the United States; in Germany the preparations for imperialist *lebensraum* from 1935 to 1939 were made under the Nazi whip.

The working class of the United States faces the war today in an entirely different condition than the European proletariat. The workers of Europe had been exhausted by decades of incessant but inconclusive struggle, disillusioned by successive betrayals, demoralized by defeats, divided by national boundaries, and weakened by economic insufficiency and blood-lettings. They were drained of resources to wage victorious battles against their enemies or to overcome their treacherous leaders.

The American working class, on the other hand, stands today at the height of its powers. It has been unified on a continental scale, has tested and tempered itself in the past five years. Although it has gone through tremendous battles with the bosses, it has not known a debilitating or enduring defeat. The extent of its inner forces is shown by the speed and resiliency with which one battalion after another—such as the auto workers—recovers from each temporary setback, reorganizes its forces, and moves forward.

American labor resembles a rising young contender for the heavyweight championship who enters the arena, fresh, confident, in the pink of condition. What this young giant needs is a trainer and seconds capable of teaching him how to deal with his crafty and experienced opponent, how to counter his tricks, win every round and score a knockout. In this respect, too, the situation is favorable to the workers. Where formerly there existed a welter of confusion in the political labor movement, the arena is now clearing.

Only Two Contenders for Leadership

Yesterday those advanced workers who understood that the working class, including the trade unions, can go consistently forward only under the leadership of a political organization of the advanced workers, were more than likely to be confused by the spectacle of numerous groups claiming to be the workers' party. Today that confusion is disappearing, and with it the false claimants to the leadership of the working class. The war is destroying the pseudo-radical groupings which flourished in the armistice between the two world wars.

The segments of the Second International have now little or no life left in them. The political and social bases of the Social-Democratic Federation are narrowing to the vanishing point. It is a relic of the political past which can no longer find reasons for independent existence. Its pro-war program has no appeal for the radical-minded youth or the militant

trade unionist, while its ultra-patriotic lawyers and labor bureaucrats, aspiring Hillmans and Dubinskys, find that program just as well and with lusher rewards in the Democratic Party. Moreover, the source of the prestige of the Social-Democratic Federation—the Second International—after demonstrating its utter impotence, has been wiped off the map by Hitler. Indicative of the plight of the Social-Democratic Federation is the horde of bankrupt reformists who sought salvation through Kerensky, Hindenburg, Benes, Azana and Daladier and who now in London and New York serve Churchill and Roosevelt. These relics of European reformism mirror the only future of which the Social-Democratic Federation is capable. They are not an incentive for American workers to join up!

As for the "left" wing of the Second International in America, Norman Thomas' Socialist Party, it is in a state of chaos and disintegration. Deprived of its chief material support by the split with the Social-Democrats, and of its powers of attraction of advanced workers by its expulsion of its Trotskyist left wing, the Socialist Party has been a hollow shell since 1937. The war has shattered that shell. The Congressional hearings on the War Powers Bill publicly disclosed the new split in its ranks. While Thomas criticised the Bill in terms indistinguishable from those of his host, Hamilton Fish, Thomas' chief associates of recent years came out in full support of Roosevelt's war program. It is noteworthy that even in its death-rattle the Socialist Party remains a reflection of bourgeois public opinion in the labor world: its isolationist and interventionist factions but repeat the quarrels within the bourgeoisie, and the voice of proletarian class struggle is conspicuous by its absence. When the split is complete, it is very likely that the formal majority in the Socialist Party will be in the hands of the interventionists. In any case Norman Thomas will be left with little more than his radio program.

The Independent Labor League of America, better known as the Lovestoneites, the American representatives of the London-Amsterdam Bureau and the Workers' Front Against War (practically all the European sections of which became chauvinist when the war came), have preceded their friends of the Second International into extinction. Thirteen years after the Lovestoneites expelled the Trotskyists from the Communist Party, the old "Majority Group of the Communist Party" has given up the ghost. Its final "Declaration" called upon all others to join in a "new start for American socialism" by . . . committing suicide like the Lovestoneites.

The demise of the Lovestoneites is the handwriting on the wall for those political grouplets—Oehler, Stamm, Shachtman—that still buzz around. They are vanishing like flies at the approach of winter. The times have room only for the major political tendencies in the labor movement which represent great historical forces.

Only the Stalinists and the Trotskyists exist as active contenders for the leadership of the class-conscious workers.

The Communist Party and Trotskyism

The Stalin-Hitler pact and its consequences inflicted heavy blows upon the Stalinists. But they maintain an influence over thousands of worker-militants through their activities within the CIO unions and by virtue of their fraudulent anti-war and anti-imperialist slogans.

Their present propaganda, centering around the American Peace Mobilization, is indistinguishable from that of Norman Thomas and other preachers of pacifism save for the additional demand of a Washington-Moscow pact which will have the same reactionary character and consequences as

the current pact with Hitler or the earlier Franco-Soviet pact with Laval.

The main policies of the Communist Party are dictated in accordance with the shifting requirements of Stalin's opportunistic diplomacy. Whereas the opportunism of the reformist parties of the Second International was an organic outgrowth of national conditions and could therefore count upon the support of a certain aristocratic section of the organized International, their opportunism is dictated by bureaucratic bosses in the Kremlin who care even less about the interests of the American workers than for those of the Russian workers. The Communist Party can thus clash head-on with the class whose leadership it claims.

The strength of the Stalinists today depends in large measure upon the present pacifist mentality of part of the workers and the lower middle-classes, a mentality which represents an inevitable stage in their political education. But this hold of the Stalinists cannot be indefinitely maintained. Both the advanced workers and the Stalinist line will change. The workers in a world at war will see more clearly the futility of pacifism as a panacea and will turn to our program—Lenin's. And the further course of the war will undoubtedly cause an alteration in Stalin's diplomatic strategy which must be reflected in another somersault by the Communist Party leaders here.

This shift, which may take place in stages but will in the end be revealed as open support of American imperialism, will provoke an even deeper crisis in the Communist Party than the Stalin-Hitler pact. It will open a wide breach between the radical-minded proletarian militants and the Stalinist leaders. Even now the members and sympathizers of the Communist Party are beginning to question the infallibility of their national and international leadership.

This is indirectly certified by no less authoritative a body than the National Committee of the Communist Party, which has been compelled to launch a campaign "against Trotskyism" in its own ranks. This new drive was initiated by an internal document on "The Struggle Against Trotskyism" which has been reprinted in full with our reply in *THE MILITANT* of February 8.

Our Ideas Make Their Way

The real purpose of this witch-hunt is to terrorize into submission and to silence all those thinking workers in the Communist Party and its periphery who are beginning to grope their way toward a really revolutionary solution to their problems. This spontaneous development leads, often unconsciously, toward Trotskyist ideas. The Stalinist document points unmistakably to such militants when it complains of those who pose as "honest rank and filers spreading doubt," attempting "to undermine the confidence of the membership in the leadership," making "very left proposals," "expressing doubts regarding various phases of Soviet policy." The Stalinist document pretends it aims at discovering our agents within the Communist Party; but it is clear that it really is directed against the thinking workers in the Communist Party who as yet have no contact with us.

The Stalinist leaders are, however, compelled to conduct this "struggle against Trotskyism" under extremely difficult conditions. They have preached for years that the Trotskyists amount to nothing. Now they have to explain why the Trotskyists evidently do amount to something. They are compelled to try to explain to their members the important advances made by the Trotskyists. How do the Trotskyists manage to get proletarian support, such as 8,761 votes in Minnesota in the last election, 6,050 votes more than Browder got? The

Stalinist leaders cannot answer such questions plausibly. They repeat all the old slanders against Trotsky, but Trotsky has been murdered by Stalin while the party of Trotskyism lives and flourishes. How is that possible? The Stalinists cannot explain, because the very last thing they will ever do is to discuss the actual *program* of Trotskyism by which it lives and grows despite the loss of Trotsky.

And at the same time that Browder is slandering the Trotskyists as fascist agents, he is compelled to permit Communist Party trade union fractions to enter into united fronts with the Trotskyists. The fractions are under the heavy fire of the war mongers in the unions, and seek allies in the struggle to defend themselves. But yesterday's allies of the Stalinists are gone. The "People's Front" friends are today in the camp of the war mongers, seeking the expulsion of the Communist Party members from the unions. The only allies against the war mongers turn out to be the Trotskyists. Rather than agree to united fronts with the Trotskyists, Browder is perfectly ready to see more than one union expelled Communists, and more than one union destroyed in the process. Fortunately, the Communist Party members involved see the matter differently than Browder. They want to save themselves and their unions, rather than go down swearing by Browder. If Browder will confront them with a choice between remaining in the Communist Party or acting jointly with the Trotskyists to preserve the unions, they are more than likely to part company with Browder. And where Browder, rather than face such consequences, permits a Communist Party fraction to carry out a united front with the Trotskyists, that united front becomes the most powerful antidote to Browder's lies about Trotskyism. Thus Browder is on the horns of a dilemma either horn of which bodes no good for the Stalinist apparatus.

In its desperate fight against such united fronts, the Browder leadership brandishes as its chief weapon the very same one which the degenerate Second International leadership used against the united front proposals of the Communist International of Lenin and Trotsky. The united front proposals, cries Browder, are really a "policy of trying to disrupt our Party." They are "designed to penetrate our ranks." These words of the Stalinist document on "Trotskyism" merely echo what Kautsky used to tell the Social-Democratic workers to persuade them not to support the Comintern's united front offers. Kautsky used to prove it by quoting certain words of Lenin to that effect, and likewise Browder quotes the words of Trotsky and Cannon.

Of course Lenin, and Trotsky and Cannon after him, defined the united front as a tactic of struggle against the opponent to whom the proposal is made. Of course Lenin said that the primary purpose of the united front with the Social-Democrats is to expose the false character of their leadership and the disastrous consequences of their policies, to raise the level of political consciousness among the workers and to make Bolsheviks out of them. Of course Lenin, and Trotsky and Cannon after him, do not view the united front as an end in itself, but as a means of winning the workers of the other party to the banner of Bolshevism. The united front becomes the arena in which the contending parties demonstrate which deserves the support of the workers. It becomes the testing-ground of the parties participating. All this used to be the ABC of Communism. It is a measure of the degeneration of the "Communist" Party under Stalin and Browder, that they, like Kautsky, argue against the united front on the ground that their opponent is attempting to disrupt their party and win its members.

In case Browder needs better quotations to prove his

point, we herewith provide him with one: In the united fronts which have taken place and those which will take place on an even greater scale, our aim is to win away from the Communist Party the worker-militants. Browder's fear on this score is something he cannot explain to his membership. Why should he fear to appear in the same arena of the united front, side by side with the Trotskyists? Isn't his fear an indication that he has no confidence in his ability to bear comparison with the Trotskyists before a working class audience?

We value every Communist Party member whom we recruit as worth, from the political standpoint, more than unattached workers of equal calibre. For in joining with us he not only augments our own forces, but thereby weakens our chief rival by an equal loss.

The New Stage of Trotskyism

The war which destroyed others was also an acid test of our party. It was a test, however, for which our party had been preparing throughout its existence, and it met the test with flying colors. There was a group which succumbed to the pressure of bourgeois-democracy, attempted to stampede our party into abandoning our program and, failing, deserted the party. For a time the ideological leader of that group, James Burnham, pretended that he "merely" wanted us to abandon our stand for the defense of the Soviet Union; his full program, however, turned out to be the abandonment of all hope for the socialist revolution. For the next epoch of humanity he, Burnham, can see only a "managerial revolution": power in the hands of an "elite" which may call itself fascist or by some other name. It was pure gain to rid ourselves of such bourgeois swine.

Scarcely had our party gone through that test, successfully defending the banner of Bolshevism against these traitors, when Stalin succeeded in assassinating Leon Trotsky. There were friends who feared and enemies who hoped that our party would not survive the death of our leader; neither such friends nor enemies understood that Trotsky had built so well. He had built on a *program*, the ideas of Trotskyism. Trotsky could be murdered; his party would go forward as he enjoined it to in his last words.

And so it has been. We write some six months after he died. It would be a great deal to record that the movement has survived such a heavy blow. Yet what we have to record is something very much more than that.

Trotsky's last words have entered into the very marrow of our young militants. The past six months have been least of all a period of mere survival. They have been a period of steady and considerable growth. Some of the signs of this growth have been evident to all; the new six-page *MILITANT*, the overfulfillment of the Trotsky Memorial Fund, the opening of new branches in key cities, the Minnesota elections, new successes and advances in the trade union movement. Other advances that we have made cannot yet be publicly discussed. But we are content to rest our case on the visible signs.

Our growth reflects not only the correct program and inherent strength of our party but also the vigor of the American labor movement. Our growth is the most mature expression of the proletarian activity sweeping through the nation in the teeth of the official and unofficial terrorism of the war mongers. The deeper penetration of our members into the trade unions and the proletarianization of our party could not have been so speedily effected were it not for the war boom. War industry has speedily absorbed our people and the class-conscious workers, with returning self-confidence as industry shows its need of them, have become the more receptive to our ideas.

Thus the new stage of Trotskyism is the product both of subjective factors—our success is meeting the tests to which we have been subjected—and the objective situation. That it is a new stage every day's reports from the party branches testify. Everywhere we are going forward. Our young militants are pervaded with the most thoroughgoing optimism. They know, better than anybody, that the terrible ravages of the war make, in comparison, the ancient tale of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse a lullaby for children. But they also know, with the sureness of utter conviction, that this war is but the expression of the death agony of capitalism. That this epoch of death is the transition to the epoch of the world revolution. They know it, and they live by it.

Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay

By LEON TROTSKY

(The manuscript of the following article was found in Trotsky's desk. Obviously, it was by no means a completed article, but rather the rough notes for an article on the subject indicated by his title. He had been writing them shortly before his death.—THE EDITORS.)

* * *

There is one common feature in the development, or more correctly the degeneration, of modern trade union organizations in the entire world: it is their drawing closely to and growing together with the state power. This process is equally characteristic of the neutral, the Social-Democratic, the Communist and "anarchist" trade unions. This fact alone shows that the tendency towards "growing together" is intrinsic not in this or that doctrine as such but derives from social conditions common for all unions.

Monopoly capitalism does not rest on competition and free private initiative but on centralized command. The capitalist cliques at the head of mighty trusts, syndicates, banking consortiums, etcetera, view economic life from the very same heights as does state power; and they require at every step the collaboration of the latter. In their turn the trade unions in the most important branches of industry find themselves deprived of the possibility of profiting by the competition between the different enterprises. They have to confront a centralized capitalist adversary, intimately bound up with state power. Hence flows the need of the trade unions—insofar as they remain on reformist positions, i.e., on positions of adapting themselves to private property—to adapt themselves to the capitalist state and to contend for its cooperation. In the eyes of the bureaucracy of the trade union movement the

chief task lies in "freeing" the state from the embrace of capitalism, in weakening its dependence on trusts, in pulling it over to their side. This position is in complete harmony with the social position of the labor aristocracy and the labor bureaucracy, who fight for a crumb in the share of super-profits of imperialist capitalism. The labor bureaucrats do their level best in words and deeds to demonstrate to the "democratic" state how reliable and indispensable they are in peace-time and especially in time of war. By transforming the trade unions into organs of the state, fascism invents nothing new; it merely draws to their ultimate conclusion the tendencies inherent in imperialism.

Colonial and semi-colonial countries are under the sway not of native capitalism but of foreign imperialism. However, this does not weaken but on the contrary, strengthens the need of direct, daily, practical ties between the magnates of capitalism and the governments which are in essence subject to them—the governments of colonial or semi-colonial countries. Inasmuch as imperialist capitalism creates both in colonies and semi-colonies a stratum of labor aristocracy and bureaucracy, the latter requires the support of colonial and semi-colonial governments, as protectors, patrons and, sometimes, as arbitrators. This constitutes the most important social basis for the Bonapartist and semi-Bonapartist character of governments in the colonies and in backward countries generally. This likewise constitutes the basis for the dependence of reformist unions upon the state.

In Mexico the trade unions have been transformed by law into semi-state institutions and have, in the nature of things, assumed a semi-totalitarian character. The state-ization of the trade unions was, according to the conception of the legislators, introduced in the interests of the workers in order to assure them an influence upon the governmental and economic life. But insofar as foreign imperialist capitalism dominates the national state and insofar as it is able, with the assistance of internal reactionary forces, to overthrow the unstable democracy and replace it with outright fascist dictatorship, to that extent the legislation relating to the trade unions can easily become a weapon in the hands of imperialist dictatorship.

Slogans for Freeing the Unions

From the foregoing it seems, at first sight, easy to draw the conclusion that the trade unions cease to be trade unions in the imperialist epoch. They leave almost no room at all for workers' democracy which, in the good old days, when free trade ruled on the economic arena, constituted the content of the inner life of labor organizations. In the absence of workers' democracy there cannot be any free struggle for the influence over the trade union membership. And because of this, the chief arena of work for revolutionists within the trade unions disappears. Such a position, however, would be false to the core. We cannot select the arena and the conditions for our activity to suit our own likes and dislikes. It is infinitely more difficult to fight in a totalitarian or a semi-totalitarian state for influence over the working masses than in a democracy. The very same thing likewise applies to trade unions whose fate reflects the change in the destiny of capitalist states. We cannot renounce the struggle for influence over workers in Germany merely because the totalitarian regime makes such work extremely difficult there. We cannot, in precisely the same way, renounce the struggle within the compulsory labor organizations created by Fascism. All the less so can we renounce internal systematic work in trade unions of totalitarian and semi-totalitarian type merely because they depend directly or indirectly on the workers' state

or because the bureaucracy deprives the revolutionists of the possibility of working freely within these trade unions. It is necessary to conduct a struggle under all those concrete conditions which have been created by the preceding developments, including therein the mistakes of the working class and the crimes of its leaders. In the fascist and semi-fascist countries it is impossible to carry on revolutionary work that is not underground, illegal, conspiratorial. Within the totalitarian and semi-totalitarian unions it is impossible or well-nigh impossible to carry on any except conspiratorial work. It is necessary to adapt ourselves to the concrete conditions existing in the trade unions of every given country in order to mobilize the masses not only against the bourgeoisie but also against the totalitarian regime within the trade unions themselves and against the leaders enforcing this regime. The primary slogan for this struggle is: *complete and unconditional independence of the trade unions in relation to the capitalist state*. This means a struggle to turn the trade unions into the organs of the broad exploited masses and not the organs of a labor aristocracy.

