

---

---

September 1944

# Fourth International

---

---

**The 1944 Presidential Elections**

*By The Editors*

---

**Europe In the Sixth War Year**

*By William F. Warde*

---

**Whither France?**

*By Daniel Logan*

---

**Trotsky's Prognosis of Our Epoch**

*By Joseph Hansen*

---

***The Arsenal of Marxism***

---

**The Program of Peace**

**The Socialist United States of Europe**

*By Leon Trotsky*

---

Twenty Cents

## Manager's Column

Letters from our readers attest to the high educational value of articles in **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**. We quote from several.

*Detroit:* "In recent months I have found myself anxiously looking forward to receiving the F.I. It has recently been impressed on me that the magazine helps me a great deal in talking to and arguing with other workers in my shop. I've found that, with my ability to explain to my shopmates the true meaning of the main events occurring throughout the world, my prestige with these fellows has increased enormously.

"Upon receiving the July issue of the magazine, I realized that, whereas formerly I would read the articles in the order in which they would appear, with the last few issues I have been turning first to Trotsky's articles on the military tasks of the Soviet Union. I think the series has been excellent."

(The series of articles by Trotsky, "Our Current Basic Military Tasks," appeared in the May, June and July issues.)

*London:* "THE MILITANT and **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** come through at odd times, but we do not receive every issue of the latter. There are some issues which we are very sorry to miss, in particular the February issue, containing an article on the National Question by Comrade Stuart. As we are studying this problem at present in relation to the present situation in Europe, we would be grateful if you could send this one issue and any other material which you think may help."

(The article by J. B. Stuart, "New Trends in Nationalist Thought on European Problems," appeared in the February issue.)

*Detroit:* "I have just finished reading the August Memorial issue of the F.I. and, as after finishing each number for the past ten years, I experienced the same reaction—I have learned something new and have had that which I had previously learned clarified.

"I am in complete agreement with the writer of the letter from London (Manager's Col-

# FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME V September 1944 No. 9 (Whole No. 48)

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

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

Editor: FELIX MORROW

## CONTENTS

<i>The Month in Review</i> .....	<i>By the Editors</i>
Sixth Anniversary of the Fourth International .....	259
The 1944 Presidential Campaign .....	260
Europe in the Sixth War Year	
	<i>By William F. Warde</i> 263
Whither France.....	<i>By Daniel Logan</i> 267
Trotsky's Prognosis of Our Epoch	<i>By Joseph Hansen</i> 270
Persecution of the Trotskyists in Uruguay .....	273
The Mexican Revolution of 1910 (Book Review)	
	<i>By Donna Kent</i> 275
<i>From the Arsenal of Marxism</i>	
The Program of Peace: The Socialist United States of Europe .....	<i>By Leon Trotsky</i> 279
U. S. and England: Imperialist Rivals	
	<i>By Charles Hackett</i> 286



umn)—"So far as quality is concerned, it is absolutely the best thing in the whole political field, nothing to compare with it at all."

"I note also, among the notes in the Manager's Column that you have indexes for the various volumes of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**. I have a complete file in unbound state and as I contemplate having them bound, I would greatly appreciate your sending me the indexes for as far back as you have them."

(We have indexes for 1938 and through 1943 which we will send upon request to our readers who have copies of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** to be bound.)

\* \* \*

Our agents are doing a good job in building up the circulation of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**. For instance, the magazine has been placed on another newsstand in Chicago, the N. W. corner of 51st Street and Cottage Grove Avenue.

Milwaukee requests that their bundle order be increased.

Our agent in Flint sold a

one-year subscription to the Flint Public Library. He writes that "the reference librarian has agreed to display the magazine with other publications."

The number of newsstands in the Los Angeles area carrying **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** have been increased by the consistent work of our agent there. His latest letter concerning the circulation of the magazine is very interesting:

"I am very concerned about increasing our F.I. circulation. To me it seems that the closest estimate of the real strength of the party can be determined by the sale of the magazine, especially when there are few intellectuals who buy the F.I. out of curiosity. And even an increased demand by these elements would have its significance for they are the first to flock around a resurgent movement, sort of weather-vanes.

"In this sense both the increase in circulation of the F.I. and the sales of 'The History of American Trotskyism' will have great meaning for us. And I

by no means underestimate the place of our Militant Subscription Drive which is, of course, another indication of the same thing. Together the signs show the pattern of history, a movement towards revolutionary Marxism.

"Enclosed find payment for the August F.I. which arrived today. It looks like a wonderful issue, and the cover is extremely attractive which should help the sales greatly."

\* \* \*

Letters from our readers in other countries tell of a great need for Marxist literature.

*Claygate, Eng.:* "Please accept my best thanks for the numbers of, **THE MILITANT** and **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** which you send me. They are really invaluable and you are doing a great service in maintaining them.

"Re the contents, I think the standard is still very good. The articles on Japan were very illuminating. As mentioned once before, I should like to see in the documentary section some reprints of the documents and speeches of the early Congresses of the Communist International, which are not available here; also as much documented information as possible on the USSR in view of the continuing reactionary changes there."

*Middle East Forces:* "I notice that you are sending me the issues of the magazine which I previously reported not having received in 1943 and I deeply appreciate your kindness.

"You will be pleased to hear that I received Leon Trotsky's book from Pioneer Publishers at the same time as your letter and have already read it through once. I am in complete agreement with the points made therein regarding the theoretical education of young people. The works of certain Marxists mentioned are mostly unknown to me. Is it possible for you to let me know if any works of Franz Mehring, Plekhanov and Antonio Labriola are available in America?

"I enclose \$5 with this letter to pay for my subscription to the magazine for 1944 and 1945. It is undoubtedly the most important and invaluable Marxist reading in the world for those who want to keep abreast of events."

# FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 5

SEPTEMBER 1944

NUMBER 9

## The Month in Review

By THE EDITORS

### The Sixth Anniversary of the Founding of the Fourth International

**FOUNDING CONGRESS MET ON EVE OF WAR** On September 3, 1938 delegates representing the Trotskyist movement in eleven countries—Germany, Great Britain, France, United States, USSR, Italy, Poland, Belgium, Holland, Greece and Latin America—convened “somewhere in Europe” for the Founding Congress of the Fourth International, the World Party of the Socialist Revolution. The congress carried out its work during the height of the Munich crisis which ushered in the period of final preparations for the second imperialist war.

It is a great gain for the world working class that it was armed for the coming revolution with the correct program and the indispensable organization—the world party—prior to the outbreak of the slaughter. This represents an enormous advance over the conditions that prevailed during the first world war, when the beginning of hostilities witnessed the collapse of the Second International. As a result of this betrayal it was possible to reconstitute the revolutionary leadership of the international proletariat only in 1919, two years after the eruption of the Russian revolution. This unavoidable delay in creating the revolutionary International was an important factor in retarding the formation of the proletarian parties with a leadership capable of mobilizing the masses throughout Europe for the conquest of power. By the time the sections of the Third International began to take shape the mass revolutionary ferment issuing directly out of the war was subsiding. In the years from 1918 to 1920 the question of power was on the order of the day. European capitalism survived owing primarily to the treacherous Social Democratic parties which headed the movement only to derail it.

This time, as Leon Trotsky pointed out shortly after the founding conference: “*All the starting positions have been occupied with precision prior to the war.* Nobody expects an internationalist policy from the Social Democratic parties which themselves do not promise anything but the ‘defense of the fatherland.’... The policy of the Third International is fixed in advance almost as distinctly.” While, as though to avow their total bankruptcy, neither the Second nor the Third Internationals bothered to convene at this critical hour, the Trotskyist vanguard of the vanguard proceeded to adopt “unanimous decisions in which the tasks of the present titanic struggle are formulated precisely and concretely, on the basis of all historic experience.”

### OUTSTANDING TRAIT OF FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

On the occasion of the founding of the Third International Lenin stated that its outstanding trait was to be found in its mission “to fulfill, to introduce in life the covenants of Marxism, to realize the age-long ideals of socialism and the labor movement.”

Today this is the mission, this is the outstanding trait of the Fourth International which has inherited all the revolutionary achievements of Lenin's International. It demonstrated this by the program adopted at its 1938 Congress. Of all the parties and tendencies in the working class movement, the Trotskyists alone occupied in advance the correct position on the war, calling for an irreconcilable struggle against all the imperialists and their war. At the same time the Trotskyists pledged unconditional support to the Soviet Union, despite its degeneration under Stalin, against any and all imperialist attacks, and reaffirmed the Leninist position of supporting in war as in peace the liberationist struggle of colonial peoples.

Among the most significant achievements of the Fourth International is its elaboration of the program of transitional demands, crowned by the slogan of Soviets (Workers' and Peasants' Councils). The need for such a program flows from the objective situation. Owing to the course of historical development, our epoch is characterized by the glaring disproportion between the revolutionary needs and tasks of the times and the level of political development of the masses who have been disoriented by decades of defeats, and who continue to be betrayed by the traditional Socialist and Stalinist parties. War has acted greatly to accentuate this disproportion. The program of transitional demands provides the means of bridging this gap, of mobilizing the masses in the course of the struggle, enabling them to learn from their own experience the inadequacy and treachery of their own leaderships and thus providing the necessary conditions for the rapid consolidation of the vanguard in the various national sections of the Fourth International.

**TRANSITIONAL DEMANDS AND THEIR ACTUALITY** When Trotsky first advanced the program of transitional demands, all the philistines, cynics and fainthearts shrugged their shoulders, pointing to it as a prize illustration of the “sectarianism,” “lack of realism,” etc., etc., of the Trotskyist movement. The developments in Italy, France and elsewhere have already demonstrated the actuality of this program. The day is not far distant when millions in Europe and throughout the world will mobilize in a determined struggle to achieve every one of the demands set down in our transitional program.

The main guarantee of the viability and ultimate triumph of the Trotskyist movement is its international character and spirit. Internationalism is not only a great ideal but an inexorable necessity, dictated by reality itself. The proletarian revolution is economic in its essence. Without an overturn in property relations, it is idle even to dream of progress in political, cultural and all other spheres of human activity. Capitalism has long ago brought society to the point where further development of economic life is impossible within the framework of national states and the limits of capitalist forms of production. This incompatibility between modern large scale industry and the artificial conditions restricting it has already led to two world holocausts within the lifetime of

a single generation, and threatens even greater devastation in the future. For war is the reactionary attempt of the capitalist rulers to solve on a world scale this fundamental contradiction of modern society. The only progressive solution to this world problem is the world revolution. Any other approach inevitably leads its proponents into the camp of bourgeois reaction. History has already demonstrated this twice: It was the nationalistic outlook of the parties of the Second International that provided the soil for the growth of opportunism and the resulting degeneration. The collapse of the Third International stems directly from Stalin's theory of "socialism in one country." By replacing the internationalist position of Marxism-Leninism with a narrow nationalist outlook, Stalinism doomed itself to reproduce under different conditions the debacle of the Second International.

**WAR DESTROYS ALL THAT IS ROTTEN** As Trotsky predicted, neither of these organizations was able to survive the war. The Second International did not even bother to convene a session of its Bureau in all these years. As for the Third International, its stinking corpse was formally buried last year by the Kremlin.

At the time of the Founding Congress of the Fourth International the Trotskyist movement had parties and groups in more than thirty countries. These small but precious cadres received their training in the years of blackest reaction and were subjected from the outset to persecution unexampled in the history of political movements. They then had to go through the added pressure and persecution of the war. Roosevelt jailed the leaders of the Socialist Workers Party; that other great "democrat" Churchill has kept in his jails leaders of the British Trotskyists, and our co-thinkers in Ceylon and India. The Nazi executioners, too have taken their toll. The list of our martyrs, headed by Leon Trotsky and Leon Sedov, is long; proportionately we have suffered greater losses than any other revolutionary movement, the brunt of the Stalinist attack upon us being borne by the Russian section.

On the sixth anniversary of its foundation the Fourth International can proudly assert that it has met and withstood the test of war. Its banner remains spotless. Its unwavering ranks have grown stronger. Constantly news arrives of new adherents to the Fourth International, new formations, new consolidations. According to our latest information, a Trotskyist party is in process of formation in Italy. We confidently expect similar news in the not too distant future from Belgium, France, Holland and other countries in Europe, especially Germany.

