
March 1942

Fourth International

INDIA:

1. Thesis of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India
2. "Democratic" Enemies of India . . . *An Editorial*
3. India's Bourgeoisie *by Larissa Reed*

Roosevelt and the War Crisis

By William F. Warde

Gaullism and Stalinism in France

A Document from the French Trotskyists

- The Farmer After the New Deal . *by Frances Willard*
Speech to the Czarist Court *by Leon Trotsky*

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

We believe the following extracts from letters of readers amply support our claim that the February issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL was a particularly good one:

D. C. of Tennessee: "I am enclosing a money order for \$1 for which please renew my sub to FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. If possible, please send the February issue as I have not received my own copy and there are articles in it I would hate not to have, and would like very much for several friends to see."

J. B. of Montana: "The F. I. was very good this time. It went over good out here."

And we want to quote from a letter we appreciate because it indicates the growing prestige of our magazine: "While not necessarily in agreement with the views expressed in your publication, I wish to state that I have found them very helpful in interpreting world events and I sincerely hope that you may be able to continue publication."

* * *

We know that all of you look forward each month to the interesting letters we receive from friends in other countries.

Argentina: "I have been receiving FOURTH INTERNATIONAL regularly and I am very grateful to you. I beg you to continue sending the magazine . . . it is very important in *this period* to continue receiving the publication of our movement."

Cuba: "During these times I want to read good papers and magazines and find interesting articles of the authentic revolutionary Marxists; so I enclose \$1 for which please mail me FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, and send me the back issues . . ."

England: "FOURTH INTERNATIONAL is extremely valuable material for educational purposes and it makes very interesting reading. Such material is vitally necessary if we are to increase the theoretical level of our friends and comrades . . . We have wonderful opportunities locally and nationally, but we cannot utilize these without a clear and scientific understanding, i.e., without material such as the above . . . We realize the difficulties in sending material to such places as 'ours.' But please endeavor to

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Volume III March 1942 No. 3 (Whole No. 20)

Published by the Fourth International Publishing Association

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.

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

Editor FELIX MORROW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Comment	67
Roosevelt and the War Crisis <i>By William F. Warde</i>	73
Gaullism and Stalinism in France	76
The Classes of India and Their Political Roles	82
The Farmer After the New Deal <i>By Frances Willard</i>	87
Speech to the Czarist Court in 1906 <i>By Leon Trotsky</i>	89
The Mind of India's Bourgeoisie <i>By Larissa Reed</i>	94

 214

Manager's Column Inside Front Cover

send us as many copies of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL as possible . . . We also would be pleased if you could send us a bound volume of the F.I. for 1941. By the way, the volume need not be 'bound'; we are in-

terested in the material and not the appearance! All our copies (half are missing) are black with use and thumb marks since they are passed around to a dozen people."

England: (From the British

monthly "Left" which publishes articles of various viewpoints): "As it seems of particular importance at the present time that the Socialist movement in Britain should be aware of what the movement in the U. S. A. is thinking, we are proposing to begin, as a regular feature, the publication of representative extracts from the American Socialist press. If this new feature is to be a success, it is necessary that copies of American journals should reach me as soon after publication as possible. May we hope for your collaboration in this?"

And above all, as this issue of F. I. shows, with its publication of two basic documents from the Fourth International sections in France and India, the international connections of F. I. are being maintained one way and another!

* * *

We are pleased to report a pick-up in FOURTH INTERNATIONAL bundle payments during the past few months. Some of our agents have cooperated in a commendable fashion with us in our attempts to establish regularity of payment. For instance, we know that every month we can depend on a payment from Montana, Boston, Chicago, Newark, Allentown, Minneapolis, Detroit, Quakertown, New Haven, Kansas, Buffalo, Cleveland, Philadelphia. In fact, some of these agents' accounts usually show a credit balance. Even though payments have increased during the past few months, however, they have not as a whole yet become stable. There are still those agents who remit in a more or less haphazard fashion, every other month, every three months, and there are a few who really keep us guessing as to just when they will make a payment. We once more urge these agents to regularize their payments as quickly as possible.

Subscriptions continue to come in quite regularly. For February, Local New York tops the subscription list, followed by Minneapolis, Chicago, Flint, Boston, Akron, Youngstown, Seattle, Detroit, St. Paul and Stockton. We would like to see the subscriptions increase, of course, and believe they will if you make it a regular habit to get a sub into the hands of every contact, and follow up on expired subs to make sure that they are renewed.

Bound Volume of

NEW INTERNATIONAL and FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

1940 and 1941

Price \$3.00

Order now from

Business Office

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

116 University Place

New York

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME III

MARCH 1942

NUMBER 3

Editorial Comment

The Opponents of India's Freedom Aid the Axis Powers—What Independence Really Means—The Anti-India Proposals of Churchill, the British Labor Party and the "Left" Laborites—The Counter-Revolutionary Role of Stalinism and Chiang Kai-shek in India—Japanese Imperialism and the Colonial Peoples—The Indian Bourgeoisie vs. the Masses—The Necessity for a Socialist Britain

The eyes of the whole world are now turning to India. That enormous colony of 400 million oppressed people has become veritably the key to the international situation. What will happen there during the next few months may very well determine the fate of the East, and of the world, for decades to come.

Yesterday the average worker in the United States hardly thought of India as existing in the same world with him. Today, in the factories and the streets, American workers are discussing whether India will get its freedom. The workers have grasped the essential fact that if British troops succeed in preventing Indian independence then in India there will be duplicated on a grandiose scale the events of Malaya, Burma and the Netherlands Indies. Reports of recent days indicate that the American workers understand that no greater aid can be rendered to the Axis powers today than to obstruct independence for India. The attitude of the Churchill government toward India is one of the main sources of the rapidly growing anti-British sentiment which is causing so much concern in Washington.

Britain's Slaves Will Not Fight for Her

It is now obvious that the British ruling class cannot mobilize its colonial slaves for the war. It was able to do so during World War I, when it conscripted two million soldiers from India alone. But that was before the Russian revolution of 1917, and the enduring inspiration it gave to the Arab Middle East, to the great Chinese revolution (1925-1927), to India's unceasing struggle for national liberation. The colored peoples put into uniform and armed by Great Britain and France during World War I, instructed how to overcome "enemy" white men, learned their lesson well and returned home to fructify the incessant battles for national freedom. The years between the two world wars have been years of colonial uprisings and never-ending struggles for national freedom against the great imperialist powers.

Hence in World War II the British have not even dared to recruit mass armies from the colonies. In India the last official figures from Simla (last September) recorded some 700,000 Indian troops, mostly still under training—and even of these a large part were from the so-called "warrior races," the Gurkhas and Sikhs, privileged groups equivalent to the

Cossacks of the Czar. Contrast this figure with the two million Indian troops who fought in the last war. Moreover, very few Indian troops have yet seen combat. In Hongkong, Malaya and Singapore, the British recruited no native troops at all. The situation was only slightly different under the allegedly "better" rule of the Dutch in the Netherlands Indies: no specific figures for colored troops are available, but the total armed forces, both brown and white, were 100,000 out of a native population of seventy millions—obviously a small hand-picked force because the Dutch dared not raise a mass army among politically maturing masses who have revolted so often. In seething Burma the British, for very good and sufficient reasons, made no attempt to recruit.

And in all these colonies the peoples have utilized Britain's difficulties in the war to wreak vengeance upon their oppressors. Some of the British capitalist newspapers, as we reported last month, complained when Malaya fell that the natives should have been recruited; even the spokesman of the overlords in the colonies, the *Singapore Free Press* (but only when the Japanese were already certain to take Singapore) called for arming the natives. After the events in Burma, however, it is unlikely that any bourgeois British paper will again indulge in this form of hypocrisy. "Natives in many districts have rebelled and are killing unarmed Britishers . . . All over Burma it is dangerous for foreigners to move around unless they are armed, and in some districts the Burmese have even attacked armed Britishers . . . Rangoon is a horrible place. Foreigners risk their lives when they walk in the city, which is completely in the hands of looters and killers who are running amok." These are the words of an American pilot, reported in a February 28 UP dispatch.

These events in the smaller colonies have posed the question of Indian independence as a life-and-death question to the 45 million people of the British Isles. The 400 millions of India must be permitted to transform themselves from bitter slaves into free and powerful fighters against fascism, or else conquering Japanese and Nazi armies will meet in the Middle East, with the people of the British Isles caught in a watery trap. Every thinking worker in Britain cannot fail to see this prospect as an imminent danger. If British capitalism will not free India then to save their lives the British workers must put an end to capitalism.

Increasingly the British and American workers are asking: Why doesn't the British Government grant the demands of the Indian people and win them as allies? If Churchill won't do it, let him be replaced by somebody who will—why isn't that being done?

What Independence Really Means

The fundamental answer to these questions is provided in a very clear and authoritative manner by the thesis which we publish in this issue of *Fourth International*, entitled "The Classes of India." The Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India, our Trotskyist co-thinkers, wrote this document about 10 months ago; this editorial is designed merely to deal with the events since then.

As our Indian comrades explain, real independence for India means above all *the agrarian revolution*—land and freedom from usury, indebtedness and murderous taxation for the 280 millions, the 70 per cent of the population of this predominantly agrarian country who live under conditions which beggar description. For these great masses the replacement of the Viceroy and his mixed Council by an Indian Viceroy or Prime Minister and an Indian Council would have little meaning. To be free means to the peasant to be free of the landlord. This is what independence has always meant for the Indian masses, no matter how politically backward; that is why their delegations have always come to the sessions of the Indian National Congress bearing the banner: "Down with serfdom!" Only thus do they understand independence.

But that would mean an end to the *zamindari* (landlords), including the native princes who rule over 25 per cent of the Indian population. And the ruin of the landlords would drag down with them the native bourgeoisie, inextricably linked to the landlords through the banks, mortgages, loans, etc. And the fall of the native parasitic classes would have to be preceded by the downfall of the British armed power which has been the sole prop of the landlords. British investments and holdings and income from taxation in India are greater than that of the native owning classes combined. In short, freedom for India means the destruction of the political and economic power of the three parasitic classes which benefit from the perpetuation of the misery of the Indian masses.

Now it is easy to understand why the British Government doesn't grant freedom to India! No ruling class in history has ever voluntarily expropriated itself, every ruling class in history has been ready to murder as many people as necessary in order to maintain its privileges. In India nothing less than a victorious civil war—civil because waged also against the native parasites—will shake off the death-grip of British imperialism.

Churchill Speaks for Capitalism

Who is Churchill and why is he at the head of the British Empire in its greatest crisis? The liberals and "socialists" who tell us that this is a war against fascism have written millions of words of clap-trap about Churchill. To them he is the ex-reactionary who transcended his previous limitations. Among the more "thoughtful" of such "socialists" is the Rev. Reinhold Niebuhr; recently in *The Nation*, after wildly praising Churchill as the indispensable leader of the war effort, Niebuhr concluded with the pious hope that the indispensable war leader would also find within himself the additional greatness to step aside at the victorious conclusion of the war and let more liberal people establish the post-war world; Niebuhr was particularly thinking about Churchill's

attitude toward India. Within a few short weeks, however, this "post-war problem" turns up as the most vital question of the critical stage of the war. Before long the Niebuhrs will be bewailing the unutterable tragedy that Churchill, so great in all else, should be so narrow on the problem on which, it so happens, the fate of the war turns.

The truth is of course that Churchill took the helm because he is the most authentic, the most resolute, leader of the capitalist class of Great Britain. In its moment of greatest need, Churchill came forward to lead his class. In defense of what? *In defense of its empire, India*. That is what this class is fighting this war for. Once this is understood, Churchill's policy, including his policy toward India, is clear, consistent. The "paradox," "tragedy," or what you will, is only in the vile heads of the Niebuhrs.

Churchill has not always been able to convince his class that his policy is the correct one for the time. In 1930 he vainly called for a perspective of crushing the Indian National Congress, instead of granting minor concessions. Again in 1935, when the Government of India Act was adopted under which India is now being ruled, and under which provincial "autonomy" was conceded (leading to Congress-led Provincial Ministries during 1938-39), Churchill led a die-hard opposition against any concessions. He was brutally frank about his motivation: two out of every ten Englishman live off India (an understatement) and concessions would in the end lead to losing everything. Those were the years when Churchill was also making his "prophetic" speeches about the re-arming of Germany and the need to prepare for war, which are now remembered with such awe. His proposals for India were, however, an integral aspect of his war perspective. Crush India well before the war comes, then there will be no colonial problem amid wartime difficulties—this was Churchill's consistent outlook.

Churchill did not have his way in 1930 and 1935, and he tried to make up for that when the war began and especially when he became Prime Minister. As our Indian comrades record in this issue the war came in the midst of a great resurgence of the class struggle and the national struggle in India, a movement which was mounting ever higher despite the anti-labor and anti-peasant repressions of the Congress Ministries. The British ruthlessly repressed the mass movement under the pretext of wartime necessity. When Churchill became Prime Minister, the news was greeted with dismay throughout India, where, of course, his views were well known. By July 1, 1941, by British official figures, 12,129 Indians were imprisoned for political reasons, including 28 ex-ministers and 290 members of the provincial legislatures. In Ceylon, which had won certain rights, including election of a State Council by universal suffrage, Churchill outlawed the Ceylon Socialist Party (adherent of the Fourth International) and imprisoned its leaders, violating the parliamentary immunity of those who had been elected to the State Council.

That these brutal repressions were not peculiar to Churchill is indicated by the history of the French colonies since the war. Years of national struggle had won certain concessions in Indo-China, including a State Council elected by general suffrage; in the April, 1939 elections the Indo-Chinese party of the Fourth International had won a brilliant victory over the Stalinist-Daladier Popular Front bloc. As soon as war began six months later, the "democratic" Daladier outlawed the Trotskyists and jailed their leaders. When Vichy took over the colony it merely continued Daladier's repressions. Likewise in Algeria, the war was a signal for

persecuting the Algerian People's Party, the nationalist movement, and when Vichy came it likewise continued that policy; leaders of the Algerian movement who fled to Syria ended up there in the dungeons of the "Free French," alongside the Arab nationalist leaders. The latest news from Syria (N.Y. *Times*, March 5) is a "Free French" communique announcing that "professional agitators"—that phrase used by all oppressors!—"have tried to foment disorder," and the authorities "have evidence" that it is being done under orders from Berlin. The Gaullists have so little faith in their "evidence," however, that they will not bring the "agitators" before the courts, but are *interning* the agitators without trial "for the duration of the war." De Gaulle, Daladier, Petain, Cripps, Churchill, Chamberlain or whoever it is—the colonial policy of imperialism is always the same.

The same—that is, it defends to the death the interests of the capitalist class of the "mother" country. That defense requires different weapons for different times. Churchill since the fall of Singapore is changing his tune, as a flexible leader of British imperialism. He no longer, as in 1935, calls for the crushing of Gandhi and Nehru; now he needs them to use against the agrarian masses of India. Churchill is not changing his mind because of what has happened in Malaya and Burma. The Secretary of State for India and Burma, Amery, who is very close to Churchill, angrily rejects such examples. "It is absurd," said Amery, "to suggest that some wider measure of local self-government would have made any difference in that respect" (N. Y. *Times*, March 7). Only one thing is moving Amery and Churchill: the fall of Singapore has broken British *armed power* in the Far East, they cannot *by force* hold back the Indian movement, their proffered "concessions" are retreats dictated by a lack of sufficient *force* with which to hurl back the masses of India.

"After the war," Churchill now says, India will be offered "dominion status." The term is an obvious deception. The dominions in the British Empire—Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa—are very loosely connected with Great Britain; they contain relatively little British investments, are ruled by strong capitalist classes which are in no sense junior partners of the capitalist class of Britain, in short bear no marks of a colonial character. But "dominion status" for India would leave British investments untouched, i.e., leave unsolved the agrarian problem, and that means leaving everything essentially as before. And even this Churchill merely promises to give after the war!

The British Labor Party's Proposal

While Churchill delayed as long as possible a formal statement on India, the officialdom of the British Labor Party served as his stalking horse. Lest the Indians have any illusions that a "Labor" Government displacing Churchill would grant more than he, the Labor Party Executive issued on February 27 its "recommendations" to the government of which it is part. It stands with Churchill on the "principle" that Indian self-government must be based on agreement between the "different interests in India"—i.e., agreement between the Native Princes and the other landlords, the native bourgeoisie, and the masses, or to speak more plainly, agreement between British imperialism's native agents and the masses—and even this is not enough, for "the full settlement of the complex issues of Indian self-government, must await the close of the war." Meanwhile, it is sufficient that the Viceroy's Council of 14—nine of whom are now "Indians," that is, members of the openly pro-British landlord-

and-capitalist Liberal Federation or of Jinnah's equally pro-British Moslem League—should be changed to make all 14 "Indians"!

"Left" Laborites and also similar-stripe "socialists" in this country are sadly deploring the British Labor Party's "mistake." But this document expresses the very essence of the British Labor Party, which is the classical party of labor agents of an imperialist power. A non-imperialist Britain would not have a British Labor Party of Citrines and Bevins. The party is based on a labor bureaucracy and a labor aristocracy directly feeding on the crumbs from the table of a fat imperialist power. The entire Second International was built on such labor lieutenants of imperialist oppressors of the bulk of the human race. The swine who wrote the British Labor Party "recommendations" on India *know* that their parasitic existence is at stake in maintaining British repression of India, and they act accordingly.

As for the "left" critics in the Labor Party, what do they propose for India? These "lefts" are, of course, supporters of the war, etc., and their leader, Sir Stafford Cripps, is now trying to sell Churchill to India. They have an organ, the weekly *Tribune*, and its March 5 issue declared:

"As we write we are told that the Cabinet has failed to arrive at the agreed solution. The Cabinet need not worry. The matter is out of their hands . . . No half-measures have any value now. The Indian revolution is on. There is only one possible chance to make up a little of the lost time and still to spike the guns of the Bose opposition.

"Nehru must be asked to become Prime Minister and Minister of Defense with full powers and with a provisional All-Indian Legislative Assembly to act as the representative organ of the State.

"Make no mistake. This is not opportunity knocking at our door—it is history battering it down."

This proposal certainly indicates a more far-seeing understanding of what is happening than anything publicly said by the British Labor Party or Churchill. "The Indian revolution is on," that is true enough. But while this revolution is battering down "our door"—a revealing phrase, their door *and* Churchill's, their door *and* also the door of India's oppressors—the "lefts" propose to re-erect that door as well as possible under the circumstances. They propose "to make up a little of the lost time," that is, the lost time of British imperialism. A *provisional* All-Indian Legislative Assembly is to be the source of power—provisional, that is to say, *appointed* and not elected by universal suffrage, appointed by agreement between Nehru (the Indian bourgeoisie) and British imperialism. "The Cabinet need not worry. The matter is out of their hands" turns out to be merely a hysterical warning that the Cabinet should hurry, or else the Indian revolution will not be stifled. This, mind you, from the "left wing" of the Labor Party! Fortunately the role of the British Labor Party as the agent of British Imperialism is well understood in India and its proposals will be taken there as equivalent to those of Churchill.

Stalinism vs. National Liberation

Unfortunately for India, however, British imperialism has another and more potent labor agency at its service—the Stalinist parties in England and the Far East. Wrapping themselves in the prestige of the Soviet Union and the Red Army's great struggles, the agents of the Kremlin are instructed to repay Churchill and Roosevelt for the trickle of supplies to the USSR with political services which the "democratic" imperialists could never achieve by themselves.

Stalinism still pays lip service to the Leninist program

for national liberation of the colonies. During 1935-39, the Popular Front era, while calling for "struggle for the realization of the right of self-determination of nationalities enslaved by fascist governments," Communists were instructed, according to Manuilsky's formula, that in the "democratic" empires they must "subordinate the realization of this right of secession . . . in the interests of defeating fascism" (*Pravda*, March 12, 1939). This "temporary" surrender of the struggle for national liberation was dropped as soon as the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed when again Indian Communists could stand for national liberation. But Manuilsky's formula to "subordinate the realization of this right of secession" became law again for the colonies of the British Empire and the "Free French" after June 22, 1941. Thus the Stalinist parties serve as so many pawns for the Kremlin's foreign policy.