* * *

The second slogan is: *trade union democracy*. This second slogan flows directly from the first and presupposes for its realization the complete freedom of the trade unions from the imperialist or colonial state.

In other words, the trade unions in the present epoch cannot simply be the organs of democracy as they were in the epoch of free capitalism and they cannot any longer remain politically neutral, that is, limit themselves to serving the daily needs of the working class. They cannot any longer be anarchistic, i.e. ignore the decisive influence of the state on the life of peoples and classes. They can no longer be reformist, because the objective conditions leave no room for any serious and lasting reforms. The trade unions of our time can either serve as secondary instruments of imperialist capitalism for the subordination and disciplining of workers and for obstructing the revolution, or, on the contrary, the trade unions can become the instruments of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat.

* * *

The neutrality of the trade unions is completely and irretrievably a thing of the past, gone together with the free bourgeois democracy.

* * *

From what has been said it follows quite clearly that, in spite of the progressive degeneration of trade unions and their growing together with the imperialist state, the work within the trade unions not only does not lose any of its importance but remains as before and becomes in a certain sense even more important work than ever for every revolutionary party. The matter at issue is essentially the struggle for influence over the working class. Every organization, every party, every faction which permits itself an ultimistic position in relation to the trade union, i.e., in essence turns its back upon the working class, merely because of displeasure with its organizations, every such organization is destined to perish. And it must be said it deserves to perish.

* * *

Inasmuch as the chief role in backward countries is not played by national but by foreign capitalism, the national bourgeoisie occupies, in the sense of its social position, a much more minor position than corresponds with the development of industry. Inasmuch as foreign capital does not import workers but proletarianizes the native population, the na-

tional proletariat soon begins playing the most important role in the life of the country. In these conditions the national government, to the extent that it tries to show resistance to foreign capital, is compelled to a greater or lesser degree to lean on the proletariat. On the other hand, the governments of those backward countries which consider inescapable or more profitable for themselves to march shoulder to shoulder with foreign capital, destroy the labor organizations and institute a more or less totalitarian regime. Thus, the feebleness of the national bourgeoisie, the absence of traditions of municipal self-government, the pressure of foreign capitalism and the relatively rapid growth of the proletariat, cut the ground from under any kind of stable democratic regime. The governments of backward, i.e., colonial and semi-colonial countries, by and large assume a Bonapartist or semi-Bonapartist character; and differ from one another in this, that some try to orient in a democratic direction, seeking support among workers and peasants, while others install a form close to military-police dictatorship. This likewise determines the fate of the trade unions. They either stand under the special patronage of the state or they are subjected to cruel persecution. Patronage on the part of the state is dictated by two tasks which confront it: first, to draw the working class closer thus gaining a support for resistance against excessive pretensions on the part of imperialism; and, at the same time, to discipline the workers themselves by placing them under the control of a bureaucracy.

* * *

Monopoly Capitalism and the Unions

Monopoly capitalism is less and less willing to reconcile itself to the independence of trade unions. It demands of the reformist bureaucracy and the labor aristocracy who pick the crumbs from its banquet table, that they become transformed into its political police before the eyes of the working class. If that is not achieved, the labor bureaucracy is driven away and replaced by the fascists. Incidentally, all the efforts of the labor aristocracy in the service of imperialism cannot in the long run save them from destruction.

The intensification of class contradictions within each country, the intensification of antagonisms between one country and another, produce a situation in which imperialist capitalism can tolerate (i.e., up to a certain time) a reformist bureaucracy only if the latter serves directly as a petty but active stockholder of its imperialist enterprises, of its plans and programs within the country as well as on the world arena. Social-reformism must become transformed into social-imperialism in order to prolong its existence, but only prolong it, and nothing more. Because along this road there is no way out in general.

Does this mean that in the epoch of imperialism independent trade unions are generally impossible? It would be fundamentally incorrect to pose the question this way. Impossible are the independent or semi-independent reformist trade unions. Wholly possible are revolutionary trade unions which not only are not stockholders of imperialist policy but which set as their task the direct overthrow of the rule of capitalism. In the epoch of imperialist decay the trade unions can be really independent only to the extent that they are conscious of being, in action, the organs of proletarian revolution. In this sense, the program of transitional demands adopted by the last congress of the Fourth International is not only the program for the activity of the party but in its fundamental features it is the program for the activity of the trade unions.

(Translator's note: At this point Trotsky left room on the

page, to expound further the connection between trade union activity and the Transitional Program of the Fourth International. It is obvious that implied here is a very powerful argument in favor of military training under trade union control. The following idea is implied: Either the trade unions serve as the obedient recruiting sergeants for the imperialist army and imperialist war or they train workers for self-defense and revolution.)

* * *

The development of backward countries is characterized by its combined character. In other words, the last word of imperialist technology, economics, and politics is combined in these countries with traditional backwardness and primitiveness. This law can be observed in the most diverse spheres of the development of colonial and semi-colonial countries, including the sphere of the trade union movement. Imperialist capitalism operates here in its most cynical and naked form. It transports to virgin soil the most perfected methods of its tyrannical rule.

* * *

In the trade union movement throughout the world there is to be observed in the last period a swing to the right and the suppression of internal democracy. In England, the Minority Movement in the trade unions has been crushed (not without the assistance of Moscow); the leaders of the trade union movement are today, especially in the field of foreign policy, the obedient agents of the Conservative party. In France there was no room for an independent existence for Stalinist trade unions; they united with the so-called anarcho-syndicalist trade unions under the leadership of Jouhaux and as a result of this unification there was a general shift of the trade union movement not to the left but to the right. The leadership of the C.G.T. is the most direct and open agency of French imperialist capitalism.

In the United States the trade union movement has passed through the most stormy history in recent years. The rise of the CIO is incontrovertible evidence of the revolutionary tendencies within the working masses. Indicative and noteworthy in the highest degree, however, is the fact that the new "leftist" trade union organization was no sooner founded than it fell into the steel embrace of the imperialist state. The struggle among the tops between the old federation and the new is reducible in large measure to the struggle for the sympathy and support of Roosevelt and his cabinet.

No less graphic, although in a different sense, is the picture of the development or the degeneration of the trade union movement in Spain. In the socialist trade unions all those leading elements which to any degree represented the independence of the trade union movement were pushed out. As regards the anarcho-syndicalist unions, they were transformed into the instrument of the bourgeois republicans; the anarcho-syndicalist leaders became conservative bourgeois ministers. The fact that this metamorphosis took place in conditions of civil war does not weaken its significance. War is the continuation of the self-same policies. It speeds up processes, exposes their basic features, destroys all that is rotten, false, equivocal and lays bare all that is essential. The shift of the trade unions to the right was due to the sharpening of class and international contradictions. The leaders of the trade union movement sensed or understood, or were given to understand, that now was no time to play the game of opposition. Every oppositional movement within the trade union movement, especially among the tops, threatens to provoke a stormy movement of the masses and to create difficulties for national imperialism. Hence flows the swing of the trade unions to the right, and the suppression of work-

ers' democracy within the unions. The basic feature, the swing towards the totalitarian regime, passes through the labor movement of the whole world.

We should also recall Holland, where the reformist and the trade union movement was not only a reliable prop of imperialist capitalism, but where the so-called anarcho-sindicalist organization also was actually under the control of the imperialist government. The secretary of this organization, Sneevliet, in spite of his Platonic sympathies for the Fourth International was as deputy in the Dutch Parliament most concerned lest the wrath of the government descend upon his trade union organization.

* * *

In the United States the Department of Labor with its leftist bureaucracy has as its task the subordination of the trade union movement to the democratic state and it must be said that this task has up to now been solved with some success.

* * *

The nationalization of railways and oil fields in Mexico has of course nothing in common with socialism. It is a measure of state capitalism in a backward country which in this way seeks to defend itself on the one hand against foreign imperialism and on the other against its own proletariat. The management of railways, oil fields, etcetera, through labor organizations has nothing in common with workers' control over industry, for in the essence of the matter the management is effected through the labor bureaucracy which is independent of the workers, but in return, completely dependent on the bourgeois state. This measure on the part of the ruling class pursues the aim of disciplining the working class, making it more industrious in the service of the common interests of the state, which appear on the surface to merge with the interests of the working class itself. As a matter of fact, the whole task of the bourgeoisie consists in liquidating the trade unions as organs of the class struggle and substituting in their place the trade union bureaucracy as the organ of the

leadership over the workers by the bourgeois state. In these conditions, the task of the revolutionary vanguard is to conduct a struggle for the complete independence of the trade unions and for the introduction of actual workers' control over the present union bureaucracy, which has been turned into the administration of railways, oil enterprises and so on.

* * *

Events of the last period (before the war) have revealed with especial clarity that anarchism, which in point of theory is always only liberalism drawn to its extremes, was, in practice, peaceful propaganda within the democratic republic, the protection of which it required. If we leave aside individual terrorist acts, etcetera, anarchism, as a system of mass movement and politics, presented only propaganda material under the peaceful protection of the laws. In conditions of crisis the anarchists always did just the opposite of what they taught in peace times. This was pointed out by Marx himself in connection with the Paris Commune. And it was repeated on a far more colossal scale in the experience of the Spanish revolution.

* * *

Democratic unions in the old sense of the term, bodies where in the framework of one and the same mass organization different tendencies struggled more or less freely, can no longer exist. Just as it is impossible to bring back the bourgeois-democratic state, so it is impossible to bring back the old workers' democracy. The fate of the one reflects the fate of the other. As a matter of fact, the independence of trade unions in the class sense, in their relations to the bourgeois state can, in the present conditions, be assured only by a completely revolutionary leadership, that is, the leadership of the Fourth International. This leadership, naturally, must and can be rational and assure the unions the maximum of democracy conceivable under the present concrete conditions. But without the political leadership of the Fourth International the independence of the trade unions is impossible.

Lessons and Perspectives of the Sino-Japanese War

By LI FU-JEN

As these lines are being written it is still difficult to forecast when and in what manner the Sino-Japanese war will end. But the outcome of the present conflict in the Far East will in any case have a provisional character. The world war which is approaching with irresistible force will review the Chinese problem together with all other problems of colonial domination. For it is in this that the real task of the second world war will consist: to divide the planet anew in accord with the new relationship of forces. The principal arena of struggle will, of course, not be that Lilliputian bath-tub, the Mediterranean, nor even the Atlantic Ocean, but the basin of the Pacific. The most important object of struggle will be China, embracing about one-fourth of the human race. The fate of the Soviet Union—the other big stake in the coming war—will also to a certain degree be decided in the Far East. Preparing for this clash of Titans, Tokyo is attempting today to assure itself of the broadest possible drill-ground on the continent of Asia.

Great Britain and the United States are likewise losing no time.—LEON TROTSKY in his Introduction to Harold R. Isaacs' *The Tragedy of the Chinese Revolution* (1938).

* * *

It is time to draw the balance of the unterminated and seemingly interminable Sino-Japanese war. The military struggle has been virtually stalemated since the fall of Canton and Hankow toward the end of 1938, when the Japanese army reached the peak of its striking power. Today neither the Japanese imperialists nor Chiang Kai-shek hope for a definitive victory. Chinese territory under Japanese control is now no greater, and is perhaps even somewhat smaller, than it was at the end of 1938 when the war had already been in progress about eighteen months. On none of the fighting fronts have Japan's forces been able to make any important advances; at some points they have been compelled to retreat. Lately they have found it necessary to shorten some fronts because of new

preoccupations in French Indo-China. But there are no signs of a Chinese offensive.

Japanese military activity in China in the recent period has been confined, in the main, to holding captured territory and lines of communication against Chinese guerrilla attacks and occasional assaults by Chinese regulars, while bombing China's bases and communications from the air. Chungking, the provisional capital in far-off Szechwan province, has been subjected to terrific aerial punishment. More than half the city has been razed by demolition and incendiary bombs. But the Kuomintang government of Chiang Kai-shek, taking comfort in American loans and Russian war supplies, feeling assured, moreover, that Japan will become involved in war with the United States, obstinately declines Japanese overtures for a "peace" which would leave the imperialists of Dai Nippon in substantial control of what their armies in the field have conquered.

Japan, hoping thereby to serve her primary Asiatic aims, has joined in a military alliance with Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. At the same time, the Kuomintang government becomes more and more enmeshed in the robber diplomacy of the democratic imperialists.

"The war in Eastern Asia," declares the *Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution*, "will become more and more interlocked with the imperialist world war. The Chinese people will be able to reach independence only under the leadership of the youthful and self-sacrificing proletariat, in whom the indispensable self-confidence will be rekindled by the rebirth of the world revolution." This declaration implies two things: first, that China's war of resistance to Japanese imperialism has been driven into a blind alley under Chiang Kai-shek's leadership; second, that the main impulsion for a new and victorious chapter in the liberating struggle of the Chinese people must come from without. That China's struggle has run up a blind alley is self-evident. Huge and important territories have been lost to the invaders. Although unvanquished, Chiang Kai-shek has been unable to win a single important victory. China's toiling millions, after terrific sacrifices in the struggle against Japan, are as far as ever from the goal of national liberation from imperialism, while socially they are victims of a system of exploitation and oppression which is more intense today than when the war commenced in the summer of 1937. As to the second proposition, the facts of the present situation eloquently suggest that China's fate, both in the immediate and long-term senses, is tied up with, and closely dependent upon, the course of the present world war and the development of the world-wide socialist revolution.

How Chiang Fights Japan

Chiang Kai-shek never regarded the war with Japan as a struggle for the liberation of China from the yoke of imperialism. After beheading a great revolution, he came to power in 1927 as the guardian of imperialist interests in China. Those interests, needless to say, are closely tied in with those of the native exploiters. When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, Chiang made non-resistance the keynote of his policy and forcibly suppressed the protest movement which arose throughout the country. Chiang justified this policy by references to China's military unpreparedness. Actually, however, Chiang's difficulty was that he could not gauge the Japanese appetite. Perhaps the Tokyo imperialists would be content with Manchuria and the provinces of Inner Mongolia? In that case a deal might be arranged. If Japan showed signs of going

"too far," her rivals in the Pacific—Britain, the United States and France—would doubtless reach out a restraining hand.

In the ensuing years, the scope of Japan's imperialist appetite became manifest. Chiang's policy of non-resistance meant abandonment without struggle of one position after another—first in Jehol, north of the Great Wall, later to the south of it—thus piling up difficulties against the day when Japan's challenge could no longer be evaded. At the same time, Chiang's policy was running into the ever more intense opposition of the Chinese people who wanted to defend their country against the foreign violator. Finally, the preoccupation of the "democratic" powers in Europe with the growing menace of Hitler made Anglo-French intervention against Japan less and less likely, while the United States, militarily unprepared, could only look on helplessly. Chiang was thus confronted with the alternative of either fighting Japan practically single-handed, or permitting China to be converted into a Japanese colony. The course of resistance was chosen.

Every social regime based on exploitation and oppression is imperiled by war. The masses, arms in hand, no longer submit readily to the old way of life. The more backward the country involved, the greater is the likelihood of social explosions, for the misery of the masses is greater. Chiang Kai-shek, for all his feudal ideas, is a sufficiently educated politician to understand the principal laws of revolution. Quite consciously and deliberately he embarked upon the war with the intention of confining it within limits which would endanger neither the positions of imperialism as a whole nor the interests and rule of the native bourgeoisie. The fighting would be conducted by the armies under his control. The masses would not be mobilized, much less armed. There would be no measures of social amelioration. Manifestations of popular discontent would be met with repression.

The one organized source from which Chiang thought opposition might sooner or later be expected was the Communist Party. Here he had an unexpectedly easy conquest. He agreed to suspend his ten-year-old war against them and promised them certain liberties they had never known before. He set up a democratic farce called the "People's Political Council," in which the Stalinists were given decidedly minor representation. Above all, he promised to resist Japan to the very end. The Stalinists, for their part, agreed to drop their opposition to Chiang and abandon the class struggle. On this basis, the "People's Anti-Japanese United Front," replica of the Popular Front in Spain, was formed. Stalin considered desertion and betrayal of the cause of the Chinese masses a cheap price to pay for a war against Japan by Chiang Kai-shek, for Japan, kept busy in China, would be unable to attack the Soviet Union in the Far East. Above everything else, Stalin feared involvement in a big war, for that would bring revolution against his Bonapartist regime. A revolution in China might be equally disastrous for the Soviet bureaucracy. Better, then, to have the war conducted by Chiang Kai-shek, by non-revolutionary means, as a purely military struggle, even if that meant ultimate failure.

The Results of Chiang's Policy

We foretold from the very outset what the consequences of the Chiang Kai-shek-Stalinist policy would be. A backward, ill-armed country engaged in an essentially progressive struggle can redress its material disadvantages in war against a well-armed imperialist power only by calling the million-headed masses to the struggle on the basis of a program which gives them a big material stake in victory. This was proved in Russia in the early years of the revolution, where the guns, the tanks, the well-armed and well-trained infantrymen of the

imperialists, together with their White Russian allies, proved no match for the enthusiastic if ill-armed, hungry and ragged soldiers of Trotsky's Red Army, who knew they were fighting to preserve and develop concrete social gains. Just this—an armed people aroused and fighting for a better future—has been lacking in the Sino-Japanese struggle of the past three and a half years.

