

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

Hue and Cry Over Kronstadt

By LEON TROTSKY



The Trial of the Twenty-One

By the Editors



A Letter to Corliss Lamont

By Max Eastman



The Record of the Democracies

By Maurice Spector



Analysis of the New Depression

Book Reviews

Correspondence

**A P R I L 1 9 3 8
T W E N T Y C E N T S**

At Home

THE OUTSTANDING merits of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL are receiving wider recognition and support. First subscriptions and orders come in from Buenos Aires, Argentina. In Great Britain THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is acclaimed and the circulation grows. London comrades and bookshops dispose of more magazines than any other city except New York. A Glasgow, Scotland, bookshop places its first order; E. F. of Battersea, England, writes: "The N.I.'s sold easily. I can sell more of the March issue. Increase order to fifty copies." (In three issues from 10 to 50 copies by a single comrade. Catch up, American comrades! A new order comes from comrade M.K., London: "The reappearance of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is greeted with great enthusiasm by us all. Please send 25 to begin with." An Aberdeen, Scotland, comrade says: "I enjoy THE NEW INTERNATIONAL very much. I think it has no equal for enlightenment socially in the English language." A subscriber from Copenhagen, Denmark, voices like sentiments. Margaret Johns, London, of THE MILITANT group, which disposed of 160 copies of the March issue, repeatedly increases orders.

The Johannesburg, South Africa, agent proceeds to increase his order to 30 copies.

In fact, though the American comrades in most instances are doing a good job, the agents in other countries are doing even better. However, the improvement in the U.S., with one important exception, is steady, and the Manager declines to grumble, but confidently expects even better results.

Yes, the March issue is all sold out. Only a copy here and there is to be found. Prospects for a print run over 4,000 next time are growing. The bundle circulation grows and is becoming stabilized—without wind, so to speak. Since the last issue, new bundle orders have been placed by the literature agents in Baltimore, Maryland, Quakertown, Pa., Reading, Pa., Salem, Ohio, the Y.P.S.L. in Rochester, N. Y., and Pittsburgh, Pa. But many Branches also increased their former orders: Akron, Ohio, to 50 copies—"The N.I. sells like hot-cakes here. C.M." A splendid job. Cleveland (Gerry Arnold, agent): 25 to 40 copies. "Comrades feel that N.I. is coming pretty close to being the type of magazine we desire. J.M.C." Detroit, Mich., has increased its order to 25 and sent a re-order. Salt Lake City, Utah, increased its previous order, plus a re-order. Berkeley, Calif., Y.P.S.L. started with ten, now sells 30 copies. Nice work. Quakertown, Pa., Howard Stump—"I can get new readers, because the N.I. was well liked by those who read it." Increases order. Hartford, Conn., ordered extra copies. Boston likewise ordered extra copies of February issue; now handles 75.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM

VOLUME IV

APRIL 1938

NUMBER 4 (WHOLE No. 19)

Published monthly by the New International Publishing Company, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles: 14c for 5 copies and up, Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up. Single copy: 20c. Entered as second-class matter December 9, 1937, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Board: JAMES BURNHAM, MAX SHACHTMAN, MAURICE SPECTOR.
Business Manager: MARTIN ABERN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Editor's Comments.....	99
Hue and Cry Over Kronstadt, by Leon Trotsky.....	103
Strike of Capital? by Dave Cowles.....	107
The Jewish Question, by Jack Weber.....	110
Problems of Colonial India, by S. Stanley.....	113
The Record of the Democracies, by Maurice Spector..	115
The Course of Herr Brandler, by Walter Held.....	119
A Letter to Corliss Lamont, by Max Eastman.....	122
ARCHIVES OF THE REVOLUTION:	
Problems of the Chinese Revolution (Cont.), by Leon Trotsky	123
BOOKS:	
Balkan Storms, by W. Keller.....	124
Plebeian Caesar, by George Novack.....	125
Red Fantasy, by Bernard Wolfe.....	126
Correspondence	127
Inside Front Cover: At Home. Notes.	

Comrade Leonard, agent, doing very good work. C.V.H., for Rochester S.W.P., doubles order from 10 to 20 copies. Doris Cooper, Toledo, says: "Comrades believe THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is a swell magazine. . . . The last edition was a 'beaut'. How about an article stressing the defense of the Soviet Union? . . . More and more Stalinists are reading the N.I. now." In Philadelphia, Sol Thomas works splendidly on behalf of the magazine, and has sent in a number of subscriptions. Phila. is now getting under way; disposes of 60 copies. St. Paul, Minn., B. Neff, agent, doubles order from 10 to 20. Minneapolis, Minn., S.W.P. handles 75 copies and has sent in additional subscriptions. The live-wire agent there is Chester Johnson. Comrade McClelland, St. Louis, Mo., Branch sends in a batch of subscriptions, besides which D.T.B., literature agent, receives a bundle of 25 for general sales. Saint Louis is doing a good job. They write: "We consider the N.I. an extremely effective and important journal . . . will do all we can to help, of course." John Boulds, Plentywood, Mont., where it's plenty cold these days, writes, "The roads are blocked now; will try to get new subscriptions in a short time." Karolyn Kerry, and Elizabeth Ryan, both of Oakland, placed extra orders for the January and February issues. Oakland order stands at 40, but extra orders have been placed with previous issues. Keep up the good work, Oakland. Youngstown, Ohio, placed an extra order last month and is pushing the N.I. Likewise is Columbus, Ohio, Morris Slavin, agent, doing well. Salem, Ohio: "The N.I.

was well received. . . . I will try to get subscriptions." And so on from other places.

A new literature agent, Abe Miller, has taken over the N.I. job in New York, and the improvement has been marked in many respects. Comrade Miller is proceeding to organize magazine distribution and sales to Party Branches and outside meetings with efficiency. As a result the Party order increased to 425 for the March issue. Morris Miller covers the newsstands on 14th Street and 42nd Street systematically. Party Branches are beginning to push the N.I. sales with greater determination. The LABOR BOOK SHOP sells 150 copies. The New York Y.P.S.L.? The exception referred to before. While the Y.P.S.L. in all parts of the country is the back-bone of the circulation end of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, as well as its intellectual devotees, in New York the Y.P.S.L. has so far been a failure, no less. With a few exceptions, the Y.P.S.L. Circles have paid little or no attention to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, a publication of special value for the ideological development of the youth. However, some changes are being effected, and improvement is hoped for. The New York Y.P.S.L. will, we feel sure, soon do its share with the N.I. as it does with other work.

A last word: Circulation is steadily on the increase. Subscriptions, however, are still too few and coming in all too slowly. Branches, consider a subscription campaign. And, may we suggest, some entertainments for the benefit of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL? The magazine warrants such support.

THE MANAGER

Notes

WE DON'T ordinarily like "continued articles", but we find that we are unable to avoid them. In this issue we complete Trotsky's 1927 article on the Chinese Revolution, the first half of which we carried in our Archives last month. Its extraordinary relevance to today's developments in China demanded its publication. Two of our articles this month will be completed in the May issue: S. Stanley's study of India, and Walter Held's analysis of the Brandler-Thalheimer position. Both of these have unusual present importance: the first not merely for the light it throws on the entire colonial problem but also as a case study in imperialist "democracy" in action; the second for its revelation of the impossibility of a half-way position between abandonment of the old Internationals and clear-cut declaration for the Fourth.

The only defense, then, against continued articles is to make sure to read every issue. Which is another argument to back up the Manager's call for more subscriptions.

We want to remind our readers again that our pages are open for discussion and debate, both on current problems and on more general and theoretical subjects. We will not, of course, guarantee to publish any crack-pot essay that comes from nowhere; but we are ready and anxious to give space to competent and serious polemical articles. Marxism has always grown and been strengthened in the living clash of ideas. We are not preachers of a sterile and changeless theology.

We have not yet been able to build our Book Review section up to the point where we would like to see it. Part of our difficulty is in establishing a large enough staff of more or less regular reviewers. We feel sure that among our readers there are many competent writers and critics whom we do not yet know about. We should like to hear from them. In any case, the task of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is, through effective collaboration, to develop new Marxist writers as well as to publish the best of those who are already known.

With all of the editorials and speeches now springing up from all sides on "the moral bankruptcy of Bolshevism" (the favorite subject these days for Philistines attempting to exploit the Moscow Trials to their own ends), we look forward to Leon Trotsky's article, "Their Morals and Ours", which has been promised for the near future.

David Cowles' analysis of "Strike of Capital" becomes even more timely as we go to press. We note that this conception is made fundamental to the theses now being published in connection with the approaching convention of the Stalinists, and that it is a background of day-by-day New Deal propaganda.

THE EDITORS

The Editor's Comments

THE TRIAL OF THE 21—TRUTH AMONG THE LIES—THE TRIALS INDICT THEMSELVES—CONFESSIONS AND NO CONFESSIONS—THE FATE OF THE GENERALS—THE TRIAL AND THE END OF AUSTRIA

THE TRIAL OF THE 21 indicates, even more plainly than its predecessors, the superficiality of a merely "juridical" analysis of the Moscow trials. Apart from the Stalinist press, there is scarcely a newspaper or magazine in the world which did not openly express its disbelief in the latest trial. There is hardly a person outside of the Stalinist ranks—and not so many even there—who thinks that Bukharin, Rykov and their co-defendants were actually guilty of the crimes with which they were charged in the indictment.

This trial, then, like the others, cannot be understood as a juridical procedure designed, together with the preliminary investigations, to determine the truth or falsity of charges brought against the defendants. It must, rather, be subjected to historical, sociological, political analysis as an expression and instrument of the Stalinist bureaucracy. It must be grasped in its concrete historical context, as an integral phase in the life-history of Stalinism. Only in this way can we avoid being driven to psycho-pathology, the Arabian Nights, or the "dark mysteries of the Russian soul"—the explanatory devices in which the surface-commentators finally take refuge.

We, and others, have already traced the historical evolution of the system of Moscow trials, and its relation to the general development of Stalinism. We shall confine ourselves here to filling in the background of this latest trial with those new or special features added during the thirteen months since the prior public trial, the Piatakov-Radek trial of January, 1937.

1. The first factor to take note of is the further working out of the internal logic of the system of trials itself. No trials, public or secret, and no purges solve anything for Stalinism. The trials and purges do not in the slightest degree affect the causes which, among other things, bring about the trials and purges themselves—causes which have their root in the fundamental conflict between the bureaucracy and the Soviet masses. The trials and purges *express* this conflict, and far from resolving it only aggravate it further. Since the conflict is deepening, one set of executions merely leads to another; and periodically certain of the executions are accompanied by the theatrical display of a public trial. Each trial must "outdo" the one preceding. Stalin is compelled to sink the wedge ever further between himself and the selected defendants—in reality between himself on the one side, and, on the other, the masses and their revolution. The crimes must be dated back to the revolution and even before it, so that Stalin will himself remain as the only authentic symbol of "the power". Likewise each trial commits its inevitable and glaring "mistakes"; so that a new trial must be held to cover up the mistakes; but it in turn only commits still graver mistakes.

2. During the past year, for the first time in the past decade, not merely did the Plan fall far behind schedule, but, from all available evidence, production ran below that of the year preceding. The "final and irrevocable victory of socialism" was accompanied by a terrible paucity in consumers' goods, and by breakdowns in many sectors of the economy. These shortages and

breakdowns undoubtedly called vividly back to mind the sufferings and privations which were earlier endured under the illusion that they were rapidly ushering in the era of universal plenty.

3. The past year witnessed the outbreak of war in the Far East, and the intensification of the war crisis generally.

4. During recent months the diplomatic hopes of the régime were smashed by the slow, sure triumph of the Chamberlain policy in Great Britain—a policy which in Stalin's eyes changes Great Britain from a potential friend to a potential enemy, and by the shift of Poland from its French alliance toward Berlin.

5. Likewise during this time the whole policy of Popular Frontism, the garb under which Stalinism was presented to the masses, went up in smoke. The growing international dissatisfaction with Stalinism was unmistakable.

These factors provide the key to the Trial of the 21.

What the Trial Said

STALIN'S PUBLIC TRIALS are not designed to prove the truth or falsity of anything whatever, certainly not of the guilt of the defendants. History, facts, dates, evidence are as of little moment in these trials as human lives and human dignity. The trials are political instruments, fashioned to serve specific political aims. Such an instrument, it is true, could be shaped only by such an agent—a bureaucracy released from all mass control, surviving solely through police terror, itself caught in an inescapably crunching trap, fighting vainly and insanelly to get free. But the instrument is nonetheless fitting and appropriate.

Our brief review of the new developments faced by Stalinism was at the same time a review of the latest trial. A year ago Poland and Great Britain were friends or at least potential friends; therefore the defendants conspired only with Germany and Japan. Today they are potential enemies; therefore the defendants in the new trial conspired also with Poland and Great Britain. A new change in the fleeting coalitions of the great powers will bring new changes in the espionage connections. If the Franco-Soviet Pact is abrogated, we will doubtless discover that Litvinov has been in the French secret service since the time of Napoleon.

If the Plan is going to pieces, that is not in the least surprising. Rosengoltz, Chernov, Rykov and the others ruined one industry after another, from gold mines to butter to cotton, and still further upset the budget by shipping out a million dollars to Trotsky. What Stalin was doing while all of this was going on he has never seen fit to explain. Apparently he was following the advice of the three monkeys to see no evil, hear no evil and speak no evil.

If the previous trials were somewhat mismanaged—well, no wonder! They were directed by Yagoda, and look what kind of fellow Yagoda is! If it seems odd to you that the leaders of the revolution turn into traitors, that is only because you do not understand that these men were *not* leaders of the revolution, but fascist mad-dogs from 1918 on, many of them in fact in the pay of the Czar long before that.

And if the Popular Front and Popular Frontism have collapsed, that, too, is easy to comprehend. They have been stabbed consistently in the back by the international allies of the defendants.

Here, then, is Stalin's parable, performed under Klieg lights in the old Hall of the Nobles. It has the same symbolized characters as the age-old parables: a god who is all-mighty, all-just and all-good; a devil, or rather a set of devils, the pure incarnation of evil; the flock of the faithful who believe (unlike the doubting Thomas) because they are told to believe; the heathen, heretics, outcasts, damned eternally for their unbelief (the "hard of heart").

But, if we look behind the parable for a moment, we will discover that this new trial tells us an extraordinary number of things which are *true*, or at any rate confirms them. To tell these things was not the purpose of Stalin or Vyshinsky, but perhaps even God overlooks certain details.

For example, this trial features what is in effect a full admission by the State of the terrible ravages of the forced collectivization period. The accounts of famine, vast peasant unrest, violent coercion of the peasantry, fantastic dislocations of the food supply, which have always been officially denied by the Kremlin and ascribed to the slanderings of fascists and provocateurs, appear in the proceedings of the trial as facts which everyone knows. Indeed, the trial reveals that as usual the objective observers had said too little, and were over-optimistic. The testimony of Bukharin, Rykov, Chernov and others pointed not merely to peasant unrest, but to widespread peasant revolts and uprisings.

Again, the trial, in its own way, indicates graphically the bureaucratic unevenness of the Plan's development, the impossible administrative conditions introduced by G.P.U. interference, and the appalling scarcity of key consumers' goods.

The methods of the G.P.U., likewise, are as if taken for granted by the trial. No surprise is expressed at Yagoda's having had a poison laboratory under his jurisdiction. The testimony of the doctors is eloquent:

BRAUDE ("Defense Counsel"): Perhaps you will sum up concretely the internal causes which led you, an old doctor, in practice for 40 years, to agree to the foul, horrible proposals of Yagoda?

DR. LEVIN: Psychologically, I explain it by some cowardice, but not for my own life. I was more terrified at Yagoda's threats to ruin my family.

BRAUDE: Please tell the court, was there a difference in the way Yagoda incited you from the time when he persuaded you regarding the murder of Peshkov and the latter time when he spoke of further crimes?

LEVIN: Of course, the difference was a very big one. At first he said I was doing a necessary thing. He spoke of this crime as of an act necessary to save Gorky from some enemies. And then, when I came to him, he immediately told me I was in his hands. . . .

VYSHINSKY: Why did you not refuse to execute this criminal plan?

DR. PLETNEV: I was threatened by Yagoda.

VYSHINSKY: Why did you attach serious importance to Yagoda's threats?

PLETNEV: After all, he was People's Commissar of Internal Affairs. . . .

DR. KAZAKOV: . . . Yagoda replied, "With Dr. Levin you must work out a method of treatment for Menzhinsky which will soon put an end to his useless existence, which hinders many people. I warn you that if you dare to resist, I will be able to deal with you. You won't escape me anywhere. . . ." I realized I was in his clutches. . . . You'll probably ask me what were my motives for keeping silence. I must say, motives of base fear. Yagoda held a high post. . . .

DR. LEVIN: He [Yagoda] said, "You must help in this. Bear in mind that you cannot but obey my orders, you will not get away from me. . . ." He once again repeated that failure to fulfill this would threaten myself and my family with ruin. I considered I had no other way out, I had to give way to him. . . . These crimes were committed. A few days after the funerals . . . Yagoda again called me to his place and said, "Well, now you have committed these crimes, you are completely in my hands, and you must undertake what I now propose to you. . . ."

That the People's Commissar for Internal Affairs has the immediate power of life and death over any man, without recourse and for any purpose, and over his family, is not questioned by Vyshinsky, Ulrich, or the Kremlin's commentators.

RAKOVSKY: I want to tell what made me confess everything. For eight months in solitary confinement I pondered over all my previous Trotskyist

views but did not confess. I did not know what was going on in the outside world. . . .

And again it is simply taken for granted that at a nod from the G.P.U., a man 68 years old, with years of imprisonment under the Czar behind him, with six years of Stalin's exile, should be placed in solitary confinement—solitary confinement, which has been often known to drive men insane in twenty days. Why do they confess!

It is furthermore assumed by all parties to the trial—this comes out particularly in the testimony of Bukharin—that the holding of any political view contrary to the official line is *ipso facto* treason against the State. That this is the case has naturally been known by everyone for many years; but now it is incorporated formally into the records of the totalitarian court.

And how much more is revealed by this nightmare trial, to those who really read its true content! The complete abrogation of the rights of national self-determination, with the consequent deepening of separatist sentiment throughout the "federated" republics; the unutterably tragic weakening of the defense and the economy under the bureaucratic whip; the universal terror, fear, suspicion; the frightful collapse of social morality; the immeasurable gulf between the régime and the people; the mad desperation of the bureaucracy itself in the midst of its death struggle. . . .

The Role of Yagoda

THE APPEARANCE OF Yagoda among the defendants has a peculiar and unprecedented importance. Alone among the leading defendants of the three great public trials of the present series, Yagoda played no role whatever in the October Revolution. Yagoda never figured in any of the oppositions. For a decade he was Stalin's right-hand man, the active head of the G.P.U., the "bright shield" defending Soviet honor and integrity.

It was Yagoda who perfected the organization of the G.P.U., who devised and consolidated its innumerable activities. It was Yagoda who, under Stalin's orders, *developed the system of the Trials*, and for many years was the executive in charge of the "investigations" and the conduct of the trials themselves. Among the trials managed by Yagoda was the Trial of Zinoviev-Kamenev in August, 1936.

When Yagoda was first demoted and later arrested, the charges against him were immorality, misuse of funds, indulgence in orgies and general luxurious living. No mention of any other type of charge was made, and no suggestion of any connection with the various "centers". The reason for this is clear: it was necessary to get rid of Yagoda, but the particular fable in which he was to be involved had not yet been invented. The "Right-Trotskyist" bloc of the Trial of the 21 had not yet come into existence. Yagoda was kept on ice, to be served up when the time came.

Yagoda, the Trial of the 21 now tells us, was a traitor, fascist and spy from the beginning. He had a Napoleonic complex, and was a great admirer of *Mein Kampf*. He was a poisoner and a murderer and a liar. He plotted and conspired continuously against the State.

But, let us repeat: it was Yagoda who managed a whole series of earlier trials, climaxing in the trial of Zinoviev-Kamenev. No attempt is made to deny or hide this. In fact, the latest trial goes with some detail into Yagoda's arrests of the defendants in the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial, his visits to them in prison, his conducting of the preliminary investigation, his advice to them on what to say in court, etc.

In this way, through the person of Yagoda, the Trial of the 21 passes judgment on the Trial of Zinoviev-Kamenev. There is no getting around this. By indicting Yagoda, the system of trials indicted *itself*.

This does not, of course, mean that the charges against Yagoda in the Trial of the 21 were true. Yagoda was no doubt guilty of

murder, poisoning, oppression, and also of immorality and misuse of funds. But these were not the charges against him. There is no more evidence that he was guilty on any of the specific counts in the indictment than that any one else was. The framer was himself framed. Yezhof is only Yagoda multiplied.

Again the Confessions

ONCE MORE THE whole structure of the trial is built on the confessions of the defendants. One or two irrelevant letters; and then confessions and more confessions; that is all. But in none of the trials has it been more strikingly apparent that—with only occasional exceptions to be noted below—there is no distinction between judge, defendants, witnesses, prosecution, and defense attorneys. In a normal trial, each of these has different specific interests to defend; in the Moscow Trials, all cooperate toward a single end. This is shown grotesquely in large sections of Bukharin's testimony. It read not in the least like questions and answers of prosecutor and defendant, but exactly like the script of a play which has been carefully rehearsed, with each character taking up cues promptly:

ULRICH: Do you confirm your testimony. . . .

BUKHARIN: I wholly and completely confirm my testimony.

VYSHINSKY: Formulate briefly of what exactly you admit yourself guilty.

BUKHARIN: Firstly, of belonging to the counter-revolutionary Right-Trotskyist Bloc.

VYSHINSKY: Since what year?

BUKHARIN: Since the moment of the formation of the bloc. . . .

VYSHINSKY: What aims did this counter-revolutionary organization pursue? . . . It stood for the overthrow of the Soviet power?

BUKHARIN: The overthrow of the Soviet power was the means for the realization of this aim.

VYSHINSKY: By violent overthrow?

BUKHARIN: Yes, by violent overthrow. . . .

VYSHINSKY: With the aid of?

BUKHARIN: With the aid of the utilization of all the difficulties confronting the Soviet power. . . .

VYSHINSKY: Which prognostically stood in perspective with whose aid?

BUKHARIN: From foreign powers.

VYSHINSKY: On conditions?

BUKHARIN: On conditions, to speak concretely, of a whole series of concessions. . . .

Perhaps more like a catechism than the script of a play. But suddenly one actor departs from the script, and the other fails to catch the cue:

VYSHINSKY: For the benefit of?

BUKHARIN: For the benefit of Germany, Japan and partly of Great Britain.

VYSHINSKY: And also by weakening the defensive power?

BUKHARIN: I don't see the use of this question, it was not discussed, at least in my presence.

VYSHINSKY: But what was the position regarding wrecking?

Vyshinsky admitted his slip, and hastened to get back to the text, without another word as to the false cue.

All rests on the confessions. As in all the trials, evidence one way or another bearing on the statements of the confessions would have been extremely easy for the prosecutor to obtain—if, that is, he had not been aware that any evidence whatever would have smashed the fabric of the confessions. How simple to trace the alleged million dollars paid to Trotsky; the "meeting" between Krestinsky and Trotsky at Merano, the activities of Rakovsky in Japan. . . .

All rests on the confessions. But here we find, in this latest trial, a new departure. A number of the defendants, outstandingly Bukharin, *do not confess* to many of the charges made against them. To many of Vyshinsky's accusations, Bukharin answers flatly, No.

VYSHINSKY: . . . I would like to ask you regarding your contacts with White Guard circles and the German fascists. Are you aware of this circumstance?

BUKHARIN: No I am not. . . .

VYSHINSKY: Accused Bukharin, you knew of this, you knew Pivovarov?

BUKHARIN: I did not know Pivovarov. . . .

VYSHINSKY: Were you aware that Karakhan was a German spy?

BUKHARIN: No I was not. . . .

VYSHINSKY: Accused Bukharin, do you admit yourself guilty of espionage?

BUKHARIN: I do not. . . .