Stalinism also still pays lip service to the Leninist program against imperialist wars; ergo, while World War I was an imperialist war (Lenin's writings on this cannot be doctored), World War II is not an imperialist war. Perhaps the most amazing proof offered for this claim is that the British-Ethiopian Treaty, which is a typical imperialist document—leaving Britain in complete control of the armed forces, the police, the courts, etc., of Ethiopia—is, according to Stalinism, a charter of freedom for the Ethiopians! The Stalinists write:

"The colonial peoples are recognizing that the war against Hitler and Japan is their war, and that necessarily its prosecution to success must bring higher status and increased recognition for them as equals. The British-Ethiopian Treaty, recording the expulsion of the Italian fascist murders from this Negro kingdom and recognizing the sovereignty of Ethiopia and Haile Selassie, is a graphic illustration of the character of this war for the colonials, despite the weaknesses of the treaty.

"Colonials and oppressed nations throughout the world can see in the restored independence of Ethiopia . . . a profound difference between this and World War I where colonies changed hands without increased freedom for the national populations . . . The denial of freedom to the colonial masses, always unjust, is now being recognized in many conservative circles as worse than folly if an adequate force to defeat Hitler is to be mustered." (*Sunday Worker*, February 22, 1942.)

If the war of the "democracies" is thus also a war for national liberation of the colonies, how does it happen that India, the West Indies, Ceylon, Syria, Equatorial Africa, etc., etc., are not free? The Stalinist explanation is that, whoever is to blame, nobody who really supports the war is to blame. As the same Stalinist article puts it:

"Yet obstacles to this objective are being stubbornly maintained by the Tories, the appeasers, the fifth columnists and the disguised pro-Hitler elements, who exert their subversive pressure upon the government war leaders to keep the subject nations dormant and divided in the fight on Hitler."

From this we can predict in advance what the Stalinists will do to resolve the contradiction between their avowal of national liberation and the refusal of the British ruling class to grant freedom to India. When Churchill presents the equivalent for India of the British-Ethiopian Treaty, the Stalinists will peddle it throughout the Far East as a genuine charter of freedom for India.

And if the Indian people reject Churchill's mess of pottage and launch a direct struggle for national emancipation, including the agrarian revolution as its necessary social content, Stalinism will then attempt to play the same counter-revolutionary role as in Loyalist Spain, slandering and murdering the revolutionaries as "agents of fascism." Our Indian comrades are absolutely correct in characterizing Stalinism as today the most dangerous influence within the working class of the Far East.

In addition to the Stalinists, British imperialism has the aid of the Chinese bourgeoisie against the Indian revolution. Chiang Kai-shek is not merely an "honest broker"; in India he called upon the people to support Britain's war effort *in advance* of any concessions—the surest way to keep concessions down to a bare minimum; and he did *not* propose independence for India; his formula, "real political power" for the Indian people, is a euphemism for the fraudulent "self-government" or "dominion status" which London is prepared to promise.

Chiang Kai-shek's Reactionary Role

Not by such methods did China win concessions from Britain. The first step in the Chinese revolution of 1925-27 was an anti-British boycott and strike which broke the back of British hegemony in South China. When the rising revolution developed into an agrarian revolution, the frightened Chinese bourgeoisie and the equally frightened British imperialists patched up their differences and joined together to destroy the revolution, with the aid of the Stalinists. Now Chiang is proposing to the Indian bourgeoisie that they avoid the dangerous stage of anti-British struggles—dangerous because such struggles inevitably develop into *class* struggles of the great masses directed not only at the imperialists but also at the native oppressors—and go directly into the stage of agreements with the British. But the laws of revolution do not operate that way. The British accepted Chiang as the national leader of China only because the anti-British struggles *had* destroyed British hegemony and because Chiang *had* beheaded the social revolution. Only under the same conditions will the British concede to Gandhi and Nehru what they conceded to Chiang in 1927.

Chiang's role in China reveals the inadequacy of the kind of struggle that the Chinese bourgeoisie is carrying on against Japan. China's war of national liberation requires the arousing of the entire Far East against imperialism. A liberated India would immeasurably strengthen China's fight for freedom. Instead Chiang, remembering how close to success was the social revolution in China in 1925-27, helps to stifle India's fight for freedom. The fundamental contradiction between China's fight for freedom and the reactionary policies of the Chinese ruling class has been dramatized in Burma, where Chinese troops arrived to aid the British while the Burmese people wreaked national vengeance upon their British oppressors.

What Washington Wants in India

Chiang went to India by agreement between Washington and London. We can well believe, however, that London gave its consent with some reluctance and under pressure from Washington. British imperialism would still like to try to get by without any change at all in India or with the slightest change, fearing that any concession at all means opening the sluice gates to the flood of social revolution. On the other hand Washington considers its own imperialist methods—dollar diplomacy without formal control of the colonial countries and with an only occasional punitive expedition by the marines—as much superior to Britain's old-fashioned methods; superior because without formal control of its colonies Britain would soon lose their revenues to United States "economic" penetration. In 1940 Trotsky predicted that during this war the United States would seek to strengthen its penetration of the Far East so that, at the next stage, it could enforce Indian "independence" in order to replace Britain. The two stages

have now been telescoped as a result of the Far Eastern defeats and the urgent necessity of utilizing India's manpower and resources for the war. This is expressed in the fact that an American "technical" mission is already on its way to India.

Hence the large-scale campaign in the American press, putting pressure on Britain for a speedy settlement with India. This campaign has produced some astonishingly strong language. Typical of this use of unaccustomed language was that of Walter Lippmann:

"The United Nations have found themselves in a position where they could be accused, not without warrant, of fighting to preserve the rule of the white man over the peoples of Asia and of being committed at fearful cost to a war for the restoration of empire . . . The Western nations must now . . . identify their cause with the freedom and the security of the peoples of the East putting away the 'white man's burden' and purging themselves of the taint of an obsolete and obviously unworkable white man's imperialism.

" . . . No doubt die-hard Tory imperialism will die hard. But it must die . . . If, as we may believe, Mr. Churchill has seen these great truths, this will have been the most critical moment in a career which fixes him already among the greatest of all English statesmen. If now, *hand in hand with Mr. Roosevelt*, he transcends the imperialist war in Asia and transforms it into a war of liberation, the longer future is ours, whatever the next months may bring." (*N. Y. Herald Tribune*, February 21).

The authoritative *New York Times* joined the campaign, saying when Chiang visited Gandhi:

"Draw a ring around the date—Feb. 18, 1942 . . . India and China are no longer suppliants at the white man's door. Not all the faded trappings of imperialism, not all the pomp of viceroys, not all the arrogance of the 'old China hands' has much meaning for them now . . . Chiang may have achieved one of the most glittering diplomatic victories in history—a united front of India and China against Japan. Good old Colonel Newcome would turn in his grave at such a vision. Kipling's soldiers and civil servants would be appalled. But if this combination can exist, it will be acceptable in London as in Washington and it will suffice." (*New York Times*, February 19.)

But as the crisis over India developed, it was also the *New York Times* which (March 5) sharply warned in an editorial: "So long as the British hold India together . . . in this crisis a radical solution of its infinitely complex problem would be as fatal as no solution at all . . ." Yankee imperialism is as fearful of opening the sluice gates as is the Tory Churchill.

The Colonial Peoples and the Japanese

Tory and Labor press, Chungking spokesmen and American "news" reports all constantly refer to the anti-British activities of the people in Malaya, Singapore, Burma, etc., as "pro-Japanese" activities. There have also been the reports of the arrest as pro-Japanese of U Saw, Burma Premier, and the role of Subhas Chandra Bose as a Nazi agent. Since the charge of being agents of the Axis powers will undoubtedly play a big role in the coming events in India, we must carefully analyze the actual facts.

The Japanese invaders have, of course, secured paid agents in every country. Such individuals must be viewed, however, as part of the espionage system of every country. Is there such a thing as *mass* aid to Japan in any country?

The Japanese have not hesitated to arouse the anti-imperialist sentiments of the masses in Britain's colonies. For example, a January 27 AP dispatch reports: "The Japanese air force appeared over Rangoon again last night and dropped vividly colored propaganda cartoons depicting an imagin-

ary massacre of Burmese by British troops. The cartoons exhorted the Burmese to 'Remember Mandalay,' which was the scene of a rebellion 10 years ago." But Japan, in this as in so much else, is merely imitating Lawrence in Arabia, German support of Polish revolt against the Czar, British encouragement to Czech revolts against Austria, etc.

To attribute anti-British mass actions to a desire to aid Japan is, however, a deliberate slander of the colonial peoples. Among the masses there has long been, as numerous observers reported before the war in the Far East broke out, widespread sympathy with the cause of China and Korea against Japanese imperialism. There is no reason to believe that the masses of Burma and Malaya prefer Japanese imperialism to British imperialism.

What is true is that, precisely when the British have been in difficulties, the colonial masses have wreaked vengeance upon them, but this has nothing to do with the masses' attitude toward Japan. We are, of course, dealing here with a predominantly peasant population, and their anti-British actions—described in the press as "looting," "running amok," killing Britishers, etc.—bear the characteristics of peasant warfare against oppressors; some of the incidents reported read like pages out of the peasant wars in Germany or the French *jacquerie*.

Were the Cuban revolutionaries or the Filipino secret societies agents of the United States in 1898? They ruthlessly settled accounts with the Spanish oppressor during the Spanish-American War, but on the morrow, when the United States merely replaced Spain as the "mother" country, the colonial revolutionaries continued the struggle, this time against the new oppressor. We can say with confidence that the Burmese and Malayan peoples will never submit peacefully to the yoke of Japanese imperialism. In its new colonies Japan will be faced with as ruthless civil war as her armies still face in Manchuria after eleven years of "conquest."

The Colonial Bourgeoisie and Japan

The anti-British actions of the masses, thus, have no connection with the Japanese. The same thing cannot, however, be said of the native *bourgeoisie*. It is quite likely that U Saw and a section of the Burma bourgeoisie were in league with the Japanese. We can be even more certain that Subhas Chandra Bose is not an isolated individual but that he represents a significant wing of the Indian bourgeoisie which believes that collaboration with the Axis powers will get more for its class than collaboration with the British. Until he voluntarily left India in 1940 to turn up later in Berlin, Bose was among the principal leaders of the bourgeoisie, former mayor of Calcutta, twice president of the Indian National Congress, etc.

What motivates Bose and his group? The answer will also illumine for us the character of the entire colonial bourgeoisie. Bose is no paid agent of Berlin. He allies himself with the Nazis in the hope that Nazi armies will aid him and his class to take power in India. He understands very well that the Nazis are imperialists. But he believes that to displace Britain, the Nazi imperialists will strike a better bargain with the Indian bourgeoisie than any which the British will agree to. Bose *wants* a partnership with imperialism. He understands that only with the aid of a great imperialist power can the weak Indian bourgeoisie maintain its parasitic role in India. The last thing any section of the Indian bourgeoisie wants is a really powerful mass movement of the workers and peasants strong enough to drive out all the imperialists. The Indian bourgeoisie understands that such a mass move-

ment would go on also to destroy the native parasites, the landlords and capitalists. Bose therefore aims to oust the British, not through a native movement but through Nazi arms, which will then aid the Indian bourgeoisie in maintaining itself against the peasants and workers.

Nehru's Present Program

Nehru and Gandhi differ from Bose only in that they still hope to make a good bargain with Britain. Like Bose, they fear nothing more than the great masses on whom they are leeches. The farther East you go, the viler the bourgeoisie, said the Bolsheviks; and India is in the Far East. The document of our Indian comrades is sufficient for an understanding of this class. We need only consider the program Nehru now offers Britain.

At moments when Britain was most adamant and when the national movement was at its lowest ebb, the Indian National Congress pushed the British toward new discussions and concessions by mobilizing the masses under the most radical demands: "Constituent Assembly"—that is, the organ of complete national liberation, elected by universal suffrage, which would mean a majority of the peasant poor—and "Agrarian Reform"—a direct threat to the Native Princes and landlords.

Today, however, the spokesmen for the Indian bourgeoisie do not mention anything remotely resembling those bourgeois-democratic demands. Asked what Britain should now accede to, Nehru says:

"In the immediate present a provisional national government should be formed, responsible to the Indian people and not to the viceroy or the British Government . . . some time later, an assembly representative of the people to frame India's Constitution without outside interference." (AP dispatch, March 5, 1942.)

No mention of universal suffrage, and *no* indication of when a legislative body would be convened. Nehru does not even come up to the democratic level of the Cadets, the party of the Russian bourgeoisie, which never dreamed after February, 1917 of publicly denying universal suffrage. But the basic question, in India as in Russia, was the question of actually convening the Constituent Assembly. And here the Indian capitalists merely ape their ill-fated Russian predecessors, who also were ready to have the Assembly meet "some time later"—after a Kornilov had given the workers and peasants a blood-bath. To put off the convening of the Constituent Assembly until "some time later"—that is the classic hall-mark of every counter-revolution.

"Agrarian Reform," likewise, Nehru now abandons. The Princes, the chief landlords of India, who also rule over States including 25 per cent of India's population, "will for the present not be interfered with," say Nehru. He adds that it is "clear that they cannot continue as they are and that Indian freedom will affect their position vitally," but this vague formula for the indefinite future means nothing if "freedom" is ushered in on a basis which leaves untouched the political and economic power of these feudatory Princes.

In brief, Nehru's program leaves the content of national liberation out, in return for British sponsorship of a bourgeois Indian government. He could scarcely be more open in his betrayal of India's long struggle for real freedom.

But from the first day of a new alliance between the British imperialists and the Indian bourgeoisie, it will be confronted with the non-confidence and resistance of the peasants and workers. During 1938 and 1939, when the Congress Min-

istries ruled, the masses were in constant collision with the Nehrus, including the November 7, 1938 political general strike of the Bombay proletariat against the Bombay Congress Ministry's Labor Disputes Bill, the arrests of peasant leaders and suppression of peasant organizations by the Congress Ministries of Behar, North-West Frontier, and United Province, etc. Despite all repressions important sections of the proletariat and the peasantry have retained their organizations; in these days when British armed power has collapsed in the Far East the trade unions and peasant unions must be growing in geometrical proportions.

From the first the economic demands of the peasant and workers' unions will tend to fuse with political demands. The Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India is correctly centering its agitation on the slogan of the immediate convening of the Constituent Assembly. The bourgeoisie undoubtedly, under the pressure of the masses, will make many "left" gestures, but under no circumstances will it convene the Constituent Assembly. Only the workers and the peasants will seek to convene it. Workers' Councils in the cities and towns, constituted not merely by delegates from the existing unions but by delegates elected in the factories and business establishments; Peasants' Councils in every section and province—these will arise, in one form or another and whatever they may be formally named, to seek the convening of the Constituent Assembly.

To the cry of the British and the Indian National Congress that India must be defended against Japan, the Workers' and Peasants' Councils will have an extremely positive answer: "By all means! Give us arms and we shall defend India against all foreign invaders!" Thus the arming of the people, the classical problem of all democratic revolutions, will be immeasurably strengthened by the war situation.

Under these conditions the "freedom" honeymoon between Britain and the Indian bourgeoisie will be of short duration indeed. Either the social revolution in India or the temporary collapse of India under Japanese invasion—there is no stable third alternative.

Only a Socialist Britain Can Endure

Events are hammering into the heads of the British workers the fact that the 400 million peoples of India do not consider themselves allies of the 45 million people of Britain but on the contrary look upon the British as oppressors. No matter what the Churchills do, they will not be able to establish a firm alliance with the people of India. No matter what the concession from British capitalism, the people of India will correctly consider it merely a wartime maneuver which, if Britain is victorious in the war, will be withdrawn leaving India enslaved as before.

Hence a real alliance between the peoples of Britain and India can be brought about only by the establishment of a Workers' Government in Britain. Only such a government, which can point to the expropriation of British capitalism, can win the friendship of the masses of India for common struggle against capitalist reaction everywhere.

If the British workers do not establish a Workers' Government, what prospect faces them? In any event India is lost to British exploitation, whether through the Indian revolution, Japanese invasion or later, in the event of "democratic" victory, United States displacement of Britain in the Far East. The "jewel" of the British Empire not only accounted for the higher standard of living of the British workers, especially the upper strata, but also accounted for the

vitality of the opportunism represented by the British Labor Party, and the loss of India confronts the British proletariat with socialism as a life-and-death question.

Under these conditions, even without the menace of Hitlerism, what kind of life faces the 45 millions of the British Isles? The most catastrophic decline in the standard of living, the status of a small nation dependent upon the good-will of imperialist powers. This at the best. More likely, the status of a Vichy France, no matter which imperialist power conquers in Europe. These are the prospects, and the only prospects, for a capitalist England, with military dictatorship or fascism at home (democracy is a luxury under capitalism which impoverished nations cannot afford) and the necessity of immigration (where?) for a large part of the population.

Roosevelt and the War Crisis

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

Three months of total participation in the war have brought American capitalism face to face with the gravest crisis in its history. The optimistic chirping about prospects of victory in an indefinite future, the official exaggeration of isolated, insignificant successes, are designed to minimize the tremendous defeats sustained in the Pacific during this period. Further military disasters must inevitably sharpen this crisis.

In order to grasp the real nature and full extent of the crisis of the American bourgeoisie, it is necessary to go behind the current military situation and take a backward glance at the pre-war capitalist world. That world, created by the Treaty of Versailles, was indisputably dominated by the United States, chief beneficiary of World War I. Thanks to their overwhelming superiority, enormous economic resources and political power, the American imperialists were able to reconstruct the war-torn capitalist system more or less in accordance with their design and to rule it on their own terms.

The Yankee colossus compelled the other imperialist countries to fall into line behind it in the exploitation of the globe. England was forced back into second place; a "modus vivendi" was arrived at with Japan in regard to Asia. After German and Italian capitalism had been rescued by American capital, the European continent was placed on rations by the dollar diplomats. The United States did not need to take direct possession of new colonies wrested from the vanquished powers; its rulers so manipulated affairs behind the scenes of international diplomacy and finance that through intermediaries they were able to appropriate for themselves the major share of the profits derived from colonial exploitation. The commanding power, the vast revenues, the stability of American capitalism depended upon the maintenance of this international imperialist structure.

The goal of Germany and Japan is to overthrow this world supremacy of American monopoly capitalism. The destruction of Britain's imperial power is viewed as the prerequisite for the subjugation of the United States. President Roosevelt first took official cognizance of this threat in October 1937 in his famous speech demanding the "quarantining of the aggressors." The growing peril to American world hegemony produced by Germany's conquests in Europe and Japan's forward march in Asia irresistibly pulled the United States into the second great struggle for the redivision of

the planet. The socialist revolution is now an absolute necessity for the British workers. A Socialist Britain can successfully lead the way to the Socialist United States of Europe. A Socialist Britain can inspire the German soldiers and workers to destroy fascism. A Socialist Britain can inspire the entire English-speaking world to follow the same path to the liberation of mankind.

We are sure that in these critical days our Trotskyist co-thinkers in England are bending every effort to bring this message to the British proletarians. We are certain that they are meeting with unprecedented response. What seemed for so long merely a theory, apparently so abstract to the workers, life itself is now urging as a desperate necessity, the only way out of capitalist slaughter and starvation.

the planet.

Today, two and a half years after the beginning of that conflict, the rivals of Anglo-American imperialism have converted that threat into a grim reality. The Axis powers have succeeded in destroying a large part of the economic and political structure of the dollar-dominated world between the two wars and are now striking at its very foundations. Europe is under the Nazis with only the island outpost of England and the Soviet Union unconquered. In the past three months the Japanese have taken over the richest sections and main strategic centers of the East Indies. India and Australia are in imminent danger of invasion and occupation.