At the commencement of the war there was tremendous popular enthusiasm in China for the struggle against Japan. It embraced virtually all sections of the population, if one excepts the big bourgeoisie who were disturbed by the disruption of their normally peaceful and prosperous lives, alarmed for their properties, and extremely skeptical of the prospects of victory. The Chinese armies in North China and at Shanghai had the wholehearted backing of students and intellectuals, workers and artisans, petty merchants and shopkeepers, and the tillers of the soil, although the government frowned on anything that looked like a mass mobilization of civilians to aid the army. The heroic battles fought at Shanghai in the closing months of 1937 proved that the armies of Japanese imperialism could be held at bay. Perhaps, at no distant date, China's armies would be able to take the offensive and sweep the invaders into the sea. What was lacking in armament—particularly planes and heavy weapons—might be compensated by manpower imbued with that fighting fervor which springs from a just cause. Victory was considered at least possible. It took more than the retreat from Shanghai and the subsequent fall of Nanking to dissipate this popular faith. Even the Japanese occupation of Canton and Hankow could not do it. Military reverses affected the national morale undoubtedly, but the fundamental causes for the disappointment, pessimism, apathy (and, to some extent, downright distaste for any further struggle) which now pervade the ranks of the broad masses are much more insidious. They are to be found in the policies of the Chiang Kai-shek regime and its Stalinist allies, policies which not only have not opened up the perspective of victory but have produced mass misery and beggary on a scale and of an intensity heretofore unknown.

The Bourgeoisie Sabotages China's War

For the reader to appreciate the situation which has arisen, it is necessary to give some idea of the manner in which China's side of the war has been conducted. Military policy contributed very largely to the succession of heavy defeats which the Chinese armies sustained on all the major fronts. Civil policy undermined the popular morale. Without mentioning the ten years of Kuomintang rule which were in the first place responsible more than anything else for China's military deficiencies (the funds squeezed from the people and pocketed or squandered by hordes of corrupt officials, including the highest members of the government, would have sufficed to create an exceedingly well-equipped army, an adequate air force and even a navy of some dimensions), it is possible to show, step by step, how the Kuomintang regime has sabotaged the struggle against Japan. The sabotage is not conscious, but flows mechanically from the preservation of ruling class interests.

China has never had a truly national government since the overthrow of the last dynasty in 1911. The warlord period which set in with the establishment of the Republic was continued over into the Kuomintang era. Chiang Kai-shek became the principal warlord and established his supremacy in a large section of the country. But particularism, that hangover from a feudal past, continued to plague his regime. Unwilling to attack the semi-feudal agrarian relations which gave it nourishment, Chiang was obliged to rule outside his par-

ticular bailiwick through deputized henchmen and retainers of dubious loyalty. The provincial governors appointed by Chiang had their own armed forces. None ever proved powerful enough to challenge Chiang successfully, but many nursed ambitions to replace him in the central seat of power. Chiang kept these henchmen in line by a combination of bribery, pressure and combinatorial maneuvers. His central problem in the domestic field—next to keeping the masses in subjection—is to prevent any of these henchmen from forming a coalition against him.

This struggle to keep in the seat of power found its reflection in the military organization of the country and has had a profound effect on the course of the war. At the outset, Chiang divided the country into war zones, each with a supreme commander. The creation of these commands required the placing of large bodies of men under a single control and Chiang had to find some way of preventing the zone commanders from acquiring too much power. He wanted no embryonic challengers to his rule springing up in the midst of war. Accordingly, a system was devised whereby district commanders, whose immediate nominal superiors were the zone commanders, were subordinated to Chiang's personal control with standing instructions to obey no operational orders unless Chiang had first sanctioned them.

The results of such a system, effective to this day, can easily be imagined. War zone commanders were reduced to the status of figure-heads with grand military titles but no real powers. Coordinated or combined actions became virtually impossible. Staff work became largely meaningless. Initiative, which could have produced favorable results where the enemy betrayed a weakness, was all too often lacking. A district officer would seldom, even in an emergency, act on the zone commander's orders without Chiang's prior endorsement. He preferred to run away. One who had more than average courage might act, but the value of his action would be cancelled out by lack of corresponding initiative in a neighboring sector or by his own fear to follow up a gain. A favorable opportunity was irretrievably lost. The zone commanders, for their part, found that the safest policy was to do nothing without orders from higher up. In any case, how can one command an entire war zone if he cannot give orders to district commanders and have them obeyed? On this score alone, as can be seen quite plainly, the continuance of the Kuomintang regime is incompatible with a serious struggle against imperialism.

Foreign military observers on the spot, usually partial to China's cause, have conceded the superiority of the Japanese army in discipline, organization, strategy, tactics and, by and large, fighting spirit. But the Kuomintang regime has done all it could to accentuate the balance in Japan's favor. The strategy of the Chinese armies was passive throughout. Aware of this, Japanese commanders frequently took chances which they never would have dared take had they faced a more active and resourceful foe.

To catalogue all the Chinese military deficiencies, most of them traceable directly to the regime in power, would require much more space than we have available. To them must be added the innumerable crimes against the army by the government and the highest officers in the military organization: subordination of military requirements to clique interests; desertion by commanders in the face of the enemy; disregard for the soldiers' welfare, including theft of soldiers' pay; graft in high places. An illuminating example of what goes on was furnished in the Chinese retreat from Taiyuan, capital of the northwestern province of Shansi. Field commanders organizing the retreat sent urgent messages into

Taiyuan, requesting trucks for the transportation of men and supplies. "No more trucks available," came the reply. However, it was noticed that a great stream of trucks was moving southward from the city, loaded with big packing cases. Asked what the cases contained, an official replied laconically: "Cigaretts." Which meant opium! General Yen Hsi-shan, "model governor" of Shansi, was more concerned to save this poisonous source of his wealth than to rescue Chinese soldiers and supplies and prevent a military debacle. The officers cursed this brazen corruptionist. The incident gave them an invaluable insight into the character of the regime. Lessons such as these will have revolutionary repercussions in the future. But it will require more than curses to oust the rotten gang which now rules over China's destinies.

Lest it be thought that the above is an isolated incident, let it be said now that innumerable incidents of similar import have occurred on practically all the fighting fronts. In their totality they amount to a gigantic sabotage of the war by the "patriotic" bourgeoisie, offsetting and nullifying the heroism and sacrifices of the soldiers. Culprits without political pull have been executed if the scandal has reached the light of day. But such gestures are hypocritical and ineffectual because they do not get at the root of the trouble, which is the Kuomintang regime itself.

The Lie of "Equality of Sacrifice"

The problem of caring adequately for millions of soldiers in the field is admittedly a difficult and costly one. To do it with any adequacy at all required the ending of official graft, the seizure of big fortunes, and the conscription of doctors. None of these things have been done, for it would have meant assailing the interests of members of the government and the ruling class which they represent. Casualties among China's soldiers have been fearful. No one knows even the approximate numbers of killed and wounded. Largely for purposes of propaganda abroad, the government has maintained a number of fairly good military hospitals which foreign correspondents can photograph. Madame Chiang Kai-shek and her sisters flutter about the wards occasionally, distributing gifts to the wounded. But these hospitals can at best handle only a few thousand men. Advance dressing station facilities are a rarity. Wounded soldiers, if they can use their legs, must hobble to the rear for treatment and there it will be hours, sometimes days, before they are given attention, for surgeons are few. It is said that a seriously wounded soldier in China has no chance of life. Either he is unable to reach the rear (wounded men are the last consideration in the military transport system) and dies on the field; or, if he reaches the rear, he dies before he can get attention or because the attention came too late.

As in all wars conducted by the ruling class in modern society, there has been in China the usual talk of "equality of sacrifice." There has assuredly been plenty of sacrifice, but it has been confined to the ranks of the soldiers and the common people. The rich in some places have been obliged to leave their accustomed habitats to escape the war, but they have taken their wealth with them to Hongkong or Manila or the foreign-controlled areas of Shanghai and continued to live as always, in opulence. But there are an estimated 50,000,000 propertyless war refugees in China today, people who have lost whatever meager possessions they had and wander hopelessly across the face of the land. Ravished by disease and hunger they die in numbers that suggest an epidemic. Some of the rich make an occasional paltry donation for refugee relief. Government members and officials do likewise. But none of them relinquish their lucrative grafts, while only

a small fraction of the national, provincial and local budgets is set aside for relief.

Equality of sacrifice! When Hankow, then the provisional capital, was under siege in 1938 and food was hard to obtain, the plane from Hongkong each day brought a case of fresh imported American fruits for the table of Finance Minister H. H. Kung, brother-in-law of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. That space on the plane might have been used to carry medical supplies. At the commencement of the war in 1937, the Shanghai Commercial & Savings Bank owned by K. P. Chen, a leading luminary of bourgeois China, converted all its cash holdings into American dollars, thereby weakening the Chinese dollar which the government was desperately trying to prop up. On reconversion, after the Chinese dollar had slipped way down, the banker made a great fortune. This piece of financial jugglery evidently qualified the banker for leadership of a financial mission to Washington, where he went to arrange the first American loan to China. As in the military sphere, this incident is not accidental and exceptional. Such actions are the rule. They characterize the entire Kuomintang regime.

The Masses Bear the Burden

A conscription law was enacted by the Kuomintang government not long after the commencement of the war. With the fall of Hankow and the removal of the government to Chungking, it became necessary to fill out the depleted ranks of the armies which had resisted the Japanese advance up the Yangtze. But in the interior west of Hankow recruiting officers encountered resistance. The cry went up: "Who will till the fields if the young men are taken?" These peasants knew nothing of the Japanese invaders. There are no radios and no newspapers and the peasants cannot read or write. The only enemies they had ever known were the tax collectors and the landlords who took as much as 60 percent of their crops for rent. The young men barricaded themselves in the houses. Many bloody affrays took place. So great was the resistance that young men impressed into service were chained or roped together like galley slaves and marched off under guard to the army stations. The forcible seizure of coolies for army carrying service aroused similar opposition. The gentry or rich men buy their sons out of army service. In some districts the purchase of exemptions, for which high prices are paid, reached the proportions of a scandal and the government, to mollify the outraged people, had a few recruiting officers shot for corrupt practices. But the corruption goes on as before. It is part and parcel of a class society in which the phrase "equality of sacrifice" is just a wry jest.

To round out the picture of China at war it is necessary to add certain other essential details. Military operations have devastated innumerable cities, towns and villages, and laid waste large tracts of country, creating the huge army of refugees already referred to. The physical destruction of industry in the war zones has created a vast unemployment problem. Instead of trying to finance the war by taxing the rich, confiscating fortunes, attacking graft and speculation in real earnest, the cost has been loaded on to the already overstrained backs of the masses. The Chinese dollar has been cut to less than a third of its value by inflation. This doesn't worry the rich and the officials, who have good American dollars jingling in their bank accounts. Instead of bringing victory, or prospects of victory, and opening up visions of a brighter future, the war has brought only grim tragedy and penury to the broad masses. It is not surprising that the enthusiasm of 1937 has given way to a dull apathy, an all-pervading indifference which only a new turn of events will be

able to shake and upset. The Kuomintang government creates a fanciful picture of a "united China" enthusiastically resisting the foreign invader and this picture is peddled in this and other countries by propagandists whose only interest in China is their monthly paycheck. The reality is vastly otherwise.

It must be pointed out, however, that hatred of the foreign violator has not died. The people have just lost faith in victory under Chiang Kai-shek's leadership and meanwhile are obliged to occupy themselves with the task of survival, with scratching a livelihood from their devastated, parasite-ridden land. No attempt was ever made to draw the masses into the struggle. The policy of the government kept them on the sidelines. No one brought before the people a program of social betterment, either during or after the war. Where popular organizations arose to give mass support and aid to the soldiers at the front, Chiang Kai-shek suppressed them if he could not control and emasculate them. The rift that grew between the people and the soldiers is well illustrated by the fact that the Kuomintang was obliged to send propagandists into innumerable villages, ahead of the army, to plead with the people not to run away. Fear of soldiers is a hangover of the warlord period, when armies descended on whole areas like swarms of locusts, requisitioned food and services (without paying for them), and maltreated the people. Unpaid, hungry soldiers in Chiang Kai-shek's armies were likely to behave similarly. Armies can be quartered, but not provisioned, in villages from which the peasants have run away, taking with them all the available food. Hence the propagandist appeal. The fears and suspicions of the peasantry, in many cases all too well-founded, have created great handicaps for the army. These fears and suspicions can be overcome and a real soldier-civilian *rapprochement* established only on the basis of a common struggle for revolutionary social aims. Only in this way can the road be opened to China's victory against Japanese and all other imperialisms.

Japan, the Weakest Imperialist Power

The cumulative result of the factors outlined above has been military stalemate after a succession of reverses which have left the Japanese invaders in substantial control of a vast territory which includes almost the entire seaboard, the principal cities and industrial centers, and most of the railway system. Nevertheless, Japan has not won the war in China. Far from it. In view of Chiang Kai-shek's earlier policy of non-resistance, the Japanese imperialists imagined that a few swift blows at vital points would show Chiang the futility of resisting. Then an agreement would be made which would give Japan virtual control of China. Tokyo was even unwise enough to announce that the war would be over in a few months. Instead, a protracted struggle ensued. The war is now in its fourth year and victory for Japan is still not in sight. A short war, ending with the capitulation of Chiang Kai-shek, would have been well within the resources of the Japanese Empire. The Chinese people in any case would have been made to pay the bills. As it is, the long-drawn-out struggle has required expenditures far beyond the normal means of this weakest of all the imperialist powers. The gold reserve quickly disappeared. Trade with non-yen-bloc countries has been adverse for a considerable time. Unable to meet the cost of the military operations by normal methods of financing, Japan has resorted to the usual expedients of inflation. There has been tremendous domestic borrowing, since no foreign loans could be obtained. Taxes have been increased enormously. Industries producing consumption goods have been made to curtail operations or disappear entirely. Only those con-

sumption goods which are indispensable for life, or which are intended for the fighting forces or for export abroad, are now being made. Scarcely a week passes without some fresh tightening of the national belt. Japan is a bankrupt empire, awaiting receivership by a revolutionary proletariat.

Realizing that the growth of deprivation may create a dangerous popular movement of discontent, the ruling clique has eliminated all organizations which might serve as crystal-lizers of revolt. The castrated trade unions were long ago dissolved by government decree and a few months ago the political parties, including the Minseitō, Seiyūkai and Social Masses, went the same way. All organized political and social life has been merged into a totalitarian war system referred to as the "New National Structure." Despite the totalitarian regime, discontent breaks to the surface occasionally. Farmers complain of the requisitioning of horses for the army, the conscription of their sons. Women raise outcries against the shortage of cotton goods and the enforced use of staple fiber, a miserable *ersatz* product which is reduced to a pulpy mess when immersed in water for washing. The drafting of peasants for the army or for industry has affected the rice harvests and contributed to an acute shortage of this fundamental diet of the masses. There is a shortage of charcoal for cooking and heating. There is a shortage of electrical power. There is a shortage of everything, in fact, but government decrees of which there is a never-ending supply, each creating some new shortage.

The ruling clique fears even unorganized protest and attempts to smother it in a spurious patriotism whereby privation is elevated to the status of a national virtue. A "Spiritual Mobilization Campaign" sprouts organizations of busybodies who plant themselves at street corners and reprimand women for being "too well dressed," for sporting furs, fine dresses, jewelry and the like. It has been made a criminal offense for a barber to give women permanent waves or similar attractive head dresses. Motion picture shows are curtailed to conserve electricity and because there is no money to pay for imported films. Neon signs which made Japan's cities gay at night have disappeared. All public dance halls have been closed down. Bars are required to close at 10 p.m. Manufacturers have been forbidden to use gay colors in fabrics for kimonos, which are the national dress for men and women alike. Universal drabness has descended on once colorful Japan. Interference with personal liberty has gone so far that people can no longer use the streets freely. If one strolls aimlessly, without any special mission or purpose, on a Tokyo street, perhaps just gazing into the empty or near-empty store windows, he will be accosted by one of the aforementioned patriotic busybodies and told not to clutter up the street, to go home.

There is plenty of complaint, but none of it organized. Complaints are aired in letters sent to Japanese soldiers at the front and occasionally get past the censors. When reading these letters, the soldiers begin to wonder about the "New Order in East Asia" which, according to their rulers, is to liberate China from Western domination and the villainous Chiang Kai-shek, and set Japan, together with China, on the road to a "mutual prosperity." They see the misery the war has created for the Chinese people, whose enmity they feel keenly. On top of this comes news of how relatives back home are being compelled to suffer more and more to continue a war that brings no benefits and shows no signs of ending. Diaries and letters found on Japanese prisoners of war testify irrefutably to a deep-seated discontent and spirit of rebellion in the ranks of the Japanese army. There have been instances of mutiny by whole Japanese regiments.

Chiang's Policy Dulls Japanese Unrest

But the unrest has never crystallized for it has received no encouragement on the China scene. As the previously-quoted *Manifesto of the Fourth International* states, the war would long ago have ended in a catastrophe for Japanese imperialism "if China had conducted it as a genuine people's war based on an agrarian revolution and setting the Japanese soldiery aflame with its blaze."

What was lacking, and what is lacking today, is revolutionary leadership in the struggle. The Communist Party betrayed the cause of the oppressed masses. It has supported Chiang Kai-shek from the beginning of the conflict, given silent endorsement to all the crimes of the Chinese ruling class, thereby helping the Japanese imperialists to deceive the Japanese soldiers and maintain rigid discipline over them. The small organization of the Fourth International, the genuine revolutionists, has been unable to gain the ear of decisive masses. Slander by the Stalinists, who accuse our comrades of being agents of Japan, and the political apathy of the masses, keep our organization small and uninfluential. It has registered some growth since the war began, but not enough. "The course of events places on the order of the day the development of our Chinese section into a powerful revolutionary party," states the *Manifesto*. This, indeed, is the indispensable condition for the advancement of China's liberating struggle. Under the influence of coming revolutionary events, wherever they occur, China will once more be impelled along the revolutionary road. There will be no lack of revolutionary situations. The task of the Chinese section is to prepare assiduously to meet them and work for their fruition. In this it will need the fraternal solidarity and aid of its co-thinkers throughout the world.