VYSHINSKY: . . . the assassination of Kirov was carried out under instructions of the Rightist-Trotskyist Bloc.

BUKHARIN: I know nothing about it. . . .

It is difficult to be sure just what accounts for this phenomenon. It may be all part of the prepared script, inserted to break the monotony of 100% confessions; but it seems more likely that in at least some of the cases Bukharin is deliberately departing from the text. (When Vyshinsky objected strenuously at one point to Bukharin's way of replying to the questions, Bukharin stated: "I have the right to answer questions as I want to, not as you want.") But whatever the reasons for Bukharin's denials, the fact that they occurred is a very significant commentary on the structure of the trial as a whole.

The alleged proof of guilt is admittedly based on the confessions alone. Bukharin failed, with reference to many of the charges, to confess—quite the contrary, he denied guilt. But this did not in the least phase Vyshinsky. Sometimes he turned to a co-defendant to get his confession of Bukharin's guilt on the particular point in question (which was often not forthcoming). But usually he merely sailed right on with the next question. There was of course no material evidence. Where, then, even according to the reasoning of those who hold the confessions to be true, is the proof of Bukharin's guilt? Obviously, by their own account, there is no proof whatever. There is no evidence (in any of the trials), so we are asked to believe the confessions. What then when there are no confessions?

One more conclusive demonstration that the Moscow Trials are a political fabrication having not the slightest relation to truth or falsity. Perhaps some future trial will even omit defendants, or have professional actors take their place. Then at least Vyshinsky would be certain of no departures from the script.

When Is a Frameup a Frameup?

THE TRIAL OF THE 21 was believed by virtually no one, even among the Stalinists themselves. However, in the reactions to this trial there is one piece of sophistry which is frequently appearing, and which is made use of even by certain Stalinists who despair of making out a convincing case for the trial as it stands. The *New Republic*, for example, writes: "Our guess is that neither the Trotskyists nor the Stalinists are completely right about the guilt of the accused. Most of them are probably guilty of something, though not of the extremes of treachery that the indictment charges. Undoubtedly there was a widespread opposition to Stalin. . . . Undoubtedly also there were from the start a few real spies and traitors. . . ."

This is a classic example of what logicians call *ignoratio elenchi*—arguing beside the point. It is being vigorously utilized as a backhanded defense of the system of trials and of Stalinism against the world-wide realization that the trials are false.

In the first place, no one denies that there have been and still are spies and traitors in the Soviet Union. This has nothing whatever to do with the trials.

Secondly, no one denies that there are some and even many true statements made during the course of the trials. Third, no one denies that *some* of the defendants may have been guilty of *something*.

What we maintain first of all is that in these trials none of the leading defendants is guilty of the specific charges in the indictment; that the prosecution knows none is guilty and makes no effort to discover the truth about the specific charges; and that consequently the trials are *frameups*. They are not partial frameups or half-frameups (there is in reality no such thing) but one hundred percent frameups. In the trial of Mooney, innumerable true statements appear in the record. That has nothing to do with the question whether or not he was framed. A trial might have every statement but one true—namely, the name of the perpetrator of the specific criminal act charged in the indictment—and that one falsehood could make the *entire* trial *completely* a frameup. When the *New Republic* writes that the accused are not guilty “of the extremes of treachery that the indictment charges” it is logically committed to the view that the trial is a *frameup* and that the Trotskyists are *completely* right about the guilt of the accused—though the *New Republic* has neither the courage nor the honesty to say this openly.

In general, no proofs that there have occurred whatever number of murders, poisonings, wreckings, spyings, treacheries, plottings, in the Soviet Union have in themselves anything to do with the guilt of defendants brought to court. The business of a trial is not to prove that a criminal act has occurred, but that the given defendant is guilty of a particular criminal act which has occurred.

But aside from this, it should be observed that there is not the slightest evidence that any of the leading defendants (with the exception of Yagoda) in any of the trials is guilty of any criminal acts whatsoever. They *may* be, of course; there is always, as Bukharin remarked, a certain “mathematical probability”, however low, that they are. But no proof has been offered. The mere fact that such grandiose public trials are held does not prove it; the thousands of times that Vyshinsky denounces them does not prove it; if a hundred more such trials are held it will not prove it. Stalin follows the old rule that if you say something often enough and strongly enough someone will begin to believe it; but a lie a million times repeated is still a lie.

This is very well worth remembering with reference to the new “light” on the secret trial of the eight generals. It will be remembered that these generals, headed by Marshal Tukhachevsky, were suddenly arrested and executed late last Spring. The story given out at that time by the special military tribunal which signed their sentence was that they were guilty of espionage, and of having prepared for the defeat of the Red Army in case of war against the Soviet Union. In the Trial of the 21, however, it was declared that they, in conjunction with the “Right-Trotskyist Bloc”, were planning a military *coup d'état* in order to seize control of the Soviet government.

It should be noticed, to begin with, that these two accounts are not merely different, but entirely incompatible with each other. In the one case, they are said to have sought the *defeat* of the Soviet Union, acting as agents of a foreign power; in the second, they are said to have planned to capture power for themselves without reference to the actions of any foreign power and quite independently of any foreign intervention or armed attack. How did Vyshinsky discover the difference? Unfortunately, since the generals were all dead, there was no opportunity for them to change their “confessions”. In point of fact, of course, both stories were spun out of the brains of Stalin and Yezhov, in accordance with their immediate political needs.

But more than this: Some persons, even among those who believe that the trials “as a whole” are frameups, play with the notion that perhaps the generals were “guilty of something”, perhaps they really did have a “German orientation” or something of the kind. Such ideas bear witness to the effectiveness of the method of the continuous repetition of lies as a way of getting them believed. There is, in actuality, no evidence of any kind that the generals were guilty of anything. There is, for that matter, no

evidence that they were ever even tried, even secretly. Evidently they were shot; that is all we know. The “sentence” passed on them was almost assuredly drawn up and its wording decided upon *after* they were already shot. Everything that is known about these generals proves their complete loyalty and devotion to the defense of the Soviet Union. Their fault—a great fault, but scarcely a crime in Soviet jurisprudence—was that they identified that loyalty with political subservience to Stalin. They, and the Red Army, paid a heavy price for that fault.

The Trial and the End of Austria

THERE IS A GRIM and tragic connection between the Trial of the 21 and the incorporation of Austria into Hitler's Reich. As Stalin undermines the strength and vitality of the Soviet Union, the confidence and aggressions of imperialism increase. A healthy and mighty Soviet Union, ruled and guided by the Soviet masses, would indeed be a great “bulwark of world peace”. Not merely its own power, but the inspiration which it would bring to the workers throughout the world would check the hands of the imperialists, and would aid in their speedy downfall. The Soviet Union sapped by the wrecking crew of Stalinism is not merely far less effective in itself, but destroys the resistance of the international proletariat, throws the workers everywhere into passivity and despair, and leaves them easy prey for their own war-mongering bourgeoisies. Watching the first two trials and the execution of the generals, Japan breathed easier for its onslaught on China. With the new trial unfolding, Hitler's last hesitation over a conclusive *coup* in Austria was removed.

The major disaster in the Austrian affair was not the loss of sovereignty for the tiny and impossible little orphan state, nor even the injuries and indignities now being heaped upon the backs of the Austrian Jews and workers—bitter as these indeed are. Far more threatening in their implications are the waves of chauvinism which the Austrian coup has let loose within the democratic countries, and the deepened isolation which is resulting for the Soviet Union. Hitler is the harvest from the crop sown by the engineers of the Versailles system, by the social democrats who smashed the post-War German revolution, by the Stalinists who gave their aid in smashing the potential revolution in 1932-33 and turning the German working class over to Hitler. And now these same social democrats and these same Stalinists call for a Holy War to make good their “errors” by—enlisting the workers of the democratic powers to be slaughtered for the sake of upholding the tottering imperialist structure of the Versailles nations.

This is the more criminal because the immediate response of the masses everywhere to Hitler's conquest of Austria expressed, on their part, a genuine and burning hatred of fascism, and a will to fight against it. Indeed, during the entire post-War period, the workers of Europe—how outstandingly the brave Austrian workers themselves!—have always shown their heroic and self-sacrificing readiness to fight fascism, whenever their parties have given the slightest lead. That hatred, that will and that readiness are more than ample to sweep aside in short order the Hitlers, the Mussolinis and the Francos. And it is these motive forces of the revolution which the social-patriots are chaining to imperialism.

But there are other plans afoot. Powerful interests within the dominant powers are driving to overcome the obstacles still impeding the consolidation of an inter-imperialist front which would solve the “German question” and perhaps also the Far Eastern crisis through allowing dismemberment of the Soviet Union, and its reduction to capitalist exploitation. There is no greater crime of Stalinism than its crime of leaving the Soviet Union ever more defenseless before its unappeasable enemies. More than ever before is it dramatically clear that the defense of the Soviet Union rests and can rest only on the international proletariat and the extension of the workers' revolution. But such defense is everywhere inseparable from the struggle against Stalinism, hangman of the proletariat and destroyer of the revolution.

Hue and Cry Over Kronstadt

A "People's Front" of Denouncers

THE CAMPAIGN AROUND KRONSTADT is being carried on with undiminished vigor in certain circles. One would think that the Kronstadt revolt occurred not seventeen years ago, but only yesterday. Participating in the campaign with equal zeal and under one and the same slogan are anarchists, Russian Mensheviks, left social-democrats of the London Bureau, individual blunderers, Miliukov's paper, and, on occasion, the big capitalist press. A "People's Front" of its own kind!

Only yesterday I happened across the following lines in a Mexican weekly which is both reactionary Catholic and "democratic": "Trotsky ordered the shooting of 1,500 [?] Kronstadt sailors, these purest of the pure. His policy when in power differed in no way from the present policy of Stalin." As is known, the left anarchists draw the same conclusion. When for the first time in the press I briefly answered the questions of Wendelin Thomas, member of the New York Commission of Inquiry, the Russian Mensheviks' paper immediately came to the defense of the Kronstadt sailors and . . . of Wendelin Thomas. Miliukov's paper came forward in the same spirit. The anarchists attacked me with still greater vigor. All these authorities claim that my answer was completely worthless. This unanimity is all the more remarkable since the anarchists defend, in the symbol of Kronstadt, genuine anti-state communism; the Mensheviks, at the time of the Kronstadt uprising, stood openly for the restoration of capitalism; and Miliukov stands for capitalism even now.

How can the Kronstadt uprising cause such heartburn to anarchists, Mensheviks, and "liberal" counter-revolutionists, all at the same time? The answer is simple: all these groupings are interested in compromising the only genuinely revolutionary current which has never repudiated its banner, has not compromised with its enemies, and which alone represents the future. It is because of this that among the belated denouncers of my Kronstadt "crime" there are so many *former* revolutionists or *half*-revolutionists, people who have lost their program and their principles and who find it necessary to divert attention from the degradation of the Second International or the perfidy of the Spanish anarchists. As yet, the Stalinists cannot openly join this campaign around Kronstadt but even they, of course, rub their hands with pleasure; for the blows are directed against "Trotskyism," against revolutionary Marxism, against the Fourth International!

Why in particular has this variegated fraternity seized precisely upon Kronstadt? During the years of the revolution we

clashed not a few times with the Cossacks, the peasants, even with certain layers of workers (certain groups of workers from the Urals organized a volunteer regiment in the army of Kolchak!). The antagonism between the workers as consumers and the peasants as producers and sellers of bread lay, in the main, at the root of these conflicts. Under the pressure of need and deprivation, the workers themselves were episodically divided into hostile camps, depending upon stronger or weaker ties with the village. The Red Army also found itself under the influence of the country. During the years of the civil war it was necessary more than once to disarm discontented regiments. The introduction of the "New Economic Policy" (N.E.P.) attenuated the friction but far from eliminated it. On the contrary, it paved the way for the rebirth of kulaks, and led, at the beginning of this decade, to the renewal of civil war in the village. The Kronstadt uprising was only an *episode* in the history of the relations between the proletarian city and the petty bourgeois village. It is possible to understand this episode only in connection with the general course of the development of the class struggle during the revolution.

Kronstadt differed from a long series of other petty bourgeois movements and uprisings only by its greater external effect. The problem here involved a maritime fortress under Petrograd itself. During the uprising proclamations were issued and radio broadcasts were made. The Social Revolutionaries and the anarchists, hurrying from Petrograd, adorned the uprising with "noble" phrases and gestures. All this left traces in print. With the aid of these "documentary" materials (*i.e.*, false labels), it is not hard to construct a legend about Kronstadt, all the more exalted since in 1917 the name Kronstadt was surrounded by a revolutionary halo. Not idly does the Mexican magazine quoted above ironically call the Kronstadt sailors the "purest of the pure".

The play upon the revolutionary authority of Kronstadt is one of the distinguishing features of this truly charlatan campaign. Anarchists, Mensheviks, liberals, reactionaries try to present the matter as if at the beginning of 1921 the Bolsheviks turned their weapons on those very Kronstadt sailors who guaranteed the victory of the October insurrection. Here is the point of departure for all the subsequent falsehoods. Whoever wishes to unravel these lies should first of all read the article by comrade J. G. Wright in *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL* (February, 1938). My problem is another one: I wish to describe the physiognomy of the Kronstadt uprising from a more general point of view.

Social and Political Groupings in Kronstadt

A REVOLUTION IS "MADE" directly by a *minority*. The success of a revolution is possible, however, only where this minority finds more or less support, or at least friendly neutrality on the part of the majority. The shift in different stages of the revolution, like the transition from revolution to counter-revolution, is directly determined by changing political relations between the minority and the majority, between the vanguard and the class.

Among the Kronstadt sailors there were three political layers: the proletarian revolutionists, some with a serious past and training; the intermediate majority, mainly peasant in origin; and, finally, the reactionaries, sons of kulaks, shopkeepers and priests. In Czarist times, order on battleships and in the fortress could be maintained only so long as the officers, acting through the reac-

tionary sections of the petty officers and sailors, subjected the broad intermediate layer to their influence or terror, thus isolating the revolutionists, mainly the machinists, the gunners, and the electricians, *i.e.*, predominantly the city workers.

The course of the uprising on the battleship *Potemkin* in 1905 was based entirely on the relations among these three layers, *i.e.*, on the struggle between proletarian and petty bourgeois reactionary extremes for influence upon the more numerous middle peasant layer. Whoever has not understood this problem, which runs through the whole revolutionary movement in the fleet, had best be silent about the problems of the Russian revolution in general. For it was entirely, and to a great degree still is, a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie for influence upon the

peasantry. During the Soviet period the bourgeoisie has appeared principally in the guise of kulaks (*i.e.*, the top stratum of the petty bourgeoisie), the "socialist" intelligentsia, and now in the form of the "Communist" bureaucracy. Such is the basic mechanism of the revolution in all its stages. In the fleet it assumed a more centralized, and therefore more dramatic expression.

The political composition of the Kronstadt Soviet reflected the composition of the garrison and the crews. The leadership of the Soviets already in the summer of 1917 belonged to the Bolshevik Party, which rested on the better sections of the sailors and included in its ranks many revolutionists from the underground movement who had been liberated from the hard-labor prisons. But I seem to recall that even in the days of the October insurrection the Bolsheviks constituted less than one-half of the Kronstadt Soviet. The majority consisted of S.R.s and anarchists. There were no Mensheviks at all in Kronstadt. The Menshevik Party hated Kronstadt. The official S.R.s, incidentally, had no better attitude

toward it. The Kronstadt S.R.s quickly went over into opposition to Kerensky and formed one of the shock brigades of the so-called "left" S.R.s. They based themselves on the peasant part of the fleet and of the shore garrison. As for the anarchists, they were the most motley group. Among them were real revolutionists, like Zhuk and Zhelezniakov, but these were the elements most closely linked to the Bolsheviks. Most of the Kronstadt "anarchists" represented the city petty bourgeoisie and stood upon a lower revolutionary level than the S.R.s. The president of the Soviet was a non-party man, "sympathetic to the anarchists", and in essence a peaceful petty clerk who had been formerly subservient to the Czarist authorities and was now subservient . . . to the revolution. The complete absence of Mensheviks, the "left" character of the S.R.s, and the anarchist hue of the petty bourgeois were due to the sharpness of the revolutionary struggle in the fleet and the dominating influence of the proletarian sections of the sailors.

Changes During the Years of the Civil War

THIS SOCIAL AND POLITICAL characterization of Kronstadt which, if desired, could be substantiated and illustrated by many facts and documents, is already sufficient to illuminate the upheavals which occurred in Kronstadt during the years of the civil war and as a result of which its physiognomy changed beyond recognition. Precisely about this important aspect of the question, the belated accusers say not one word, partly out of ignorance, partly out of malevolence.

Yes, Kronstadt wrote a heroic page in the history of the revolution. But the civil war began a systematic depopulation of Kronstadt and of the whole Baltic fleet. Already in the days of the October uprising, detachments of Kronstadt sailors were being sent to help Moscow. Other detachments were then sent to the Don, to the Ukraine, for requisition of bread and to organize the local power. It seemed at first as if Kronstadt were inexhaustible. From different fronts I sent dozens of telegrams about the mobilization of new "reliable" detachments from among the Petersburg workers and the Baltic sailors. But already in 1918, and, in any case, not later than 1919, the fronts began to complain that the new contingents of "Kronstadters" were unsatisfactory, exacting, undisciplined, unreliable in battle and doing more harm than good. After the liquidation of Yudenich (in the winter of 1919), the Baltic fleet and the Kronstadt garrison were denuded of all revolutionary forces. All the elements among them that were of any use at all were thrown against Deniken in the south. If in 1917-1918 the Kronstadt sailors stood considerably higher than the average level of the Red Army and formed the framework of its first detachments as well as the framework of the Soviet regime in many districts, those sailors who remained in "peaceful" Kronstadt until the beginning of 1921, not fitting in on any of the

fronts of the civil war, stood by this time on a level considerably lower, in general, than the average level of the Red Army, and included a great percentage of completely demoralized elements, wearing showy bell-bottom pants and sporty haircuts.

Demoralization based on hunger and speculation had in general greatly increased by the end of the civil war. The so-called "sack-carriers" (petty speculators) had become a social blight, threatening to stifle the revolution. Precisely in Kronstadt where the garrison did nothing and had everything it needed, the demoralization assumed particularly great dimensions. When conditions became very critical in hungry Petrograd the Political Bureau more than once discussed the possibility of securing an "internal loan" from Kronstadt, where a quantity of old provisions still remained. But delegates of the Petrograd workers answered: "You will get nothing from them by kindness. They speculate in cloth, coal, and bread. At present in Kronstadt every kind of riff-raff has raised its head." That was the real situation. It was not like the sugar-sweet idealizations after the event.

It must further be added that Lettish and Esthonian ex-sailors who feared they would be sent to the front and were preparing to cross into their new bourgeois fatherlands, Latvia and Esthonia, had joined the Baltic fleet as "volunteers". These elements were in essence hostile to the Soviet authority and displayed this hostility fully in the days of the Kronstadt uprising. . . . Besides these there were many thousands of Lettish workers, mainly former farm-laborers, who showed unexampled heroism on all fronts of the civil war. We must not, therefore, tar the Lettish workers and the "Kronstadters" with the same brush. We must recognize social and political differences.

The Social Roots of the Uprising

THE PROBLEM OF A SERIOUS student consists in defining, on the basis of the objective circumstances, the social and political character of the Kronstadt mutiny and its place in the development of the revolution. Without this, "criticism" is reduced to sentimental lamentation of the pacifist kind in the spirit of Alexander Berkman, Emma Goldman, and their latest imitators. These gentlefolk do not have the slightest understanding of the criteria and methods of scientific research. They quote the proclamations of the insurgents like pious preachers quoting Holy Scriptures. They complain, moreover, that I do not take into consideration the "documents", *i.e.*, the gospel of Makhno and the other apostles. To take documents "into consideration" does not mean to

take them at their face value. Marx has said that it is impossible to judge either parties or peoples by what they say about themselves. The characteristics of a party are determined considerably more by its social composition, its past, its relation to different classes and strata, than by its oral and written declarations, especially during a critical moment of civil war. If, for example, we began to take as pure gold the innumerable proclamations of Negrin, Companys, Garcia Oliver and Co., we would have to recognize these gentlemen as fervent friends of socialism. But in reality they are its perfidious enemies.

In 1917-1918 the revolutionary workers led the peasant masses, not only of the fleet but of the entire country. The peasants seized

and divided the land most often under the leadership of the soldiers and sailors arriving in their home districts. Requisitions of bread had only begun and mainly from the landlords and kulaks at that. The peasants reconciled themselves to requisitions as a temporary evil. But the civil war dragged on for three years. The city gave practically nothing to the village and took almost everything from it, chiefly for the needs of war. The peasants approved of the "Bolsheviks" but became increasingly hostile to the "communists". If in the preceding period the workers had led the peasants forward, the peasants now dragged the workers back. Only because of this change in mood could the Whites partially attract the peasants and even the half-peasants, half-workers, of the Urals, to their side. This mood, *i.e.*, hostility to the city, nourished the movement of Makhno, who seized and looted trains marked for the factories, the plants, and the Red Army, tore up railroad tracks, shot Communists, etc. Of course, Makhno called this the anarchist struggle with the "state". In reality, this was a struggle of the infuriated petty property owner against the proletarian dictatorship. A similar movement arose in a number of other districts, especially in Tambovsky, under the banner of "Social Revolutionaries". Finally, in different parts of the coun-

try so-called "Green" peasant detachments were active. They did not want to recognize either the Reds or the Whites and shunned the city parties. The "Greens" sometimes met the Whites and received severe blows from them, but they did not, of course, get any mercy from the Reds. Just as the petty bourgeoisie is ground economically between the millstones of big capital and the proletariat, so the peasant partisan detachments were pulverized between the Red Army and the White.

Only an entirely superficial person can see in Makhno's bands or in the Kronstadt revolt a struggle between the abstract principles of anarchism and "state socialism". Actually these movements were convulsions of the peasant petty bourgeoisie which desired, of course, to liberate itself from capital but which at the same time did not consent to subordinate itself to the dictatorship of the proletariat. The petty bourgeoisie does not know concretely what it wants and, by virtue of its position, cannot know. That is why it so readily covered the confusion of its demands and hopes, now with the anarchist banner, now the populist, now simply with the "Green". Counterposing itself to the proletariat, it tried, flying all these banners, to turn the wheel of the revolution backwards.

The Counter-Revolutionary Character of the Kronstadt Mutiny

THERE WERE, OF COURSE, no impassable bulkheads dividing the different social and political layers of Kronstadt. There were still at Kronstadt a certain number of qualified workers and technicians to take care of the machinery. But even they were chosen by a method of negative selection as unreliable politically and of little use for the civil war. Some "leaders" of the uprising came from among these elements. However, this completely natural and inevitable circumstance, to which some accusers triumphantly point, does not change by one iota the anti-proletarian physiognomy of the revolt. Unless we are to deceive ourselves with the pretentious slogans, false labels, etc., we shall see that the Kronstadt uprising was nothing but an armed reaction of the petty bourgeoisie against the hardships of social revolution and the severity of the proletarian dictatorship.

That was exactly the significance of the Kronstadt slogan: "Soviets without Communists", which was immediately seized upon, not only by the S.R.s but by the bourgeois liberals as well. As a rather farsighted representative of capital, Professor Miliukov understood that to free the Soviets from the leadership of the Bolsheviks would have meant within a short time to demolish the Soviets themselves. The experience of the Russian Soviets during the period of Menshevik and S.R. domination and, even more clearly, the experience of the German and Austrian Soviets under the domination of the social democrats, proved this. Social Revolutionary-anarchist Soviets could serve only as a bridge from

the proletarian dictatorship to capitalist restoration. They could play no other rôle, regardless of the "ideas" of their participants. The Kronstadt uprising thus had a counter-revolutionary character.