The fall of Singapore has shaken American capitalism more than the fall of France. The collapse of Britain's imperial power directly endangers the world supremacy of the United States. England is not simply a military ally; it is one of the principal pillars and agencies of the existing system of world imperialism. The rulers of the United States had hoped to take advantage of World War II to complete the process initiated in 1914 and reduce the enfeebled British lion to absolute dependency. They now find themselves obliged to rescue that lion from extinction in order to save their own skins.

To beat back the onrushing Axis forces and maintain world supremacy, the United States is called upon to exert efforts to the limit of its capacities and to strain its whole organism to the breaking point. The American Atlas is already visibly staggering beneath its burdens. The intolerable weight, the colossal magnitude, the unprecedented complexity of its tasks have already induced many people in high places to question whether the United States and its allies will succeed in solving them or whether the United States will go down to defeat and American capitalism perish in the ruins of capitalism itself. "The nation needs to understand that it is possible for the United Nations and the United States to lose this war and suffer the fate of France—and that this possibility may become a probability if the present tide does not change" (*N. Y. World-Telegram*, March 5, 1942).

Roosevelt's Report to the Nation

The chief steward of American capitalism and the Commander-in-Chief of its armed forces on February 23rd delivered a "report to the nation" when the significance of this critical situation was penetrating the minds of the American

people, despite ineffectual attempts to hide its real meaning and magnitude from them. Roosevelt's speech was for domestic consumption. Unlike most of those he has made in the past, it was a defensive speech. The Roosevelt administration is on the defensive in national politics because the United States is in retreat on the world arena.

From the first reactions to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, it had seemed that Roosevelt was assured of national unity during the first part of the war. That illusion of national unity has since melted away, and the administration is under attack both from the right and from the left. The American masses have become alarmed by the uninterrupted defeats suffered at Pearl Harbor, in Asia and Africa, and are feeling the first consequences of the conflict (rationing, large-scale recruiting, the first casualties, longer working hours, soaring cost of living, etc.). They are beginning to question the conduct of the war and the capacities of its leaders.

The reverses have also evoked the first symptoms of defeatism in ultra-reactionary capitalist circles and produced considerable criticisms of Roosevelt's policies in the opposition camp. The Republicans are turning these moods to account with an eye to the November elections; the anti-labor coalition in Congress is using them as a pretext for enchain- ing organized labor; fascist-minded elements are conducting a whispering campaign against the Soviet Union and in favor of a deal with Hitler.

Roosevelt's speech had a double purpose. It was designed to uplift the depressed morale of the masses, to still their questionings, to calm their fears. It was also intended to answer those capitalist critics who were exploiting the administration's difficulties for their own aims.

On the occasion of his assumption to power, Churchill promised the British people "blood, toil, tears and sweat." This is the only promise the Prime Minister has fulfilled. In essence, Roosevelt offered the same prospect to the American people—and he, too, will not disappoint them.

Roosevelt's Program for the War Crisis

Capitalist statesmen have one unflinching recipe for dealing with crises: unload their consequences and their costs upon the working masses. This is how Hoover sought to counteract the economic catastrophe of 1929. Roosevelt proposes to deal with the current crisis in the same way. The gist of his domestic program is contained in the "three high purposes" he recommended "for every American."

"1. We shall not stop work for a single day. If any dispute arises, we shall keep on working while the dispute is solved by mediation, or conciliation, or arbitration—until the war is won.

"2. We shall not demand special gains or special privileges or special advantages for any one group or occupation.

"3. We shall give up conveniences and modify the routine of our lives if our country asks us to do so."

The first point is an unmistakable threat to the trade unions that they must surrender their right to strike and submit to compulsory arbitration. As CIO President Murray "boasted" on March 6th, the no-strike agreement between Roosevelt and the AFL-CIO top leaders has kept work stoppages down to "minor incidents" since the war began. Meanwhile, all kinds of justified grievances have accumulated; the War Labor Board indulges in interminable delays and refuses to render decisions on vitally important issues. Speed-

up inside the factories accelerates together with the rise in the cost of living. The workers are growing restless.

Now Roosevelt calls upon labor to abolish entirely the right to strike. The strike weapon can no longer be held in reserve to compel open-shop employers and profiteering corporations to grant the just demands of the workers. The workers are to be hog-tied by governmental regulation and delivered over to the mercy of the bosses.

This "high purpose" of Roosevelt was jubilantly received by the most reactionary sections of the capitalist class, who are far more interested in crushing the trade unions than they are in defeating Hitler. The conservative press suggested that Roosevelt would soon revive Wilson's "Work or Fight" strike-breaking ukase, whereby men were forced to choose between returning to work on the employers' terms or suffer induction into the army. According to CIO officials, the Selective Service Administration is already being used to weed militant labor leaders out of industry and to club workers into submission.

The pro-capitalist character of Roosevelt's program is no less evident in his second "high purpose." The thin veil of impartiality cannot conceal the fact that his demand for an end to "special gains" is directed exclusively against the workers. Indeed, this former thunderer against the "economic royalists" and war profiteers does not even mention these super-privileged groups by name in his speech. Only the workers beset by the mounting costs of living are impelled to demand special gains. The wealth and monopolistic positions of the plutocrats automatically assure them special advantages and immense profits. Immediately after Roosevelt's speech, the union-hating Douglas Aircraft Corporation announced earnings of \$30.29 per share for 1941. The steel workers, who are requesting \$1 a day wage increase, are to be told that they are demanding "special gains" while the steel magnates can well afford to stand pat on their piling-up war profits.

Under these circumstances the President's demand for "uninterrupted production" can mean only ceaseless sacrifices for the workers and an uninterrupted flood of profits for the employers.

Roosevelt's third point officially sanctions the policy of placing the whole burden of the war upon the masses. The "conveniences" the workers are being forced to give up are not luxuries but vital necessities. Increased taxes, rationing measures, higher prices, strike most heavily at the worker and his family, who can buy much less with their meager earnings.

The "sacrifices" of the rich, on the other hand, mean at most the dismissal of a servant or two out of thirty or forty flunkies or the closing up of one of their many homes. While open and hidden taxes subtract a greater share of the workers' income, the funds of the rich can take refuge in tax-exempt securities or in depreciation reserves, etc.

No strikes, freeze wage levels, lower the people's standards of living—such is the sum and substance of Roosevelt's "three high purposes." His method for overcoming the war crisis is to make the producers and not the plutocrats pay for the war. The main complaint of the big capitalists against Roosevelt is simply that he does not prosecute his campaign against the workers fast or ferociously enough to satisfy them.

The privileged positions of the plutocratic powers who emerged victorious from the first World War and could thereby afford the luxury of political democracy at home also encouraged stagnation, corruption and incompetence in

their directing circles. These toplofty regimes came to believe themselves unchallengeable, impregnable, eternal rulers of the world.

The *blitzkriegs* of the desperate Axis war machines has laid bare the accumulated dry rot within the administrative apparatus of these decaying bourgeois democracies, just as lightning strokes split and expose the rotted cores of apparently sound oak trees. Following the French debacle, the capitalist rulers of England and the United States are beginning to pay the heavy price of blind over-confidence.

Roosevelt's Foreign Problems

President Roosevelt had the task, in his speech, of explaining to the American people the reversals suffered by the United States and its allies since Pearl Harbor. His explanations were extremely apologetic in tone. To calm the criticism about the situation in the Philippines he stated that U. S. strategists had never planned to hold these islands but only to fight a delaying action and that, in any case, the Japanese encirclement made it impossible to send supplies and reinforcements to MacArthur's beleaguered forces. He tried to minimize the extent and consequences of the attack on Pearl Harbor. To give an optimistic gloss to disastrous events, the President asserted that more Japanese airplanes have been shot down in three months than had been destroyed at Pearl Harbor, and that the destroyers damaged there had been repaired and were now better than ever.

The President's declaration that the war was being fought all over the globe put an end to isolationism as a fact. But the "isolationists" as a native political tendency have rallied into opposition again, reappearing with new demands and slogans. They are insisting that ships and supplies be kept for the western hemisphere. They are suggesting that England is already a dead lion, not worth saving, that the USSR should not be aided to score greater victories, and that it might be wise to come to an agreement with Hitler before all is lost.

Roosevelt complained that, just as the Axis antagonists were aiming to separate the Allied powers from each other by military means, the "Cliveden set" were trying to divide them politically. But the dissension in the ranks of the United Nations is an indubitable fact. Churchill recently attributed the fall of Singapore to the fact that the American fleet "had been dashed to the ground" at Pearl Harbor. Roosevelt flatly contradicts this in his speech by charging that "rumor-mongers" and "poison-peddlers" have widely exaggerated "the consequences of the attack on Pearl Harbor." The Dutch, making a last stand in Java, have bitterly and publicly complained of the non-arrival of promised American aid. The unified command created for the Pacific area two months ago has been abruptly dissolved. Australia and New Zealand turn away from Mother England to beseech the United States for protection. The Indian bourgeoisie also look in their hour of need to Washington. Washington is not unwilling to turn England's difficulties to its own advantage. Churchill had stated explicitly on September 9, 1941 that the Atlantic Charter did not apply to the Pacific. Roosevelt's counter-statement, in his speech, that "the Atlantic Charter applies not only to the parts of the world that border on the Atlantic, but to the whole world," can only be construed as a rebuke to Churchill and a warning to the British Tories to make concessions to India's possessing classes before the impending revolutionary crisis comes to a head. Chiang Kai-shek, alarmed by Japan's successes and by Secretary Knox's declaration that Hitler is

the main enemy, had to be mollified and the Chinese bourgeoisie sustained by a half-billion dollar loan.

As for the Soviet Union, Roosevelt, who condemned the Red Army in its fight with Finland two years ago, now "saluted the superb Russian Army on its 24th Anniversary." The fewer the arms and supplies Roosevelt and Churchill ship to the Soviet Union, the more profuse are their compliments to the Red Army and their flattery of Stalin. Words are the only commodities they can manufacture and dispense in abundance or transport quickly over long distances.

Just as Roosevelt made no specific mention of profiteering capitalists in his remarks on the home front, so he omitted all reference to fascism in the foreign field. Instead of the "fight against fascism," Roosevelt states: "We and the other United Nations are committed to the destruction of the *militarism* of Japan and Germany." This is not accidental but reflects a deliberate policy of placating Mussolini, Franco, and certain semi-fascist South American governments.

Roosevelt's real attitude toward fascism is like that expressed by Anthony Eden in a radio address on January 4th: "The trouble with Hitler was not that he was a Nazi at home. The trouble with him was that he could not stay at home." Washington, too, is not worried overmuch about the state of the four freedoms within the realms of other countries so long as their governments do not oppose its foreign policies. A forcible reminder of this fact is the sudden solicitude Roosevelt displays for the freedom of the 24,000,000 Koreans who were ignored before Japan went to war with the United States.

Roosevelt held out the prospect of universal war—but no imminent prospect of peace. Both sides keep prolonging the duration of this terrible conflict. On March 3rd, at the crest of Japan's victories, Premier Tojo warned a conference of provincial governors that the war still was in its initial stage!

Their mutual outlook of interminable war is a sign of the insoluble difficulties in which all the belligerents find themselves entangled. Their convulsive efforts to alleviate their problems at one point involves them in a worse plight at another point, or at a later turn of events. For example the British bombings of the Paris factories, dictated by military consideration, can prove only a political boomerang by multiplying anti-British feelings amongst the French masses.

The crisis of the American bourgeoisie is a product and an integral part of the universal crisis of the imperialist system of world capitalism. Each of the powers is attempting to overcome this crisis at the expense of the others, whether they are antagonists or allies. All together they hope to emerge somehow, sometime, from this bloody mess at the expense of the Soviet Union, the colonial peoples, the working masses.

They do not know how they will manage to do this. They hope and pray for miracles to save them and their social system from complete destruction. This is the fundamental source of the division, confusion, hopelessness, and helplessness evident in the ruling circles of all the powers—not least in the United States.

Roosevelt and the Labor Movement

Roosevelt was able to drag the country out of the crisis of 1933 and to save American capitalism for a time by making considerable concessions to the labor and farmer aristocracy. Under the New Deal the trade unions obtain certain significant reforms and added strength. The war crisis is threatening all these concessions won through the pressure and struggles of the labor movement. American capitalism,

like German capitalism before it, can no longer afford concessions to the masses. It is compelled to take away even those concessions it has made in the past.

This fundamental factor determines the present policies of Roosevelt and the capitalist class toward the labor movement. In order to wage their war for world domination, the government and the capitalists are obliged to conduct an offensive against labor. No matter how much protest and suffering this creates amongst the workers the capitalists are in such a tight corner that they can no longer take these protests into account. As a result, their efforts to solve the international war crisis serves to intensify the crisis at home.

From reliable reports, the workers for the most part have little confidence in this war. They do not believe that much good can come out of it nor do they believe that an enduring peace is possible under the existing system. For the present, they resign themselves to the conflict as a bitter necessity, hoping at least to hold on to some of their advantages.

These hopes are illusory. The war has already begun to drive their living standards toward coolie levels—and these levels must sink ever lower as the war progresses. Price Administrator Leon Henderson recently warned that living standards would soon drop below those of 1932. In 1940, according to Social Security Board statistics, 40 million workers had an average annual wage of \$940, which is less than the amount that the government authorities themselves consider adequate to maintain an "emergency" level of living. A worker with a family of two small children, who was required to live on this wage, would be "subjected to a serious health hazard," says a government health study. As these poverty-line incomes are slashed further and further, the morale, health and working efficiency of these families must suffer accordingly.

The workers are being squeezed as producers no less than as consumers. Priorities unemployment has thrown many hundreds of thousands of workers out of their jobs. The workers know that the "business as usual" corporations are primarily responsible for their idleness. Meanwhile Congress refuses to appropriate the small sum of 300 million dollars to sustain these unemployed workers, an amount about equal to that saved by wealthy families as a result of Congress' action last year in permitting joint income tax returns. Congress which spends hundreds of billions for the war cannot spare

a third of a billion for the victims of the economic dislocation produced by the war.

The bootlickers of Big Business in Congress are supplementing the assault upon the workers' living standards with a drive against wage and hour legislation. While the big corporations are refusing to run their plants to capacity in order to avoid paying overtime wages, their agents are howling that the workers are holding up production. The Congressional anti-labor bloc is conspiring with the National Association of Manufacturers to abolish overtime pay to swell corporation profits.

The workers support the war in a very different spirit and from a different class standpoint than the patriotic profiteers. They believe that they are fighting to defend their rights, their conquests and their institutions against fascism. They do not as yet see any real alternative to the capitalist war. Yet they see no reason to fight or to sacrifice for this war unless at the same time they can maintain their trade unions, their social gains and their rights, and they are resolved to maintain them and not relinquish them without struggle.

This brings them into continuous conflict with the capitalist rulers who in order to maintain their imperialist profits, privileges and predominance abroad are driven to beat down the working masses at home. The Roosevelt administration is aligning itself far more openly and decisively than ever before with the capitalist class.

The present mood of the workers is one of watchful waiting. They view with anxiety, with suspicion, the maneuvers of the reactionaries, the policies of the administration and the acquiescence of their top leaders in the "no-strike" policies. This tension and unrest in the ranks is being communicated to the secondary leaders of the CIO in closer contact with the workers in the shops. Although they formally agree with the officials' position in support of the administration's war policies, they are increasingly outspoken in their criticism of governmental anti-labor moves and measures.

From now on the American bourgeoisie can only stagger from one stage of its crisis to the next. However, the workers will not indefinitely repress their discontent and will inevitably erupt into action in defense of their interests. The administration and its labor lieutenants can no more avert the development of this critical situation than Roosevelt was able to solve the war crisis.

Gaullism and Stalinism in France

A Resolution Presented to the Third Conference of the Unoccupied Zone by the Regional Committee of the Unoccupied Zone

The German occupation has brusquely altered the political physiognomy of the invaded countries. With the exception of very small groups of native fascists, the traditional parties and organizations have been swept away. The workers' movement had to go underground and to adapt itself to new methods. Groups of national resistance, of the most diverse colorations, have appeared everywhere.

In France especially the Communist Party plays a major role in the opposition. The three problems of national resistance, of the defense of the USSR, and of the criticism of Stalinism, are closely connected.

These problems now occupy the center of attention of our co-thinkers, the French Fourth Internationalists.

The party of the French Trotskyists, the Internationalist Workers Party, had its national conference on Sept. 15, 1941, somewhere in western Europe, and groups of the two zones which now form France were represented. The resolution adopted by the Conference begins by precisely defining the character of the present war:

"This war is fundamentally an imperialist struggle for a new distribution of raw materials and markets, for the conquest of new fields for expansion of finance capital.

It is not giving birth to a new progressive society—a 'new order'—as the fascists and certain naive or cynical petty-bourgeois politicians would have us believe. Nor is it a war for the victory of democracy. It is still much less a war for the defense of socialism. Anglo-American imperialism is trying to make use of the USSR merely as a war machine against Hitler."

And further:

"Hitler means a Europe directed, colonized and crushed by the military boot for the benefit of German finance capital. An Anglo-American 'liberation' would be the open military domination of the victors for

the benefit of Wall Street . . . For the workers of all countries, therefore, the task is to prepare the proletarian socialist revolution throughout the military crisis."

The question of the defense of the USSR plays today a great role in the European workers' movement. Any group which permits or tolerates the slightest equivocation on this subject condemns itself to political death. The resolution of our French comrades clearly answers the question:

"In the conflict between Germany and the USSR, all the workers of the world are with the Soviet people and cooperate with them. By their class methods, they take part in the struggle against the forces of reaction . . . The USSR can count on them alone. Its imperialist 'allies' will try to reach a compromise with their rivals at the expense of the USSR and the oppressed peoples as soon as the situation becomes directly menacing."

The resolution thus characterizes the Vichy government:

"France is the cross road of all the imperialist rivalries. The Vichy government is a miserable clique whose existence is justified only by the balance of the existing forces; a balance between the two imperialist blocs; a balance between the rival clans of French imperialism, a balance between the classes momentarily incapable of promoting their historic solutions (fascism or socialism). Springing from this extremely frail balance, the Vichy government leads an existence made up of perpetual wavering and impotence."

On the colonies, the French Trotskyists offer their solution, which is opposed to the solutions of both imperialist camps:

"The only real basis for Vichy is the French Empire, Vichy tries by every means to preserve it in the face of its rival imperialisms, as well as against the demands of the colonial populations. But the extreme weakness of Vichy makes the dislocation of the empire inevitable. The present period is favorable for the development of movements for national liberation in the colonies. 'Liberation of the colonies from the yoke of French imperialism' is one of the essential slogans of a revolutionary party in France."

The resolution notes the rise of the movement of national resistance:

"The most immediate expression of popular discontent is the movement of national resistance to oppression. This is the first spontaneous petty-bourgeois expression of the rising revolutionary tide. To the extent that French economic dependence and German internal difficulties will draw Berlin and Vichy together, popular national sentiment will turn the masses more and more violently against Vichy."

But the resolution immediately proclaims the necessity for turning away from chauvinistic channels:

"The development in a proletarian and anti-capitalist direction of the popular movement of hostility to Hitlerism is the necessary condition for a fraternization with the soldiers and workers of Germany. The Party does not forget that without the collabora-

tion of German workers and soldiers, no revolution would be possible in Europe. Thus, fraternization remains one of our essential tasks. Any act which widens the breach between German and European workers is directly counter-revolutionary."

The resolution records that the Communist Party remains the principal group in the working class and insists upon the necessity of establishing closer contacts with the Communist workers. Let us note here that the Internationalist Workers Party has already made very important progress in that field. The united front has been realized on a local or regional scale between Stalinist and Trotskyist sections. Common meetings for discussion have taken place and even, in certain instances, common illegal newspapers have been published. The conditions prevailing there prevent us from giving more details on this new and promising development.

The problems of the national movement and of Stalinism are examined at length in the document we print below. This document was written as a resolution for the Third Regional Conference of the Internationalist Workers Party of the Unoccupied Zone which took place in the first days of December, 1941. The document was not adopted as such by the Conference, but incorporated into a resolution which unfortunately we are unable to present to our readers. We print it as a valuable introduction to the discussion of the problems of European revolution.—EDITOR.

