

---

---

December 1943

# Fourth International

---

---

## Perspectives and Tasks of The Coming European Revolution

*Resolution of 15th Anniversary Plenum of the Socialist Workers Party*

Notes of the Month . . . . . *Editorial Comment*

*Stalin's Foreign Policy*

*Italy and the "Democracies"*

*Fourth Mine Strike and Its Aftermath*

World Role of U.S. Capitalism . . . by *William Simmons*

*From The Arsenal of Marxism*

**Marxism and Military Knowledge**

By **LEON TROTSKY**

---

Twenty Cents

## Manager's Column

We have received a number of letters during the past period which pay the highest tribute to FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

*New York:* "The October issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL continues to meet the function of a Marxist theoretical magazine—to equip revolutionary cadres and the working-class vanguard with an understanding of each new turn in world affairs and the class struggle at home.

"With the outcome of the war decided by the preponderance of the Allies, the question of 'What kind of a post-war world?' comes to the fore.

"John Adamson in his *Post-War Preview* competently submits the program of the Allied 'democracies' to analysis. The trend toward totalitarian government at home, the unrelied continuation of imperialism abroad—this is the program of the American and British ruling classes. Against this program of stark reaction on a world scale, Adamson counterposes the liberating program of the working-class—world socialism.

"In reviewing 'The Machiavellians' (James Burnham's latest book), Joseph Hansen draws a profitable and interesting comparison between Burnham's ideas and the ideas of Lawrence Dennis, America's self-styled fascist theoretician. Burnham proves what Marxists have always asserted—that the intellectual and the middle class must serve either the interests of capitalist reaction or follow the program of the working class. Since Burnham has rejected the ideas of Marxism, the arrows of his intellectual 'progress' all point, as Hansen demonstrates, to the extreme right."

\* \* \*

*Chicago:* "Enclosed is 25c for which please send me a copy of the February 1938 issue containing Trotsky's article, '90 Years of the Communist Manifesto' . . .

"Your September and October issues contain some very illuminating information which is quite a relief from all the canned news one gets in the laily press, etc."

\* \* \*

*Scotland:* ". . . You can have no conception of the tremen-

## FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Volume IV December 1943 No. 11 (Whole No. 39)

Published monthly by the  
Fourth International Publishing Association

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

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

Editor: FELIX MORROW

	Page
<i>The Month in Review</i>	
Stalin's Foreign policy .....	323
The Fourth Coal Strike and Its Aftermath .....	325
Italy and the "Democracies" .....	327
Perspectives and Tasks of the Coming	
European Revolution .....	329
World Role of U.S. Capitalism	
<i>By William Simmons</i>	334
Wartime Crimes of Big Business	
<i>By George Breitman</i>	337
<i>From The Arsenal of Marxism:</i>	
Marxism and Military Knowledge	
<i>By Leon Trotsky</i>	342
International Notes .....	351

214

dous assistance the journal miss the occasion to read them FOURTH INTERNATIONAL thoroughly and have them by gives us in our work. When the few copies that are sent do arrive, there is an immediate scramble for them and sometimes it is unavoidable that we

miss the occasion to read them thoroughly and have them by us for reference.

"Most of us in Glasgow are young and inexperienced, especially politically, and since funds and time do not permit

the more advanced comrades at the center to come up here often, it means that we ourselves have got to and mean to undertake the task of building the Fourth International. But it is precisely here that we come up against the snag of our lack of knowledge. We are doing all the reading we can but especially for lectures, which we take in turn to give once a week, we find that there is nothing to touch FOURTH INTERNATIONAL to give us in concentrated form the material we require.

"We feel that if we had at our disposal bound copies of the old numbers of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL or files that we ourselves could get bound that our tasks would be much easier. Can you possibly do anything for us in this connection?"

\* \* \*

*Canada:* "Enclosed is money order for five bucks for support of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and THE MILITANT. I received two copies of the September issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL and put them to good use.

"'Post-War Preview' by Adamson in the October F. I. cuts the fog like a light. Wright's article on 'Soviet Life in War Time' is good ammunition against the renegade labor progressive party here."

\* \* \*

We again want to call to the attention of our readers the fact that our stock of bound volumes is rapidly dwindling. As the volumes for earlier years become scarce, the prices will go up accordingly.

\* \* \*

*In accordance with postal regulations, your address is not complete unless it shows the postal zone number. For instance, the correct address of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL is New York 3, N. Y. The postal authorities are now insisting that this regulation be carried out in mailing our magazine.*

*Check the wrapper in which FOURTH INTERNATIONAL is mailed to you and if your zone number is not included, be sure to send it to us at once so that we can correct your mailing address and thus assure the delivery of your magazine.*

*Send your postal zone number to:*

*Business Manager  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.*

### Only a Few Left!

We still have in stock bound volumes of The NEW INTERNATIONAL and FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for the following years:

1938	\$5.00
1939	5.00
1940-41	4.00

If you do not already have your bound volume, get it now.

Order from

Business Manager  
Fourth International

116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.

# FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME IV

DECEMBER 1943

NUMBER 11

## The Month in Review

### Why We Had to Skip the November Issue of *Fourth International*

We regret to inform our readers that owing to the sudden illness of Felix Morrow, Editor of *Fourth International*, the necessary preparations for the November issue could not be completed in time. Postal regulations do not allow us to get out a double issue in order to make up for the skipping of the November number; and we are therefore compelled to limit ourselves to the regular December issue. The term of all subscriptions will be extended one month in order to compensate for this unavoidable omission.

Comrade Morrow was stricken with an attack of acute appendicitis while in Philadelphia covering the CIO Convention for *The Militant*. He underwent an emergency operation at New York's Beth Israel Hospital and is now convalescing nicely.

\* \* \*

### Stalin's Foreign Policy

**STALIN AGAIN CONSPIRES AGAINST THE REVOLUTION** On the very eve of the 26th Anniversary of the October revolution Stalin placed his seal of approval on the Hull-Molotov-Eden agreement, implicit in which is a conspiracy between the Kremlin and its Allies to collaborate in an attempt to drown in blood the coming socialist revolution in Europe, above all in Germany. The liars and traitors in the Kremlin immediately proclaimed this agreement to be a great victory for the Soviet Union and the war-stricken masses throughout the world.

The Allied chancelleries are now agog. New negotiations are on foot. The chief issue of the projected Roosevelt-Stalin-Churchill meeting is the price that the "democracies" are willing to pay Stalin in return for his hangman's services. The dupes of Stalinism are ready in advance to accept and acclaim any and all diplomatic deals of the Kremlin with the capitalist powers. In their opinion, Stalin's "realistic" policies safeguard the Soviet Union. Some of them even think that in this way they are aiding the cause of socialism. They have learned nothing at all from the terrible lessons of the past.

When Stalin made his treaty with Hitler in August 1939, the kept press of the Kremlin also hailed it as a mighty blow against the enemies of the Soviet Union and a great victory for the world working class. They claimed that the pact with Hitler would preserve peace, disrupt the anti-Soviet front, safeguard the Soviet Union and keep it out of war.

Subsequent events have proved how worthless these boasts were. The real results of Stalin's deal with Hitler turned out to be quite different. The Moscow agreement of 1939 gave the signal for the Second World War. The position of the USSR was weakened by the demoralizing effects of Stalin's alliance with Hitler upon the European working masses. The power of German imperialism was enormously enhanced by the Nazi conquests of Western Europe. Finally, instead of

securing the Soviet Union from attack, Stalin's blind policy permitted Hitler to strike when he chose without warning at the workers' state.

Now, more than five years later, another deal is being consummated by Stalin. In contrast to its predecessor, this 1943 agreement is concluded with the Anglo-American imperialists and is directed against Hitler. But although the front of diplomatic operations has been reversed in the interim, the general line of Stalinist policy remains unchanged. This agreement, dictated by the nationalistic interests of the degenerate Kremlin clique, is no less reactionary in essence, no less perfidious toward the Soviet Union and the European proletariat, than Stalin's previous pact with Hitler.

This does not, of course, prevent the choir of Stalinist journalists from singing the same songs about the pact with Roosevelt and Churchill as they formerly sang about the pact with Hitler. According to them, the Hull-Molotov-Eden agreement is a passport to the Promised Land. Under the economic, political and military collaboration of the "Three Powers," war-shattered Europe will bloom like a garden. The occupied countries will be liberated. Democracy will be freely restored to its peoples. Wars will be prevented by disarming Germany and by the organization of a new League of Nations. The Anglo-American capitalist press paints a no less radiant prospect for Europe.

**THE ALLIED PROGRAM FOR WAR-TORN EUROPE** Those who permit themselves to be deluded by these intoxicating phrases will soon become disillusioned. They are nothing but fantastic lies and false promises. The real meaning of the Moscow conference is not to be found in the diplomatic deceptions of the official propagandists but in the appetites and predatory aims of Anglo-American imperialism, on the one hand, and the reactionary policies of the Stalinist bureaucrats, on the other.

Churchill and Roosevelt, the political executives of Anglo-American capitalism, have no more benevolent designs for Europe than the present Nazi oppressors. Nor do they have any greater friendship for the USSR. Whenever they enter into any diplomatic, economic or military agreements, they do so in order to protect and to promote the interests of the ruling capitalist class, and for no other reason.

The Stalinist press, however, seeks to embellish Roosevelt and Churchill in the same cynical manner as they used to embellish Hitler, and thereby cover up the real aims and crimes of the imperialists. By assuring the world that the "peace-loving" Anglo-American capitalists intend to bring democracy, freedom, peace, security and prosperity to Europe, the Stalinists are performing the greatest service to the imperialist bandits and facilitating their plans to subjugate the European peoples. Again Stalin deceives and betrays the international working class and prepares new catastrophes for the Soviet Union.

The Four-Nation Declaration adopted on November 1 at Moscow proclaims the need of united action for the main-

tenance of peace and security after the war against Germany is won. What kind of security is really envisaged by the Declaration and against whom must peace be maintained? After the Nazi military machine has been smashed there will arise only one great power in Europe. That is the power represented by the revolutionary masses, headed by the working class. Although this power was not represented at Moscow and its existence was not even mentioned, its shadow hung over the conference and determined its major decisions.

The chief capitalist spokesmen do not try to conceal their dread of the coming European revolution. Churchill speaks of the necessity for combatting "anarchy and chaos." Before his departure for Moscow, Hull referred to the possibility of 14 revolutions in Europe this time as against 4 after the last war. Secretary of the Navy Knox talks of "policing the world" for the next 100 years. The plans of the American authorities for ruling conquered European countries and holding down insurgent popular movements have been published in the magazines—and the AMG administration in Sicily and Italy has provided a preview of them.

#### COMMON GROUND OF MOSCOW CONFEREES

But the key to the Moscow Conference consists in the fact that the Kremlin gang shares this fear of the European revolution, and above all, the rising of the German workers. The Kremlin's fear of the consequences of a victorious proletarian revolution in Germany was confirmed in an article cabled from Cairo by C. L. Sulzberger, published in the *New York Times* of October 31:

"Many Russians with whom the writer has talked frankly discussed the dangers of a communized Germany. They take the view that this would eventually turn in the direction of Trotskyism, and might conceivably once again, therefore, foment dangers for the Soviet Union—a possibility which must at all costs be avoided."

The authenticity of these conversations is indubitable. The Russians with whom Sulzberger talked so "frankly" were obviously Stalinist diplomats and functionaries, and their "fears" cast a floodlight upon the political psychology of the Stalinist bureaucrats.

The history of the past decade proved that the greatest danger to the Soviet Union has come from a capitalist-dominated Germany in which the revolutionary movement has been crushed. But Nazi Germany is only one detachment of world imperialism. If the workers do not take power in post-Hitler Germany, then the Anglo-American imperialists will move to impose their own dictatorship upon the German people, and together with their Quislings, will inevitably try to encircle, isolate and strangle the Soviet Union.

A "communized Germany" is no threat to the USSR. On the contrary, it is the best guarantee against another imperialist intervention. A "communized Germany," for which the Trotskyists are consciously fighting, would provide the greatest possible protection for the Soviet Union and become the source of unbounded benefits for the Soviet peoples. Why then do the Stalinist bureaucrats dread it so? Because a victorious German revolution would menace the privileged position of the Stalinist usurpers who have entrenched themselves in power as a consequence of the two decades of defeats of the European working class. A successful revolution anywhere on the continent would act to undermine the totalitarian power of the Kremlin, raise the self-confidence of the Soviet workers, and revive the spirit of the October revolution. When Stalinists speak of "the dangers of a communized Germany," this is what they have in mind.

This fear of the European revolution, which Stalin shares with Roosevelt and Churchill, provided the common ground for their agreement at Moscow. For the Moscow pact is above all Stalin's pledge to the Anglo-American capitalists for common action against the proletarian revolution which will spring out of the overthrow of Nazism, just as the Italian revolution emerged from the collapse of Italian fascism. Stalin's signature signifies his willingness to strive to prevent the outbreak of such revolutions and to join hands with the Anglo-American imperialists in an attempt to crush them, if they arise despite all maneuvers. This is the real counter-revolutionary significance of the Moscow pact.

#### NEW INFAMOUS PAGES OF SECRET DIPLOMACY

Upon returning from Moscow, Secretary of State Hull declared that no secret agreements had been entered into at the conference. Only a political infant would be taken in by this assurance. If, as the press candidly admits, important clauses in the deal with Badoglio have not yet been made public, who can believe that all the agreements arrived at in Moscow in a conspiracy of this magnitude would be disclosed?

The First World War was supposed to abolish secret diplomacy. The first of Woodrow Wilson's "Fourteen Points" promised an end to "secret covenants, secretly arrived at." The Second World War has witnessed an unprecedented flowering of the practices of secret diplomacy. Not only were the agreements at Moscow "secretly arrived at" but, we may be sure, a great part of these decisions remains hidden.

As long ago as the Inaugural Address of the First International (1864) Marx taught the working class that "their duty lies in mastering the secrets of international politics, in keeping a watch upon the activities of their governments and, when necessary, with all the power at their command, counteracting such activities." The Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky fulfilled this task by publishing the secret treaties of the Czar with his Allies, and repudiating them. In the field of foreign policy, as in all others, Stalinism tramples upon the traditions of Marxism and Leninism and reverts to the reactionary policies of the old ruling classes. Instead of denouncing and exposing imperialist secret diplomacy, Stalin connives with the imperialists against the interests of the working class.

The unrestrained jubilation of Washington and London over the results of the Moscow Conference shows who triumphed at Moscow. Roosevelt and Churchill express great gratification. Secretary of State Hull, the patron of Darlan, Franco, Salazar, Petain, Badoglio, King Victor Emmanuel and half a dozen assorted decayed monarchs, is being hailed as a savior of democracy and civilization. Poll-tax Senator Connally, co-author of the Smith-Connally anti-strike law, and his Senatorial colleagues took time off from their anti-labor campaign to sponsor and pass a resolution endorsing the "principles" of the Moscow agreement.

The agents of American Big Business have ample cause for rejoicing. They scored their biggest diplomatic victory of the war at Moscow. Has not Stalin agreed to help them maintain capitalism and try to suppress the revolution in Europe? Has he not countersigned their deal with Badoglio? By accepting the establishment of a "general international organization" to impose "collective security" in "the period following the end of hostilities," has not the Kremlin pledged itself to help the capitalists police Europe? And does not Stalin supply the Anglo-American imperialists with an otherwise unobtainable cover for their counter-revolutionary plots?

Hitler's power is crumbling and his days are numbered. His collapse could be hastened by appealing to the workers, soldiers and peasants of Germany to move against the fascist regime with the same revolutionary vigor that enabled the Italian workers to bring about the downfall of Italian fascism. The prospect of a Socialist Germany would be the greatest spur to the war-weary and dispirited German masses. Such a prospect would mobilize irresistible internal forces which would quickly topple the Nazi regime.

Stalin, however, acts otherwise. At the Moscow Conference he endorsed the Casablanca "unconditional surrender" formula for Germany. To the German people this can mean only that the USSR has slammed the door against any separate peace with a workers' socialist revolution in Germany, and that they can expect nothing from Moscow but a far more savage edition of the Versailles Treaty.

The German people fear the projected dismemberment of Germany and the atomization of her economy which has been openly discussed in England and the U. S. By accepting an "independent" Austria, Stalin has underwritten the first step in the Allied plan to Balkanize Germany. This, together with Stalin's endorsement of a new imperialist League of Nations, can only act to depress the German people instead of arousing them against the Nazis. Stalin's deal thus serves to restrain the German masses from moving to overthrow the hated Hitler regime and thereby prolongs Hitler's rule.

The capitalist press acclaims the Moscow pact as "realistic" and "durable." The *Daily Worker* has characterized it as one of the "great peaks in history" which has opened "great new perspectives to the future." All parties to the agreement chant in close harmony that the conflict and differences which produced the need for the Conference are now ironed out in principle and that the road has been cleared for complete and continuous collaboration between Stalin and his "Allies."

**THE IRRECONCILABLE ANTAGONISM REMAINS** In reality the Moscow Conference has not settled the basic issues. It did not even provide a solution for the most critical immediate points of difference between the Kremlin and Washington-London. The question of the Polish border which was presumably left in abeyance by the conference was at once raised by the Catholic bishops in the U. S. And it has been posed in a far more practical and pressing manner by the swift advance of the Red Army.

No sooner had Hull landed in Washington than the sweep of the Red Army successes brought forth a clamor for a new conference, this time between Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, which would definitively and authoritatively settle these and all other unresolved questions. The *New York Times* correspondent cabled from London on November 16 that:

"The Russian offensive has progressed so far toward the German frontier that questions that seemed comparatively remote even a few weeks ago—questions of the occupation of Germany, the disposition of Poland, etc.—now logically rise for discussion. . . ."

At every turn of events the underlying and irreconcilable class antagonism between decaying capitalism and the Soviet Union—with its nationalized property and resurgent masses—asserts itself. Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill, each in their own way, try to conceal and to deny this basic antagonism between the two economic systems, but, despite all their protestations, it haunts them like Banquo's Ghost at the feast. And they cannot drive it away. The same class forces that brought Washington and London to the verge of a break with the Soviet Union at the time of the Finnish events in 1940,

the same forces that impelled Hitler to attack the USSR, the same forces that produced the previous discord between Stalin and his "Allies" are at work undermining their agreements and setting them against each other.

It is well known that the four victorious powers who imposed the Treaty of Versailles upon Germany and Europe after the last war quickly fell out with one another. Far more profound antagonism exists between the workers' state, even in its degenerate condition under Stalinism, and the Anglo-American capitalists than was the case among the four victors of 1918. In fact, the Allied statesmen are already maneuvering against the USSR, despite their deal. Shortly after the Moscow Conference both Churchill and Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to Washington, called for "closer cooperation" between the U. S. and Great Britain. Against whom could such a "cooperation" be directed, if not against the USSR?

It is this basic class antagonism which will determine the subsequent development of the relations between the Kremlin and its Allies and nullify in the end their transitory diplomatic deals. The successes of the Red Army which are delivering hammer blows against Hitlerism and accelerating the developing European revolution are also dealing blows to the continued collaboration between Stalin and Roosevelt-Churchill.

Neither the individual aims nor the collective projects of the Anglo-American bandits and the Stalinist bureaucrats will determine the destiny of Europe. The counter-revolutionary conspiracies hatched in Moscow are a long, long way from realization. They fail to reckon adequately with a force potentially far more powerful than themselves, the force of the insurgent masses driven by the desperate urge and most urgent need to find their way out of the bloody capitalist chaos and create a new society.

While Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill bargain and maneuver with one another, these revolutionary masses are beginning to mobilize for the assault against capitalism. The first contingents of these shock troops of the maturing European revolution have already engaged in action in Italy. Tomorrow they will be joined by millions upon millions more who will form a mighty army of revolutionary warriors. At their head will march the mighty German proletariat. Woe unto those who try to oppose their movement for peace, bread, and security. Neither Stalin nor Roosevelt-Churchill will succeed in crushing them where Hitler and Mussolini failed.

## The Fourth Coal Strike And Its Aftermath

### LITTLE STEEL FORMULA AND ITS PRESENT STATUS

What is the present status of the Little Steel formula? In other words, how successfully has Roosevelt weathered the last labor crisis and what is the present status of his labor relations machinery? Unlike the war in Europe, Roosevelt has all the advantages of maneuvering, of initiative, of surprise, of choosing when, where and how to give battle in his war on the labor movement. On this front, he faces a leadership which is utterly subservient to him and the war machine.

The class struggle is taking place under conditions where the complete leadership of one side of the battlefield has gone over lock, stock and barrel to the opponent trenches and conspires with the capitalist foe against its own side. Murray and Green need Roosevelt's support just as Roosevelt knows

that he must have his "labor lieutenants." Trotsky in his outline for the article "Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay" gave a generalized description of this process which is true throughout the capitalist world:

"Imperialist capitalism can tolerate (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. . . ."

Under these conditions, how is it possible for the trade unions to fight at all? Of course, as the experiences since the war have shown, the trade unions are not fighting very effectively for the preservation of their rights and gains. The trade unions since Pearl Harbor have been in constant, uninterrupted retreat before the offensive of the industrialists. It is a tribute, however, to the powers of resistance and endurance of the American working class, that they have been able to absorb all the anti-labor legislation of the past year, to withstand the savage union-busting campaign and to even increase, to an extent, the numerical strength of its organizations. Students of the labor movement may ask: What is so startling or new about the subservience of the labor bureaucrats? They have always practiced class collaboration; they have always been subservient to the capitalist state.

Yes, that is true. Of course, the trade union leaders, even prior to the war, practiced opportunism, par excellence. They invariably sacrificed the historic interests of the working class for piddling immediate concessions to this or that small group of workers. They invariably sabotaged the class struggle of the working class. They invariably worked to channelize every manifestation of class consciousness into support of liberal capitalist politicians. They invariably attempted to squelch strike struggles. Nevertheless, in their cowardly fashion, and their own respectable, class collaboration methods, they attempted to protect the wage structure, the traditional rights of their own union members and give lip service and often even back-handed support to many of the strike struggles. Even the ultra-reactionary, moribund AFL unions of the 1920's fought in their own restricted fashion to protect the interests of the highly skilled workers. *The present policies of the labor bureaucrats are an extension and a continuation of their pre-war policies. But the extension is so great as to constitute a virtually qualitative difference.*

**LABOR BUREAUCRATS AND WAGE-FREEZING** Today, the labor bureaucracy is openly espousing the wage-freezing program of the bankers. Today it is not Edward F. McGrady and the government mediators who run around the country like firemen, putting out strikes. The Murrays and Greens have themselves taken over the job. They are the bloodhounds for the WLB, crushing every manifestation of revolt, of independence; and turning over the best militants to the mercies of the corporations or the government police.

What is going on before our very eyes is a monstrous growing together of labor bureaucracy with the state apparatus. Unbeknownst to the membership, the unions have been converted into auxiliary police in the service of Roosevelt and the banks. Trotsky called attention to this very phenomenon in the opening of his article:

"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 com-

munist 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 to all unions."

But to effectively carry out this policy of betrayal and surrender, it is necessary for the trade union bureaucrats to wipe out all internal democracy in the unions. It is practically impossible for a capitulatory leadership to retain its balance in the face of an alert, active and articulate rank-and-file opposition. We see manifestations of this phenomenon on every side. The brutal threats of the union officials against many of the union militants, the many expulsions and persecutions and the intrusions of the government into internal affairs of the unions in support of union bureaucrats, have not been without results. The trade union bureaucrats have succeeded in stifling the democratic rights and crushing all opposition movements in many of the older AFL unions and many of the Stalinist-led unions. But one need only examine in a cursory manner the internal structure and the life of such unions as the auto, rubber, and other mass production CIO unions or even such unions as the AFL Machinists and Murray's CIO Steelworkers, to realize that the bureaucrats are a long way from having achieved their aims in this direction. The large measure of democracy that still exists in many of the mass production unions is the Achilles' heel not only of the union bureaucrats but of Roosevelt and the capitalists as well. In spite of all the retreats the labor movement is still strong and has not been defeated in battle. The labor ranks are still independent and aggressive. Their fighting qualities and capacities remain unimpaired. They need only a new leadership and to be shown a way out—a program that gives real promise of success.

**THE CRUX OF PROBLEM FACING TRADE UNIONS** Trotsky wrote: "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 Murrays and Greens are of course pulling the trade unions in the direction of *secondary instruments of imperialist capitalism*. They have already gone a long way in throttling the trade unions and putting them at the service of the capitalist state. But the battle is by no means over nor the issue decided. The American mass production unions are not going to be thoroughly bureaucratized nor will their teeth be drawn merely by means of threats, pressure and betrayals.

There lies a stormy period ahead. The issue will be settled only in struggle. The American labor movement will experience in the coming days great conflicts and struggles. Far more likely than the thorough bureaucratization of the unions, as a preliminary to their total annihilation will be the rise of a new leadership fighting to convert the unions into militant class organizations of struggle.

#### FOURTH COAL STRIKE AND ITS AFTERMATH

The fourth general coal strike and its aftermath fully demonstrated labor's power. With the help of his labor flunkys, Roosevelt hurled the miners back three times. As the miners trekked back to work, empty-handed, at the end of the third coal strike, it seemed that the forces arrayed against them were too strong to repulse. By their furious thrusts, the miners many times seemed on the verge of toppling Roosevelt's imposing labor edifice. But with the help of his labor lieutenants, Roosevelt was able to rally his forces, impose his will and stabilize again his labor relations.

The defeat of the third coal strike and the government's new anti-labor barrage, climaxed by the passage of the Smith-Connally anti-strike Act and Roosevelt's infamous "sanctions" decree, which went even beyond the Act in its anti-labor ferocity, brought on a temporary depression in the labor movement. The feeling of pessimism, bewilderment and listlessness on the part of the rank and file was clearly mirrored by the conduct of the union delegates at the important conventions of the auto, rubber and shipbuilding unions. The workers reasoned that if the miners under their aggressive leadership could not win, what chance did they have under the leadership of the Murrays and Greens?

The miners, however, remained impervious to this defeatist mood. They were immune to the "public opinion" and pressure of the capitalist newspapers. No sooner did Ickes return the last of the mines to the private owners—in violation of the "truce" declaration issued by Lewis, at the time he called off the third mine strike—than the miners walked out of the pits again and stayed out in defiance of the WLB, Roosevelt and their own Union Policy Committee. By October 31, the "truce" deadline, 530,000 miners were out of the mines. The fourth general coal strike was on.

#### ROOSEVELT AND HIS LABOR LIEUTENANTS

This time Roosevelt yielded. He threw a few thin concessions to the coal miners (and, of course, a fat price increase to the coal operators) in the hope of burying, once and for all, this troublesome issue, which had kept his administration in an uproar for over six months. Roosevelt, better than anybody else, understood how much in prestige and authority, the mine fight had cost him and his administration. His knowledge that the Murrays and Greens stood ready to repeat their work of treachery did not solve his terrible dilemma.

The fourth coal strike occurred at the very time that a new labor crisis was ripening on the railroad front; at the time when the standing of some of his leading labor lieutenants was hitting an all time low. His own labor support was ominously beginning to drift away from him. Possibly Roosevelt could drive the miners back empty-handed again; but he knew that he could not decisively settle the coal question; that he could not housebreak the miners' union and *he could not get the maximum coal production*. Roosevelt simply could not afford to attempt a head-on strikebreaking policy a fourth time. His furious attacks on Lewis had only strengthened the latter's position and dangerously weakened his own. The miners had finally breached the Little Steel formula.

One would imagine that here was the heaven-sent opportunity for the Murrays and Greens to rush in and win some concessions for their own members. The miners had already done the hard spade work. It still wasn't safe enough for the Murrays and Greens. Observe their wretched behavior: After issuing grandiloquent statements opposing the Little

Steel formula, they let precious weeks pass by while the effect of the miners' victory is allowed to wear off, the enthusiasm of the rank and file is allowed to cool and the WLB can again reestablish the Little Steel formula. They do nothing to hurl back the impudent WLB attack on the labor movement and its threats to press for new union-busting legislation that would tie the unions even more completely in the strait-jacket of the war machine. They permit Roosevelt to maneuver the whole issue again onto the farcical ground of a price rollback and again the Murrays and Greens become the lobbyists for Roosevelt and his administration. Again they provide him with the necessary support to drag something distracting across the labor trail, by his spurious campaign for the rollback of prices by means of subsidies to the food monopolists. Obviously if it depended on the Murrays and Greens, the workers would be kept from ever winning their wage demands.

#### NEW LABOR CRISIS LOOMS ON HORIZON

The economic pressure, however, is already becoming more and more unbearable on the working class; that is why the rank and file pressure is growing heavier all the time on the trade union bureaucrats. The labor officials are forced to make some gestures of fighting for wage increases especially after the miners' victory. Already many of the CIO unions, the Textile workers, the Aluminum workers, even many of the Stalinist-led unions, have demanded wage increases of the corporations.

What do all these wage demands amount to? Do they presage a new vigorous drive on the part of labor to smash the Little Steel formula and achieve wage increases? Or are they merely face-saving gestures on the part of the labor bureaucrats? The Murrays and Greens cannot and will not fight and they are determined to prevent the rank and file from fighting. That is definite. It is not for nothing that the first act of the Philadelphia CIO convention was to demonstratively reaffirm the no-strike pledge. With the rank and file, it is another matter. They are dead serious about breaking the Little Steel formula. They mean business in the coming wage negotiations. There is no question but that the Roosevelt government will be in the throes of a new labor crisis as the rank and file press for action in the coming wage negotiations.

#### Italy and the "Democracies"

##### ALLIED PROMISES AND POLICIES IN ITALY

The "Declaration Regarding Italy" issued at Moscow on November 1 contains all the resplendent phrases and false promises typical of the "democratic" charlatans and their Stalinist accomplices. With hands upon their hearts these statesmen swear that they are dedicated to the destruction of fascism and the restitution of democracy and civil rights in Italy.

The policy actually pursued by the Allies in those parts of Italy which have fallen under their domination exposes them for what they are: unconscionable cheats who will lie like Hitler to gain their ends. To date the AMG in Southern Italy and Sicily has restored no democratic liberties or civil rights to the population. On the contrary, political meetings and activities are prohibited, and even the craven Italian liberals are denied freedom of the press; and clapped in jail the moment they attempt to exercise it. The journalist Demaree Bess boasts that the AMG officials acted on Washington's orders "to suppress all forms of local political activity." (*Saturday Evening Post*, October 30.) Instead of rooting out fascism.

AMG has kept all but the most hated of the fascist officials and police in office and protected them from the angry people. Mussolini has gone, but his associates and underlings remain.

Among the hypocritical statements issuing from the Moscow agreement was one calling for the punishment of war-criminals. Italy is a good place to apply this, too. For King Victor Emmanuel and Marshal Badoglio stand high on the list of those responsible for the atrocities of this war. In point of fact, the House of Savoy and all its servitors have been directly involved since 1921 in countless crimes committed not only against the Italian but also against the Abyssinian, Albanian, Greek, and other peoples.

If any war-criminals are "to be tried and punished for their atrocities in the countries where they committed their crimes," as the Moscow Declaration proposes—on paper—then the King and his Marshal should be among the first handed over to the tribunals of the Italian people for trial and punishment. But these criminals are instead being propped by the Allies—with the blessing of the Kremlin; and are abetted in adding to their already long list of crimes.

Far from proceeding to restore democracy, Washington and London have from the outset exerted every effort to preserve the monarchy and the military caste in Italy. The House of Savoy is receiving this backing in defiance of every sector of the Italian people. Nobody in Italy outside the ultra-reactionary minority of big industrialists and bankers, landowners, nobles and the Vatican supports the monarchy. Covered with filth and blood, the throne on which Victor Emmanuel still sits has not the slightest popular support. The Italian monarchy today is a shadow government resting upon Anglo-American bayonets.

#### LIBERALS, STALINISTS AND HOUSE OF SAVOY

So discredited and despised is the King that Italian liberals, headed by Croce and Sforza, who cling to Anglo-American coattails like limpets to a stone, fear to compromise themselves by association with Victor Emmanuel. They yearn for a regency of some kind. Even Gaetano Salvemini, the most honest and consistent of the exiled liberals, favors a provisional regency as custodian of power in Italy. Liberalism is so bankrupt and corroded, so terrified of mass action, that it must crawl for cover behind monarchical institutions, even the House of Savoy.

And it appears that "socialists" and Stalinists also support this proposition. Among the parties which have called for a reconstituted Badoglio government is the Communist Party. On the very same day (October 14) that Badoglio appealed to the Allies for help "in the press and in propaganda, so that communism does not stand a chance," the *Daily Worker* published an interview with an Italian Stalinist leader who expressed his readiness to serve in a coalition government under Badoglio, or a regency.

Stalinists may make their peace with the House of Savoy and all its Badoglios, but the Italian workers and peasants have as little use for Victor Emmanuel as the Russian masses had in 1917 for Czar Nicholas Romanov. They want to rid themselves not only of fascists but all the parasites who battered upon them during Mussolini's reign, and who supported and served it: the King, the generals, the industrialists, the bankers, the Catholic dignitaries, the landlords. They intend to sweep the peninsula clean of all these vermin.

#### ITALIAN PUPPET SHOW AND ITS REAL LESSON

On the other hand, both camps of the belligerents, Nazis and "democrats" alike, refuse to give the insurgent Italian masses the slightest say in determining

the form of government. The spectacle now being enacted in Italy is the sorriest kind of puppet show. On one half of the platform, the "democrats" scurry about trying to make the King and his Marshal walk, talk and behave like independent rulers. While these puppets are being manipulated, the Nazis, on their side of the stage in the North, are trying to restore a semblance of vitality to their tattered sawdust Caesar Mussolini. "Democrats" fervently advocate the monarchy, while Hitlerites have turned "republicans" in Italy. Life itself has once again provided proof that the imperialists will utilize any sort of political label and regime in order to preserve and safeguard capitalism.

Both the Nazi puppet "republican" Mussolini in the North and the Anglo-American royalist puppets in the South are meeting with stubborn and sharp opposition from the people. According to persistent reports, assassinations of Italian Black Shirts and sabotage against the Nazi forces have so increased that the Fascist Party Secretary, Alessandro Pavolini, has ordered summary trials of the "moral instigators" as well as those directly responsible. There has been street fighting between civilians and fascists in Turin. It is reported that Mussolini has fined Milan 100,000,000 lire and has doubled to 2,000 the number of hostages seized from among the defiant population. Fascist party leaders were said to have ordered monstrous reprisals for the killing of Iginio Ghisellini, fascist leader, whose bullet-riddled body was found in the streets of Ferrara.

#### ONLY WORKERS WILL MAKE ITALY FREE

The workers and peasants of Italy are fighting the fascists, taking vengeance for more than two decades of torture, hunger, oppression and war. The infuriated populace has been the only force that has meted out justice to the Black Shirts and treated them according to their deserts.

Meanwhile under the protection of the Anglo-American bayonets, Mussolini's ex-accomplices get off scot-free. The King keeps in his entourage such notorious fascists as the Duke of Aquarone. In Badoglio's cabinet until yesterday sat Mario Roatto, responsible for machine-gunning helpless Spanish refugees on the road to Malaga in 1937. This chief executioner of the Croats and Slovenes in the Balkans was the general who ordered his troops to fire upon demonstrating workers in Turin. Still in Badoglio's regime is General Vittorio Ambrosio, author of bloody massacres in Yugoslavia and Greece. And these figures represent only the top layer of former fascists who remain in power thanks to Anglo-American backing.

The same November 18 issue of the *New York Times* which carried reports of the Italian workers' struggle against Mussolini's henchmen, published another dispatch which told how Badoglio's soldiers had entered and broken up the office of a liberal newspaper in Avelino because the editor had dared demand the immediate abdication of King Victor Emmanuel "to clear the foul air of Italy." These are the practices for which Mussolini's regime became notorious. The air of Southern Italy remains foul indeed! Only the driving gale of the workers' revolution can make it fit for free men to breathe again.

Once the Italian people succeed in getting rid of both gangs of imperialist invaders, it will not take them long to settle accounts with all native Quislings and the ruling class who have been selling them out for so many years, as though the people were cattle to be brought to the market, sold to the butchers, and slaughtered for the greater profit and enhancement of Big Business.



# Perspectives and Tasks of the Coming European Revolution

*Resolution Adopted by the Fifteenth Anniversary Plenum of the Socialist Workers Party, November 2, 1943*

This plenum of the National Committee meets one year after the Tenth National Convention of the Socialist Workers Party. The Political Resolution unanimously adopted by that convention set forth the basic position of the Fourth International and the Socialist Workers Party on the imperialist war and the tasks of the proletarian world revolution.

Everything that has happened since has operated to confirm our Marxist analysis of the world situation and to reinforce our political and strategic conclusions based upon the revolutionary conviction that the workers in alliance with the peasants and colonial peoples will prove capable of overthrowing capitalism and organizing the foundations of an international socialist society of peace, security, human solidarity and unbounded progress.

The course of world events during the past year can be summarized in four major developments of historical significance. These are: (1) the downfall of Mussolini and the collapse of Italian fascism, signaling the beginning of the Italian, and consequently, the European revolution; (2) the growing preponderance of Anglo-American military power over that of the Axis camp, which has already exposed Wall Street's aspirations to replace Nazi Germany as master and oppressor of Europe and thrown into bold relief the counter-revolutionary role of American imperialism on the world arena; (3) the colossal victories of the Red Army; (4) the formal dissolution of the Comintern.

## *Lessons of the Italian Events*

Italian fascism which set out in 1922 to rejuvenate tottering Italian capitalism over the broken bones of the revolting workers and peasants utterly exhausted itself within two decades. The murderous regime which its leader boasted would build a new Roman Empire lasted just long enough to celebrate its twentieth anniversary. The workers and peasants simply refused to fight, to work, or to sacrifice for the fascist state which gave them nothing but oppression, misery, starvation and broken promises. The middle classes lost all confidence in the corrupt, incompetent, vainglorious Bonapartist gangsters headed by the mountebank Mussolini. Finally, even the ruling classes, the capitalists, landed proprietors, the Church, the Royal Family, the military caste and part of his own governing clique found it expedient to dump Mussolini in the hope of saving themselves from complete catastrophe. With the entire people in opposition, the African Empire lost, the national economy bankrupt, facing occupation by two superior hostile armies, "fascism, at the end, broke apart like a rotten apple." To this epitaph Marshal Badoglio added: "Not the slightest resistance to the change was met even from any of the 7,000,000 belonging to the fascist party proper."