**TASKS AND PROSPECTS** Out of the second world war the masses are emerging with new moods, new determinations, and a new receptivity to communist ideas. With this new wave of mass radicalization, the Trotskyist movement enters a new stage of its development; the building of mass parties—not as a perspective but as an immediate task.

Once these mass parties are formed in Europe as well as in America and throughout the world the Fourth International will complete the work begun by Lenin's International. The October Revolution will be spread beyond the frontiers of the Soviet Union. Together with the regenerated Soviet Republic, purged of the Stalinist incubus, the European peoples will merge in a Socialist United States of Europe, as a stage on the road to the establishment of the World Socialist Federation.

## The 1944 Presidential Campaign Under the Two-Party System

**DEMOCRACY IN DECAY** The fate of democracy in the present period of the death agony of capitalism is illustrated by the fact that the United States is one of the very few countries left in the world—and the only great power—where national elections have been held during the war. Great Britain, that other stronghold of capitalist democracy, has not held a general election since 1935, almost ten years ago.

The material reasons for this decay of democracy and its displacement by dictatorship, as well as the greater stability of bourgeois democracy in the United States, were explained by Trotsky as follows in his introduction to *The Living Thoughts of Karl Marx*. "In its expanded manifestation bourgeois democracy became, and continues to remain, a form of government accessible only to the most aristocratic and the most exploitative nations." The United States, as the most privileged of all nations, has thus far been able to preserve the machinery of democracy thanks to its accumulated wealth. However, Trotsky added, the continuing progressive paralysis of capitalism is also undermining the foundations of democracy in the richest countries. "The uncontrollable deterioration in the living conditions of the workers makes it less and less possible for the bourgeoisie to grant the masses the right of participation in political life, even within the limited framework of bourgeois parliamentarism."

**ANOTHER LUXURY THEY CAN AFFORD** In addition to these underlying economic conditions, there is an important political factor which makes it possible for the American capitalists to afford the luxury of a national election in wartime. One of the peculiarities of American development has been the lag in class differentiation. This has expressed itself politically in the absence of an organized labor party through which the workers can challenge the political power of the ruling class. Owing to the existence of the Labor Party and the traditions of independent working class political action, the capitalist rulers of Great Britain fear to risk a general election in which the question of confidence in the capitalist regime and the Tory-Labor coalition is put to the people. In this country where for all practical purposes the two capitalist parties monopolize the political scene, the plutocracy can hold a national election without so much danger to its rule.

At the same time the capitalist rulers try in every way possible to prevent the American people from exercising their political rights fully and freely, and especially to prevent the workers from playing an independent political role. They enact all kinds of restrictive measures such as the poll-tax and the refusal to permit soldiers to vote and pass state laws which virtually prohibit new parties from getting on the ballot. The main mechanism by which the plutocracy maintains its actual monopoly of political power is the capitalist two-party system. While contending with each other for possession of the spoils of office, the Democratic and the Republican parties share the tasks of carrying out the program of Big Business and enforcing its domination over the American people.

**WALL STREET'S PEACE PROGRAM** In the present campaign the utter subservience of both parties to the interests of Wall Street and the identity of their fundamental aims is most clearly expressed in the sphere of foreign policy. Through this war America's monopolists aim to acquire mastery over the entire

world. They seek to impose a *Pax Americana* upon the rest of the globe which will pave the way for the most intense exploitation of its peoples for the benefit of Wall Street. They want to stabilize Europe by placing it on starvation rations and to exercise unlimited oppression over the colonial nations. And they are prepared, in the words of the late Secretary of the Navy Knox, "to police the world for a hundred years," if need be, to fulfill this program.

Roosevelt, Dewey and their respective parties are unqualifiedly committed to this program of world conquest and imperialist expansion. Roosevelt is already engaged in executing it; Dewey is ready and willing to carry on. Dewey explicitly admitted the basic identity in the foreign policies of the two parties in his address on foreign affairs delivered in Louisville at the start of his campaign.

Although the conferences at Dumbarton Oaks are, like their predecessors in this war, being held behind barred doors with their decisions kept from the people, Dewey did not hesitate to endorse the form of world organization which is growing out of these secret conferences. In addition, he solidarized himself with Roosevelt's policy of preserving "peace by force"—that charter of unrestricted aggression for American militarism. The world organization, Dewey said, should develop "effective cooperative means to prevent or repel military aggression," and added: "Such means should include the use of force as well as the mobilization of international opinion or moral pressure and of economic sanctions."

**NO DISPUTES ON FOREIGN POLICY** Making a political virtue out of a class necessity, Dewey demanded unity at home on foreign policy. "These efforts must never be made subjects for partisan political advantage." He pointed to the conferences between his representative, John Foster Dulles, and Secretary of State Hull as "a practical beginning of an attempt to formulate an American foreign policy which will go on for decade after decade regardless of the party in power."

What Dewey is really calling for is a continuation of the unity on foreign policy which has prevailed in practice between the two parties since Pearl Harbor. With the unfoldment of the war the former tactical dispute between the "interventionist" and "isolationist" tendencies within the capitalist camp over the methods, order and timing of dealing with Germany and Japan has largely been resolved. The presidential candidates of both capitalist parties stand shoulder to shoulder behind Wall Street's plans for world domination.

The maintenance of the capitalist two party system and its ability to mislead the masses depends in large measure upon deception. One of the indispensable elements in this mechanism of deception is the fiction that there are major and decisive differences between the Democrats and Republicans. The avowed identity of their foreign policies makes it all the more imperative for their supporters to manufacture and to exaggerate differences in domestic policy.

But here too the war and the deepening crisis of American capitalism make this task exceedingly difficult. In most important questions the differences between the positions of the two parties and their candidates tend to dwindle to a narrow margin, if not to vanish altogether. In addition to their common war-program both parties support Wall Street's plans for maintaining monopolist control during "reconversion." They agree on guaranteeing profits to the bankers and cost-plus patriots and handing over billions in government-owned plants

and equipment to private ownership at fire-sale prices. For the workers they hold out nothing but mass unemployment, wage-slashing, hunger and increasing taxes and insecurity.

**THE PARTY OF POLL-TAXERS** The Democratic party has the reputation of being more "liberal" than the Republican. But there are no more reactionary political groups in the country than the Southern poll-taxers and big city bosses like Hague who control the Democratic machine. If the respective party platforms were taken as the sole criterion, it might even appear that the Republicans are more outspoken defenders of Negro rights than the Democrats. But every informed person knows that this particular plank was inserted in the Republican platform for demagogic purposes to curry favor with the Negro voters in the north and to exploit their growing revulsion against the policies of Roosevelt's administration. Both Republicans and Democrats uphold the Jim Crow system, support discrimination in industry and the armed forces, and conduct no genuine fight against lynching and the poll-tax.

While the Republican party is traditionally and correctly associated in the minds of most workers with Big Business, Roosevelt is regarded as "the friend of labor." Yet in the past four years under Roosevelt's administration Big Business, through its control of the war production program, has greatly strengthened its monopoly grip on America's productive facilities and resources. It has piled up unprecedented war profits and is now being offered billions worth of government-financed plants, machinery and land developments.

**"LABOR'S FRIEND" AND HIS RECORD** At the same time Roosevelt has dealt one blow after another at the workers. He erased such gains as double-time pay, enforced compulsory arbitration through government agencies, froze wages, permitted anti-strike legislation and broke strikes by fake government seizures. He taxed the needy instead of the greedy. In the light of this record, it can well be asked: what more would the rich have received and what more would the workers have suffered, if a Republican instead of a Democratic "friend of labor" had been in office?

Dewey in fact is trying to steal some of Roosevelt's thunder and exploit the justifiable dissatisfaction of the workers with administration policies by masquerading as a "friend of labor" too. To snare the miners' vote for the Republicans John L. Lewis has even pointed to Dewey's "pro-labor record" as Governor of New York. Who will be fooled by these pretensions? When Dewey points an accusing finger at the "planned confusion" which routs labor's demands through 25 different government agencies, he is speaking to cover up for Big Business. "This policy of delay, delay, and more delay" does not "serve only the New Deal and its political ends," as Dewey tries to make out; it primarily serves the interests of the employers who can thereby hide behind the government in refusing labor's demands.

The presidential race between Roosevelt and Dewey is simply a competition to decide which one of the two capitalist candidates can best deceive and harness the masses in the interests of American imperialism. The veteran Roosevelt seeks a fourth term on the basis of his past performance as chief executive officer of the ruling class. The newcomer Dewey is making his bid for office on the ground that a fresh set of people is required to replace the old worn-out "New Deal" administration.

### BOTH SERVE WALL STREET LOYALLY

So far as the household affairs of the ruling capitalist class are concerned, the matter is not much more important than that of changing chauffeurs.

Such a question can cause considerable controversy among the various members of a millionaire's family and even hard feelings, but it does not decisively affect the family fortunes. Whichever one sits at the wheel will have to carry out both at home and abroad the dictates of the master. If Dewey should succeed Roosevelt in the White House, the main policies of his administration would be no more different from his policies when he succeeded Roosevelt and Lehman as Governor of New York.

The fundamental policies of both parties are determined by the needs of American capitalism, by its program of world conquest, its determination to shackle the workers to the war machine and to make them pay for the costs of its war. This is the iron-bound framework within which both parties and their leading personalities must move and maneuver.

It would, however, be wrong to conclude, because both parties support the big capitalists in all fundamental questions and the big capitalists in turn support them, that there are no differences whatsoever between them. There are considerable differences in the backgrounds, abilities, obsequiousness, characters, etc., of chauffeurs which capitalists take into account when it comes to choosing among them. There are even greater differences among the political parties which serve, or aspire to serve, the ruling capitalist class.

It is necessary to understand the precise nature and limits of the differences between the Republican and Democratic parties. It is not that the Republicans are more "reactionary" or the Democrats more "progressive." This is an illusion entertained by many workers and fostered by the bulk of the labor bureaucracy, the Social Democrats and the Stalinists. Both parties are equally reactionary in their basic positions and policies. It is not that the one is any the less subservient to Big Business or more responsive to the needs of the workers than the other. Both parties are instruments of Big Business opposed to the workers.

### WHAT THE ACTUAL DIFFERENCES ARE

The differences between the Republican and Democratic parties exist on a different level. They spring from the different origins and paths of development of the two parties, with all the consequent differences of tradition, composition, sectional interests, etc., they have accumulated and preserved over the decades. Each of these political machines has its own special interests to promote and uses different techniques and methods of demagoguery to hold various strata of the population under its control.

Classes in society are not homogeneous and neither are the two big class parties. Although, so far as fundamental issues are concerned, big capital rules through the two party system, this is not always done directly or in response to their unanimous commands. Deep conflicts of interest as well as differences of opinion divide the ranks of the capitalists themselves. The numerous factions and cross currents within the ruling circles of the two parties as well as between them reflect these conflicts and differences.

Although the big capitalists are on the whole far more class-conscious than the workers, they are by no means omniscient in judging their own political interests or even the best way of promoting them under the given conditions. Nor are they notably grateful to politicians who have served them best in a difficult situation. The Social Democratic traitors in

Europe who were first used and then cast into the junk pile by the capitalists could give informative lectures on that subject.

The plutocratic Oliver Twists always cry for more with an animal instinct. And they are not a bit squeamish about their methods of getting it. Their ruthless criticism, obstruction and sabotage of the Roosevelt administration—undeterred by the plaintive bleats of the liberals and labor fakers that they were hurting the "war effort"—must be understood as methods of pressure to compel Roosevelt and company to do things their way. It is not an unreasoning "opposition," as the labor fakers represent it. There is a calculated class aim in their apparent madness.

Results have shown that their brutal "opposition," which has put Roosevelt in his place as their servant, has been far more effective than the lackey support the labor leaders offered to Roosevelt as the master. Why should Roosevelt pay for support that he can get for nothing with a mere snap of his fingers?

### INNER PARTY CONFLICTS

These secondary differences manifest themselves not only in the struggles between the two parties but also in the factional contention within them. For example, the differences among the diverse groups which compose the Democratic party were conspicuously demonstrated at the national convention in the clashes over the Vice-Presidential candidate, the plank on discrimination, and above all on the refusal to approve the demands of labor. On all the disputed questions in this convention the big city party bosses like Hague, Flynn and Kelly together with the Jim-Crow Southern Democrats showed that they were really running the party. And Roosevelt aligned himself with the most reactionary forces inside his party.