From the class point of view, which—without offense to the gentlemen eclectics—remains the basic criterion not only for politics but for history, it is extremely important to contrast the behavior of Kronstadt to that of Petrograd in those critical days. The whole leading stratum of the workers had been drawn too out of Petrograd. Hunger and cold reigned in the deserted capitol, perhaps even more fiercely than in Moscow. A heroic and tragic period! All were hungry and irritable. All were dissatisfied. In the factories there was dull discontent. Underground organizers sent by the S.R.s and the White officers tried to link the military uprising with the movement of the discontented workers. The Kronstadt paper wrote about barricades in Petrograd, about thousands being killed. The press of the whole world proclaimed the same thing. Actually the precise opposite occurred. The Kronstadt uprising did not attract the Petrograd workers. It repelled them. The stratification proceeded along class lines. The workers immediately felt that the Kronstadt mutineers stood on the opposite side of the barricades—and they supported the Soviet power. The political isolation of Kronstadt was the cause of its internal uncertainty and its military defeat.

The N.E.P. and the Kronstadt Uprising

VICTOR SERGE, WHO, it would seem, is trying to manufacture a sort of synthesis of anarchism, P.O.U.M.ism and Marxism, has intervened very unfortunately in the polemic about Kronstadt. In his opinion, the introduction of the N.E.P. one year earlier could have averted the Kronstadt uprising. Let us admit that. But advice like this is very easy to give after the event. It is true, as Victor Serge remembers, that I had already proposed the transition to the N.E.P. in 1920. But I was not at all sure in advance of its success. It was no secret to me that the remedy could prove to be more dangerous than the malady itself. When I met opposition from the leaders of the party, I did not appeal to the ranks, in order to avoid mobilizing the petty bourgeoisie against the workers. The experience of the ensuing twelve months was re-

quired to convince the party of the need for the new course. But the remarkable thing is that it was precisely the anarchists all over the world who looked upon the N.E.P. as . . . a betrayal of communism. But now the advocates of the anarchists denounce us for not having introduced the N.E.P. a year earlier.

In 1921 Lenin more than once openly acknowledged that the party's obstinate defense of the methods of military communism had become a great mistake. But does this change matters? Whatever the immediate or remote causes of the Kronstadt rebellion, it was in its very essence a mortal danger to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Simply because it had been guilty of a political error, should the proletarian revolution really have committed suicide to punish itself?

Or perhaps it would have been sufficient to inform the Kronstadt sailors of the N.E.P. decrees to pacify them? Illusion! The insurgents did not have a conscious program and they could not have had one because of the very nature of the petty bourgeoisie. They themselves did not clearly understand that what their fathers and brothers needed first of all was free trade. They were discontented and confused but they saw no way out. The more conscious, *i.e.*, the rightist, elements, acting behind the scenes, wanted the restoration of the bourgeois regime. But they did not say so out loud. The "left" wing wanted the liquidation of discipline, "free Soviets", and better rations. The regime of the N.E.P. could only gradually pacify the peasant, and, after him, the discontented sections of the army and the fleet. But for this time and experience were needed.

Most puerile of all is the argument that there was no uprising, that the sailors had made no threats, that they "only" seized the fortress and the battleships. It would seem that the Bolsheviks marched with bared chests across the ice against the fortress only because of their evil characters, their inclination to provoke con-

flicts artificially, their hatred of the Kronstadt sailors, or their hatred of the anarchist doctrine (about which absolutely no one, we may say in passing, bothered in those days). Is this not childish prattle? Bound neither to time nor place, the dilettante critics try (17 years later!) to suggest that everything would have ended in general satisfaction if only the revolution had left the insurgent sailors alone. Unfortunately, the world counter-revolution would in no case have left them alone. The logic of the struggle would have given predominance in the fortress to the extremists, that is, to the most counter-revolutionary elements. The need for supplies would have made the fortress directly dependent upon the foreign bourgeoisie and their agents, the White emigrés. All the necessary preparations toward this end were already being made. Under similar circumstances only people like the Spanish anarchists or P.O.U.M.ists would have waited passively, hoping for a happy outcome. The Bolsheviks, fortunately, belonged to a different school. They considered it their duty to extinguish the fire as soon as it started, thereby reducing to a minimum the number of victims.

The "Kronstadters" Without a Fortress

IN ESSENCE, THE GENTLEMEN critics are opponents of the dictatorship of the proletariat and by that token are opponents of the revolution. In this lies the whole secret. It is true that some of them recognize the revolution and the dictatorship—in words. But this does not help matters. They wish for a revolution which will not lead to dictatorship or for a dictatorship which will get along without the use of force. Of course, this is a very "pleasant" dictatorship. It requires, however, a few trifles: an equal and, moreover, an extremely high, development of the toiling masses. But in such conditions the dictatorship would in general be unnecessary. Some anarchists, who are really liberal pedagogues, hope that in a hundred or a thousand years the toilers will have attained so high a level of development that coercion will prove unnecessary. Naturally, if capitalism could lead to such a development, there would be no reason for overthrowing capitalism. There would be no need either for violent revolution or for the dictatorship which is an inevitable consequence of revolutionary victory. However, the decaying capitalism of our day leaves little room for humanitarian-pacifist illusions.

The working class, not to speak of the semi-worker masses, is not homogeneous, either socially or politically. The class struggle produces a vanguard that absorbs the best elements of the class. A revolution is possible when the vanguard is able to lead the majority of the proletariat. But this does not at all mean that the internal contradictions among the toilers disappear. At the moment of the highest peak of the revolution they are of course attenuated, but only to appear later on a new stage in all their sharpness. Such is the course of the revolution as a whole. Such was the course in Kronstadt. When parlor pinks try to mark out a different route for the October revolution, after the event, we can only respectfully ask them to show us exactly where and when their great principles were confirmed in practice, at least partially, at least in tendency? Where are the signs that lead us to expect the triumph of these principles in the future? We shall of course never get an answer.

A revolution has its own laws. Long ago we formulated those "lessons of October" which have not only a Russian but an international significance. No one else has even tried to suggest any other "lessons". The Spanish revolution confirms the "lessons of October" by the inverted method. And the severe critics are silent or equivocal. The Spanish government of the "People's Front" stifles the socialist revolution and shoots revolutionists. The anarchists participate in this government, or, when they are driven out, continue to support the executioners. And their foreign

allies and lawyers occupy themselves meanwhile with a defense . . . of the Kronstadt mutiny against the harsh Bolsheviks. A shameful comedy!

The present disputes around Kronstadt revolve around the same class axes as the Kronstadt uprising itself in which the reactionary sections of the sailors tried to overthrow the proletarian dictatorship. Conscious of their importance on the arena of present-day revolutionary politics, the petty bourgeois blunderers and eccentrics try to use the old Kronstadt episode for the struggle against the Fourth International, that is, against the party of the proletarian revolution. These latter-day "Kronstadters" will also be crushed—true, without the use of arms since, fortunately, they do not have a fortress. COYOACAN, Jan. 15, 1938. Leon TROTSKY

Sabotage and Mayhem at the North Pole

AS WE GO TO PRESS news comes from Moscow that nineteen defendants in a "secret treason trial that ran simultaneously with the world-publicised Moscow trial have been shot". The execution of this fresh batch of nineteen only rated a short item in the provincial paper Kazakhstan Pravda. Among the executed was former Provincial President U. Kulumbetoff and the charges were the usual concoction of treason, sabotage and espionage.

But the real sensation in this A.P. dispatch is that Dr. Otto Schmidt, head of the Northern Sea Route Administration and who was in charge of last summer's polar flights, has been officially denounced by resolution of the Council of People's Commissars. It is alleged that he was responsible for the fact that the transport ships and ice-breakers of the N.S.F. "spent the winter drifting in the ice". Such a resolution as all past experience indicates is tantamount to Professor Schmidt's death-warrant.

The details of preceding show trials as cooked up by the diseased and venomous imagination of Stalin's Ogpu leave the satirist helpless. Schmidt's scientific activity has received the highest possible acclaim. He will now be pilloried as a loathsome agent of Japanese imperialism who for the three hundred or three thousand rubles sold his Fatherland to the Mikado. Eventually he will be tried and will confess how, between spells of attempts on Stalin's life, he furtively arranged to put ice in the way of the ice-breakers heading for the drifting ice floe. He will confess further how he cunningly conspired to doctor up the Soviet weather in order to hamper the work of Papanin. He will be shot sobbing, "Long live Comrade Stalin, Father of the Peoples and co-discoverer with Doctor Cook of the South Pole".

Strike of Capital?

A NEW SLOGAN, "strike of capital", has cropped up in recent months. It has been repeated in the Stalinist press, it has been taken up by the Roosevelt aides, and it has spread increasingly among liberals and in the labor movement.

The occasion which called forth the strike of capital theory was the precipitate stock market crash of August, 1937. Within a little more than two months (August 14—October 18) the Dow-Jones average of industrial shares dropped 35%, a percentage drop that compared only with the crash of 1929, and was about equal to it. The usual interpretation of such a debacle is either that the current profit records of the corporations have fallen sharply, causing proportionate declines in the value of shares, or that a sharp fall in profits was generally anticipated for the near future. In either case, the crash aroused fears of another depression.

On this occasion the Communist Party reported on the meaning of the stock market crash. Stock market speculators were claiming that Roosevelt's stock exchange regulations were the cause of the crash. But the Communist Party asks and answers:¹ "Is the present fall of stock values merely or largely the result of such clumsy handling of or interference with its inner mechanics, whether by the Security Exchange Commission or by its Wall St. opponents? To this question we must answer no." Others feared that this was the sign of a new depression. But the Communist Party insisted: "The second idea which we should reject is that the decline on the stock exchange reflects the entry of business into a new cyclical depression, that business has *already* entered a crisis phase." The reasons why they reject this idea are that "We are still in the recovery phase . . ." and "There are still present possibilities for the maintenance of the recovery trends".²

This only said what the cause was *not*. The crash still remained to be explained. The question still remained "What is the cause of the stock market crash?"

The Stalinists' answer slides out rather shamefacedly at first but warms up as it proceeds. It starts off with "A very important contributing factor to the decline of the stock market, and the uneven recession in various branches of industry is this: that big capital, the reactionary monopolists, may be considered as being on a sort of political strike."

What could be the purpose of the strike? The answer is: "It is not excluded that in expectation of this Congress [the special session of Congress called by Roosevelt] and what it may do, the monopolists seek to produce or hasten the aggravation of economic conditions, in order to terrorize Congress and keep it from adopting progressive political measures." On the theory that anything that "is not excluded" is thereby proved—which works well in frame-up trials but not among sane people—they charge that "The underlying motive of this sabotage of the monopolies is political: it is a struggle against the people, against progress and against the administration of President Roosevelt."

Briefly stated, the cause of the stock market crash was a strike of capital. We need not go into any analysis of the purpose. The existence of the strike itself must first be proven. If there was no strike, it could have no purpose. Was there a strike of capital?

¹"Economic Trends Today, Monopoly Sabotage, and Tasks of Our Party—A Report to the Political Bureau of the Communist Party on the Present Economic Situation", by Alex Bitelman. *Daily Worker*, October 28, 1937. All subsequent quotations, unless otherwise noted, are from this report.

²This propaganda is identical with that spread by the Roosevelt administration and the capitalist press to hide the truth of capitalist decline. The fact is, all basic economic indexes at the time this was written were plainly downward. For instance, the New York Times index of business activity, which is based on industrial production and wholesale distribution, fell from a peak of 111.2 on August 14 to 100.2 on October 16, a far sharper drop than occurred in the same period following the crash of 1929. The more inclusive index of business activity of *Business Week* really began to drop September 4, more than two weeks after the crash began, and fell from 79.6 to 69.4 on October 16, showing that in less than six weeks one-eighth of American business activity had been destroyed. The seasonally adjusted index of manufactures and minerals, published by the Federal Reserve Board, began falling as far back as December, 1936. Even more damning, the Stalinists' own economic service, Labor Research Association, warned in its October issue of *Economic Notes* that "Developments of the last few months have strengthened the belief that the country is facing another depression."

To strike, according to Funk and Wagnall's dictionary, is "To quit or cease, as work, in order to compel compliance with a demand, redress, or grievance." A strike of capital, if it took place, would mean that at a specific time monopoly capitalists got together, organized themselves, and all together "quit" trying to enrich themselves. They would do this either by preventing the unity of the elements of production, capital and labor, and in this way "cease" expropriating surplus value from the workers; or, failing in this, by preventing the realization of surplus value in exchange, and in this way "cease" making profits. Or when they are in a period of recovery and have every opportunity to increase their profitable exploitation of workers by means of greater capital accumulation, they would refuse to convert profits into capital and, in this way, "quit" enriching themselves. In short, a strike of capital would mean that monopoly capitalists organize themselves to destroy profits and capital accumulation, organize themselves for suicide.

Merely to define it is enough to show how fantastic it is. However, the Stalinists insist the strike of capital caused the stock market crash—and for that matter, although we are still supposedly "in the recovery phase", it is also responsible now for the depression—and they even submit "proof". The proof consists, as usual, only of accusations, such as that the monopoly capitalists "have refused to expand, to make new investments, they sabotage recovery, thereby threatening the nation's economy." And in another place: "But most particularly, big capital sabotages the further development of recovery by failure to do the traditional thing, that is, to come to the support of a weakening market and weakening spots in industry *during a period of recovery*, by failure to energetically exploit the basis of still existing recovery for further expansion."

That American monopoly capitalists, who give lessons to the world in the art of efficient exploitation, should need lessons from the Stalinists on how to "energetically exploit" anything or anybody, and how to make greater profits anywhere—this will surprise most people and most of all the monopolists. However, "it is not excluded". Let us consider the charges.

Stock exchange speculators did not come to the support of the weakening market. This is undeniable. It is also understandable. They purchase stocks because of their current profits or because there is expectation of future profits from them. Stock prices and bond prices had been declining gradually since March, 1937, indicating the general judgment of stock speculators concerning current or future profits. When the market broke in August, the immediate reaction was either caution or suspicion that it was the beginning of a crash. For instance, as stocks fell and no support came into the market, one of the outstanding financial weeklies asked "Then why aren't stocks a buy?" Its answer was, "Maybe earnings will fall so stocks will become relatively less attractive. . . . Barron's business index declined again last week." (*Barron's*, Oct. 18, 1937.)

The Stalinists can deceive untutored workers into believing that when "Barron's business index declined again last week," this is more proof of the Stalinist thesis that "We are still in the recovery phase". The monopolists have their own advisers who get paid to advise and not deceive. Their facts showed that business was falling, that "earnings will fall", that there was nothing in the market which any monopolist could "energetically exploit". Anyone who bought stocks was certain of nothing—except losses. It was not that the monopolists "refused" to function. They were unable to function *profitably*. This proves not that "we are still in the recovery phase" but that capitalism is in a crisis phase.

The accusation that "They have refused to expand, to make new

investments" etc. has a grain of truth. That there has been a great dearth of capital expansion is undeniable. Consider the total of private new capital flotations for domestic purposes, which is the best current measure of capital expansion:³

YEAR	AMOUNT IN DOLLARS
1929	8,002,064,000
1930	4,483,082,000
1931	1,550,049,000
1932	325,362,000
1933	160,584,000
1934	178,258,000
1935	403,570,000
1936	1,191,950,000
1937	1,191,895,000

The figures show unmistakably that there has been not nearly the capital expansion since 1929 that took place then. The two latest years, which were years of "prosperity", had little more than one-eighth the capital expansion in each year that 1929 had. The years 1932-1935 showed insignificant amounts of new capital flotations. And yet capital expansion is the very backbone of capitalist prosperity, permitting capital accumulation and the enrichment of the capitalists while at the same time affording widespread employment and great purchasing power to the workers.

The fact of diminishing capital expansion is undeniable. What is the reason for it? One explanation is that the contradictions of capital accumulation are responsible for a condition where capitalism *cannot expand profitably any further*. When that condition becomes permanent, the decline of capitalism has begun. Since 1929, American capitalism has been declining, and this decline is due to its inability to expand today and its even greater inability to expand in the future. The effect of this decline is depressed prosperity, increasingly sharp crises, increasing unemployment, and wholesale decline in the standards of living of the American masses. The fault is with the system. The solution is to overthrow it. This is the explanation of Marxian economists.

The other explanation is that despite the crises resulting from the contradictions of capital accumulation there is still room today in which American capitalism can expand profitably. The reason why it does not is attributed to the personal faults of the capitalists. The kind of faults varies with the idiosyncrasies and the political axes of the individual economists. This is the basic position of capitalist economists and reforming liberals. Regardless of attempts to hide the issue in weazel words, this is also the basic position of the Stalinists. For their statement of the case is that there is a strike of capital, a sit-down of big business, in which the monopolists "have refused to expand" and their "underlying motive . . . is political." In short, the fault is with persons, not with the system.

Here is involved not merely the strike of capital but the whole question of Marxism versus reformism. The Stalinists choose reformism. Which is right? Let us consider the evidence.

A strike, whether of labor or capital, begins at some specific time. The Stalinists claim that the strike of capital caused the stock market crash. The time when the capitalists "refused to expand" must have taken place before the crash. When did the crash take place? When did the capitalists begin to refuse to expand?

The time when the market crashed is easy to give—it crashed on August 14. When did the monopoly capitalists begin to strike and to "refuse" to invest? Was it just a few months before the crash? But the government statistics show that as late as June, 1937, only a month and a half before the crash, new capital flotations for business expansion were \$268,946,000, the largest in any month of over seven years.⁴

Perhaps the strike began the night before the crash—an unusual instance of a lightning-fast strike? In which case it would have continued at least into September. However, government figures show that private new capital flotations were \$112,757,000 in Sep-

tember, 1937, twice as much as in August and not much less than the capital expansion in the full year of 1933 or 1934. Even in October, when all monopoly capitalists should have learned from the Stalinists that they were on strike and should have obeyed orders, new capital flotations for business expansion were \$66,647,000, which amount was exceeded by only two of the forty-eight months of 1932-1935 inclusive.

In short, the monopoly capitalists either planned a strike and then scabbed on each other; or, they did not call a strike but merely told the Stalinists they would, leaving them holding the bag with their "scoop"; or the strike of capital is just another Stalinist fiction. For among the many sentences about strike of capital and sit-down of big business, there is not one that tells *when* it all began.

Another characteristic of a strike is that it has persons who take part. Who participated in the strike of capital? Of course, not all participants could be identified in any strike, least of all in a strike of capital whose motive is to "terrorize Congress". However, at least some would be known. The Stalinists as usual name no names and give no proof.⁵ Nevertheless, let us hunt out the proof for them.

Beginning with February, 1937, the number of commercial failures began to mount, rising to threatening figures. In February, 1937, it was higher than in the same months of 1935. Was it to "terrorize Congress" in August that these businesses started to commit suicide as far back as February?

It may be argued that these commercial failures took place among small business and represent part of the strike of capital, part of the efforts of monopoly capitalists to destroy economic expansion. The answer is that this started as far back as February. Our previous figures showed that the capital flotations in June were the highest in seven years. Had there been a strike of capital causing commercial failures in order to undermine business expansion, would the same strike at the same time have increased economic expansion through new and greater capital flotations?

As far back as March, the general level of wholesale prices was declining. Farm prices fell precipitately. Was it to prepare themselves for a strike in August that these wholesalers slashed their prices in March?

Here we had an orgy of capitalist suicides whose one purpose was political, to "terrorize Congress", and the Stalinists cannot prove who planned it, when it was organized, or who participated. Either the strike of capital is fiction, cannot be proved and the Stalinists know it—in which case they stand indicted for conscious deception of the workers. Or the strike of capital is fact—and they take their responsibility to the workers so lightly that they do not concern themselves with evidence. Here both are true. They hold the workers lightly and the strike of capital is fiction.

Then why do the Stalinists repeat it? Not because it explains the stock market crash, certainly. Here the strike of capital is worthless. They repeat it because it has political worth, because it serves a political function. Their very efforts to meet anticipated criticism of its political function gives the hint at what function they expect it to serve.

The criticism that they try to ward off is that the strike of capital is a cloak for opportunism in politics. They insist that to say there is a strike of capital "is not to say that the monopolists can at will and in an organized way bring about either recovery or depression. Nothing of the sort. To assume that would mean to assume something which is closely akin to the opportunist theory of 'an organized capitalism', something that does not exist."

Upon this much there is agreement: The theory of "an organ-

⁵To point to a shut-down of General Motors or U. S. Steel as proof of participation in a strike of capital avoids the whole question: Are these plants shut because they have no market for their products, because of depression; or do they have customers who can give them a profit and nevertheless the plants "strike", refuse to produce, to make profits, because of a secret agreement to "terrorize Congress" by aggravating economic conditions and causing a depression?

³Survey of Current Business, Feb. 1938, pp. 18-20.

⁴Survey of Current Business, Feb. 1938, pp. 18-20. All other statistics of capital flotations are from same source.

ized capitalism" is a product of opportunist politics which seeks to justify itself by falsifying economics. Does the strike of capital assume an organized capitalism? If it does, it brands the Stalinists as being "closely akin" to opportunists by their own confession. Let us consider the matter further.

Can there be a strike of capital if we do not assume an organized capitalism? Certainly not. If there is no organized capitalism and only some of the monopoly capitalists struck, the others would scab on them and soon smash them into bankruptcy. These possible scabs must be organized. Organization cannot stop there. It must include also all capitalism. If not, when the monopoly capitalists struck the small capitalists would scab, get the market away from monopoly capitalists, become monopoly capitalists themselves and bankrupt the striking capitalists. The strike of capital assumes—and must assume—"an organized capitalism". And by their own admission, this is "closely akin to opportunism."

Anyone that requires more concrete evidence that the strike of capital is a cloak for opportunism need but consider the measure which the Stalinists propose against the strike. Taking off on one of Roosevelt's speeches, they propose: "It is possible to combat more effectively the sabotage of the monopolies by strengthening and democratizing the Federal Reserve System. This is what we have been saying right along ourselves."⁶

Finance capital dominates modern industry. If industry struck, surely finance capital through its control of the Federal Reserve System, would also strike. To strengthen the Federal Reserve System would be to strengthen the "sabotage of the monopolies". So the Stalinists include "democratizing" as part of the solution. The Federal Reserve System must be democratized in order to lend money to good capitalists and break the strike of bad capitalists.

Should the democratized Federal Reserve System refuse to break the strike of capital, the workers will have to do it themselves. One way would be to take over the factories and run them. This would break the strike quickly. For Stalinists this is excluded. It is against capitalism and capitalist democracy. It might antagonize the petty bourgeoisie, whose friendship must be kept at all costs. It smacks of revolution and Trotskyism.

The Stalinists will solve the problem in their own peculiar way. How do capitalists break a workers' strike? By calling in scabs, "good" workers. Then how should the workers break a strike of capital? By following the same tactics—by calling in "good" capitalists. We have visions of the *Daily Worker* running want ads: "Some good capitalists wanted to run a struck steel plant"; or "The Communist Party faction of the auto workers has coöperatively paid for this ad—ONE SINCERE HONEST BOSS WANTED! WILLINGNESS TO MAKE PROFITS ESSENTIAL!"

The strike of capital is not only a cloak for opportunist politics but, like opportunism itself, it is a weapon of capitalism in its struggle against the workers. This fact slipped out in the syndicated column of a capitalist correspondent writing from Washington: "The charge that there has been a deliberate strike of business against the administration is encouraged here to establish a *popular excuse* and to offer the public an *easily visualized villain*. But, in private, when considering what ought to be done, the administration does not take that talk seriously." (Raymond Clapper in the *World-Telegram*, Jan. 5, 1938.)

⁶There is a striking similarity in approach between this and the approach of petty-bourgeois demagogues and Fascists. The Stalinists, in their strike of capital, insist that the cause of the present depression is not capitalism but some bad monopoly capitalists. The Fascists agree with this, only they are even more specific—the bad capitalists are Jews. The Stalinists propose to democratize the Federal Reserve System and in this way break the strike of capital that is causing the depression. The Coughlinites, etc., propose the *identical* measure to break the control of international "Jew" finance. Both are demagogic appeals to petty-bourgeois prejudices in order to win over the middle classes. But in this conflict of demagogues, the Stalinists must lose. The Fascists can play upon anti-Semitism and other base emotions. The Stalinists will have to compete more effectively. And in France, according to Max Nomad, who recently returned from visiting it on a Guggenheim fellowship, the Stalinists are resorting to anti-Semitism and burlesque shows to get members among the backward districts of Paris.