This annihilating collapse of Italian fascism pricks like a soap bubble all those theories spawned by the renegades from Marxism that fascism is some new form of managerial or bureaucratic-collective society destined to replace capitalism and bar the road to socialism. It is now clear that these pretentious theories really represented a special form of intellectual capitulation and adaptation to fascism. The Italian experience has once for all demonstrated that fascism is essentially the political instrument of monopoly capitalism in its death agony.

The crumbling of fascism in Italy provides further evidence of the bankruptcy of bourgeois rule. All the repressions, pretensions and demagoguery of their fascist mercenaries did not enable Big Business to stifle the class struggle and prevent it from developing. On the contrary, under the iron lid of fascism the class frictions generated enough explosive pressure to blow the regime to bits.

The Italian events have demonstrated the indomitable vitality of the working class. Fascism had smashed all the mass organizations of the Italian workers, their unions, cooperatives and political parties; murdered, imprisoned, exiled their best leaders; excommunicated revolutionary ideas and prohibited their expression; chained the workers to the bosses through the totalitarian state; isolated them from the rest of the world. Nevertheless, the defeated and atomized proletariat gradually reassembled their forces, lifted themselves to their feet, resumed their struggle for freedom and bread; brought forth new leaders out of their ranks; and moved to settle accounts with their oppressors at the first favorable opportunity.

Mussolini signed his death warrant by dragging the Italian people into the imperialist adventure of the Second World War. After three years of torture and horror, the masses began to revolt. Workers and peasants in uniform refused to fight, deserted, retreated or surrendered. As early as March 1943 strikes broke out in the northern industrial cities. The fascist regime was unable to cope with the revolt. Power was beginning to slip from Mussolini's hands. Further strikes and demonstrations during the following months made it apparent that Mussolini's murder machine was breaking down.

Terrified by the rising revolt of the people, by the military disasters and total bankruptcy of fascism, and by the prospective invasion of the mainland by Anglo-American armies, the possessing classes, headed by the monarchy and its military aides and inspired by the Vatican, hastened to depose Mussolini and set up a military-monarchist dictatorship in place of fascism. By a timely coup d'etat these palace conspirators hoped to forestall the workers' revolution.

But their removal of Mussolini provoked the most unintended and contradictory consequences. Instead of dampening the rebellious spirit, this move enormously heightened the revolutionary mood and spurred the masses to more daring action. No sooner did the news of Mussolini's downfall become known than the pent-up revolutionary feelings of the people manifested themselves with titanic force. The people

poured into the streets in continual joyous demonstrations; they hunted out and vented their wrath upon the fascist vermin; opened prisons and liberated political prisoners; exulted in their newly regained freedom. They demanded an end to the war. Parties came out from underground, trade unions arose, a free press was established, workers and soldiers councils were organized, and fraternization began. Returned exiles and liberated political prisoners took their places at the head of the masses. Through a series of militant strikes the workers addressed their demands to the Badoglio government.

These developments disclosed the indubitable features of a genuine revolutionary uprising in which the masses directly intervene as an active and decisive force in the determination of events. This stormy movement threatened to sweep over the heads of King Victor Emmanuel and his Marshal Badoglio and upset their new monarchist-militarist government which had succeeded fascism. To prevent any further development of the revolution, all the forces of reaction combined against the insurgent workers and peasants. Badoglio decreed martial law, outlawed public assemblies of more than three persons, took measures to drive the workers back into the factories, shot and jailed their leaders, censored the press, duplicating all the practices of Mussolini's dictatorship.

While trying to beat down the revolution in the first weeks, Badoglio dangled the prospect of peace before the war-weary Italian people. He utilized against the workers the military forces both of the Nazis and of the Anglo-American bloc with whom he was negotiating terms for collaboration. Badoglio and his generals permitted the Nazis to occupy northern Italy while Anglo-American planes bombed the revolutionary centers of Milan, Turin and Bologna.

### **Military-Monarchist Plots**

These military-monarchist plots against the revolution were facilitated and shielded by the treacherous policies of the Socialist, Stalinist and liberal parties. Instead of arousing and organizing the people for the overthrow of the Badoglio dictatorship and the creation of a Workers' and Peasants' Republic, these parties restrained the workers from struggle; advised them to trust the new government; and to wait until peace and liberty were bestowed upon them by the King and Badoglio in alliance with the Anglo-American forces. This combination of repression and deceit enabled the ex-accomplices of Mussolini to arrest the development of the revolution and to flee when ready into the embrace of the Allies.

After ruining the country, the utterly reactionary possessing classes have helped convert Italy into a battleground for the rival imperialist camps. Whichever side they may deal with at the moment, both sections of the divided bourgeoisie side with the foreign oppressors against their own people. While Mussolini calls upon the Italians to die for the resurrection of fascism and for nazism, the King and Badoglio solicit them to die for a military-monarchist dictatorship and for Anglo-American imperialism.

The cynical conduct of the Italian ruling classes confirms the great political lesson taught the workers by the French bourgeoisie after the fall of the Third Republic. The capitalist class cares nothing for democracy, national independence or the welfare of the masses. Profits, power, privileges and property are their sole concern. Whenever their political predominance and their social and economic interests are imperiled by the proletariat, the possessing classes are capable of unlimited crimes against the nation and the people.

The Italian workers and peasants can find their way to peace and freedom only by tearing political and economic

power out of the hands of the capitalists and uniting with their fellow workers of Europe in a war for socialism. The revolutionary fighters of Italy have already performed deathless deeds. They were the main force which toppled Mussolini and his rotten regime. Their actions constituted a magnificent prologue to the forthcoming European proletarian revolution. They inspired with fresh hope and courage the masses of all Europe.

The Italian workers, isolated and caught between the armies of the rival imperialist camps, have been temporarily driven back on the defensive. They were not given time to organize their own strong Marxist party. The treacherous Stalinist and reformist leaders therefore had a free hand to restrain and disorient the masses. The Axis and Allied armies are now, each in their own way, striving to finish the work of strangling the revolution.

Despite betrayal and bloody repressions, the Italian workers fight on. They thereby serve notice that the Italian revolution still lives. The continued resistance of the workers under the prevailing adverse conditions gives assurance that they will resume their forward march as soon as the opportunity presents itself.

The sequence of events since the fall of Mussolini has shown the interconnection between the Italian revolution and the European revolution. The further course of the Italian revolution is bound up with the development of the European, and especially the German, revolution. The heroic actions of the Italian workers have kindled revolutionary sentiments and ideas throughout the continent and shaken regimes from Madrid to Berlin and Budapest. The subsequent unfolding of the maturing revolution elsewhere in Europe will in turn impart a powerful new impetus to the temporarily arrested Italian revolution.

The developments in Italy have posed point-blank all the major problems of the European revolution. They have confirmed the Marxist conclusions that the only revolutionary social forces are the workers in alliance with the peasants. The only kind of revolution the working class can and will lead is the socialist revolution. The only alternative to the continued rule of monopoly capitalism is the Workers' and Farmers' Government based upon Workers, Soldiers and Peasants Councils.

### **Bourgeois Democracy**

The decay of capitalism and the acuteness of class conflicts forbid another extended period of bourgeois democracy for war-torn Europe. While interim bourgeois-democratic regimes may be set up here and there as by-products of uncompleted revolutionary movements, they must by their very nature prove unstable and short-lived. They must either give way before the conquest of power by the revolutionary workers or the military-police dictatorship of the capitalist counter-revolution.

The fact that the economic pre-conditions for an extended period of bourgeois democracy in Europe have disappeared does not, however, put an end to the role that bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democrats can play to stem the advance of proletarian revolution. With the collapse of fascism, capitalism will attempt to rule by means of naked military force, as already demonstrated in Italy. When this device proves powerless to control the insurgent masses, the native capitalists, allied with the invading imperialists, will push forward their treacherous democratic, social-reformist and Stalinist agents in an effort to strangle the revolution in a "democratic" noose. When all other defenses crumble, the forces of capital-

ism will strive to preserve their dictatorship behind the facade of democratic forms, even to the extent of a democratic republic.

This stratagem of the bourgeoisie may be aided by the revival of democratic illusions among considerable sections of the masses, especially in the absence of revolutionary mass parties. Under such conditions it is possible and even probable that the treacherous parties of social-reformism and Stalinism can play the leading role in the first stages of the revolution. The definitive victory of the revolution can be assured only by the leadership of a revolutionary Marxist party. The creation of such parties is the most important task of the revolutionary proletarian vanguard of Europe. Amid the gigantic convulsions which will shake European society this task can be accomplished in a very short time.

The revolutionary wave may be so overwhelming as to enable the workers to take power immediately following the collapse of the fascist dictatorship. Hence it is necessary to put forward the slogans of Workers Councils (Soviets) and All Power to the Workers Councils, as soon as the masses begin to move against the fascist regime or any makeshift substitute.

The Trotskyist parties everywhere have the basic duty to expose and fight against the illusions that stable bourgeois-democratic regimes, which have lost their material foundation, can be restored in Europe. They must wage irreconcilable warfare against the reformist and Stalinist parties, and their perfidious "People's Fronts" which attempt to limit the struggle of the workers to this reactionary utopian program. The Fourth International has long ago foreseen the emergence of this question in the first stages of the downfall of fascism and has spoken explicitly in regard to it. The program adopted by the Founding Conference of the Fourth International (1938) affirms that "once it breaks through, the revolutionary wave in fascist countries will immediately be a grandiose sweep and under no circumstances will stop short at the experiment of resuscitating some sort of Weimar corpse." The same program makes clear the value and necessity, as well as the limitations and subordinate character, of democratic slogans as a means of mobilizing the masses for revolutionary action.

To win the masses will require linking ourselves with them as we find them with all their illusions. Our task is rendered all the easier by the fact that democratic demands have revolutionary implications in Europe today, if seriously fought for, because the bourgeois governments cannot satisfy them. Appearing before the masses with the fundamental slogans of the *Socialist United States of Europe* and *All Power to Workers Councils*, the Trotskyists must also show themselves as the most resolute fighters for democratic demands. These democratic demands (freedom of press, the right to unionize, etc.) will be intertwined with the transitional ones and all of them

connected with our fundamental slogans of the *Socialist United States of Europe* and *All Power to Workers Councils*.

The proletarian revolution may begin in one country, but no European country can make its way out of the war and the catastrophic crisis of contemporary civilization by itself alone. A victorious revolution in any single European country would immediately be compelled to defend itself from military attack by the imperialists and would have to appeal for international proletarian aid by revolutionary means. In the ensuing struggles it would not be possible to maintain the outlived and arbitrarily drawn borders of the existing national states and the proletariat has no interest in attempting to do so. The national state which once provided the historical arena for the development of the productive forces has long since become a reactionary fetter upon them. The unpostponable historical task of the European peoples is the revolutionary destruction of the reactionary national state and the creation of the Socialist United States of Europe. Peace, security and prosperity can be assured only by the economic unification and socialist collaboration of the free nations of Europe. The only power capable of solving these tasks is the revolutionary proletariat. The central unifying slogan of its fight is "*The Socialist United States of Europe*."

Europe, today enslaved by the Nazis, will tomorrow be overrun by equally predatory Anglo-American imperialism. By their attempts to replace the Nazis as masters of Europe the Allied imperialists will thereby transfer to themselves all the consequences which prevented Hitler from "pacifying" the continent. The hatred of the European peoples, now directed and vented against their Nazi oppressors, will be turned tomorrow with intensified ferocity against Yankee imperialism. The burning desire of the European masses to get rid of the invaders and to achieve national freedom will necessarily become fused with their social struggle against the native ruling classes and their Anglo-American overlords; and impart a powerful impetus to the proletarian revolution. Fraternalization between the European workers and the soldiers of the occupying forces will become an imperative necessity on the road to the socialist revolution in Europe.

The entire combined forces of the European proletariat will be needed to organize and lead the people in revolutionary struggle against their oppressors. The slogan of *The Socialist United States of Europe* will serve as the great rallying cry of unity against the counter-revolutionary schemes of the Anglo-American bloc to colonize, exploit, and dismember the European continent. This slogan will inspire and guide the European workers in their struggle for power. Through the Socialist United States of Europe—and not otherwise—they will achieve their economic unification, fraternal solidarity, social and cultural progress. Only on this basis will ruined and shattered Europe be lifted to its feet again and rise to new heights.

## ***The Counter-Revolutionary Role of American Capitalism***

The preponderance of American power has everywhere begun to assert itself with increasing force. The industrial, financial and military might of the United States has become the decisive factor in the inter-imperialist struggle for world domination.

Washington's diplomatic dealings and political acts during the past year have served to expose the pretense that this war is being waged to defend democracy against fascism and to extend the "Four Freedoms" throughout the world. They

have disclosed the real reactionary character of the war aims of Washington which are dictated by the drive of American Big Business for political and economic mastery of the world.

The slogan of "the war for democracy" was considerably tarnished from the outset by the inclusion of the Vargas and other despotic governments in the "United Nations" coalition; by demonstrative friendship for the butcher Franco of Spain and Dictator Salazar of Portugal; by the wooing of Petain, the patronage of Otto of Hapsburg and various European mon-

archs-in-exile. Today the deals with Darlan and Badoglio outline in precise terms the counter-revolutionary policies and imperialist aims of Anglo-American capitalism.

The deal with Darlan, the executioner of Vichy and Hitler's collaborator, served to maintain French imperial relations and to secure the collaboration of the French capitalists, colonial governors and military caste. The old system of colonial oppression and super-exploitation remains unchanged under de Gaulle as under Darlan and Giraud; neither the African natives nor the French colonial workers have acquired democracy through Anglo-American occupation.

In Sicily AMGOT kept at their posts all but the most notorious and hated fascist officials and police. The people are forbidden to carry on political activities; the press is controlled. "The fascist label is removed," cables the *N. Y. Times* reporter, "but the same men carry on the same functions."

### Allied Policy in Italy

This policy has been climaxed by the deal with Marshal Badoglio and King Victor Emmanuel, who supported fascism for more than twenty years and whose sole backing comes from the industrialists, bankers and big landowners. Roosevelt and Churchill are using their armies and resources to prop up this military-monarchist dictatorship, detested and distrusted by the Italian masses. They do not want the Italian people to have a government of their own free choice for fear that such a regime would make inroads upon capitalist property and power.

The policies pursued by the Allied leaders in North Africa, Sicily and Italy demonstrate that their backing of ultra-reactionary forces is due neither to accidental deviations nor

"military expedients" but flows from a calculated plan which is dictated by the interests and necessities of the Anglo-American imperialists. They provide a preview of the Anglo-American program for Europe. These capitalist powers aim to impose new forms of servitude upon the European peoples. They propose to crush all manifestations of revolutionary independence by the European workers and to set up military-monarchist-clerical dictatorships under the tutelage and hegemony of Anglo-American Big Business. They have concluded an alliance with the world general staff of reaction and obscurantism, the Vatican, to promote the realization of their counter-revolutionary schemes.

The Allies shrink from encouraging popular democratic movements of liberation because they fear that these would release the powers of the working class and flow toward the channels of socialist revolution. Roosevelt and Churchill understand that it is not in the cards to establish stable "democratic" capitalist governments in Europe today. Given free scope, given their democratic rights, the European working class will not require overly much time to organize their revolutionary parties and to overthrow all of their capitalist oppressors. The choice, from the Roosevelt-Churchill point of view, is a Franco-type government or the specter of the socialist revolution.

The greatest contribution American revolutionists can make to the fight for socialism in Europe is to expose these counter-revolutionary aims; struggle relentlessly against them; arouse the American workers against the reactionary program of Big Business and awaken sentiments of solidarity with their hard-pressed class brothers in Europe and all other parts of the world.

## Significance of the Soviet Victories

The prodigious vitality of the October revolution is strikingly demonstrated in the Red Army victories over Nazi imperialism. While France and Italy, victors in the last war, crumpled before invading armies, the Soviet Union stood up under unprecedented defeats and losses and flung back the assault of the mighty Nazi military machine. The superior powers of resistance and recuperation of the USSR flow essentially from the fact that the proletarian revolution, which was crushed in France and Italy, conquered in the Soviet Union.

The unbreakable will to struggle and high morale of the Soviet armies and peoples refute those deserters who, recoiling against the crimes of the Stalinist bureaucracy, abandoned the workers' state in its hour of mortal peril. They gave up the Soviet Union for lost at the very moment when, despite the incubus of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the state which issued from the October revolution was about to exhibit unprecedented defensive powers in the supreme test on the field of battle.

The USSR, by virtue of the social foundations laid down by the October revolution, still remains a workers' state in fundamental contradiction with world imperialism. The reactions of the Allies to the Soviet successes and their repercussions among the capitalist rulers of the neighboring countries once again show that the imperialists recognize this fact. The prospect of further Red Army advances has terrified rather than encouraged Stalin's "democratic" allies.

The recently concluded Moscow pact, based upon an agreement to join forces against the European revolution, has not and could not eliminate the fundamental antagonism between the economic systems of the Soviet Union and the capitalist world. Stalin's pact with Roosevelt and Churchill, counter-

revolutionary in its essence as was his previous pact with Hitler, will prove no more enduring. Neither Stalin's subservience to imperialism, nor his counter-revolutionary aims in Europe, can abolish this basic antagonism. At a subsequent stage the underlying antagonisms must break into the open and, unless the European revolution intervenes or Stalin makes concessions to the imperialists which change the basic character of Soviet economy, will lead to armed conflict between the USSR and Anglo-American imperialism. In combining with the Anglo-American imperialists against the European revolution Stalin is aiming a mortal blow at the Soviet Union itself.

### Stalin's False Policies

The "enigmatic" character of Stalin's policies which so perplexes bourgeois commentators is explained by the contradictory position of the Soviet bureaucracy which conducts its reactionary nationalistic policies upon the social foundations of a degenerated workers' state encircled by imperialism. Stalin's nationalist outlook impels him to bargain with the imperialists for territorial and strategic concessions on the periphery of the USSR at the expense of the betrayal of the international proletariat. The inevitable consequences of such a treacherous policy have already been demonstrated by Stalin's dealings with Hitler. No sooner had Stalin's ally, Hitler, conquered Western Europe than he hurled his might against the Soviet Union.

Stalin's Anglo-American allies cannot act otherwise. Once established in a dominating position upon the European continent, they, like Hitler, would of necessity seek to surround and strangle the USSR in order to crush and dismember the

Soviet Union, restore capitalist private property, and open up a vast field of resources for imperialist exploitation.

Stalin is aware of the perils to the USSR implicit in the conquest and consolidation of Europe by the Anglo-American imperialists over the prostrate body of Germany. His foreign policy can appear to be temporarily effective only so long as Europe is divided between conflicting imperialist camps which can neutralize each other and permit him to maneuver between them. A decisive victory of one over the other can be followed only by war against the USSR.

The Soviet Union could frustrate the imperialist designs of the Anglo-American war-camp and secure itself against attack by stimulating and supporting revolutionary uprisings of the European peoples. But the Moscow ruling caste will no more dare to pursue this course against its present allies than against Hitler. A victorious proletarian revolution in any major European country would arouse and heighten the self-confidence of the Soviet masses, regenerate the October revolution and doom the hated Kremlin clique.

Stalin's policy, bankrupt through and through, consists in seeking a middle way between these two fundamental alternatives. On one hand, he sets up "Free Germany" and "Free Poland" Committees and supports the Yugoslav Partisans and similar movements as counter-weights to Anglo-American influence. He plays with the hopelessly reactionary program of reconstituting pseudo-democratic regimes upon a capitalist basis with a "friendly" orientation towards the USSR. On the other hand he concludes agreements with the Anglo-American imperialists to cooperate with them in the subjugation of Europe.