Japan's Economic Policy

Two years ago we predicted that Japanese plans to exploit the occupied territories in China would give a fresh impulse to China's economic life, that the scattered proletariat would once more be assembled in industry on a large scale, and that the groundwork would thereby be laid for a renewal of the labor and revolutionary movements. It must be said that this perspective, viewed as a comparatively short-term development, has thus far failed to materialize. Outside of the foreign-controlled areas of Shanghai, where an exceptional situation has invited large-scale Chinese and foreign investment, there has been very little economic revival. Japanese imperialism, too poor to conduct a lengthy war without the direst financial and economic strain, is still less able progressively to exploit what has been conquered. Even in Manchuria, conquered nearly a decade ago, grandiose industrialization plans have long been bogged down for lack of capital. In China proper, lacking the capital resources necessary for rational exploitation, the Japanese occupation has taken on the character of outright robbery and spoliation, thus worsening an already desperate economic situation.

At Shanghai, Japan found it necessary to respect the status of the foreign-controlled International Settlement. She has need of this "neutral" area, with its free exchange and commodity market, for sundry purposes—among other things to defeat Washington's embargoes on the export of oil products, scrap iron and machine tools to Japan. By her hands-off policy with regard to the Settlement, Japan has contributed to a considerable industrial revival in the city. With the growth of employment and security, the proletariat has renewed its fighting spirit. The past year and more has witnessed a steady succession of strikes in scores of industrial and commercial enterprises, Chinese and foreign alike, and

in the public utilities. The strikes have all been of an economic character, for higher wages to meet the rising cost of living which soars with each new decline of the currency. The workers strike without benefit of unions, the strikes being conducted by *ad hoc* committees. In not a single instance have the workers failed to win a substantial part of their demands. The class struggle is very much alive in Shanghai. More favorable circumstances will be necessary for it to be renewed throughout the rest of the country.

Meanwhile, in the remote places of the country, the war drags on. Failing to bring Chiang Kai-shek to terms, the Japanese imperialists have accorded full recognition to the puppet regime of Wang Ching-wei at Nanking, which exists under the protection of Japanese bayonets. While turning part of their attention to French Indo-China, Singapore and the Netherlands East Indies, they cherish the hope that Chiang Kai-shek's government will split, with Chiang going into retirement, while the rest of the government will merge with the "new" Kuomintang government at Nanking to form a single administration which will do Japan's bidding. There is a sizeable "peace faction" within the Chungking government, composed of politicians who see no hopeful outlook for the war and would therefore like to conclude peace on any terms. They don't like being cooped up in the far west, they detest the chaos of war, even though they have suffered little from it. Above all, they want a larger bailiwick to rob. This faction has the backing of important bourgeois elements who want a return to normal business and normal profits. Among the leading members of the faction are Chiang's war minister, General Ho Ying-ching, and Dr. H. H. Kung, his finance minister. But in China armed force is everything in politics. Chiang has the armies, or the bulk of them. He believes Japan is heading rapidly for war with the United States, that she will be beaten and that China's lost territories will be regained for him by American imperialism. He will not capitulate because he sees the possibility of passing more fully into the service of Japan's rivals on more favorable terms. America will not want to take over the country. It will be content to share with Chiang in the exploitation of the Chinese people by means of loans, investments and trade. So Chiang calculates. It is not at all unlikely that Chiang will enter into an alliance with American imperialism if (or even before) there is war between Japan and the United States.

Role of American Imperialism

The American imperialists are rapidly preparing for war with Japan. This is evidenced not only in the naval and military measures which in all spheres are placing the United States in position to strike swift and telling blows in the Pacific, but in the economic and financial spheres as well. In that portion of China's foreign trade which passes through the great *entrepot* of Shanghai, America now holds the leading position. Dollar imperialism has not only taken over the place previously held by the British, but has in a short time succeeded in ousting their successors—the Japanese. At the same time, the character of American "aid" to China has undergone a change. In the first period of the Sino-Japanese war, U.S. loans to China were simple advances from one government to another, without formal security. The more recent loans, however, have been advanced against specific security: exports of certain vital materials such as tin, tungsten and wood oil, of which China is a large producer. There is no formal lien over either the products or their sources, but it would only be a short step from the loan agreements to a demand for control over sources in the event of a default. The tin mines in Yunnan Province (where, incidentally, child

labor is exploited in a most horrible manner) are the source of the tin which is to be exported to the United States in part liquidation of recent loans. If Japanese troops were to invade Yunnan Province and try to cut off these exports, Washington would have a pretext for charging Japan with an aggressive act against the United States. Military intervention would be in order. The United States would be at war with Japan. It is much more likely, however, that the precipitating issue will arise over a Japanese grab at the Netherlands East Indies, or attempts to take over Singapore and Hongkong. Whatever the initial incident may be, American intervention in the Far East will bear a wholly reactionary character. It will be undertaken, not in order to aid victims of Japanese aggression, but to preserve and extend American imperialist interests.

Trotsky pointed out that Chiang Kai-shek fights against Japan, not with the intention of freeing China from imperialist domination, but with a view to passing into the service of another, more magnanimous power. And there can be no doubt that when American intervention against Japan gets under way, and increases in range, Chiang Kai-shek under Washington's pressure will tend to subordinate the present Sino-Japanese war to the completely reactionary war aims of American imperialism in the Far East. If this is to be prevented, the Chinese masses will have to intervene, for they have no interest in substituting the American taskmaster for the Japanese slave-driver. The intervention of the masses can take place only on a revolutionary basis. Their struggle will have to be directed, not only against the imperialists, but also against the native exploiters and their government. The agrarian revolution must be brought to life under the slogan "Land to the peasants!" Workers must take to the road of the class struggle. The reawakened millions will find a true leadership only in the Chinese section of the Fourth International. Having absorbed the lessons of 1937-41, having learned under fire the reactionary character of the Kuomintang-Stalinist leadership in the struggle against Japan, the masses will acquire an unshakable confidence in the revolutionary program for which the Fourth International stands.

* * *

Note on the Chinese Stalinists

It is necessary to add some additional information regarding the position of the Chinese Communist Party and its policies, which are the policies of Moscow. Driven out of their southern and central China strongholds in 1934-35, the Chinese red armies after long marches established themselves in northern Shensi, most barren of the northwestern provinces, and parts of neighboring Kansu and Ninghsia. The latter is a province of Inner Mongolia. The so-called Chinese Soviet Government was set up at Yen-an. Some time after the outbreak of the war in 1937, former fighters of the Ho Lung-Yeh Ting red army, who did not take part in the long trek, but remained scattered throughout the south, assembled near Shanghai to form the New Fourth Army under Yeh Ting's command, with Han Ying as field commander. This force, organized on a semi-guerrilla basis, quickly swelled its ranks to several thousand and took control of a sizeable territory in the Kiangsu-Chekiang-Anhwei-Kiangsi border region where it still operates against the Japanese.

Chiang Kai-shek would never have had any dealings with the Stalinists if not for the armed forces and territory under their control. For the same reason, they were useful as a pawn in Stalin's diplomatic game. To mark their passage from opposition to collaboration with Chiang, they renamed the Red Army in the north the Eighth Route Army (which, as in the case of the New Fourth Army, distinguished it only by num-

ber from the armed forces under Chiang's control), while the Chinese Soviet Government became the local administration of a "Border District" in the north. Both the territories and armed forces of the Stalinists are nominally under Chiang's control—but only nominally.

The territory of the New Fourth Army is distinguished by very little from the Kuomintang domain. But encouraged by the revolutionary phraseology which the Stalinists still use occasionally, the peasants here began giving rapacious landlords a rough time. From Chungking came complaints that the Stalinists were violating their pledge to end the class struggle. The Stalinists interposed themselves between the peasants and the landlords as arbitrators, persuading the landlords to accept modest rent reductions and urging the peasants not to go "too far." In some cases angry peasants sought to seize the land of owners believed to have been trafficking with the Japanese enemy. The Stalinists stepped in to pacify the angry ones and bring them back to the path of sweet reasonableness. Wherever the agrarian revolution raised its head, the Stalinists, fearing the displeasure of Chiang Kai-shek and a rupture of the People's Anti-Japanese United Front, interposed themselves between the peasants and their exploiters. In the Border District in the north, mild reforms have been instituted. Taxation is comparatively light and there is something approaching a system of universal education, etc. Private property and landlordism remain, but are subject to restraints. The Stalinists pretend to regard all this as the modest beginnings of a democratic revolution which later will evolve by degrees into socialism—socialism in two districts, presumably.

The Eighth Route Army and the New Fourth Army have both been active in the war and have displayed the same fine fighting qualities which distinguished them in operations against Chang Kai-shek's forces years ago. But their activities are of the guerrilla variety—swift raids on Japanese communications, the blowing up of railway tracks, etc. Without the development of the agrarian revolution and the transformation of the war into a genuine people's war, such sporadic fighting can have no future. In the conditions of modern warfare, guerrilla operations can have only an auxiliary value. They cannot decide an issue.

Friction Between Chiang and Stalinists

In the course of these guerrilla actions, the Stalinists have encroached on the domain of the Kuomintang. The Eighth Route Army now controls nearly all of Hopei and part of Shantung, in addition to large slices of Shensi, Kansu and Ninghsia. When complaints come from Chungking, the Stalinists apologetically explain that the acquisition of new territory is demanded by military exigency and that they have no intention of enlarging their sphere of power at Chiang Kai-shek's expense. Nevertheless, they have kept the new areas, causing Chiang to suspect their motives. Chiang would probably have broken with the Stalinists over this issue had he not wished to avoid offending Stalin and thus losing Moscow's material aid in the war with Japan.

Chiang's suspicion of the Stalinists on this and other scores has led him to institute severe repressions against their local leaders in Kuomintang territories. In the past year, many local Stalinists, or Stalinist suspects, have been arrested and executed without trial for stepping beyond the limits of the People's Anti-Japanese Front. Some, as the American journalist Edgar Snow reported, were buried alive, a method employed against revolutionists when Chiang Kai-shek was riding to power with Communist Party aid in 1927. The Stalinists, hewing faithfully to the line set by Moscow,

fearful of a break with Chiang, have made no public protests against these barbarities, but cover them up just as they have all the crimes of the Kuomintang regime since the beginning of the war. They have even suppressed the fact that big battles have taken place between the Eighth Route Army and Chiang's troops.

(Editors Note: In mid-January, after this article was received, came the first public knowledge of these struggles, when the brewing conflict between Chiang Kai-shek and the New Fourth Army in the Yangtze Valley boiled over. A pitched battle was fought between Chiang's troops and the New Fourth Army, the latter suffering thousands of casualties. Yeh Ting, its commander, was arrested and held for court martial on the grounds that he disobeyed orders to move his troops across the Yangtze to the Northwest. A Tass dispatch from Chungking to Moscow on Jan. 27 spoke openly of the threat of "civil war" resulting from this conflict. This dispatch accompanied renewed rumors of a Soviet-Japanese non-aggression pact.

(The immediate cause of the Kuomintang-Stalinist conflict was the reiteration of a demand by Chiang—made originally more than a year ago—that the New Fourth Army transfer to the North and there amalgamate with the Eighth Route Army. Battle ensued when the Stalinists failed to comply with this demand. Chiang's desire to get the Stalinist forces out of central China has a dual basis: military and political. Should Stalin make a deal with Japan, it will be easier to isolate and attack the Chinese Stalinist forces if they are all located together in one part of the country. But as matters stood until the recent battle, the New Fourth Army would have been splendidly situated to strike at Chiang from the rear whenever he undertook military operations against the Eighth Route Army in the north. On the political side, the New Fourth Army, in spite of the political renegacy of the Stalinists, has been a stimulant to peasant activity in the central China region. The peasants still associate the Stalinists with the agrarian revolution. This is embarrassing to the Stalinists, but to Chiang Kai-shek and the ruling class it is positively disturbing. Chiang was undoubtedly encouraged to act sternly, after months of fruitless negotiation, by the increasing American aid to his government. American loans have substantially decreased his dependence on Moscow for material aid in the struggle with Japan. He can "offend" Stalin with greater impunity than would have been possible three months ago.)

But incidents such as the foregoing create friction, and there are also other points of disagreement. The Stalinists have been insisting—mostly privately—that Chiang fulfill his promise to convene a democratic assembly. Dates have been set many times, but the assembly never meets. They also demand democratic liberties for the people, an end to the period of "political tutelage" under the Kuomintang. Chiang makes more promises, but there is not a shadow of real liberty anywhere in the Kuomintang domain.

Answering questions by Edgar Snow late in 1939, Chairman Mao Tse-tung of the Border District referred to the continuance of the Kuomintang dictatorship in violation of the promises Chiang gave the Stalinists. He asserted that unless this "archaic political system" were changed to "democracy" China would lose the war with Japan. The problem, he added, was to change the political system without endangering the resistance to Japan. Truly, it is hard to see how one can end a dictatorship without getting rid of the dictator. But the last thing Mao thinks of is getting rid of Chiang Kai-shek.

"Resistance and democracy," Mao continued, "are the two edges of a single sword. Some people pretend to support

resistance but to reject the principle of democracy. In reality, they do not want to use either edge of the sword. They are dragging the anti-imperialist struggle towards failure." Mao does not seem to know that modern wars waged by the exploiting classes are incompatible with democratic liberties.

In the same interview with Snow, Mao asserted that the Communist Party would be "glad to participate" in a coalition government with Chiang Kai-shek if the offer were made. But why should Chiang share cabinet posts with the Stalinists when he can get their services more cheaply, when he is assured that they will keep their mouths shut and give silent endorsement to all his crimes? Why should he accede to their democratic demands—did they not promise to be good boys and to abandon all thought of class struggle as long as Chiang continued resisting Japan? In late 1939, when the war had been in progress nearly two and a half years, Mao surveyed the situation with Snow and found that "they" (he meant Chiang Kai-shek's regime but didn't dare name it) were "dragging the anti-imperialist struggle toward failure." More than a year has passed since then. He might now be asked how long a cause can be dragged toward failure without actually arriving. Here is displayed for all to see the gross criminality of the Chinese Stalinist leaders. They know how and by whom the war of China against Japan has been led into its present impasse and how the interests of the masses are being trampled on. But they refuse to denounce Chiang Kai-shek, to lead a revolutionary movement of protest, to organize the masses for defense of their rights. They even refuse to name the culprits. Such a party, it is clear, is too corrupt ever to redeem itself.

A Stalin-Mikado Pact?

After the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact, there was much talk of a rapprochement between Japan and the Soviet Union. Stalin, believing with Chiang Kai-shek that Japan is bound to get into war with the United States, has been in no haste to sign up with Tokyo. Japan, moreover, is greatly weakened by the China war and is not likely to attack the Soviet Union in the east unless Hitler also attacks in the west. Stalin tries desperately to stay out of the world war, but there are limits to the maneuvers and concessions a neutral can make in order to stay out. It is not improbable that Stalin will find himself in the company of the "democratic" imperialists, fighting against Germany and Japan, together with the United States and Britain. Washington and London are both cautiously courting the Kremlin boss. Had China conducted the war against Japan as a revolutionary struggle, Japan would long since have been defeated. Instead of the imperialist threat of Japan in the Far East, a revolutionary Japan and a revolutionary China would stand as giant bulwarks of Soviet defense.

It is by no means assured that Stalin will be compelled, in the present phase of the war, to fight imperialist Germany and Japan. The course of events may force him into active alliance with them. Signature of a non-aggression pact with Tokyo would signify that the die had been cast. Soviet assistance to the Chiang Kai-shek regime would then, presumably, cease. What position would the Chinese Stalinists take? Will they sustain their opposition to Japanese imperialism, or will they suddenly discover that Chiang Kai-shek has become the tool of Anglo-American imperialism, make their peace with Japan, and resume their opposition to the Kuomintang? It is impossible to forecast in detail the future of Chinese Stalinist policy. The further development of the world war, and its inevitable extension to the Pacific, will open a variety of alternatives. Having nothing further to

gain from Moscow, Chiang Kai-shek might decide to launch a military expedition against the "Red" border district and the domain of the New Fourth Army—perhaps even with Japanese cooperation. In that case the Stalinists will have to fight if they wish to survive. On the other hand, if Stalin were sufficiently concerned for the continued preservation of his Chinese henchmen and their forces, he might use telling threats against Chiang to restrain him. The huge territory of Sinkiang (Chinese Turkestan) has been coming ever more under Moscow's domination in the last two years. Stalin might threaten to annex it outright. The Chinese Stalinists, mean-

while, could use their army to expand their territorial domain west. Without much difficulty they could obtain mastery over all of Shensi, Kansu and Ninghsia, effecting a junction with the Soviet protectorate of Outer Mongolia via Ninghsia, and with Sinkiang across Kansu. Such an expansion would be pleasing neither to Chiang Kai-shek nor Japan. But since this possible line of development is based on the assumption of a Stalin-Mikado pact, it can further be assumed that there would be a prior agreement demarcating the Soviet and Japanese spheres of operation—just as Stalin and Hitler arranged the partition of Poland.

Military Methods in the Colonies

By EUGENE VARLIN

"Peacetime" Functions of the Army

Colonel Pierre Lyautey, one of the "great" French colonizers, analysed the three "stages" of colonial conquest—"Military, at first, in the course of the conquest, then administrative, so that the civil power can combine with the military authorities to give the country an organisation and at the same time a constitution, public services, legislation; economic finally, when exploitation is the dominant preoccupation." Lyautey's demarcation of military from civil authority in "stages" hides the truth. The military arm is always there and the two are often indistinguishable. The main function of the army in the colonies remains the suppression of the revolting natives. There is no period that does not demonstrate this.