I

The weight of the fascist terror is on Europe. The policy of conciliation between the fascist conqueror and the colonized peoples, inaugurated under the auspices of "continental collaboration" through the Lavals, Quislings and Hachas, has broken down under the impact of the war in Russia. Today the Nazis impose their will solely by force. The argument of "European unity," little enough attractive to the masses, has had to give way to the argument of firing squads. The flaring up of resistance in all the occupied countries leads to repressions which ceaselessly become more severe.

The more or less peaceful integration of conquered France into the system of German imperialism is definitively dead. From the repatriation of the ashes of L'Aiglon we have arrived in a few months to the mass executions of Nantes and Bordeaux. The collaborationists, with their Anti-Bolshevik Legion, are fully unmasked and appear as the valets of Hitler.

The German difficulties in the USSR—for in spite of the advance to the outskirts of Leningrad and Moscow the essential objectives are still not attained—are the immediate source of the increased resistance, which represents socially a people's movement, politically a national movement.

While in the free zone general discontent remains within the bounds of a sullen opposition—without external manifestation and without social movement—in the occupied zone on the other hand, where the threat of famine is more serious, Stalinist forces more concentrated, and the Nazi oppression more direct, the political atmosphere is heavy with the premonitory rumblings of open revolt. From the strikes in

Northern France to the demonstrations in Paris—not to speak of the numerous acts of sabotage and individual terrorism—one finds every form of resistance to German fascism.

The national question dominates today every other political and social problem. Even the defense of the USSR, a slogan par excellence of class action, is presented by the Communist Party merely as a national task.

The Leninist vanguard could not find the correct path through the approaching events if it did not take these facts into account.

At the same time it would be dangerous for us to overestimate the revolutionary content of the present movement, or to underestimate Hitler's strength and especially the repressive capacities of the Gestapo allied to the police of the Vichy government.

The military and economic collapse of Germany is not on the order of the day, and will not be this winter. There can be no question of a *short* perspective in France. It is more than probable that the present stage of violent resistance will be succeeded by a stage of apparent calm, the product of the white terror and a momentary exhaustion of the movement of resistance. It is probable also that the next wave of struggles will be for economic demands dictated by the spreading of famine throughout France to an unprecedented degree.

The National Question and Socialist Revolution

European economy collides everywhere with national frontiers, created by the victory of bourgeois nationalism during the nineteenth century. Historically, these frontiers repre-

sented enormous progress, not only over the petty principalities of Germany and Italy, but also over the great reactionary and semi-feudal empires (Turkey, Austria-Hungary, Russia). But the national frontiers have become too constrictive in the present stage of imperialism: henceforth there is no longer room for rival imperialisms on the peninsula of Europe. Continental unification is imperative. This unification can be realized in two different ways: in the form of an imperialist "new order," under the hegemony of a victorious imperialism, or in the form of the socialist transformation, under the hegemony of the European proletariat (Socialist United States of Europe). The "new order," in its fascist form *as in its "democratic" form* (in case of an Anglo-Saxon victory), is by very definition a counter-revolutionary solution. It creates a permanent regime of coercion and oppression. It implies preparation of a new, third World War which would complete the work of capitalist destruction; it implies the transformation of the independent national economies into a "hinterland" of the victorious imperialist power and entails more or less complete loss of national independence for the majority of the European peoples. Hence the burning immediacy of the national question in Europe.

Opposed both to the propositions of the theoreticians of ultra-imperialism (Kautsky), and to the position which in the name of revolutionary internationalism neglects the national struggle of oppressed peoples (Luxemburg), *Leninism* demands unequivocally the right of self-determination for the colonial masses, for all the oppressed national minorities, for all the peoples whose independence is menaced. The fight for national liberty in no way conflicts with the profound internationalism of proletarian socialism. Just as "the proletariat which does not lead a consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy on all questions cannot prepare itself for the victory over the bourgeoisie" (Lenin), in the same way the only progressive solution of the European problem is intimately bound up with the fight for national liberation. These two objectives are today inseparable. To break the chains of national oppression but one road remains, the proletarian revolution. Europe is faced, one cannot repeat too often, with the final alternative: *advance toward socialism or relapse into barbarism.*

The Double Aspect of Gaullism

The occupation of France—the free zone being virtually subordinated to German control—poses anew, this time in all its force, the national question, solved one hundred and fifty years ago and for seventy years existing in its partial aspect only for the French in Alsacé-Lorraine. The national movement incontestably influences the majority of the French people, especially since the bloc between the De Gaulle forces and the Stalinists. To deny this fact is to deny the obvious. But to state the importance of the national factor and the scope of the longing for liberation still is to say nothing about its character or the tendencies of its development. A German victory would undoubtedly leave to the French bourgeoisie its imperialist character; and the latter would then enter upon the road of total collaboration. But a German victory excludes the independence of the French nation, even if the German troops then left the territory and even if the new frontiers formally corresponded with ethnic divisions.

An English victory, on the other hand, poses the same problem for the German nation, for this victory can only have as its goal the possibility for English (and French) imperialism destroying **once** for all the menace beyond the Rhine. It

is the section of the bourgeoisie that has irrevocably chosen the path of revenge which forms the backbone of the Gaullist movement.

As an organization Gaullism is but an extension of the English military apparatus. Politically it represents not a revolutionary national movement, but a national imperialist party. Its objective is by no means a regime free of all oppression by one people over another but rather, within the framework of English hegemony, the reconstitution of the French empire.

Objectively, Gaullism fights much less for national liberty than for the liberty of imperialist exploitation. Its methods are not the actions of the masses exasperated by the occupying troops and by the German and native despoilers, but the recruitment of specialists, sabotage and terrorism.

The proletarian vanguard has no common ground with Gaullism. On the contrary, it will be capable of fulfilling its tasks only by inoculating the national movement against Gaullism, by unmasking its reactionary traits, by jealously defending the complete independence of the proletarian vanguard in relation to every other political grouping, even the "anti-fascist," above all by elevating the forms of resistance to the level of a mass struggle with a socialist content. The proletarian vanguard must prevent opposing the national tasks to the workers' struggle for emancipation. "It must know how to contrast the patriotism of the oppressed to bourgeois nationalism" (Transition Program of the Fourth International). It must therefore unambiguously oppose Gaullism, for that is precisely bourgeois nationalism par excellence. The anti-collaborationist spirit of the masses, their struggle against oppression, in brief the national movement, is one thing; quite another thing is the Gaullist party itself.

The aspiration of the masses to national liberty is a profoundly healthy reaction. If it should become Gaullist, even in the most attenuated sense of the word, this aspiration would be marked with the seal of the class enemy and would reflect the predominance of the chauvinist bourgeoisie and Anglophile petty bourgeoisie in the national movement.

With its patriotic deformations, the Gaullism of the masses is a hybrid reaction, without a clear-cut class character; it is the corollary of the weakness of the internationalist movement. Even if the majority of French workers were under the influence of Gaullism—which is not so—it would be all the more necessary to combat this nationalist deviation. Our activity must tend toward isolating Gaullism and liquidating it as a current in the toiling masses. That does not mean we must fight the diverse camps of Gaullism as one reactionary whole. Our tactics toward them must be determined by their social structure. But our propaganda will always be *anti-Gaullist* because it will always be internationalist and revolutionary. "In the patriotism of the oppressed are elements reflecting their devotion to what they consider their own interests and we must be able to seize upon these and draw revolutionary conclusions from them" (Transition Program of the Fourth International).

The entire problem of common action between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie is posed by the existence of Gaullism. We participate in every action of the masses struggling against national oppression, but we participate to divert it from chauvinist channels. We assist in them not to tail-end an unleashed patriotism but to agitate for the imperative socialist conclusions.

We seek unity of action with all workers' groups and all groups with a socialist tendency, a united front based on a precise program and with clearly determined objectives.

Work directed toward the German soldier is not the least

of our tasks in the months to come. This depends directly and intimately on the internationalist character we shall be able to impart to the nationalist manifestations. We have nothing to gain by joining in the demonstrations by students of the monarchist "Action Francaise" "against the Boches," if we are not strong enough to oppose these by expressions of fraternization with German workers in uniform. Admittedly our tactic on the national plane is not simple and demands much flexibility. But those who through fear of mistakes refuse to take actual part in any movement not purely proletarian have understood nothing of Leninist policy. They preach abstentionism, indifference of the proletariat towards national liberty. They oppose to the exigencies of national liberation an abstract internationalism, which ends in a complete negation of the problem of national oppression. This policy of the esthetes of the proletarian revolution escapes danger by fleeing from the struggle. "The intensification of national oppression in the period of imperialism impels socialists not to renounce the struggle, 'utopian' as the bourgeoisie claims, for the self-determination of nations, but on the contrary obliges them to the most intense utilization of all the conflicts which surge on this arena in order to lead mass actions and struggle in a revolutionary manner against the bourgeoisie" (Lenin).

Audaciously led, the national struggle can be a training ground proving the necessity for socialism. A nation under the heel of the invader is extremely sensitive to the truth of Marx's words: "A people which oppresses another people cannot be free." In a revolutionary movement's armory of slogans, the independence of every colonial people must be given the same weight as the French right of self-determination.

Anglophilism in the proletarian movement inevitably tends to deny freedom to the colonies and to end in an openly anti-Leninist revisionism. Its source is skepticism of the proletariat's power and as a consequence loss of the revolutionary perspective. Like all opportunism Anglophilism fights under the banner of "realism." From the beginning of a working-class movement the "realists" have opposed themselves to the "doctrinaires." Commencing with the flirtation of Lassalle with Bismarck, they have always corrupted the revolutionary movement in the name of "given possibilities." Bernstein, the Mensheviks, the Austro-Marxists, the Kautskyists, Blum, Stalin—so many names, so many "realists." For them there is only the fixed state of things as they are. Frightened by the strength of powers so real as British imperialism, German fascism, Stalinism, the opportunists are incapable of foreseeing the revolutionary overthrow that will put an end to the rottenness of the existing disorder. Let us be clearly understood. We do not deny the power of counter-revolution in all its forms. But the rhythm of events during this war permits us to discern, behind the imposing facade of today, the impotencies of tomorrow.

Because society, as it is, lacks true solidity, the genuine realists in the workers' movement are those who steadfastly prepare for the advent of the future society.

* * *

II

Stalinism in the Present Period

All the turns of Stalinist policy since 1933 have had as a goal the avoidance, cost what it may, of war with Germany. By concession after concession, betrayal after betrayal, Stalin sought to break out from the vicious circle of the strategy of "socialism in one country." By substituting bureaucratic man-

euvers for the politics of permanent revolution the genial Stalin has led Russia, after the heavy defeats of the European proletariat, to conflict with Germany under conditions extremely unfavorable for the USSR. The German army is before Moscow and Leningrad, in the Crimea, and is poised to thrust into the Caucasus. Stalin, who promised to defeat fascism on its own territory and threatened those who dared to "stick their snouts in the Soviet garden," Stalin now prepares for defense behind the Urals, a defense indeed precarious if one thinks of the pincers which could suddenly close with a Japanese attack against Vladivostok.

The experience of five months of German-Russian war sets in relief two essential facts: the Russian people and the Red Army are fighting with a heroism without parallel; on the other hand, Stalin is not capable of leading a revolutionary war. If we push aside the explanations of the myth-mongers and pen prostitutes ("Slavic soul," "Russian mysticism," "fear of political commissars"), we can then explain why the Russian people defend their country with such tenacity, why it happens that the Stalinist bureaucracy organizes a savage resistance against the ally of yesterday.

Can one imagine a people living under painful material conditions, denied all political rights, forced to tolerate the regime imposed on them, can one imagine this people making war to the death without thinking of utilizing the first crisis, the first difficulties and military reverses, to liberate themselves from the oppressor? In principle, no. But then, we must explain a double phenomenon: the cohesion of the German army, and the inner solidarity of the Red Army.

Like all mass armies, the Reichswehr is composed of workers and peasants. It reflects the concentrated force of German imperialism which has been able to weld together its antagonistic components, on the one hand by arousing the national hatred against the Versailles Treaty, on the other hand by eliminating opposition through terror. But let us keep this in mind: the German army up to now has fought advancing actions. It is especially the young generation, including the shock troops, which is the spearhead of battle. The officer corps of the army, derived from the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, is formed from the most stable elements of the regime. All this is combined with a unique war machine and with an enormous industrial potential. Finally we must not forget that Nazism was able to temporarily improve the economic situation of the German masses and to reabsorb the unemployed by transforming the accumulated riches of Germany into war instruments and by practising "dumping" on the external markets. This fact, of course, drove Nazism to war, as the only means of saving the edifice it built. Nevertheless this economic euphoria has served to neutralize large strata of workers and to enable Nazism to throw them into the conflict.

In Russia it is exactly the contrary. The framework of resistance, the shock troops, do not come from bourgeois or petty-bourgeois circles especially trained for warfare for many years, but are composed of those workers who brought about the five-year plans without always being able to eat properly, who have borne the burden of the economic upbuilding without always tasting the benefits of it and who finally have been systematically deprived of their political rights.

The Russian army is today fighting against the most powerful army in the world, against an equipment indisputably superior in quantity as well as in quality, against a technical apparatus whose power far exceeds the power of its own.

What is it that animates the Red Army and makes it show a heroism that astonishes the world? There is but one

explanation: The Russian workers are defending the October revolution. Despite the experience—and what an experience!—of fifteen years of Stalinist Bonapartism, they are fighting for the survival of the first proletarian revolution. They are defending against Nazism the conquests of an anti-capitalist state. They are fighting—despite its bureaucratic deformations—for the first workers' state in the world and for the promise which it bears for the future.

They are temporarily caught by the Stalinist demagogy; they do not have a very clear picture of the political situation in the USSR. They do not comprehend the real character of the regime.

Nevertheless they are defensists on the same grounds that we are. Their class consciousness dictates their heroic conduct, a class consciousness that manifests itself fully despite all the ideological destruction which the bureaucracy has wrought. Briefly, we affirm that the "defensism" of the Russian proletariat is a profoundly and fundamentally correct class position.

The victory of the Russian workers against Nazism depends, however, on the political clarification that can come about during the war. Proletarian patriotism is sufficient to animate the Russian masses with an exemplary heroism, but cannot be sufficient to give to their war the strategy of a real revolutionary war, a strategy without which the USSR is destined to suffer the fate of Spain. The arguments of Leninist criticism will be able to reach the Russian soldiers and workers in the measure that we can prove in practice the eminently defensist character of our tactics. And these Russian soldiers and workers will be capable of victorious resistance in the measure that they will accept the arm of revolutionary criticism to bring about the revolutionary criticism by arms.

The Stalinist bureaucracy is defending Russia, but only to defend itself. It is the bureaucracy of a deformed workers' state; its privileges have been acquired on the basis of planned production; its well-being is the result of parasitic expropriation, but on the basis of the Soviet social structure. A German victory would liquidate not only the workers' character of the USSR, but would with the same blow sweep away the bureaucracy. The war has settled by its bloody lessons many theoretical conflicts; among others it has brushed aside the theory of a "new class society," neither socialist nor capitalist, that some had discovered not only in Russia but also in Germany. The Nazis are preparing in Russia the restoration of capitalism and imperialist exploitation of the riches of this country by German finance capital. The victory of fascism once brought about, there may still be some places for individual bureaucrats, but there will no longer be a place for the Stalinist bureaucracy as a social unity. Individual treasons are possible and probable; as a ruling caste, however, the bureaucracy cannot betray its state.

The bureaucracy is defending Russia, but in a bureaucratic way. The limitations of this defense are laid down by the more and more intimate alliance with Anglo-American imperialism, which is demanding certain concessions (churches, national units on Russian soil such as the Legion of the Polish Colonels and the Czech Legion of Benes) and which in repayment gives arms only in dribbles.

The bureaucratic limitations exclude workers' democracy from the system of defense. This democracy would be in no way in contradiction to the iron discipline which is necessary to the conduct of the war. On the contrary, that very democracy alone would assure a Bolshevik discipline superior to the

purely military discipline of Stalin's generals. Workers' democracy is the creative basis for the initiative of the masses, which is the only force capable of overcoming the material superiority of the Nazis. Stalin, side by side with Churchill and Roosevelt, is carrying on a war against the Germans—the Stalinist press already speaks of the "Boches"—in the name of a reactionary patriotism whose heroes are the Generals Kutuzov and Suvorov of the Czarist armies. But only revolutionary patriotism, whose hero is Trotsky, the great organizer of the victory against the Allies, could accomplish the "miracles" which can save the USSR and inject the virus of internationalism into the German armies.

Soviet Defensism and Class Struggle

What should be the attitude of the English workers whose government is in practise the ally of the USSR? We cannot repeat often enough: class struggle. More than ever it must be explained to the English and American workers that the best method to save the Soviet Union is to go forward toward the Soviets in their own country. The British and American workers know that the policy of their governments toward the USSR is full of reserve and reticence, that they are helping the Soviet Union only insofar as the latter helps to carry out the imperialist plans against Germany. It is exactly on this same basis that Hitler signed the Russian-German pact of August 1939.

The adversaries of "defensism" for the USSR claim that the "defensist" English worker will be brought by the force of circumstances to make "social peace" with the bourgeoisie allied to the USSR. The objection is groundless. The situation of the Anglo-American bourgeoisie—engaged in a war against Germany at the side of a workers' state—is an excellent springboard for proletarian struggles. We are already witnessing the first symptoms of a break between the British government and the British people. For the first time since the formation of the Churchill government the coalition socialists find themselves, under the pressure of the masses, in latent opposition to the Conservative majority. Yet this pressure of the masses is not the expression of a national ideology, but is rather the expression of class solidarity with the Russian proletariat. The British worker begins to ask Churchill: "Do you want to defend the USSR? Alright. I believe you. Then I have a word to say about that." Even now he asks for arms and ammunition for the Soviet Union in danger and by the very logic of things, we believe, he will not be led toward sacred union with the bourgeoisie, but rather will demand control over the sending of arms. The British capitalists want to make the workers accept increased hours of work by invoking the danger confronting the Soviet Union. But if the workers then demand control of production, on what basis could the bosses then object, except the sacrosanct principle of super-profits? Thus the defense of the USSR directly leads the English workers to the development of the class struggle against their own bourgeoisie, sometimes almost unknowingly.

However, we know that the policy of the working class in the countries allied to the USSR will not always be easy to determine. It will be essential not to lose sight of the general situation, namely that the war expresses the fundamental contradictions of capitalism and at the same time is a capitalist method for temporarily resolving this contradiction; that the USSR does not lose the character of a progressive state by fighting at the side of an imperialist state, no more than the latter ceases to be imperialist because it is in practise

allied to a workers' state against a common enemy.

History knows periods where an imperialism in its struggle with another imperialism is forced to put all the logs on the fire, even at the risk of getting itself burned.

The opponents of Soviet defensism are frightened at the idea of seeing British and Soviet troops side by side in Persia, in the Caucasus or elsewhere. "So you will tell the one to fight to death and the other to fraternize?" Exactly, because the same thing must be said to the English Tommies as to their working-class compatriots. Under the orders of Wavell, they are not really defending the USSR. Our "unconditional defense" does not mean the end of political work in the Red Army, even less, therefore, in the British army. The defensist spirit of the British soldier, in the daily contacts with the Red soldier, instead of making him submit blindly to his superiors, could make him oppose them.

For Hitler and the German bourgeoisie there is a single fight for a "greater Germany," while for us there is the double conflict: Anglo-German on one side, German-Russian on the other.

The Communist Party and the Policy Of the Working Class in France

Those who will later study the Stalinist policy in France during the past ten years will find it at first glance incredible. The continued adherence of the masses to a party whose contradictions, abrupt turns, and about-faces have since 1939 reached a dizzying tempo—this adherence will not be the least of the surprises to the superficial observer. The "periods" of the Stalinist policy have followed the curve of events.