But Stalin's attempts to find a middle course are doomed to failure. Either the socialist revolution will triumph throughout Europe or the helpless continent will become the victim and vassal of Anglo-American imperialism. Either the Soviet Union will secure itself in alliance with the victorious European proletariat or it will be eventually conquered and destroyed by the imperialists. There are no other alternatives. The Stalinist bureaucracy is doomed in either case. It is not a new "class," as renegades and philistines denominate it, but

a parasitic caste, transitory in nature. There is no solution for the contradictions of Stalinism any more than for the contradictions of imperialism.

Stalin, exploiting the enhanced prestige of the Soviet Union as a result of the Red Army victories, seeks to gain control of the popular movements in Europe in order to use them for bargaining with the imperialists and, when nationalistic considerations require, sell them out. The Stalinist bureaucracy is capable of any treachery to socialism and the international proletariat. Past experience, particularly in Spain, leaves no doubt that the Stalinists, confronted with mass uprisings on the continent of Europe, would be ready to join hands with the imperialists and undertake to do their hangman's work. But to attempt such an enterprise is one thing; to carry it out successfully is another. There exists a vast difference in conditions between the Spanish revolution and the coming European revolution. A pre-war revolution in the corner of Europe could be isolated, strangled, and sold out as part of the Kremlin's diplomatic maneuvers. A revolution issuing from this war in any one country will rapidly spread across the national borders and assume continental proportions. Such a revolution cannot be harnessed by any bureaucracy, including the Stalinist, or permanently held down by any imperialist power, including the Anglo-American.

Those who draw defeatist conclusions regarding the prospects of proletarian victory in Europe ignore above all the independent revolutionary action of the masses and assign them a purely passive role as though the Stalinist bureaucracy and the Anglo-American imperialists were two gangs of butchers cutting up a dead carcass. The task of revolutionary fighters is to arouse the masses for independent action under their own banner, and not to speculate, as passive observers, on the designs of Stalin and the imperialists, and still less to take for granted the success of these designs.

The decisive power in Europe is the revolutionary proletariat. Upon this fundamental social force we Trotskyists stake our hopes and base our policy through all the twists and turns of Stalinist and imperialist diplomacy.

## *The End of the Comintern*

Stalin's dissolution of the Communist International officially ends the career of an international workers' organization which once, under Lenin and Trotsky, was the vanguard of the world proletariat and the hope of all the oppressed. The history of the Comintern since 1924 is a record of degeneration and capitulation. The betrayals of the Stalinist bureaucracy have inflicted the most disastrous defeats upon the world working class.

The successive steps in this process of degeneration after Lenin's death embrace the promulgation for the first time in 1924 of the theory of socialism in one country; the bureaucratization of the Comintern and all of its parties; the expulsion of the Bolshevik-Leninist opposition, first in the Russian party and then internationally; the capitulation of the German Communist Party, with its 600,000 members and its 6 million voters, without a fight, to Hitler fascism in 1933; the systematic betrayal of the proletariat of the world in the interest of the diplomatic policy of the Kremlin; the murder of the Old Bolsheviks; the assassination of Trotsky; the betrayal of the proletariat in the Second World War, first to Hitler and then to Roosevelt and Churchill.

Stalin's cynical repudiation of internationalism and in-

ternational proletarian organization renders the greatest ideological service to capitalism which aims to keep the workers divided along nationalist lines and to dupe and enslave them with nationalist illusions and prejudices. The renunciation of internationalism is the renunciation of the basic principles of scientific socialism. Ever since the Communist Manifesto of 1848 proclaimed "Workers of the World Unite!" the Marxist movement has taught that the emancipation of the workers could be achieved only by their common action on an international scale. The First, Second and Third Internationals were all originally organized to promote the class unity of the workers on a world basis in struggle against the capitalist system for the creation of socialism.

The Third International was born out of the experiences of the last world war, 1914-1918. From the first day of its birth it taught the necessity of international solidarity and fought every variety of national self-inclusiveness. Now, a quarter of a century later, when the bankruptcy of capitalism and its system of national states has developed into its death agony, in the midst of a second world war which threatens the existence of civilization, Stalin and his traitor

gang tell the workers there is no need of international cooperation and organization.

The formal burial of the Comintern ten years after it had ceased to exist as in any respect a revolutionary force, does not signify the end of Stalinist intervention in the world labor movement. The Stalinists still retain their organizations, their GPU apparatus and connections, and remain as always the cyn-

ical agents of the Kremlin's foreign policies. The Italian events have shown the capacity of the Stalinists for perverting the struggle of the workers, demoralizing and betraying the working class. The struggle against the false policies of the degenerate servants of the Kremlin remains as one of the most important tasks of the revolutionary vanguard in Europe and the rest of the world.

## ***The Coming Triumph of the Fourth International***

The Third International which has been buried by Stalin in shame and disgrace nevertheless left behind the greatest treasures for the future. Its founders, Lenin and Trotsky, belong to us. Their teachings, their example, their traditions are ours. The record of the long internal struggle from 1923 of Trotsky and his co-thinkers and disciples is the basic literature upon which the new generation which is destined to lead the revolution will be trained and educated. The first four Congresses of the Comintern produced documents which are the basic program of the movements of the Fourth International.

Out of the Third International, long before it died and was buried, came the initiating cadres of the Fourth International. The Fourth International is today the only workers' international. The Fourth International is Trotsky's crowning contribution to the liberating struggle of the world working class. The Fourth International rests upon the granite foundations of unfalsified Marxism. Trotsky incorporated into its program all the great lessons of the post-Leninist epoch and

armed the revolutionary vanguard with the indispensable ideological weapons of the coming struggle for power. The Fourth International alone carries on the progressive traditions of the first two Internationals and the work of the Comintern in its first years. The critical test of the war has destroyed every other international grouping except the Fourth International. Nothing and nobody can dissolve this International, the heir of the Communist International of Lenin and Trotsky. Today the numbers of the Fourth International are small but they exist in every important country. They are bound together by common principles and a common goal. Their ideas are correct, their program represents historical necessity, their victory is assured.

Under the banner of the Fourth International, World Party of the Socialist Revolution, the workers and colonial peoples will emancipate themselves from capitalism, fascism and war and create the socialist society of peace, freedom and plenty for all mankind.

# **World Role of U.S. Capitalism**

**By WILLIAM SIMMONS**

Due primarily to the successes of the Red Army the center of gravity in the Second World War shifted definitely some time ago in favor of the "United Nations." But within this not-so-united combination the United States from the beginning moved forward to occupy the dominant position, militarily and politically as well as economically. The American ruling class is now preparing for aggression and conquests on a scale that will put all previous similar drives for expansion in the shade. From this point onward the spectre of American imperialism will haunt the entire planet.

The condition of world economy under capitalism with its furiously growing productive forces and its rapidly shrinking markets can no longer afford sufficient room for *several* major powers to exist in relative concord alongside one another. Henceforth there will be room for one only. Out of this bloody carnage a single power is seeking to emerge supreme and to defeat *all* challengers. How well this is understood in London is not entirely clear; but there is positive proof that it is perfectly well understood in Washington.

President Roosevelt and his collaborators have committed the United States definitely and unalterably to that one single objective. The vast economic preponderance of the U.S. is to find its full and complete realization through this war.

The very nature of capitalist imperialist developments dictates such a course. Technological advance has reached its highest peak in the United States. Under the pressure of war economy it is making new and enormous strides each day. The strong internal market, sufficient for decades of capitalist expansion, is now entirely inadequate. On the one hand, the

monstrous accumulation of capital, if it is to provide a continuous profit return, requires open fields of investment and exploitation embracing nothing less than the entire world. On the other hand, the vastly accelerated mass production presents here its most complex problems. All the vital natural resources of the earth, located in various parts of the globe, become essential raw materials needed to feed the huge assembly lines. Undisputed control of the source of these materials, and of the avenues of supply, together with the fields of investment and exploitation, has for American capitalism become an irreducible minimum of conquest. The commander-in-chief does not hesitate. He aims to build the American armed forces to a point beyond challenge; their field of operation stretches across the seven seas.

Such unbridled expansion by one single power, however, can be accomplished only at the expense of all others. England in this case would be no exception. And so, while we have become accustomed to speak in terms of the United States putting Europe on reduced rations, as if it were already an accomplished fact, the policy that is now taking on definite shape in Washington would make this kind of ration system a monstrous world-wide reality.

We know well enough that economic preponderance is the decisive factor in present-day mechanized warfare. Not only that, but under conditions of capitalism this economic preponderance can find its full realization only through war. From this it follows quite logically that if the outcome of this war were to be finally decided solely by the military resources of the rival powers, American mastery of the world need not be

questioned. But the war is by no means confined to the military questions involved. War itself is an integral part of the whole social structure; and as such it becomes a sociological problem of the highest order.

Our present epoch includes both wars and revolutions. And we, on our part, accept the unceremonious intervention of revolutionary upheavals as a foregone conclusion. But this is also quite well understood in Washington. To the President and his collaborators, victory of American imperialism presupposes not only the subjugation of the Axis partners, but also the strangling of any and all revolutionary interventions.

To illustrate this contention, let us cite the fact that the Washington government, immediately upon its entry into the war and in spite of the anger aroused in the country at the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, nevertheless declared Hitler to be Enemy No. 1 and concentrated its attention and the overwhelming part of the forces at its disposal to the European scene.

The greatest potential rivalry to world hegemony does, indeed, come from fascist Germany with its highly developed technology and its formidable military machine. It is equally true that the European battlefield is the most important because it embraces most of the major colony-possessing nations. Moreover, it also embraces the Soviet Union with its potentially superior nationalized economy. And, as is known to anyone but the Stalinist hatchmen, the peaceful co-existence of the USSR alongside of capitalist economy is in the final analysis impossible. But there were other, perhaps weightier, and certainly more compelling immediate considerations motivating the specific course of America's rulers. It is in Europe, above all, that capitalism faces the most serious and the most imminent dangers to its continued existence. The threat of the dreaded revolutionary intervention is the most acute, precisely in Europe. And, let there be no doubt about it, this very question will be the pivot of the war and all the imperialist machinations from this point onward.

## U.S.-British Partnership

Insofar as American world conquests are concerned the British empire is bound to suffer the most. The rich colonial possessions with their abundance of essential raw materials and cheap native labor are the prize objectives in the present struggle for the redivision of the earth. England holds most of these cherished possessions. Hitler has none. England has something worth taking. Hitler has nothing at all.

England apparently now enjoys a solid partnership with the United States. But, in regard to this, it is well to remember what Trotsky told us in his introduction to *Whither England*:

"The United States and Britain," he said, "may be regarded as twin stars, one of which grows dim the more rapidly as the brilliance of the other increases." And to make this even clearer, Trotsky added: "The powerful and constantly growing influence of the United States on world affairs is rendering more and more impossible and hopeless the situation of British industry, British trade, British finance and British diplomacy."

This process is now being accelerated. England is today already reduced to the status of junior in the partnership. Tomorrow the senior will demand and collect payments from the junior partner by lopping off whole chunks of the empire. This is known of course to the sardonic Goebbels, who declared at the time of the first Hopkins visit to England that "the new heir to the estate had come to claim the property before the former owners were properly buried."

The fall of Singapore marked the turning point in the his-

tory of the British empire, the beginning of the loss of its colonial possessions. This does not mean to say that this fortress will remain henceforth in Japanese hands. Far from it. It is much more likely that Singapore will be retaken—by American armed forces—not, however, to be returned to England, but to remain an American springboard to the fabulous riches of Asia. Washington's policy leaves little doubt on that score.

While questions of proletarian revolutions in Europe and independence for Asia's colonial and semi-colonial peoples still hang in the balance this policy envisages the total exploitation of these fabulous riches of Asia, which are the colossal stakes in the struggle for the redivision of the earth.

## Tapping Asia's Resources

It is not the oriental splendor of gold, precious stones, ornate palaces and exotic gardens—the mystic lure of the past—that is now attractive. Asia is a rich storehouse of raw materials. But, above all, in these parts of the globe, India, China, the Dutch East Indies, etc., lives half of mankind. The majority of this population, numbering hundreds of millions, still subsists on a primitive basis of natural economy. The extent to which this large segment of mankind can be turned into producers and consumers of capitalist goods holds out an enticing prospect indeed for capital investments at a higher rate of profit.

The all-important question, however, arises: Is capitalism in its present stage of decay capable of converting Asia's teeming millions into producers and consumers of capitalist goods? In the final analysis such a transformation would actually mean the industrialization of these backward regions. But the fact is that industrialization in the sense of a corresponding progressively rising standard of living for the masses can be accomplished only on a socialist basis.

Capitalism is no longer progressive, and cannot function as a progressive force anywhere in the world, not even the American brand of capitalism, which is still the most vigorous. But the latter, owing to its industrial development, faces most acutely the dilemma of finding some avenue of expansion regardless of all rival powers, or else perish. Any attempt to extricate itself from this dilemma can very well presuppose a certain expansion of the feeble industrial bases of backward regions. Theoretically that cannot at all be ruled out. Moreover, such is the aim of American imperialism. Expressed in terms of dollar diplomacy this foreshadows new methods of imperialist exploitation.

India is the classic example of the golden era of crude colonial rule. Industrial and technological development was in the main retarded in favor of more immediate and more direct looting. In return for heavy levies, archaic systems of feudal landowners or princely domains were retained and hundreds of thousands of peasant communities kept deliberately within their century-old isolation. Social and economic backwardness has, of course, remained. Extreme poverty is its outstanding feature. During the year 1939 the per capita income for the country as a whole is reported to have been no more than \$18.00. In contrast to this policy, the American imperialist exploiters aim to pour in funds from their superabundance of capital available for lucrative investments accompanied by exports of tools and implements of production. There are raw materials to be tapped, refined and manufactured at the source; plants, railways, highways, airways to be built. Of course, this will mean industrialization—at least to a certain extent. Dollar diplomacy, in its final analysis—that is, if it should really find an opportunity to unfold—cannot possibly mean anything else. But we can be sure that it will mean,

above all, more intense exploitation of cheap native labor on a colossal scale.

We can speak today only of aims, of policy and of preparations that are in the course of development. Actual accomplishments are an entirely different matter. The extent and scope of this projected new and fiercer exploitation is directly and intimately connected with the sweep and power of the coming revolutions.

## Plans for Latin America

A very good indication of such aims, put into concrete terms, was afforded by the program of economic development for the Americas presented by the U.S. delegation to the Rio Conference about a year ago. A grandiose plan of exploitation weaved into the alluring pattern of the "Good Neighbor" policy.

Stated briefly, some of the main features were: The United States proposed the removal of all trade barriers, including tariff, import duties and other regulations or restrictions which impede the free flow of war or civilian supplies among the American nations. This to remain in effect for the duration of the war. Envisaged was the creation of a free international exchange currency, on a gold basis, and in accordance with which the countries of Central and South America would peg their respective national currencies. Great Britain, the Netherlands, China, India and all British dominions would also enter into this currency agreement. Further, the plan provided for the pooling of all Latin American resources, agricultural and mineral, for a common stockpile of war resources; the U.S. would provide finances and exports necessary for conversion. Among other projects the United States would agree to finance and build free trade ports throughout the Americas, provide transportation for exports and imports, underwrite and build storage warehouses, processing and refining plants for special conversion industries, as, for example, the conversion of the banana fields of Central and South America to production of industrial alcohol. The United States would further agree to complete the Pan American highway, and dredge a 60-mile canal to connect the Rio Negro river, a tributary of the Amazon, with the Casiguiare river, an Orinoco feeder. It would agree to extend to the east both the Amazon river route and the trans-Andean highway from Peru, as well as underwrite the cost and maintenance of airlines within the signatory republics. The manpower problem in this plan was to be solved through the establishment of an emergency civilian workers corps for the manning of war industries throughout the continent.

In return for the "generous" financing of all of these huge projects by the United States, the signatory South American republics were to lease the land necessary for 99 years. Moreover, they also were required to agree to forego their property rights under private ownership laws. But such properties, proposed the big "good neighbor," could again be acquired—by purchase—by the respective governments, or citizens, after a period of 10 years.

At the Rio Conference, Argentina and Chile were recalcitrant. They were not yet ready to submit to the "magnanimous" plans of the big "good neighbor." In order to bring them into line it appears that the United States will first have to demonstrate that it is *the one* supreme power.

Unquestionably, American capitalism represents today the strongest link in the imperialist chain. But it faces on the morrow the most convulsive interplay of contradictions growing out of its world position. Unbridled U.S. expansion will operate to turn the elements of its present strength into basic factors of weakness.

In the first place, American capitalism now seeks to extend

its foundation at a time when the capitalist system as a whole has passed its peak and is in decline and decay. The spiral of the capitalist business cycle is now definitely and irrevocably on its downward course. The fact that the youngest of the imperialist powers has forged ahead to assume the dominant position is proof, not of this system's rising to new and higher peaks, but rather of its approaching doom.

An extension of the American capitalist foundation can be accomplished only at the expense of rival powers—by further reducing their rations in world economy. The result is inevitable. Such limiting of rations will in each case impel the popular masses so much more surely into revolts and upheavals.

Yet while their system is plummeting in a downward spiral, all the major capitalist powers are engaged in a terrific expansion of technology for war purposes exclusively—for destruction. Truly, a completely chaotic world!

And so, while American imperialism is attempting to overcome its rivals it prepares simultaneously for the much more momentous task of "organizing" this chaotic world in order to assure a conqueror's peace. It is preparing to police the entire world. Without that all its aspirations to hegemony would come to naught. Primarily and above all, however, it is preparing to assume wholly and completely the task of defending the capitalist system as a whole against the oncoming proletarian revolution.

This is the basic conflict. One or the other must triumph. And any such active police intervention against revolutionary upheavals can serve only to aggravate the conditions from which revolutions spring and prepare the conditions under which the revolutions succeed.

Trotsky put this whole question in a nutshell when he said back in 1928: ". . . it is precisely the international strength of the United States and its unbridled expansion resulting from it, that compels it to include powder magazines throughout the world among the foundations of its structure."

## European Perspectives

But the fuses leading to these powder magazines are already lit everywhere. In Europe, in particular, the crucial stage is at hand both in regard to the military conflicts as well as to the imperialist political maneuverings. Moreover, the explosions have already begun.

Obviously the fall of Hitler's regime is now only a matter of very limited time. His "New Order" never even got started. What then? Is a restoration of bourgeois democracy on the European continent—a "democratic" regime—possible? For a limited time, yes—as an interim regime, because of the absence of an experienced, decisive, proletarian, revolutionary leadership—as an attempt to dam up the floodgates of revolution. Such a restoration may be imposed and supported from abroad; but it can never be invested with any degree of stability. Even the connivance of the Stalin bureaucracy in such an attempt would be impotent, for Stalin would be faced, only more sharply, with the same class contradictions that haunt the world capitalist rulers at every step.

Will a conqueror's "peace" mean a return to the old state system of Europe—with Germany dismembered and with the multitudes of small, seemingly independent but rival nations, all attempting to exist under the authority of a brand new police force from across the sea? This is as impossible as would be a stable bourgeois regime. Neither could offer a social or economic solution to the masses of Europe.