Reynaud, in a speech delivered on May 6, 1931, waxes lyrical on the role of the military in civil affairs. "The first administrators were the admirals, the officers of our admirable colonial army. They made war only to bring peace, to make new cities surge and (did this) while respecting the (native) religions, institutions, customs." "Civil" administration by the army has been a common form of imperialist rule in the colonies. From 1830 to 1870 (save for the years 1848 to 1851, during the brief existence of the Second French Republic) Algeria was "submitted to a military regime." Faidherbe not only "conquered" and "pacified" Senegal; he also "organized" it. Gallieni, at Madagascar, was "invested with civil and military powers" and "had a program neatly determined, touching all branches of human activity." At Morocco, toward the close of the nineteenth century, Lyautey "concentrated in his hands political, administrative, and military duties." The Sahara is administered by military officers; Councils of War located at Algiers, Constantinople and Oran handle crimes committed by the natives. Nor is the military regime a French disease. Hawaii's municipal government, administration, and public utilities are all U. S. Army Divisional functions. The viceroy, who is the highest civil authority in India, is also the commander of the army. The fraudulence of Reynaud's claims of "peace" brought by the military is revealed by Gordon Casserly, full of admiration for the French colonial system and ready to recommend its fine points to the British imperialists in whose army he served. "Morocco," he said, "is normally divided into a number of regions or sub-divisions, those settled and peaceful being governed by civil officers, while those which include tribes not yet subdued are ruled by military officers—generals of brigades or colonels. Each of these has had under his orders a self-contained small field force to be employed as necessary against the unsubmitted tribes in his districts or to be lent to a neighboring tribe."

In a word, the "peace" of the admirals was erected over the dead bodies of the natives.

Peace in the colonies is only a temporary truce between wars. Again and again, the natives have made use of armed force to break the military vise of their oppressors. Boulioi, a Lieutenant-Colonel of the French Colonial Artillery, stated that "military operations in the colonies have most frequently the object of pacifying revolting regions." Boulioi was in a position to know. How continuous such wars against the natives are is exemplified by the campaigns in a typical colonial possession, the British Cape Colony. In 1852 the government sent detachments of European police consisting predominantly of young Colonial farmers, mostly English, with a sprinkling of Germans, to quell turbulent natives in the eastern frontier districts. In 1869, in the same colony, two troops and a detachment of Royal Artillery conducted a campaign against the Hottentots on the Orange River. Four years later, in November, 1873, troops were ordered to Basutoland to arrest a rebel chief. In 1897, a force under Lieutenant-Colonel Balgaty conducted operations in the Landberg against Behuana tribes. The close of the South African War in 1899 brought a curtailment of the armed forces. In the words of Colonel Judd, "the real *raison d'etre* of the corps' existence, that of keeping the turbulent natives between the Cape and Natal in order had gone. The tribes were no longer troublesome." But this "real reason for the corps' existence" was gone only to return again: for in February, 1916, in the same Cape Colony two squadrons and a machine-gun section were sent to the northern area for service against the Ovamba tribe. How many years of "peace" were there?

The existence of "peace" is not necessarily an indication of apathy on the part of the natives. It may be based on experience, a knowledge of what they are up against, an understanding that the desperate efforts of individuals or small groups are helpless against the organized army of the imperialists. It may be the understanding that it is necessary to prepare for a combined effort of *all* their forces instead of frittering away their energies in scattered and isolated efforts. The official *Report of the Committee to Consider Suggestions for the Reorganization of the Defence Forces of Kenya Colony and Protectorate* (1936) makes this point clear. In proposing "some form of organization of the European community (as) . . . necessary to protect life and property in the event of a serious or local disturbance," it notes, as a point in favor of this proposition "that the mere knowledge that a European Defence Organization exists, cannot fail to have a steadying effect on the native population in times of unrest."

The bourgeoisie in the colonies, as at home, compel the

slave to pay for the chains that bind him. The French colonies are required to provide the costs for their own "defence." India pays the entire cost of the army—native and British. This is like making an American Negro foot the bill for his lynching.

In 1900 the United States was still an amateur in this colonial game—but learning fast, as in the suppression of the Aguinaldo revolt in the Philippines. During the elections in Panama in June and July, 1918, troops from the U. S. Canal Zone Department entered the "independent" Districts of Panama and Colon to supervise the elections and preserve order. In July, 1918, a detachment of troops was sent to Chiriqui Province to suppress lawlessness. This detachment remained on duty in the province until August, 1920. As Major-General Menoher, Commander of the Hawaiian Division, put it, "Like all frontier forces our troops must always be ready for any emergency, either as a garrison of the island itself or as an expeditionary force." We need not cite the many familiar instances of the use of United States troops in Cuba, Nicaragua, Mexico.

Defending the Booty Against Others

Today, another main task of colonial militarism, the defense of the captured booty from the inroads of rival imperialisms, is most conspicuous. The conflict of Italy and England in Africa has received wide publicity. The American bourgeois press hails the English troops as defenders of democracy. And the petty-bourgeois democrats who know better but are afraid for their skins add their little squeaks of delight to the booming of their masters.

All the imperialists have long been preoccupied with this problem. Bouliol in 1904 opposed the use of natives in regiments attached to coast brigades "because this regiment will be called to fight *against Europeans*." The above-mentioned *Kenya Report* stated:

"The Explanatory Memorandum to the Defence Force Bill published in the Official Gazette of the 12th January, 1927, makes it clear that the purposes for which the Kenya Defence Force was established were two-fold. In the first place for defence against External Aggression (against rival imperialists—E.V.) and secondly for the defence of life and property in the event of Internal Disturbance (against struggles for freedom of the natives—E.V.) . . . Whatever differences of opinion there may be as to how the European British subjects of this country should be organized for its defence, we found no one who quarreled with this description of the two-fold nature of the defence problem." Hitler did not exist then; who, then, was the "aggressor" against whom Britain was preparing?

The Role of White Chauvinism

Counterposing the white race "in general" to the native races is a weapon in the hands of the ruling imperialist class. It breeds in the native a hatred of all whites including his natural ally, the exploited proletarian of the imperialist countries. On the other hand, it links the white worker with his class enemy, the capitalist, against his natural ally, the colonial slave.

The British officer Gordon Casserly disclosed the intimate relation between the power of the imperialists and chauvinism. In 1925 he wrote:

"In North Africa, it is impossible not to see which is the dominant race. The French may not seem at first sight to keep natives at such a distance as we in India and our colonies; but below the surface and in all essentials they are as keen on the colour bar as we are. They regard intermarriage with the same horror as we in India . . ."

In the military forces, white chauvinism sometimes assumes peculiar forms. The Dutch colonial army placed half-breeds on a position of equality with Europeans. "Coloured holders of army commissions in the French colonies" there are, and they are "members of the military clubs," but, Casserly noted, they mix "little socially with French officers or their families."

A fairly elaborate presentation of the standpoint of the white-chauvinist officer was given by Lieutenant von Keller, who spoke, as he himself made clear, not only for the German Army but for the armies of her fellow-imperialisms. He wrote:

"The reason why colored non-commissioned officers, not only in Germany's colonial army but in all European colonial armies, are not accepted in the officers' corps is simple and clear. The responsibility of being an officer and a gentleman requires a cultural and social background on the highest plane. Not only do the blacks lack this but they lack also the energy, the vitality, the military tradition which are necessary requisites for a commissioned officer. To admit them would mean the disintegration of the Junker tradition, the destruction of the morale of the white officer. One could not expect a white lieutenant, for example, to work together wholeheartedly with a black officer whom he feels in his heart to be inferior in every way. This example can be extended even further if we imagine white officers and troops taking commands from a black."*

White-chauvinism is nothing more than a rationalization of the actual behavior of the imperialists. Von Keller is simply putting his seal of approval on the specific organizational means by which imperialism maintains its control in the colonial army. The exploiter looks with loathing on those whom he exploits.

The utilization of native non-commissioned officers is, however, essential to imperialist domination. It is done with due regard for white superiority. These native officers are ranked by whites and under their control. Their numbers are few. In the British army, "neither *the junior officers* nor the privates are required to show the native officers any mark of respect," writes an authority (Herron). Casserly wrote that in the Algerian army "a few junior officers are natives but at present none command French soldiers." And, "although native officers are now eligible for promotion to any rank—if they pass all the competitive and other examinations, a difficult proviso—France is not guilty of our latest folly of starting out to officer Indian regiments with natives only." The British "started out" but didn't get very far.

"German subjects," said Herron, "are *always* given preference over natives whatever their grades, and German warrant officers, non-commissioned officers and privates are *in no way* subordinate to a native officer." In 1936, the *Commission on the Reorganization of Kenya's Defence Forces* came "to the conclusion that in any future war in East Africa the primary function of the European community in the event of External Aggression should be to supply officers, non-commissioned officers, and instructors for the expansion of the King's African Rifles which, in our view, must follow the threat of External Aggression." These "instructors" were not chosen because of their military ability. On this score, we have the testimony of one of them, Cleland Scott. In an article written for "Blackwood's Magazine" last year, he described his experiences in Kenya. "I had jumped from private to sergeant; so it seemed promotion was going to be rapid in this new war . . . In fact, privates seemed rare (among the

*"Ueber Kolonialtruppen"—*Jahrbucher fur die deutsche Arme und Marine*, 1901.

whites, he means—E.V.), whereas sergeants, second lieutenants, and captains were common, *most of them lacking even elementary knowledge of things military, much less of war.*"

Conduct of the Colonial Army

Everybody knows that colonial expansion is undertaken for the most virtuous reasons in the world. The imperialists have assured us of this on countless occasions. The "white man's burden" is a poetic tradition of imperialism. Capitaine Weber declaimed that Belgium's Arabian campaign was conducted for a "noble cause: the repression of slavery." Coanet wrote that especially after 1789 the idea arose "that the colonies were not only a source of profits but one of the indispensable elements in the equilibrium and grandeur of France." He described the five functions of the colonial army as pacification, liberation, the study and understanding of the different native races, the development of local resources for the purpose of profiting therefrom, and, finally, educating and assisting the natives. Lieutenant von Keller maintained that the "occupation of industrially retarded territories is carried out mainly for the purpose of bringing these territories up to the cultural and social plane of the motherland. Armed force is only used if this mission is resisted by those reactionary forces among the natives in the colony who acquire profit by exploiting the people in illegal commerce of all kinds..." Matsui Iwani insisted in a memorial to Geneva in 1932 that despite the Japanese "aerial bombardments of open towns, inflicting cruel sufferings on the civilian population," that "all foreign observers... have drawn attention... to... acts of kindness performed by our Army."

One of the most complete revelations of the conduct of troops in a colony is contained in two reports issued in 1902 by the United States War Department. The title of the first is "Trials or Court-martials in the Philippines in Consequence of Certain Instructions"; of the second: "Letter of the Secretary of War relative to the reports and charges in the public press of cruelty and oppression exercised by our soldiers toward Philippine natives."

Pages 42 to 44 of the Secretary of War's Letter list some instances of cruelty committed and the punishments which were received. Second Lieutenant Capp, for example, was reprimanded for firing into town and looting. Lieutenant Thomas was fined \$300 and reprimanded for cruelty and for assaulting prisoners. The "punishment," commented the report, "inflicted by Lieutenant Thomas was very 'severe and amounted almost to torture and his actions can not be too much deplored nor too emphatically denounced.'" These words were the sole punishment sustained by the culprit. Second Lieutenant Ellison looted and encouraged looting—reprimanded. Captain Brandle's favorite way of torturing captives was hanging them by the neck for ten seconds—reprimanded. Numerous cases of rape, robbery, murder in cold blood, and the like are listed. The "water cure" which consisted in pouring water into the victim's mouth for an hour or so was a common form of torture. Many deaths followed this treatment. A diet of salt herring and nothing else was another ingenious device of the Americanos.

No less distinguished a person than Brigadier-General Jacob H. Smith was one of those tried in Manila for "conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline." Specifically, he was charged with giving "instructions in regard to the conduct of hostilities on the island of Samar, Philippine Islands, to his subordinate officer, Major L. W. T. Waller... in language and words to wit: 'I want no prisoners, (meaning thereby that giving of quarter was not desired or required) and 'I wish you to kill and burn. The more you kill and burn, the better you will please me,' and did give further instruc-

tions to said Major Waller that he (General Smith) wanted all persons killed who were capable of bearing arms, and did, in reply to a question by said Major Waller, asking for an age limit, designate the age limit as 10 years of age..." Smith was found guilty and sentenced "to be admonished by the reviewing authority." The court explained its leniency by "the undisputed evidence that the accused did not mean everything that his language implied" and other equally unconvincing reasons.

President Theodore Roosevelt commented on Smith's trial. Roosevelt approved the lenient sentence, saying:

The very fact that warfare is of such character as to afford infinite provocation for the commission of acts of cruelty by junior officers and enlisted men, must make officers in high and responsible positions peculiarly careful in their conduct so as to keep a moral check over any acts of an improper character by their subordinates. Almost universally the higher officers have so borne themselves... But there have been instances of the use of torture and of improper heartlessness in warfare on the part of individuals or of small detachments. In the recent campaign ordered by General Smith, the shooting of the native bearers by the order of Major Waller was an act which sullied the American name... Loose and violent talk by an officer of high rank are always likely to excite to wrongdoing those whose wills are weak or whose passions are strong." But Theodore Roosevelt's mealy-mouthed apology cannot conceal from the reader of these reports the fact that these cruelties were an *integral* part of the subjugation of the Philippines. Smith was merely a scapegoat.

The Problem of Native Troops

The employment of native troops has been continuously on the increase. This phenomenon is similar to the increased military uses to which the bourgeoisie puts its class enemy at home, the proletariat. How explain this contradiction, this army composed in large part of natives whose chief purpose is to hold the natives in a state of subjugation? Why do the imperialists utilize native troops?

Captain Wissmann looked at the colonizing of East Africa in 1889 as a dollar and cents proposition. He claimed that using European troops would greatly increase the expenses of the expedition; natives came cheaper and Wissmann was all for taking them on. Moreover, he thought that they were better able than white soldiers to bear up under the hardships of warfare in tropical climate.

Captain Rhodes gave similar reasons for making use of native soldiers in the Philippines. He pointed to the high expense of training, equipping, and transporting a single American soldier. The Filipino suffered a far lower mortality from tropical disease than the American. Then, too, a native Filipino was better acquainted with the topography of the islands and with the language, nature, and habits of his people. The natives, furthermore, would be less inclined to fight the Americans if they saw that their own brothers were enlisted in America's colonial army. Finally, Rhodes pointed out that, after all, America was only a young fry among old fish. "...The more an American travels in the Orient, the more he realizes that our country is indeed an amateur in the colonizing business. And setting aside all questions of national expediency, we would do well to set about organizing native forces, if for no other reason than that the veteran colonizers of the old world have found them absolutely necessary to permanent success."

Lieutenant-Colonel Mangin was the French "apostle" of the idea of black troops. The blacks had been utilized in the French colonial army long before Mangin. The uniqueness of

Mangin's proposals lay in the fact that he wanted to use the black troops in Europe in the eventuality of a war with Germany. He pointed to the more rapid growth of the German population as compared with that of France. In a prolonged war, he contended, given equal mechanization, numbers would be decisive. Mangin was successful in convincing the Minister of War in 1908. In 1912, a period of military training was made compulsory for native Algerians. In the course of the World War I, France increased its black troops to a hitherto unprecedented degree. One of Clemenceau's first big jobs was working out, together with Mangin, a general plan of recruitment from the colonies. 268,000 native soldiers were furnished by Tunis, Algeria, and Morocco alone during the World War. A few years after the Armistice was signed, Commandante Guignard envisaged a native army of 500,000 in the war to come.

When the French Revolution introduced the *levee en masse*, the arming of the entire adult male population of France, its opponent, Prussia, was compelled to resort to similar measures in order to meet France's revolutionary armies. The employment of native troops by France on an enormous scale compelled England to do likewise. England, even when it was allied with France, regarded her as a rival empire-builder. The *Report on the Reorganization of Kenya's Defence Forces* published in 1936 makes the following statement:

"... It is impossible to ignore the tendency of Powers possessing Colonial Empires (only France could be meant here—E.V.) to recruit the indigenous man power of the territories under their control for purposes of war. The native armies thus established form an offensive force very different in character to those encountered in the past, when large primitive and undisciplined hordes were customarily dispersed by small, but highly trained, European forces." In 1938, the *entire* native population of Kenya was made subject to conscription.

The imperialists are well aware that they are playing with fire. But they are driven to the increased employment of the natives by the contradictory necessities of their system. They know that they are building up an army of enemies and they repeat this thought constantly. Nevertheless, they cannot help themselves.

Lieutenant-Colonel Bouliol, in 1904, opposed the employment of native troops in coast brigades because they would be compelled to fight against Europeans. The natives, he said, "would be influenced by the prestige that the white race exerts on them and would not have a confidence sufficient to support the shock of the enemy; in the case, on the other hand, where they would have the audacity to pit themselves against the Europeans, it is quite credible that these qualities would some day return against us." Despite Bouliol, the Negroes were pitted against whites during the World War. When the war was over, and the need for manpower was no longer so pressing, the horror-stricken imperialists raised their voices against this "anomaly" of black troops on European soil. "... In view of the international disturbances (that is, of the complaints of the international bourgeoisie—E.V.) the French government withdrew the last blacks from the Rhine on June 1, 1920. The withdrawal was likewise due to the influence of the *Rue Oudinot* which believed the blacks' psychology toward whites in general would be seriously altered by being garrisoned as conquerors in a white country."*

At the Versailles Conference, Lloyd George, on January 24, 1919, urged the seizure of Germany's colonies on the

grounds that the Germans "had raised native troops and encouraged these troops to behave in a manner that would have disgraced the Bolsheviks." Lloyd George went on to say that "the French and British, doubtless, had also raised native troops, but they had controlled them better." No idle chatter about the "self-determination of nations." On the contrary: "The Germans are bunglers in this game of oppression. Now, we'll do the job right!"