When the Stalinists spread among the masses the idea of a "strike of capital", they perpetuate a threefold deception.

Their first deception is to give the workers an "easily visualized villain" for the stock market crash and the economic decline. They cover up the bankruptcy of capitalism by blaming them both, not on the capitalist system but on some bad capitalists. But in doing so they deny the obvious fact of widespread economic decline heading toward depression. They ridicule the obvious fears of the capitalists themselves, as does the report when it says "We do not subscribe to the naive view of the National City Bank which wonders whether we are going to have a miracle of a new depression setting in before we are fully out of the old one." They ridicule the evidence of their own economic service whose verdict, given weeks before the strike of capital became official dogma, was: "Developments of the last few months have strengthened the belief that the country is facing another depression." (*Economic Notes*, October 1937.) Above all, they ridicule whatever faith the masses still have in their competency and integrity. In spreading the propaganda of strike of capital, the Stalinists act as the agents of capitalism.

Its second deception is to spread the illusion that the New Deal is in the interests of the workers and not the capitalists, that the Roosevelt administration represents the people and is not the "executive committee" of the ruling class. It hides the fact that the New Deal has not been able to solve the crisis of capitalism, that the present crisis occurs under the New Deal. In all this the Stalinists show themselves the agents, among the workers, of the capitalist government.

These deceptions are great enough in themselves. However, they are only parts of a third, and colossal, deception: the People's Front, the politics of opportunism pursued on an international scale.

People's Front opportunism must spread the illusion among the workers that there is room for recovery and progress under capitalism. Unless they do this the workers will realize that capitalism is in decline, that there is no place in it for liberal labor politics and reforms, and that their only solution is the overthrow of capitalism—revolution. The opportunists will speak, but to no audience. That is why the Stalinists insist that "We are still in the recovery phase" although their own economic service proves they lie.

People's Front opportunism must spread the illusion that the capitalist democracy symbolized by the existing government is good capitalism, that it is progressive, and fights for the people and progress against the "bad" capitalists who represent fascism. It must spread this among the workers in order to get them to support the government. In this way they prepare the workers to support the capitalists in the coming imperialist war. And People's Front opportunism must deliver up the workers in advance in order to convince the capitalist government that a military alliance with the Soviet Union means mass support of the imperialist war.

But daily events rise up to challenge these deceptions. In order to continue this false politics, the Stalinists must falsify all economics. They must deny the reality of capitalist decline, when it becomes vivid in crashing stock markets. They must invent the "strike of capital" to hide the real function of the New Deal, to absolve the Roosevelt administration from any blame for the depression, and to tie the workers more completely to the government which "represents" them and progress.

This strike of capital is false economics to hide anti-working-class politics. It is only the American version of Stalinist fraud. And it is only part of the giant fraud being perpetrated upon the international working-class by the Stalinist International.

The Jewish Question

THE RISE OF FASCISM to power in one country after the other in Europe, poses acutely again and again, along with the problems faced by the working class, the entire Jewish Question. King Carol's dictatorial "solution" of the social and political crisis in Rumania, and now the extension of Hitler's power to Austria, serve to widen the scope of the problem. Already a major social catastrophe in time of "peace", the plight of Jewry seems destined to be frightful indeed in the coming World War, acknowledgedly close upon us.

Where shall the Jew turn? Where lies his salvation? The question takes on a different aspect indeed from that faced in the period of the rise of capitalism. The Jews played a highly progressive role in helping to bring into being and firmly establish the capitalist system. With the movement toward national capitalist unification, it seemed possible that the Jews might become assimilated in the various lands of their dispersion. Particularly did this seem likely as social and political rights were granted to the Jews and as the ghettos began to disappear. The early Marxists felt that this process of assimilation would solve the Jewish Question. But the epoch of decay of capitalism has brought with it a tremendous resurgence of nationalism which in turn engenders anti-semitism.

Obviously there is nothing new in the methods of persecution adopted by Hitlerism in Germany—neither specifically nor in general. Imperialism maintains its sway by sowing division and hatred everywhere, at home and abroad. In India it pits Hindu against Moslem, in the Balkans one race against another, in Palestine Arab against Jew. In old Russia the Czars thought to divert the Revolution from its channel by instigating pogroms. Hitler borrows this self-same weapon from the arsenal of Czarist reaction. True he does not permit a Kishenev in Germany, but applies the far worse method of slow starvation, the "cold" pogrom. What is new about this decadence is that the rise of Hitler to power has contributed a political technique to the reactionaries of all Europe for their emulation. Thus anti-semitism is part of the cancer of Nazism that spreads poisonously outwards from the center of infection, Germany, the very country in which the Jews had been more nearly assimilated than anywhere else in the world. Hitler has elevated anti-semitism into a part of reaction's *Weltanschauung* and into a world problem.

At a time when the right of unrestricted immigration would prove of invaluable aid to the persecuted Jews, all lands are more or less closed to them. The great influx of Jews into the United States was stopped by the Johnson Quota Law of 1924 (a law promulgated not during any period of crisis, but entirely on the basis of reactionary racial politics). At that time Canada and South Africa followed suit and closed their doors. Thus when the terrible Polish crisis developed in that year and the Jews were oppressed unbearably under Grabski's economic policies, the wave of migration that followed could seek the shores of Palestine alone. The pressure of economic necessity awakened a new interest in the idea of a Jewish homeland. Whether one sympathizes with this idea or not it must be acknowledged that Zionism grew as a force among Jews. Certainly one can have only the profoundest sympathy with the idealism of the Jewish masses who longed for some solution of their desperate plight during and after the World War. But we have had a whole generation of experience with Palestine since the War and surely it is now possible to evaluate that experience.

What a tragic experience it has been! View it from any angle one chooses, the short history of Palestine can only convince those whose minds are at all open to the simple truth, that the establishing of a "free and independent" Jewish homeland there or anywhere else is an impossibility so long as capitalism lasts. How can the Jews, for one thing, entrust their fate to British imperial-

ism? That imperialism seeks only its own interests, the defense of the imperial trade routes through the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal, the establishing of a naval base and a protected air base in the Near East, the protection of its oil fields, the setting up of some force completely dependent on Britain to act as a counterfoil, if and when necessary, to the Arabs seeking *their* national independence. How can the Jewish masses—we do not speak here of the Jewish big bourgeoisie or their close henchmen—seeking freedom and liberation from oppression ally themselves with the greatest oppressor of all, British imperialism?

But even the most sanguine of the Zionists, the most trusting in the good faith of the "democratic" English bourgeoisie, have received a rude lesson from that source recently. The White Paper calling tentatively for the partition of Palestine into two separate states, the smaller one for the Jews, indicates quite clearly that England is seeking the best way to satisfy its own needs in the situation. The times do change, and English policy changes accordingly. Those Zionists who are willing to foster the complete dependence of their movement on English bounty, have already adapted themselves to a bad bargain and are even willing to accept the much narrowed base for their state existence, as a lesser evil. The trouble is that behind the purposely vague plans for partition all Zionists can see plainly the possible preparation for a complete abandonment of support for a Jewish homeland. In the debate in the House of Commons on the Palestine question between Ormsby-Gore, Secretary of State for the Colonies, and Colonel Wedgwood, that "Laborite champion of the Zionists", the best solution this good friend could advance was for England to arm the Jews, withdraw all British troops and "let them fight it out with the Arabs". This can be understood in only one way: Wedgwood, Laborite adherent to the Second International, has no solution to offer and would like to have England wash her hands of the whole matter. Wedgwood demands that the Jews be allowed unrestricted entry—into Palestine. He makes no effort to have England herself, or South Africa, or Australia, open the door to unrestricted immigration. In that respect he agrees with Hitler.

But even if we ignore the ever-present threat of a complete collapse of the homeland idea, we are bound to face another side of the question: in a world dominated by the great powers, with no part of it free from their influence (not even Russia with its one sixth of the globe) what sort of homeland could be set up in Palestine? Only a replica of the capitalist state with all its class oppression. And that is, of course, precisely what has been set up there. The Jewish toilers, pioneering in a country without great natural resources and with no free land available, have suffered as much misery in Palestine as anywhere else. If there was any delusion in the minds of Jews that the artificial and short-lived prosperity of Palestine during the worst years of the world crisis would endure, the present desperate situation there has brought quick disillusion. The boom period of speculation has been followed by the complete prostration of economy so that the trade union movement is faced with a herculean task in coming to the relief of its members.

Palestine is an integral part of the world capitalist system, subject to the same laws of crises and unemployment. Truly when the Jews migrated to Palestine, the *dalles* (poverty) went with them. It is utterly unthinkable—that goes without saying—that the Jews could set up socialism and a planned economy in Palestine alone. The class struggle in Palestine presents the same features so familiar in other capitalist countries. There is even a movement afoot, that of the Revisionists, to suppress working class organizations, particularly the trade unions. In short, the so-called Jewish fascist movement, with its gangsterism.

Finally, the terror that hangs like a pall over Palestine, due to the conflict with the Arabs, has placed the Jews in a most tragic situation from which there seems little hope for escape so long as the present capitalist system remains dominant. If the Jews must depend on Palestine for a solution to their problems, then it can only be said that they have reached an utter impasse. Palestine offers no way out—unless the rest of the world is changed first, unless capitalism is abolished from the earth. For only with the disappearance of exploitation will the fierce race hatreds and racial oppression die down and finally vanish.

Trotsky has pointed out that to establish real self-determination for the Jew would require that all those desiring to foster a Jewish culture and to participate in a common life, should be free to travel to some assigned spot—whether Palestine or any other—and that this transportation of millions of human beings would require the voluntary agreement of many different countries and the providing of vast facilities. Such voluntary aid on so vast a scale is absolutely unrealizable so long as capitalism lasts. It could become possible only under a coöperative, a socialist system of society. The conclusion is inevitable that even for those Jews who desire a separate homeland, the path to the realization of their goal lies through the class struggle, through allying themselves with the rest of the working class and the masses everywhere to bring about the proletarian world revolution. This involves first of all a struggle in their own ranks against their own bourgeoisie and all the propounders of capitalist ideology. It means the utter repudiation of the upholders of imperialism, of the Revisionists with their vicious pan-Jewish (what an ironic anomaly!) brand of chauvinism. It means the repudiation of the leadership of types like Jabotinsky and Lord Melchett (the same Sir Alfred Mond who sells nickel and other metals to all the world's armament manufacturers), who speak openly of making Palestine the Singapore of the Near East for England. Their leadership means offering the Jewish masses in bondage to English imperialism.

The Jews the world over must commit themselves to the defeat of fascism. In this struggle they become inevitably the allies of the workers in the anti-fascist movement. At the same time the anti-fascist cause comes naturally to the defense of the Jews. Thus it comes about that the Polish workers, the greatest victims of the anti-semitic poison spread by the Polish rulers, have begun to come to the defense of their Jewish brothers, a striking instance being the rout of the pogromists a short time ago by an organized detachment of P.P.S. workers at the Iron Gate of Warsaw. In Vienna during the short-lived opposition to Hitler's conquest of Austria, the workers also fought against the pogromist activities of the Nazis. In Rumania also, although this may prove temporary, the anti-fascist peasant party came to the defense of the Jews, the Peasant Guards fighting the fascist Iron Guards in their behalf.

But the anti-fascist struggle can only mean the fight for socialism. Every new happening on the international arena brings that lesson home—unless the workers seize the power in the cause of socialism, all other expedients to prevent the coming to power of fascism prove to be merely temporary stop-gaps. This in turn means that the Jews must define their attitude clearly to all working class forces and parties. Immediately the question arises as to which International to support. The Second International, with its reliance on the forces of bourgeois democracy alone, forces which are the first to disappear under the heels of the armed bands of fascism, has proved completely bankrupt, utterly impotent to bring about socialism. By all its collaborationist policies and tactics the Second International gave objective support to the victory of fascism and hence betrayed the workers and also the Jews. In the present instance the Second International betrays the Jews anew by assisting actively in linking their fate and the fate of Palestine with that of "democratic" British imperialism. But then how about the Third International?

At once the question of Biro-Bidjan comes to mind. This should

serve as a crucial test of the Stalinist Comintern for the Jews, bearing always in mind the clear-cut distinction to be drawn between the Soviet Union set up by the October Revolution and the ruling Stalinist caste. The Jews were to be permitted to build an autonomous national republic as part of the Federated Soviet Union, thus carrying out for the Jews the democratic right of national liberation in accordance with the ideas of Leninism. Certain "friends of the Soviet Union", notably Lord Marley, once told us that "The number of Jews who could be received in Biro-Bidjan is *quite unlimited* [his own italics] and there is no problem of an existing local population to be dealt with". He pointed out that this republic was more than half the size of England. Unlimited space, opportunities, vast natural resources! The American section of the I.C.O.R. alone was to be permitted to send over one thousand families (not so many, after all!).

What has become of Biro-Bidjan and why? We demand an explanation! Why has Russia, that country above all others that should be the spokesman for all the oppressed, the logical spokesman therefore to defend the persecuted Jews, not only remained completely silent but actually closed her doors to all "foreign" Jews? Nay, more, why has Stalin refused to accept back those sixty Russian Jewish families, Soviet citizens, that Hitler wanted to deport to Russia? Why did Stalin purge the administration of Biro-Bidjan along with that of every other national republic without exception? These republics were all founded with a view to permitting the unhampered development of national cultures within the framework of the Soviet system. Stalin, that erstwhile People's Commissar of Nationalities, removes entire national governments, administrations previously hand-picked by himself, without so much as a by-your-leave on the part of the peoples involved—on the pretext that they are "nationalistic"!

The truth is that the Stalinist bureaucracy, among all its other crimes, has completely ignored the "rights" of nationalities; Stalin has restored the old Czarist system of centralized bureaucratic control of the various nations that constitute Russia. The Stalinist clique has reconstituted the Great Russian administrative center with its oppression of other nationalities. It was inevitable that the counter-revolutionary Stalinist caste should come into violent conflict with, among other democratic rights, that of national democracy and national autonomy guaranteed by the obsolete Leninist Soviet Constitution. Far from becoming the spokesman for the Jews, Stalin stated, when he closed the door to foreign Jews, that he wanted to avoid "international complication". Evidently he did not want to embarrass the fascist dictators! Truth to tell, Stalin also does not want any foreigners at all, Jew or non-Jew, to enter Russia to discover what is actually happening there.

The lot of the Jew in Russia is far from being that free and equal life that the Stalinist apologists, the Jewish hirelings included, would have us believe. Quite the contrary, true reactionary "leader" of a totalitarian state, Stalin has taken a leaf from the notebook of Hitler and attempts to divert the smoldering hatred of the Russian masses away from the reactionary tops of the bureaucracy to the middle and lower layers, frequently Jews. Anti-semitism is again becoming part of the Russian system, though not yet quite as openly as under Czarism. Indeed one must ask, when Jews among others are removed from near the frontiers (as enemies of the people!) in furtherance of the plans for military defense, where are they sent? Is it possible that Biro-Bidjan will be converted into a national ghetto?

By his betrayal of the October Revolution and his active aid against world revolution, Stalin has been, along with the leaders of the Second International, the outright betrayer of the working class and of the Jews. The Third International bears just as much responsibility for the advent of fascism in one country after the other as does the Second. The Jews must throw their lot with those forces in the ranks of the working class really working for the social revolution; that can mean only those forces striving to constitute the Fourth International on the foundations of Marxism

and Leninism. In turn the Fourth International is the true spokesman for the Jewish masses who form one section of that oppressed humanity to whose liberation the Fourth International is devoted.

The Jewish masses must recognize that their plight is the obverse side of the plight of capitalism and nationalism in general. The Jews have reached an impasse because the capitalist system as a whole has reached an impasse. It is no accident at all that in its dying agony capitalism should reflect its struggle for continued existence in the form of rampant nationalist chauvinism. Early capitalism found the national state a powerful weapon with which to pulverize the feudal enemy, but also through which it could set up its new system of exploitation on a sufficiently broad basis. The new forces of production needed a wide area as a free market in order to give these forces the chance to grow. The national boundaries shut in such an area for the national capitalists, at the same time shutting off the encroachment of foreign capitalists.

In time these walls became too narrow for the powerful forces of production that developed in all the advanced countries. Hence there arose the system of extending the national economic boundaries by the seizure of colonies. Colonial imperialism thereby served to prolong the life of the capitalist system. But that road to expansion is now inexorably closing. If each country now strives desperately to extend its boundaries for national capitalist exploitation and this striving creates a life and death struggle that culminates in imperialist war, that now means only that the national boundaries themselves have become unbearable chains on society. It means that all further growth of the economic forces, as well as the very preservation of what has been achieved thus far, demands the sweeping aside of the national boundaries. Internationalism has become a necessity for humanity if civilization is to survive. What stands in the way of this necessary development is the capitalist class in each country, holding its possessions in a death grip. No wonder it wants to defend and maintain the national idea, the national boundaries. Its fate is inextricably tied up with those boundaries.

But the appeal to nationalism and to racialism in the advanced countries solves nothing. It can for a time serve to delude a larger or smaller section of the masses, but it is incapable of leading capitalism out of its complete impasse. All the reactionary ideas and programs of rabid nationalism, leading backwards with giant strides toward the Middle Ages, give way to renewed attempts at imperialist robbery. As a cover for this unrestrained plundering, German, Polish, French, all capitalist classes try to persuade their victimized people that the preservation of culture and people is identical with the preservation of the respective capitalism. Precisely the opposite is true. Having reached an impasse, capitalism begins visibly to decay. The accustomed class relationships begin to give way. The golden age of opportunity vanishes into the past and all classes feel themselves suspended over an abyss. The old loyalty of the petty bourgeoisie to the big bourgeoisie is replaced by awful fear and bitter hatred. Hence the ruling class, acting for its self-preservation, attempts everywhere to divert this wrath away from itself by using all the prejudices and hatreds engendered for decades by the capitalist system itself. And the easiest scapegoat is always the Jew.

Hence it is clear that the solution of the Jewish Question is the same identical solution as that for the present world system as a whole. Only the abolition of the capitalist system can put an end to national oppression, which is one expression of political oppression in general. The attempt, while the present system endures, to establish a homeland anywhere on the earth for the Jews, as Palestine amply demonstrates, can only succeed in involving the Jews in all the contradictions of capitalism. And of course it cannot be a solution for the overwhelming majority of the Jews, even granting that it might help that small minority that could find its way to the homeland. For the vast majority are tied down by economic necessity in whatever country they happen to be.

The coming imperialist war, brought much closer by Hitler's march into Austria, means a catastrophe if anything more profound for Jewry than for any other section of the population. In many lands they will become automatically "enemy aliens" to be herded into concentration camps to starve or to die of plagues of one kind or another. Or they will be driven from their homes without notice by one army or the other, leaving all their little possessions behind. Pogroms are already the order of the day in Europe even before the war, and they have always accompanied capitalist wars. The Jewish masses must enlist in the struggle against imperialist war. For them to follow acquiescently those Jewish misleaders who would place them at the service of one imperialism or the other, would mean to give willing aid in fastening the yoke of slavery on themselves and on others. Nor will silence, in the hope that they will be let alone, help. Their only defense is whole-hearted participation in the struggle against the capitalist oppressors. The cause of struggle against imperialist war coincides with the fight against fascism and for socialism. But that means that the Jewish masses must give their support to and fight with the Fourth International, the only force really opposed to imperialist war, the only force capable of leading the working class and the oppressed to victory in the transformation of capitalist into socialist society.

Jack WEBER

The Good Neighbor

FEW POLICIES OF the Roosevelt régime have been more successfully ballyhooed than the "good neighbor" act toward Latin and South America. In a manner directly analogous to the demagogic reformism of his internal propaganda, Roosevelt has hidden the steel claw of U.S. imperialism under the protective coating of this charming and fatherly phrase. Thanks to the kindness of Latin and South American dictators and the blessings of an upswing in the business cycle, for five years the "good neighbor" was all outward smiles and handshakes.

Suddenly the good neighbor has begun to frown, and to bare his teeth. He has been touched in his tenderest spot: in the spot where profits grow.

With a magnificent step forward, the Mexican Government expropriated the gigantic British and American oil companies, the leaches which for decades have sucked out the riches of Mexico for the benefit of Rockefeller and Sir Henri Deterding. For a few days Secretary of State Hull waited quietly, while Ambassador Josephus Daniels politely explained to President Cardenas the displeasure of U.S. finance-capital.

President Cardenas, with the Mexican workers in full possession of their own fields and in control of operations, failed to give Ambassador Daniels the necessary assurances.

Then the good neighbor got to work. With no preliminary notice, the agreement of the U.S. Treasury to buy Mexican silver was withdrawn, and at the same time the Treasury lowered its buying price for silver on the world market—both moves calculated to smash at the weakened position of Mexican currency on the international money market.

Then moves to shut off imports from Mexico to the United States. Then a "stiff note" explaining in none too obscure language just what it means to be the little neighbor of a good neighbor.

It is not ending here, of course. Already, we may be confident, the representatives of the oil companies are meeting in full consultation with the leaders of Mexican reaction and fascism. The next months, weeks even, will provide their full commentary on the real nature of the good neighbor.

Problems of Colonial India

ONCE AGAIN THE COLONIAL question comes to the fore. The Far-Eastern War, accompanied by the mighty though unsuccessful resistance of the Chinese people, has again set the stage for a new act in the movements of colonial masses for liberation from their imperialist rulers.

Such movements have always been characterized by the sweep and scope of the revolutionary powers they unleash. There is every historic reason to believe that this new cycle in colonial movements will surpass all others. Thus, the colonial problem demands the imperative study of every Marxist practitioner. As India is an almost ideal illustration of a backward country under the domination of a foreign, imperialist nation a study of its problems should serve to determine *concretely* what a general, revolutionary colonial policy has to face.

International-imperialist colonial policy today is influenced, above all, by the disintegration of the vast British Empire. In their ever-growing desperation, the imperialist rulers of England turn with renewed ferocity to India for their salvation. This has meant a deepening oppression and exploitation of the Indian masses in the name of senile British capitalism. With this new imperialist speed-up has come its inevitable counter-part—a revival of the Indian National Liberation movement, practically dormant since 1933. The purpose of this article is two-fold: (1) to give a brief sketch of Indian history under British rule, along with the present economic set-up in India; (2) to outline the Indian nationalist and revolutionary movement, including the more recent developments in the Indian Nationalist Congress since its last meeting (Dec., 1936) and the movement's future prospects.

1.

Lord Brentford in his speech to Parliament:

We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians. I know that it is said at missionary meetings that we have conquered India to raise the level of the Indians. That is cant. We conquered India as an outlet for the goods of Great Britain. We conquered India by the sword, and by the sword we shall hold it.

I am interested in missionary work in India and have done much work of that kind, but I am not such a hypocrite as to say that we hold India for the Indians. We hold it as the finest outlet for British goods in general, and for Lancashire goods in particular.

F. J. Shore (Indian Colonial Administrator):

*The fundamental principle of the English has been to make the whole Indian nation subservient, in every possible way, to the interests and benefits of themselves. They have been taxed to the utmost limit; every successive province, as it has fallen into our possession, has been made a field for higher exaction. . . . (Quoted in Reynolds, *The White Sahibs of India*.)*

For 250 years England has been in India. Writing in 1853, Marx summed up the various phases of Indian policy pursued up to that year in the following words: "The aristocracy wanted to conquer India, the moneyocracy to plunder it and the millocracy to undersell it." As far back as the 1500's Dutch, English and French merchants had contacted Indian coast towns and brought back to the West the products of its famous handicraft industries. By 1708 the British East India Company—that crowning product of mercantilist, oligarchic England—had secured from the British king the right to monopolize all trade with India. In that year began the territorial conquest of the land of the Hindus. Ancient India had always been a tempting land of easy access to conquerors. It had known scores of invasions from the east and west, the last of antiquity being those of Alexander the Great and the Romans. But

because of its great size and its superior civilization India had always been able either to repel or to absorb the invaders.