In the modern era of mass production small nations, hemmed in within narrow national borders, with extremely limited sources of raw materials and dwarfish tools and machinery of production, have no chance whatever of surviving



against the mighty competitor, not to speak of prospering or progressing. This, when considered together with the hard reality of diminishing rations in world economy, poses more clearly, more sharply and more inescapably, the alternative—the only alternative—a Socialist United States of Europe.

Any advance in industrialization by a victorious American capitalism penetrating colonial or semi-colonial spheres in Asia or Africa would bring its own deep repercussions. Instead of allaying the once awakened nationalist independence aspirations of the native populations it would add new fuel to the smouldering fires. Instead of suspending their struggle against imperialist exploitation it would lead this struggle to new heights of intensity.

The newest and most advanced in technological developments implanted in a social framework of backwardness, poverty and degradation could result only in giving these aspirations more positive content and rendering the struggle more explosive in character. Increasing numbers of backward natives would be turned into industrial and agricultural proletarians. Uprooted from their peasant surroundings of natural economy, their wants as well as their demands would grow. This quantitative change, that is, the numerical increase in the number of proletarians in the colonies, would, especially in this case, produce a qualitative difference; a change toward greater cohesion, greater consciousness and greater strength. These growing ranks of native proletarians would constitute an ever more powerful force in the anti-imperialist crusade. And the latter would merge directly with the class struggle, and thereby add greatly to its explosive power.

At the same time, the increased capital investments in these colonial fields of exploitation would of necessity imply an expansion of imperialist ownership and control of the sources and the means of production. Thereby the national bourgeoisie would become, if anything, only further reduced in its importance. The conclusion is inescapable. The role of leadership in the struggle against the imperialist exploiters falls exclusively to the native proletariat.

But the internal dynamics generated by these colossal efforts of expansion and conquests, we may be sure, will be most

sharply reflected in social relations at home. This country will not remain the tranquil sector from which mass forces can be drawn leisurely in any attempts to squelch disturbances or crush upheavals abroad. Of course, there will be internal repercussions in the U.S. as well. While the world is heading toward social crisis its main sector must become more and more deeply involved in all the convulsions.

Naturally, a total war for imperialist ends cannot be conducted by any ruling class without totalitarian means. Here, many of the methods are borrowed from the arsenal of fascism.

Totalitarian means are applied to one degree or another in war economy, in politics, in the armed forces; yes, in all social relations. In their practical essence they are all directed against labor. And this is not at all strange because these very means provide added protective armor for the possessing class against the dispossessed.

Owing to this salient fact all efforts to freeze class relations, for the sake of preserving the much vaunted "national unity," come to naught. The actually existing, and growing, monopoly control of economy allows less and less room for negotiation or conciliation between classes. Up to now this has led to a greater organization and greater solidarity on both sides. In the crucible of conflict this equilibrium falls asunder. Henceforth the fierce desperation with which the ruling class strives to save its system will, under the impact of the oncoming world social crisis, produce its opposite: confidence, boldness and consciousness of strength on the part of the working class, and an unswerving resolve to realize the socialist aims.

One of the outstanding expressions of American capitalist contradiction lies in the fact that the period of preparation for its greatest conquests also became the period of greatest expansion and advance of American labor organizations. Thus, what we have hitherto known as a form of combined development, that is, a highly advanced technology existing alongside of a socially and politically backward working class, promises to level out. Tomorrow this backwardness will be transformed into its opposite. The American working class will begin to prepare itself with truly American speed to fulfill its historic mission.

# Wartime Crimes of Big Business

By GEORGE BREITMAN

Big Business spouts patriotic speeches about "the boys in the foxholes" every time the workers ask for a wage increase to meet the rising cost of living. But Big Business patriotism is only a hypocritical cloak for self-interest. Profits always come first with the capitalists—even during a war which they want to win. To get profits and more profits they do not even hesitate to endanger the lives of the men in the armed forces of this country and its allies. Here is the proof:

On Jan. 17, 1943—more than a year after Pearl Harbor—the S. S. Schenectady snapped in half and sank off the West Coast, only a few hours after it had been delivered to the Maritime Commission. The American Bureau of Shipping reported the sinking was due to the steel plate on the ship which was "brittle" and "more like cast iron than steel." The U. S. Senate's Truman Investigating Committee took over the case and at a hearing before this body in Washington on March 23, 1943, the truth came out: The defective steel had been supplied by the Carnegie-Illinois Corporation, subsidiary of the giant United States Steel Corporation, whose offi-

cial had willfully and consciously delivered faulty material to the Navy, Maritime Commission and Lend-Lease administration and had falsified the steel test records to cover up their tracks.

Testimony before the Truman Committee showed that the faking of tests had covered at least 28,000 tons of substandard plate; that minor officials and employes who had complained to their superiors about the faking of tests had had their "ears pinned back"; that high corporation officials "instead of cooperating (with the Truman Committee) . . . attempted to delay and obstruct the investigation." U. S. Steel officials naturally "deplored" the situation, describing it as "so unnecessary," and tried to put the blame on "a few individuals" with good intentions who had grown "lax." This alibi, however, was decisively rejected by a federal grand jury in Pittsburgh in May, which refused to indict four individual employes offered as scapegoats and indicted the Carnegie-Illinois Corporation itself.

Equally indifferent to the murderous effects of its frauds

was the Anaconda Wire and Cable Company whose Marion, Ind., plant (financed by the government) was indicted on Dec. 21, 1942 for conspiring to sell the government defective communication and other combat wire, although its officials "well knew at all times" that use of such wire would "endanger the lives of men in the military service of the U.S.A." The Pawtucket, R. I., plant of the company was indicted a month later on similar charges.

The company was shown to have gone to great lengths to devise ingenious machinery for escaping government tests of its defective wire and thus getting the wire accepted for use by the armed forces of the United States, Soviet Union and Britain. Senator Kilgore has pointed out:

"The batteries on all our warships, including the anti-aircraft guns, are fired, controlled, aimed and ranges set, over this self-same cable, and if the cable is defective, the ship is helpless against aircraft attack. Also, the safety and success of the entire land combat forces are frequently dependent on messages sent overland by these self-same cables."

The government charged that the conspiracy began about Nov. 1, 1940 and continued up to Oct. 1, 1942. Commenting on this, Senator Bone said:

"The fact that we were suddenly plunged into a deadly war did not in any wise induce the defendants to change the criminal practices outlined in the complaint. After Pearl Harbor, and while the boys were dying on the battlefields, Anaconda and its officials continued their sordid work of defrauding the government by furnishing faulty cable."

Bone also declared the cable was "so defective that the persons deliberately creating the defects would be brought before a firing squad if they had done this in the war zones." Attorney General Biddle called it "one of the most reprehensible cases of defrauding the government and endangering the lives of American soldiers and sailors ever to come to the attention of the Department of Justice."

But it was no more reprehensible than the case of the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, subsidiary of the huge Curtiss-Wright Corporation, holder of the second largest war contracts in the country. Wright's Lockland, O., plant (financed by the government) was accused by the Truman Committee in July 1943 of falsifying tests on airplane engines, destroying records, forging inspection reports, changing tolerances allowed on parts, skipping inspection operations, etc. Inspectors who complained were intimidated or transferred. These activities were aided, abetted and covered up by Army inspectors and important Army officials influenced by the corporation. The result, according to the committee's report, was:

"Engines were built and sold to the government which were leaking gasoline. . . . Unsafe material has been discovered in completed engines ready for delivery. The company's own reports from its field representatives indicate that these parts had failed in a substantial number of cases. A substantial number of airplanes using this engine have had crashes in which engine failures were involved. . . . More than 25% of the engines built at the plant have consistently failed in one or more major parts during a three-hour test run. Spare parts were shipped without proper inspection. . . ."

Accused of exaggerating the gravity of conditions at the Lockland plant, Truman retorted: "The facts are that they were turning out phony engines and I have no doubt a lot of kids in training planes have been killed as a result. The Committee was conservative in its report, in order to prevent too much alarm over the situation."

A number of other and smaller companies were accused of the same crime during 1943: the Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation of Detroit, charged with fraud for willfully violating specifications for engine castings used in Rolls Royce air-

planes; the Sandusky Foundry and Machinery Company of Sandusky, O., whose officials pleaded guilty to faking tests on propeller sleeves used on Navy vessels; the National Bronze and Aluminum Company of Cleveland, convicted for selling the government defective sand and aluminum mold castings which are used in combat planes; the Antonelli Fireworks Company of Spencerport, N. Y., indicted for deliberately selling the Army faulty hand grenades and incendiary bombs; the Collyer Insulated Wire Company of Rhode Island, indicted for conspiring to avoid government inspection and deliver defective wire and cable.

## Biddle's Admissions

Nor does this exhaust the list. In a speech in Chicago on Aug. 23, 1943, Attorney General Biddle reported that Big Business frauds in this war are "much bigger than they were in 1917 or 1918"; he declared that 123 federal indictments had already been filed, with 1,279 investigations pending. Biddle did not indicate how many of these indictments and investigations involve fraud endangering the lives of servicemen, but there can be no doubt that a substantial number do.

In this same speech Biddle noted that so far 71 cases have been disposed of, with convictions or other penalties in about 90% of the cases. But, he complained, in many cases the offenders had gotten off with extremely light penalties. If anything, that was an understatement. While a few of the smaller companies have not gotten off scot free and some of their officials have even been given prison sentences, the great majority of offenders—and particularly the powerful ones—have escaped thus far with at most a mere slap on the wrist. Typical was the trial in Fort Wayne, Ind., June, 1943, of the Anaconda Wire and Cable Marion plant:

"The most obnoxious fraud ever presented to a court of the United States!" That was how a prosecuting attorney described the Anaconda case. "Revolted" was the comment by Federal Judge Thomas W. Slick, who presided at the trial. Nevertheless, not a single one of the indicted Anaconda officials spent an hour in jail for their crimes. Some were fined and given prison sentences, but the judge ordered the suspension of the prison sentences upon payment of ridiculously light fines. Anaconda attorneys at the trial volunteered the information that the company had made \$46,000 from the frauds, but the total fines imposed by Judge Slick came to \$31,000. Thus, even after paying these fines the company had a tidy margin of profit from its criminal activities!

The company got away so easily by pleading nolo contendere, that is, not contesting the charges and throwing itself on the mercy of the court. Its lawyers admitted "technical guilt" but not "moral guilt"; they explained their reluctance to go before a trial jury on the ground that such a course "would have impeded the war effort." The court, as has been shown, was exceedingly merciful. The judge explained the suspension of prison terms by saying he felt the guilty officials "could better serve the war effort by going back to work"; he did not say whether he meant the same kind of work for which they had been indicted. The judge also asserted that this disposition of the case would "stop anything of a similar nature elsewhere"—a view shared by almost no one else. Thus, the first important trial for wartime fraud endangering the armed forces indicated that Big Business can get away with murder.

"But," some people say, "these are the crimes of individual corporations, and Big Business as a whole should not be blamed for them." This is the position taken among others

by AFL president William Green and CIO secretary James Carey. Contemptible as this argument is—especially from trade union leaders who are supposed to defend the interests of the workers against their Big Business enemies—it deserves an answer.

First, it must be remembered that U. S. Steel and Curtiss-Wright are not two-bit businesses unrelated to the rest of industry. On the contrary, they are among the most powerful groups in American Big Business, being two of the 25 companies which hold 50% of the war contracts, and they are controlled by the same financial interests that dominate the national economy. Check the names of their chief stockholders and boards of directors and you will find listed the same respected bankers and industrialists who top the list of America's Sixty Families.

Second, let it be noted that the revelations of these wartime crimes have not evoked a single word of criticism or denunciation from a single important capitalist in this country. The employers' associations, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce—all have been as silent as the tomb, none has even implied that there is anything reprehensible in frauds that deliberately endanger servicemen's lives. This silence speaks volumes more than a million consciously deceptive statements by cowards like Green and Carey, for it indicates that the basic outlook of the corporations caught in the act is shared by Big Business as a whole.

### Cynical Whitewash

Third, there is the behavior of the capitalist press, which reaps fortunes from the big patriotic advertisements inserted in their pages by the powerful corporations (and paid for out of the taxpayers' money). For every line they have devoted to incomplete and confusing accounts of the war frauds, they have printed ten lines whitewashing the corporations and trying to smear the Truman Committee. When used at all, the stories of the wartime frauds have been relegated for the most part to the inside pages where they will not attract the same attention as the huge headlines and editorials denouncing the miners and other workers forced to strike in order to secure a living wage. This is not because the capitalist press fails to recognize news when it sees it; rather it is because the press recognizes that these crimes are a damning indictment of all capitalists.

Fourth, and most revealing, there is the following evidence about the steel and aircraft industries as a whole: A few days after the Truman Committee hearing on U. S. Steel had been concluded, the steel barons began to talk about a threatening decline of 35% in national steel production. "Lower production prospects are due to the demoralizing fear the Senate inquiry has instilled into every steel plant," said the *Pittsburgh Post Gazette* on Apr. 16, 1943. These reports—inspired by the steel corporations in an attempt to get the Truman Committee to lay off—showed that the entire steel industry feared such investigations. The only logical explanation for this fear is that other steel corporations besides U. S. Steel are engaged in illegal production practices.

Similarly, when the capitalist press was trying to blame the Truman Committee for an 85% decline in shipment of finished airplane engines at Wright's Lockland plant in the period between April and August, 1943, it was shown that Curtiss-Wright was not the only company panic-stricken by the prospect of investigation: "Leading industrialists and production experts the country over are carefully watching the case,..." the *New York Times* reported on Sept. 2. "The extent to which other companies and other plants of the Curtiss-Wright

group have been affected by what happened at Lockland is difficult to estimate. Many other concerns are said to be worrying, however, lest they run into similar situations. . . ." But why should they be worrying if they are not guilty of the same crimes as Curtiss-Wright? Their apprehension is good reason for concluding that the Truman Committee investigations have scratched only the surface of Big Business crimes in this war and that further investigation would involve all the other big monopolies and corporations.

### True to Form

The sale of defective war material has shocked some people more than the other wartime activities of the corporations because it is so openly cynical and in such flagrant contrast to the high-minded sentiments spread over the newspaper advertisements. As a result there is a tendency to look upon this practice as something exceptional and unrelated to the general policies of capitalism. But at bottom it is no different in kind from the other "scandals" perpetrated by Big Business every day in the year.

The explanation for the policies and activities of the monopolies and corporations is always to be found in the profit motive. No employer keeps his factory running unless there is profit to be made from it. This is as true in wartime as in peacetime, with only one difference: in wartime there is usually more profit to be made and the capitalists, maddened by greed, sweep aside all restraints and obstacles in the way of ever greater profits. Rare indeed is the case of an employer who has said: "I have got enough." The tendency of the ruling class is always to go after more and more. Billions are being made on war contracts, but even the most powerful corporations do not disdain to pick up a few millions extra by manufacturing substandard products and then palming off the defective material as the article for which they are being paid such generous prices.

But in what sense does this differ from the normal practices of capitalism? In peacetime Big Business' concern for profits and profits alone often results in the shutting of the factories. The hardships this brings to the whole working class, the undernourishment it visits on millions of children, the diseases that follow in its wake, surely take as heavy a toll of human life and well-being as the war frauds. Who will say which is worse? Who will contend that the cause is different?

What about war profiteering? The people were solemnly assured that there would be no war millionaires this time. Yet profits were bigger in 1942, after the payment of taxes, than they were during the last war or in the boom year of 1929. And they were 14% higher during the first six months of 1943 than during the same period in 1942, according to a report by the Department of Commerce. Which scandal is more detestable—the war frauds or the war profiteering which will place heavy burdens on all the masses and act as a drag on their living standards for years to come? And who will deny the connection between the two?

No, the Big Business "scandals" of this war do not begin and end with their cynical disregard for the safety of the servicemen. They began long ago, they touch on every aspect of the war program and they vitally affect the rights and conditions of every worker.

Ask the sailors at Pearl Harbor and they will tell you what they think about the manufacturers who sold the Japanese warlords the scrap metal used to make the bombs that were dropped upon them.

Ask the marines in the malaria-infested South Pacific jungles what they think about the capitalists who restricted the production of quinine and other drugs so that they could maintain high prices for these products.

Ask the aviators and the merchant marine men who survived the sinking of their ships what they think about rubber barons and oil magnates whose demand for monopoly control of rubber in the post-war period impeded the production of synthetic rubber necessary to build rafts and other life-saving equipment.

## Critical Shortages

There are shortages of aluminum, binoculars, critical chemicals, magnesium, tetracene, dyestuffs, tungsten carbide, etc., all important materials in wartime. The reason? Because Standard Oil, du Pont, General Electric, ALCOA, General Motors and the other big corporations formed cartels with their fellow monopolists in Germany, Britain, France, Japan, etc., for the purpose of restricting production, maintaining monopoly and raising prices. More lives have been lost in this war because of these cartel deals than because of the sale of defective material.

Other shortages affecting the war program can be traced directly to the fact that the big corporations have hogged the great majority of the government's war contracts. As Assistant Attorney General Tom C. Clark has reported:

"At the start of the war program in this country 175,000 companies provided 70% of the nation's manufacturing output, while today, two and a half years later, the ratio has been reversed to the point where 100 corporations hold 70% of the war and essential civilian contracts. This group, he declared, has obtained the bulk of the fourteen billion dollars worth of new plants built at government expense." (*New York Times*, April 23, 1943.)

As a result many small plants have been driven to the wall; with them disappeared their productive capacity, while many of the new plants remain partly unused and unproductive. A typical example of how the monopolists impede production is the shipbuilding industry, where the revolutionary Higgins assembly-line production program was strangled because it was considered a competitive threat to the position of powerful companies like Bethlehem Steel.

Other wartime blessings for which the workers can thank Big Business are: the speedup, which resulted in 1942 in a greater number of casualties on the industrial front than on the military front; an artificially created manpower shortage—due to labor hoarding by the manufacturers and big agricultural interests, discrimination against Negro and women workers, managerial inefficiency—which is used to justify freezing the workers to low-paid jobs; an aggravation of the housing crisis in many war production centers, resulting in increased sickness, disease, child delinquency and disruption of family life; food shortages designed to force price rises.\*

Big Business could not get away with all this if there were a government in Washington seriously interested in stopping it. But the government is itself the outstanding advocate of capitalism. The government is well aware of the attitude of Big Business, as was shown in Monograph No. 26, "Economic Power and Political Pressure," issued by the government's Temporary National Economic Committee in November, 1940, and stating in part:

\*The full story of shortages deliberately created by the food corporations is told in "Your Standard of Living—What Is Happening To It" by C. Charles, Pioneer Publishers, New York 1942.

"Speaking bluntly, the government and the public are 'over a barrel' when it comes to dealing with business in time of war or other crisis. Business refuses to work, except on terms which it dictates. It controls the natural resources, the liquid assets, the strategic position in the country's economic structure, and its technical equipment and knowledge of processes. The experience of the World War, now apparently being repeated, indicates that business will use this control only if it is 'paid properly.' In effect, this is blackmail, not too fully disguised."

Blackmail it may be, but the government has given in to it without complaint or rancor. It has given the employers the greatest profits in their history; and to pay for these profits, it has piled one scandalous tax bill after another on the masses, frozen wages and jobs, prohibited strikes, prevented effective price control, abolished all limits on big salaries. Big Business has no reason to complain that it is not being "paid properly," according to its own lights. To make doubly sure that they don't miss any opportunities, the corporations have offered and the government has appointed a considerable number of dollar-a-year men to head the most important wartime agencies and posts. Even the New Deal Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes admitted on July 21, 1943, that "it is the business men who are running the war." And while running it, they see to it that the interests of the corporations are well protected.