But five years ago the *Committee for the Reorganization of Kenya's Defence Forces* opposed the indiscriminate issue of rifles to European subjects because they might be stolen by the natives. Two years later, however, the same people who presented this Report authorized the conscription of Kenya's natives in preparation for a "major war." These people are in a blind alley and, what is more, they know it, too.

Bribing Native Troops—And Its Limits

Faidherbe, who became governor of Senegal in 1854, advised that native troops be given a "sufficient wage." Herron wrote that "the war-like propensities of the North-African Kabyle and Berber tribes, their craving for adventure, love of uniform and loot, have heretofore proved sufficient incentive to provide an ample supply of recruits." It might be necessary, he continued, to increase their pay and to make service obligatory. Casserly wrote in 1925 that many Arabs enlisted voluntarily in spite of the fact that obligatory service was then in force. They were "allured by the pay, the possession of a horse, and the showy uniform." He said of the Kabyles that they enlisted freely before the introduction of conscription, serving for their pensions and then returning to the mountains where they were born. Herron showed that in the English colonial army, too, pensions served as an incentive for recruitment.

The native troops, it is clear, are privileged characters compared to the natives as a whole. That is how the imperialists seek to gain their support against their own people. Yet one of the reasons the native has been employed is that he costs less. Herron wrote, "The pay of the native troops is very meager but a native soldier in India is almost rich by the side of a native farm-laborer, who makes hardly half as much." Rhodes, in his pamphlet urging native troops in the Philippines, said that "the pay of a native soldier, small though it appears to us, means much to the peasantry of the native islands and will mean more, when they become more or less dependent on it for support."

As far as possible, then, the imperialists at home and in the colonies attempt to place their armies in a privileged position, thereby ensuring their loyalty. The employment of mass conscript armies, however, makes this an impossibility. Producing the necessary armaments strains the bourgeois economy to its limits. The soldiery cannot be pampered, too. At this point the bribery of the bourgeoisie assumes intangible forms—not money, not pensions, but promises which it never intends to realize. Here is one example. During the World War, a policy of reforms was "announced" in Algeria to stimulate native recruitment. "The enthusiasm that followed the announcement of reforms... was immense... About 70,000 men were recruited... immediately," writes Grugnard. But "the end of the war came before the plan of reforms... could be put into practice completely... The political conflict arose again."

The physical defects of the natives, a by-product of the reign of imperialism, form a major obstacle to recruiting. In 1926, a census in the French colonies to determine how many young blacks were physically able to serve in the army, showed 45% to be suitable in the Upper Volta, 32.8% in

*Davis, S. C.—"Reservoirs of Men"—1934—p. 165.

Dahomey, 31% in Niger, 28.6% on the Ivory Coast, 23.5% in Senegal, 22.5% in the Soudan, and 14% in Guiana.

The most significant obstacle to recruiting natives is their refusal to become agents of their enemies. Native betrayers, those who voluntarily fight in the armies of imperialism against their brothers, are objects of particular hatred. Treacherous native chiefs have often facilitated the recruitment of their unwilling subjects. In February and December, 1885, "the beginning of a French recruiting policy based upon the active cooperation of the native chiefs was laid down." These found "tyrannical methods (necessary) to impress their young subjects into French service... It was... difficult to bring recalcitrant subjects from the interior to the coast." Twenty-eight years later, in 1913, the problem was far from settled. Although Ponty stated that "the problem (of recruiting) is today happily solved," the *Revue Politique et Parlementaire*, "certainly no sensational periodical, noted... numerous cases of resistance in French West Africa and wholesale emigrations to the neighboring English colony of Gambia."

"Divide and Rule"

Native troops are shifted around frequently so that they will not maintain close contact with their brothers in the fields and mines and factories.

Within the army, the imperialists utilize the differences among the native tribes. Members of rival tribes are placed in the same regiments. Those coming from the same tribe are kept separate. In the Philippine Islands, the Tagalogs and the Macabebes had been traditional enemies. Rhodes concluded that "it would seem that the ultimate composition of such (native military) organizations should be one-half Tagalog, and the remaining half, one of the friendly tribes... Probably there would be much friction at first but this very fact would insure few conspiracies being hatched, without coming to the ear of the company commander."

Long before this, the French colonial army resorted to a similar stratagem. Guignard wrote that the great losses of the French expeditionary force in North Africa "made everyone think soon of profiting from the existing dissension among the natives, for the purpose of utilizing one against the other. Of this idea was born in 1831 the Zouaves corps, recruited among the Zouaves, a tribe neighboring on Algeria."

Captain Rhodes attributed "the unbroken period of fidelity to the crown which has followed the Sepoy Rebellion... to that ingenious system of organization, which combines natives of different tribes and religions in the same regiment."

Another application of this imperialist principle is sending natives from one region to fight against natives of a different region, far from their own home. Consequently, a unit of blacks was not formed in Senegal itself until thirty years after the first black Senegalese company had been sent abroad. The natives used by Captain Wissmann in German East Africa came from the Anglo-Egyptian army or were enrolled at Mozambique. Duchesne's expedition to Madagascar in 1895 was composed in great part of Senegalese *tirailleurs*. The British colonial army employs native regiments frequently for expeditions in other countries; the China expedition of 1900 consisted almost entirely of such native regiments. In 1934, Davis wrote that "since 1908 two black battalions had been stationed in Morocco, and had been judged successful."

Von Wissmann remarked with smug satisfaction that "in quelling the mutiny of the 15th native Landwehr (on April 10, 1903 in the Kamerun) the Military Commandant showed great wisdom and discretion in utilizing the method used by the French in a similar instance. In the situation referred to,

Colonel Halke, not wishing to give the natives cause for revenging themselves on white communities, picked firing-squads at random from other native regiments in order to execute the mutineers. Thus, dissension was created among the natives with no serious disturbances to the German white troops or settlers."

The Contradictions Multiply

Thus we see the complex and contradictory process: the imperialists driven to create larger and larger armed forces of natives in the colonies; seeking ever more efficacious means of bribing or terrorizing these natives; but the imperialist methods of domination breaking down as the armed native forces grow larger and larger.

The imperialist powers were able to conquer the backward countries not because they had more man-power or more courageous troops but because they possessed superior arms. One of the preoccupations of the colonial army to this day is preventing the natives from acquiring modern military equipment. Rhodes described the endeavor "of our forces in the Philippines... to obtain possession of the insurgent arms and ammunition. The capture of these was usually more important than the capture of prisoners for the reason that the insurgents had three or four soldiers for every rifle." In opposing the issuance of rifles to all white individuals, the *Report on the Reorganization of Kenya's Defences* pointed out that when this had been done in the past, large numbers had been stolen. It advocated the use of central armories but said that these must be placed in some secure place—behind police lines, for example—since these armories would be tempting targets for the natives.

Within the colonial armies themselves, the most effective weapons are concentrated in the hands of the whites. The British in India had about 73,000 men at the turn of the century; the native army, 143,000 or almost twice as many. Yet the British army had ten times the artillery of the native army. This was and is true of the French army also. "When in Algeria and Morocco," said Gordon Casserly in 1925, "I first saw colored men in officers' uniforms and Frenchmen serving as private soldiers and even in Negro... regiments, I thought it an unwise policy of lowering the status of the white races or of raising natives to an equality with them. I soon realized that, as regards the latter, it was merely a case of employing Frenchmen to do special work as... machine-gunners, etc., that natives... might not be wisely entrusted with... just as we in India keep the artillery in English hands."

However, even on this question of arming the native troops, the imperialists are in difficulties. If it were up to them, sling shots would be good enough. Unfortunately, rival imperialists, must be taken into consideration. Moreover, native insurgents seize more advanced arms whenever they can. Thus Captain Rhodes could write, "Prudence would dictate the issue of an inferior arm—either rifle or shot-gun. But with the latter, and perhaps the former, scouts would be at a great disadvantage when operating against an enemy armed with Mauser rifles and using smokeless ammunition." Rhodes concluded finally—hesitatingly and "all things considered"—that the regulation U. S. magazine carbine should be given to the natives but that the use of ammunition should be carefully accounted for.

Despite similar fears, the imperialists have trained native armies greater in size today than ever before. And if past experience and the openly expressed fears of the imperialists are any guide, these troops will be a reservoir of revolution in the very near future.

The Dean of Canterbury's "Soviet Power"

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

The Soviet Power, by Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury; Modern Age Books, New York, XVII, 352 pp., 35 cents. (Special Edition for "Soviet Russia Today.")

* * *

The Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, author of *The Soviet Power*, introduces himself to the reader as a "Friend of the Soviet Union," a "progressive," a champion of "essential truth," "morality" and "science." He worships the "scientific mind"; enjoys only the company of men to whom "truth (is) sacred and whose assertions are capable of concrete verification."

These credentials together with an autobiography are presented in order to establish that he evolved, so to speak, organically towards admiration and concern for a "a great experiment in the new order of society."

It goes without saying that to speak out, especially today, in favor of the Soviet Union is far more praiseworthy than to support Hitler, Churchill or Roosevelt. But the whole point is that this Dean is a supporter and friend of the Kremlin and the G.P.U. and not of the October revolution. He supports Stalin and Churchill and Roosevelt. He belongs to the gifted and prolific tribe of European theologians who are past-masters at reconciling, in the interests of reaction, anything in the universe: they reconcile religion and science, communism and Fascism, Christ and Stalin, English hypocrisy with an appearance of rectitude, sincerity, humanism, and so on.

His sympathy for the Soviet Union, declares Mr. Johnson, flows solely from the highest considerations of morality. He scorns capitalism on moral grounds: "Our system lacks a moral basis." Conversely, he is full of sympathy toward the Soviet Union: "It is the moral impulse of the new order... which constitutes the greatest attraction and presents the widest appeal." No doubt it is purely on moral grounds that he wants an alliance between Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt. Let us follow this latter-day Tartuffe from Canterbury through all of his grimaces and posturings.

Not that he is uncritical of the conditions in the Soviet Union. God forbid! "There is need," he admonishes, "to guard against a too rosy and optimistic view of life in the Soviet Union." "I have seen and heard things," he confesses, "which have shocked and disturbed me." If he eschews criticism, it is solely because involved are "a hundred minor points" and "chiefly because other writers have already (and with over-emphasis) done the task for me." The Dean has been thus spared a great deal of bother, if not embarrassment.

Furthermore, "Russia has inherited," he explains, "an evil tradition not to be eradicated in a day." If he himself has witnessed and heard shocking and disturbing things—no matter, he can keep mum. Others have "over-emphasized"—and besides, as he says, "I have heard and learned and seen many more (things) which enthuse and encourage me." As the Russian peasants say: If you don't touch it, it won't stink.

Hear Not, See Not, Tell Not

Is there a bureaucracy in the Soviet Union? Mr. Johnson, in the name of Jesus, vows that not even a vestige of a

privileged caste exists there. "There is no closed hierarchy in the Soviet Union."

What about the G.P.U.? Didn't he hear about the Moscow Frame-up Trials?

The Dean cannot very well play the innocent here. And so, through one of those remarkable pronouncements, which distinguish the editorials in *Pravda*, he disposes of the business wholesale: "The extensive spy system of earlier days (which is still unfortunately to a certain extent proceeding), the secret police, secret courts, and political executions were not inherent in Sovietdom: they were a hangover from the days of Tsardom." In other words Tsardom, say, from Ivan the Terrible to Nicholas the Bloody, is really to blame for Stalin's crimes. Lest some fail to understand such an explanation he offers another: "Russia is young. Literally and physically the Russia that matters today is young... The Russian masses may be... at times even thoroughly cruel like the young."

Elsewhere in the book, while discussing the natural resources of the Union, he quotes Professor Tyrrell, who refers to the Moscow Frame-up Trials and the purges as "the present lamentable phase of internal dissension." "Those of us," sighs the Dean, "who believe in absolute values will never be satisfied until the violation of these values ceases." The priest, confronted with the crimes of the rulers, piously sighs for a better world—and saves himself from the painful and risky duty of indicting the criminals.

The author toured Russia, visiting "five Soviet Republics and several great Soviet towns." He wandered on foot all by himself "many long hours on many occasions and entirely alone." His wanderings took him "into all parts of the various towns and villages and at all hours of day and night." He thus speaks with the authority of an eye witness. To be sure, he hardly dwells on his actual observations and experiences, especially in the dead of night. But by way of compensation, he scatters statistics and charts in all directions.

Least fraudulent is that section of his book which deals with the economic successes of the Soviet Union—which the Dean, incidentally, invites the reader to skip! The Dean's data are false data, supplied to all tourists and "Friends" by Moscow. Nonetheless reflected in these falsified statistics are the colossal achievements of the Soviet masses, made possible only by the conquests of October. These successes are undeniable. Equally undeniable is the fact that they were attained *against* and *despite* the fatal regime of Stalinism, which has usurped the credit for them just as it has usurped the banner of the October revolution.

To the Dean, however, the Kremlin bureaucracy and the Soviet Union are one and the same thing. He writes precisely in glorification of Stalin's regime, underwriting all of its lies.

A Pious Lie Against Trotskyism

No book on Russia is acceptable to the Kremlin unless it contains a slander against Trotsky and Trotskyism. The Dean obliges by reviving an old falsehood, that Trotsky, the real sponsor of planning and industrialization, obstructed "the scheme tooth and nail."

As a matter of recorded fact, it was Stalin who opposed

the plan and sneered, prior to 1929, at such projects as the building of the Dnieprostroi electric plant, claiming that it would be as superfluous as a gramophone to a moujik. It was Stalin who launched a campaign denouncing the Trotskyists as "super-industrialists"; and when forced to adopt the Trotskyist program of planning, he not only distorted the plan itself but, as is his custom, laid his own previous crimes at the door of his opponents. These statements are easily capable of the "concrete verification" which the Dean presumably demands. They are recorded in the party documents and minutes of that period.

No book is acceptable to the Kremlin unless it lies about the position of women. What has remained of the conquests of October so far as women are concerned? To believe Mr. Johnson the position of women in the Soviet Union is as enviable today as it was under Lenin. They are accepted into heavy industry. They have the greatest freedom. "A woman is free to have as many children as she likes." As "many" but not as *few* as she likes. In other words, the same "freedom" as is afforded her by the Catholic Church. ("Abortion was permitted as a temporary measure . . . and it was abolished. . . in 1936 after a prolonged public discussion." The protestant Dean refrains from mentioning the fact that so far as the public was concerned, it universally opposed the anti-abortion and anti-Birth Control Ukase of the Kremlin.) The lot of womanhood cannot be considered apart from those conditions in which workers and children find themselves. That is why we center our review precisely around these aspects of Soviet life under Stalin.

No book is acceptable to the Kremlin unless it lies about the workers—about their standard of living, their wages, their working conditions, etc.

As concerns the workers, the Dean literally bristles with statistics. He never tires of demonstrating—on paper—how prices fall, wages rise, social amenities increase, and the standard of living advances along with the increased consumption of goods. On page 177 there is a chart illustrating how prices have dropped and wages have risen steadily and consistently from 1934 to 1937. If the Dean refrains from adducing a few charts and figures since 1937 and especially since 1939, it is because commodity prices have sky-rocketed in that period 50 to 100 percent and more, while the wages were slashed time and again.

However, lies have a logic of their own. The more Stalin, and his apologists, are compelled to lie, all the more graphically is truth revealed.

The Land of Milk and Honey

The Dean doubtless believes—as does the *Daily Worker*—that he is doing Stalin a service by painting up the regime, especially in such chapters as *The New Horizons*, and *The Open Gateway*. In another chapter, *The Democracy of the Workshop*, he glorifies the conditions in Soviet factories; sings paeans to the seven-hour day and the leisure and opportunities afforded to the workers. Under Stalin, announces the Dean, the worker "enjoys a new freedom in the workshop." "The democracy of the workshop is the bulwark of Soviet liberty. Its nature and value have been largely overlooked." This was true under Lenin but this bulwark of workers' democracy was long ago destroyed by Stalin.

The seven-hour day, five-day week was introduced by the bureaucracy as a *political* measure in 1927, the year when the struggle against the Left Opposition—Trotskyists—reached its climax. To the mass of the Soviet workers it remained a seven-hour day in name only.

On June 26, 1940, Stalin abolished that 35-hour week and

instituted the 48-hour week, i.e., replaced one legal fiction by another. Soviet workers actually work much longer hours. The June 26 ukase not only lengthens the "legal" hours of the working day, and cuts wages, but also makes it a criminal offense for anyone to quit his job. The penalty for "self-willed departure" is the G.P.U. dungeon. Skipping a day's work or tardiness, is punishable by penal-labor terms of two to four months, plus a fine up to 25% of the wages.

Here is the law: "Article 5. Workers and employees who arbitrarily leave state, cooperative and public enterprises and/or institutions are remitted to court and by sentence of People's Judges incarcerated in prisons for a term of two to four months. For stopping or skipping work without serious reason workers and employes of state, cooperative and public enterprises and/or institutions are remitted to court and sentenced by People's Judges to terms up to six months of penal labor at place of employment, and up to 25 percent of their wages (are) withheld."—*Text of the June 26, 1940 Ukase*.

If for any reason a worker turns out defective goods, he goes to jail (*Ukase* of July 10, 1940).

For taking away so much as a nail, a worker is guilty of theft and goes to jail. "Petty theft, *regardless of the amount*, committed in institutions and enterprises, is punishable by a term of one year in jail."—*Ukase* of August 10, 1940.

Any accident in a factory can come under the head of "hooliganism" and carries with it a jail sentence. "A worker Gavrilov, while dismantling a kiln in the Nogin factory in Leningrad, dropped a plank which fell on some frames lying on the floor. Several panes of glass were broken. Gavrilov was arrested and brought to court on the charge of hooliganism."—*Pravda*, October 12, 1940.

The *Ukase* of October 19, 1940 extended the compulsory labor laws to the administrative and technical staffs of Soviet institutions, thus in effect converting them into wardens, turnkeys and trustees of these virtual prisons.