Even with the gigantic apparatus for deception at their command, Big Business could not long continue to dupe the workers and keep them chained to the two-party system if it were not for their agents in the ranks of the working class. Chief among these are the labor bureaucrats. Instead of exposing the fraudulent character of the two-party setup and organizing an independent class opposition to the capitalist parties on the political field, they do all in their power to perpetuate the political servitude of the workers and they block the road to their political emancipation.

In this election Murray and Hillman, Green and Tobin have surpassed their previous records of capitulation and betrayal. The CIO leaders deliberately launched their Political Action Committee to head off the promising movement in the ranks toward an independent party and have mobilized all the forces and resources of the CIO behind Roosevelt's reelection. Roosevelt in return has not even promised to do anything for the workers. Tobin, who again heads the Labor Division of the Democratic National Committee, has already spent, it is reported, over a million dollars of his union's funds for Roosevelt.

Neither in the trade union nor the political fields have these cowardly bureaucrats policies other than those dictated by Roosevelt. But even the one union leader who has dared oppose Roosevelt and defend the economic positions of the members of his union against employer-administration aggression, John L. Lewis, displays no more independence in the political arena. At the UMW convention after he made an impressive indictment of Roosevelt's policies, Lewis by implication called upon the miners to vote Republican.

Thus the labor bureaucrats have conspired to close the two-

party political trap once again upon the American workers. They confront labor with the choice of remaining captive to the Democratic Party—or crawling back into the Republican swamp. No wonder that so many workers are indifferent to the outcome of the elections.

The entire press has remarked upon "the demonstrated apathy of the voters." For example, the *U. S. News* of Sept. 22 observes: "Neither the speeches of Thomas E. Dewey nor the pictures of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the role of world leader have shaken the public lethargy." The primary reason for this apathy is that increasingly large sections of the people rightly see no decisive difference between the two capitalist parties, their candidates and their claims.

The political situation would today be very different if organized labor had taken the lead in launching a new party opposed to the Democratic and Republican parties of Big Busi-

ness. Armed with a program of class struggle against the policies of the plutocrats, such an independent labor party would not only arouse the enthusiasm and fighting spirit of the workers but it would also enlist the sympathy and support of all those sections of the people who are suffering from the consequences of the capitalist war and disillusioned with the capitalist parties.

The present political task of the advanced workers consists in explaining persistently and patiently to their fellow workers that the formation of such a party is the only way out of the blind alley into which the union bureaucrats have led the labor movement. The presidential campaign must be utilized for this purpose of education around the need for independent class politics. Such an educational campaign cannot promise any miraculous results but it constitutes the indispensable penetration for the inevitable move of the progressive American workers to break with the capitalist two-party system and assert their independence in the political arena.

## Europe In The Sixth War Year

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

In almost all respects the magnitudes involved in the second imperialist world war surpass those in the first. Never before has humanity experienced destruction on so vast a scale. The total result of this total war has meant ruin for Europe, the principal theater of military operations.

Scores of cities, including London, Warsaw, Berlin, Hamburg, Rotterdam, Stalingrad and others equally famous, have been pulverized. Buildings, factories, utilities, mines have been destroyed; highways and railroads blasted. Throughout the countryside crops, fields and livestock have been laid waste.

The civilian population lives precariously amidst these ruins piled upon ruins. With the disruption of communications and transportation one community, one section of the country is cut off from others. Tens of millions have been conscripted for service in the armed forces; millions more have been drafted for labor in foreign lands. It is estimated that there are over twenty million homeless refugees.

The killed, the maimed, the wounded mount into tens of millions. How many no one knows. The majority of the living suffer from extreme hunger and the lack of the most elementary necessities. The war-weary, undernourished, harried masses are without adequate food, clothing and shelter. Epidemics are a constant threat. Disease exacts a fearful toll.

A few facts concerning food, public health and mortality rates in Italy suffice to show the plight of the population. In Rome infant mortality has increased over fourfold. Almost half the babies are dying in their first year. The general mortality rate has almost doubled within the past year.

About 200 out of every 1,000 Romans are said to be infected with tuberculosis; the death rate from this disease in Italy has jumped from 60,000 per year before the war to 200,000.

Before the war the average Italian consumed a daily ration of 2,900 calories. Since the Allied occupation a basic ration of 664 calories daily has been allowed. This is little more than half the number of calories required to maintain normal health. Prolonged undernourishment has produced a general loss of weight among the people.

The situation in France is not much better. Gen. Adolphe Sice of DeGaulle's Ministry for Social Service reports that

the child death rate has gone up 25 percent since before the war. Tuberculosis among the undernourished is rapidly spreading.

The cost of living has increased at least 300 percent since 1939 in France. Three thousand francs represents a good annual wage for a minor official or artisan. One restaurant meal in France today costs anywhere from 200 to 600 francs.

Prices are even higher in Italy. "The Italian with an income of 1,500 to 3,000 lire, which represents a fair average for the lower middle class, might just as well be unemployed as to try to exist on his earnings," says Anne O'Hare McCormick (*New York Times*, August 30).

### Runaway Inflation

Workers' wages have been frozen or increased only a fraction. They remain as frozen under Allied occupation as they were under the Nazis, Mussolini, and Vichy.

Industrial activity has slowed down or come to a dead stop. Production in France is less than 20 percent of normal. During the occupation of these countries by the Nazis that industry continued operation as part of the German war-machine; occupation by the Allies has brought a sharp decline of production. Mass unemployment exists on a gigantic scale among the French and Italian workers. There are over 200,000 unemployed in Rome alone.

Successive occupations and regimes coupled with the costs and consequences of the war have generated runaway inflation. Everything is lacking in Italy today but paper money complained Marcelo Soleri, Minister of the Treasury in the impotent Bonomi cabinet. The Nazis seized the last remnant of the Italian gold reserve. The fascists in the north have been printing ten milliards of banknotes a month. The Allies in the south have been issuing their own paper lire by the millions.

The financial systems of almost all countries on the continent are in chaos. "The money problems looming as an aftermath of this war make those of World War I appear mild by comparison," observes the *U. S. News*, July 7. "Nations on all sides will be bankrupt. Japanese yen and

German marks may be nearly worthless. Many varieties of currency will flood France and other European countries. China is already in a wild inflation. So is Greece."

Amidst these catastrophic conditions, while the entire continent is bleeding to death, with famine, destruction and misery on all sides, the rich, the monopolists, the speculators have been coining money. Correspondents describe the "brilliant" social season in Rome where aristocrats and war-profiteers now entertain Allied officers instead of Nazis and Black Shirts. American corporations in Italy which prospered under Nazi and fascist rule have been returned intact to their owners. Bankers and industrialists accommodate themselves to collaboration with the Allied conquerors as easily as they collaborated with the Germans.

Such is the economic state of Europe after five years of imperialist war. Marx foretold that capitalism left to itself would bring the masses nothing but increasing misery and degradation. Lenin and Trotsky warned the workers of Europe that unless they moved forward along the road of socialist revolution, the capitalist rulers would plunge the continent into barbarism. Today these predictions are becoming converted into the most tragic and terrible realities.

This retrogression of European civilization is noted by capitalist commentators.

"Living conditions were already abnormal in 1940," cables Anne O'Hare McCormick from Rome. "But an observer who left Europe then and returns today feels as if life in the meantime slipped back a hundred years... People accustom themselves to living within a narrow radius, climbing long flights of stairs, cooking and heating with a handful of charcoal in a brazier, sitting in the dark—to living, in short, in medieval fashion surrounded by the broken-down machinery of the twentieth century."

## The Downfall of Fascism

Along with this destruction of the accumulated labor of centuries and of countless lives, much that is rotten is also being destroyed. Among these is the power of fascism, which arose out of decaying monopoly capitalism as the most bestial expression of the destructive forces of imperialism. Mussolini's regime has been shattered; Hitler's is ready for the undertaker; Franco's is next in order.

To perpetuate capitalist rule, the fascists smashed the labor organizations and swept aside all social gains and democratic rights. Having become dictators over the nation, they were inexorably driven onto the path of conquest by the demands of the capitalist cliques they served. While Mussolini had to limit himself to the subjugation of such small and weak countries as Abyssinia and Albania, Hitler set forth to enslave all Europe as a base for a new redivision of the world and its markets.

For a time it appeared that nothing could prevent the fulfillment of German imperialist plans. Through a series of diplomatic and military victories the Nazis seized the entire European continent and began to organize that armed camp into their "new order." These successes of German militarism dazzled a great many people, not only in Europe and in the ruling circles of the other powers, but also in radical circles. Taken in by Hitler's boast that Nazism would rule "for one thousand years" and underestimating both the contradictions in his position and the revolutionary power of the working class, certain renegades from Marxism hastily improvised theories that fascism had ushered in a new form of society ("bureaucratic collectivism," "managerial society," etc.), destined to replace capitalism and bar the road to socialism.

Adapting their ideas in a less thoroughgoing manner to the changed war map of Europe, others contended that Hitler's domination made the revolutionary program and perspectives of the Fourth International "unrealistic" and that the proletarian vanguard had to adopt new tasks and new slogans. Upon examination these "new" programs turned out to be nothing but the motheaten formulas of petty-bourgeois nationalism.

At the height of Hitler's triumphs in June 1940 Leon Trotsky answered the arguments of the renegades and revisionists in one of his last articles: "We Do Not Change Our Course." (*Fourth International*, October 1940). Trotsky pointed out that even in the event of a complete victory over England Hitler would be unable to stabilize his empire in Europe and reap the expected harvest from his conquests:

"National socialism is without any prescription for transforming defeated peoples from foes to friends... One can expect with assurance the rapid transformation of all the conquered countries into powder magazines... It would be a fatal blunder, unworthy of a revolutionary party, to turn Hitler into a fetish, to exaggerate his power, to overlook the objective limits of his successes and conquests."

## Trotsky's Prediction

Subsequent developments have completely confirmed Trotsky's estimate. The Nazis encountered the fiercest resistance from the masses in the occupied countries. But Hitler's greatest mistake flowed from his incapacity to appraise the mighty powers of resistance lodged within the proletarian revolution.

"Hitler, the conqueror, naturally has day-dreams of becoming the chief executioner of the proletarian revolution in any part of Europe. But this does not at all mean that Hitler will be strong enough to deal with the proletarian revolution as he has been able to deal with imperialist democracy," wrote Trotsky.

Hitler found this out when he attacked the Soviet Union. Despite the desecration and degeneration of the Soviet state, despite the initial defeats, the Soviet masses, defending the remaining conquests of the October revolution, proved strong enough in the supreme test on the field of battle to repel the assaults of German imperialism and to hurl the invaders back. These Soviet victories demonstrated that the October revolution was still alive. In dealing blows to the army of German imperialism the Red Army at the same time struck damaging blows to the imperialist system as a whole.

The power of the revolutionary masses was not manifested in the USSR alone. Mussolini also came up against this indomitable power. Two decades after his hangman's crew set out to rescue Italian capitalism by crushing the insurgent workers and peasants, his regime was destroyed by the revolutionary offensive of these same toilers.

If in its initial stages the war acted to deepen the demoralization and apathy of the masses resulting from almost two decades of defeats, then in its later stages the effect of the war has been to rouse them into action against their oppressors. Signs of this mass resurgence appeared in the civil wars that flared in Yugoslavia and Greece; in the resistance movement in Norway; the general strike in Denmark; most recently in the general strike followed by the uprising of more than a million workers in Paris. Recent developments indicate that the greatest of revolutionary explosions is maturing in Germany. These facts provide the revolutionary vanguard with ample assurance of the correctness of its political prognoses and policies to which it so unwaveringly adhered through the black years of reaction.

As Trotsky predicted, the downfall of Nazism will prove

the most catastrophic event of modern history. It will deal a mortal blow to European capitalism. In all countries the peoples know that the fascists were the guardians of capitalist interests; that the ruling possessing classes worked hand in glove with these butchers; that they were jointly responsible for the war and all its murderous fruits. The class antagonisms which created one revolutionary crisis upon another in pre-war Europe and which the fascists sought to suppress are now breaking out in their most acute forms from one end of the continent to the other. Fascism has failed to fulfill one of its proudest boasts, that is, forever to abolish the class struggle.

With the crumbling of fascist power and the threat of the proletarian revolution, the European property owners are seeking a new savior. Having expended their own forces and resources, they have no one else to turn to than the United States. On the European arena American military might is displacing that of Germany.