From April 1935 to August 1939 the anti-fascist campaign was at its height. Everything had to be subordinated to the struggle against Hitler, including, of course, the class struggles in the countries "allied" to the USSR. August 1939: this saw the "bombshell" of the German-Russian pact. This pact will allow Hitler to take care of things in the west and to crush the French bourgeoisie. On the basis of the pact, the Communist Party preaches in France a defeatism without revolution and a sabotage without perspective. Once the armistice is signed between France and Germany the Stalinists flirt with the occupying authorities; they are not bothered or are bothered very little by them. In the Stalinist leaflets of that period no attack against the Nazis can be found. The problem of the occupation of the country, the national question, are not raised, but against the British "plutocrats" the Stalinists are unsparing in their criticism.

The German-Russian conflict exploded in spite of the fawning of Stalin. Once more the policy of the Communist Party will be shaped by the diplomatic game of the Kremlin. The usurping bureaucracy, of course, does not call upon the assistance of the proletarian revolution. It prefers to bet on Anglo-Saxon imperialism and to take up once more with them the slogan of the anti-fascist struggle, which had been left in the prop-room for the past two years.

However, the new allies—who are also former allies—force the Communist Party to give its propaganda a still more nationalist character; even more basely chauvinist than in the years from 1935 to 1939, because of the acuteness of the crisis which now faces Anglo-Saxon imperialism.

Last July saw the establishment of the "National Front of Struggle for the Independence of France," in the name of the "superior interests of the fatherland." In the spirit of this national front of which it is part, *Humanite* of Oct. 17, 1941 writes: "Yesterday's enemy has not become today's friend. Quite the contrary, the anti-German feelings have

been considerably sharpened by contact with reality. The only ones who can deny this are the Boche Vichy government and a handful of other traitors. On November 11 in all the towns and villages, in powerful demonstrations of remembrance, all the patriots of the national front, ex-service men, men, women, children, gather beneath the folds of the tricolor flag! Honor those who fell for the cause of France against the enemy, against the Boche." Here we have almost all the present ideology of the ex-Communist International.

Thus the Comintern has come to the worst anti-German nationalism. The policy of the Communist Party loses any working-class character. Perhaps even the name "Communist," so embarrassing to them, will be exchanged for the name of "Anti-Fascist" as less offensive (already No. 4 (July) of *Rouge Midi* speaks of the "Anti-Fascist Party of Liberation"). Soon Stalin will perhaps proceed to liquidate the Communist International in exchange for a few dozen airplanes.

All this would be without great importance if the working masses did not follow the Communist Party. But they are following it—without doubt. The attractive power of the Communist International flows from the very existence of the Soviet Union and the necessity for defending it, and the more menacing becomes the counter-revolution, the more tenacious is the adhesion of the proletariat to the country which in its eyes is the realization of the socialist will of the working class.

The Communist Party retains its hold on the French workers not only by usurping the Leninist banner, but also by its combative activity, which especially carries away the young generation of workers between 20 and 30, who do not know by experience the heroic days of the Communist International and thus believe the Stalinist turns to be revolutionary tactics. Let us add to this the police repressions, which are directed above all against the Communist Party, and which provoke not only fear but also defiance—and we then understand the principal factors of the continuance of Stalinism, which still influences the most honest and most devoted sections of the working class. It is the tragedy of the European proletariat to see its vigor wasted by the gravedigger Stalin by a policy directed against the revolution. And today, with the slogan of sabotage, more sabotage, and nothing but sabotage, the Communist International condemns its parties to new catastrophes. The military gain from such a policy is extremely small. Only a mass movement can shake off fascism.

The policy of the Communist Party does not provide any way out of the present chaos. With the present increase of difficulties for the USSR, the convulsions of Stalinism will soon reach paroxysm. The time is coming when Stalin will have lost his aura as a great leader of the working class. We must be able then to transform disillusionment of the workers with Stalinism into a positive proletarian program.

Under conditions of illegality, the apparatus of the Communist Party cannot directly control the rank-and-file groups. Thus great possibilities for united fronts are open to us. The common platform for them and for us is the defense of the USSR. Our common goal is the proletarian revolution. The unity of action will enable us to exercise a friendly criticism and to detach the Communist workers from Stalinism.

We must orient the organizations of the Fourth International toward the proletariat, toward the Communist parties. We must find our way to the factories. Everything, literally everything, depends upon the success of this policy.

November 1941.

The Classes of India and Their Political Roles

A Thesis of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India

At this moment when India takes a central place in the international arena, there opportunely arrives from our Indian comrades a series of documents and the most encouraging news.

The following document is a section of a thesis adopted in the latter part of last year by the Formation Committee of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India as the program on which all Marxist revolutionists could form a single revolutionary party. Together with certain other groups, the original committee has now constituted the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India as an adherent of the Fourth International. The party is now centering its agitation on the central slogan of the Constituent Assembly (see the Editorial Comment in this issue).

Together with the Ceylon Socialist Party (the Lanka Sama Samaja Party) and a recently-formed organization in Burma, our Indian comrades have established the Federation of Bolshevik-Leninist Parties of Burma, Ceylon and India, for the revolutionary destiny of these three peoples is closely linked together.

All three parties stand firmly on the program of the Fourth International. On the decisive question of defense of the Soviet Union and the character of the USSR as a workers' state, they stand with Trotsky and

the Socialist Workers Party against the petty-bourgeois opposition of Burnham-Shachtman which abandoned Trotskyism. In documents which we have received, the parties of the Federation make unambiguously clear their agreement on the Russian and all other questions with the Fourth International against the petty-bourgeois opposition, which has been spreading false stories about the position of the Indian and Ceylonese comrades.

Readers of our magazine have been previously informed of the successes of the Ceylon Socialist Party (see particularly our September, 1939 issue), the leading proletarian organization in this important colony of six millions bordering India. For some years it functioned as an unaffiliated organization. In 1941 it adopted a new program and declared for affiliation to the Fourth International. This document we shall publish next month. Although a number of its leaders have been imprisoned since the beginning of the war and the party itself is illegal, it has nevertheless managed to continue publishing its three newspapers—A *Sinhalese* organ for Ceylonese workers and peasants, an English one for students and certain other purposes, and one in *Tamil*, the language of the Hindu immigrant

laborers from India who form a tenth or more of Ceylon's population.

The rich experience of our Ceylonese comrades in organizing trade unions and peasant organizations in Ceylon, where they have played the leading role in a surging mass movement, will undoubtedly be invaluable to the new party in India during the coming great days. They have already contributed greatly to the theoretical foundations of the new party.

The document which we print below demonstrates by irrefutable facts that to the great masses of India the question of independence is inextricably connected with the agrarian revolution. Of no avail will be the deals in Washington and London with the Indian bourgeoisie whom Nehru and Gandhi represent. The laws of the permanent revolution will sweep those agreements into the discard.

Every advanced worker should carefully study this document. Though written nearly a year ago, it will tell him far more about what is going on in India than the abundantly-publicised reports of the negotiations between Cripps and Churchill, Nehru and Gandhi, Roosevelt and Chiang Kai-shek. With the collapse of British armed power in the Far East, the revolution has begun in India!—EDITOR.

The Native Princes

The revolt of 1857 represented the last attempt of the old feudal ruling class of India to throw off the British yoke. This revolt, which despite its reactionary leadership laid bare the depth of mass discontent and unrest, alarmed the British rulers, and led to a radical change in policy in India. Seeking for bases of social and political support, the British abandoned the policy of annexing the Indian states within British India, instead guaranteeing the remnants of the feudal rulers their privileged and parasitic positions in innumerable petty principalities, buttressing their power and protecting them against the masses, and receiving in return the unqualified support of these elements for the British rule. The princes of the Indian states, maintained at the cost of a chaotic multiplication of administrative units, are today only the corrupt and dependent tools of British imperialism, and the feudatory states, checker-boarding all India as they do, are no more than a vast network of fortresses erected by the British in their own defense. The variety of the states and jurisdiction of the feudal princes defies a generalized description, but they bolster alike the reactionary policies of imperialism in India. The despotism and misgovernment practiced by the great majority of these rulers in their territories have created and perpetuated conditions of backwardness extreme even in India, including the

most primitive forms of feudalism and slavery itself. Their collective interests are represented by the Chamber of Princes, instituted in 1921, which is the most reactionary political body in India.

The Landlords

The most solid supporters of British rule in India, after the princes, are the landlords. In fact the majority of the princes are no more themselves than glorified landlords, playing the same parasitic role as the landlords of British India. The landlords of India have a record of medieval oppression, of rack-renting and usury, and of unbridled gangsterism over a disarmed peasantry, which has made them the most hated exploiters in India. The rapid extension of landlordism in modern times through the development of intermediary and new parasitic classes on the peasantry, has not only increased the numbers of those who receive land rents, but firmly linked their interests with those of the Indian capitalist class, by ties of investment and mortgage. The political role of the landlords has always been one of complete subservience to British imperialism, as well as the greatest obstacle in the way of agricultural development which demands a thorough-going democratic revolution in the agrarian field and the liquidation of landlordism in all its forms.

The second half of the nineteenth century saw the rise of an Indian capitalist class in Bombay and other industrial centers. The Indian bourgeoisie of the early period, conscious of its own weakness and dependent position in economy, offered no challenge whatever to British rule. But the deep economic conflict between their own interests and those of their British competitors drove them from the first decade of the twentieth century, to utilize the national political movement to strengthen their bargaining power against British imperialism.

The Indian Bourgeoisie

The bourgeoisie, in the absence of any competing class and especially of an independent proletarian movement, assumed complete leadership of the national political movement through its party, the Indian National Congress. The bourgeois leadership of the movement was clearly demonstrated in 1905, by the choice of the economic boycott of foreign goods as the method of struggle against the partition of Bengal. The aims of the bourgeoisie were defined during this period as the attainment of "colonial self-government within the Empire" as junior partners of the imperialists. They abandoned the struggle and adopted a policy of cooperation with the British after the grant of the Morley-Minte reforms, their own aims being satisfied for the moment.

The last years following the first World War, and the years which immediately followed it, were marked by the development, for the first time since 1857, of a mass struggle on a national scale against imperialism based on the discontent and unrest of the peasantry and the working class. This discontent was especially marked in Bombay, where the wave of working-class strikes was on a scale hitherto unknown in India, and reached its highest point in 1920 for which year the number of strikes reached the gigantic total of 1½ millions. The Montague-Chemsford reforms were designed to meet this rising threat by buying off the bourgeois leadership, and they succeeded to an extent, that section of the bourgeoisie who wanted whole-hearted cooperation with the government seceding from the Congress to form the Liberal Federation (1918). But the growth of the mass movement compelled the Congress bourgeoisie either to enter the struggle or be isolated from the masses. Launching under its own banner the passive resistance movement, and later the mass civil disobedience movement of 1921-22, the Congress entered the struggle, but only to betray it from the inside.

The mass movement which, despite its timid and unwilling leadership, had attained the undeniable character of a mass revolt against the British Raj, was abruptly called off when at its height by the bourgeois leader Gandhi, and a period of demoralization followed for the masses. The reactionary and treacherous character of the bourgeois leadership was shown clearly in the Bardoli Resolution of 1922, which condemned the no-tax campaign of the peasantry and insisted on the continuation of rent payments to the landlords, assuring the zamindars (landlords) that the Congress "had no intention of attacking their legal rights." The bourgeoisie thus demonstrated its reactionary attitude toward the land question in which lies the main driving force to revolution in India.

With the worsening conditions of the late 20's, the mass struggle developed again at a rising tempo, and was again led to defeat by the Congress (1930-34). The aims of the new struggle were limited by Gandhi beforehand to the cele-

brated 11 points which represented exclusively the most urgent demands of the Indian bourgeoisie. Nevertheless the movement developed in 1930 far beyond the limits laid down for it by the Congress, with rising strikes, powerful mass demonstrations, the Chittagong Armory raid, and the risings at Peshawar and Sholapur. Gandhi declared openly to the Viceroy that he was fighting as much against the rising forms of revolt as against the British imperialists. The aim of the bourgeoisie was henceforward to secure concessions from imperialism at the price of betraying the mass struggle in which they saw a real and growing threat to themselves. The Gandhi-Irwin settlement was a settlement against the mass movement, and paved the way for a terrific repression which fell on the movement during its ebb in 1932-34.

Since 1934 Gandhi and the leaders of the Congress have had as their chief aim that of preventing the renewal of a mass struggle against imperialism, while using their leadership of the national movement as a lever to secure the concessions they hope to obtain from imperialism. They see in the rising forces of revolt, and especially in the emergence of the working class as a political force, a threat to their own bases of exploitation, and are consequently following an increasingly reactionary policy. Reorganizing the party administration so as to secure to the big bourgeoisie the unassailable position of leadership (1934), they transferred the center of activities to the parliamentary field and to working the new Constitution in such a way as to secure the maximum benefits to the bourgeoisie, until the intransigence of the British parliament and the Indian government in the war situation and the withdrawal of many of the political concessions of provincial autonomy again forced the Congress into opposition (1939). The Congress bourgeoisie then engaged in a restricted campaign of individual "non-violent" civil disobedience with narrowly defined bourgeois aims, and under the dictatorial control of Gandhi himself. By this move they hoped to prevent the development of a serious mass struggle against imperialism, the leadership of which will be bound to pass into other hands.

The main instrument whereby the Indian bourgeoisie seeks to maintain control over the national movement is the Indian National Congress, the classic party of the Indian capitalist class, seeking as it does the support of the petty bourgeoisie and if possible of the workers, for its own aims. Despite the fact that under these conditions revolutionary and semi-revolutionary elements still remain within the fold of the Congress, despite its mass membership (five millions in 1939), and despite the demagogic programmatic pronouncements (Constituent Assembly, Agrarian Reform) which the Congress has repeatedly made, the direction of its policy remains exclusively in the hands of the bourgeoisie as also the control of the party organization, as was dramatically proved at Tripuri and after. The Indian National Congress in its social composition, its organization, and above all in its political leadership can be compared to the Kuomintang, which led the Chinese revolution of 1925-27 to its betrayal and defeat.

The characterization of the Indian National Congress as a multi-class party, as the "National United Front," or as "a platform rather than a party," is a flagrant deception and calculated only to hand over to the bourgeoisie in advance the leadership of the coming struggle, and so make its betrayal and defeat a foregone conclusion.

The more open reactionary interests of the Indian bourgeoisie find expression in many organizations which exist side by side with the Congress. Thus the Liberal Fed-

eration (1918) represents those bourgeois elements who cooperate openly with the imperialists. The sectional interests of the propertied classes are represented by various communal organizations, notably the Moslem League (1905) and the Hindu Maha Sabaha (1925) which are dominated by large landlords and bourgeois interests and pursue a reactionary policy in all social and economic issues, deriving a measure of mass support by an appeal to the religious and communal sentiments of the backward masses.

The Petty-Bourgeois Intelligentsia

Because of their position of dependence on the capitalist class, and in the absence of a real challenge to their leadership from the proletariat, the various elements of the urban petty bourgeoisie and of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia have always played a satellite role to the bourgeoisie. The radicalization of the petty bourgeoisie under imperialism found its first and strongest expression in the prolonged terrorist movement in Bengal and elsewhere, the failure of which, despite the heroism of its protagonists, demonstrated finally the utter inability of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia to find an independent solution of its own problems.

Today the urban petty bourgeoisie finds its political reflection mainly in the various organizations within the fold of, or under the influence of the Indian National Congress, such as the Forward Bloc, the Congress Socialist Party, the Radical Democratic Party of M. N. Roy, etc.

Within the Congress, the petty-bourgeois leaders have repeatedly lent themselves to be used by the bourgeoisie as a defensive coloration before the masses, bridging with their radical phrases and irresponsible demagoguery the gap between the reactionary Congress leadership and the hopes and aspirations of the masses. Thus the demagoguery of Bose and Nehru, as well as the "socialist" phrases of M. N. Roy and the Congress Socialist Party, to say nothing of the "Marxism" of the National United Fronters of the Communist Party of India, have in turn served the Gandhian leaders as a smoke screen for their own reactionary maneuvers.

The humiliating capitulation of the Congress Socialist Party to the Congress leadership, the conversion of M. N. Roy and his Radical Democrats to imperialist war-mongering, and the departure of Subhas Chandra Bose from the Indian scene, are symptoms of the diminishing political role of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, which however theatrically it may posture before the masses in normal times, exposes in times of growing crisis its political bankruptcy, and exists only to be utilized by the bourgeoisie in its deception of the masses.

The Peasantry

The peasantry comprises the vast majority of the Indian population (70 per cent). The stagnation and deterioration of agriculture, the increasing land hunger, the exactions of the government, the extension of parasitic landlordism, the increasing load of rural debt, and the consequent expropriation of the cultivators, are together inevitably driving the peasantry on to the revolutionary road. Peasant unrest, leading frequently to actual risings (Santhal Rebellion of 1855, Deccan Riots of 1875), have been a recurring motif in Indian history. In the last two decades, and especially since the world economic crisis (1929), the peasant movement has been on the rise, and has taken on a more and more radical character.

It is precisely the depth and scope of the agrarian crisis

that places the revolution against imperialism on the order of the day, contributing to it the driving force and the sweep which are necessary to accomplish the overthrow of the ruling power. Nevertheless the agrarian revolution requires the leadership of another class to raise the struggle to the level of a national revolution. The isolation and the scattered character of the peasant economy, the historical and political backwardness of the rural masses, the lack of inner cohesion within the peasantry, and the conflicting aims of its various strata, all combine to make it impossible for the peasantry to play an independent role in the coming revolution.

The invasion of moneyed interests has sharply accelerated the disintegrating tendencies within the peasantry. The creation of a vast army of landless peasants, sharecroppers and wage-laborers on the land has immensely complicated the agrarian problem, and rendered necessary revolutionary measures of the most far-reaching character. The basic antagonism between landlord and peasant has not been reduced by the entry of finance capital into agriculture, since this did not bring with it any change for the better in farming methods or in the system of land tenure. On the contrary, the landlord-peasant antagonism has been given a sharper emphasis by the extension of parasitic claims on the land, and the overthrow of landlordism by the transference of the land to the cultivator remains the primary task of the agrarian revolution. Nevertheless, this basic antagonism has been supplemented by a new one, which is reflected in the growth of an agricultural proletariat in the strict sense of the word. Besides this, the invasion of finance capital has made the problems of mortgage and of rural debt more pressing in some parts of India than in others, and these facts taken together will probably give to the agrarian revolution, at least in some areas, an anti-capitalist character at a very early stage.

Leadership of the Peasantry

The leadership of the revolution, which the peasantry cannot provide for itself, can come only from an urban class. But the Indian bourgeoisie cannot possibly provide this leadership, since in the first place it is itself reactionary through and through on the land question, sharing as it does so largely in the parasitic exploitation of the peasantry. Above all, the bourgeoisie, on account of its inherent weakness and its dependence on imperialism, is destined to play a counter-revolutionary role in the coming struggle for power.

The leadership of the peasantry in the petty-bourgeois democratic agrarian revolution that is immediately posed can therefore come only from the industrial proletariat, and an alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry is a fundamental prerequisite of the Indian revolution. This alliance cannot be conceived in the form of a "workers' and peasants' party" or of a "democratic dictatorship" in the revolution. The revolutionary alliance between the proletariat and peasantry can mean only proletarian leadership of the peasant struggle and, in case of revolutionary victory, the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship with the support of the peasantry.