Such are the *real* conditions in the factories under Stalin. The *Daily Worker* has not dared to publish a single one of these Ukases. No foreign correspondent was permitted to cable the text of these laws from Moscow.

Here is how the Reverend disposes of the June laws in a *footnote*: "In August 1940, the hours of labor have been increased but now the times are serious. . . and . . . workers are prepared to give some of their treasured leisure to produce the sinews of war and make impregnable the Socialist Soviet Republic." (P. 237).

Not a word about the ferociously repressive aspects of this legislation. And for very good reasons. Even the most brazen apologist for Stalinism cannot unload everything on the war danger. Furthermore even the most gullible follower of the Kremlin must ask himself: If conditions were as wonderful as the Dean—and the *Daily Worker*—claim, why was such legislation necessary? What must have been the real and terrible conditions up to now, if such savage laws have to be passed today? Just how is the Soviet Union strengthened by reducing workers to the status of prison labor? So the Dean says nothing: If you don't touch it, it won't stink.

Modern large-scale industry, let alone planned economy, cannot be operated by prison labor. It is impossible to run large-scale plants *under* a prison administration. By his latest laws, Stalin has gravely weakened the defensive power of the Soviet Union. Every thinking worker understands this. It is well to ponder in this connection the following incautious words of this preacher-apologist of Stalinism:

"Discipline imposed from above and involved in an operation in which the worker is in no sense a partner acts as a clamp upon the mind. It thwarts initiative," continues the

Dean. "Resentment smoulders beneath the surface only awaiting some new grievance to burst into flames. A real sense of injustice always present, even if subconsciously, leads to a deep-rooted hostility and suspicion, erecting barriers . . . in its ultimate manifestation this leads to . . . revolution.

We subscribe whole heartedly to these words with one reservation—in addition to the bosses in England and elsewhere, we also address them to the parasites in the Kremlin whom the Dean exempts. The Soviet Union can be strengthened only by restoring workers' democracy in factories, in trade unions, in the schools, in the Army, in the Soviets, etc. Only a *political* revolution against the Stalinist bureaucracy can restore workers' democracy.

The Plight of the Youth

According to the Dean, he was brought closest to the Kremlin by the concern and love for children which they share in common. We, too, place the utmost importance upon the fate of children and the youth. That is why we spare no efforts in exposing the crimes of Stalinism, which is the deadliest enemy of the youth.

Stalin stands in mortal fear of the youth. We Trotskyists have said for years that the Komsomols (the Russian Y.C.L.) was liquidated politically because Stalin was afraid it would develop into a political party against him. The Dean of Canterbury himself now corroborates this. As the *first* proof of Stalin's love of democracy, he presents the fact that Stalin removed "political power from the Komsomols—i.e., from the Young Communist League—when they were challenging the Party itself as an organ of political power." (P. 306).

If this is how a "friend" of the Soviet youth speaks, what would an enemy say?

There is internal evidence that this English-bred enemy of the youth—who gloats over its political expropriation—did most of his visiting in the Soviet Union in 1937, the year which marks the apogee of Stalin's brief public career as the world's greatest humanist and lover of youth.

In 1937, when Stalin was being photographed kissing babies and painted walking in parks surrounded by happy children, etc., the Dean first stated that he was particularly impressed by the work being done for the children in Russia.

"For thirty years I have urged," he said at the time, "that every child should be given the utmost opportunity for development for his or her powers . . . This is the debt we owe to children . . . Here I see the desire and the will that it shall be done more thoroughly perhaps, than any other part of the world." (*Moscow News*, Nov. 7, 1937). In writing his book two years later, this hypocrite from Canterbury claims that he has remained true to his life-time endeavor. "What impressed me most in Soviet Russia," he vows, "was not her factories and material statistics but her children."

Let every thinking worker read what he says about the meaning and importance of equal opportunity and free education, and then let him compare this with the *Ukases* of October 2, 1940—which the *Daily Worker* has not dared to print. Stalin has not only abolished free education for the children of workers and peasants but has drafted children and adolescents from 14 to 17 into industry.

Stalin's program, insists the liar from Canterbury, is "to give every man, woman and child . . . equal education in childhood and youth." Further, "Equal opportunity for education is provided universally, the school-leaving age is in process of being raised to seventeen and payment is made to students at universities." (P. 64).

He devotes two special chapters, *The New Horizons* and *The Open Gateway*, to this very important conquest of the

October revolution—the *right to education*—, sealed by law under Lenin,* "guaranteed" by the Stalinist Constitution, and now abolished without even consulting the Supreme Council of the U.S.S.R., the only body allegedly empowered to amend the Constitution.

"The ideal held out to a child differs entirely from that still too common here (England)—'Word hard and get on.'" (P. 195).

"Education from first to last is provided for all without monetary payments, from the excellently equipped nursery-schools right up to the university course." (P. 185).

"There is no financial difficulty which hinders a . . . student from entering the university or institute for higher education." (P. 207).

"Technical institutes await children (of workers) free of charge." (P. 237).

"What has the Soviet Union done for its youth and what is it doing? . . . On his seventeenth birthday and not before, he can enter industry." (P. 205). And so forth and so on.

He solemnly declares: "By 1940 education for children of eight to fifteen will be compulsory throughout the Union, from the Arctic to the desert steppes. By the same date education in all towns, industrial settlements, and rural centers will be compulsory from eight to eighteen." (P. 195).

Now, let us confront this liar with facts:

"The fees for college are 400 roubles a year in Union Republic capitals, 300 rubles in other cities; and 500 rubles for art, theatre and music schools. For the 8th, 9th, and 10th grades the fee is 200 rubles in the capitals, 150 in other cities." (*Soviet Russia Today*, January, 1941). Thus education even in grades equivalent to those of the American public schools is no longer free. Correspondence courses must likewise be paid for at the rate of one-half of the respective school fees.

On December 1, 1940 more than 600,000 Soviet children and adolescents from fourteen to seventeen were drafted into industry. By February 1941, 200,000 more were drafted. In the euphemistic language of the *Daily Worker*, they are attending "industrial training schools" which will "graduate workers for—first and foremost—the coal mining, ore mining, metallurgical and oil industries, and the building trades." The latest news from Moscow is that children are also being "graduated" for the timber industry, i.e., the lumber camps. "In this way," continues the *Daily Worker*, "in 1941 the . . . schools will be able to give socialist industry approximately 800,000 workers." (*Daily Worker*, February 7, 1941).

The term "industrial training schools" is nothing but a revolting cover for the legalization of child labor in the Soviet Union. The conditions in industry have become so intolerable under Stalin that peasants, to say nothing of adult city-dwellers, refuse to enter the jail-factories. This has been openly admitted by the Kremlin. In his speech on the Twenty-Third Anniversary of the October Revolution, Kalinin said: "The reserves of labor power in the cities have been exhausted, and the influx from the villages has ceased" (*Izvestia*, November 7, 1940).

Who Defends the Soviet Union?

Apart from other vital considerations, we oppose child labor because modern large-scale industry cannot be operated

* Provision for education in the Program of the Communist Party adopted March, 1919:

"1) Free and compulsory general and polytechnical education for all children of both sexes up to the age of 17. . . .

"4) All students must be supplied with food, clothing, footwear, text books, and all other school accessories at the expense of the state."

by children. Stalinism is now taking a terrible toll of the most precious young lives, the reservoir of the revolution. Instead of being strengthened the defensive power of the Soviet Union is all the more weakened thereby.

These Draconic laws went into effect more than four months ago. The Reverend Mr. Johnson has not yet seen fit to add so much as a footnote to his text. It is not hard to guess how all of Stalin's priests and professors, from Canterbury, England, or Cambridge, U.S.A., * will try to explain them away. They will invoke the war danger; they will cite the difference between 1939 (when the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed) and 1940-41 (when Hitler's armies line the borders of the Soviet Union from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea), etc., etc. But no matter how these gentlemen squirm, they cannot evade the fact that these laws do not at all flow from the need to defend the Union but from the need to maintain the bureaucracy in power. The greatest danger threatening the Soviet Union comes not from the outside but from the inside. It is Stalinism.

If in Britain and the United States Stalin's flunkeys try to explain away child labor as an unfortunate but indispensable measure of defense, then his flunkeys in Moscow hail it, on the contrary, as a great historic triumph. Free education, to believe *Pravda*, is not only unessential but it is a great evil. It demoralizes the pupils: "Many of our students haven't really appreciated the boons of higher education which they received without any exertion on their part." It demoralizes the parents as well: "Free education has to a certain extent lowered the value of education in the eyes of a certain section of parents and students." (*Pravda*, October 22, 1940). Some of the Kremlin's pen-prostitutes in America go so far as to declare that education itself is of no particular value: "In the U.S.S.R. one does not need to attend college to be an honored member of society." (*Soviet Russia Today*, January 1941).

Every syllable uttered by these bureaucratic scoundrels breathes nothing but contempt for the workers whether in Russia, England or America. But these gentlemen and ladies will not find it easy to dupe the masses on such vital issues.

What Is Happening to the CPSU

Every thinking member of the American Communist Party should above all familiarize himself with what Mr. Hewlitt Johnson has to say about the position and role of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union.

The party, he writes, "is the tangible means by which primarily, workers feel and exercise their ownership of industry" (p. 241).

Further, "the Party exercises general supervision over the whole collective enterprise and maintains its standard. The Party is the inspiring, stimulating, regulating spirit of any enterprise" (p. 242).

* "Professor" H. W. L. Dana, Reverend F. Hastings Smythe (a former student of the Dean of Canterbury), Professor Dirk-Struik of M.I.T., et al.—a few of the super-salesmen of the Dean's book.

Again, "Branches of cells of this Communist Party are found in all factories, and complete consultation takes place between the Party and the management of all matters affecting the general direction of the factory and the well-being of the workers" (p. 243).

We are willing to grant to any honest worker who still follows the Stalinists that the Dean is telling the truth about the real *position and function* of the party in the Soviet Union. If he believes this, then he has all the more reason to demand from Earl Browder and the *Daily Worker* an answer to the following questions:

Why has the *Daily Worker* failed to print a single word about the Eighteenth Party Conference since the publication of the call on December 20, 1940?

Walter Duranty writes in the *New York Times* that very important changes in the role of the party in all spheres of Soviet life are not only being contemplated but will actually be ratified on February 15 when the Conference convenes in Moscow. Is that true?

If it is, why is the *Daily Worker* silent on so important a subject?

Why does *Soviet Russia Today* (February 1941 issue) delete Duranty's reference to the party while reprinting practically the whole of Duranty's first dispatch?

What are they trying to hide from the members of the Communist Party in the United States?

The Russian Party has been shoved aside and shorn of any real voice, power or leadership in the vital spheres of Soviet life, in the economy, in the Red Army, in the government, etc. Why?

* * *

Very few survivors remain of the once vast and gullible horde of "Friends of the Soviet Union." Most of Stalin's intellectual "giants" have been exposed for what they are—venal agents of the G.P.U. The Kremlin can find today no figure more imposing than that of a sycophantic priest to serve its ends.

The ostensible purpose of the book is to promote a "better understanding" between the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States. It is really intended, however, to bolster up the morale of what remains of the Stalinist liberal periphery and of the membership itself—after the effects of the purges, the Frame-up Trials, the Stalin-Hitler pact, Finnish invasion and, above all, the most recent decrees, purges and developments in the Soviet Union. That is why the Dean's book is being promoted so frantically.

If anyone in the Soviet Union dared to quote from this book, he or she would have to finish the quotation before a G.P.U. firing squad. When the Kremlin wakes up to the realization of just how "outdated" the Dean's book really is, and what "footnotes" it really requires, the current edition will be withdrawn from the market, and a few ears in the offices on Thirteenth Street will be pinned back for "lack of vigilance." Meanwhile, we express the hope that workers will really read this book and consider all the lies in it—in the light of what is now happening in the Soviet Union.

Burnham's Attorney Carries On

By JOSEPH HANSEN

It will surprise no one who has followed the political degeneration of Max Shachtman since the outbreak of World War II to learn that he has now reached the stage where he denies that the Soviet Union is a workers' state. This position

was implicit in his demand at the outbreak of war that the Socialist Workers Party should revise its program of defense of the Soviet Union. It was thus characterized by Trotsky, who explained Shachtman's demand for revision of the pro-

gram as flowing from James Burnham's conception that the Soviet Union is not a workers' state. In order that the party might understand all the steps of Shachtman's betrayal of Marxism, Trotsky analyzed Shachtman's relationship with Burnham, beginning with the bloc they formed against dialectical materialism. Shachtman's dependence upon Burnham on the question of the USSR, according to Trotsky, was due to his lack of a scientific method of analysis and to his leaving out a "trifle: his class position."

Shachtman stormed with indignation, swore that he saw no necessary connection between method (dialectical materialism) and politics except in the "last analysis" and that if he were given a similar opportunity once more to form a philosophical bloc with Burnham he would "do it again and again tomorrow." As for the defense of the USSR, that too, in Shachtman's estimation, was related to the class structure of the Soviet Union only in the "last analysis." The proletarian majority in the Socialist Workers Party who under the leadership of Trotsky gave battle to Burnham and his attorneys predicted that Burnham's views on the Soviet Union would inevitably come into the open. This prediction has now been fulfilled. Approximately a half year after Burnham deserted the working class camp for the camp of the bourgeoisie, Shachtman has advanced Burnham's views on the nature of the Soviet Union. In the December issue of the *New International*, the magazine which formerly was the property of the Socialist Workers Party but which the petty bourgeois opposition stole when they split from the Fourth International, Shachtman has published a treatise on property. As a result of his study he declares the socialized property established by the October revolution is now the property not of the workers' state but that a new exploiting class hitherto unknown to history has come to power in the Soviet Union on the basis of the "ownership" of this property.

For a full and ruthless characterization of this latest development in Shachtman's political degeneration it is only necessary to quote Shachtman himself before he became a renegade:

"Outraged by the brutality of the reactionary usurpers, by their blood purges, by their political expropriation of the toilers, by their totalitarian regime, more than one class conscious worker and revolutionary militant has concluded that nothing is left of the Russian revolution, that there are no more grounds for defending the Soviet Union in a war than for defending any capitalist state. The professional confusionists of the various ultra-leftist grouplets prey upon these honest reactions to Stalinism and try to goad the workers into a reactionary position. Some of these philosophers of ignorance and superficiality prescribe a position of neutrality in a war between the Soviet Union and Germany; others, less timid, call for the strategy of defeatism in the Soviet Union. At bottom, the ultra-leftist position on the Soviet Union, which denies it any claim whatsoever to being a workers' state, reflects the vacillations of the petty bourgeoisie, their inability to make a firm choice between the camps of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, of revolution and imperialism." (*The New International*, January 1938, p. 11.)

The above characterization represented Shachtman's considered opinion before he entered into the orbit of James Burnham. Now Shachtman has furnished us with Shachtman as an example of how a revolutionary militant can succumb to the "philosophers of ignorance and superficiality," grow "less timid" and end up as a "professional confusionist" denying the Soviet Union "any claim whatsoever to being a workers' state," thus reflecting the "vacillations of the petty bourgeoisie." In his latest article on Russia, Shachtman revises his position on the Soviet Union back to the year 1933. He thus furnishes us in addition a living proof that one's "agreement or disagreement on the more abstract doctrines of dia-

lectical materialism" not only affects "today's and tomorrow's concrete political issues" but in the "last analysis" those of yesterday as well.

Shachtman's article reveals complete abandonment not only of the Marxist method but of the Marxist concepts of the class and the state. He presents absolutely nothing new on the development of the USSR, no new data, no further concretization whatsoever of our knowledge of the real relations—Shachtman admits he has nothing to add to Trotsky's "studies." He confines himself to juggling abstractions hatched in his own brain, denies what he affirms, contradicts himself at every turn, reveals his sterility, sheds a few sentimental tears, speaks disconnectedly—indeed his whole article bears the aura of the petty bourgeois gone completely mad and become intent on proving it.

It is possible to consider here only a few issues out of the host Shachtman's article raises. We do not have the space, no matter how instructive it might prove, to follow Shachtman everywhere in his "garden of theory" as he digs and delves with "critical cultivation" among Burnham's turnips and horse-radishes, "re-planting" the little professional cabbage plants, "also weeding out," and at odd moments circling about with a butterfly net. The question of the class character of the USSR was discussed in all its aspects by the Fourth International over a period of years with various ultra-left groups and individuals; these discussions together with the writings of Comrade Trotsky in the recent struggle with the petty bourgeois opposition provide a wealth of material to which we refer the reader who wishes a more thorough and ample reply to Shachtman.*

Shachtman "Interprets" Trotsky

Shachtman bases his argument on a deduction he makes from Trotsky's article "The USSR in War," published in the *New International* of November 1939. Trotsky in this article analyzed the thoughts of those who believe a new class has developed in the Soviet Union and showed their ultimate and absurd conclusion. "Historical experience bears witness," Trotsky declared, "in the opinion of certain rationalizers, that one cannot entertain hope in the proletariat." He then outlines the beliefs of these "rationalizers" that the proletariat was incapable of averting the world war despite the existence of the material pre-requisites for socialism, that the proletariat failed to make the revolution in a series of countries when the opportunity offered, that they failed to avert the second imperialist war, and hence are congenitally incapable of ruling.

"If this conception is adopted," wrote Trotsky, "that is, if it is acknowledged that the proletariat does not have the forces to accomplish the socialist revolution, then the urgent task of the statification of the productive forces will obviously be accomplished by someone else. By whom? By a new bureaucracy, which will replace the decayed bourgeoisie as a new ruling class on a world scale. That is how the question is beginning to be posed by those 'leftists' who do not rest content with debating over words."