## Role of U. S. Imperialism

This change of the war map in Europe is in turn breeding a new set of illusions centering around the new would-be master of Europe. To pacify the masses the agents of Anglo-American imperialism and certain sections of the European bourgeoisie are deliberately fostering the myth that the Allies will bring liberation, democracy and security to Europe. The transatlantic Shylock is cast in the part of the rich uncle who will rescue Europe from ruin in the nick of time and lift the war-torn continent to its feet.

This propaganda is pure fiction. American militarism comes not to liberate but to subjugate Europe; not to heal its wounds but to further dismember it; not to invigorate its economy but to keep it impoverished. Anglo-American Big Business does not intend to grant voluntarily the slightest democracy to the European peoples but aims to set up and prop up the most reactionary military-monarchist-clerical dictatorships. Roosevelt and Churchill will not hesitate to suppress with the utmost ruthlessness the revolutionary movements of the European workers.

The real and predatory aims and counter-revolutionary schemes of the Allies have already been disclosed in Italy and France. Upon both these conquered countries the Allied rulers have imposed military-police dictatorships, caricatures of coalition governments, without any mandates from the people. Both the Bonomi and DeGaulle governments rule by decree as agencies of native and Allied imperialism.

Under Allied occupation the living conditions of the peoples have not improved but drastically worsened. Already the hopes of the Italian and French masses that the Allies would help them regain some measure of freedom and security are being dissipated. Their opposition will increase as the Allied program of counter-revolution, plunder and enslavement unfolds in the coming period.

The belief that the Anglo-American powers will be able to consolidate their contemplated conquest of Europe and to permanently hold down the revolutionary proletariat has no more serious a foundation than the previous confidence in Hitler's omnipotence. Roosevelt and Churchill will not succeed where Hitler and Mussolini have failed. It is undeniable that these imperialist forces represent a colossal obstacle to the triumph of the proletarian revolution. But they too are only a relative and not an absolute obstacle. As Trotsky pointed out in the case of Hitler, they also are "without any prescription for transforming defeated peoples from foes to friends. . . . One can expect with assurance the rapid transformation of all the conquered countries into powder magazines . . ."

In fact this process is already taking place in Italy and is fast developing in France. Both these countries are today heading toward a revolutionary crisis of the greatest tension and explosive force.

The history of the last four decades has demonstrated that no imperialist power or combination of powers can solve the basic problems of Europe and save it from decline. Europe has been dragged into the abyss by the outlived system of national states with their customs houses and standing armies and by the intolerable fetter which capitalist property relations place upon its productive forces. American imperialism intends to perpetuate these conditions and even to aggravate them. The unpostponable task is the economic unification of the continent. This can be accomplished only by the revolutionary workers in irreconcilable struggle for the Socialist United States of Europe against the imperialists and all their agents.

The impending downfall of German fascism will find two main class forces confronting each other upon the European continent. One is the camp of imperialist counter-revolution headed by the United States. The other is the camp of the insurgent masses striving for socialism. The outcome of the titanic struggle between these forces will determine the fate of Europe, including the Soviet Union.

## The Class Camps

Many short-sighted individuals believe that with the crushing of German militarism the Soviet Union will emerge so strong that any further menace to its existence will have been indefinitely postponed, if not altogether removed. Through their Teheran propaganda the Stalinists are doing their utmost to disseminate this false impression.

The appearance of unlimited strength does not correspond with the reality of the Soviet Union's position in relation to world imperialism. As a result of the war, the international position of the Soviet Union has not been bettered but worsened. The war has exhausted and devastated the USSR more than any other country.

Thanks to the superiority of nationalized economy and the devotion of the Soviet peoples to the gains of the October revolution, the USSR has been saved from immediate destruction at the hands of the Nazis at the price of incredible sacrifices and sufferings. But the Nazis represent only one detachment of world imperialism. Even before this threat has been beaten off, another appears on the horizon. Over the worker's state stands the ominous shadow of the military and economic power of American imperialism which now bestrides the continent.

Turning its back upon the revolutionary proletariat in the sphere of foreign policy as well as domestic, the Kremlin has staked everything upon its alliances and agreements with the imperialist powers. This course has brought only misfortune upon the Soviet Union. Neither Stalin's kowtowing before the "democracies" nor his pact with Hitler saved the USSR from involvement in the war. On the contrary, the Soviet Union became the principal battleground. By fearing and failing to arouse the masses of Germany to revolt against the Nazis, Stalin prolonged the war; and his chauvinist propaganda against the German people, has greatly helped Hitler in maintaining his regime.

For years the Kremlin's foreign policy was dominated by dread of the coming world war and guided by the effort to escape entanglement in it. Stalin's latest diplomatic maneuvers flow from fear of the consequences of the war. The USSR

has become economically enfeebled. The masses who have sacrificed so much and especially the demobilized soldiers will find their living standards depressed far below the pre-war levels. The Kremlin fears the reaction of the victorious Red soldiers to such conditions. The bureaucracy is well aware of the mortal danger to its power and position that is latent in the growing European revolution. In addition, despite all the public protestations on both sides, the Kremlin is apprehensive of the might of Anglo-American imperialism.

To secure aid against Hitler Stalin allied himself with the Anglo-American imperialists. He hopes to perpetuate this alliance with American imperialism to obtain economic assistance in rebuilding the war-shattered Soviet economy. In return for such aid he has agreed to sell the services of his agents to Anglo-American imperialism and to support their conspiracy to strangle the European revolution.

## Stalin's Allies

Washington and Wall Street have been willing to collaborate with Stalin and make concessions to him in order to promote their own immediate aims. They recognize the value of Stalin's services in helping to defeat the armies of its German imperialist rival, in upholding capitalism in Europe, in seeking to curb and suppress the revolutionary masses. As Rickenbacker and others have frankly stated, they believe that Stalin's regime is moving in the right counter-revolutionary direction within the Soviet Union.

But neither Stalin nor the Anglo-American imperialists trust each other. Stalin knows that when Hitler goes and the Anglo-American imperialists dominate Europe they will constitute a colossal threat to the USSR. Ex-Ambassador Bullitt has already begun to beat the drums for a new anti-Soviet crusade at the instigation of the Vatican and undoubtedly with the approval of a significant section of American capitalism.

The primary source of this anti-Soviet propaganda is the class hatred and hostility of the imperialists toward the worker's state, even in its degenerated form under Stalin. Despite Stalin's counter-revolutionary course and his valuable services to them, the propertied classes will not rest until the USSR is overthrown, nationalized property is abolished, and capitalist relations restored in Russia. This irreconcilable contradiction between world imperialism and the Soviet Union keeps disrupting relations between Washington-London and Moscow and must eventually lead to an open break between them.

To forestall such an eventuality, Stalin seeks guarantees against his allies by constructing a ring of small and "friendly" states around the borders of the USSR, just as he previously tried to protect himself from Hitler by seizing Eastern Poland, the Baltic states, and bases in Finland. While he builds buffers against his allies, he agrees to cooperate with them in their plots against the European revolution.

In Yugoslavia, in Greece, in Italy and in France the agents of the Kremlin have placed themselves at the head of the movements of the insurgent workers and peasants in order to betray and behead their revolutionary struggles. The principal beneficiary of these betrayals have been the old ruling classes and world imperialism: King Peter and his crooked gang in Yugoslavia, King George and his clique in Greece, King Michael and the court camarilla in Rumania, the capitalists in Italy and France.

The victories of the Red Army have given a mighty impulse to the revolution throughout Europe. But the rising proletarian revolution threatens to upset Stalin's alliance with the imperialists and in the subsequent course of its development the

positions of the bureaucracy within the Soviet Union itself. A victorious revolution in any major European country would have enormous repercussions within the USSR and arouse the Soviet masses to struggle against the usurpers. That is why the Kremlin is so terrified of the revolution and is not only willing but anxious to curb and crush the revolutionary actions of the masses.

The Kremlin is the most valuable agency of imperialism in Europe today. Stalinism is the gravest danger within the working class movement to the revolution. But the influence and power of Stalinism is not insuperable. The Stalinists are able to exploit for their own reactionary purposes the victories of the Red Army and the unawareness of the masses that Stalin has long ago betrayed Bolshevism. But the Kremlin cannot indefinitely conceal the truth. The masses will learn through their own experiences the counter-revolutionary nature of Stalinism. This is already beginning to happen in Italy, Greece and Yugoslavia. Marshal Tito has just had to defend the sell-out agreement he recently signed with King Peter's Yugoslav Government-in-exile against what he said was "a lack of understanding from our fighting men and people." It is obvious that the Yugoslav partisan ranks are beginning to understand only too well the meaning of Tito's betrayal.

## The Danger of Stalinism

The entry on September 3 of five Stalinist leaders of the EAM into Premier Papandreou's cabinet of the Greek monarchist government-in-exile is likewise provoking fierce opposition from the Greek partisan ranks. So far as Italy is concerned, the *London Times* correspondent cabled from Rome on August 18 that "Signor Togliatti's step in joining the government has created a crisis among Milan Communists. The views he has publicly expressed are considered to be too conciliatory, and he is accused of having moved too far to the right. Moreover, many Communists do not agree with certain developments of Marshal Stalin's policy and profess reluctance to becoming mere instruments of the Kremlin."

One of the main tasks of the Trotskyist vanguard is to speed this process of liberation from the influence of Stalinism.

What Trotsky said in reference to Hitler in 1940 applies equally well to Stalin in 1944. It would be a fatal blunder, unworthy of a revolutionary party, to turn Stalin "into a fetish, to exaggerate his power, to overlook the objective limits of his successes and conquests."

It is necessary to remember what conditions gave rise to the Stalinist bureaucracy and permitted it to consolidate power. Trotsky pointed out that both Stalinism and fascism had their roots in the same world political conditions:

"In the last analysis, Soviet Bonapartism owes its birth to the belatedness of the world revolution. But in the capitalist countries the same cause gave rise to fascism. We thus arrive at the conclusion, unexpected at first glance, but in reality inevitable, that the crushing of Soviet democracy by an all-powerful bureaucracy and the extermination of bourgeois democracy by fascism were produced by one and the same cause: the dilatoriness of the world proletariat in solving the problems set for it by world history. Stalinism and fascism, in spite of a deep difference in social foundations, are symmetrical phenomena. In many of their features they show a deadly similarity. A victorious revolutionary movement in Europe would immediately shake not only fascism, but Soviet Bonapartism." (*The Revolution Betrayed*, pp. 278-279.)

The conditions in Europe which gave rise both to fascism and Stalinism are quickly vanishing under the onset of the

resurgent masses. The decisive test of the stability of Stalin's totalitarian regime will come in the not too distant future.

As the war enters its sixth year, the entire continent of Europe is entering the road of revolution. The first movements of the masses have pushed to the forefront the Stalinists and the Social Democrats, the traditional mass parties in the European labor movement. These bankrupt and perfidious organizations cannot long remain at the head of the revolutionary workers and peasants. A new leadership will supplant them.

This leadership will come from the vanguard organized around the program and banner of Trotskyism. To the imperialist attempts to perpetuate misery and ruin in Europe,

the Trotskyists counterpose the Socialist United States of Europe, a free federation of the peoples with a socialized economy in which the profit system will be replaced by the cooperation of the toilers.

Bourgeois democracy is completely bankrupt. The only democracy now possible in Europe is proletarian democracy, the system of Soviets, the elected organs of the working people. There is only one road out of slavery, exploitation and misery for the European people—the road of socialist revolution. The victorious socialist revolution will drive all the imperialists from the continent and save the Soviet Union from destruction by overthrowing the Stalinist bureaucracy and restoring worker's democracy. It will clear the way for the regeneration of Europe.

## Whither France?

By DANIEL LOGAN

The swift expulsion of the German armies from France has not been merely the result of the Anglo-American military superiority, but was precipitated by the uprising of the French people. In Paris and in the second largest city of France, Marseille, the masses rose up, took guns into their hands, erected barricades and drove out German troops and French fascists before the arrival of the Allied troops. The action was repeated in many less populated cities. In the countryside, the guerrilla bands, the "maquis" or, as they have been respectably baptized, the French Forces of the Interior (FFI) have taken innumerable towns and villages, whole departments.

### The Uprising of the French Masses

In Paris (information about other cities has been very scarce) the insurrection was preceded by strikes. A railroad strike started as early as August 13. Then the postal workers struck. On the 18th the General Confederation of Labor, the central organization of French trade unions, joined by the Confederation of Christian Workers, called for a general strike. Soon afterwards fighting broke out in the streets.