With the English the story was entirely different. Besides representing the superior western civilization they came from the most advanced and unified country of the time. Utilizing the internal struggles between various warring divisions of the Chief Mogul, The Moguls, Mahrattas and Northern Afghans; British troops began the conquest of East India without much difficulty. They clashed with Dutch and French mercantilists, but the latter were no match for the English. (The Napoleonic Wars, the French and Indian Wars in America, were reflective aspects of this rivalry over India.) Having obtained a free hand, the British were able to secure control over the territory of one Mogul after the other, reaching as far as the Punjab region.

During this extended period of conquest, a revolution—gigantic in its scope and historic implications—was sweeping over British India's expanding territory: destroying, transforming, uprooting the most remarkable of all ancient civilizations. The British mercantilists and later the British industrial bourgeoisie tore to bits the whole fabric of the ancient Indian social and economic structure. At the same time they laid the material and social basis for the ultimate emancipation of the Indians not only from ancient Asiatic despotism under which they labored for so many centuries but also from the neo-despotism of British rule itself. Marx clearly recognized this. "Whatever may have been the crimes of England, she was the unconscious tool of bringing about that [future] revolution." (Article in *New York Tribune*, June 25, 1854.) While emphatically denouncing the cruelty, hypocrisy and "scientific barbarism" employed in subduing the natives, Marx nevertheless saw the historically progressive rôle performed by the British. The English rulers might "drink the nectar of India from the skulls of the slain" but that drink would turn into a poison that one day would spell their death!

The nature of this British revolution is clear. Ancient civilizations of the East were built primarily upon two foundations. (1) Communal ownership of the land (no private land-ownership). This Marx called "primitive communism". (2) A system of artificial soil irrigation, vitally necessary to the agricultural life of the country. (The countries of Asia Minor, Egypt, India.) In India, upon this material foundation there had arisen the independent Indian communal villages and village confederations, with their limited, closed-in economy; the famous handicraft and manufacturing industries (loom and spinning-wheel); the innumerable caste divisions resting upon a minute, *hereditary* division of labor; the numerous variations of mystical and fantastic religions and cults; finally, the despotic political state (the Mogul) with its bureaucratic and priestly adjuncts. All this the British destroyed.

With the ruthlessness of armed force they overthrew the native village communities and industries. Indian manufactures (mainly hand-woven cloths) were excluded from importation into England as early as 1697. Rickarts, an extensive English writer on Indian affairs, estimated that in 60 years of the 18th Century, one thousand millions sterling had been brought back from India. The *London Daily News* wrote, "The whole wealth of the country is absorbed and the development of its industry is checked by a government which hangs like an incubus over it." Indian agriculture fell into complete decay as the system of artificial irrigation (a system requiring continual care and repair) broke down. At the famous trial of Warren Hastings in England, it was revealed that in 1771—a year in which the East India Co. reported a large increase in its dividends—one-third of the Bengal population, *i.e.*, 10,000,000, had died as the result of a ghastly famine! The 18th

Century, the century which saw the British East India Company at the height of its power, was for India a time of unequalled pillage and destruction, outstripping even the efforts of Spain's Conquistadores in Mexico and Peru.

England herself, meanwhile, was changing. The mercantilist-financial aristocracy found itself confronted by an infinitely more powerful English bourgeoisie—private merchants and industrial capitalists. As the exploiter himself changed, so did the nature of his exploitation. By 1813 the old oligarchy (East India Co.) had lost its trade monopoly to private merchants and was well on its way out of Indian affairs. The Company still ruled the land, but open attacks were leveled against it in Parliament. Cotton cloth and cheap manufactures from Manchester mills began to pour into India and complete the destruction of the indigenous industry. In 1813, for the first time India had a trade balance on the *importing* side.

A new period—one of *capitalist-imperialist* penetration—had started. India became more important than ever for Industrial England. Further military encroachment, this time under imperialist direction, took place. For the first time in thousands of years of Indian history, systems of private ownership of land and land tenancy (*Zemindaree* and *Ryotwar*) were created. India became a prime source of food stuffs. English-owned plantations (run by forced labor) were established to furnish these needs. Heavy land taxes were placed upon the peasantry. The result has been described by Isaiah Bowman in his *The New World*:

"Pressing upon the people of India in a manner to produce great distress is the land tax, in addition to which is the water tax in the irrigated areas. The land tax keeps the mass of the population in a state bordering upon slavery. Millions cannot get sufficient food. At the end of his year of labour, the farmer finds his crop divided between landlord and the government. He has to go into debt to the village shopkeeper, getting credit for food and seed in the ensuing year. Since 240,000,000 people in India are connected directly or indirectly with agriculture, this means that a large majority of them, probably two-thirds, are living in a state of squalor."

The primitive agronomy which had sufficed to give each community its simple necessities was thus "improved" upon by private ownership. Railroads—always the forerunner of modern industry—were built. The static, hereditary Hindu society crumbled. New mobile and shifting classes took the place of the ancient groupings. The "millocracy" came into control both in England and India. Marx wrote in 1853, "At the same rate at which the cotton manufactures became of vital interest for the whole social frame of Great Britain, East India became of vital interest for the British cotton manufacturers." By 1857 the English industrial bourgeoisie was sufficiently powerful at home to force the revocation of the East India Company's charter. It demagogically used the Great Sepoy Mutiny, which had occurred in that year and had been aimed at *all* of British rule, as justification for this act. In Parliament, the Mutiny was laid at the door of the Company and its innumerable evils.

The new landlords immediately proceeded to display their passionate love of the Indian masses by levying upon them a tax of 40 million pounds (the cost of suppressing the 1857 Revolt!). The "Better Government of India Act" was adopted, placing the country under direct control of the British Parliament. From then on the natives received the benefits of naked imperialist rule. "Scientific barbarism" raised to a higher plane took on the form of a different type of exploitation and expropriation of wealth. This is how Marx described it, writing in 1831: "What the English take from them [the Indians] annually in the form of rent, dividends for railways useless to the Hindus, pensions for military and civil service men, for Afghanistan and other wars, etc., etc.—what they take from them *without any equivalent* and quite apart from what they appropriate to themselves annually within India, speaking only of the *value of the commodities* the Indians have to send over

to England gratuitously and annually—it amounts to *more than the total sum of income of the 60 million agricultural and industrial laborers of India!* This is a bleeding process with a vengeance!" (Emphasis as in original.) It is this same process, now pushed with the energy born of despair, that has continued down to our day.

2.

What is the present economic situation within India itself? School teachers generally divide the country into two parts: British India and Native India. Such a division is sheer nonsense, being incorrect even in the geographic sense. *All* of India is British if by that we understand British military, economic and political domination. The ostensibly "independent" Native Princes (there are, according to the 1930 census, 562 native states covering an area of 711,032 square miles and having a population of 80,838,527 out of the total Indian population of 351,399,880) clearly "rule" only by permission of the British. As will be shown later, these Princes exercise no independent functions in their feudatory states. They are retained solely because they possess that added skill, born of long tradition and practice, in despoiling the peasant masses.

Of the total population, 75% to 80% live on the land. India is therefore overwhelmingly *agrarian*, consisting almost entirely of a huge, backward peasantry living in a most primitive state. In every respect the country belongs to the group of backward, colonial countries. To an even greater extent than China it is bound to the traditions and social practices of its antiquity. The great variety of religions (Hindu, Mohammedan, Buddhist, Animist, Christian, Sikh, Parsee, Hebrew, etc., etc.) testify to the poverty of historical and scientific development and the ignorance that permeates the entire country. Barbarous practices of the past (*sutree*, *purdah*, etc.) date back to days long before the conquest of East India by Alexander. Yet they are still widely practiced. England's hypocritical attempts to "stamp out" such customs have recorded "success" solely in school text-books.

There is no contradiction between these facts and the historic fact that England fulfilled a revolutionary rôle in India. The point is that that rôle has long ceased and has now become the major obstacle to even the most elementary social or cultural advancement. The English bourgeoisie, the international imperialist Frankenstein, bases its work in India today on but a single premise: the more widespread the poverty, superstition and ignorance, the more stable tends to become the British "Raj". Thus, 320 out of 350 million people are illiterate!

Since the overturn of the native economy there has been relatively little economic or industrial development in the country. Is this due to a paucity in natural resources? On the contrary, the country is rich in mineral and mining deposits. Coal is found in every part of India, copper, iron ore, vast areas of petroleum. Rare minerals exist (*tungsten*, *manganese*), but are hardly mined. Transportation is extremely poor and still largely primitive. True, the country has been loosely bound into a single unit by railroads and telegraph, but these connecting links are primarily of *military* importance. There are only 40,000 miles of railroad, less than 100,000 automobiles and trucks, a few airlines. Every attempt is made to keep apart and, above all, antagonistic toward one another, the 45 different racial groupings of the population with their 200 different languages and dialects.

To imperialist England, India is useful for two primary purposes: to draw forth from the rural population the nourishment provided by its abundant crops of cotton and foodstuffs (wheat, rice, sugar cane, tea, etc.). Then to sell upon the Indian market its cotton and textile manufactures, small manufactured articles, machinery, etc. It should be thoroughly understood that English capitalism and the entire British Empire it has constructed *could not possibly survive* without the annual stimulants received in the form of Indian raw materials, trade and commerce. This alone dis-

poses of reformist illusions regarding the possibility of a peaceful severance of the ties that bind India to England. Let us sooner expect British capitalism to commit hari-kari than to let go of India! Only deliberate agents of British imperialism such as the leaders of the British Labor Party (Atlee, Citrine, Herbert Morrison . . .) envisage a peaceful (that is, *no*) relinquishing of the hold upon India. To Marxists it is axiomatic that only through a determined revolutionary struggle can the Indian masses hope to free themselves from Britain. The rôle of Ghandism, to be analyzed below, has further revealed the necessity of an organized, violent struggle.

But England has not completely checked industrial growth. There have been erected—mainly since the World War—6,713 factories employing 1,215,000 workers (1931). Cotton spinning and weaving mills account for 502 of these and employ 381,265 workers. Next in order of the number of workers employed are the jute industry, rice mills, munition plants, lumber mills, tea factories, etc. We thus find in India that economic class essential to the carrying out of the Indian revolution—the modern, industrial proletariat. The Indian proletariat (including the highly important transport workers) counts in its ranks 10% to 11% of the total working population. Highly exploited because of the rapid concentration of Indian industry in the hands of a few members of the English and Native bourgeoisie, it has quickly arrived at a realization of its historic position and gropes instinctively for revolutionary weapons to employ against its enemies. At the same time, having sprung but recently from out of the great peasant mass, it feels the necessity of forming a revolutionary alliance with that section of the population.

We cannot emphasize too strongly capitalist England's dire necessity to retain its grasp upon India. In 1934 she was Britain's best customer, taking close to 200 million dollars worth of goods. This meant that England supplied over 40% of the total import trade, with Japan, her sharpest rival in competitive Indian imperialist activity, still far behind (15.7%). Indian raw material exports to England *alone* were worth 186 million dollars. The Ottawa Imperial Conference (1932), in an attempt to shut out the trade of other nations, forced India to accept preferences upon all British products. In the face of this, nothing short of a gigantic mass movement of the Indian masses, at whose head must stand the incomparably more advanced and clear-sighted Indian proletariat, will win liberation from England. Even such a movement

would face a terrific opposition—an opposition that would resort to every modern weapon of mass murder. We shall return to the obstacles faced by the revolution in examining the Indian Nationalist movement.

Before doing that, however, we shall list some of the more direct means employed by England in controlling the restless masses. It will make more apparent the utter hopelessness of the "methods" embodied in the "non-violence" doctrine. The Native Princes and the native bourgeoisie are the first arm of the British "Raj". The Princes are abject tools of their British masters—the finances and economy of their states are run by the British; foreign affairs and relations, military and taxing powers are no longer in their hands. Real power resides with the British appointed "advisers". Over the Prince's head is suspended the perpetual threat of incorporating his land into British India if he should become recalcitrant.

England has likewise assiduously cultivated a native bourgeoisie, made up not only of industrial capitalists, but also of great landowners, money-lenders, and bankers. In actual daily life, it is largely this native bourgeoisie, "middlemen" for British imperialists, which exploits the workers and peasants. Another important adjunct of imperialist domination is the armed force. Britain maintains two highly trained armies in India: the British Regular Army (58,000 men); the Indian Army consisting of 166,000 high caste Indians, officered by Britishers (the infamous Nabobs of Rudyard Kipling). Attached to this armed force is the Royal British Air Force whose English pilots have had great training through bombing (like Mussolini's pilots in Ethiopia) participants in local tribal revolts deep in the country's interior. In essence, British rule depends upon these front-line, military forces for its continued sojourn in India. And finally, the Indian Civil Service. For a long period made up solely of the favorite sons of the English aristocracy (from Oxford and Cambridge), or retired army officers, it has now relaxed far enough to include native Hindus from the supremely aristocratic Brahman castes. A rigidly controlled and bureaucratized outfit, it eats up an amazing proportion of the country's annually produced wealth in the form of salaries and large retirement pensions. Inspectors, land assessors, tax-collectors, petty supervisory officials, etc., swell this hated parasitic growth upon the backs of the Indian masses.*

S. STANLEY

*The second part of this article will be published in the next issue.

The Record of the Democracies

THAT THE FASCIST POWERS worship what Goethe called the inseparable trinity of war trade and piracy is plain as a pike-staff. They wreak their imperialist violence on Ethiopia, Spain and Austria. They pile up super-arms for the day of Armageddon. They are the enemies of human civilization and harbingers of a new barbarism. All this and more the liberal and Stalinist press pound into us incessantly and it is true enough. But what follows? That we reverently thrill to the sermons of Cordell Hull and march with the *New York Times* in a crusade for collective security? That we range ourselves with "the great law-abiding, liberty-loving powers"? But who are these Great Democracies, these bulwarks of our liberties, guardians of world peace and repositories of civilization? One glance is sufficient to disclose our old friends, the Allied and Associated Powers who saved Democracy from 1914 to 1918.

The opening sentence of a 5-volume history* of the Versailles Peace Conference reads as follows: "The war was a conflict between the principles of moral influence and material force, of

government by consent and government by compulsion." Our favorite whited sepulchre, H. G. Wells, wrote, "We fight because a whole nation has become obsessed by pride, by the cant of cynicism and the vanity of violence, by the evil suggestion of such third-rate writers as Gobineau and Stewart Chamberlain, that they were a people of peculiar excellence, destined to dominate the earth. . . ." Said Premier Asquith, "The purpose of the Allies in this war is to pave the way for an international system which will secure the principle of equal rights for all civilized states." England would not sheathe the sword "until the rights of the small nationalities are placed upon an unassailable foundation." Woodrow Wilson issued a proclamation of the signing of the Armistice in which he declared, "Everything for which America fought has been accomplished. It will now be our fortunate duty to assist by example, by sober friendly counsel, and by material aid, in the establishment of just democracy throughout the world."

Now that Bernhardt and Treitschke were cast down and Grotius and the sanctity of treaties exalted, what did the democratic Peace of Paris look like? Pretty much as the terms of the Secret Treaties

*Published under the auspices of the Institute of International Affairs.

regarding the future peace settlement had laid down. In 1915 the Allies secretly supplemented their lofty aspirations by inducements of a more substantial character. Tsarist Russia was promised Constantinople and all of Poland. France was to recover Alsace Lorraine and be given control of all German territory as far as the Rhine, and Great Britain should appropriate the bulk of the German colonies. Italy in 1915, and Roumania in 1916 were both promised territorial aggrandizement. In 1916 Russia was secretly awarded Central and Northern Armenia and lands south of the Black Sea; France was given the sovereignty over Southern Armenia, Cilicia and the Syrian coast, with Damascus and Mosul as a sphere of influence. Mesopotamia was reserved for Great Britain. A year later Italy was promised the southern half of Anatolia. (Smyrna was simultaneously pledged to Italy and Greece!) Though China too had entered the war on the side of the Allies, Japan was to have the forcibly-leased German Chinese port of Kiaouchau.

The peace treaty deprived Germany of two-thirds of her iron, 26% of her coal, 13% of her territory, 7% of her population, 40% of her blast furnaces, 30% of her steel mills, 28% of her rolling mills, and a million square miles of her colonies. To the protesting Germans the Allies virtuously explained that it was all being done for the good of the natives. "Germany's dereliction in the sphere of colonial civilization has been revealed too clearly to admit of the Allied and Associated Powers consenting to make a second experiment of their assuming the responsibility of again abandoning 13 or 14 million natives to a fate from which the war has delivered them." The colonies were thus assigned to those more humane and experienced in the art of their administration. England saw her duty and accepted the extra load to her White Man's Burden without demur.

2.

In 1914 England ruled over an empire of 12 million square miles, one quarter of the inhabitable surface of the globe, and of which area she herself constituted less than one hundredth part. The possessing class of one-tenth of the population of this empire dominated 370 million natives of India, 50 million natives of Africa, and millions of Malay, Polynesian and Chinese natives. To this overseas empire Britain now added Mesopotamia, Trans-Jordania, Palestine, the German colonies of East Africa and South-west Africa, as well as parts of the Kamerun and Togoland. The British Empire now controls half the world's annual production of gold, a third of the coal, a fourth of the cotton, a fifth of the wheat and a sixth of the pig-iron. British capitalist investments of 20 billion dollars abroad netted the governing classes a return of 1 billion dollars a year. The "Blessed Isle" had indeed won the war. German competition was destroyed and England dominated trade from Cairo to Singapore.

Occasionally the natives, for whose welfare she is a trustee, doubt England's democracy and there is trouble. Concentration camps have to be set up in India, and the extremes of the massacre of Amritsar may become necessary to restore the natives to a mood of coöperation. The "pacification" of the Indian Northwest Frontier keeps thousands of British troops constantly engaged. In 1927 the Chinese went on a rampage against British extra-territorial rights and Great Britain was compelled to dispatch an expeditionary force. The Arabs take violent exception to the British Zionist policy in Palestine, and it becomes necessary to stamp out terrorism by burning their villages wholesale. But enough has been said, perhaps, to demonstrate the high moral difference between British occupation of Egypt and the brutal Japanese conquest of Manchuria. To confuse these would be tantamount to missing the fine ethical distinction between Italian ambitions to replace France in Tunisia and France's replacement of Turkey in Algiers. What Britain finds unpardonable is the utter disregard that Japan and Italy have manifested for the sanctity of treaties.

She can never condone a breach of faith. For example, in 1897 Lord Salisbury who suspected that a Belgian syndicate had obtained a concession for building a railway from Peking to Hankow, directed the British Minister to inform the Chinese that Her Majesty's Government had been badly treated. "Unless they agree at once (to employ British capital) we shall regard their breach of faith concerning the Peking-Hankow Railway as an act of deliberate hostility against this country and shall act accordingly. After consultation with the Admiral you may give them the number of days or hours you think proper within which to send their reply."

The status quo created by the Treaty of Versailles was naturally a beautiful thing for the imperialist states satisfied with their holdings. The present territorial distribution of markets, colonies and raw materials was declared virtually sacrosanct and boundaries were treated as immutable. Having destroyed German competition, Great Britain however finds herself menaced anew. Japan in the east and Italy in the Mediterranean give the City sleepless nights. With almost a billion dollars of British capital invested in China, with Hong Kong, Singapore, the East Indies and Australasia to defend, there is every reason for the British government to express abhorrence of those who violate the sanctity of treaties. The Ethiopian crisis sent Britain into a paroxysm of idealism over the League covenant, with what results are generally known. The conquest of Ethiopia, like the present Japanese occupation of China, places England before accomplished facts and negotiations are proceeding on both fronts for a deal at the expense of the colonial populations, with democracy having nothing to do with it.

3.

The other great beneficiary of the Versailles Peace was the French Republic. With an area of 212,659 square miles, and a population of 42,900,000, France exploits African colonies with an area of 3,894,727 square miles, and a native population of 38,668,000, including Algeria, Tunis, Morocco, part of West Africa, Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, parts of former German Togoland and Kamerun Colonies. Her Asiatic Empire comprises the five provinces of French-Indo-China, and Syria and Lebanon, a total area of 331,050 square miles with a native population of 25,660,000. Here too the natives are singularly lacking in appreciation of the benefits of French democracy, whether it is of the National Union or the Popular Front variety. Again and again French troops have had to put down popular uprisings in Syria, Morocco and Algiers.

The restoration of Alsace-Lorraine and the control of the Saar gave France the illusion that the old equilibrium having been displaced, she could replace it with her own diplomatic and military hegemony. To this end she built up an elaborate system of post-war alliances with the other beneficiaries of the new distribution of power, Belgium, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia and Roumania. But the base for long-range French hegemony on the continent was too narrow. The center of world economic gravity had shifted to the United States and France never was in a position to organize European economy. On the contrary, her post-war authority depended on the chaos brought about by the Balkanization of Europe. Every move of French imperialism against Germany from the imposition of the impossible reparations to the occupation of the Ruhr merely accentuated the antagonisms and the crisis. French security was built on sand. The world-wide economic crash finally blasted away the foundations of French hegemony.

As a result of French policy the foundations of bourgeois democracy in post-war Germany were also blasted away, but at no time were the Allies concerned about preserving European "democracy". England was interested in the restoration of Germany's industry so far as it was necessary for the stability of British markets, and the extraction of a reasonable amount of reparations. She was equally concerned about maintaining the

balance of power, since that has always been the aim of Downing Street. The British government, therefore, viewed Hitler's advent with some satisfaction as a means of holding French ambitions in check. France was interested chiefly in keeping Germany in a state of perpetual subordination. Neither of the two victorious Democracies were motivated by any other than imperialist considerations. Although the Weimar Republic had suppressed the uprising of the revolutionary Spartacists in blood, it never was for that reason treated other than as a potential imperialist rival. When the Cuno government attempted to evade reparations payments France occupied the Ruhr regardless of what revolutionary situation might ensue. The German middle class was wrecked and in default of proletarian action became ripe for the Hitler *coup d'etat*. French financial coercion of Austria, when the Bruening government tried to evade the prohibition of Anschluss by framing the Austro-German Tariff Union Pact, helped pave the way for the crash of 1931 in the Reich. It could not be otherwise. The notion that England or France are animated by concern for democracy is fantastic. The imperialist power which only yields a dominion government to Ireland in bloody civil war, and the imperialist power which suppresses the colonial populations of Indo-China, can hardly be expected to foster either genuine democracy or self-determination. The League of Nations was what Lenin called it, "a den of thieves".

4.

One of the most revealing chapters in the record of the Great Democracies was their attempt to strangle the Russian Revolution. Allied intervention in Soviet Russia began in March 1918. The Czechoslovaks were organized. Allied Expeditionary Forces landed at Murmansk and Vladivostock. White Guard revolts were incited. Lloyd George and Winston Churchill strained every nerve and expended huge sums to foment counter revolution in the Caucasus in order to gain possession of its oil. Wilson sent an expedition to the Archangel on his own hook. The end of Allied military support witnessed the collapse of the counter revolution and the anti-Bolshevik uprisings. Yudenitch was driven out of the Baltic area, Denikin was expelled from Southern Russia, and Kolchak collapsed in Siberia. But the famous French democracy continued nevertheless in its efforts to destroy the Soviet Republic. Poland was encouraged in her territorial ambitions and Wrangel was subsidized to renew the struggle in Southern Russia. That counter revolution did not triumph was due only to the heroic resistance of the Russian workers and peasants.

5.

Something should be said about the rôle of the third Great Democracy. No one has expressed it more succinctly than Harold G. Knowles, formerly American Ambassador to Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic and Bolivia. "We have been guilty of violating the sovereign rights of neighbors and proceeding contrary to universally recognized principles of international law. We have imposed our force upon weak people, and defenceless countries, and slaughtered thousands of her citizens. We have attacked them when they expected we would defend them." The Monroe Doctrine sets the United States up as the imperialist guardian of South America. Monroe's own formulation has been adapted to the requirements of modern imperialism until it means the right of the United States to declare which is the constitutional party in the event of a revolution in Latin America (1912 first intervention in Nicaragua), and to take over political and economic control as in Haiti in 1915 when the United States reaches the conclusion that the Latin America country is unable to maintain law and order. It is applied to enforce and secure the cancellation of public debts, as in the case of Santo Domingo 1916, and it has been applied when revolutionary ideas are conceived to endanger

the private interests of American capitalists (Nicaragua and Mexico).