The Peasant Movement

The growth of the peasant movement in recent times has led to the formation of various mass organizations among the peasantry, among which the most important are the Kisan Sanghs (Peasant Committees) which are loosely linked up in a district, provincial, and finally on an all-India

scale in the All-India Kisan Sabha, whose membership in 1939 was 800,000. These associations, whose precise character varies from district to district, are in general today under the control and influence of petty-bourgeois intelligentsia elements who, as pointed out before, cannot follow a class policy independent of the bourgeoisie, although the growing mass pressure upon them is reflected in the more sharply radical demands they are forced to put forward. There is no means of deciding in advance the exact role of the Kisan Sanghs in the coming revolution. This will be determined by the correlation of forces within them, which in turn will depend largely on the consciousness and militancy of the lower layers of the peasantry and the measure of control they exercise in the Kisan Sanghs. But it can be stated beforehand, on the basis of the experience of the Russian and Chinese revolutions, that the existence of Kisan Sanghs on however wide a scale does not offer a substitute for the *separate* organizations of poor peasants and agricultural laborers in rural Soviets, under the leadership of the urban working class. Only the Soviets can assure that the agrarian revolution will be carried out in a thorough-going manner.

The Working Class

The industrial proletariat is the product of modern capitalism in India. Its rapid growth in the period since 1914 can be illustrated by a comparison of the Factory Acts Statistics for 1914 and 1936:

	<i>No. of Factories</i>	<i>No. of workers employed</i>
1914	2,936	950,973
1936	9,329	1,652,147

The numerical strength of the industrial proletariat can be estimated at five millions, distributed mainly as follows (1935 figures):

- (a) Workers in power driven factories
(including those of the Native States) 1,855,000
- (b) Miners 371,000
- (c) Railwaymen 636,000
- (d) Transport workers 361,000
- (e) Plantation workers 1,000,000

The Indian working class is chiefly employed in light industry (cotton, jute, etc.) but also to some extent in the iron, steel, cement, and coal mining industries. The degree of concentration in industrial establishments is relatively high, owing to the recency of industrial development and the typically modern character of many of the new enterprises. The proletariat holds a position in Indian society which cannot be gauged by its actual size; the true gauge is the vital place it occupies in the economy of the country.

The wage rates of the Indian proletariat are among the lowest, the living conditions the most miserable, the hours of work the longest, the factory conditions the worst, the death rate the highest in the civilized world. The fight to remedy these intolerable conditions and to protect themselves against the steadily worsening conditions of exploitation bring the workers directly to the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and the capitalist system, the destruction of which is necessary for their emancipation.

Working Class Struggles

The record of proletarian struggle in India dates back to the last century; but the movement took on an organized character only in the post-war period. The first great wave of strikes (1918-21) signaled the emergence of the Indian

working class as a separate force, and gave to the national political movement during this period a truly revolutionary significance for the first time in its history. In 1920, on the crest of this strike wave, the Indian Trade Union Congress was formed. The second great strike wave of the late twenties, especially in Bombay, showed an immense advance in the working-class movement, marked by its growing awakening to communist ideas. The increasing millions of the workers and the growing influence of the Communists caused the trade union movement to be split in two by those leaders who sought the path of collaboration with the bourgeoisie. Thus the reactionary Trade Union Federation was formed in 1929. This policy of the reactionary labor leaders was facilitated by the disastrous "Red Trade Union" policy followed by the Communist Party of India on orders from the Comintern bureaucracy. With the arrest of the Communist leaders on a trumped-up charge (the Meerut Conspiracy case) and the further splitting of the Trade Union Congress in 1931, the wave of working-class struggle subsided once more. It was in this period (1930-31) that the Communist Party of India, which commanded the confidence of the awakening workers, made the grievous political mistake of standing aside from the mass movement which was again assuming revolutionary proportions.

The tendency towards economic recovery commencing in 1936, combined with the mass activities in connection with the election campaign of the Congress led to a revival in the mass movement which entered once again on a period of rise. The Congress Ministries saw a resurgence of the working-class strike movement with the Bengal jute strike (1937) and the Cawnpore textile strike (1938), a resurgence which was arrested only by measures of increased repression introduced by the government since the outbreak of war; but not before the Indian working class had clearly demonstrated its attitude towards the imperialist war, particularly by the mass political anti-war strike in Bombay of 80,000 workers.

Left Groups

The Communist Party of India, which alone in the last two decades could have afforded the Marxist leadership that above all things is needed, made instead a series of irresponsible mistakes, which find their expression in bureaucratically-conceived policies of the Comintern. In conformity with its false central programmatic aim, the "democratic dictatorship" of the proletariat and the peasantry, the C.P.I. fostered the growth of workers' and peasants' parties from 1926 to 1928, at the expense of an independent working-class party. This policy was shelved in 1929 to make way for an ultra-left sectarian policy (in the celebrated Third Period days of the Comintern), the signal expression of which came in the splitting of the trade union movement by the formation of "Red Trade Unions." This sectarian policy of the C.P.I. led to its isolation from the mass struggle of 1930-31, and made the bourgeois betrayal of the struggle so much the easier. In the period of ebb which followed (1934) the C.P.I. was illegalized and has remained so since. From 1935 onwards, the C.P.I. (again at the behest of the Comintern now openly and flagrantly the tool of the Soviet bureaucracy), reversed its policy once more and held out the hand of collaboration to the bourgeoisie through the policy of the National United Front which credited the bourgeoisie with a revolutionary role. The C.P.I. was transformed into a loyal opposition within the Congress, having no policy independent of that organization, a state of things which continues today.

Mechanically echoing every new slogan advanced by

the Comintern to suit the changing policies of the Soviet bureaucrats, the C.P.I. has shown its reactionary character by its attitude towards the imperialist war. With its false theory of national united front, the C.P.I. is making ready to repeat its betrayal of the Chinese revolution by handing over the leadership of the revolutionary struggle to the treacherous bourgeoisie. The Communist Party of India, because of the prestige it seeks to obtain from the Russian revolution and the Soviet Union, is today the most *dangerous* influence within the working class of India.

Openly preaching collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and today with the British imperialists at war, is the party of M. N. Roy. With a narrowing base within the working class, Roy has turned for a following to the labor bureaucrats supporting the war, and to the bourgeoisie itself.

The Congress Socialist Party (1934) has from the beginning followed a policy of utter subservience to the Congress bourgeoisie, and remains today completely without a base within the working class. Surrendering its claim to an independent existence, the C.S.P. has been split wide open by the Communists who worked inside it, and is today an empty shell devoid of political substance.

To the left of the Communist Party, disgusted with its bureaucratic leaders and its reactionary policies, there exists a number of small parties and groups, occupying more or less centrist positions. Such are the Bengal Labor Party (Bolshevik Party of India), the Red Flag Communist (Communist Party) led by S. N. Tagore, etc. Without a clear-cut revolutionary policy and without making a decisive break organizationally and politically with the Comintern, these parties and groups are unable to offer the working class the independent leadership it requires. Nevertheless these groups and parties contain many tried fighters and able Marxist theoreticians, who would be invaluable in a revolutionary working-class party.

This party can be only the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India, the party of the Fourth International in India, which alone with its revolutionary strategy based on the accumulated experience of history and the theory of permanent revolution in particular, can lead the working class of India to revolutionary victory. This party has still to be built on an all-India scale, though many groups exist already whose fusion in the Formation Committee of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India has provided the nucleus for its formation.

Despite its subjective weakness in organization and consciousness, inevitable in a backward country and in the conditions of repression which surround it, the working class is entirely capable of leading the Indian revolution. It is the only class objectively fitted for this role, not only in relation to the Indian situation but in view of the decline of capitalism on a world scale, which opens the road to the international proletarian revolution.

The Permanent Revolution

India faces a historically belated bourgeois-democratic revolution, the main tasks of which are the overthrow of British imperialism, the liquidation of a semi-feudal land system, and the clearing away of feudal remnants in the form of the Indian Native States. But although bourgeois-democratic revolutions occurring in the advanced capitalist countries in previous centuries found leadership in the then rising bourgeoisie, the Indian bourgeoisie appearing on the scene only after the progressive role of the bourgeoisie in the world

as a whole has been exhausted, is incapable of providing leadership to the revolution that is unfolding in India.

Connected with and dependent on British capital from the beginning, the Indian bourgeoisie today displays the characteristics of a predominantly comprador bourgeoisie, enjoying at the best the position of a very junior partner in the firm British Imperialism & Co. Hence, while they have been prepared to place themselves through the Indian National Congress at the head of the anti-imperialist mass movement for the purpose of utilizing it as a bargaining weapon to secure concessions from the imperialists, the bourgeois leaders have restricted the scope of the movement and prevented its development into a revolutionary assault on imperialism. Incapable from the very nature of their position of embarking on a revolutionary struggle to secure their independence, and fearful of such a struggle, the bourgeois leaders have maintained their control over the mass movement only to betray it at every critical juncture.

Secondly, unlike the once revolutionary bourgeoisie of former times which arose in opposition to the feudal landowning class and in constant struggle against it, the Indian bourgeoisie has developed largely from the landowning class itself, and is in addition closely connected with the landlords through mortgages. They are therefore incapable of leading the peasants in the agrarian revolution against landlordism. On the contrary, as is clearly demonstrated by the declared policy and actions of the Congress both during the Civil Disobedience movements and in the period of the Congress Ministries, they are staunch supporters of *zamindari* interests.

Finally, unlike the bourgeois-democratic revolutions of former times, the revolution in India is unfolding at a time when large concentrations of workers already exist in the country. The industrial proletariat numbering five millions occupies a position of strategic importance in the economy of the country which cannot be measured by its mere numerical strength. It is important to remember, moreover, that a hitherto uncalculated but indubitably very high proportion of these workers is employed in large concerns employing several hundreds of thousands of workers. The high degree of concentration of the Indian proletariat immeasurably advances its class consciousness and organizational strength. It was only in the post-war years that the Indian working class emerged as an organized force on a national scale. But the militant and widespread strike waves of 1918-21 and of 1928-29, which were the precursors of the mass Civil Disobedience movements of 1920-21 and of 1930-33 testify to the rapidity of the awakening. These workers are in daily conflict not only with the British owners of capital, but also with the native bourgeoisie. Faced by the threat of the working class, the Indian bourgeoisie has grown more conservative and suspicious. With every advance in organization and consciousness of the workers, the bourgeoisie has drawn nearer to the imperialists and further away from the masses. It is clear that not a single one of the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution can be solved under the leadership of the Indian bourgeoisie. Far from leading the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the Indian bourgeoisie will go over to the camp of the imperialists and landlords on the outbreak of the revolution.

The urban petty bourgeoisie, daily becoming declassed and pauperized under imperialism and declining in economic significance, cannot even conceive of playing an independent role in the coming revolution. Since, however, there is no prospect whatever of improving their conditions under

imperialism, but on the contrary they are faced with actual pauperization and ruin, they are forced onto the revolutionary road. The peasantry, the largest numerically and the most atomized, backward and oppressed class, is capable of local uprisings and partisan warfare, but requires the leadership of a more advanced and centralized class for this struggle to be elevated to an all-national level. Without such leadership the peasantry alone cannot make a revolution.

The task of such leadership falls in the nature of things on the Indian proletariat, which is the only class capable of leading the toiling masses in the onslaught against imperialism, landlordism and the native princes. The concentration and discipline induced by its very place in capitalist economy, its numerical strength, the sharpness of the class antagonism which daily brings it into conflict with the imperialists who are the main owners of capital in India, its organization and experience of struggle, and the vital position it occupies in the economy of the country, as also its steadily worsening condition under imperialism, all combine to fit the Indian proletariat for this task.

But the leadership of the working class in the bourgeois-democratic revolution poses before the working class the prospect of seizing the power and, in addition to accomplishing the long overdue bourgeois-democratic tasks, proceeding with its own socialist tasks. And thus the bourgeois-democratic revolution develops uninterruptedly into the proletarian revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the only state form capable of supplanting the dictatorship of the Indian bourgeoisie in India. The realization of the combined character of the Indian revolution is essential for the planning of the revolutionary strategy of the working class. Should the working class fail in its historic task of seizing the power and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, the revolution will inevitably recede, the bourgeois tasks themselves remain unperformed, and the power will swing back in the end to the imperialists without

whom the Indian bourgeoisie cannot maintain itself against the hostile masses. A backward country like India can accomplish its bourgeois-democratic revolution only through the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The correctness of this axiom of the theory of permanent revolution is demonstrated by the victorious Russian revolution of October 1917, and it is confirmed on the negative side by the tragic fate of the Chinese revolution of 1925-27.

In India, moreover, where the imperialists are the main owners of capital, the revolutionary assault of the workers against imperialism will bring them into direct and open conflict with the property forms of the imperialists from the moment the struggle enters the openly revolutionary stage. The exigencies of the struggle itself will in the course of the openly revolutionary assault against imperialism demonstrate to the workers the necessity of destroying not only imperialism but the foundations of capitalism itself. Thus, though the Indian revolution will be bourgeois in its immediate aims, the tasks of the proletarian revolution will be posed from the outset.

But the revolution cannot be stabilized even at this stage. The ultimate fate of the revolution in India, as in Russia, will be determined in the arena of the international revolution. Nor will India by its own forces be able to accomplish the task of making the transition to socialism. Not only the backwardness of the country, but also the international division of labor and the interdependence—produced by capitalism itself—of the different parts of world economy, demand that this task of the establishment of socialism can be accomplished only on a world scale. The victorious revolution in India, however, dealing a mortal blow to the oldest and most widespread imperialism in the world will on the one hand produce the most profound crisis in the entire capitalist world and shake world capitalism to its foundations. On the other hand it will inspire and galvanize into action millions of proletarians and colonial slaves the world over and inaugurate a new era of world revolution.

The Farmer After the New Deal

By FRANCES WILLARD

On March 9th there was celebrated with great fanfare the Ninth Anniversary of the Administration's Farm Program. Secretary of Agriculture Wickard recalled that "For nine years these programs have stood between the farmers and the bankrupt prices. They have rehabilitated thousands of farm families. They have made it possible for farmers to own their own farms . . . It took wise and courageous leadership to inaugurate those farm programs in March, 1933." Vice President Wallace told the farmers about Roosevelt: "His heart has always been extremely sympathetic to the farmer . . ." "Farmers remember how the farm program sustained prices . . . as a result of the farm program there were 30,000,000 people in the open country standing firmly for the nation's welfare, in position to use their time, their machinery and their soil to the best advantage." Finally on the basis of this build-up President Roosevelt called for "cooperation and restraint on the part of every group," the context making clear that the admonition was being particularly directed at the farmer's predilection for good prices for his product.

The Bureau of the Census is now releasing piecemeal the results of the decennial census taken in 1940; a large

part of the statistics for agriculture are now available; they certainly do not bear out the Administration's rosy portrait of the results of its farm program.

There were 6,096,799 farms in 1939, about 200,000 less than in 1929.

The average farmer's age is 48, only one in ten being under 35; the younger men manage better, one way or another, in the cities.

This grim truth is expressed in precise statistical terms by the census figures for farm income. Two-thirds of the farms in the United States had gross annual incomes including food raised and consumed, of less than \$1,000 each; one out of every five farms had a gross income of less than \$250 in 1939. Keep in mind, in pondering these stark figures, the admonition of the census statisticians that "gross income" covers all trading in produce and livestock among farmers so that there is a duplication of income reported, and that the average farm supports more than one family.

What the figures mean may perhaps be indicated by a detailed study of 14,000 farm families made a few years ago by the Department of Agriculture, using the same methods

of computing "gross income" as were later employed in the decennial census. The Department reported that the "absolute minimum requirement for health and decency for a farm family is \$1,800 per year." Further, it specified that at least \$1,200 of this amount must be received in cash to allow for proper use of income. Thus, by the government's own criterion, two-thirds of the nation's farm families, with gross incomes of less than \$1,000, were living at an extreme poverty level.

The following table from the census shows the income of the nation's farm families for 1939 and compares it with 1929, the year recorded by the previous decennial census. The figures are startling enough to merit more than a glance:

Annual Gross Income	% of Farms In This Group In 1939	% of Farms In This Group In 1929
	Under \$250	19.2
\$250 to \$399	13.8	8.6
\$400 to \$599	14.6	12.8
\$600 to \$999	17.7	20.8
\$1000 to \$1499	11.9	15.6
\$1500 to \$2499	11.4	16.4
\$2500 to \$3999	6.3	10.5
\$4000 to \$5999	2.8	4.9
\$6000 to \$9999	1.5	2.5
\$10,000 and over	1.0	1.4

Thus, after six years of the New Deal farm program, there were three times as many farms with an annual income under \$250 as in 1929; almost twice as many with incomes between \$250 and \$399; the number of farms bringing their operators \$600 or less annually increased from 28 per cent in 1929 to 47 per cent in 1939, and this increase despite the fact that 200,000 tenants and sharecroppers, the poorest of all farmers, were pushed completely out of agriculture during the decade.

Many farm families would starve to death on such incomes; hence it is not surprising to find that, like the poverty-stricken peasants of Europe and Asia, "29 per cent of all farm operators supplemented their farm income by work off their farms."

The average American farmer is revealed by the census to be a United States citizen who lives without the benefit of running water, modern plumbing, electricity, telephone (only one out of four farms have one) or mechanization of farm operations. His wife must join him in the fields to earn their pittance: more than 50 per cent of the white women and 85 per cent of the Negro women were recorded as regularly working in the fields. In addition she has her household burden, far greater than that of her city sister since but one-third of farm dwellings are lighted by electricity and there is a similarly low percentage of dwellings piped for running water. Some measure of adult's work is also a universal requirement of the farm child. The most modern farm machinery is generally beyond the farmer's reach. About one out of five reported tractors; one out of five had motor trucks; three out of five had automobiles (30 per cent models of 1930 or earlier). A trend between 1929 and 1939 toward service cooperatives—which provided use of such things as spray rings, trucking and tractors—aided about one out of every eight farms; but even such cooperatives are either unavailable or beyond the pocketbook of most farmers. Thus in the machine age, the census makes clear, the average American farmer is still his own beast of burden.

The poverty of the white tiller of the soil of the South is proverbial, and is borne out by the census figures: 40.5

per cent of them own no land at all but are tenants, about 30 per cent of whom are "sharecroppers, depending on their landlords not only for land, but also for the work stock with which to farm that land and often even for food and feed while making their crop." But as a group the white tillers are prosperous compared to the Negroes. Compared to the 40.5 per cent of the Southern whites who are tenants, of the Negroes 74.5 per cent are tenants of whom 60 per cent are sharecroppers. Out of all proportion to the population in the Southern states, whites are full-owners more than ten times as often as Negroes.

The Permanent Crisis of Agriculture

Such, in a few figures, is the picture of the permanent plight of American agriculture under capitalism. It must always be remembered that the agricultural crisis did not begin with the collapse of the stock market in 1929, but began after World War I, in 1922. The American farmer had his peak of affluence in 1909 to 1914, the last years of the United States as a "debtor" nation; from 1870 to 1914 the country was veritably the granary of Europe, paying with agricultural exports the capital (and the debt charges on it) borrowed by Wall Street from the European money markets. This role for American agriculture ended in 1918 when the United States became pre-eminently the chief creditor nation; but the needs of post-war Europe, before the war-torn lands were reclaimed, kept the farmer from feeling the full weight of the change until 1922. The farmer's share of Wall Street's world supremacy was permanent depression.

The permanent deterioration of the American farmer since then is indicated graphically by the following figures:

	National Farm Income	Value of Farm Land
1922	\$15,000,000,000	\$66,000,000,000
1929	10,000,000,000	48,000,000,000
1939	8,000,000,000	33,500,000,000

So, after these bitter 20 years, the farmer is told by Roosevelt to exercise "restraint" lest he wax too fat, while Vice President Wallace urges the farmer "to avoid undue pressure on the nation in time of trouble," so that "we shall be just that much more likely to have a soundly functioning farm program when the war is over. That is when the farmer will really need friends."

In attempting to urge and press the farmer into "restraint," Wallace probably said more than he intended. Yes, "the farmer will really need friends" when the war is over and his situation, momentarily alleviated by the war boom, reverts to the "normal" permanent crisis of agriculture. But he will not find those friends in either the Republican or Democratic parties. The census figures, after six years of New Deal farm "aid" demonstrate irrefutably that the farmer can have no hope for a future under capitalism.