## Government Cooperation

Even after Pearl Harbor the government was still trying to get industry to discontinue illegal practices hampering war production. Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold complained in his report to Congress on Jan. 3, 1942, about:

"... the attitude of powerful private groups dominating basic industries who have feared to expand their production because expansion would endanger their future control of industry. . . . There is not an organized basic industry in the United States which has not been restricting production by some device or other in order to avoid what they call the 'ruinous overproduction after the war.'"

The government pleaded with the corporations to cooperate, to discontinue their cartel deals and violations of the anti-trust laws, and to let other companies use their patents for war production; the corporations flatly refused. Early in 1942 the government—in order to prevent the complete breakdown of the war program, that is, in order to protect the interests of the capitalist class as a whole—was finally compelled to institute a series of suits against a number of monopolies, making public the damning facts about which the government had been aware for many years.

The corporations had been caught red-handed. But the government, once having gotten their promise to permit the use of the patents during the war, dropped the charges and let these corporations escape virtually unpunished. Standard Oil, for example, whose restriction of synthetic rubber production had blocked the whole war production program, was permitted to plead *nolo contendere* and was given a \$50,000 fine (which amounts to about the average profit this corporation makes every hour). The other corporations got away even more easily. To make the government's attitude unmistakably clear, Arnold, Biddle, Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of Navy Knox wrote Roosevelt on March 20, 1942, in the midst of the public revelations about the cartels, and said that "some of the pending court investigations, suits and prosecutions under the anti-trust statutes by the Department of Justice, if continued, will interfere with the production of war materials. . . . In those cases we believe that continuing such prosecutions at this time will be contrary to the national interest and

security." This was some more "blackmail," a threat to hold up on production if the prosecutions were continued, with government officials covering up for the corporations. Roosevelt answered: "I approve the procedure outlined in your memorandum to me. . . ." Thus, punishment of the corporations for violating the laws has been postponed to some remote future in the post-war period, if then.

The same course has been followed in connection with the defective war material cases. Reluctantly the government has been compelled to prosecute in a few of the more flagrant cases, but each time high government representatives have stepped forward to make light of the corporation crimes.

The War Production Board held a closed meeting on the U. S. Steel case, but its only outcome was a statement by WPB chairman Donald Nelson deploring a "more than usual" vigilance on the part of steel plant inspectors and a WPB telegram to several steel companies urging them not to lean over backwards while seeking "unattainable perfection" in meeting production specifications. Other key government spokesmen issued statements implying that there was no need to worry about the practices of U. S. Steel.

## Labor Must Act

When a wave of protest arose after the Truman investigation of Curtiss-Wright, Undersecretary of War Patterson, while not daring to deny the truth of Truman's charges, nevertheless issued a statement asserting that conditions at the Lockland plant were "much less sensational than some of the inferences drawn in recently published statements." An Army investigation board under Lt. General William S. Knudsen also had to admit the Truman Committee charges were accurate but sought to minimize their importance. Both these and other government officials seemed more concerned in quieting public indignation than in taking measures against the Curtiss-Wright criminals.

And during the period between Anaconda Wire and Cable's indictment and trial, the Offices of the Inspector of Navy Material in New York and Cincinnati went out of their way to commend Anaconda for its "good workmanship" and to announce that it was being considered for an "E" award. During this same period Army and Navy procurement officials showed how little concerned they were about the corporation's malpractices by awarding Anaconda's Marion plant almost \$4,000,000 in additional business.

The trade union and liberal press have protested against most of the Big Business crimes and have often criticized government officials for their behavior. But they continue to regard each of the crimes and whitewash moves as a unique incident, isolated from all the others and caused by bungling or some other bad quality of individual capitalists and government officials. That is one reason why the union leaders and liberals are unable to work out a program to effectively combat such crimes.

The workers who are seriously concerned about the present situation must take another approach. They must learn to look at all the crimes of capitalism together as a whole and to understand that each individual "scandal" is part of and flows from the biggest scandal of all—Big Business domination not only of the war program but of the whole national economy. They must recognize that Big Business could not get away with its crimes were it not for the collusion or at best indifference of the government officials. Only on this basis can they determine on effective countermeasures. For Big Business will not voluntarily change its methods, and the administration and Congress will not and cannot make the

punishment fit the crime. If anything is to be done, it will have to be done by the labor movement.

Whatever else one may conclude from these government actions, it is safe to say that they do not have the effect of strongly discouraging war frauds.

Some people have suggested the passage of legislation imposing the death penalty on manufacturers whose fraudulent practices endanger the lives of the men in the armed forces. A bill providing this penalty or a million dollar fine has even been introduced into Congress. It is hard to imagine the present Congress—which is the servant, body and soul, of the big corporations—ever adopting legislation to punish them. The members of the administration who have been rushing into print to defend the corporations accused of fraud likewise have no interest in seeing such a bill passed.

Because its adoption would undoubtedly have the effect of discouraging many corporations from continuing their murderous frauds, a Socialist Workers Party member of Congress would vote for this bill. But as he did so, he would warn the workers that its passage alone could not put an end to the crimes of Big Business for it would not do away with the basic causes of such crimes: the profit motive and the corporations' domination over the means of production.

To get to the root of the problem, the Socialist Workers Party advocates that the ownership and control of industry be taken out of the hands of the capitalists. This course of action will be regarded by Big Business as far more drastic than any bill providing the death penalty and it will be fought by them with every weapon they have, but it is the only practical answer to capitalist mismanagement of industry.

At its June 1943 meeting in Toronto, the international executive board of the United Auto Workers, CIO, drew up a series of proposals designed to ensure full employment in the post-war period. One of these called for government ownership after the war of "monopolistic industries and of industries strategically essential to the national safety."

## Why Postpone?

This is a sound idea, and offers the key to the solution not only of unemployment, as nationalized production has shown in the Soviet Union, but also of the criminal practices of the capitalist class. Let industry be owned by the government and operated under the control of committees democratically elected by the workers. The profit motive would be removed, and with it would be removed the incentive to produce and sell dangerously defective products. The costs of production would be lowered and the workers' committees, having no interest in exacting profits from the blood of the soldiers, would guarantee production and honest testing in the interests of the masses of the people.

The UAW executive board proposes post-war government ownership of industry. But why wait until the war is over? The contents of this pamphlet demonstrate that Big Business domination of industry menaces the welfare and safety of the masses in wartime as much as if not more than in peacetime. The war may last a long time, and so long as Big Business is in control, the number of victims of capitalist greed will continue to mount. Meanwhile the big corporations are using the war itself to smash thousands of smaller businesses and to tighten their own grip on industry. The longer the workers wait, the harder it may prove to expropriate the capitalists. The time to act is now.

It will not be easy to put this program into effect. Union men and women who have had to strike for a wage increase of even five cents an hour know how vindictively the employ-

ers resist every challenge to their profits; capitalist ferocity will be multiplied a hundred times when the workers try to take the factories away from them. The daily press and radio commentators will become frenzied in their denunciations and incitations to violence against the workers; all the instruments of capitalist propaganda will be turned on full blast to bolster the myth that production cannot continue without the capitalist coupon-clippers, that society cannot function without parasitic exploiters. And, of course, the capitalists will be aided throughout in this campaign by their political parties and their agents in the government.

The question of who is to own and operate industry is a political problem. To make the change that is necessary the workers will have to conduct a political struggle against Big Business. The employers already have their political organizations, the Republican and Democratic Parties, and to fight them successfully the workers will have to create a political organization of their own. The capitalist parties are last-ditch supporters of the system of private property and private profit which enables the employers to do what they wish with the

means of production. The workers need a party which will be just as firmly devoted to the program of government ownership and workers' control of industry. That means an independent labor party, based on the trade unions and running its own labor candidates in elections.

The present government has already shown where it stands on this question. The billions of dollars worth of factories, properties and equipment now owned by the government are going to be turned over at bargain prices after the war to the employers, who will use them to swell their profits and to further strengthen their monopoly control. That is why the workers and their party must fight for the creation of a new kind of government, one which will aid, not oppose the struggle for government ownership and workers' control, a Workers' and Farmers' Government.

The wartime production crimes have torn away the mask from the rapaciously greedy countenance of Big Business. Now the working people must tear out of the capitalists' hands the power to continue their criminal activities.

October 1, 1943

## From the Arsenal of Marxism

EDITOR'S NOTE: Leon Trotsky's monumental work in organizing and modernizing the Red Army during the seven and a half years he held the post of Commissar of War (1918-25) is one of the main reasons for the unprecedented power shown by the Soviet Union on the military arena. Since Lenin's death, Stalin has aimed, above all, to destroy all documentary records of Trotsky's military role and work. In connection with the 26th Anniversary of the October revolution it is only fitting to restore, at least partially, the historic record as it relates to the glorious Red Army, and Trotsky's role in its achievements.

A vital chapter of this record is Trotsky's struggle during and immediately after the Civil War against false and ruinous ideas in military work, which were in those days

invariably sponsored or backed behind the scenes by Stalin. Stalin not only opposed at the beginning the utilization of military specialists, etc., but later championed the proponents of "proletarian" military doctrine.

In 1921-23 an acute struggle over theoretical military questions, directly affecting the work of reorganization then at hand, took place among the Soviet military top circles. Very little is now known about it, especially in this country. The two speeches of Trotsky reprinted below relate to this crucial struggle. They were delivered on May 8, 1922 at a session of the Military Scientific Institute, attached to the Red Army's Military Academy. Trotsky's views prevailed, clearing the road for the further building of the military arm of

the first workers' state.

These two speeches are, at the same time, of utmost value in still another connection, namely for the study of the Marxist method, especially in its application to the most remote parts of the social superstructure. In this respect, too, all of Trotsky's contributions to theoretical military questions comprise one of the richest treasures of Marxist thought.

These 1922 speeches were first published in Russian by the Supreme Military Council of the Red Army in its three volume publication of Leon Trotsky's "How The Revolution Armed Itself" (Moscow, 1925. Vol. III, Book 2, pp. 271-289). This is the first time they appear in English. The translation from the Russian original is by John G. Wright.

# Marxism and Military Knowledge

By LEON TROTSKY

I

## OPENING REMARKS

Permit me to declare open the 51st session of the Military Scientific Society.

The subject of today's discussion will be: The place of military knowledge and military skill in the system of human knowledge as a whole. Let me confess at the outset that the responsibility for initiating this discussion falls largely upon me. Not that I consider this complex, abstract, theoretical-epistemological and philosophical question—in the best and worst meaning of these words—to be the most current and unpostponable of our military studies. But it does seem to me that such questions are forced upon us by the ideological

development, and a certain theoretical-ideological controversy among our army tops.

In one of our publications, closely associated with your Society, I happened to read two articles,\* one of which presented the argument that military science cannot be built and the methods of Marxism cannot be applied to its tasks, inasmuch as military science pertains to the order of natural sciences. Accompanying this article was a polemical and critical reply, apparently reflecting the views of the editors. In contrast, this reply was an attempt to prove that the methods of Marxism are *universal* scientific methods—and therefore retain their validity in the field of military science. Let me

\* *Red Army*, No. 12, March 1922.—Ed.

again confess that both these viewpoints seemed incorrect to me: Military science does not belong among natural sciences, because it is neither "natural" nor a "science." Our discussion today may perhaps bring us closer to clarification on this question.

But even if one grants that "military science" is a *science*, it is nevertheless impossible to grant that it can be built with the methods of Marxism; because historical materialism isn't at all a universal method for all sciences. This is the greatest possible misconception which, it seems to me, can lead to the most harmful consequences. It is possible to devote an entire lifetime to military affairs very successfully, without ever devoting any thought to theoretical-epistemological methods in military matters—just as I am able to take daily readings of my watch without knowing anything about its internal workings, its interplay of wheels and levers. If I know about the numbers and the hands, then I can't go wrong. But if, not satisfied with the movement of the hands on the dial, I want to talk about the construction of the watch, then I must really be acquainted with it; there can be no room for independent thinking here.

### A Correct Attitude to Philosophy

In the course of a previous discussion (on unified military doctrine) I adduced one of the traits of George V. Plekhanov, the first crusader for Marxism on Russian soil, a man of broad vision and high gifts. Whenever Plekhanov observed that questions of philosophic materialism and historical materialism were being opposed to one another, or on the contrary lumped together, he hotly protested. Philosophic materialism is a theory imbedded in the foundation of *natural sciences*; while historical materialism explains the history of *human society*. Historical materialism is a method that explains not the structure of the entire universe, but a rigidly *delimited* group of phenomena; a method that analyzes the development of historical man. Philosophic materialism explains the movement of the universe as matter in the process of change and transformation; and it extends its explanation to include the "highest" manifestation of the spirit. It is difficult, if not impossible, to be a Marxist in politics and remain ignorant of historical materialism. It is quite possible to be a Marxist in politics and not know about philosophic materialism; such instances can be adduced to any number. . .

And whenever any Marxist (in our old terminology, "social democrat") used to stray into the domain of philosophy and began muddling there, the deceased Plekhanov would go after him without mercy. How many times was he told,

"But, after all, George Valentinovich, this happens to be a very young man who hasn't had the time for questions of philosophy; he was busy fighting in the underground."

But Plekhanov would with reason reply:

"If he doesn't know, then let him keep quiet. Nobody is forcing him to open his mouth. . . . There is nothing said in our program about a social democrat's having to have all his four feet shod with philosophic materialism. As a party member, you must be active; you must be a courageous fighter for the workers' cause; but once you do invade the field of philosophy, beware of muddling. . . ."

And Plekhanov would rise to his full height and reach for his superb polemical whip. Anyone reviewing the history of our party could still find discernible to this very day the marks left by this whip on many ribs.

My premise is that we should follow in the excellent tradition of the deceased Plekhanov in the field of applying philosophy to military affairs. We are not at all obliged to occupy ourselves with questions which are known as "gnos-

ological," "theoretical-epistemological," philosophical; but once we do take them up, then it is impermissible to muddle, and to go wandering with wrong instruments into an entirely different field in the attempt to apply the method of Marxism directly to military affairs, in the proper meaning of this word (not military politics).

It is the greatest misconception to try to build in the special sphere of military matters by means of the method of Marxism; no less a misconception is the attempt to include military matters in the list of natural sciences. Unless I am mistaken, the proponents of both these tendencies are ready to take the floor today; in all likelihood, they will be able to expound their views better than I can. After they have spoken, we shall take up the discussion.

### Lessons of the Previous Discussion

I don't think, Comrades, that we shall arrive today at any binding decisions on this question. But if we do succeed in introducing some clarity into the issue, and if we draw the conclusion that caution must be exercised in applying Marxism directly in special creative spheres, then this alone would be a major conquest. In our discussion over "military doctrine," which has a certain bearing on today's question, we kept, as you all know, circling around and muddling to our heart's content; and I don't think we were greatly enriched thereby—unless in the negative sense only: all became convinced that nothing really significant came of it. We undertook to build a "unified military doctrine" on a "proletarian, Marxist" foundation, and after debating the matter, we retraced our steps and decided to review our statutes on the basis of our past experience. And we are reviewing them—slowly, limping along the roads and also into the pits, since our roads are rough country roads and there is no lack of ravines.

But I firmly hope that real benefits shall accrue from this review of our statutes. We will not think up a new military doctrine by means of special commissions, but, by way of compensation, we shall get rid of a lot of rubbish and set down more precise formulations in some things. So far as our today's session is concerned, the benefits of discussing the broad question of the relation between military affairs and Marxism will be rather those, so to speak, of mental hygiene: There will be less confusion. And in practical terms our task is: Let us learn to speak more simply about the cavalry; let us not clutter up our discussion of aviation with ostentatious Marxist terminology, high-sounding terms, pompous problems which turn out, one and all, to be hollow shells without kernel or content. . . .

This concludes, Comrades, the introductory remarks which I have taken the liberty to make. For the sake of the audience comprised of comrades, acclimated to questions of philosophy in varying degrees, I must very urgently request all reporters and those who take part in the discussion to express themselves in the most concrete terms as precisely, simply and lucidly as possible. I believe that I come quite close to the truth in saying that not everybody here has studied philosophy, so to speak, from beginning to end; and assuredly, some of us have not even read the most elementary books on philosophy. I believe that such a presentation, that is, one designed for an audience not expert in philosophy, will also have the added advantage of helping us examine the content of each reporter's kit bag. For philosophic terminology is an artifice akin to make-up. . . . The make-up may be terribly imposing but underneath it there is nothing at all. Yet, as I have had occasion to note from many articles in our military publications, this occultism for the augurs, this occult procedure for the initi-

ated, these medieval traditions and practices are retained among us. And so, I ask you to expound your ideas as simply as possible.

With your permission, Comrades, we shall proceed with the discussion.

## II

### TROTSKY'S SUMMARY SPEECH

The speakers' list has been concluded. Allow me in summation to say a few words in defense of an art which, in my opinion, has been slighted here, slighted at the expense of military science, which several comrades have in their turn defended against our slurs, in my opinion imaginary.

Comrade Ogorodnikov, the last speaker, and a few others before him directed their attack especially at Comrade Svechin, against whom I, too, have had occasion to polemicize. They are indignant: How could a guild member of military science suddenly renounce himself, uncrown military knowledge and declare that there can be no talk of science here?

In a roundabout way Comrade Polonsky also touched upon this question. Let us get oriented, he says:

"Knowledge is either scientific or non-scientific. If military matters are scientific then we are dealing with a science; if they are unscientific, then... they are worth a groat."

Comrade Polonsky compared an army leader to a surgeon. Not a bad comparison! A surgeon performs an operation. This is an action which requires certain habits, a certain art; but for a student, watching the operation, says Comrade Polonsky, it is a science. But that isn't so at all. For the student, too, the operation is not a science but a schooling. If a painter makes a sketch, then this is art; others sit around and copy. What would you say this is for them, for the students? Is it a science? No. It is a schooling, which is not quite a science. This is the way in which "science" was understood in Suvorov's days when the soldiers were made to run the gantlet. This was even known as the "science of victory."

### Art and Science

One of the speakers said that it was impermissible to compare military affairs to art. Art, if you please, has esthetic criteria. And what about the practical arts? What about the art of building bridges, the art of building houses, the art of canalizing? A practical art, let us not forget, also has a scientific basis. In the last analysis all sciences have, of course, grown out of practice, out of the crafts and other varied activities; later on, however, they freed themselves from this direct, "coarse" association, while nevertheless preserving their historical, utilitarian significance. In making chemical experiments or following the crossing of species in a laboratory, a scientist may be pursuing an immediate practical aim, but he also may not be. On the other hand, even a purely theoretical conclusion serves in the last analysis to enrich practice.

An art may base itself on a multiplicity of sciences. One man works in science for the sake of science, "selflessly" as the saying goes; another operates with scientific conclusions only for practical goals; a third, guided by creative instinct, catches up intuitively what he requires for practice. Comrade Snessarev hit the nub better than the others when he proposed to apply the term "science-ized art" to military affairs. A dozen other terms can of course be devised, nor do I propose to make Snessarev's term obligatory but, in my opinion, the author of this term showed himself freest from guild prejudices when he said, "Even the denomination of a craft does not scare me; all the less so will I shy away from the denomination of an art."