De Gaulle and the Allied command were taken aback by such an independent intervention of the masses, that they had not called for. On August 26 a correspondent cabled from Algiers to the *New York Times*:

"Local leaders precipitated the uprising and battle in the capital without awaiting the approval of either General De Gaulle or the Allies, who had hoped to avoid that battle."

This is a fairly good account, except that the insurrection was not "precipitated" by a few leaders. It came from the irresistible pressure of large masses.

As soon as the Parisian workers saw that, with the advance of the Allied armies, they had some chance to get rid of the Nazi hangmen, they rose up and fought. They could not wait for the few days until the Allied armies would have arrived. They had to settle their own accounts with the regime that had tormented them for four years. What an example of indomitable energy and independence!

The Paris insurrection was fought by the workers. This is confirmed by *Le Populaire*, organ of the Socialist Party published in Paris. On August 29, writing shortly after the event, it declares:

"To drive away the Nazis, the Parisian workers have known how magnificently to stop all work, to arm themselves and to defend their barricades."

This short description coincides with the picture we can reconstruct here through the press dispatches. Undoubtedly, the Parisian workers carried along with them large strata of the petty bourgeoisie, not only its lower ranks, but also civil servants, students, sons and daughters of bourgeois families. The insurrection, the immediate objective of which was the overthrowing of the German yoke, thus took a "popular" and "unanimous" aspect. With its democratic and patriotic illusions the atmosphere was somewhat reminiscent of that of the 19th century revolutions.

The power fell into the hands of the insurgents. Their military organization, the FFI, which in Paris consists mainly of workers and workers' sons, took over the policing of the city. A correspondent cables from Paris to the *New York Times* on August 31:

"The French Forces of the Interior, which have their share of young hoodlums, have taken over the city."

(Only a journalist who feels more comfortable in reactionary salons than near barricades could call "hoodlums" the Gavroches who fought and died for freedom.) Then he continues:

"Their members [of the FFI] ride around armed with Bren guns, hand grenades and rifles. They guard the entrances and exits of Paris and they allow none but military personnel to pass in or out. It is to them that the people go to denounce collaborationists, and it is to them that people who have endured four years of German occupation look for leadership and direction."

On September 7 another correspondent cables to the same paper, relating how the purge of collaborators is conducted:

"There are now 5,000 internees at Drancy [a town near Paris]. Most of these were taken there by the FFI during the first exciting days of the liberation of Paris."

Similar news came from the provinces. A UP correspondent cables from Rouen on August 30:

"This correspondent saw police loyal to the republic taking orders from the maquis and aiding them openly."

The masses, crushed under despotisms for four years, lifted their heads, now bursting forth with courage and hope. In Paris the president of the Tribunal d'Etat (something like a Supreme Court Justice), who had sent many anti-Nazi fighters to the guillotine, was arrested by his janitor.

The offices and the large printing plant of *Le Matin*, a rightist newspaper that had turned collaborationist, were taken over by the Socialist Party. In the days following the insurrec-

tion the circulation of the workers' newspapers, or rather of the newspapers that the workers consider theirs,—*L'Humanité*, organ of the Stalinist Party, and *Le Populaire*, organ of the Socialist Party,—rose to about ten times the circulation of the bourgeois, mainly Gaullist, press.

What is the situation in the factories, now that the workers have gone back to work, after the fighting? The scarce information about France in the American press is still scarcer on that point. In fact, it would be a complete silence, if it were not for a dispatch from David Anderson to the *New York Times* on September 9, which provides illuminating information.

## Workers Take Over Factories

Mr. Anderson writes:

"Rumors of workers having taken over great industrial establishments in the Paris suburbs, particularly in the 'Red Belt' to the north and west, have been circulating for days. This morning I happened to run into one when visiting the Hispano-Suiza plant in Bois-Colombes on an entirely different matter."

Although rumors of a fact as important as the taking over of great industrial establishments in Paris suburbs had been circulating for days, neither the correspondent nor, it seems, any of his colleagues found it interesting enough to investigate these rumors in order to inform the outside world. The whole situation was revealed to the American readers only because of a visit "on an entirely different matter."

What a commentary upon the objectivity of the bourgeois press! Thousands and thousands of words are written, cabled and printed about the charm of Paris boulevards, but such a fact, big with most important consequences for the future of France, is disclosed to the public only by accident. However, let us thank Mr. Anderson at least for that accident.

On September 9, more than a week after the street fighting has ceased, he writes:

"Committees manned by the rank and file of some of the most important factories in the Paris area are growing in strength daily."

The committees are growing at that time; thus they are obviously not momentary organs of the uprising, but rather a product of it. In fact, they consider future tasks:

"The men serving on them refer to themselves as 'les responsables' and profess to be the forerunners of permanent groups that will represent the workers in the direction of the plants after the war."

What the workers want is control over the production of factories that they keep in motion through their hard and long labor. They have had enough of the uncontrolled dictatorship of the bosses. How can they express their will? It is not clear to them yet:

"They envision an equal three-way division of power among the workers, the technical staffs and the managements."

The bosses will never share power in a permanent way. They may be compelled to do so for a short time when they are threatened with losing everything. But if the threat does not materialize, they will compose their forces, retake power, more dictatorial than ever. A permanent division of power over the factories is impossible. The unlimited power of the boss can be "controlled" permanently in one way: by socializing the factories. Who will do that? The present government? Of course not. Only a workers' government can do it. That is why we have to build such a government.

The first necessary conditions to go along this road are already here: a firm will among the workers not to go back to

the past, a deep contempt for the ruling classes, a great confidence in their forces. That's what the mere existence of the workers' committees means. They will gradually fully understand the implications of their position and draw the revolutionary conclusions. The obstacles will not be lacking, the most dangerous of them being the treacherous policy of the Stalinist Party. But the French workers are on the march.

How did the Hispano-Suiza committee studied by Mr. Anderson come into existence? The plant was producing war material (probably airplanes' engines) for the Germans. And then:

"The company's regular management decamped on August 18 on the eve of the liberation of Paris . . . The Hispano-Suiza management's position can be made clearer when it is pointed out that the heads of many French firms deemed it wise to remain away from their plants until the fever of excitement over liberation had died down and they could explain why valuable aid had been given to the Germans during the occupation."

What a telling story! The excitement over liberation was just too much for "many" capitalists! The bosses' "explanation" had been in the past that the best way to sabotage the German war machine was to produce arms for it. As Mr. Anderson reports:

"This reasoning was not always understood or accepted by most of the employees."

It was so little understood or accepted that, when the German bayonets were about to stop supporting the "explanation," the bosses decamped, probably in search of a better explanation. It must have been hard to find, for by September 9 they had not yet returned with it. It is not too risky to predict, after the Italian experience, that some American official will soon help the unfortunate management to "explain."

The way the committee appeared indicates that national feelings must run quite high among the workers. This is confirmed by the committee's declaration to Mr. Anderson that "the workers are interested solely in producing weapons," apparently for the war against Germany. The word "solely," if correctly reported, is probably a kind of excuse the workers felt obliged to give to an American journalist. But the existence itself of nationalism cannot be doubted. In the present circumstances, with the bosses' subservience to the German masters, this nationalism contributed to the sharpening of the class struggle which led to the taking over of the factories. In other circumstances it can work as a brake on the revolutionary initiative of the workers. It would be dangerous to close our eyes to that.

## The F.F.I.

Mr. Anderson's dispatch is rich in interesting pieces of news. Among others the following:

"The spokesman for the factory . . . insisted on receiving visitors with a half-dozen of his associates, wearing French Forces of the Interior armbands, in attendance."

With the present scarcity of news these few lines represent invaluable information. It shows that workers actually employed at the present time are in the ranks of the FFI, which is extremely important; but still more important is the fact that these workers wear the FFI armbands in their factory, where apparently they are the sole authority. It means that they consider their FFI group not as an alien organization in which they feel uncomfortable,—for in that case these class-conscious workers would hardly have kept their armbands at their place of work,—but as their own organization. It appears thus that certain FFI groups are groups of armed workers; they are, in fact, a workers' militia.

On the character of the FFI organization as a whole, it is difficult to make general statements, in view of the scant information available abroad. Its strength is put by the most conservative estimates at 300,000 men and is certainly quite higher than that. Many of the members belong to the generation that was too young to be taken into the French army in 1940. Stories frequently refer to 17-year-old fighters. The ranks of the FFI are certainly far from being politically or organizationally united. In fact, they look rather like a conglomerate of semi-autonomous groups and bands. Information on what their members think about the future is scarce. A correspondent cables from London to the *New York Times* on August 26:

"The FFI have all the strengths of a people's army and all the weaknesses of a league of non-professional soldiers bound by a holy desire to free France but somewhat divided by the various political, economic and religious dogmas held by its members."

What are these "dogmas"? Probably all kinds, from chauvinistic *revanche* to proletarian socialism. What is the relative strength of the various tendencies? No precise answer to this question is possible from afar. The strongest single tendency is, undoubtedly, the Stalinist, although the movement is far from being in the hands of the Stalinist Party.

On the whole, a leftist spirit must dominate,—a great thirst for freedom, a deep distrust for authority, a complete contempt for the old ruling classes, with their industrialists and bankers compromised by collaboration, a strong desire for something new. For what exactly? These aspirations remained probably until today rather vague, the immediate task having been the struggle for the liberation of the country. But questions that were able to wait for an answer yesterday will now have to be answered soon,—and precisely.

## De Gaulle's Program

De Gaulle's program is, nationally and internationally, the restoration of bourgeois France. Nationally, his first aim is the reestablishment of "law and order." The present objective of De Gaulle is to stifle the uprising against the Nazis and Vichy in the noose of "republican legality",—which, of course, would not prevent the general from using in the future, if need be, the Bonapartist sabre. He now meets the popular opposition to Vichy with a loudly proclaimed loyalty to the Republic. But it remains to be seen if, by calling to his side Jeanneney, senile president of the senile Senate of the senile Third Republic, he can satisfy the aspirations of the masses for liberty.

To the workers, who have suffered so much and fought so heroically, the De Gaulle government has nothing to give, except a few niggardly increases of salaries (when the cost of living has been multiplied by five to ten), which represent the bare minimum of what it was forced to do. To cover up this vacuum it speaks of a "legal revolution" which will bring "social changes" (?) "in the coming years." The hungered and exasperated workers will soon see through such empty promises.

The government speaks of elections,—when the situation will be settled, "in nine months or more." Meanwhile De Gaulle appoints his hand-picked men as prefects in every department, and they intend to rule in the good old bureaucratic way. They will inevitably come into conflict with the organizations which have sprung from the masses, the department committees of liberation, the FFI groups, the committees of the workers who have taken over factories.

The De Gaulle government has already been reorganized a few times in the past three weeks. The meaning of the changes, when seen from afar, is not always clear. Of the ministers

brought from Algiers half a dozen were dismissed to make room for men from the resistance movement in France. From that movement De Gaulle is not, of course, taking into his cabinet the young "hoodlums" who fought with gun in hand. He is picking up "respectable" men, judges or professors, who under Vichy helped the resistance movement with money or otherwise while keeping a bourgeois facade and now think of nothing but of returning as soon as possible to "law and order."

On the whole, the De Gaulle cabinet is composed of personalities of second rank, belonging to the administrative personnel of the Third Republic. One Socialist, not a leader of the party and belonging, it seems, to its extreme right, is now in the cabinet. In Algiers there were two Stalinist ministers. On September 9 one of them was dropped. No reason was given. Three days later it was reported that he had "resigned from the government to agitate freely for the cause."

## Perspectives

The relations between the Stalinists and De Gaulle remain unstable. If such a supposition is permitted, it can be said that, had the government directly sprung out of the uprising and not come from outside, it would have been much farther to the left, probably with a Stalinist and Socialist majority.

The Stalinist Party tries to channel the first deception of the masses into an attack against the "Algiers men", who have kept too many ministerial posts in their hands and not given enough of them to underground leaders of France, that means, to the Stalinists.

The Stalinist influence among the Parisian workers is very great, far outstripping that of the Socialists. In the FFI the party has strong positions. In fact, the Stalinist Party is the strongest organized political force in France. It has avoided outright collaboration with De Gaulle and is, at the present time, in a kind of opposition, which cannot fail to increase its influence.