The same Wilson who was to utter his solemn platitudes about self-determination ordered the bombardment of Vera Cruz when Huerta failed to salute the United States flag by way of reparation for an alleged insult. Vera Cruz was captured by United States forces and occupied for several months. That was in 1914. Two years later a punitive expedition was dispatched to capture Villa. They didn't capture Villa but they spent about \$130,000,000 trying to.

During the Great Depression there was an apparent retreat from Dollar imperialism. Roosevelt proclaimed his good neighbor policy. Thus the Hawes-Cutting bill of January 1933, and the Tydings-McDuffie bill of March 1934 provided independence for the Philippines after a ten year period. In March 1930 the J. Reuben Clark memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine reiterated that it would not be used to justify intervention in Latin America. In 1934 a new treaty abrogated the Platt Amendment Treaty of May 1903, abolishing all United States rights of intervention or of military and fiscal control in Cuba. Haiti was relinquished by executive agreement in 1933, and the Marines withdrew from Nicaragua the same year. But at no time has there been any real surrender of United States strategic, political or financial interests. The principal motive behind these concessions was the desire to retain the good-will of the Latin American countries and restore shrinking markets for American exports. Cordell Hull explained the new dispensation in these words, "A new spirit inspired by the policy of the good neighbor was born at Montevideo. It was the spirit of the Golden Rule. . . . We must sell abroad more of our surpluses."

In the last few months American imperialism has resumed its aggressive attitude. The independence of the Philippines is being adjourned, reprisals are directed against Mexico for its oil nationalization policy, and the "utmost concern" is evinced by the State Department about the commercial relations of South American countries with the "Fascist Aggressors". As a measure of reprisal against the Mexican government's nationalization of the oil industry Roosevelt and Hull have decided to strike a blow at the very foundations of Mexican economy. Washington announces that the Silver-Purchase Scheme will be halted. Since metal constitutes 76% of Mexico's exports and provides 13% of her revenues, the meaning of the New Deal's policy towards Mexico is plain. It is the attempted imperialist coercion of a semi-colonial country to prevent her national self-determination, to dictate her domestic policies, sabotage her agrarian program and keep her workers in the U.S. owned oil industry on starvation wages. Washington stands solidly behind the rapacious American oil interests. The New Deal's velvet glove is a thin cover for the mailed fist of dollar diplomacy.

6.

It is nothing but a liberal myth that bourgeois democracy is somehow a guarantee of a pacific foreign policy. We have seen how little democracy there can be in the relations between the British ruling class and the Indian "native". Bourgeois democracy is founded in the economic exploitation of both the working classes and the colonial masses. "Pacifism", as Trotsky says, "stands on the same foundation as the theory of the harmony of social interests. The antagonisms between capitalist nations have the same economic roots as the antagonism between the classes." The theory of bourgeois democracy which is based on the assumption that government is the expression of the popular will implies that there is such a thing as "democratic control of international policy". The fact of the matter, of course, is that no department of the State is a closer preserve of the imperialist interests, the interests of the economically dominant class, than foreign policy. The stakes of diplomacy arise from the interests of the ruling class. The agrarian autocracy of Tzarist Russia ruled by the landed nobility

was territorially aggressive and so was the agrarian democracy of the United States before the Civil War. The Dutch commercial state of the 17th century and the English state of the 18th century were hungry for commodity markets. The industrialized capitalist states of the 20th century fight for investment markets, and monopolies in trade and finance.

The foreign policy of a country like Japan, or of the Fascist countries, is obviously free of control by democratic pressure. But it should be noted that in England foreign policy is equally free of "democratic control". The power to make war and peace is part of the prerogative of the Crown which Parliament has never taken away. Treaties are made without legislative consent. The House of Commons never even discussed the Anglo-Russian Treaty of 1907 before it was ratified by the Crown. Nor did the Commons ever have the chance to discuss the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1905. Everybody knows the familiar instance of the repeated assurances to Parliament in 1913-14 that England had no obligations to France until the outbreak of the war when Parliament was informed that the country was bound by the terms of the Entente Cordiale. While the power of the French President to declare a war is dependent upon the consent of parliament, the term war does not cover military expeditions against backward peoples, which permits the President to take in quite a lot of territory. Nor is there any obligation to submit alliances, arbitration treaties, etc. to Parliament. Neither the Treaty of Berlin 1878, nor the Franco-Russian Alliance 1891, were approved by the French Parliament before being ratified.

In the United States where the Presidential power to make treaties is subject to the consent of two-thirds of the Senate and the power to declare war rests with Congress, the Executive has nevertheless been able to evade these checks. If the United States is "attacked" the President may declare a blockade and permit acts of war without waiting for Congress. McKinley sent troops to China in 1900, Wilson sent troops to the Archangel in 1918, and Coolidge sent three warships to Honduras in 1923, all without authorization of Congress. As Commander in Chief of the military forces, the President has repeatedly intervened in Caribbean and Latin American countries upon his own authority. The President has a further device for evading restrictions imposed upon his treaty-making power. He may annex territory to the United States, make an armistice or negotiate a treaty by "Executive Agreement" such as Theodore Roosevelt negotiated with Santo Domingo, when the Senate balked.

More recent evidence of the disregard of the "will of the people" when the imperialist interests of the United States demands it, is furnished by Franklin Roosevelt's manipulation of the Neutrality Law and his aggressive formulation of a foreign policy that is the opposite of the "isolationism" implied in the popular support for the Ludlow Referendum. In an injured tone Secretary of State Hull recently asked: "What warrant is there in reason or in experience, for the assumption—which underlies such proposals as the plan for a popular referendum on the subject of declaring war—that the Chief Executive and the Congress will be at any time more eager and more likely to embark upon war than would be the general body of citizens to whom they are directly responsible? No President and no Congress have ever carried this country into war against the will of the people." Woodrow Wilson was elected on the slogan that he "kept us out of war", but on his re-election he plunged the country into the war on the side of the Allies. In the period of 1914-1917 United States trade with the Allies increased from 1½ billion to 4 billion dollars. By 1917 the United States had loaned the Allies 2 billion dollars. In 1917 Walter Hines Page, U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, sent the following confidential message to Wilson: "Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present pre-eminent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted." So we went to war.

7.

All the sermonizing in the world cannot obliterate the fundamental fact that the "crisis of democracy" derives from the decay of capitalism. Consider such a thing as the evaporation of the famous Spirit of Locarno. Signed in the Autumn of 1925 the accords of Locarno adjourned all territorial disputes arising from the Treaty of Versailles. Germany renounced the purpose of recovering her lost provinces. Great Britain and Italy guaranteed the status quo at the Rhine against either French or German aggression. Germany entered the League of Nations. To bourgeois pacifists it looked for a moment as if the terrors of the Versailles Peace and the occupation of the Ruhr were to be dissipated. But the "appeasement" of the Germans that followed proved illusory. The temporary German prosperity of the period was based not on a real development of industry or commerce, but on American and British loans with which to pay reparations and purchase essential raw materials abroad. With the crash in the United States and the end of American and British loans, the economic life of the Reich collapsed again. This also was the end of the Stresemann policy which had worked on the assumption that if Germany loyally accepted the terms of the Versailles Treaty she would be able to recover material prosperity along with her former enemies. German capitalism in fact had only adopted the Stresemann idea as a stop-gap; its revenge for the bankruptcy of Stresemannism took the form of Hitlerism.

German collapse was of course due to the Versailles Peace in part only. Versailles intensified all contradictions of capitalist imperialism by creating eleven new national states, with eleven new national frontiers. In their own way the international bankers saw this when in 1926 in convention in London they declared, "It is difficult to view without dismay the extent to which tariff barriers, special licenses and prohibitions since the war have been allowed to interfere with international trade and to prevent it from flowing in its natural channels. . . . One state lost its supplies of cheap food, another its supplies of cheap manufacturers, industry suffered from want of coal, factories for want of raw materials. Prices have risen, artificial dearness has been created. Production as a whole has been diminished, credit has been contracted, and currencies have depreciated. . . ." Or as Trotsky once put it, far more concisely, "Imperialism is the predatory expression of the tendency of modern industry to tear itself completely away from the stupidity of national narrowness, as it did formerly with regard to local and provincial confinement." The mere restoration of the old German frontiers would not have solved the crisis materially. The cause of the crisis was that the productive forces in Germany were potentially geared for the frontiers of the world market. The real and permanent solution of the crisis lay therefore in the political and economic union of Europe without state barriers, without strangling tariffs, and without armaments. But such a United States of Europe is only conceivable under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and despite the urgent revolutionary situations of 1918, 1923 and 1933, the German proletariat under its social democratic and Stalinist leadership failed to take revolutionary action. The initiative thereupon passed into the hands of Fascism and neo-German imperialism.

The inglorious liquidation of bourgeois democracy in Germany points the roads-end of popular frontism in France, Spain and wherever it is tried. Whatever its form, Catholic-social-democratic-liberal coalition, socialist-communist-radical-Popular Front, Labor-Government or New Deal—bourgeois democracy in the epoch of its imperialist transformation, is utterly incapable of maintaining the social equilibrium nationally or internationally. It is profoundly true and attested by every fresh experience since 1914 that humanity faces the alternatives either of slaughter under imperialism or peace through the Revolution in Permanence. The futility of the bourgeois peace societies lies in the fact that though frequently aware of the economic reasons for imperialism they

propose solutions that are impossible without social revolution. What they ask is the voluntary, self-liquidation of capitalism. Thus they suggest that trade restrictions should be done away with, that embargoes on exports should be lifted, that monopolies should be abolished, that international cartels should be dissolved, that all people should have equal access to raw materials, that tariffs should be reduced, the standards of living raised, and the world disarm. But how all this is to be done without waging war on capitalism is a mystery.

The war against Fascism can only be waged as a class war against imperialism. Between the Fascist and the so-called democratic powers the real antagonism is not of "ideologies" or the political régimes, but of markets, colonies and raw materials. The idea of England or France or the United States waging a war for democracy as a political ideal is nonsense. As well have expected the Russian bourgeoisie to initiate the bourgeois revolution. The foreign policy of the Popular Front is a sheer caricature of Jacobinism. Marx supported Germany against France in 1870 and the north against the south in the American Civil War, but he did so on the basis of the then existing class relations. He was supporting an aggressive capitalism against a decaying feudal order. In the war against feudalism, Marx saw a way to the victory of democracy as the prerequisite for the victory of the working class movement.

The reformists tried to exploit Marx' position of that time in order to justify their own support of the rival imperialisms of 1914. But the imperialist transformation of democracy already accomplished in 1914 carries with it today, the Fascist transformation of the bourgeoisie.

The war against Fascism can be waged successfully only as a revolutionary war. Such a war would have been justified in 1923 when the revolutionary crisis was maturing in Germany, the country was splitting up into two armed camps, and the Red army was on the alert in the Soviet Union. Had the German workers fought Hitler in 1933, and had the military forces of the Soviet Union not been weakened by Stalin's economic adventurism, mobilization of the Red army against German Fascism, and the revolutionary war in coöperation with the German proletariat would have been in order. But that is not the kind of war that the advocates of Collective Security, and of the "peace-loving" nations against the aggressor nations, have in mind. In the United States the last war produced 21,000 new millionaires, one for every five American doughboys killed. The proletariat of the Fascist and "democratic" countries equally must proclaim Karl Liebknecht's slogan, "The enemy is within your own country"!

Maurice SPECTOR

The Course of Herr Brandler

I. Brandler-Thalheimer Yesterday and Today

UNTIL 1937 BRANDLER-THALHEIMER defended the dictatorship of Stalin on questions of Russian domestic policy. In the spring of 1934 they gave *Pravda* a statement in which they took a strong position against the Opposition and counseled surrender to Stalin. In January 1935 Brandler-Thalheimer accepted the Stalinist version of the murder of Kiroff and in September 1936 they even descended to a defense of the trial of Zinoviev. And this was not all. As clever Marxists Brandler-Thalheimer even recalled the fact that they had predicted the lamentable end of the "Trotskyite-Zinovievite" Opposition. In their statement of September 16 they wrote:

"The pitiful end of the Trotsky-Zinoviev Opposition is the best confirmation imaginable of the point of view which we have always represented; namely, that the Opposition within the Soviet Union has no justifiable basis and must be fought. In these questions the policy of Stalin has been more progressive than that of his opponents, in these questions the Stalinist leadership has . . . proved to be correct *in all finality*." (Our emphasis.)

On the other hand, the present pamphlet dated July 27, 1937 contains the realization that "Stalin has subordinated the party to a bureaucratic régime which finally resulted in a reign of terror" and the "removal of Stalin and his circle from the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and thereby also from the leadership of the Soviet state" is stated as one of the first necessities.

The reader of the quotations juxtaposed above will say, to err is human and why should not Brandler-Thalheimer possess this human failing. To be sure, for a long time, perhaps all too long, they have been blind. Let us rejoice all the more if the latest events in the Soviet Union—the Piatakov trial, the shooting of the most talented leaders of the Red Army and the ensuing mass executions—have opened their eyes and they at last recognize their mistake. The reader, however, is mistaken if he thinks that Brandler-Thalheimer were ever in error. On the contrary, both declare with genuine bureaucratic complaisance, "The CPG(O) and the ICL(O) are not compelled to change their previous fundamental

conception." Thus Brandler owes us proof that Stalin and his régime have changed overnight, that until yesterday it was progressive, but today suddenly became reactionary; that the trial of Zinoviev was justified, but the trial of Piatakov was a counter-revolutionary crime. But Brandler-Thalheimer are careful not to make any such attempt. The accusations against Trotsky which yesterday were declared "understandable, natural and logical" are today "fabricated", "absurd", "products of G.P.U. imagination. The criticism of Stalin who they yesterday said had been correct in all finality today goes back to 1924. The Stalin cult, the prostitution of Marxist theory, the breakneck tempos of the first five year plan, the terrible inner party régime with its moral terror, with its forced declarations of remorse which preceded the false confessions—all this is today subject of criticism by Brandler-Thalheimer. If nothing of their fundamental conceptions has changed, then they knew all along that these things have nothing in common with socialist politics. If in spite of this they stated that the policy of Stalin was correct and that of the Opposition which in contrast with Brandler criticised all of these things when they were actual, was wrong, then for purely opportunist reasons, possibly in the hope of a compromise with Stalin, they were guilty of deception. What else then can Brandler's fundamental conception be but that in theory any deception is permissible? Actually, on the basis of the present pamphlet, it will be shown that Brandler has not broken with *this* basic conception. His polemic against Trotsky seethes with distortions, imputations and outright falsehoods. Let no one believe that we are harping on these things so tenaciously because of petty stubbornness. The morals of a revolutionist are illuminated in his attitude toward theory. As Max Horkheimer who otherwise agrees with us so little has put it, indifference toward the idea in theory leads to cynicism in practice. In the Stalin who in the spring of 1924 declared that Lenin considered the international revolution to be the necessary precondition for socialism and who already in the fall of the same year imputed to Lenin the opposite idea of socialism in one country, in this Stalin there existed already the murderer of his comrades. The bitter experiences of Stalinist and Bernsteinian revisionism have taught us to deal mercilessly with all theoretical quacks and patent medicine men. . . . That is the reason why we want to

"Zur Krise in der Sowjetunion." A pamphlet of the I.C.L.I.

subject the latest product of Brandlerian ideas to a thoroughgoing criticism.

II. On the Origin of the Bureaucracy

ON PAGE 15 OF BRANDLER'S pamphlet we read:

"It is not as Trotsky, quite unhistorically, has stated; that under Lenin the Soviet state began with a fully developed soviet democracy, whereas under Stalin soviet democracy was completely throttled and replaced by a total bureaucratization of the Soviet state. That is not in accord with historical facts. That means making historical development dependent upon the good or bad personal will of the leaders. Naturally, the good side is represented by Lenin-Trotsky, the bad side, the principle of evil, of bureaucratism, by Stalin. To be sure, the development in the one or the other direction was also connected with the personal qualities of the leadership, but the relationship is the opposite of the way in which Trotsky presents the case. The objective factors are primary."

We who think we know something of Trotsky's work can find no place where he has attempted to explain the origin of the bureaucratic régime as the result of Stalin's bad personal qualities. Even if Brandler did not consider it necessary to enlighten us with a quotation, he might at least have given us a reference to literature. Otherwise Brandler must permit us to maintain our interpretation that Trotsky is the only one who has given us an objective, materialistic explanation for the rise of the bureaucracy. Actually, Brandler-Thalheimer know that. For on page 55, they accuse Trotsky of the opposite; namely, that he overestimates the significance of the objective factors in Stalin's rise. In other words, on page 15 they simply falsified a little in order to take a crack at Trotsky. Let us, however, listen to the opposite accusation word for word:

"To the question of why it was possible for Stalin to subjugate the party to his personal rule Trotsky has answered that this was inevitable because of the failure of the revolution in capitalist countries. This point of view of Trotsky's which declares the Stalin regime to be an inevitable product of history corresponds to Trotsky's total conception of the impossibility of a real development toward socialism in the Soviet Union so long as it is isolated. To be sure there are objective causes. . . ."

In the same philistine, boring, pedantic style the objective causes are now made primary, now made secondary; now Trotsky is accused of exaggerating the subjective factors, now he is accused of exaggerating the objective ones. Let us examine the latter statement. Trotsky maintains that the Stalin regime is an inevitable product of history because he traces its origin to the failure of world revolution. Therefore the failure of world revolution was inevitable? Where does Trotsky say that? On the contrary, did not the Bolshevik party of the October victory and the Communist International of the early years proceed from the *inevitability* of world revolution? In actual fact, the objective situation in the early post-war years was exceptionally favorable in a number of capitalist countries and above all in Germany. Only the lack of theoretical and political maturity in the Comintern and above all in the leadership of the German Communist Party under Brandler-Thalheimer prevented the utilization of the favorable situation. Because Brandler-Thalheimer replaced Bolshevik policy by Menshevik policy in the revolutionary year 1923 the defeat of the German proletariat became "inevitable"; that is, the inevitable result of a policy which Brandler and Thalheimer could have avoided. If it is a fact that the historic defeat of the German revolution in 1923 marked the end of a revolutionary period and led to a stabilization of world reaction—which in its turn helped Thermidorian reaction into power in the Soviet Union, the rise of which was still further abetted by the economic and cultural backwardness of Soviet Russia and the destruction of means of production by the world war and the civil war—then one must seek

one of the chief causes of this fateful development in the insufficient theoretical and political maturity of Brandler-Thalheimer. It is, therefore, not only "understandable, but also logical and natural" that Brandler-Thalheimer attempt to divest themselves of this fateful responsibility and as well as for the "theory of socialism in one country" which was a direct result of the German defeat and the origin of which is unthinkable without this defeat, as well as Stalin's domestic policy which rests on this theory. It is just as "logical and natural" that in their present, extremely tardy attempt to break with Stalin they involve themselves in completely undialectical, simply hair-raising contradictions.

What are the reasons that Brandler himself advances for the rise of the bureaucracy? On page 16 of the pamphlet under discussion he mentions three objective tendencies for the growth of bureaucratism, all of which in reality can be reduced to a common denominator: the economic and cultural backwardness of Russia. As is known, Lenin and Trotsky pointed this out time and again since 1917. Russia's backwardness existed during Lenin's time as well as during Stalin's. Therefore, to clarify the question of the transition from the Lenin to the Stalin regime, which is the only question that interests us in this connection, it is not at all sufficient. But instead of explaining this transition in historical-materialistic fashion, Brandler bestows upon us the following platitudes:

"The party and its leadership can give way to these objective tendencies (strengthening the bureaucracy) or it can oppose them. Under the leadership of Lenin it opposed them, under Stalin's leadership it gave way to them."

Why, how, for what reason? You put the question to me, I put it to you. On page 16 Brandler-Thalheimer give us as their own wisdom that which they falsely ascribed to Trotsky and call unhistorical. "The good Lenin struggled against this, the bad Stalin gave in." In other words, an explanation which is insufficient for Trotsky is good enough for Brandler-Thalheimer. Here, perhaps, they are really right. This "idea", that the bureaucratization of the party is a personal, voluntary act on the part of Stalin impresses them so much that they "develop" it further on pages 54-56. There we read:

"The answer to the question, why Stalin could seize the leadership of the party is much simpler.

"In the general questions of socialist construction he stood for a correct line against his inner-party opponents. For this reason not only the clique of his personal adherents and friends followed him, but also the mass of the party members. The average member of the party accepted the bureaucratization of party life for the sake of Stalin's line of socialist construction. The average party member was inclined to think that inner-party relations were not so important. Socialism is more important than the inner-party régime, especially as the leaders of the opposition against Stalin had also promoted or at least not energetically struggled against bureaucratic methods as long as they were in power. This attitude of the party members . . . was wrong," etc.

Prior to this they said that Stalin had fulfilled the testament of Lenin in his "politics as a whole" excluding only the question of the bureaucracy. Here he had "subjected the party to a bureaucratic régime which was continuously extended until it finally developed into a reign of terror".

Once again, what they imputed to Trotsky on page 15 in order to take a crack at him, is their own ultima ratio. For if Stalin's policy was correct as against that of his opponents and if in general politics he fulfilled the testament of Lenin, what other explanation for the abolition of inner-party democracy by Stalin can there be but Stalin's "evil" nature? The petty bourgeois philosophy of Brandlerian philosophy here reaches its highest level or, more correctly, its lowest. What an awful conception: Stalin himself chooses his methods, the terrible repressions in the Soviet Union are the result of one of his moods added to which this mood is able to influence history so much because Stalin's

policy was "correct". History, however, does not follow such a meaningless course. For a Marxist policy and method are indivisible concepts, the latter follows of necessity from the former. If Stalin's policy in the years subsequent to 1923 was "correct", what reason would he have for terrorizing the party, falsifying the discussion, expelling the opposition and abolishing internal democracy.

If his policy was "correct", *i.e.*, in the interest of the proletariat and the poor peasants, then he would have no lack of arguments against the opposition, he would not have to be afraid of a struggle against it before the party masses. And if, as Brandler maintains, the membership followed Stalin, why was it necessary to expel the opposition, send it abroad and into the provinces, exile it to Siberia and finally execute it? Not to mention the fact that the members who apparently followed Stalin, the old Bolshevik, proletarian cadres, were gradually expelled from the party, exiled, thrown into prison and executed. It must also be asked, *which* "general policy" of Stalin's was really correct: that of 1923-1928, that of 1928-1934 or the present one? Was the "tortoise march toward socialism" of 1923-1928 just as correct as the "jump over Lake Constance" of 1928-1934? One could just as well maintain that the alliance with the arch-reactionary leadership of the British trade unions was just as correct as the R.L.U.I. policy and that the latter was just as correct as the present day "People's Front" policy with the capitalists. In the period of 1923-1928 Stalin was allied with Rykov and Bukharin and together with them he poked fun at the "superindustrialism" of Trotsky. On page 54 of their pamphlet Brandler-Thalheimer criticize Bukharin and Rykov for denying the necessity of general industrialization and collectivization. Until 1928 Stalin shared Bukharin's point of view on these questions. If the policy of Bukharin was false, how could Stalin's be correct? If it was incorrect, *i.e.*, if it did not correspond to the interests of the workers and poor peasants, then it must have corresponded to other interests, interests of strata opposed to the proletariat or more correctly, steadily becoming opposed to it.

We stated that policy and method were not too hard and fast antinomies now running parallel, now crossing each other, but were inseparable components of the same thing, a subject-predicate relationship. Lenin represented the interests of the working masses. By this his method was determined. His goal had to be the education of the masses for the execution of political functions, for the control of the state apparatus, etc. For the state to die away all had to participate in its functions. The subject-object relationship between the state apparatus and the subject had to disappear. For all of these reasons there could not be any other method for the proletarian politician Lenin than democratic ones in the life of the party. If, on the other hand, Stalin freed himself more and more from the control of the masses, excluding them more and more from the execution of political functions and degrading them to objects of his police rule, he did this because he represented a social stratum whose interests more and more ran counter to those of the masses. These were the interests of the new state apparatus and of the new bureaucracy.