Trotsky then carried to the end the historic alternative which *the rationalizers and "leftists" posed* and showed that if we accept *their* views, then the prospect of socialist revolution must be renounced. Trotsky asks whether there are any objective data which would compel us to renounce this pros-

* See the following articles in *The New International: The U.S.S.R. in War*, November 1939; *Again and Once More Again on the Nature of the U.S.S.R.*, February 1940; *A Petty-Bourgeois Opposition in the Socialist Workers Party*, March 1940; *From a Scratch to the Danger of Gangrene*, March 1940; *Balance Sheet of the Finnish Events*, June 1940.

pect, does not see any, declares that no such data exist, and concludes that the Stalinist bureaucracy is therefore not the first stage of a new exploiting society, but "an abhorrent relapse in the process of transforming bourgeois society into a socialist society," that it is a relapse in the direction of restoration of *bourgeois* society in Russia.

Here is how Shachtman distorts Trotsky:

"In 'The USSR in War' Trotsky declared it **theoretically possible**—we repeat: not probable, but nevertheless theoretically possible—1, for the property forms and relations now existing in the Soviet Union to continue existing and yet represent not a workers' state but a new exploiting society; and 2, for the bureaucracy now existing in the Soviet Union to become a new exploiting and ruling class without changing the property forms and relations it now rests upon. To allow such a **theoretical possibility**, does not eliminate the revolutionary perspectives, but it does destroy, at one blow, so to speak, the **theoretical basis** for our past characterization of Russia as a workers' state." (*The New International*, December 1940, pp. 196-7.)

The theoretical basis for our calling the Soviet Union a workers' state, let us recall, was the smashing of bourgeois forms of property and the establishment of socialist forms. We can admit the theoretical possibility of the estimate of the "rationalizers" proving correct, but that does not destroy *today*, our "past" characterization of the Soviet Union as a workers' state. Something more substantial is needed than a theory posed by these people, who hold that bureaucratism will sweep the world and establish a new historically necessary bureaucratic class.

Today there are no objective facts, nothing new, especially in Shachtman's article, which would lead us to believe them correct. Shachtman seems to believe that the mere act of posing a theoretical possibility destroys the *basis* for all past characterizations of a given phenomenon. Trotsky... "advanced a theoretical possibility which fundamentally negated his theory . . . of the class character of the Soviet state," says Shachtman. According to this theory Shachtman would need do no more than pose the theoretical possibility of his reapplying for membership in the Socialist Workers Party in order to destroy the theoretical basis for Trotsky's characterization of him as a sophist who has betrayed Marxism. This is to endow theoretical abstractions, or in Shachtman's case, sophistry, with undue powers. If Shachtman still believes the posing of abstractions concocted in his own head is of such efficacy, let him pose the theoretical possibility of the moon developing into green cheese. He will have a hard time convincing the astronomers that his mere posing of the possibility thereby destroys the theoretical basis for their past scientific characterization of the moon even though he uses as "evidence" that some great astronomer in ridiculing the medicine men who did believe it had taken their assumption, shown the alternative: belief in science or witchcraft, and developed the alternatives to their conclusion.

A Shyster Analyzes Property Relations

In his section on "Property Forms and Property Relations" Shachtman informs us that the state "is not owned like a pair of socks or a factory; it is controlled." We, however, can imagine a condition where socks and especially factories could be controlled without being "owned." We even have a slogan calling for workers' control of the factories while they are still owned by the bourgeoisie. Shachtman's point could have more happily been illustrated with the case of *The New International* which was owned by the Socialist Workers Party but controlled by Shachtman, Burnham, and Abern. However, they utilized their position of trust to bring about a change in "property relations." In brief they filched

the magazine. This did not give rise on our part to a desire to call them a new exploiting class hitherto unknown in history—sneak-thievery is very old in history—we simply characterized it as the act of an opposition with petty bourgeois social roots.

Shachtman's point is that "In the Soviet Union the proletariat is master of property only if he is master of the state which is its repository. That mastery alone can distinguish it as the ruling class." Having lost this mastery, the proletariat is no longer ruling class, concludes Shachtman, and therefore the "property relations established by the Bolshevik revolution" have been destroyed. This is Shachtman's case for his theory that a new type of society has come into being in the Soviet Union. He approaches the whole question as if it were a question of a petty theft in a bourgeois society. This man "owned" the article, another gained control of it, possession is nine points of the law, and so the first man lost ownership and the second one became master of the property.

But in presenting this viewpoint, Shachtman completely forgot that he had written about Soviet property relations before:

"Class rule is based upon property relations," declared Shachtman in 1938. "Bourgeois class rule, the bourgeois state, is based upon private ownership, appropriation and accumulation. The political superstructure of the bourgeois class state may vary: democratic republic, monarchy, fascist dictatorship. When the bourgeois can no longer rule directly politically, and the working class is still too weak to take power, a Bonapartist military dictatorship may arise which seeks to raise itself 'above the classes,' to 'mediate' between them. But it continues to rule over a bourgeois state (even though, as in Germany it has politically expropriated the bourgeoisie and its parties), because it has left bourgeois property relations more or less intact.

"The October revolution abolished bourgeois property relations in the decisive spheres of economic life. By centralizing the means of production in the hands of the state, it created new property relations. The counter-revolutionary bureaucracy, although it has destroyed the political rule of the proletariat, has not yet been able to restore capitalist property relations by abolishing those established by the revolution. This great reality determines, for Marxists, the character of the Soviet Union as a workers' state, bureaucratically degenerated, it is true, usurped and therefore crucially imperiled by the Bonapartists, but still fundamentally a workers' state. This great remaining conquest of the revolution determines, in turn, our defense of the Soviet Union from imperialist attack and from its Bonapartist sappers at home." (*The New International*, January 1938, p. 11.)

In this same article quoted above, Shachtman defined the economic foundations established by the October revolution as "nationalized property, planning, the monopoly of foreign trade." Thus in the "decisive spheres of economic life" he established the basic differences between bourgeois property relations and socialist property relations which make it possible for *Marxists* to term the state based upon the latter a workers' state.

Now, however, Shachtman in his latest article tells us that "what is crucial are not the property FORMS, i.e. nationalized property, whose existence cannot be denied, but precisely the relations of the various social groups in the Soviet Union to this property, i. e., *property relations!*" It is not necessary to ask the read to come to a full stop at this point. He is certain to come to a stop without a request from anyone. Why in the devil, the reader cannot help asking, has Shachtman suddenly dragged in "property forms"? What is *Shachtman's* distinction between property relations and property forms? Shachtman does not say. He rests his entire case on the "distinction," but keeps the distinction itself in his pocket. Let him produce it in public!

The Marxist method is one of following the development of *productive* relations in their origin, development and decay. In his polemic against Proudhon, Marx accused that petty bourgeois of doing exactly what Shachtman is now doing with the concept "property."

"The deficiency of the book (Proudhon's *What Is Property?*) is indicated by its very title. The question was so falsely formulated that it could not be answered correctly. Ancient 'property relations' were swallowed up by feudal property relations and these by 'ourgeois' property relations. Thus history itself had practised its criticism upon past property relations. What Proudhon was actually dealing with was modern bourgeois property as it exists today. The question of what this is could only have been answered by a critical analysis of 'political economy,' embracing these property relations as a whole, not in their legal expression as voluntary relations but in their real form, that is, as relations of production. But as he entangled the whole of these economic relations in the general juristic conception of 'property,' Proudhon could not get beyond the answer which Brissot, in a similar work, had already, before 1789, given in the same words: 'Property is theft.'" (Letter to Schweitzer, published in the International Publishers edition of the *Poverty of Philosophy*, by Karl Marx, p. 165-6.)

In his preface to the *Critique of Political Economy*, Marx develops this conception further:

"At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic—in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out." (*Critique of Political Economy*, p. 12.)

If Shachtman were a Marxist, then he would try to prove his case by showing how the "material transformation of the economic conditions of production which can be determined with the precision of natural science" brought into being a new exploiting society in the USSR. We must conclude with Marx (*Poverty of Philosophy*, p. 130) that "To try to give a definition of property as of an independent relation, a category apart—an abstract, an eternal idea—can be nothing but an illusion of metaphysics of jurisprudence."

"Widening" the Definition of Class

In place of trying to show how the "material transformation of the economic conditions of production" inexorably gave rise to a new class, as a Marxist would have done, Shachtman converts the Stalinist bureaucracy into a class through the simple expedient of *widening the definition* of class. Engels' definition of a class, argues Shachtman, was wider than Trotsky's. Engels "qualified" the merchants as a class; Shachtman as a consistent follower of Engels believes he has full right to call the Stalinist bureaucracy a class. In short Shachtman calls up the shade of Engels to confound Trotsky and to prove that Shachtman conforms more strictly to Marxism than Trotsky. This is in line with the whole tendency of the petty bourgeois "Workers" Party to belittle Trotsky, to reduce him to a harmless icon.

In reality there is not the slightest difference in Trotsky's and Engels' conceptions of what constitutes a class. Trotsky, like Lenin, Engels, and Marx, considered the merchants a class, a historically necessary class which played a progressive

role and which constituted a necessary stage in the development of the productive forces. There could be no disagreement on that score. But what do the merchants as a class have in common with the Stalinist bureaucracy? Is the Stalinist bureaucracy a historically necessary class as was the merchant class? Shachtman admits that it is not. (He thereby uses the term "class" in a non-Marxist sense, incidentally.) Why the reference to the merchant class?

"Classes are but an empty word, unless we know what are the elements on which they are based, such as wage-labor, capital, etc. These imply, in their turn, exchange, division of labor, prices, etc. Capital, e.g., does not mean anything without wage-labor, value, money, prices, etc." (*Critique of Political Economy*, p. 292.)

What concrete elements do the merchant class and the Stalinist bureaucracy have in common which makes it possible to equate one with the other? Shachtman is completely silent. He gives us an empty word and through widening the emptiness tries to establish an exploiting class hitherto unknown in history.

Marx and Engels traced the rise of the merchant form of capital with great precision, even in its most primitive stages in antiquity, showed that it was inevitable and necessary at a certain stage in the development of capital, and that it developed inevitably and necessarily into a higher form, industrial capital. In speaking of the dominating role of merchant capital in the eighteenth century, Marx and Engels even declared:

"Compared with the manufacturers, and above all with the craftsmen, they (the merchants) were certainly big bourgeois; compared with the merchants and industrialists of the next period they remain petty bourgeois, cf. Adam Smith." (*The German Ideology*, p. 55.)

The reason the merchants can be called a class in the Marxist sense is clear: They constituted the first historical form, and at a later stage, the dominant form of the *bourgeois* class.

In the very next sentences following the passage from Engels which Shachtman quotes from the *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Engels in the conscientious fashion that characterized the founders of scientific socialism, indicates that the merchant class was indispensable to the development of the bourgeoisie, and he indicates very briefly *how* it was indispensable. (It is not necessary to dwell on this since the Marxist classics are rich in material on the merchant class. They developed commodity production, money, exchange, accelerated the movement of capital, increased the division of labor, etc.) Shachtman, however, as is his custom, finds the analogy with the merchant class no longer serviceable and immediately drops it. It is clear why he does this. It is manifestly absurd to maintain that the Stalinist bureaucracy plays the progressive role the rising merchant class played in the development of the productive forces in its day. Shachtman discreetly shifts into a field in which he is more secure: sophistry. Through a play on words he attempts to prove that the Stalinist bureaucracy is a historically necessary class. He quotes Trotsky:

"If the Bonapartist ruffraff is a class this means that it is not an abortion but a viable child of history. If its marauding parasitism is 'exploitation' in the scientific sense of the term, this means that the bureaucracy possesses a historical future as the ruling class indispensable to the given system of economy." (Again and Once More Again on the Nature of the USSR, *The New International*, February, 1940, p. 14.)

Trotsky is here repeating in different words what he had already said in his article, "The USSR in War":

Scientifically and politically—and not purely terminologically—the question poses itself as follows: does the bureaucracy

represent a temporary growth on a social organism or has this growth already become transformed into an historically indispensable organ? Social excrescences can be the product of an accidental' (i.e. temporary and extraordinary) enmeshing of historical circumstances. A social organ (and such is every class, including an exploiting class) can take shape only as a result of the deeply rooted inner needs of production itself. If we do not answer this question, then the entire controversy will degenerate into sterile toying with words." (The New International, November, 1939, p. 326.)

Trotsky is begging the question, declaims Shachtman, because "the question is precisely: what is the given system of economy? For the *given* system—the property relations established by the counter-revolution—the Stalinist bureaucracy is the indispensable ruling class." There is Shachtman in all his tattered cleverness—right at the very moment when we expect him to show how the new class is a historically indispensable organ, how it took shape as a result of the deeply rooted inner needs of production itself, and from that how it deserves to be qualified as a "class" Shachtman is gone with the wind, and what a wind!

Prove there is a new class? It is a question of the system of economy, responds Shachtman.

Prove there is a new economy? It is a question of the property relations, responds Shachtman.

Prove there are new property relations? It is a question of Trotsky having posed an absolutely new theoretical possibility in the future development of society, responds Shachtman.

And he accuses Leon Trotsky of begging the question!

It is only necessary to add that Shachtman himself begs the question when he admits that his new class is not a viable or indispensable ruling class "in the same sense as the historical capitalist class," that is, it is not a class in the Marxist sense of the term, and then declares "we may and do speak of it as a ruling class."

Why Shachtman Invented a New Class

In describing the characteristics of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the Trotskyists from the very beginning have pointed out that it represents the tendency toward "revival of all the old crap" in the Soviet Union, that is, the tendency to revival of capitalism due to the economic level of Russia being behind that of the leading capitalist nations. In all spheres, the Stalinist bureaucracy represents the influence of the surrounding capitalist states upon the isolated workers' state. The tendency of the Stalinist bureaucracy is toward restoration of *bourgeois* forms of production—not toward the establishment of hitherto unknown property forms. Trotsky has traced this *bourgeois* influence in the fields of culture, art, science, family life—all the relations prevailing in the USSR, and especially the economic—with great exactitude. He established beyond all doubt in the minds of the most advanced workers that in the face of the Stalinist bureaucracy they see the hideous face of international bourgeois reaction as refracted in the Soviet Union.

Shachtman's article is conspicuous in only one respect aside from its theoretical absurdities: in place of the international *bourgeoisie* as the source of the evils we see in the Soviet Union, he *substitutes* a new exploiting class hitherto unknown to history. What does Shachtman gain by trying to thus establish a new ruling class in one country? No conclusion is possible except that he thereby tends to *whitewash the bourgeoisie*.

We are justified in drawing the conclusion that we have here a case of a development toward social-patriotism—a very subtle and perhaps unconscious form—but nevertheless a form of social-patriotism.

Under the pressure of the war mongering bourgeoisie, who at any cost must whitewash themselves and, as in the last war, become again the immaculate champions of democracy, Shachtman constructed a *new* exploiting society and a *new* exploiting class out of the Stalinist bureaucracy. But in carrying out this not slight service for the bourgeoisie, Shachtman laid the basis for a subsequent shift to outright social patriotism. Why defend an *exploiting* society? In what way is this new exploiting society *better* in any respect than the present exploiting society of capitalism? On the contrary isn't capitalism—*democratic* capitalism, naturally, naturally—*better* than a bureaucratic society like that outlined by Shachtman? In fabricating a new exploiting class, Shachtman has constructed nothing less than a bridge to outright social-patriotism.

We understand of course that it was only by sheer coincidence that at the precise time war broke out Shachtman rejected the slogan of defense of the Soviet Union. That it happens to be a coincidence which makes it possible to stand aloof when the bourgeoisie are howling for the blood of the Soviet Union is not Shachtman's responsibility. He can't help it if he was born under a lucky star!

It is likewise nothing but coincidence—if an unhappy coincidence—that in Shachtman's party an outright social patriotic tendency has already risen which is daily gaining adherents and becoming more articulate.

Continuing Burnham's tradition, this tendency bases itself on complete disavowal of Bolshevism. They say for instance: "We believe that the rejection of Bolshevism—openly and clearly—is a necessary condition for the construction"* of the party. For "construction" of the kind of party they want, they advocate "reading" the anarchist attacks on the Soviet Union and Benjamin Gitlow's confession of how a one hundred percent Stalinist became converted to the benefits of capitalist democracy. In regard to the Soviet Union they declare: "*Socialist totalitarianism is not better but on the contrary is worse than bourgeois democracy.*" They emphasize these words themselves, as if completely conscious of their import.

This tendency in the Workers Party is not at all embarrassed that it advocates the same views as the case-hardened social patriots who betrayed the workers in the first world war: like Shachtman they feel that this is only a happy coincidence. It is only a "notion" they say, that "because a man shares one or several ideas with social patriots that therefore he does or must share all or most of them."

These views are so obviously the logical continuation of Shachtman's own views that it would seem he could not honestly refuse to open the columns of *Labor Action* and *The New International* to them. Can it be that the suspicion voiced by this grouping concerning Shachtman is correct, that he does not grant them their right to bring their views before the public only because he is interested in retaining organizational control of the party by *any* means?

Burnham went directly to the camp of the bourgeoisie. Shachtman has moved more hesitantly and with characteristic fanfare concerning his noble intentions. But the direction is the same as that of Burnham. Let the Workers Party opposition be patient, who want openly to advocate the views of the anarchists, renegades and social patriots. Shachtman will catch up—even outstrip—just give him a few more months to develop theoretically!

* All quotations are from *Defining a Tendency*, mimeographed declaration of Joan Cornell, Martin Eden, Bert Edwards, Irving Ferry, Bud Gordon, Martin Lewis, Hal Mitchell, and Philip Sherman.

Subscribe!

... to insure your own regular receipt of the only Marxian periodicals published in the United States,

... for that fellow-worker who is beginning to see the need for a working-class interpretation of the problems of his life and job,

... for that friend who needs an introduction to Marxian writings on today's events.

We announce a

Special Introductory Offer

2 issues of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

8 issues of THE MILITANT (formerly Socialist Appeal)

BOTH FOR ONLY 50c

(This offer is valid only until April 1, 1941)

(Regular yearly combination offer: \$3.00)

SEND YOUR SUBSCRIPTION NOW TO

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

116 University Place

New York City