For the great mass of the farmers, the only hope is the socialist revolution. Socialism will permit the farmer to maintain his individual farm if he wishes, lending him at nominal rates the machinery and other materials he needs and providing him with a market for everything he can produce. Socialism will also demonstrate, through giant state farms, the superiority of large-scale collective farming, which the individual farmer may voluntarily join. In either case, a Workers' and Farmers' Government will assure the farmer of security and peace.

The alternative to socialism is indicated by Messrs. Roosevelt, Wallace and Wickard: "restraint" after twenty years of suffering, to be followed by the dire need for "friends" after the war and as long as capitalism exists.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

Speech to the Czarist Court in 1906

The trial of the members of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' Deputies which was formed during the first Russian revolution (1905) took place on September 19, 1906. Czarism succeeded in crushing the revolution after first announcing the Constitutional Manifesto on October 17, 1905.

The activity of the Petrograd Soviet, the precursor of the Soviets that took over state power in 1917, lasted 50 days. On December 3, 1905 it was dispersed and about 300 members were arrested; 52 of these members of the Soviet and the Chairman of its Praesidium, Leon Trotsky, were indicted on the charge of "preparing an armed uprising" against the then existing "form of government."

In his autobiography Trotsky gave the

following description of the conduct of this trial:

"The yard of the court building and the adjoining streets were turned into a military camp. All the police of St. Petersburg were mobilized. But the trial itself was carried on with a certain amount of freedom; the reactionary government was out to disgrace Witte by exposing his 'liberalism,' his weakness in dealing with the revolution. About four hundred witnesses were called; and more than two hundred came and offered evidence. Workers, manufacturers, members of the secret police, engineers, servants, citizens, journalists, post-office officials, police chiefs, students, municipal councillors, janitors, senators, hooligans, deputies, professors, soldiers, all passed in

file during the month of the trial, and, under the cross-fire of the judge's bench, of the prosecution, of the attorneys for the defense, and of the defendants—especially the latter—reconstructed, line by line, and stroke by stroke, the activity of the workers' Soviet."

The stenographic report of this unique trial has never been published. Fifteen of the defendants, including Leon Trotsky, were deprived of all civil rights and sentenced to life exile in Siberia. Two defendants received short-term jail sentences. The rest were acquitted. The only document relating to this trial which has survived is the speech Trotsky delivered in his defense. This is the first time the text appears in the English language.—EDITOR.

Messrs. Judges and Gentlemen of the Jury!

The main issue before the court, as was also the case during the preliminary investigation, is the question of the armed uprising. No matter how strange it may seem to the prosecution, this question was not placed on the agenda of any of the sessions of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies throughout the fifty days of the existence of the Soviet. The question of the armed uprising as such was not posed or discussed at a single session. Furthermore, we did not take up as such the questions of the Constituent Assembly, the democratic republic, or even the general strike and its principled meaning as a method of revolutionary struggle. These fundamental questions which have been debated for a number of years first in the revolutionary press and then at meetings and assemblies were not subjected to review by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. I shall presently explain this and characterize the attitude of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies toward the armed uprising. But before passing to this question, which is the central one from the standpoint of the court, I take the liberty of calling the court's attention to another question which is more general and less acute in character—the question of the employment of violence in general by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. Did the Soviet recognize its right to employ violence, repressions, in certain instances through one or another of its organs? My answer to a question posed in this general form is—yes!

I am no less aware than the prosecuting attorney that in every "normally" functioning government, regardless of its form, the monopoly of violence and repressions belongs to the ruling power. This is the "inviolable" right of state power; and towards this right the state power maintains an attitude of most jealous solicitude, being always on guard lest some private body infringe upon its monopoly of violence. In this way the state organization struggles for survival. One need only picture modern society concretely, envisage this complex and contradictory commonwealth, say in a vast country like Russia, in order to become immediately aware that in a modern social system, torn by antagonisms,

repressions are absolutely inevitable. We are not anarchists, we are socialists. The anarchists call us "state-ists" because we recognize the historical necessity of the state and, therefore, the historical inevitability of state violence. But under the conditions created by the general strike which essentially consists in this, that it paralyzes the state machinery—under these conditions the old, long-outlived state power against which the political strike was directed proved to be completely impotent. It was absolutely incapable of regulating and safeguarding public order even by resorting to those barbaric measures which alone remained at its disposal. Meanwhile, the strike had propelled hundreds of thousands of workers from the factories into the streets where they began to live a social-political life. Who could lead them and introduce discipline in their ranks? What organ of the old state power? The police? The gendarmes? The departments of the *Okhrana* (Czarist secret police)? I ask myself this question. And there is only one possible answer. No one except the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. No one else!

The Tasks of the Soviet

The Soviet in directing this colossal elemental force set itself the immediate task of reducing internal friction to a minimum, preventing excesses and limiting the inevitable victims of the struggle to the smallest possible number. And if that is the case, then as a result of the political strike which created it, the Soviet became nothing else but the organ of self-government of the revolutionary masses, *the organ of power*. It wielded command over the parts of the whole by the will of all. It was a democratic power which was obeyed voluntarily. But insofar as the Soviet was the organized power of a great majority, it was inevitably confronted with the necessity of employing repressions against those sections of the masses which were introducing anarchy among the unanimous ranks. To counterpose its power to these elements was deemed as its right by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. It was its right as a new historical power, as the only power in the period of the complete moral, political and technical

bankruptcy of the old apparatus, as the sole guarantee of the inviolability of the individual and of public order in the best sense of these terms. The representatives of the old power which rests entirely on bloody repressions cannot dare to speak with moral indignation about the violent measures of the Soviet. The historical power in whose name the prosecutor speaks in this court is the organized violence of a minority over the majority! The new power, whose precursor was the Soviet, represents the organized will of the majority calling the minority to order. Because of this distinction the revolutionary right of the Soviet to existence stands above all juridical and moral speculations.

The Soviet recognized its right to employ repressions. But under what circumstances? and within what limits? We have heard hundreds of witnesses on this score. Before resorting to repressions, the Soviet employed arguments and tried to convince. This is the real method of the Soviet, and in applying it the Soviet was untiring. By means of revolutionary agitation, with the weapon of words, the Soviet raised to their feet and brought under its authority ever newer and newer layers of the masses. Whenever it met with opposition from unenlightened or degenerated groups of proletarians, the Soviet said to itself that there was always ample time to render them harmless by physical force. It sought, as you have heard from the testimony of witnesses, other means. It appealed to the common sense of the factory administration, calling upon them to cease operations; it exerted its influence upon the unenlightened workers through technicians and engineers who sympathized with the general strike. It sent delegates to workers in order to "take them off" their jobs, and only in extreme cases did it threaten to apply force to strike-breakers. But did the Soviet apply force? Messrs. Judges, such instances are not to be found among the materials of the preliminary investigation, and, despite all the efforts, none was successfully established even during the sessions of this court. Even if one were to take seriously those instances of "violence," more comical than tragic, which have been presented to the court (somebody entered a strange apartment and kept his cap on; somebody arrested somebody else with the latter's consent . . .), then it is only necessary to juxtapose this *cap* which somebody forgot to remove with the hundreds of *heads* which are "removed" by mistake day in and day out by the old power—and then the violence of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies will appear before our eyes in its true guise. And that is all we want. Our task is to reestablish the events which then transpired in their true guise; it is precisely for the sake of this, that we defendants have taken active part in the trial.

Czar's Regime Violated Own Legality

Did the Soviet of Workers' Deputies—and here I come to another question of importance to the court—did the Soviet of Workers' Deputies take a stand in its actions and declarations on legal grounds, and, in particular, on the grounds of the Manifesto of October 17 (October 30, n.s.*)? What was the relation between the October Manifesto and the Soviet resolutions on the Constituent Assembly and the democratic republic? This question did not occupy us at all at the time—and I say this as emphatically as I can—but this question is now undoubtedly of great importance to the court. We have heard here, Messrs. Judges, the testimony of the witness Luchinin. I personally found this testimony extremely interesting, and in some of its conclusions very apt and deep-

*Dates in parentheses refer to the new style calendar.

going. He said among other things that while the Soviet of Workers' Deputies was republican in its slogans, principles and political ideals, it put into effect actually, directly and concretely those freedoms which had been in principle proclaimed by the Czar's Manifesto, and which were being opposed might and main by precisely those who were the authors of this Manifesto of October 17. Yes, Messrs. Judges and Gentlemen of the Jury, we of the revolutionary proletarian Soviet did actually realize and did carry out the freedom of speech, the freedom of assembly and the inviolability of the person—all of which had been promised to the people under the pressure of the October strike. On the other hand, the apparatus of the old power showed signs of life only in tearing to pieces the already legalized conquests of the people. Messrs. Judges, this is an incontrovertible fact, already a part of history. It is impossible to controvert it.

If I—or my comrades—were asked did we *subjectively* base ourselves on the Manifesto of October 17, then we would categorically reply in the negative. Why? Because we were profoundly convinced—and we were not mistaken—that the Manifesto of October 17 did not create a legal foundation, did not establish the foundation for new laws because a new legal order, Messrs. Judges, arises, according to our convictions, not through manifestoes but through a real reorganization of the entire state apparatus. Inasmuch as we took our stand on this materialist viewpoint—the only correct one—we deemed ourselves justified in not cherishing any trust in the immanent power of the Manifesto of October 17. And we stated our views openly. But it seems to me that our subjective attitude as party people, as revolutionists, does not as yet determine for the court our objective relation as citizens towards the Manifesto, the formal foundation of the existing state order. Because the court insofar as it is a court *must* look upon the Manifesto as such a foundation or it must cease to exist.

In Italy there exists, as is well known, a bourgeois parliamentary republican party which functions on the basis of the country's monarchical constitution. In all the cultured countries socialist parties which are in essence republican legally exist and carry on a struggle. The question is: Does the Manifesto of October 17 apply to us Russian socialist-republicans? This question must be decided by the court. It must say whether we social democrats were right in arguing that the constitutional manifesto was only a catalogue of promises which would never be fulfilled voluntarily. The court must say whether we were right in our revolutionary criticism of paper promises, right in calling the people to an open struggle for genuine and complete freedom. Or were we wrong? In that case, let the court tell us that the Manifesto of October 17 constitutes a genuine and legal foundation on the basis of which we republicans are people of law and order—people who have acted "legally" even if contrary to our own conceptions and intentions. Let the Manifesto of October 17 speak to us here through the lips of the court and say in the verdict: "You have denied me but I nevertheless exist for you as well as for the whole country."

I have already stated that the Soviet of Workers' Deputies never posed at its sessions the questions of the Constituent Assembly and the democratic republic. Nevertheless its attitude toward these slogans was quite definitive, as you have heard from the statements of the worker witnesses. How could it have been otherwise? After all, the Soviet did not arise in a vacuum. It appeared after the Russian proletariat had already passed through January 9 (January 22, n.s.); through the Commission of Senator Shidlovsky, and

in general through the long, much too long school of Russian absolutism. Long before the Soviet, the demands for the Constituent Assembly, universal suffrage and democratic republic became the central slogans of the revolutionary proletariat, alongside of the demand for the 8-hour working day. That is why the Soviet did not find it necessary to raise even once the questions and discuss them in principle—it simply introduced them into its resolutions as matters that have been decided once and for all. The same thing was in essence true with regard to the idea of an uprising.

What Is an Uprising?

Before passing to this central question—the armed uprising—I must warn that insofar as I understand the attitude of the power that accuses us and, in part, of the judicial authorities, the latter differs from our attitude not only in the political or party sense, not only in the sense of evaluating it—it would be futile to combat this—no, we differ on the very concept of the armed uprising. The concept of the prosecution differs fundamentally, most profoundly, most irreconcilably from the concept held by the Soviet, and which I believe was and is shared with the Soviet by the entire Russian proletariat.

What is an uprising, Messrs. Judges? Not a palace overturn, not a military conspiracy but the uprising of the working masses? One of the witnesses was asked here by the court praesidium whether he considered a political strike an uprising? I do not recall his answer but I think and I say that a political strike, contrary to the doubts of the Presiding Judge, is in essence an uprising. This is not a paradox! Although it might seem to be a paradox from the standpoint of the indictment. I repeat, my concept of the uprising—and I shall presently demonstrate this—has nothing in common except the name with the police-prosecution conception of this concept. I have said that a political strike is an uprising. As a matter of fact, what is a political general strike?

With the economic strike it has only one thing in common: in both instances the workers suspend work. In everything else they are absolutely dissimilar. The economic strike has its own fixed and narrow goal—to exert influence upon the will of a given entrepreneur and to remove him from the ranks of competition with this goal in mind. Production is halted in a factory in order to gain changes within the confines of this factory. The political strike differs profoundly in nature. It does not at all exercise pressure upon individual entrepreneurs; it does not as a rule present partial economic demands—its demands are directed, over the heads of the entrepreneurs and consumers who are cruelly affected, to the state power. How does the political strike act upon the state power? By paralyzing its vitality. A modern state even in so backward a country as Russia rests on a centralized economic organism composing a single body whose skeleton is railways, and whose nervous system is the telegraph. And if, so far as Russian absolutism is concerned, the telegraph and railways and generally all the conquests of modern technology do not serve for cultural-economic aims, then they are all the more indispensable to it for the purposes of repression. Railways and the telegraph are the indispensable instruments for shifting troops from one end of the country to the other; and for unifying and directing the activities of the administration in the struggle against disturbances. What does the political strike do? It paralyzes the economic apparatus of the state, disrupts communication between the various branches of the administrative machine, isolates the govern-

ment and renders it impotent. On the other hand, it unites politically the mass of workers in the mills and factories and counterposes this army of workers to the state power. In this, Messrs. Judges, is the essence of an uprising. To unite the proletarian masses in a single revolutionary protest and to counterpose them to the organized state power, as one hostile force to another—that, Messrs. Judges, is precisely an uprising, as the Soviet of Workers' Deputies understood it, and as I understand it. We have already witnessed such a revolutionary clash between the two hostile sides during the October strike which broke out spontaneously without the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, prior to its formation, and which itself created the Soviet. The October strike engendered state "anarchy" and one of the products of this anarchy was the Manifesto of October 17. I hope that this will not be denied even by the prosecution, just as it is not denied by the most conservative politicians and publicists, including the semi-official *Novoye Vremya* whose editors would very much like to expunge from memory the Manifesto of October 17 which was born out of the revolution, along with other manifestoes of similar or contrary nature. Only the other day it was written in *Novoye Vremya* that the Manifesto of October 17 came as the result of governmental *panic* created by the political strike. But if this Manifesto constitutes the foundation of the existing modern order, then it must be admitted, Messrs. Judges, that at the foundation of our existing state order lies panic, and this panic in turn is based on the political strike of the proletariat. So you see that the general strike is something more than a mere cessation of work.

I have said that the political strike the moment it ceases being a demonstration is in essence an uprising. It would be more correct to say that it is the fundamental and the most general method of the proletarian uprising. Fundamental but not exclusive. The method of the political strike has its own natural limits. This was manifested the moment that the workers resumed production at noon of October 21 (November 3, n.s.) at the summons of the Soviet.

The Political Strike

The Manifesto of October 17 met with a vote of non-confidence; the masses had good grounds to fear that the government would not introduce the promised freedoms. The proletariat saw the inevitability of a decisive struggle and gravitated instinctively toward the Soviet as the focus of their revolutionary strength. On the other hand, absolutism, having recovered from its panic, began to restore its semi-shattered apparatus and to reassemble its regiments. As a result it turned out that there were two powers in existence after the October clash: the new people's power basing itself on the masses—this power was the Soviet of Workers' Deputies; and a second, the old official power, basing itself on the army. These two powers could not exist side by side: the intrenchment of one meant death to the other.

The autocracy, resting on bayonets, naturally tried to introduce confusion, chaos and disintegration into the colossal process of the fusing together of the national forces centering round the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. On the other side, the Soviet, resting on the confidence, discipline, activity and unanimity of the working masses could not fail to understand the terrible threat to the popular freedom, civil rights and inviolability of the person represented by the fact that the army together with all the material instruments of power in general had remained in the same bloody hands as prior to October 17. Between these two organs of power begins a

titanic struggle for the influence over the army — that is, the second stage of the developing popular uprising.

On the basis of the mass strike which counterposed the proletariat to absolutism as two hostile forces, there arises an intense eagerness to attract the troops over to the workers' side, to fraternize with them, to conquer their souls. This eagerness naturally gives birth to the revolutionary summons to the soldiers on whom absolutism bases itself. The second strike in November was a mighty and magnificent demonstration of solidarity between the factory and the barracks. Of course, had the army gone over to the side of the people, an uprising would have been unnecessary. But is such a peaceful transition of the army into the ranks of the revolution conceivable? No, it is inconceivable! Absolutism will not wait with folded hands until the army, free from its demoralizing influence, becomes a friend of the people. So long as it has not lost everything, absolutism will itself assume the initiative of the offensive. Did the Petersburg workers understand this? Yes, they understood. Did the proletariat think, did the Soviet of Workers' Deputies think that it would come to an open clash between the two sides? Yes, the Soviet thought so, it had no doubts on this score; it was aware, firmly aware that sooner or later the fatal hour would strike. . . .

Naturally, if the organization of social forces could have proceeded without interruptions by any attacks of the armed counter-revolution along the road undertaken under the leadership of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, then the old order would have been destroyed without the slightest application of force. For what did we witness? We saw that the workers rallied to the Soviet; the peasant alliance, embracing ever larger masses of the peasantry, sent its deputies to the Soviet; the railway, postal and telegraph unions united with the Soviet; the liberal professions, the Union of Unions, gravitated toward the Soviet; even the attitude of the factory administration toward the Soviet was one of tolerance, almost friendly. It seemed as if the entire nation was making a kind of heroic effort, striving to deliver out of its womb an organ of power that would create the genuine and unquestionable foundations of a new order prior to the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. If the old state power had not interjected itself into this organic process, if it had not striven to introduce real anarchy into the national life, if the process of the organization of forces had unfolded quite freely — then a new and resurgent Russia would have been born without violence and without bloodshed.

The Nature of Czarism

But the whole point is that we did not for a moment believe that the process of emancipation would unfold in this way. We knew only too well what the old power was. We social democrats were certain that despite the Manifesto, which seemed like a complete break with the past, the old state apparatus would not withdraw voluntarily, would not transfer the power to the people, would not surrender a single one of its vital positions. We foresaw and warned the people openly that absolutism would still make many convulsive attempts to retain the remnants of power in its own hands, and even to take back once again everything it had so solemnly granted. That is why, from our point of view, an uprising, an armed uprising, Messrs. Judges, was inevitable — it was and remains a historic necessity in the process of the struggle of the people against a military-police order. In October and November this idea dominated at all the meetings and assemblies; it dominated the entire revolutionary press; it filled

the whole political atmosphere; and, for better or worse, it crystallized in the consciousness of every member of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. That is why it naturally entered into the resolutions of our Soviet; and that is why we did not have to discuss it at all.

As a consequence of the October strike we inherited a tense situation: the revolutionary organization of the masses fighting for its existence, basing itself not upon a body of laws which was non-existent but upon force insofar as the Soviet existed; and the armed counter-revolution waiting for its hour of revenge. This situation was, if I may be permitted to use such an expression, the algebraic formula of the uprising. New events would introduce only new arithmetic magnitudes. Contrary to the superficial conclusions of the prosecution, the idea of the armed uprising did not leave its traces only in the motion passed by the Soviet on November 27, i.e., one week before our arrest, where it is expressed clearly and definitively. No, from the very beginning of the activity of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies — in the resolution cancelling the funeral demonstration as well as subsequently in the resolution calling for the cessation of the November strike — in a whole series of other decisions the Soviet spoke of an armed conflict with the government, of the final onslaught or the final battle as an inevitable moment of the struggle. Thus, under diverse forms but identical in essence, this idea of an armed uprising runs like a red thread through all the decisions of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies.

How were these decisions understood by the Soviet? Did the Soviet believe that an armed uprising was an undertaking to be created underground and then transferred ready-made into the streets? Did the Soviet conceive it as an insurrectionary act to be accomplished in accordance with a definite plan? Did the Executive Committee elaborate the technique of the street struggle?