During the general economic insecurity of the post-revolutionary years it was an immeasurable advantage to belong to the apparatus. Even if the income of officials was by no means as grandiose as it is today, nevertheless a certain amount of economic security was concomitant with membership in the apparatus. Parallel with the N.E.P. and the increase in the production of commodities, the apparatus began to loosen itself from the masses. It is clear that in this apparatus the tendency to stabilize its situation would grow. Lenin's demand that the masses should have the right to recall officials and functionaries daily and hourly in case of malfeasance of office, that everyone in his turn should assume the function of a state official—this demand must more and more have appeared to the new officials as a direct threat to their still relatively modest privileges. Fearing a fall back into the masses,

their appetite rose to further privileges. Stalin became spokesman and representative of this new privileged caste. It is obvious that this group whose interests stood opposed to those of the proletariat and to the demands of the proletariat as formulated in Marxist theory could not fight for their interests with democratic methods. It was compelled to rid itself of the masses. For this reason the type of rule embodied in the personal dictatorship corresponded best of all to their interests. The ambitions and the policy of Stalin were identical with the ambitions of this privileged caste. Stalin's policy was the "correct" policy precisely for the bureaucracy, which, therefore, supported him and chose him as dictator. The bureaucracy made him the supreme arbiter and administrator, but also the captive of its interests. Stalin and the bureaucracy turned against the masses to whom they owed their rise. For this very reason Stalin was compelled to falsify and finally abolish discussion, slander opponents, increase police terror to the greatest limit possible and take to the methods of a Caesar Borgia. Even if Stalin was predestined for this rôle because of his limitless political ambition which was the outcome of a more than defective political, theoretical and cultural training, his methods are the result of the objective contradictions of Soviet society which has produced the bureaucratic type of Stalin in not one but some ten thousand examples.

According to Brandler-Thalheimer, however, bureaucratic methods do not flow from the privileges of the bureaucracy which defends them tooth and nail, but, on the contrary, bureaucratic methods are the subject and the privileges at best the predicate. Where the methods originate remains a mystery. Apparently in the evil nature of the bureaucrats. As a cure Brandler does not recommend a reduction of the differentiation in income, but reestablishment of Communist morals! He himself seems to feel that thereby he dangerously approaches Christian preachers of morality, who preach the brotherhood of poor and rich without desiring to remove the contradictions themselves. He tries to pull himself out of his predicament on the basis of the fact that from the point of view of production there is no exploitation in the Soviet Union. As is well known, that is exactly the argument of the bureaucracy itself. For the worker, however, the point of view of consumption, so despised by the learned wiseacres with full stomachs, is decisive. To be sure, as Marx explained to the Lassalleans, the worker will never receive the full return on his labor. A part of the product of labor, even under socialism, will be used for reproduction on a higher level, for the renewal of the apparatus, for children and the aged, for administration, etc. In the transition period, as long as value and money accounting are adhered to, the worker still produces surplus value which is used in various ways. Decisive as to whether society is moving toward socialism is the tendency of the process itself. The question is, are the differences disappearing more and more, is the standard of living of the people as a whole rising. In the Soviet Union, however, the opposite process is taking place. A privileged caste, the bureaucracy appropriates a steadily increasing portion of the surplus value of society, thus in this roundabout fashion exploiting the workers. It builds palaces for itself, keeps servants, rides in luxurious automobiles while the mass of the workers remain in misery. In the Soviet Union, too, being determines consciousness; bureaucratic being determines bureaucratic consciousness and bureaucratic methods. To break the power of the bureaucracy it is necessary to abolish their privileges. He who wants to remove the contradiction between bureaucratic and proletarian being only in the realm of consciousness without demanding its abolition in reality must acquiesce in the comparison with a hypocritical Christian preacher of morals.

Today, quite suddenly, Brandler-Thalheimer remember Lenin's last articles which were all directed against the danger of bureaucratism and against Stalin as the personification of this danger.

A Letter to Corliss Lamont

DEAR CORLISS,

In 1934, when I met you, and asked about your political position, you said: "I am a Communist, but I am a Truth-Communist." And you explained that striking phrase to mean that you believed in the theories of Marx as interpreted by Lenin, but that you did not accept the policy of political lying to the masses practiced by the official communist parties under Stalin. That gave me a high feeling of respect for you, and upon that basis there arose a certain intellectual and moral friendship between us. You expressed it upon your side by presenting me with a copy of your book, *The Illusion of Immortality*, and inscribing upon the fly-leaf:

To Max Eastman

Who believes with me that Truth is
"More sweet than freedom; more desired
than joy,
More sacred than the serving of a
friend."

Corliss Lamont

April 1935

Although so clearly seeing that lying to the masses was an essential ingredient of Stalinist policy, and so solemnly abjuring it for yourself, you continued to run with the Stalinist chiefs. You never exposed their political lies, or said publicly what you said to me in private. For a very long time you played friends with both Lie-Communists and Truth-Communists, and gave your money with one hand to the Stalinists and with the other to independent revolutionary papers which still believed that scientific integrity and honest education of the masses is essential to the proletarian movement. Anybody who plays both sides in quiet times will be found in a crisis on the side with power. And in the issue between truth and political lying, between science and jesuitism, between intelligence and blind bigotry, between education and indoctrination, between the enlightenment and manipulation of public opinion, between the life of reason and the totalitarian state of mind—and that is the paramount issue upon which in this day the fate of civilization rests—the Moscow trials are a crisis. They carry the whole cult, art, ideology and technique of political and party lying to so hideous an extreme that every man in the labor and radical movement must take his stand for or against. And you have taken yours with those whom you yourself so clearly defined as the "Lie Communists", because they are in the ascendant, and because you lack the moral force to stand against them for the truth.

You have enough sensitivity to feel, if your feelings were free, the crime against knowledge and social understanding involved in the mystification of these trials, even if the men were guilty. You have enough brains to know that if they were

guilty of the complicated conspiratorial acts charged against them, it would be easy to prove them guilty beyond a peradventure. You know that that would be the honest way, the way of Truth-Communists and of truthful people anywhere. You are not so blind to the rays of justice, if your eyes were not held shut, as to accept these show trials of a few dozen who were ready to "confess", as proof of the guilt, and justification for the murder behind closed doors, of hundreds, and indeed thousands, who were not. You are not so superior to the idea of mercy that you would naturally ignore the still unanswered question: What has become of the wives and children of these thousands of murdered communists? You would, under normal conditions, sense the ugliness of your own position—the son of a leading finance capitalist engaging in a campaign of slander by private correspondence on engraved stationery against the executed leaders of the Russian revolution, a scion of the house of Morgan assisting in the process of their dishonor by circulating arguments from the *Saturday Evening Post* based upon the premises of black reaction. Surely you could find a more appropriate way to serve the cause of labor! And you would find it, if you were free from pressure, free to be your simple, chivalrous self. That is why I assert that you have joined the Lie-Communists, and are serving as their "non-member" stooge and mouthpiece, merely because you lack the force of character to stand against them for the truth.

The one priceless thing you could have brought to the proletarian movement, coming from the source you do and with your education, was true knowledge and absolute principled integrity. Instead you are bringing a little money, a small gift even when it is large, and an increase of mental confusion and moral decay.

You played a very small dishonest trick in the matter of the Trotsky Committee and the *New York Times*. The committee had issued a press release on its usual stationery, and in printing it the *New York Times* had remarked that "Among those supporting the Committee's statement as members were . . ." and then reproduced sixteen names from the Committee's letter-head. You, following the lead of the *Daily Worker*, issued one of your privately-mailed letters, in which you said that in the *New York Times* these sixteen persons were "alleged to have signed" the statement, and that therefore the Trotsky Committee was guilty of "a shocking use of names under false pretenses". If you could push away those who are pressing upon you and take space for reflection, you would know that the action both of the Trotsky Committee and the *New York Times* was perfectly natural, and that it is you who are guilty of false pretenses and a rather shocking misuse of facts. Not extremely shocking, perhaps—and in your

own person this may be only a beginning. It is a significant beginning of the career that is before you as a defender of Lie-Communists.

A more significant beginning, although more subtle, is contained in your circular letter of March, protesting against what you call "vituperation" in the Secretary's reply to you. It reads:

"I wish to say in conclusion that in these turbulent times it is possible, in my opinion, for intelligent men to differ sincerely on the grave issues which are confronting all of us. And I am deeply conscious of the tragedy involved in the present divisions in the labor and radical movement."

There is pathos in that appeal for intelligence and "sincere" disagreement, but there is also a certain Pharaism. As National Chairman of the Friends of Soviet Russia you are, and must be if you remain in office, on all basic issues an obedient adherent of the Stalin party line. You will know the "for us or against us" policy. You know that the unscrupulous vilification and destruction of critics is as essential a technic of the Monolithic Party as of the Totalitarian State. You know that your pose of detached intelligence is being used, and what it is being used for. Perhaps you will realize why I call the resulting state of consciousness Pharaism, when I remind you that you have addressed these noble-sounding sentences to me, among others, and that they arrived in my hand just after I had been criminally advertised to the world by your colleagues and co-workers, on the basis of these same "confessions" whose credibility you are so eagerly advocating, as an "Agent of the British Secret Service". You are hand in glove with the authors of that criminal libel. You are doing their work, the work of which it is an integral part. You know them to be, and have yourself named them "Lie Communists". And yet you strike this pose, and make this plea against "vituperation", and for a "sincere" disagreement about "the grave issues" etc. And you send the letter to me!

Corliss, the grave issue at the present moment is between truth and lies. It may seem to you that I am drawing moral issues rather fine against you here and now. But you will find that in your role of public defender of a deliberate policy of falsification, you will be impelled, and compelled, to more and more crude, more and more conscious, more and more debased and foul, and even as we see in Russia, murderous, tricks of public deceit and private knifing, until there is not a clear fibre left of the man who coined those words "Truth Communist" and "Lie Communist", and who wrote that moving inscription in my copy of his book.

Yours sincerely,

Max EASTMAN

Archives of the Revolution

DOCUMENTS of the HISTORY and THEORY of the WORKING CLASS MOVEMENT

Problems of The Chinese Revolution*

A DIFFERENT path of development can be opened up only if the proletariat plays the leading rôle in the national democratic revolution. But the first and most elementary pre-condition for this is the complete independence of the Communist party, and an open struggle waged by it, with banners unfurled, for the leadership of the working class and the hegemony in the revolution. Failing this, all talk of non-capitalist paths of development serves only to cover up Right-Menshevik politics by Left-S.R. phraseology of the [Russian] pre-revolutionary period—the most revolting of all conceivable combinations. A program of assisting in the “influx of workers’ and peasants’ blood into the Kuomintang” (what an infamous phraseology!) gives nothing and means nothing. There also happen to be different kinds of workers’ and peasants’ blood. The blood which is being shed by workers of China is not blood shed for class-conscious tasks. Workers who enter the Kuomintang will become followers of the Kuomintang, *i.e.*, the proletarian raw material will be recast in the petty bourgeois Sun Yat Senist mould. To prevent this from taking place, the workers must receive their education in a Communist party. And for this, the Communist party must be completely free from *any outward* restrictions to leading the workers in their struggle and opposing Leninism to Sun Yat Senism.

However, it may be the author of the article envisions, in the ancient and truly Martynovist style, the following perspective: First, the national bourgeoisie completes the national bourgeois revolution, through the medium of the Kuomintang which is, with the assistance of Chinese Mensheviks, infused with workers’ and peasants’ blood. And following this so to speak Menshevik stage of the national revolution will come the turn of the Bolshevik stage: The Communist party withdraws from the Kuomintang, the proletariat breaks with the bourgeoisie, wins the peasantry away from it and leads the country to a “democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants”. It is very likely that the author is guided by a conception which is a result of his failure to digest the two stratifications in the 1905 period—the Menshevik and the Bolshevik. But such a perspective must be declared pedantic nonsense.

It is impossible to achieve the national democratic revolution twice: first in the bourgeois and then in the proletarian spirit. To be sure, if we were to hinder the proletarian vanguard from breaking with the bourgeoisie in time and utilizing the

revolutionary situation to prove to the masses in the non-recurring events of the supreme struggle its energetic and unwavering loyalty to the cause of the toilers; if we were to accomplish this end by further enslaving the C.P. to the Kuomintang, then the time would sooner or later come when the proletarian vanguard would break belatedly with the bourgeoisie in all likelihood not under the banner of Communism, and would perhaps renounce politics altogether. The past of the European labor movement would provide the revolutionary proletarians of China with a corresponding ideology in the shape of syndicalism, anarchism, etc. Under these conditions, the Chinese nationalist-democratic state would very easily arrive at methods of Fascism or semi-Fascism.

We have observed this in the case of Poland. Was it so very long ago that Pilsudsky was one of the leaders of the petty bourgeois revolutionary organization of the P.P.S.? Was it so very long ago that he sat in the Peter and Paul fortress? His entire past gave him influence and authority among petty bourgeois circles and in the army; and he used this authority for a Fascist *coup* directed wholly against the proletariat. Will anyone wish to deny that in the staff of the Kuomintang its own Pilsudskys will be found? They will. Candidates can already be designated. If the Polish Pilsudsky required three decades to complete his evolution, then the Chinese Pilsudsky will require an interval far more brief to accomplish his transition from the national revolution to national Fascism. We are living in the imperialist epoch when the tempo of development is extremely accelerated, when convulsions follow upon convulsions, and each country learns from the experiences of another. To pursue the policy of a dependent Communist party, supplying workers to the Kuomintang, is to prepare the conditions for the most successful and triumphant establishment of a fascist dictatorship in China at that not very distant moment when the proletariat, despite everything, will be forced to recoil from the Kuomintang.

Menshevism, even in the period of its revolutionary “flowering”, sought to be not the class party of the proletariat which rises to all-national and then world tasks (Bolshevism) but a supervisor of national development, in which capacity the party of the proletariat was assigned in advance a subordinate place (to collaborate, to push, to effect blood transfusion and so on). But aspiring to such pseudo-Marxist supervision of history has always proved in action to be pedantic idiocy. The Mensheviks completely revealed this as far back as 1905; Kautsky did likewise somewhat later but no less decisively.

A national revolution in the sense of a struggle against national dependency is achieved through the mechanics of classes.

Chinese militarists represent a class organization. The compradorian bourgeoisie represents the most “mature” detachment of the Chinese bourgeoisie which does not want a Chinese February lest it arrive at a Chinese October or even a semi-October. The section of the Chinese bourgeoisie which still participates in the Kuomintang, constituting there an internal brake and an auxiliary detachment of the compradorian bourgeoisie and of the foreign imperialists will on the morrow seek to lean upon the bombardment of Nanking in order to exert pressure on the revolutionary rank and file and above all to put a harness on the proletariat. They will succeed in doing so, unless the proletariat is able to counteract them from day to day by a well-directed class resistance. This is impossible so long as the Communist party remains subordinate to the Kuomintang, which is headed by the auxiliary detachment of the compradorian bourgeoisie and foreign imperialists. It is indeed embarrassing to have to explain this in the year 1927 and doubly embarrassing to have to direct these ideas against the leading article in the organ of the Comintern!

As Chinese revolution extends geographically it at the same time deepens socially. Shanghai and Hankow—the two most important industrial centers which together embrace about three-quarters of a million workers—are in the hands of the nationalist government. Nanking was subjected to a bombardment by the imperialists. The struggle immediately passed into a higher stage. Having captured Hankow and Shanghai, the revolution has thereby drawn into itself the most developed class contradictions in China. It will no longer be possible to orient the policies on the handicraft-petty trade peasant of the South. It is necessary to orient either on the proletariat or the bourgeoisie. The proletariat must orient itself on the many-millioned rank and file in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. We have this on the one hand. And on the other—the imperialists show by their Nanking butchery that they are in no jesting mood. Are they hoping in this way to terrorize Chinese workers or to bring the agrarian movement to a halt? Hardly. In any case, this is not their immediate aim. They desire above all to compel the bourgeois tops of the nationalist movement to understand that the time has come for them to break with the rank and file, if they do not wish to have the guns of world imperialism trained upon them. The bombardment of Nanking is propaganda for the ideas of compradorianism, *i.e.*, the salutary nature of ties with world capitalism which is mighty, united, and armed, which can provide not only profits but also armed aid against one’s own workers and peasants.

It is frivolous to assert that the bombardment of Nanking will fuse the whole Chi-

*This is the continuation of Trotsky’s article of April 3, 1927, the first part of which was published in our last issue.

nese nation as one man, etc. Such declamation suits middle class democrats. The revolution has risen to a new level and a more profound differentiation within the nationalist camp, its splitting into a revolutionary and a reformist-compradorian wing flows with iron necessity from the situation as a whole. The British guns, after the initial wave of "universal" indignation will only speed this process. Hereafter, to drive workers and peasants into the political camp of the bourgeoisie and to keep the Communist party as a hostage within the ranks of the Kuomintang is objectively tantamount to conducting a policy of betrayal.

Should the representatives of the C.P. participate in the national government? Into a government that would correspond to the new phase of the revolution, into a revolutionary workers' and peasants' government, they must unquestionably enter. Into the present national government, under no conditions. But before raising the question of Communist representation in a revolutionary power it is necessary to consider the question of the Communist party itself. After the capture of Shanghai by the revolution, former political relations have already become absolutely intolerable. It is necessary to approve as unconditionally correct the resolution of the June plenum of the C.C. of the Chinese C.P., which demands that the party withdraw from the Kuomintang and conclude a bloc with that organization through its left wing.

To deny the need of organizing a left faction within the Kuomintang and to recommend instead that the Kuomintang as a whole be made to acquire a left orientation, as is done by the leading article in the *Communist International*, is merely to occupy oneself with babbling. How can a political organization be given a left orientation if not by gathering within it the partisans of this orientation and setting them up against their opponents? The Kuomintang will, of course, object to this. It is quite possible that they will begin citing the resolution of our Tenth Party Congress against factions. We have already witnessed a masquerade of this kind on the question of the dictatorship of a single party. The arch-right wingers in the Kuomintang insist upon its unconditional necessity, citing the C.P.S.U. as an example in point. Similarly they will insist that a single party effecting the revolutionary dictatorship cannot tolerate factions in its midst. But this only signifies that the right wing of the nationalist camp, which assumed power through the Kuomintang, seeks in this way to prohibit the independent party of the working class and to deprive the radical elements of the petty-bourgeoisie of any possibility to obtain within the party a real influence on its leadership. The author of the article which we analyzed above goes all the way in all these questions to meet the bourgeois wing of the Kuomintang.

We must clearly understand that the Chinese bourgeoisie is still trying to cover itself with the authority of the Russian rev-

olution and that, in particular, it is plagiarizing from the forms of the future dictatorship of the Chinese proletariat in order to strengthen its own dictatorship against the proletariat. That is why it is of utmost importance today not to permit any muddling in the determination of the stage through which the Chinese revolution is passing. It is a question not of the socialist but of a bourgeois democratic revolution. And within the latter, it is a question of the struggle between two methods: bourgeois conciliationist as against worker-peasant. It is possible today only to speculate as to the manner and conditions in which the national democratic revolution can rise to the socialist revolution, whether it will occur with or without an interruption and whether this interruption will be long or brief. The further march of events will bring the necessary clarification. But to smear over the question of the bourgeois character of the present revolution with general considerations of a non-capitalist development is to befuddle the Communist party and to disarm the proletariat. Let us hope we shall not live to see the International Central Control Commission calling the Chinese Communists to account for an attempt to build a left faction in the Kuomintang.

From the standpoint of the class interests of the proletariat—and we take them as our criterion—the task of the bourgeois revolution is to secure the maximum of freedom for the workers in their struggle against the bourgeoisie. From this standpoint the philosophy of the leaders of the Kuomintang in regard to a single centralized party which permits neither any other

parties nor any factions within itself is a philosophy hostile to the proletariat,—a counter-revolutionary philosophy which lays down the ideological foundations for Chinese fascism on the morrow. It is absurd to say that the withdrawal of the Chinese C.P. from the Kuomintang signifies a break of collaboration. It is the termination not of collaboration but of servitude. Political collaboration presupposes equality between the sides and an agreement between them. Such is not the case in China. The proletariat does not enter into an agreement with the petty-bourgeoisie but rather submits to its leadership under a veiled form, with an organizational seal set upon this submission. In its present form the Kuomintang is the embodiment of an "unequal treaty" between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. If the Chinese revolution as a whole demands the abrogation of unequal treaties with the imperialist powers, then the Chinese proletariat must liquidate the unequal treaty with its own bourgeoisie.

It is necessary to summon the Chinese workers to the creation of Soviets. The proletariat of Hong Kong during the general strike created an organization very close in structure and functions to the elementary type of workers' soviets. With this experience as a basis, it is necessary to go further. The Shanghai proletariat already possesses the priceless experience of struggle and is fully capable of creating Soviets of Workers' Deputies which will set an example for all China and thereby become the center of attraction for all genuinely revolutionary organizations.

BOOKS

Balkan Storms

PLOT AND COUNTER-PLOT IN CENTRAL EUROPE. By M. W. Fodor. xvi+317. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co. \$3.50.

In recent years, the political literature of the bourgeoisie has been allotting an ever wider place to a distinct category of authors: the book-writing news reporter. Amidst the chaos of events and the concurrent, lightning-swift reevaluation of values in the world of politics, this species of writer has come to take upon his shoulders the mission of providing the disoriented bourgeois reader with a "line". With a generous sprinkling of political witticisms and personal anecdotes he helps the reading public surmount the oppressive lack of perspective by means of improvised, snap judgments. In its essential features, the latest work of M. W. Fodor, for many years the central European correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*—introduced to the American public by another reporter-writer, John Gunther—belongs to this very category.

Although the journalistic fustian of the book will impress the more serious reader

as a shortcoming, it can impel a comprehensive, critical survey of the Central European situation, even if it is not, in itself, a key to it. Fodor introduces us to many details in the life of the Danubian and Balkan countries, recounts the rivalries of the great powers for the domination of the puppet states in post-war Europe, describes the plots and counter-plots of the conflicting and competing little nations, depicts the alternating waves of revolution and counter-revolution.

Before us arises the spectacle of a tattered Europe, where side by side with the few nations which have attained the level of modern capitalism, dozens of little nations compelled by imperialist interests to take up an existence as "independent" states painfully grope for a way out of their misery and backwardness. We see how these feeble nations shift the pressure of circumstances onto the shoulder of still feebler ones; the Czechs through a sort of imperialistic exploitation of five other nationalities; the Serbs through the oppression of the Croats, Albanians and Macedonians within the borders of Yugoslavia; the Ru-

manians through the strangulation of Magyars, Bessarabians, Germans, and Jews, etc., etc., *ad infinitum*.

Fodor, a liberal and an advocate of the League of Nations, whom, as Gunther writes, "both the Nazis and the Communists worry" equally, is far more outspoken, as a reporter for isolationist England, about some of the aspects of post-Versailles Europe than his French colleagues. He recognizes the "errors" of the peace treaties. He criticises Masaryk who betrayed the Slovaks and Pasitch who deceived the Croats. But since Masaryk was a democrat and humanist, his betrayal is "rather weakness than bad faith". Pasitch, on the other hand, who employed the more uncouth Balkan methods, is regarded as a sort of devil's apprentice who "never intended to keep" his agreements. That's the logic of the liberal idealists.

A special chapter is devoted to the peasant problem. And rightfully so. The average reader is accustomed to look upon Central Europe as exclusively a center of modern industrial capitalism. However, the peasant is one of the most important factors in the economic and political life of Central and Southeastern Europe. Fodor contends that of the 98,000,000 inhabitants of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, Bulgaria, etc., 68,000,000 are peasants. Immediately following the war they were the decisive instrument of the bourgeoisie in the suppression of the proletarian revolution. Land reforms were the means whereby the men of the sickle were played off against the men of the hammer. And yet, according to Fodor's own data, land reform in all of Central and Southeastern Europe has taken care of only two million peasants, i.e., scarcely three per cent.