Many comrades approached the question under discussion from an "aristocratic" standpoint, from the standpoint of commanders—military leaders of today or tomorrow. But if we take military affairs as a whole, then the fact remains that every soldier must know his maneuver. That maneuver which a *rank-and-file* infantry soldier knows or has to know—is this a science or no? It is said about a *commander* that he must know geography and history—it would not be amiss, let me add, for him to learn political economy as well; he must know the military history of at least the last hundred years. But are military matters then exhausted by the army commander? No. Let us not forget the soldier, the individual platoon commander among whom military matters rest on the plane of a craft skill.

If a soldier doesn't know his maneuver, then he is simply cannon fodder; if he does know it, then he is a "craftsman." Beyond this what you have is already an art which utilizes the methods and conclusions of many sciences, employed in military matters. For example, methods of geography can and must be utilized for military affairs. A knowledge of statistics is absolutely required. Ethnography is required. So is history. All these are sciences. But the military business itself is not a science. We must distinguish, on the one hand, between science which establishes the *lawfulness of phenomena*, their causality and art, on the other—an art which has in view the *expediency of devices*. The expediency of devices, habits and methods and the lawfulness of objective phenomena—these are not one and the same thing. I am better able to elaborate an expedient method, the better I am familiar with the lawfulness of events; but it is nevertheless impermissible to confuse the latter with the former.

### False Objections

Our military method in the Soviet Republic is determined in the last analysis by our technology, class correlations, and so on. But from these correct Marxist postulates it is impossible to deduce the subdivisions of a cavalry regiment. Gleb Uspensky depicted exquisitely in his story, "The Land's Power," how a peasant's entire life and all his thoughts are under the sway of the land and are wholly determined by the condition of the peasant's productive means. Marxism can supply an answer to the question: Why will the *moujik* continue to believe in hobgoblins so long as he goes around in *lapti*? *Lapti* (bast shoes) derive from and are determined by the peasant method of production; the latter also calls forth a whole number of other phenomena which are inseparable from the *lapti*: a narrow horizon, a slavish dependence on rain, sun and other elementary manifestations of nature; and all this, in the aggregate, creates the peasant's prejudices. Marxism can analyze and explain all this. But can Marxism teach how to make *lapti*? No, it can't. It can *explain* why the *moujik* goes around in *lapti*—because there is the forest, there is wood bark and poverty all around—but it is impossible to make *lapti* by means of the Marxist method! Comrade Akhov, however, wants to make *lapti* with the aid of Marxism. Nothing will come of it.

One speaker protested against calling military affairs an art on the ground that military affairs are not subject to the criterion of beauty. But this is already sheerest misconception. Trading is most surely not subject to esthetic criteria; there exists, nevertheless, the art of trading. Trade has its own complex methods, bound up with certain theories akin to science: Italian double bookkeeping, commercial correspondence, commercial geography, etc. What is trade—a science or an art? Marx made a science out of trade—in the sense



that he established the laws of capitalist society, he made trade the object of scientific investigation. But can one trade "according to Marx"? No, this is impossible. One of the most stable, if not eternal principles of trade is the rule: "No cheating, no sale." Marxism explains whence arose this "principle" and how it later came to be supplanted by Italian double bookkeeping, which expresses the self-same thing but in a more delicate way. But is Marxism able to create a new system of bookkeeping? Or is a Marxist freed of the necessity of studying bookkeeping if he seriously wishes to take up trading? Behind the attempts to proclaim Marxism as the method of all sciences and arts there frequently lurks a stubborn refusal to enter new fields. For it is much easier to possess a "*passee-partout*," that is, a master key that opens all doors and locks, rather than study bookkeeping, military affairs, etc. This is the greatest danger in all attempts to invest the Marxist method with such an absolute character. Marx attacked such pseudo-Marxists. In one of his letters he literally said, "I am no Marxist," when in place of an explanation of the historical process, in place of a careful and conscientious investigation of what was occurring Marx was proffered some kind of itinerary for history. Even less did Marx intend to replace all other fields of human knowledge by his social-historical theory. Does this mean that a military leader has no need of the Marxist method? Not at all. It would be absurd to deny the great importance of materialism for disciplining the mind in all fields. Marxism, like Darwinism, is the highest school of human thought. Methods of warfare cannot be deduced from Darwin's theory, from the law of natural selection; but an army leader who studied Darwin would be, given other qualifications, better equipped. He would have a wider horizon and be more fertile in devices; he would take note of those aspects of nature and man which previously had passed unnoticed. This applies to Marxism even to a greater extent.

## The Province of Historical Analysis

One more comment on Comrade Akhov's remark concerning the role of historical analysis in clarifying this or that concept or hypothesis. It is absolutely correct that a historical point of view is fruitful in the extreme and that a history of science is superior to any Kantian epistemology. Man must keep cleaning his concepts and terms like a dentist cleans his instruments. But what we need for this is not a Kantian epistemology which takes concepts as being fixed once and forever. Terms must be approached *historically*. But a history of terms, hypotheses and theories does not replace science itself. Physics is physics. Military affairs are military affairs.

Marxism may be applied with the greatest success even to the history of chess. But it is not possible to learn how to play chess in a Marxist way. With the aid of Marxism we can establish that there once was an old *Oblomovist* nobility too lazy even to play chess; later, with the growth of cities, intellectuals and merchants appeared on the scene and there also arose the need of exercising the brains by playing checkers and chess. And now in our country workers go to chess clubs. Workers now play chess because they have overthrown those who used to ride on their backs. All this can be excellently explained by Marxism.

It is possible to show the entire course of the class struggle from one angle—that of the history of development of chess play. I repeat that it is possible by using the Marxist method to write an excellent book on the history of the development of chess play. But to learn to play chess "according to Marx"

is impossible. Chess play has its own "laws," its own "principles." To be sure, I recently read that in the Napoleonic epoch chess play was maneuverist in character and so remained until the middle of the nineteenth century; whereas, during the interval of armed peace—from the Franco-Prussian war to the recent imperialist war—chess play remained wholly "positional," and nowadays it is allegedly again becoming fluid, "maneuverist." At all events this assertion is made by one American chess player. It is possible that social conditions, in some unknown ways, penetrate into the brains of a chess player and without being conscious of it, he reflects these conditions in his style of play. A materialist psychologist might find this of great interest. However, to play chess "according to Marx" is altogether impossible, just as it is impossible to wage war "according to Marx." Marxism does not teach how to use surprise when this becomes necessary in relation to the elusive Makhno.

What constitutes the essence of military matters is the totality of rules for conquering. These rules are summed up for better or for worse, in our statutes. Are they a science? I think that our statutes cannot be called a science. They are a system of prescripts, a body of rules and methods of a craft or an art.

## "Eternal Principles"

To those comrades who wish to build in military affairs by means of the Marxist method I recommend that they review our field statutes in this light and indicate just what changes—from the standpoint of Marxism—should be introduced into the rules for the gathering of intelligence, for securing one's lines, for artillery preparation, or for attack. I should very much like to hear at least a single new word in this sphere arrived at through the Marxist method—not just "an opinion or so" but something new and practical.

Such are the mistakes of young and immature Marxist thought in the field of military theory. As against them there are the mistakes of military academicians and metaphysicians who tell us that military science discovers and formulates the eternal principles in military matters. What do these principles signify? Are they scientific generalizations or practical precepts? In what sense can they be called eternal?

War is a specific form of relations between men. In consequence, war methods and war usages depend upon the anatomical and psychical qualities of individuals, upon the form of organization of the collective man, upon his technology, his physical and cultural-historical environment, and so on. The usages and methods of warfare are thus determined by changing circumstances and, therefore, they themselves can in no wise be eternal.

But it is quite self-evident that these usages and methods contain elements of greater or lesser stability. Thus, for example, in cavalry methods are to be found elements in common between ourselves and the epoch of Hannibal, and even earlier. Methods used in aviation obviously are only of recent origin. In our infantry methods are to be found traits in common with the behavior of the most backward and primitive clans and tribes who waged war against one another before the domestication of the horse. Finally, in military operation it is possible in general to find the most elementary usages, common to men and other fighting animals. Clearly, in these cases, too, it is a question not of "eternal truths" in the sense of scientific generalizations which derive from the properties of matter but of more or less stable usages of a craft or an art.

An aggregate of "military principles" does not constitute a military science, for there is no more a science of war than

there is a science of locksmithing. An army leader requires the knowledge of a whole number of sciences in order to feel himself fully equipped for his *art*. But military science does not exist; there does exist a military craft which can be raised to the level of military art.

A scientific history of warfare is not military science but social science, or a branch of social science. A scientific history of warfare explains why in a given epoch, with a given social organization, men waged war in a certain way and not differently; and why such and such usages led in this epoch to victory whereas other methods brought defeat. Beginning with the general condition of productive forces, a scientific history of war must take into account all the super-structural factors, even the furthest removed, including the plans and the mistakes of the commanding staff. But it is quite self-evident that a scientific history of war aims by its very nature to explain that which undergoes change and the reasons for these changes, but not to establish eternal truths.

What truths can history give us? The role and significance of the growth of medieval cities in the development of military affairs. The invention of firearms. The overthrow of the feudal system and the significance of this revolution with respect to the army, and so on.

Marxist political economy is an incontestable science; but it is not a science of how to manage a business, or how to compete on the market, or how to build trusts. It is the science of how in a certain epoch certain economic relations (capitalist) took shape, and what conditions these relations internally, and constitutes their lawfulness. Economic laws established by Marx are not eternal truths but characteristic only of a specific epoch of mankind's economic development; and, in any case, they are not eternal principles as is represented by the bourgeois Manchester school, according to which private ownership of the means of production, buying and selling, competition and the rest are eternal principles of economy, deriving from human nature (about which however there is absolutely nothing eternal).

## Source of the Blunder

Wherein lies the fundamental theoretical error of the liberal Manchester school of political economy? In this, that the generalizations (laws) which determine the economic practice of mankind in the epoch of commodity economy are transformed by the Manchester school into eternal principles which must serve eternally to guide economic activity.

Naturally, even for the Manchester economists it is no secret that the principles of commerce and competition did not always exist but arose at a certain stage of development. The doctrinaires of Manchesterism, however, get out of this difficulty by dating economic science from the origin of capitalist relations. Mankind has hitherto wallowed in the mire of dark ignorance or of feudal barbarism but later the truth of free trade was discovered, and this truth remains the eternal principle of human progress. For the Manchesterites, their economic laws possess the same significance as the laws of chemistry. In the Middle Ages mankind wallowed in the mire of serfdom, particularism and religious prejudices; neither the laws of chemistry nor the laws of the free market were known; later, both the former and the latter were discovered. Their objective value, their "eternity" is not compromised by the fact that people did not know about them earlier.

Doctrinaires in military affairs behave in exactly the same way with regard to military truths. Military generalizations, or more correctly the usages of a certain epoch, are transformed

by them into eternal truths. If people were previously unaware of these eternal truths, so much the worse for those who wallowed in the mire of barbarism. But ever since their discovery, they remain eternal principles of military affairs. The erroneousness of such an approach becomes quite apparent if we use a proper scale for our inquiry. Medieval economy was not at all a product of ignorance; it had its own inner lawfulness derived from the then existing condition of human technology and the respective class structure of society.

The very simple laws which determined the economic relations between a feudal lord or seignior and his peasants, or a guild craftsman and his customers are just as "lawful" from the standpoint of economic science as the most complex laws of capitalist economy; both the former and the latter are transitional in character.

The army of *landsknechts*, the regular armies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the national army called to life by the Great French Revolution—all these correspond to definite epochs of economic and political development, and they all rest upon a certain technology on which they depend for their structure and methods of operation. Military history can and must establish this social conditioning of the army and its methods. But what does military philosophy do? As a rule it looks upon the methods and usages of a preceding epoch as eternal truths, at last discovered by mankind and destined to retain their meaning for all times and all peoples. The discovery of these eternal truths is linked primarily with the Napoleonic epoch. The same truths and principles are then discovered in the operations of Hannibal and Caesar. The period of the Middle Ages is turned into a hiatus in the course of which the eternal principles of war were forgotten along with the science and philosophy of antiquity.

## Peculiarity of Military Affairs

There is, however, a difference between the mistakes of Manchesterism and the mistakes of the doctrinaires of eternal principles of military science. This difference lies in the difference between the two kinds of activity. Economic relations in capitalist society take shape, as Marx said, behind people's backs, arising from their ant-like economic labors; and the people then find themselves confronted with already crystallized property relations which determine the relations between man and man.

In military affairs the element of planned construction, of conscious direction by the human will comes into play on a far greater scope. Under capitalist relations plan, will, calculation, supervision, initiative are applied within the limits of an individual economy; and the laws of capitalist economy grow out of the relations between these individual economies: that is why they take shape "behind the backs" of people. But the army is by its very nature an all-state enterprise and consequently plans and projects are here applied within a state framework. This does not of course cancel the decisive dependence of military matters upon economy, but the subjective element in the person of military leaders attains a scope which cannot obtain in the sphere of economy.

This distinction, however, is by no means unconditional or unalterable in character. The action of the "eternal" principle of free competition led, as is well known, to monopoly, to the creation of powerful national and even international trusts. Individuals at the head of these trusts gain a field for strategical maneuvers wholly comparable to the theater of military activities during the last great war. Naturally, Rockefeller's arena for manifesting his "free will" in the domain

of economic construction is far greater than was the case with some big industrialist or merchant 50 or 100 years ago. Rockefeller, however, is not an arbitrary violation of Manchesterite truths but their historical product, and at the same time their living negation.

Every industrialist-merchant, beginning with Gogol's Goat Beard and ending with the clean shaven Rockefeller, has his petty eternal truths of commercial operations: from "no cheating, no sale," and all the rest up to the complex calculations of an oil trust. Italian bookkeeping is of course not a science but an aggregate of commercial usages. It can be raised to the level of an art when applied along the proportions of a gigantic trust. The usages and habits of directing an industrial enterprise, the methods of supplying it with raw materials, the Taylor methods of labor organization, the methods of calculating prices, etc., represent a most complex practical system, which might even be called a "doctrine," in the sense of an aggregate of habits, usages, methods and means which best assure the plundering of the market. But of course this is not a science. To put it simply, political economy, that is, a genuine science, studies the internal relations of capitalist society but does not at all point out ways and means of surest enrichment. Military history, scientifically grounded, studies the typical traits of army and war organizations in each given epoch in correlation with the social structure of a given society, but does not and cannot at all teach how artillery is created and how conquest may be gained most surely.

## Marshal Foch and Military Art

The military art of our time is summed up in statutes. These statutes are the concentrated experience of the past coined into currency intended for future use. This is an aggregate of the precepts of a craft or an art. Just a collection of textbooks on the best organization of industrial enterprises, on calculation, on bookkeeping, on commercial correspondence and the rest does not comprise the science of capitalist society, so a collection of military manuals, regulations and statutes does not constitute military science.

In order to convince ourselves of the great unclarity and contradictoriness of the so-called eternal military principles (these are likewise the laws of military science) let us take the book "On the Principles of War," written by the outstanding victorious army leader in our time, Foch.

In his 1905 introduction Foch, on the basis of the initial data relating to the Russo-Japanese war, writes: "In the long run maneuverist offensive operations overcome any and all obstacles." Foch offers this idea as one of the eternal truths of military art, in contrast, let me add, to our native innovators who perceive in offensive maneuverist strategy qualities specific to revolutionary warfare. As we shall presently see, both sides are mistaken—both Foch who holds offensive maneuvering to be an eternal principle as well as those comrades who see in the maneuverist offensive the specific principle of the Red Army. In the introduction to the first edition of his book Foch approvingly cites the words of von der Goltz:

"While it is true that the principles of military art are eternal, the facts analyzed and taken into account by it are subject to constant evolution. Military theory is precisely comprised by a totality of these eternal principles."

The existence of this theory is just what makes, according to Foch, an art of war. One can thus say that military theory is constituted by a totality of those principles which were applied in all the correct operations, which when violated led to failure, and which must be applied in all the wars of the

epochs to come. There thus exist such principles ("eternal" ones) as formed the foundations of military operations during the capture of Troy, when crafty Greeks hid in the belly of the wooden horse, just as they do in our time when a squadron of planes unloads hundreds of pounds of the most destructive explosives, or volumes of poison gases upon cities. What sort of principles are these?

Anatomical or psychological laws are not involved here. Unquestionably, there have been no very drastic changes in this connection. A Greek or Trojan whose heart was pierced dies just like one of our fighters. Cowards take fright and flee from battle. An army leader encourages his warriors, and so on. Man's basic psycho-physiological and anatomical structure has not altered very radically. Needless to say, the laws of nature have remained the same. But the relations between man and nature have altered in the extreme. The artificial milieu—weapons, instruments, machines—interposed by collective man between himself and nature has grown to such a degree as to completely transform his working habits, the organization of labor, the social relations. Since the days of Troy there has undoubtedly been preserved the urge in human groups (nations, classes) to destroy, conquer and subjugate one another. The artificial milieu, or human technology, in the broad meaning of the word, has transfigured war just as all other human relations. It is indubitable that even in the period of the siege of Troy this goal was already being attained not by means of nails and teeth alone but with the aid of artificial weapons interposed by man between himself and his enemy. This most common ground remains unchanged. In other words, war is a hostile clash between human groups equipped with the instruments for killing and destroying with the direct aim of gaining physical domination over the hostile side.

## Foch's Principles

The concept of war is delimited in such a definition by social and historical frameworks. An outline of the general traits of war—first, the clash between human groups; second, the use of weapons; third, the goal of gaining preponderance over the hostile side—still does not, naturally, provide any principles of military art. At the same time, such a definition puts limits on the "eternity" of war itself. During that period when man had not yet learned to fight with clubs and stones, and not yet organized correctly acting herds (gens and tribes), there could obviously be no talk of war. For a clash between two of our distant progenitors biting through each other's throats for the sake of a female in the forest cannot be referred to as military art, bathed in the light of "eternal principles." The eternity of military art must thus at once be limited, and a running account opened for it only from the moment when man stood firmly erect on his hind legs, armed himself with a club and learned in battle, as in economic life, to act collectively, in detachments, although still without firmly established subdivisions.

Von der Goltz, and after him Foch, acknowledged that the factors studied by military art undergo change (the club, the musket, the automatic rifle, the machine gun, the cannon, and so on), but that the principles of the art remain if not eternal, then in any case unaltered since war first began.

What then are these principles? In his introduction to the second edition Foch seems to sponsor maneuverist offense as the main principle. But in the very first lecture he gives the following answer:

"And so, the theory of war exists. It puts to the fore the following principles:

"The principle of economy of forces.

"The principle of freedom of action.

"The principle of free disposition of forces.

"The principle of security."

And so on.

And further, in order to bolster himself up ("comfort me in my disbelief"), Foch adduces a few citations, including the words of Marshal Bugeaud: "Absolute principles are few, but they nevertheless obtain."