The resistance movement and the FFI are going toward a quick polarization. The conservative element, whose sole aim was the struggle against the Germans will rapidly separate itself from the proletarian and plebian core, for which the fight against German oppression has been a springboard for a struggle against bourgeois society.

After the first "popular", "unanimous" stage of an uprising is over, a problem inevitably rises up: what to do with the arms that brought victory? Today in France hundreds of thousands (maybe over a million) have arms in their hands. The De Gaulle government cannot tolerate such a situation for long, so fraught with dangers for the bourgeois "law and order." It can do, and is probably attempting to do, two things: either outright disarming the FFI groups or incorporating them into the regular French army. In the second case the question of the discipline would immediately rise up. The FFI elected or chose their own leaders. In the regular army they have to obey officers imposed upon them from above. Conflicts on that point have already sprung up, although American journalists are not too prompt nor too wordy in reporting them.

The problem of disarming the population will occupy a large part of the political arena in the coming period. De Gaulle has certainly not forgotten the story of the Commune: Thiers had come to the conclusion that the disarmament and crushing of the armed Garde Nationale was a necessary preliminary to the restoration of "order." In a night of March he sent one of his generals to seize the cannon of the Garde Nationale parked in Montmartre. The Parisian masses rose up.

De Gaulle has obviously not the force at the present time to imitate Thiers. His first task is the regrouping of the bourgeoisie. He will eliminate its most discredited and hated representatives, soothe its divisions, try to give it back its internal strength and cohesion and an honest face. He needs time. He will postpone elections, postpone answering the urgent problems of the day, postpone everything . . . until the day when the bourgeoisie feels strong enough.

At the right of De Gaulle the bourgeois factions will keep a cautious silence for some time, pushing him forward as their best cover. A Darlan-Giraud adventure is impossible at the present time.

A more and more loudly voiced opposition to De Gaulle will come from his left. A possible variant is an increasing Socialist and Stalinist participation in the cabinet. We may

even see a Stalinist-Socialist cabinet, with De Gaulle relegated to the decorative post of president of the Republic.

Behind De Gaulle there is, of course, the Anglo-American power, with its various arms: food, the hopes that rich America will help economic reconstruction, and, if need be, military force. This power is great and it may for some time slow down the tempo of political developments, but only to make them more dramatic at a later stage. For the French workers are not alone, tomorrow they will have allies throughout all Europe. Their struggle will merge with that of hundreds of millions fighting for their emancipation. Victory will not be easy. But the French workers have made a good start: coming out of the political primitivism of German oppression, they have immediately started to storm capitalist society. The greatest hopes can be theirs.

September 17, 1944.

# Trotsky's Prognosis of Our Epoch

By JOSEPH HANSEN

Marx and Engels, the great founders of scientific socialism, died before the unfolding of the modern and final stage of capitalist development. It therefore remained for the continuators of the Marxist movement, on the basis of the method they had inherited, to analyze and formulate the character and laws of this stage, that of imperialism.

At the beginning of our century this work was begun in the Second International, still a genuine revolutionary movement at the time. In 1909 Karl Kautsky, the acknowledged theoretical leader of the Second International, summed up the Marxist position on the new historical epoch in his pamphlet *The Road to Power (Weg zur Macht)*. In this pamphlet Kautsky affirmed that the relatively "peaceful" period of capitalist development had terminated with the rise to dominance of monopoly capital. Henceforth the contradictions of the capitalist system could become only more and more aggravated, thus precipitating a revolutionary epoch. He declared that it was no longer possible to speak of proletarian revolutions as "premature." He directly connected the then impending first world war with the perspectives of the proletarian revolution. Kautsky branded as "outright betrayal of our cause" the renunciation of all steps leading to the direct revolutionary struggle for power.

This viewpoint was affirmed in the resolutions adopted not only by the German Socialist Party but by the world congresses of the Second International. In particular, on November 24-25, 1912 an Emergency Congress of the Second International was convened at Basle, Switzerland, in connection with the Balkan war which threatened to precipitate the world conflict. The Basle Congress adopted a resolution sharply underscoring the imperialist nature of the impending war, summoned the Socialist movement to a resolute struggle against it, and closed with a warning to the bourgeoisie that the war would inescapably result in the proletarian revolution, which the Second International was presumably pledged to organize and lead to victory.

What happened is a matter of historical record. The first world war broke out. *All the contradictions* were aggravated to the point of actual explosion. It was precisely at this juncture, however, that the leadership of the Second International, with Kautsky in the forefront, betrayed the world

working class. Corroded by opportunism the Second International became transformed into its opposite—from an instrument of the revolution it became the agency of the counter-revolution. Its leaders denied what they had affirmed right up to the actual outbreak of hostilities. Revolution was now declared to be premature. Capitalism was extended unlimited historical credit. "Socialists" undertook the task of salvaging the bankrupt system, and "making it work." National unity was put in place of internationalism and the class struggle. It was a political debacle no one had foreseen. The world working class was temporarily left leaderless.

The task of reconstituting the revolutionary cadres of the proletariat devolved upon a handful of internationalists, first and foremost, Lenin and his co-thinkers who remained true to the program and banner of Marxism. The Marxist teachings developed within the Second International became the heritage of the new, or more correctly, the reconstituted revolutionary movement. Lenin and his co-thinkers preserved, extended and deepened the analysis of the imperialist epoch.

## Lenin's Analysis

Lenin's doctrine may be summed up as follows: With the rise of monopoly capitalism, the system as a whole can head only towards decline. The "peaceful" phase of development lies irrevocably in the past; it has been replaced by an epoch characterized by violence, sudden leaps, catastrophic changes and vast conflicts.

In March 1915 Lenin wrote:

"We are unquestionably living on the borderline between two great epochs, and the historical events of the greatest importance which are occurring before our eyes can be understood only through an analysis, first and foremost, of the objective conditions under which the transition from one epoch to the other is occurring. What is here involved are great historical epochs; in every epoch there are and there will be isolated, partial movements, sometimes marking an advance, sometimes marking a retardation; there have been and there will be various deviations from the average type and the average tempo of movements. We cannot tell just how quickly or successfully the various historical movements of the given epoch will unfold. But we can know and we do know *which class* stands at the center of this or that

epoch, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main peculiarities of the historical background of the given epoch, and so on."

To the question of which class holds the key position in this new epoch, Lenin gave an unequivocal answer—the *proletariat*. Here we have the touchstone that divides Marxism-Leninism from all varieties of revisionism. The distinguishing trait of the opportunists of the Second International as is the case with their latter-day disciples is their exaggeration of the resources and power of the bourgeoisie; the obverse side of this is, of course, the underestimation of the role of the working class, and, above all, of its main historical instrument, the proletarian party. The deserters from Marxism invariably crawl out of their skins to paint up the bankrupt ruling class. A classic example of this in the period of the first world war is Kautsky's invention of a "super-imperialist" capitalism allegedly capable of organizing world peace and of mitigating the contradictions that devour capitalist society.

From the Leninist analysis of the imperialist epoch, it followed that the imperialist war could develop in one direction, and one direction only: that of an immediate revolutionary situation which would pose the question of power point-blank. This perspective appeared to be fantastic to the philistines of the Second International.

Events brought their verification. In the very midst of the first imperialist war, the Czarist empire crashed and the first workers' state was established over one-sixth of the world. As Lenin put it, this world-historic event inaugurated "the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

From the beginning Lenin envisaged the transition from capitalism to socialism ushered in by the October revolution as one of "incredible complexity." A few months after the seizure of power in Russia, in March 1918, in a speech delivered before the Seventh Party Congress Lenin characterized this epoch as:

"... A whole epoch of the most diversified types of war—imperialist wars, civil wars within the respective countries, the intermeshing of the latter with the former, national wars, liberation struggles of nationalities oppressed by the imperialists, wars between the various combinations of imperialist powers... This epoch is the epoch of gigantic catastrophes, of violent mass military decisions, of crises. It has begun, we see it clearly. This is only the beginning."

## Post-War Developments

Such was the background, as Lenin envisaged it, against which the proletarian struggle for power was destined to occur. All of Lenin's basic ideas were subsequently incorporated in the program of the Communist International, organized as the instrument for the conquest of power by the world working class.

Reality proved even more complex than correct theoretical forecasts. Capitalism was able to emerge from the revolutionary crisis in Western Europe only thanks to the treachery of the social chauvinists. The lag in revolutionary developments resulting directly from the absence of a revolutionary party enabled the German bourgeoisie to stabilize itself in 1918. The mobilization of the proletarian vanguard which was initiated only in 1919 by the founding of the Communist International could not keep pace with the swift revolutionary developments during the initial post-war years. As a consequence, open capitalist reaction was able to triumph under Mussolini in Italy in 1922. Then followed the most decisive event of the previous phase of development: in 1923 an exceptional revolutionary situation in Germany was missed.

This led to the isolation of the workers' revolution within the borders of the Soviet Union, and brought about a situation that no one could have predicted: a temporary equilibrium between the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country and the rest of the capitalist world. Within the Soviet Union this temporary and extremely unstable condition permitted processes of degeneration to set in which in the end completely destroyed the Third International as a revolutionary organization.

The revolutionary situation kept unfolding, but the false policies of the leadership turned the most favorable situations into a series of catastrophic defeats. In 1926 the British general strike was smashed. In 1927 the Stalinists policies permitted Chiang Kai-shek to drown the Chinese revolution in blood. In 1928 the vanguard of the world working class headed by Trotsky was deprived of all positions of power and influence, slandered, hounded, exiled, thrown into prison, and the state power in the USSR under Stalin began to swing more and more directly into the orbit of one imperialist power or another. The road was cleared for the triumph of the counter-revolution.

In 1933 Hitler succeeded in taking power without even a defensive struggle on the part of the working class because of the uninterrupted betrayals of the Social Democrats and the Stalinists. Trotsky before the event predicted that such a defeat would set back the proletarian revolution by years, if not decades. To this series of staggering defeats, the traitors of the Second and Third Internationals now added the sidetracking of the French revolutionary movement in 1936-1938. And as the culminating convulsion of this entire period, the Spanish revolution went down, stabbed in the back by Stalin. Thus the events unfolded not along the rising curve of the victorious revolution but along the downward sweep of reaction.

This profound wave of reaction made possible the outbreak of the second world war and extended into the first years of the war up to the downfall of Mussolini. This event may be said to mark the beginning of a new proletarian upswing just as Mussolini's rise twenty-two years previously marked the beginning of worldwide reaction following the first world war.

It was not difficult for superficial thinkers and sophists to draw from the treachery and bankruptcy of the working class leadership the conclusion that the working class itself was incapable of fulfilling its historic mission. This conclusion was invested with a semblance of truth by the way in which the defeats affected the great masses of the proletariat who naturally gave way to profound moods of discouragement, hopelessness, apathy. The masses needed time to recover from the defeats which set back mankind but which have not in the least altered the basic features and the basic forces of our epoch.

We witnessed once again solemn "burials" of Marxism. New classes ("bureaucratic collectivism") were manufactured as coming to the fore to solve the contradictions of capitalism, etc., etc.

The Leninist analysis of the character of our epoch, the decisive class force in it, and the tasks ahead has been preserved, extended and deepened by only one tendency within the working class movement, the Fourth International founded by Leon Trotsky. In its basic aspects the position of the Fourth International remains that of Lenin during the last war and of the Third International in Lenin's lifetime. Abrupt and even cataclysmic changes continue to mark our entire epoch. Far from mitigating, the contradictions of capitalism

grow more and more acute. Capitalism is in its death agony. There is only one way out of this condition of uninterrupted social crisis and that is through the socialist revolution.

In an article written at the outbreak of the second world war, *On Workers' Self-Defense*, Trotsky formulated the basic conception of our movement in a few words:

"Today, at the beginning of the world war, we take as our point of departure, more than ever before, the inevitability and proximity of the proletarian world revolution. This fundamental idea which differentiates the Fourth International from all other labor organizations determines our entire activity..."

The fundamental strategic conception upon which is based all the politics of the Fourth International was summed up by Trotsky in the *Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution*. In this Manifesto it is once again established that the material base of our epoch remains that of imperialism; the only progressive force remains the working class. All the historic conditions for revolution are rapidly being fulfilled *except that of leadership*, i.e., the organization of a political party possessing the will and the ability to take power. Trotsky lists as rapidly maturing these key conditions:

"1) The bourgeois impasse and the resulting confusion of the ruling class; 2) the sharp dissatisfaction and the striving towards decisive changes in the ranks of the petty-bourgeoisie without whose support the big bourgeoisie cannot maintain itself; 3) the consciousness of the intolerable situation and the readiness for revolutionary actions in the ranks of the proletariat."