After Zinovieff's abortive attempt to unite the Balkan peasants in a "red international", their political organizations became once more pillars of reactionary and Fascist governments. But the peasant masses constitute, together with and as a part of the oppressed splinter nationalities in the Danubian and Balkan countries as well as in Poland, the most important reservoir for the future proletarian revolution.

Fodor is big-hearted. He admires the Viennese social-democrats. He also venerates Dollfuss, whose way to resist attacks "really commanded admiration". One cannot help but smile sadly in reading that the pious Dollfuss, who had women and children mowed down with artillery fire "possessed the courage and fanaticism of a crusader". This is easily enough explained. After the pacifists' moral indignation at the Dollfuss barbarism of 1934 had subsided, they had to discover new "ethical" reasons for the defence of impotent Austrian Fascism against its more imposing Nazi rival. Only a few weeks ago we witnessed a similar example of gushing enthusiasm in the whole Versailles camp, reformists and Stalinists included, on the occasion of the "courageous" and "liberty-loving" stand of Kurt von Schuschnigg, the chancellor of clerical-corporative Austria.

The book abounds in such contradictions,

in the great as well as in the lesser questions. Take, for instance, the Austrian *Anschluss*. Fodor writes:

"Many of my friends in England and America believe that the *Anschluss* is inevitable. *Anschluss* is inevitable only if and when the Nazi regime is no more and Berlin is returning to a less centralized and more federalistic regime. A federal Germany, in which the Southern Catholic States would enjoy a certain amount of autonomy, naturally would be an immense lure for Austria; and if Germany and Austria were then ruled by democratic governments all the power of the Western States could not prevent the *Anschluss*."

But how does he explain the fact that the "Western democracies", whose mouth-piece Fodor is, stubbornly continued to oppose *Anschluss* although, as he himself writes, ninety percent of the population of the Tyrol and Salzburg provinces favored *Anschluss* in a test vote held in 1921. This demand was backed up not only by the Catholic peasantry but also by the social-democratic workers. Mr. Fodor wastes a good deal of space and effort in presenting Fascism as an ideological offspring of Marxism. Doesn't he realize even now that Austrian Fascism was raised in a country where there were practically no Communists but only one-hundred-percent democratic reformists, on the very yeast of the unscrupulous exploitation of the victory won by the "democratic" imperialists in 1918?

On the other hand, Fodor's book involuntarily gives the foreign reader a vivid glimpse of the tremendous responsibility of the reformists for the Austrian catastrophe, now being paid by the workers with blood and humiliation. Fodor sees the reason for this defeat in the Austro-Marxists' failure to make a timely "peace with honor" with Dollfuss. As though the policy of the "lesser evil" in Germany and the People's Front in Spain were not likewise attempts at a timely "peace with honor". However, it is evident from Fodor's own story that Bauer, Deutsch, and the other Austrian Socialist leaders were prepared to renounce every shred of "honor" in order to make peace with Dollfuss. While the latter was preparing, together with Mussolini, the Pope and Major Fey, the plan for the annihilation of organized labor, these heroes literally ran after him like beggars. Fodor takes particular pains to describe in striking detail how Dollfuss obstinately refused to receive them and how he had his henchman, Karwinsky, give them the run-around. Let's hear the extent of their self-degradation:

"... The Socialist leaders explained [to Karwinsky] that the corporative ideas of the Papal Encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, could be coupled with elements of the Swiss constitution, thus preserving at least some liberties in an authoritatively ruled state. Such a vigorous ideology could be matched against the Nazi ideology, explained the Socialists. . . ."

But in vain. Dollfuss answered with cannon. Once the courageous Austrian

working class had been disarmed by the political capers of the liberals and the reformists, Hitler was able to take over Austria without firing a shot.

Actually, Fodor's book contains hundreds of facts to substantiate the contention that Europe knows only one alternative: Either liberation from its strangling state fetters by means of the proletarian revolution or irreparable collapse and disintegration as a result of new imperialist wars.

W. KELLER

Plebeian Caesar

BONAPARTE. By EUGENE TARLÉ. 431 pp. New York. Knight Publications. \$4.50.

The rebirth of Bonapartism in diverse forms and phases is the most striking political phenomenon of postwar Europe. Italy, Germany, and the Soviet Union have already produced rulers of the Napoleonic stamp; candidates for the crown are grooming themselves in France and other crisis-torn countries. From whatever angle we inspect them, these contemporary dictators are puny specimens compared to the great Napoleon, possessing all his vices and none of his virtues. Coined from baser metal, they nevertheless belong to the same category and are faced with similar problems. Ought we not to find in the fateful career of the master portents of the destiny awaiting his twentieth-century epigones?

The latest European events give greater timeliness to the English publication of Professor Tarlé's biography. Professor Tarlé is a Russian Marxist and world-renowned authority on the Napoleonic epoch. His life of Bonaparte, the ripe fruit of two decades and a half of scrupulous scholarly investigation, is a concise, well-paced and well-proportioned, dramatic narrative.

While proper consideration is accorded Napoleon's genius as an administrator, general, and statesman, he is consistently viewed in his social and political setting at the center of the vortex of the bourgeois revolution. Napoleon rose to the throne by exploiting the otherwise insoluble antagonisms between the conflicting social forces in revolutionary France. The successive stages by which the little Corsican conquered and consolidated power are excellently delineated by Professor Tarlé, but the finest chapters in his work deal with the downfall of Napoleon.

In 1810-11 Napoleon stood at the height of his power. He was absolute monarch of France and unchallenged master of Europe. He had defeated all his foes, save for the indomitable Spaniards, who waged an annoyingly persistent guerrilla warfare against his army of occupation. The Emperor, however, could not halt at this point in his progress. He aspired to rule the world, driven forward not only by his limitless ambition but by the insatiable demands of the class he most directly and consistently represented, the French bourgeoisie. In replacing the Directory by his own absolute personal régime, Napoleon had expropriated political power from the corrupt and incompetent upper middle classes only

to serve their social and economic interests more energetically and efficiently thereafter. The savior of the French bourgeoisie found his chief social support and supply of cannon fodder among the peasantry, the secondary beneficiaries of the Revolution. At moments of acute danger, he also received aid from the proletarian masses of Paris and other industrial centers, who saw in him "Général Vendémiaire", the destroyer of the royalist rebellion of 1795.

In defending the interests of these three classes of revolutionary France against the Bourbon counter-revolution, Napoleon acted as champion of the new bourgeois order against the decadent forces of feudal and semi-feudal reaction throughout Europe. At the same time Napoleon conducted from the outset on behalf of the ruling French bourgeoisie a relentless diplomatic and military struggle against the English for control of the backward continental countries and the world market. In order to complete his conquest of Europe and dominate the world, Napoleon was faced with the double task of subordinating the feudal order embodied and sustained by Czarist Russia on the one hand, and of strangling capitalist England on the other.

Accordingly, in 1812, Napoleon set forth to humble his former Russian ally as the first step in the realization of his cosmic aims. By crushing Russia, he hoped to tighten the continental blockade around England and strike later at her most precious possession in India. The strategic failure of the Russian campaign, despite his military successes, followed by the disastrous retreat from Moscow, marked the collapse of this grandiose plan and the beginning of the end.

This first decisive check revived the morale of Bonaparte's adversaries. All the enemies and victims of the Corsican conqueror prepared for revenge. Under England's direction, Prussia, Austria, and other European vassals of Bonaparte revolted and pounced upon the wounded lion. The second chapter was terminated with the defeat inflicted upon Napoleon by the Allied powers at the Battle of the Nations at Leipzig in October 1813. The Empire crashed.

Napoleon withdrew to France. But the most brilliant military victories could not save him. The twenty year epic, inaugurated in February 1793 at Toulon, ended with Napoleon's abdication in April 1814 at Fontainebleau. The epilogue of the Hundred Days served only to emphasize his military genius and his political impotence.

Thus each step forward was at the same time a step toward his ultimate ruin. Will not this inescapable dialectic of history apply with full force to the lesser Bonapartes of our own time?

Professor Tarlé makes clear that the main causes of Napoleon's downfall lay less in his overreaching aims and in the coalition of forces against him than in his social situation. The same policies that had first created, extended, and fortified his rule finally sapped his social supports. The endless wars, the blockade, taxes, arbitrary administrative methods crippled French com-

merce and alienated part of the bourgeoisie upon whom he primarily depended; the peasants were bled white by his levies of troops and taxes; the laboring masses were increasingly impoverished. The growing economic crisis transformed itself into a political crisis of the régime. The moral and political ties binding his state disintegrated. The intelligentsia detested his despotism; the bourgeoisie split and left him in the lurch; the lower classes became restless and discontented. In the hour of need, even his marshals, bound to him not by common principle, but by personal fealty and ambition, betrayed him. Napoleon, in the last analysis, was not so much overthrown from without as undermined from within.

Napoleon fell a victim to his own policies. The strangler of the revolution could not and dared not, in his extremity, arouse the revolutionary spirit and masses he had crushed, which alone might have rescued him and France from the Bourbons.

"It has often been claimed for Napoleon", concludes Professor Tarlé, "that he consolidated the victory of the French Revolution. This of course is not the case. He borrowed from the Revolution those reforms designed to further the economic development of the French bourgeoisie, but in so doing he extinguished the revolutionary flame which had been burning so fiercely for ten years. He did not so much 'complete' the Revolution as 'liquidate' it." The forces of counter-revolution only completed what Napoleon had begun.

These and similar observations made by Professor Tarlé apply, *mutatis mutandis*, with such telling accuracy to the present Russian régime that it is not surprising that he has himself been a prisoner of the Stalinist Fouchés. His work, however, bears no imprints of the iron heels of Stalin's totalitarian régime. It can be unreservedly recommended as an introduction to the life and times of the first and foremost of modern dictators.

George NOVACK

Red Fantasy

MEET ME ON THE BARRICADES. By CHARLES YALE HARRISON. 206 pp. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.00.

P. Herbert Simpson, the unobtrusive little hero of Harrison's new book, is a much harassed man. Outwardly he is a meek and mild oboe player, living comfortably removed from the barricaded trouble-spots of the world in leafy Mount Vernon. But only outwardly. Actually his mind runs more frequently to social salvation than to Sibelius; he is afire with brotherhood and athirst for the liberation of humanity; in his tortured flights of fancy Mount Vernon is miraculously metamorphosed into the scene of soul-stirring social battles, in which he never fails to play his part—now as Commandante Pedro H. Simpson of the International Brigade, now as the gallant lover of Natasha and the dauntless leader of the Russian revolution (symbols of sex and salvation are curiously intertwined in his reveries), again as the staunch fellow-

traveller of the Great Cause, hobnobbing indiscriminately with Browders and Roosevelt.

Suburban, oboe-tooting Herbert Simpson is, in short, the prototype of the Friends of the Soviet Union, of the sort who hail the new Constitution, collect peasant knick-knacks from the Georgian steppes and, inspired by Dostoyevsky and Duranty, meditate on the dark, turbid recesses of the Russian soul. He is the chronic partisan of peace, progress, plenty and prosperity, plus anything else which may appear on the masthead of the *Daily Worker*. He is the ardent popular-fronting sympathizer. He is the backbone of innumerable Leagues Against This and For That, the inchoate mass which thrills once a week to the editorials of the *New Masses*, the respectable liberal fringe which contributes regularly, applauds loudly, and salaams dutifully toward the Kremlin at sunset. He is—Stalinism incarnate.

The tragedy of little Simpson—and of the whole social category which he represents; he is an individual only nominally—is that he is sincere. His love for humanity is not simulated; his fervent hopes for the liberation of the oppressed ring true and ingenuous. But, like all the naive fellow-travellers, he is "caught in the coils of the hired publicists". He wades desperately through a "gluey sea of propaganda, floundering from ideology to ideology". Simpson is no equal for the cunning distortions and calculating chicanery of the Louis Fischers, Walter Durantys, Anna Louise Strongs and all the other well-oiled gears in the Stalinist lie-machine. His laudatory sentiments are battered into cruel caricatures of themselves by an unceasing barrage of editorial blasts from those who have been called red journalists gone yellow.

Simpson is, to be sure, beset by recurrent doubts and uncertainties. The Moscow trials disturb a fellow's equanimity; the devastation wrought by the G.P.U. in Spain is hair-raising; the new war-mongering on the left occasions sleepless nights. But that way lie despair and madness. In these grievous times of stress and strain, it is at least reassuring to find that the *Daily Worker* is vindicated in the columns of the *Nation* and the *New Republic*. The boys with supple spines and agile pens provide plausible excuses for every puzzling policy: support of imperialist war, you see, is really defense of the Soviet Union and, by that same token, defense of the ultimate world revolution which in the interim you suppress with machine-guns and firing-squads; the murder of revolutionists in Spain means purging the anti-fascist ranks of the Fifth Column; the counter-revolution of the popular front amounts really to achieving unity against the common enemy. The only way out for congenial believers like Simpson is to follow the leader, scotch "disruption", and hope for the best.

In Herbert Simpson, playing his scales and leading the world proletariat *in absentio*, Harrison has created a type: the little man of honorable motives and worthy

loyalties who, stunned by the sweep of reaction, becomes the sanction and shield for betrayal. It is the Simpsons who, in the name of unity and progress, try with might and main to gloss over the Moscow trials, who read victory and hope into the grim news from Spain, who express their love for peace by preparing to shoulder their rifles in tomorrow's crusade to save democracy. Harrison, who got an intimate taste of the last war, has not approached today's unparalleled corruption among liberal and labor forces with detachment and complacency. The treachery of self-styled progressives and labor leaders sometimes reaches such proportions that it can not always be adequately handled with instruments of cool literary and political analysis, devised in less parlous times. This book is inspired by a hatred for that treachery and a fear that the gullible Simpsons will again swallow the fatal pills of patriotism prepared by the imperialists and sugar-coated by their hired publicists. It is not a political brochure, nor a reasoned treatise, nor a tract of special pleading. It is a satire in the form of a novel, intent on exposure and derision. If the mockery is bitter, if the ridicule is grim and biting, the subject-matter shoulders more of the responsibility than does the author.

The literary vehicle which Harrison has chosen is interesting technically, if uneven in its execution. Fantasy, day-dreaming, untrammelled flights of imagination—these are the stuff of the book. They have been conveyed, with varying success, through the stream-of-consciousness technique, with all its abrupt shifts of association, irrelevancies and discontinuity. The clipped, terse sentences which Harrison used in *Generals Die in Bed* have been smoothed out and expanded, verging sometimes on the verbose. There is, nevertheless, a certain compression achieved: the book at times takes on the character of a movie-script, and, indeed, the longest chapter, a scene of drunken fantasia in the Joycean tradition, through which parade a host of characters from Sam Johnson to Earl Browder, is written entirely in play form. A directness and economy of expression is attained by the use of bracketed adverbial notes, suggesting stage-directions, and italicized explanations for associational swerves, the author's asides to his reader. The boldness with which varying forms of presentation are juxtaposed is startling and the transition may sometimes be found difficult, but on the whole the technical devices manage to convey the formlessness and confusion of the mental vagaries which constitute the bulk of the book.

Harrison's book has met with a mixed reception. The least meritorious of the complaints has been that the author's own point of view has been overlaid and obscured by his pitiless pillorying. There are foils to Simpson's infinite faith in the book: Darrell, the cynical newspaperman, who echoes the despair and disillusion of a large wing of the radical movement, and Ascaso, the musician, who, while dismayed by the treachery which pervades the labor

movement, nevertheless retains his conviction that the revolution will yet conquer. Those who are impatient with doubters and eager for answers to all questions may be irritated by Harrison's failure to choose as between the symbols of despair and hope. But the task of the writer, particularly in a work of this sort, hardly involves the necessity for personal commitment. The book is at once more realistic and more provocative for its failure to pass beyond a presentation of the alternatives. Simpsonism, and those who prey upon it, are exposed and condemned for what they are. This is the book's *raison d'être*. The uncertainty as to the outcome of the conflict between Ascaso and Darrell, while not satisfying, is a reflection of the period in which the book is written. Harrison seems to be saying that the conflict can be resolved, not by this or that commentator or critic, but by events themselves, and by those who participate in them. He has wisely declined the function of seer. A political satirist in a period of dark reaction has a more negative but no less important task to perform.

And in that connection it may be suggested that *Meet Me on the Barricades*, despite certain shortcomings, ventures upon new and fruitful literary fields. It indicates, in the opinion of this reviewer, that there may be unplumbed creative possibilities for the revolutionary novelist in the domain of political satire. The straightforward wedding of politics and literature in the satirical novel furnishes a medium peculiarly suited to the times. In a period when politics brutally dominates the whole of life, the social tract can form an integral part of its literature. Harrison's book suggests that the field is well worth exploring.

Bernard WOLFE

Correspondence

A friend, in New Zealand, sends, along with a standing order for copies of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, an interesting letter from the other side of the world, from which the following passages are taken:

AS YOU KNOW we have had a Labor Government since November, 1935. It issues a weekly, a copy of which will reach you soon. It speaks for itself both politically and technically. The circulation (not officially revealed) is about 25,000 throughout the country reckoning on the very largest possible estimate. The Stalinists, feeble imitators of their European and English confrères, publish a footling weekly, a classic copy of which I enclose. The manifesto will interest you. It is entirely an overstatement of the "rallying of the bourgeoisie". The fact is that the Nationalist Party, an amalgamation of town-country bourgeois traditional parties resulting from their defeat in 1935, has not yet recovered from the shock of its shattering rout at that election. Its policy speeches have been woe-fully weak, with nothing to substitute for the Labor Party's reformism. One or

two Freedom Associations, Constitutional Leagues, etc., have arisen "to protect the democratic rights of New Zealanders from the ravages of Socialism" but in our atmosphere and in a time of relatively good prices and "prosperity" they will cut little ice. But the Communist Party sounds the alarm! To arms, citizens, in defence of the (sorry our) Labor Government! Defend peace, freedom, democracy! Any damn thing that is so fatuous in the light of modern history that the radio-doped, gullible populace need not think out its class position. You know the stuff so well that I need not enlarge on the theme—international in its viciousness.

I am also sending you some Labor Party pamphlets which one of your comrades might like to read. They are social-democratic with essential differences based on our lop-sided economy and our distance from political affairs in the Old World. . . .

May I congratulate you on the first issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL? . . . Altogether I hope that you can maintain the standard and sufficient circulation to make it a permanent effort. This is all the more important as the revolutionary movement seems decisively to have shifted to the English-speaking world in general and the U.S.A. in particular. The "new" countries—U.S., Australia, South Africa and even N.Z.—will carry on the movement that has so regularly moved its center of gravity. That's a theory of my own that is easily demonstrable from the facts of the last few years. The appearance of the N.I. is a piece of evidence not lightly to be dismissed. . . .

I mentioned above that no Fourth International movement exists here. The whole position is unreal to us. Problems seem so local. Trotsky vs. Stalin is academic. The fate of the U.S.S.R. or the Roumanian Jews or the Spanish Popular Front seem equally so. We are sorry that the Spanish people have decided to end their peaceful civilization and that Japanese are being dirty dogs in China—but as long as these stupid people keep away from us and Britain keeps out of a scrap things are O.K. Wool and butter prices are much more important. That is our mental and political outlook in this fair country. Biologically speaking this is the best country on earth. Not too hot nor too cold; healthy; low death rate; very low infant mortality; hardly a slum, etc., etc. Intellectually—well that's another tale. Still a few people here understand the necessity of resolving theoretical issues as the only guide to one's own practice. The very few who take up your position (more or less) are, however, in close contact with each other and in prominent Trade Union positions. We hope that we may provide some sort of rallying ground in time of trouble as long as we can keep some sort of personal position in our respective Unions and in the wider Trade Union movement generally. This is slow, heart-breaking work in a Labor-in-power atmosphere where the workers are sworn friends of their traditional party and the more leftward workers have come under the influence of unprincipled Stalinism. . . .

What We Hear From Our Contemporaries

Among the comments arriving at the office, we are delighted to be able to list the following:

"We congratulate you on the reappearance of your monthly organ. With our best wishes."

QUE FAIRE, Independent Communist organ.
Paris, France.

"I read with great pleasure the article by Leon Trotsky in your January number. We should like greatly to reproduce it in an early number of CONTROVERSY."

C. A. Smith, Editor, CONTROVERSY,
organ of Independent Labor Party.
London, England.

"A local Canadian Commonwealth Federation Club has printed the section on the Ludlow amendment in their monthly bulletin. . . . The 'Review of the Month' section is excellent."

Vancouver, B.C., Canada. G.S.

"I enjoy the THE NEW INTERNATIONAL very much. I think it has no equal for enlightenment socialistically in the English language."

Aberdeen, Scotland. A Reader.

"I recognize it as a valuable organ of revolutionary Marxism."

A Columnist on a weekly paper.
Arkansas, Kans.

"The article on Roosevelt alone makes the magazine worth while."

New York City. Margaret De Silver.

"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is the outstanding journal of revolutionary Marxism in the English language. No socialist can afford to miss the Marxist expositions in its columns of the situation in the various countries."

THE MILITANT, official organ,
Workers Party of Australia.
Sydney, Australia.

"I do not want to miss an issue. Please send me the revived magazine, which continues the same fine tradition of the original."

Newark, N.J.

J.C.H.

These comments, and the many others we have received, are an indication that THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is living up to its name, and is carrying on the great tradition of genuine internationalism to which the magazine is dedicated. THE NEW INTERNATIONAL is a cooperative enterprise, and its readers and friends have as great a part to play in building and strengthening it as have the editors, contributors, and the business staff.

What we need right now above all is subscriptions. Bundle orders and general sales are increasing in a most encouraging manner, but a subscription list is the only firm and permanent foundation for a magazine like ours.

Send all checks and domestic and international money orders to

The New International

116 University Place

New York, N. Y.

ANNUAL BOOK SALE For Limited Time Only

TROTSKY—The Third International After Lenin . . .	(\$2.00)	\$1.00
The Stalin School of Falsification	(\$2.50)	1.50
Lessons of October (Cloth)	(.75)	.49
Whither France? Cloth	(.75)	.49
History of the Russian Revolution	(\$2.98)	2.50
My Life	(\$5.00)	3.50
The Revolution Betrayed Autographed		2.50
* * * *		
SERGE, Victor—Russia: Twenty Years After	(\$2.50)	1.50
JAMES, C. L. R.—World Revolution: 1917-1936	(\$3.50)	2.50
THALHEIMER, A.—Int. to Dialectical Materialism	(\$2.50)	1.50
LETTERS OF LENIN	(\$4.00)	1.25
FINE, Nathan—Labor and Farmer Parties in the U.S.	(\$3.00)	1.25
LEWINSON, Paul—Race, Class and Party	(\$3.75)	.98

A History of Negro Suffrage

RIVERA, Diego—Portrait of America	(\$4.00)	1.50
WALKER, C. R.—American City	(\$2.50)	1.25
COATES, W. P.—Armed Intervention in Russia	(\$3.50)	2.00
JELLENIK, Frank—The Paris Commune of 1871	(\$3.00)	2.00
STEIN, Rose M.—M-Day	(\$2.50)	.98
GRATTAN, C. H.—Why We Fought	(\$3.00)	.98
KAUTSKY, Karl—Economic Doctrines of Marx	(\$1.50)	.75

Send post card for new book list—just issued.

WE CAN SUPPLY YOU WITH BOOKS OF ALL PUBLISHERS—
POST FREE.

Order all your books from:

LABOR BOOK SHOP

28 East 12th Street

New York, N. Y.

Off the Press

Leon Sedoff

SON — FRIEND — FIGHTER

Dedicated to the Proletarian Youth

by LEON TROTSKY

Published by

YOUNG PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST LEAGUE
(4th Internationalists)

116 University Place

New York City

ORDER NOW

10c per single copy

7c in bundles of 5 or more

Just Published

HOW TO FIGHT WAR

Isolation?

Collective Security?

Relentless Class Struggle?

By JAMES BURNHAM

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

116 University Place, New York City

3c per single copy

2¼c in bundles of 10 or more