## Economy of Forces

But what comprises the first of these absolute principles, namely the principle of the economy of forces? The task of war is to overwhelm the enemy's living forces. This can be achieved only by means of a blow. For this blow a concentration of one's own forces is required. But before this blow can be dealt, it is necessary to discover the enemy's location, safeguard oneself against a sudden blow from his side, assure communications, and so on. This requires a disposition of corresponding detachments (reconnaissance, defense guards, etc.). The principle of economy of forces consists in assigning for auxiliary and preparatory tasks from among the basic detachments such forces—no more, no less—as are required by the very nature of these tasks; and at the same time, of assuring oneself at the decisive moment the possibility of bringing into play these auxiliary detachments in order to deal a concentrated blow. Foch explains that this result can be obtained only through the maneuverist offense of the basic army core as well as of the auxiliary detachments. The eternal principle of economy of forces is thus, according to Foch, characteristic only of maneuverist strategy. And it is hardly surprising that Foch permits into the holy of holies of military art only maneuverist offensive operations, holding that "theories previously current among us are false." Proceeding from maneuverist offense as the sole strategy, Foch predicts that the "initial combat actions will prove decisive in the next war." (Page 10.) In harmony with this same view, Foch draws the "conclusion that it [the next war] cannot be of long duration, and must be conducted with fierce energy and brought swiftly to its goal—otherwise it will be without results." (Page 38.)

In essence, it suffices to cite these conclusions in order for Foch's eternal principles to appear before us quite pathetically in the light of subsequent events. In the course of the last war the French army—after initial and costly attempts at offensives—went over to positional defense; the initial reverses did not at all predetermine the war's outcome as Foch had predicted; the war lasted four years; in essence, the war preserved throughout a positional character and was settled in the trenches; the first maneuverist period in the field served only to disclose the need of digging into the earth; the final period of field operations revealed only what had already been achieved in the trenches: the exhaustion of Germany's power of resistance.

This experience is of a certain value. If, according to Foch, the theories that dominated the French military school up to 1883 were false and the light of true principles began to dawn only toward the end of the last century, then a decade after his book was written it was already disclosed that the war had unfolded in complete contradiction to those predictions which Foch had deduced from eternal principles.

One might of course say that the error here is wholly on the side of Foch, who simply proved incapable of drawing the necessary conclusions from correct principles. But as a matter of fact, if the "eternal" principle of economy of forces is stripped of Foch's incorrect conclusions, then not much re-

mains of the principle itself. According to Foch's line of thought, which is here nourished in the main by the Napoleonic experience, it is necessary first of all to locate the enemy, safeguard oneself by bringing up necessary reconnoissance and defense units to the front, along the flanks and in the rear; and then, having outlined the basic direction of the blow, to subordinate all forces to a single overwhelming offensive action. Essentially, the bare principle of "economy" of forces has nothing to do with all this. It all comes down to the pattern of the Napoleonic offensive maneuver in which all other considerations are subordinated to the moment of the concentrated blow.

The principle of economy of forces thus consists in an expedient distribution of forces between the basic and auxiliary units, all the while retaining the possibility of using all of them for the destruction of the enemy's living forces. However, the same Foch, basing himself on a famous conversation between Bonaparte and Moreau, gives another, more concrete and partial interpretation to the principle of economy of forces.

## A Second Interpretation

On returning from Egypt Bonaparte explained to Moreau how he had secured himself a superiority of forces in the face of numerical inferiority by first descending with all his forces upon a single flank, smashing it and utilizing the ensuing confusion in order to strike with all his forces at the other flank. Does this mean that from the "theorem" (the expression is Foch's) of economy of forces is to be derived the principle of successive annihilation of the flanks? Obviously, no. We have here a specific case of a successful operation which is characterized by many most important elements: the number of troops, their armament, their respective mood, their disposition, the command, etc. In the concrete circumstances the problem was solved by Napoleon through one of several possible methods. Its successful outcome proves that Napoleon had the ability in the given instance of employing his forces; or, if you prefer, he used them economically; or he had applied the principle of "economy of forces." And nothing more.

But to interpret the principle of economy of forces in this way is only to give another name to the principle of expediency. This principle counsels us to act rationally, not to expend forces in vain. This smacks a little of—the "principles" of Kuzma Prutkov. If I remain ignorant of military affairs as such then this principle will afford me nothing. With a mathematical law which states that the square of the hypotenuse is equal to the sum of the squares of the other two sides, I can confront every corresponding phenomenon and apply the theorem practically. But if all I know is the "principle of economy of forces," what can I do with it? It is only a mnemonic sign which can be of use only after one possesses all the corresponding practical knowledge and habits. Surprise, economy of forces, freedom of action, initiative, and so on and so forth—these are only mnemonic signs for someone learned in military affairs. "Free masons" turned the signs of the mason's craft into freemasonic signs. Similarly, in military affairs a certain accumulated experience has a symbolic conditional denomination, that is all. There is nothing more.

Foch proves the absolute or eternal character of the principle of "freedom of action" by tracing it back to Xenophon: "Military art consists in an ability to retain freedom of action." But what is the content of this freedom? First of all, freedom of initiative must be maintained as against the enemy, that is, he must not be given the opportunity to bind your will.

In this general form the principle is quite incontestable. But it applies equally to fencing and to chess and generally to all forms of sport which involve two sides, and finally, to parliamentary and juridical debates. Foch later gives another interpretation to this same principle. Freedom of action is retained only by the commander-in-chief. All the other commanders are bound for they must act within the framework of his assignments. Consequently, their will is placed under the restraint not only of material circumstances, but also of formal prescriptions. But economy of forces, or common sense, or expediency—whichever you please—demands that the highest command not fix too narrow a framework for its subordinates. In other words, it is necessary to set a clearly defined goal, leaving to the subordinate command the maximum freedom of choosing and combining means for the realization of the set goal. In such a general form the principle is again incontestable. The difficulty in issuing orders, however, lies in finding that limit beyond which the definition of the desired goal already passes into inordinate supervision over the choice of means. The "theorem" does not in and of itself provide any ready-made solution here. At best it serves only to remind the commander that he must find some solution to this problem.

But even apart from all this, it is quite clear that Foch gives an equivocal interpretation to the principle of freedom of action: On the one hand, it is that degree of initiative in battle which assures the necessary independence from the enemy's will; and on the other hand, it is a sufficiently wide freedom of maneuver for the lower command, within the limits of the goals and tasks fixed by the highest command.

## War Is an Art

Neither the former nor the latter interpretation can, however, be called a theorem, even in the broadest meaning of the word. In mathematics we understand by a theorem a correlation of variable magnitudes that holds good under all quantitative changes of these magnitudes. In other words, the equality is not disrupted by whichever arithmetical figures are substituted for the algebraic terms, designating the magnitudes. But what does the principle of economy of forces signify? Or the principle of freedom of action? Is this truly a theorem which permits, through a substitution of concrete magnitudes, of drawing correct practical conclusions? In no case. Any attempt actually to invest such a principle with "absolute" meaning, that is, raise it to the degree of a theorem, results in vacuities like: It is necessary to use all forces expediently; it is necessary to retain initiative of action; it is necessary to issue expedient or realizable orders, and therefore exclude from them superfluous conditions, and so on. In such a form these are not at all military principles, but *axioms of all purposive human activity*.

But, in point of fact, among military theoreticians these and similar principles are given a far more concrete interpretation. That is, these principles are (either openly or surreptitiously) made to include regiments, corps and armies of a specific structure and armament, which operate on a basis of numerous statutes and regulations, summing up the experience of the past. In such a form there is nothing eternal about these eternal principles; and they in nowise resemble theorems, but are conditional denominations of certain methods, empirical habits, positive and negative experiences, etc., etc.

In the nature of things, all military theoreticians cannot escape from the following contradiction: In order to dem-

onstrate the eternal character of the principles of military art they have to throw out the entire "ballast" of living historical experience and reduce them to pleonasms, commonplaces, Euclidian postulates, logical axioms, etc. On the other hand, in order to demonstrate the importance of these principles in military affairs, they have to stuff these principles with the content of a specific epoch, a specific stage in the development of an army or in the development of military affairs; and thereby these principles are invested with the character of useful practical manuals for the memory.

These are not scientific generalizations but practical directives; not theorems, but statutes. They are not eternal, but transient. Their significance is all the greater, the less absolute they are, that is, the more they are filled with the concrete content of a given period of military affairs, its living peculiarities of organization, technique, and so on. They are not absolute but conditional. They constitute not a branch of science, but a practical manual of art.

## An Abortive Attempt

Frederick the Great said: "War is a science for those who are outstanding; an art for mediocrities; a trade for ignoramuses." This statement is incorrect. There isn't and can't be a science of war, in the precise meaning of the word. There is the art of war. On the other hand, even a trade presupposes a schooling, and whoever has schooling is no ignoramus. It would be more correct to say that war is a skilled trade for the average individual and an art for an outstanding one. As regards an ignoramus, he is only the raw material of war; its cannon fodder, and not at all a skilled man.

The attempt to eternalize the Napoleonic principles proved, as we see, abortive. This was disclosed by the imperialist war. It could not have been otherwise, if only for the reason that the wars of the [French] revolution together with the Napoleonic wars that grew out of the former were distinguished by the colossal moral and political preponderance of the revolutionary French people and their army over the rest of Europe. The French took the offensive in the name of a new idea, closely bound up with the powerful interests of the popular masses. The opposing armies put up a half-hearted defense for the old system. But during the last imperialist war neither side was the bearer of a new principle embodied in a new revolutionary class. On both sides the war was imperialist in character, but, at the same time, the very existence of both sides, above all Germany and France, was equally threatened. There was no violent blow which would have immediately caused demoralization and dejection in the opposing camp; nor could such a blow have been struck in view of the great human and material strength of both camps who moved up all their forces and resources gradually.

For this reason the initial battles, in contrast to Foch's forecasts, did not at all predetermine the outcome of the war. For this very reason, offensives were shattered by counter-offensives and the armies, leaning more and more on their rear, dug into the earth. For this very same reason, the war lasted a long time—until the moral and material resources of one side were exhausted. The imperialist war thus went its course from beginning to end in violation of the "eternal" maneuverist offensive principle proclaimed by Foch. This circumstance is underscored all the more by the fact that Foch turned out to be the victor, despite and against his own principles. The explanation for this is to be found in the fact that while Foch's principles were against him the English and American soldiers, and especially Anglo-American munitions, tanks and planes, were with him.

One may of course say that the principle of economy of forces remains valid for positional warfare as well. For in this case, too, an expedient distribution of forces between frontal detachments and the various categories of reserve is required. This is quite indisputable. But in such a general presentation, not even a trace remains of the scheme whereby forces are distributed for a concentrated offensive blow. The "eternal" principle dissolves into a commonplace. In positional, defensive, offensive, as well as maneuverist wars it is necessary to have an expedient and economic distribution of forces depending upon the task at hand. It is quite self-evident that this "eternal principle" applies to industry and commerce as much as to war. It is always necessary to utilize one's forces economically, that is, obtain maximum results from a minimum expenditure of energy. All human progress, and first of all, technology are based on this "eternal" principle. Man began to use a stone ax, a club, etc., because he thus obtained the greatest results with the least expenditure of effort. Precisely for this same reason man went from the club to the spear and the sword. From them—to the gun and the bayonet, and later to the cannon, etc. For the very same reason, he now passes to the electric plow. The eternal principle of war thus comes down to a "principle" which is the motor of all human development. As regards the concrete interpretation given by Foch to the principle of economy of forces, it proved to be an abortive attempt to give an absolute character to the Napoleonic offensive maneuver which is resolved by a concentrated blow.

### A Materialist Approach

And so, insofar as the principle of economy of forces is "eternal," it contains nothing military. And insofar as it is given a military interpretation, there is nothing eternal about it.

But why does all this talk about "eternal" principles continue to persist? Because, as has already been pointed out, at the basis there is man. Human qualities undergo little change. Anatomical, physiological, psychological qualities alter slowly as compared to changes of social forms. The relation of man's hands and feet and the structure of his skull in our epoch are approximately the same as in the days of Aristotle. We know that Marx used to read Aristotle with delight. And were it possible to assume Aristotle's transfer to our epoch in order for him to read Marx's books, then in all likelihood Aristotle would have understood them excellently.

Man's anatomical and psycho-physical make-up is far more stable than social forms are. Corresponding to this there are two sides in military affairs: There is the individual side, which finds its expression in certain habits and methods, determined to a large measure by the biological nature of man, not eternal but stable; and there is the collective-historical side which depends on the social organization of man in war. But it is precisely this latter moment which decides the issue, because war begins when socially organized armed man enters into combat with another socially organized armed man. Otherwise we would have a fight—between animals.

Comrade Lukirsky approached the question from the following standpoint: There is, on the one hand, experience and empirical inquiry—an imperfect method; and there is on the other hand, "pure reason" which deductively, by means of logical methods arrives at "absolute" deductions and thereby enriches military affairs. As a materialist I have become accustomed to look upon reason as one of the organs of historical man, developed in the process of man's adaptation to nature. I cannot oppose reason to matter; I cannot agree to

think that reason can supposedly give birth to that which material experience has not already provided. Our reason only coordinates and correlates conclusions from our practice; from "pure" reason man can deduce nothing new, nothing he had not abstracted from experience. Naturally, experience does not "take shape" mechanically, but rather there is an order introduced into it—an order which corresponds to the order of the manifestations in themselves and which leads to the knowledge of the lawfulness of these manifestations. But to think that reason can arbitrarily give birth to a conclusion which is not prepared by and grounded in experience—this is absolutely wrong. And if that is the case, neither can there be principles of a twofold character: practical and eternal.

In conclusion, let me say that we have already had one discussion on the subject of "military doctrine," and now we have reached the ultimate philosophic heights. The time has come for us to begin the downward climb and get down to the tasks of practical schooling. We had once planned to put out *A Syllabus For An Individual Commander*, but nothing has yet come of this project. Which is more difficult to write—abstract theses or a syllabus for an individual commander? The latter is a hundred times more difficult; but, by way of compensation, it is a thousand times more fruitful.

I wish to utilize this large gathering, the presence of many competent workers, in order to make once again my proposal that we supply individual commanders with general directives—with a model little book "How To Conquer Knowingly." It would be an excellent school for all of us were we to set down our military experience in such clear and precise regulations that an individual commander could not only read but study them with profit.

Out of the very same bricks it is possible to build a factory, a home, or a temple. The only requirement is that the bricks be made of good material and properly baked. The very same regiments, with one and the same schooling, under one and the same objective circumstances can be deployed and utilized for the most diverse strategical and tactical assignments. The sole requirement is that the basic cell—the *sub-division*—be viable and resilient. And for this we need a conscious individual commander who knows his business and his own worth. Our task of tasks consists in educating such individual commanders. To educate the individual proletarian commander does not at all mean to implant in his mind the idea that hitherto there have allegedly been bourgeois tactics and now the time has come for proletarian tactics. No. Such an education would lead him astray. To create the individual proletarian commander means to assist our present individual commander in acquiring at the very least that sum of knowledge and habits which such an individual possesses in bourgeois armies in order that he may consciously use this knowledge and these habits in the interests of the working class.

GET YOUR COPY NOW

Leon Trotsky's

IN DEFENSE OF MARXISM

(AGAINST THE PETTY-BOURGEOIS OPPOSITION)

240 Pages—Paper \$1.50; Cloth \$2.

Pioneer Publishers, 116 University PL., New York 3, N.Y.

# INTERNATIONAL NOTES

## England

### More News About Split in Glasgow C.P.

The split in the ranks of the Communist Party in Glasgow continues to grow. To the already reported developments a recent letter from a British Trotskyist adds the following:

"The latest bombshell for the Stalinists on the Clyde is that the Convenor of Shop Stewards in one of the largest factories in the area—a Communist Party member of some years standing—has publicly broken with Stalinism at a meeting of the workers in the plant.

"His resignation has not been accepted by the Stalinists on the ground that he had been 'operating under the pressure of the Trotskyist controlled Clyde Workers' Committee'. He has been followed by others. This is only the beginning. In London the crack is also beginning to appear."

J. H.

\* \* \*

### Militants Study Trotsky's Books

"The Case of Leon Trotsky" is one of the books which are now playing an important role in the political education of those English militants who are moving away from the C. P. and towards the program of revolutionary socialism.

One Clyde militant writes:

"I have read the case of Leon Trotsky twice, and not only is it an eye-opener but a complete re-education . . ."

"Trotsky's analysis of the world position is indubitably the dialectical and historical truth and is amazingly simple to grasp in comparison with the tortuous so-called policy of the so-called Communist Party. His summary on his own behalf is really the finest possible survey of the history of the world during the last twenty-five years—the world as a worker should see it.

"Prior to this it has always been my opinion that only a world war could give us the revolutionary situation on a large enough scale to be successful. Clearly, an extension of the struggle in Spain by the French proletariat—backed and guided by the Comintern, in a Bolshevik manner—could have dispensed with the capitalist war, and under favorable circumstances made use of the general European revolutionary situation to sovietize Germany, France, Spain, and Italy. The fresh revolutionary leadership of these countries would have rendered the bureaucratic leadership sterile and expedited the political revolution in the Soviet Union.

"The other major point is the criminal policy of 'Popular Front' as compared to the united front of all progressive proletarian and intellectual, petty bourgeois organizations, at least so long as we are going on the same road . . ."

\* \* \*

### "Mission To Moscow"

A London letter supplies the information that early in August the Davies-Warner Brothers whitewash film, "Mission To Mos-

cow," was released in the provinces after a few weeks' run at two London movie houses. Apparently the film proved as much of a box-office flop in England as it did in the U. S. A.

English Trotskyists, picketing the film, on the very first weekend "sold 7,000 penny supplements exposing the film."

The English intellectuals and "left-wingers" have maintained a disgraceful silence. "Only the Glasgow *Forward*," writes our correspondent, "and the *Tribune* were at all critical among the socialist press—the latter barely so."

The *New Leader*, organ of the British ILP carried a review which contrived to omit any mention of the attack and frame-up against Trotsky and Trotskyism.

A protest by English Trotskyists to Fenner Brockway, leader of the ILP, elicited the following reply:

"I note what you say about 'Mission To Moscow.' You will appreciate that I can't hold myself in any way responsible to you for the contents of the *New Leader*, but as a matter of fact we are arranging to review the film 'Mission To Moscow' more fully when it is generally released."

The Davies film has done something unintended and unforeseen by its sponsors: it has revived interest in the Moscow Frameup Trials in England. The WIL group decided to publish 10,000 copies of Leon Trotsky's "I Stake My Life," together with a summary of the report of the Dewey Commission.

# THE STRUGGLE FOR A PROLETARIAN PARTY

By JAMES P. CANNON

LEON TROTSKY wrote about this companion volume to his "In Defense of Marxism":

"It is the writing of a genuine workers' leader. If the discussion had not produced more than this document, it would be justified."

Price: Paper Cover, \$1.50

Clothbound, \$2.00

Order Now From

## PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

# ***RAILROADED TO PRISON***

## **Because They Fought For Labor And Socialism**

**18** Members of the Socialist Workers Party And  
of Minneapolis Truckdrivers Local 544-CIO

**FIRST VICTIMS OF THE VICIOUS SMITH "GAG" ACT—  
DENIED A HEARING BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT—  
CONDEMNED TO SERVE 12 to 16 MONTH PRISON TERMS—**

## **Extend The Hand of Solidarity to These Militants**

**Aid Labor's Wartime  
Political Prisoners  
And Their Families**

**They Are Counting  
On YOU!**

**JAMES T. FARRELL, Chairman  
CIVIL RIGHTS DEFENSE COMMITTEE  
160 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY 10, N. Y.**

Here is my contribution of \$..... to the fund  
for the relief of the 18 political prisoners in the Minneapolis  
"Gag" Law case and their families.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY and STATE.....