In answer to the arguments of petty bourgeois cynics that the masses are not ready or willing to move toward revolution, Trotsky had this to say:

"Today almost nothing remains of the democratic and pacifist illusions. The peoples are suffering the present war without any longer believing in it, without expecting anything more from it than new chains. This applies also to the totalitarian states. The older generation of the workers who bore on their backs the burden of the first imperialist war and who have not forgotten its lessons are still far from eliminated from the arena. In the ears of the next to the oldest generation, which went to school during war time, the false slogans of patriotism and pacifism are still ringing. The inestimable experience of these strata who are now crushed by the weight of the war machine will reveal itself in full force when the war compels the tolling masses to come out openly against their governments."

It is in the light of these facts that Trotsky reached his conclusion that the masses are far more ready for decisive action in the course of this war than they were in 1914-1918. Indeed, he declared specifically in the same Manifesto:

"Those great tasks which only yesterday seemed long years, if not decades away, can loom up directly before us in the next two or three years, and even sooner."

One might expect that Trotsky would accordingly have outlined for his followers a program based on expectations of early or easy rise to power. He does precisely the opposite. He warns:

"It is necessary to prepare for long years, if not decades, of war, uprisings, brief interludes of truce, new wars and new uprisings. A young revolutionary party must base itself on this perspective."

In Trotsky's eyes the grave danger in the period which we have already entered was not that the proletariat would fail to take the path of revolution, but that the initial battles for power would occur before a leadership had been consolidated capable of holding power. "This or that uprising may

end and surely will end in defeat owing to the immaturity of the revolutionary leadership." Despite such possible and even probable initial set-backs, Trotsky expected the unfolding events to provide the young revolutionary party "with enough opportunities and possibilities to test itself, to accumulate experience and to mature." He emphasizes: "It is not a question of a single uprising. It is a question of an entire revolutionary epoch."

In connection with the inevitability and proximity of the proletarian revolution Trotsky thus underscores that the central problem facing the working class is the organization of the revolutionary political party:

"The conclusion is a simple one! It is necessary to carry on the work of educating and organizing the proletarian vanguard with tenfold energy."

## The Central Task

The outbreak of the proletarian revolution, or more correctly, its extension beyond the boundaries of the Soviet Union has been delayed by more than two decades of reaction, the final link of which is the second world slaughter which has already lasted more than five years. It took slightly longer than Trotsky had originally calculated (two or three years) for the masses to overcome the effects of the previous defeats.

Still another cause for the delay of the revolution is the role of Stalinism. During the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact, which gave Hitler an opportunity to secure his western front while preparing for the colossal invasion eastward, Stalin provided political support to the Axis. After the invasion he provided political support to the Allied imperialists. The prestige of the Soviet Union was thus utilized to divert the workers from espousing the historic interests of their own class and to betray them into supporting the cause of their mortal enemy, the bourgeoisie. Under different conditions, the Stalinists have repeated the role played by the Social Democrats in the last war. Today, instead of calling for the socialist revolution, Stalinism is doing its utmost to prevent it, and is organizing its murder squads to try to crush and stifle it wherever it might flare up. Rather than call upon the German workers to revolt—workers who have been dragooned into Hitler's armies—rather than offer them a program of uniting to organize the Socialist United States of Europe, Stalinism simply labels them along with the rest of the German people "beasts" and utilizes its entire state power and the prestige of all the military victories of the Red Army to prevent them from finding the path to socialism.

But the final effect of the delay in the proletarian revolution will be to make its outbreak far more profound and sweeping from the very outset.

The entire continent of Europe is now seething. Events in Italy, France and in the Balkans have demonstrated already that the masses, first and foremost, the workers are evincing a growing capacity for self-action.

More than 20 million people in Europe have been torn from their homes, driven over the face of the continent. Nationalities have been thoroughly mixed. Millions have been herded into armies; other millions have been forced into factories. Europe today is a vast melting pot. Into this melting pot, the Allies are pouring a steady stream of high explosives. The iron hoops of Nazism are beginning to crack. The pressures generating are enormous. When the explosion finally occurs its violence will be unprecedented in history. Under these conditions the task of creating the revolutionary party can be greatly facilitated and expedited.

We have already entered the first stages of the second revolutionary wave in the epoch of imperialism. This time it will sweep across Europe, shattering everything in its path, state barriers, the monopolistic cliques, the assassin regime of Stalin, the social democratic and liberal fossils—all these will be swept aside. The revolution will reach the Far East

with incredible speed, raising to their feet the overwhelming majority of oppressed mankind. Led by the workers of the world they will end forever the monstrous barbarism of capitalism in its death agony.

History will then demonstrate the profundity of Trotsky's insight and the correctness of his program.

## Persecution of the Trotskyists in Uruguay

In their ferocious campaigns of repression against the labor movement the capitalist rulers in one country after another have singled out the Trotskyists for their first attacks. The Trotskyists are first in the line of fire because they are the spearhead of militant resistance to the developing reaction. The strategy of the governmental agents of capitalism is to strike at the extreme left wing of the labor movement in order to behead its vanguard. If these initial attempts prove successful, they can then move forward in frontal assault against the rest of the working class.

This plan of action has already been put into effect by the Roosevelt and Churchill governments of Big Business in their frameup and imprisonment of the Trotskyist leaders in the United States and England. It has recently been deliberately imported into the South American republic of Uruguay by the capitalist regime there.

Following a large scale strike at the Swift packing-plant, National Frigorifico, the Uruguayan government issued an executive decree declaring this privately owned plant to be a "public service." Under Article 165 of the Penal Code any strike by the workers in such a "public service" industry would make them liable to penalties of from three to eighteen months' imprisonment. The resemblance of this law to the Smith-Connally Act in the United States and similar anti-strike legislation in England is manifest.

This decree was the subject of a violent debate in the Chamber of Deputies of Uruguay which began on June 9 and continued in the sessions of June 13, 14 and 15. Deputy Cardozo of the Socialist Party spoke against the decree as an attack upon the elementary rights of the workers to defend their living standards.

In reply to the questions put by Cardozo, the Minister of the Interior tried to shield the repressive anti-labor actions of his government by raising the smoke-screen of a "Red Scare." He launched the most venomous accusations against the Trotskyists for their "agitation" among the workers. At the same time he was careful to exonerate the Stalinists, and also the Social Democrats, from all connection with the strike movement. The two Stalinist deputies, in accordance with the scabby role of the Stalinists everywhere, joined in this reactionary attempt to slander and discredit the Trotskyist movement. They went so far as to divulge the names of the members of the movement and to demand severe punishment for these working class leaders as "traitors." It is reliably reported that the Stalinists had a hand in instigating the Minister's attack and in providing him with the libels and misinformaton in his speech.

That the Minister's action was part of the world-wide slander campaign against the Trotskyist movement undertaken by the Stalinist apparatus in conjunction with the persecutions of the capitalist class is apparent from the nature of his charges.

"This preaching," the Minister declared, "which has appeared in our country is not produced solely in Uruguay. That preaching has appeared at the same time in Great Britain, in the United States, in South Africa and in our own country."

He then referred to the police raids upon the headquarters of the Trotskyist Revolutionary Communist Party in London which preceded the arrest of four British Trotskyist leaders last spring. They were convicted in connection with the strikes of the miners and of the engineering apprentices on the Tyneside. They were the first to be prosecuted and imprisoned under the vicious Trade Disputes Act of 1927.

The Minister then proceeded to call attention to the activities of the American Trotskyists and to accuse them also of "treason against the efforts of the United Nations" by provoking internal social strife. "They are dangerous," he said, "because of their intelligence and of their extraordinary activity carried on in the U. S. trade unions and because with their aggressive language they appear at the head of the workers' actions, provoking and encouraging strikes. They oppose any agreement with the bosses and denounce all reformist politics."

Waving two copies of the Uruguay Trotskyist paper *Contra la Corriente* (Against the Stream) for all the deputies to see, the Minister shouted:

"These people are already amongst us... In our midst they say that this is actually an imperialist war; that the working class must not believe in the vote; they malign parliamentarism; they say that the victories of justice be supplanted by the social tragedy of direct revolutionary action."

This minister of a capitalist government believes it is a crime to call the imperialist war by its true name. He has the impudence to picture himself as a defender of parliamentary democracy against the Trotskyists immediately after he has deprived workers of their democratic right to strike! Such is his idea of "the victories of justice."

The Uruguayan Trotskyists, the Revolutionary Workers League, met this reactionary attack upon them and the entire labor movement with a vigorous counter-campaign. Through their press, through leaflets circulated among the workers, and through an open letter addressed to Dr. Cardozo they refuted the base slanders of the Minister and pointed out to the workers that the attacks against them were an integral part of the anti-labor offensive of the bosses.

"WORKERS OF URUGUAY: once again we warn of the danger confronting our trade union liberties, our democratic rights and the workers' organizations," declared the leaflet. "And only the workers by their own efforts will be able to save them. It is necessary to take heed in time before the bourgeoisie binds the working class completely with its laws and decrees.

"Form a class united front to defend the right to strike and trade union liberties!

"Demand that every union mobilize in defense of those liberties and that it initiate a campaign together with the other workers' organizations against the repression of the workers' movement!"

In their open letter addressed to the interpellating Socialist Party deputy, Dr. Cardozo, the Revolutionary Workers League pointed out that the Minister of the Interior "is trying to abuse our revolutionary movement in order to dictate restrictive measures against the liberties of the trade unions. Denouncing our official organ *Contra la Corriente*, distorting our principles, he wishes to show that all the conflicts which have recently taken place between capital and labor are the result of our provocation."

"During all of historical development," the letter continues, "we observe how behind the mask of provocation, attempts have been made to disfigure ideas of social progress. The idea itself, its real content, is not attacked, but rather those who propagate it are attacked as professional agitators, as provocateurs of artificial conflicts in order to disturb the public order."

The Trotskyists affirm that they are genuine communists and sharply distinguish themselves from the Stalinist traitors to communism.

"We are not professional agitators, nor provocateurs, but rather propagandists of the communist principles, that is of the revolutionary ideas forged by the greatest minds of history: Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. *It is impossible to find one single act of ours that departs from the scientific and political line established by them...*

"For that reason we disavow also all the maneuvers of the so-called Communist Party, which having departed from the scientific and political line of the teachers of socialism, try to stop us from propagating it, slander us, revile us and attribute to us all the elements expelled from their completely putrefying ranks... Let the Minister of the Interior leave these calculated slanders alone and attack our real principles and our real activities."

In reply to the false accusation of the Minister that the Trotskyists advocate strikes as "revolutionary exercise," the Revolutionary Workers League explains that since "we consider the strike as the only arm that the workers possess to obtain their transitional demands, we consequently advise them to defend this fundamental right by all possible means... As revolutionists we understand perfectly well that any conflict between capital and labor which is *artificially* provoked leads *only* to the demoralization of the workers and the destruction of their trade union organizations. Are we the ones who provoked the recent strikes? Or are the economic conditions the cause, the low wages and the high cost of living that drove the workers into action? As proof, we call attention to the fact that the recent strike struggles were led not by us but by the UGT (the regular trade union organization.)"

The capitalist minister had alleged that the Revolutionary Workers League opposed the use of the ballot and renounced participation in parliament. The Trotskyists presented the following exposition of their real position:

"As Marxists we know perfectly well that 'all class struggle is a political struggle', and consequently that the workers must acquire their political consciousness. Why, then, should we try to destroy the only arms we have, the democratic rights with which the proletariat can acquire consciousness and prepare itself for the next great task which history gives it: forging the socialist society?"

The letter goes on to show that this socialist revolution of the working class is rendered necessary and inevitable by the fact that

"the capitalist system has become too narrow to hold the

riches created within itself... How to carry out this transformation? What methods to use? That does not depend upon us but upon the old society which is opposed to the change. If it will permit a peaceful change, why use other methods? But just as feudal society did not abandon the arena of history except through the profoundly violent methods which the bourgeoisie used to fulfill its historic mission, we believe that the latter will not abandon its privileges and will not permit the proletariat to construct the socialist society except by means of social revolution."