Of course not! And this cannot fail to stump the author of the indictment who stands with his mouth agape before a few dozen revolvers which constitute in his eyes the only genuine prerequisites for an armed uprising. But the viewpoint of the prosecution is only the viewpoint of our criminal code which knows of conspiratorial complicity but has no inkling of mass organizations; which knows of attempts and mutinies but does not and cannot know of revolution.

The juridical concepts on which the present trial is based have lagged many decades behind the evolution of the revolutionary movement. The modern Russian labor movement has nothing in common with the concept of conspiracy as defined by our criminal statutes which have remained essentially unaltered since the days of Speransky who lived in the epoch of the Carbonari. That is why the attempt to squeeze the activity of the Soviet into the narrow framework of articles 100 and 101 (of the Czarist criminal code) is absolutely hopeless from the standpoint of juridical logic.

Nevertheless our activity was revolutionary. Nevertheless we actually did prepare for an armed uprising.

Inevitability of Revolution

The uprising of the masses, Messrs. Judges, is not something man-made but a historical event. It is the result of social relations and not the product of a plan. It is impossible to manufacture it, it is possible to foresee it. Through the operation of causes depending on us as little as they do on Czarism, an open conflict had become unavoidable. Each day brought us closer and closer to it. For us, preparation for it meant doing everything in our power to reduce the victims of this irrepressible conflict to a minimum. Did we think

that this required first of all that we prepare arms, draft a plan of military actions, divide the city into specific sections, in a word do everything that is done by military authorities in expectation of "disorders" when they divide Petersburg into sections, appoint colonels for each section, assign a certain number of machine guns and all the necessary equipment? No, that is not how we understood our role. To prepare for the inevitable uprising—and we, Messrs. Judges, never *prepared an uprising*, as the prosecutor thinks and says, we *prepared for an uprising*—for us, this meant first and foremost to bring clarity into the minds of the people; to explain to them that an open conflict was inevitable; that they would be deprived of everything that had been granted them; that they could preserve their freedoms only by force; that a mighty organization of the revolutionary masses was indispensable; that it was necessary to meet the enemy head on; that they had to be prepared to go to the end in the struggle; that there was no other road. For us, this constituted the essence of the uprising.

The Role of the Army

What did we believe necessary for the uprising to be victorious? The sympathy of the troops! It was necessary first of all to attract the army to our side. To compel the soldiers to understand the shameful role they were playing and to summon them to joint action with the people and for the people—that is the kind of task we set ourselves first and foremost. I have already said that the November strike which came as an unselfish outburst of direct solidarity with the sailors who were threatened with a death-sentence was likewise of enormous political significance. It attracted the attention and sympathy of the army toward the revolutionary proletariat. This is where the prosecutor should have first of all sought to find the preparation for the armed uprising. But naturally the issue could not be decided by a single demonstration of protest and sympathy.

Under what conditions, then, did we think at the time and do we think now is it possible to expect the army to pass to the side of the revolution? What is needed for this? Machine guns? Rifles? Of course, if the workers possessed machine guns and rifles they would hold an enormous power in their hands. The very unavoidability of uprising would in large measure be eliminated thereby. A wavering army would surrender its weapons at the feet of an armed people. But the masses did not possess weapons, they did not and could not have them in large quantities. Does this mean that the masses are doomed to defeat? No! Important as weapons are, the main power does not lie in weapons, Messrs. Judges. No, not in weapons. *Not the capacity of the masses to kill but their great readiness to die*—this is what, Messrs. Judges, in the last analysis guarantees in our opinion the victory of the people's uprising.

Why Czarism Forced the Struggle

When the soldiers march into the streets to quell the crowds and come face to face with the crowds and become convinced that these crowds, this people will not leave the pavements until they gain what they must have, that they are ready to pile corpses upon corpses—when the soldiers see and are convinced that the people have come to struggle seriously, to the very end, then the hearts of the soldiers, as has happened in every revolution, must inevitably waver because the soldiers cannot fail to become dubious about the stability of the regime they are serving and cannot fail to

believe in the victory of the people.

It has become customary to associate uprisings with barricades. If we leave aside the fact that the barricade colors far too strongly the prevailing concept of the uprising, even in that case it should not be forgotten that the barricade which is so obviously and purely a mechanical element in the uprising plays essentially and primarily a *moral* role. For in all the revolutions the barricades did not at all have the meaning of physical barriers that fortifications have in war. The barricade served the cause of the uprising by forming a temporary physical obstacle to the movement of the army thus bringing the latter into close contact with the people. Here, at the barricade, the soldier heard, perhaps for the first time in his life, honest human language, a fraternal summons, the voice of national consciousness. And here as a result of this communion between soldiers and citizens in the atmosphere of revolutionary enthusiasm, discipline fell apart, dissolved, disappeared. This and this alone assured victory to the people's uprising. That is why we are of the opinion that a people's uprising is "ready" not when the people are armed with machine guns and cannon—for in that case it never would be ready—but rather at a time when they are armed with readiness to die in open street struggle.

But naturally the old power seeing the growth of this great feeling, this capacity to die for the sake of the interests of the native land, the capacity to sacrifice one's life for the happiness of future generations, seeing that the masses were becoming infected by this enthusiasm so alien, strange and hostile to it—this besieged power could not tranquilly look on the moral regeneration of the people which was taking place before its very eyes. By passive waiting the Czarist government could only have doomed itself to extinction. This was clear. What was there left for it to do? Use its last resources and every means to fight against the political self-determination of the people. For this purpose the unenlightened army, the Black Hundred gangs, agents of the police and the venal press were equally useful. To incite some against others, to cover the streets with blood, to plunder, violate, burn, sow panic, spread lies, deceit and slander—this is what remained for the old and criminal power. It did all this and is continuing to do it to this very day. While the open clash was inevitable, it was not we in any case but our mortal enemies who were anxious to bring the hour closer.

You have already heard here more than once that the workers were arming themselves in October and November against the Black Hundreds. To those who know nothing it might seem absolutely incomprehensible that in a revolutionary country where the enormous majority of the population is on the side of liberationist ideals and where the popular masses have openly evinced their readiness to struggle to the bitter end—it might seem incomprehensible that in such a country hundreds of thousands of workers should have to arm themselves for the struggle against the Black Hundreds which represent a weak and insignificant portion of the population. Are these dregs, these degenerates recruited from all layers of society really so dangerous? Of course not! How easy that task would be if the wretched gangs of the Black Hundred were the only ones barring the road to the people! But we have heard not only from the testimony of attorney Bramson but also from hundreds of worker witnesses that behind the Black Hundred there stands if not the entire state power then a goodly portion of it. Behind the gangs of thugs who have nothing to lose and who are not deterred by anything—neither by the grey hair of the aged, nor defenseless women and children—there stand the agents of the govern-

ment who organize and arm the Black Hundreds and do so, one must presume, at the expense of the state budget.

After all, didn't we know all this before the present trial? Didn't we read the papers? Didn't we hear the reports of eye-witnesses? Didn't we receive letters? Didn't we see it with our own eyes? Are we unacquainted with the shocking revelations of Count Urusov? The prosecution believes none of this. It cannot believe it. For in that case it would have to direct the barb of its accusations against those whom it is now defending; it would have to admit that a Russian citizen in arming himself with a revolver against the police is taking the necessary measures of self-defense. But it is in the nature of things immaterial whether the court believes or disbelieves in the pogrom activities of the authorities. So far as the court is concerned, it is sufficient that we believe it, that hundreds of thousands of workers who armed themselves at our summons are convinced of it. For us it was unquestionable that behind the decorative facade of the hooligan gangs was the guiding and august hand of the ruling clique. Messrs. Judges, we see this evil hand even here, even now.

The power that accuses us invites you, Messrs. Judges, to recognize that the Soviet of Workers' Deputies armed the workers for the direct struggle against the existing "form of government." If I were categorically asked, Is that true? I would answer—Yes! Yes, I agree to accept this charge, but on one condition. I do not know whether this condition will be acceptable to the prosecution or to the court.

I ask: What does the prosecution understand by the term "form of government"? Does there really exist among us a form of government? The government has long ago drifted away from the nation to its military-police-Black Hundred apparatus. What we have is not a national power but an automaton for mass murder. I cannot define in any other way a governmental machine which is hacking to pieces the living body of our country. And if I am told that the pogroms, the murders, the incendiary fires, rapes—if I am told that everything which took place in Tver, Rostov, Kursk, Sedletz—if I am told that Kishinev, Odessa, Bielostok constitute the form of the Russian empire, then I will acknowledge together with the prosecution that during October and November we armed immediately and directly against the form of government of the Russian empire.

The Mind of India's Bourgeoisie

By LARISSA REED

"MY INDIA, MY AMERICA," by Krishnalal Shridharani. Dual, Sloan & Pearce, 1941. 607 pages. \$3.50.

The author of this book is a high-caste Hindu visitor to the United States. He is an "unofficial" spokesman for the Indian bourgeoisie—the weakest of the three parasitic classes that feed upon the blood and toil of the Indian workers and peasants. The other two are the native landlords and the British imperialists.

Shridharani's chief complaint is against British imperialism, which rules by direct force and squeezes the budding Indian bourgeoisie in its monopolistic vise. "The British Governor General of India," he protests, "appointed by the British Cabinet, is armed with such decisive powers that he can render the Federal Legislature impotent whenever he thinks imperial interests are at stake." The Federal Legislature, elected under methods which provide no representation to the great masses, is the means by which the native bourgeoisie hopes to secure a larger share of the wealth and power of India.

Next to the intolerable grip of the British rulers, Shridharani complains about the native princes. Regarding these glorified landlords, Shridharani declares: "Our fight is as much against the native exploiters as against the foreign ones." The British imperialists throw only crumbs to the native capitalists, while the "560 Maharajahs" continue to be "a group . . . of the richest men on earth." These potentates, he complains, "rule over one-third of India . . . and they can do anything they wish unless they become too good for the British interests"—that is to say, pit their power against the

British rulers. Great Britain "has pledged herself to provide for their protection against aggression from without and rebellion from within."

Shridharani does not propose to combat the imperialists and the landlords by mobilizing the masses, even in the form of democratic government. "The weakness of democracy," he states, "is that every man's son is so important that no one is important enough." He consoles the agrarian masses with the old apology for aristocracy: "It is impossible for a suffering minority to get redress in a democracy . . . a benevolent despotism, with all its limitations . . . is capable of being moved by compassion, justice, pity." Trapped by the contradictions of the present epoch of decaying capitalism, imperialist wars and proletarian revolutions, Shridharani has nothing better than "a benevolent despotism" to offer the Indian masses!

His Fear of Socialism

For he understands that the bourgeoisie of India today cannot play the same historical role as their American predecessors, who won complete independence for themselves in an epoch when capitalism marched uphill. Shridharani reflects: "We live in times . . . of *blitzkrieg* and *blitzpolitik* . . . and should not forget that . . . we run the risk of being too late." Indeed, the Indian bourgeoisie has arrived too late on the historical arena in an epoch of monopoly capitalism. In this second titanic struggle of the great imperialist powers for supremacy, Shridharani realizes that his class is impotent except to serve one or another of these gigantic contenders. Possessing all of

the vices and none of the virtues of their predecessors, the Indian bourgeoisie can only obstruct and betray the revolutionary emancipation of the masses.

"The rise of socialism in India," writes Shridharani, "can be traced to the (first) World War. Manufacturing tycoons doubled and tripled their wealth overnight . . . but the plight of the workers remained unchanged. The rumbling of discontent among the proletariat, audible in pre-war days, grew louder . . . in the inevitable post-war slump . . . the industrialists forgot the abnormal profits of war-time, and began to reduce wages, to dismiss employees." The second World War is reproducing these tensions on an enormously magnified scale.

Shridharani "ignores" the October revolution in Russia in 1917, achieved out of the crucible of the first World War. The Russian masses combined the bourgeois-democratic with the proletarian revolution and leaped in two swift strides from Czarist absolutism to a workers' state. This bourgeois Hindu hierarchist strives to conceal from the Indian masses the lessons of the revolutionary alliance between the workers and peasants which resulted in the overthrow of the bourgeoisie together with the feudal overlords.

"The great population of little farmers in India still blames kismet for their sufferings, not the capitalist system," writes Shridharani—imitating Tolstoy's fatalism, which contributed to the defeat of the first Russian revolution in 1905. Learning from this defeat, in 1917 the "little farmers" of Russia, still clinging to their ikons and fatalism, were nevertheless led to victory by a revolutionary vanguard of workers, armed with a correct revolutionary program.

"India, recently industrialized, has a proletariat too small to be the vanguard of a revolution," says Shridharani, with false hope and deliberate deceit. The fact is that the five million industrial workers created out of the expansion of British capital, and to a lesser degree out of native capital, represent a social and political force far stronger than the bourgeoisie itself. They are fully capable of leading the Indian masses to a victorious Indian revolution.

Shridharani is an apostle of Gandhi's doctrine of "non-violence," which he offers as a substitute for revolutionary action. In his "Blueprint of Bloodless Revolution," he assures the American capitalists that "Democracy has nothing to fear from a non-violent revolution" and explains in detail its operation.

"If a mighty army should march upon a free country," states Shridharani, the inhabitants "would let the invader in without opposition." They would "offer themselves unarmed as fodder for the aggressor's cannon." Thousands upon thousands of them would "voluntarily lie down a hundred deep . . . to be trampled under horses' hoofs . . . iron tanks . . . or soldiers' boots." They would say, "You can march in over a bloody human carpet or you can go back."

In the event that the invaders are not shamed into turning back, but "march to power over a bloody carpet," the next stage calls for "direct negotiations with the leaders of the opposition . . . by a deputation composed of influential and notable citizens." Obviously, these gentlemen are not among the thousands who have been trampled to death, but are now appearing to make a peaceful horse-trade. They begin their bargaining through "such legislative channels as might be open to them." This is exactly the way the defeated ruling classes in Europe made deals with the fascists. Shridharani is paving the way for a similar bargain with the imperialist victor.

If the trading does not proceed satisfactorily, Shridharani's blueprint calls for "a campaign of agitation among the people." Possessing a freedom of action unexplained by Shridharani, the notable citizens begin "issuing pamphlets, circulating books and papers" as well as through "songs . . . slogans . . . group meetings . . . debates . . . radio . . . cinema," all upholding the vague program labelled "The Cause." Further stages include "the perilous step of issuing an ultimatum." This is "a document drawn up by the Leader with the consent of party dignitaries," in which "the needs of the people are set forth in plain terms." The Indian National Congress, led by propertied lawyers and subsidized by millionaire merchants and manufacturers, has proven itself very skillful at exploiting the power of the masses in this fashion. Gandhi accepts "invitations . . . to the Viceregal Palace" to conclude a deal with the British rulers.

"At this point," announces Shridharani, "self-purification, the fourth phase . . . is introduced." This requires "fasting, public

prayers, voluntary suffering and self-denial." This "One-Way Street named Martyrdom" is indeed a blind alley for the masses, and a bourgeois device to keep them subdued and harnessed to their native exploiters.

Shridharani exalts the author of this "inspired" technique of mass deception. He describes the other achievements of the "practical idealist" Gandhi, in paralyzing the masses. To serve the "economic needs" of the peasantry, he writes, Gandhi "launched his program for the revival of the cottage industries with the spinning wheel as the symbol of the movement." In reality, this reversion to handicraft methods in an industrial epoch could not lift the peasants out of their impoverishment, but only riveted them to their barbaric state.

Between retirements, writes Shridharani, Gandhi staged "three triumphant comebacks." He does not specify, however, that Gandhi came forward to betray the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants at each of three critical junctures. With a "natural gift for the unusual and startling," Gandhi turned back the clock in his person as well as in his politics. Shridharani writes: "From expensive and up-to-date European suits, he has passed through a shirt and dhoti stage, and wound up with a loin-cloth." No doubt, on the eve of the impending socialist revolution, Gandhi will come forth in the last act of the Strip-Tease of Treachery clad in nothing at all!

The End of "Non-Violence"

"In 1929 strikes occurred all over India," writes Shridharani; "the labor movement was becoming class conscious for the first time in India's short industrial history." He blurts out: "The workers . . . did not see the answer to their problem in the Congress" but "looked upon it as the mouthpiece of the bourgeoisie, a body financed by the capitalists of the country . . . consequently they began to consolidate their ranks in unions of their own." This grave situation, he admits, called for a change of leadership; "for a strong Congress president who could swing the youth leagues and workers behind that body." For this change of faces, "Gandhi's choice was Nehru." The Indian bourgeoisie was quite satisfied with Nehru, the "thoroughbred, born of blue-blooded parents" and a descendant of "two centuries . . . of culture and luxury."

When the second World War broke out, Shridharani writes that the Indian National Congress had stated flatly: "India cannot associate herself in a war said to be for democratic freedom, when that very freedom is denied her." But afterward the Congress leadership swung around to support England's imperialist war.

Shridharani, the apostle of "non-violence," is a little embarrassed by his approval of this capitulation, which is so obviously a "betrayal of the cause of non-violence." With the characteristic agility of bourgeois be-

trayers, he turns a political somersault, and announces: "*I have always regarded it (non-violence) as one of the methods, and not as the method.*" The best Pathan warriors, who in 1930 laid down their arms in obedience to the doctrine of "non-violence" and who were slain by British guns, cannot, however, be recalled to life. In an earlier section of Shridharani's voluminous book, he reprints with pride an "eye-witness's" account of their fate:

- "1. Nearly 500 men have lost their lives.
2. They all died in a strictly non-violent manner, bravely courting bullets.
3. They could have created the most terrible riot, if they were not actuated by a touching, though perhaps a blind faith in 'Baba Gandhi.'"

Alas, they did not know that "non-violence" is only a bourgeois program for castrating the rebellious masses.

Shridharani and his class became alarmed when the war placed Winston Churchill in power. In 1935, he recalls, this "die-hard Tory" had bluntly declared: "England cannot afford to give up India" because "two out of every ten Englishmen depend on India." Anxious to dispense with the expensive political services of the native bourgeoisie, Churchill had declared: "Sooner or later you will have to crush Gandhi and the Indian Congress and all they stand for." The Indian bourgeoisie found themselves staring straight into two gun-barrels; between the turbulent and rebellious masses from below and the arch-reactionary power on top. To Shridharani, "the conviction was carried home . . . that the only language Great Britain was prepared to understand was the language of military force and political blackmail." But neither he nor his class acted on that conviction.

He Seeks a New Master

Now the specter of revolution is arising out of the visible crumbling of the British Empire. Whereupon Shridharani looks for a new master.

Shridharani rules out Japanese imperialism, whose "battle-cry of Asia-for-the-Asiatics" is only a device to conceal "its own expansionist aims"—at the expense of the Indian bourgeoisie. He prefers American imperialism. Other Indian capitalists, however, like Subhas Chandra Bose, are for the Axis powers.

"The magnitude of America's stake in India's future is greater than is commonly known," says Shridharani, the servant, who has selected his new master. Raising the soiled and tattered flag of deception, he bleats: "The United States is the apex of western civilization . . . the hope of the world really lies in this country, the powerhouse of democracy." Shridharani prepares to embrace an alliance with American imperialism in the dire event that the British empire collapses and the unleashed revolution threatens to drag the native capitalists down with it.

OUR BIGGEST SELLER!

SOCIALISM ON TRIAL

by James P. Cannon

- The official court record of James P. Cannon's testimony in the famous Minneapolis "Sedition" trial with an introduction by Felix Morrow.

116 Page Pamphlet . . Only 10 Cents!

This pamphlet—really a book—is an elementary introduction to the ideas of socialism.

JUST OUT!

A Companion Pamphlet to
James P. Cannon's Testimony

In Defense Of Socialism

by Albert Goldman

- The text of his two-day final argument to the jury in the Minneapolis "Sedition" Trial.

96 Pages

Only 10 Cents!

Order Both Pamphlets From

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York City