The Trotskyists do not at all deny the fact that they consider the present war imperialist in character:

"Because all the countries that participate in it *except for the Soviet Union*, do so for imperialist interests. This war will be really and truly for democracy only when the people take into their own hands the conduct of the war. Does this policy favor a victory of Hitler? We defy anyone to show us one single act of ours that has favored the development of Nazism. No one desires the defeat of Hitler as we do and since 1930 Trotskyism has been the only force that warned of the Nazi danger, while the British and Yankee capitalists supported the economic development of Nazism."

"No one knows more than ourselves what the barbaric Nazi regime means for the workers' movement, with its destruction of all the trade union organizations, its complete subjugation of the working class, with the impossibility of spreading Marxist doctrines and the persecution of all its defenders. How then could we favor the triumph of Nazism? Only malicious slander could impute such an aim to us."

In Uruguay, as elsewhere, the Trotskyists are demonstrating in action that the only effective method of beating back the anti-labor offensive of the capitalist government and the slanders of the Stalinists is to redouble their political struggle in the very face of persecution. An unflinching fight in defense of the threatened rights of labor and the ideas of socialism will pave the way for the inevitable offensive of the workers against their oppressors, exploiters and misleaders.

### "The History of American Trotskyism" A New Important Book

AN IMPORTANT NEW BOOK BY J. P. CANNON

A publishing event of importance is the appearance this month of *The History of American Trotskyism*,\* by James P. Cannon. Although Trotskyism has existed in America since 1928, Cannon's book is the first history that has been written of its development. It should thus prove of unusual interest to the entire labor movement.

Cannon traces the rise of Trotskyism from its first beginnings in the Communist Party, carrying his story back to the days of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. He reveals the true story of the factional struggles that kept the Communist Party in turmoil in its early days. Others have dwelt on these struggles, but their reports have been without exception biased, one-sided, and even factually distorted. As one of the outstanding leaders of the Communist Party of those days, Cannon was in position to know the truth.

From 1928, when the followers of Leon Trotsky were expelled from the Communist Party, Cannon traces the development of Trotskyism as an independent movement. He recounts

\* *The History of American Trotskyism*, "Report of a Participant," by James P. Cannon, Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. 268 pp. \$2.75 cloth bound. \$2.00 paper bound.

the trials and tribulations of the early days when it seemed that surely the tiny movement would go down under the combined blows of Stalinist gangsters, competing working class parties, and capitalist reaction. The story of the "three generals without an army" who set out to organize a revolutionary movement to overthrow the capitalist system constitutes one of the inspiring sagas of the American labor movement.

**LESSONS OF THE STRIKE STRUGGLES SUMMARIZED** The role of Trotskyism in the great strike struggles of the past decade is likewise carefully analyzed. The strikes of food workers, truck drivers, maritime workers, auto workers—Cannon recounts the Trotskyist connection with all these mighty battles of the working class. No militant can afford to ignore the lessons summed up by Cannon as a result of the participation of the Trotskyists in those struggles.

The history also follows the complicated path of the Trotskyists in fusing with other political groups and splitting with elements that proved unassimilable. Many names of once prom-

inent radicals appear in these pages. Cannon deals with all of them fairly, considerably and truthfully. Cannon's book in fact constitutes a roster of the leading figures of the American radical movement of the past quarter century. His judgment of their roles will undoubtedly carry weight with future historians who finally sum up this period of American labor politics.

For the world movement of Trotskyism, the history will undoubtedly be added to the standard list of textbooks. The experiences of the American Trotskyists, who forged successfully to the forefront as the only party in the United States truly representative of Marxism, will prove instructive to revolutionists everywhere.

Written in the form of a series of lectures, the history is colloquial and extremely readable. Workers first becoming acquainted with labor politics will find the book fascinating reading.

In making this history available to the labor movement, Pioneer Publishers are to be congratulated as having passed another milestone in their publishing program.

## The Mexican Revolution of 1910

**ZAPATA, THE UNCONQUERABLE**, by Edgcomb Pinchon, Doubleday, Doran & Co., New York, 1941. 332 + X. \$3.00.

\* \* \*

The story of Emiliano Zapata and of his role in the Mexican Revolution of 1910 has been brilliantly told by Edgcomb Pinchon, under the title of *Zapata, the Unconquerable*.

Pinchon spent one year in field research in Zapata's native state. He also had for reference three biographical sketches of Zapata written by men who had served for several years in Zapata's Liberator Army of the South, as well as a script prepared especially for him by Colonel Serafin Robles, who was Zapata's personal secretary for seven years.

Because of this research and this wealth of information about Zapata's personal life, it may be safely assumed that the liberty the author has taken on constructing conversation and depicting the inner workings of Zapata's mind has not caused him to stray from the truth. Certainly this account of important revolutionary events has lost nothing because of the novelistic technique employed.

The characters are brilliantly portrayed. There is Porfirio Diaz, for forty years Dictator-President of Mexico. As "the Father of his People," Padre to the Indios, he sheds sentimental tears over his humble origin and early revolutionary struggles. As "the Strong Man of Mexico," he sheds no tears for the "massacre of some thirty thousand men, women and children in the Valley of Papantla so that room might be made for land speculators; nor for the two freight train-loads of millworkers, the dead and not yet dead, dumped to the sharks of Vera Cruz Bay for asking a few centavos more pay; nor for the newspapermen gone mad in the undersea dungeons of San Juan de Ulua."

There is Francisco Madero, liberal reformist politician, who in 1910 boldly campaigns for the presidency with a program of demands for constitutional government, social reform, and the restoration of the village lands to the agrarian masses. He is supported on the one hand by the bourgeoisie, who desire a constitutional democracy and a modern "business" administration, and on the other hand by the desperate, dispossessed masses of Mexico, who see in him a savior.

There are the famous military men; Huerta, Obregon, Carranza—ruthlessly unconcerned for the welfare of the Mexican masses.

There are the loyal Zapatistas—villagers, farmers, a few scholars and intellectuals, completely devoted to Zapata and the Revolution.

There is Pancho Villa, blustering conqueror of the North, loyal Maderista, who with Zapata was master of Mexico and let the power slip through his fingers.

But towering above all others, there is Zapata, the Unconquerable, who in the words of his biographer, was "for nine years the unconquered leader not of an army but of a people in arms." Incorruptible, uncompromising revolutionary, Zapata's spirit and personality dominate the whole book. His singleness of purpose makes him an inspiration to his people. He burns always with the same intense passion to secure for his people *Tierra y Libertad!*—Land and Liberty!

### Historical Background

What was Zapata's heritage? What events in Mexico's history culminated in the revolution of 1910?

Mexico's independence from Spain had been achieved in 1821 after 11 years of struggle. The first independence movements were agrarian uprisings, led by the patriot priests, Hidalgo and Morelos, for whom Zapata's home state was named.

The rebellions led by Hidalgo and Morelos were opposed by the sons of the Spanish Conquistadores and the reactionary Mexican clergy because their interests lay in the protection of the Spanish Crown. But in 1820, during the short-lived triumph of the liberal constitutionalists in Spain, the Mexican clergy and landowners did an about-face and joined forces with the movement for Mexican independence. They feared a liberal Spain might institute constitutional reforms in their own territory.

The revolutionary upsurge of Mexico's landless peasantry and the movement for national independence were thus diverted by the reactionary forces of the Church and the feudal barons and utilized as a means of perpetuating their own feudal regime.

The establishment of the Republic of Mexico brought no change for the masses of Mexico. Chattel slavery was formally abolished, but debt slavery took its place. Serfdom was succeeded by peonage. The hacendados (landlords) paid their peons at a rate below the subsistence level. The difference between the wage paid and the amount required to sustain life was entered on the hacendado's books, and this debt load passed from the backs of the fathers to the backs of the sons. The law supported the hacendado. A debt slave who attempted to escape could be brought back and whipped to death.

Such was Mexico of 1821. The next half-century saw Mexico the scene of about fifty revolutionary uprisings. Some of the struggles were the sporadic revolts of desperate peons, and some were led by bourgeois radicals, attempting to destroy the semi-feudal system, which was strangling the development of their class as surely as it was reducing the peasants to starvation.

The outstanding figure of this period, during which Mexico was invaded by troops from England, the United States, Spain, and France, was Benito Juarez, a pure-blooded Indian. Juarez led the reform movement to power and as president separated Church from State and began distributing the land among the peasants.

Shortly after Juarez' untimely death in 1872, General Porfirio Diaz, erstwhile revolutionary fighter under Juarez, made a pact with American interests, drove the legally elected president, Tejada, from office, and established himself as dictator-president of Mexico.

## Mexico under Diaz

Foreign financiers and industrialists congratulated themselves and the Mexican people each term that Diaz succeeded himself in office. Mexico had found her Strong Man. Mexico was now a safe place to do business. The Mexican government had secured huge loans from German and other European capital. The Diaz regime had suspended the constitutional provisions which had reserved the subsoil resources as the property of the Mexican nation.

English and American capital owned the railroads. English and American capital owned the oil wells. American interests owned 90 percent of the mines, Mexico's most important industry. American money had swallowed up plantations of cotton, sugar, timber, and vast cattle ranches. William Randolph Hearst, for example, owned thousands of acres of Mexican land.

The foreigners enjoyed extra-territorial privileges: tax-free concessions, customs-free machinery, right of way in the courts—the foreigner was *always* right. But topping all these privileges was the guarantee of cheap labor, obedient and long suffering.

The Diaz cabinet was composed of elderly scholars and gentlemen, Los Cientificos, the scientists, who believed the true science of government was to nourish business. The governors of the states were chosen personally by Diaz from among the big landowners and business men. Each governor was in his own state a dictator with a well-organized police machinery to take care of people suspected of having dangerous thoughts. The towns were ruled by political chiefs who were chosen by the governors, subject to the approval of Dictator Diaz. Mexico's roads were patrolled by rurales, agents of law and order, who combined with their more humdrum duties the kidnapping of villagers and peasants for service in the army, or for shipment to the tropics at 25 pesos a head.

The Diaz standard for the Indian masses was *pan y palo*, bread and the club. "Let them work and keep the peace." It was Mexico's misfortune, said Los Cientificos, to be saddled with such a burden—more than 85 percent of the population illiterate, and what was worse, more than 75 percent were nearly pure-blooded Indians. What a misfortune that the Spanish Conquistadores had allowed so many of the Indian creatures to live and propagate! How much wiser had been the Indian policy of the United States! How could such lowly beings claim any participation in government? Destiny had marked *them* for slaves.

All was glitter and brilliance at the top. Lavish entertainments were daily occurrences. The Porfirian Peace seemed destined to last forever.

But in the minds of the Indian masses, the hatred of centuries was smoldering. They had been driven off their ancient communal lands and herded to work on the big plantations or in the factories, sometimes being driven by armed riders. At night, on some estates, they were chained to their miserable little cabins.

Occasional strikes and small rebellions were ruthlessly put down by troops, Mexican and American. Newspapermen indiscreet enough to report the incidents truthfully were thrown into dungeons.

In 1908, there was a planned, well-organized strike—put down with much bloodshed—at the Rio Blanco Textile works, which was owned by German and Spanish capital. The strike was directed by two exiles living across the border in St. Louis. They were two brothers, Enrique and Ricardo Magon. They published and smuggled across the border a little revolutionary weekly called *Regeneracion*. *Regeneracion* was the voice of the revolutionary junta of the Mexican Liberal Party, which had been crushed by Diaz. The junta had fled across the border into St. Louis and there, living a hand-to-mouth existence, continued their revolutionary activity.

It was a copy of *Regeneracion* which crystallized Zapata's rebellious thoughts into the slogans, *Viva La Revolucion! Viva Tierra y Libertad!*—Long Live the Revolution! For Land and Liberty!

Zapata set about organizing a secret revolutionary group. Other similar groups were being organized in other villages, in other states, and even in Mexico City itself. Zapata attended a meeting of the group in Mexico City, which was composed of liberal lawyers, writers, teachers and students.

\* \* \*

## 1910 Events

The year 1910 marked the one hundredth anniversary of Mexico's independence. Preparations were made for the gala celebration that was to last the entire month of September. Distinguished guests from all the important nations of the world were invited to attend, at the expense of the Mexican government. The culture and prosperity of Mexico were to be displayed for all the world to see—and no expense spared. Indians and peasants were forbidden to use the central thoroughfares, lest their poverty strike a jarring note and offend the sensibilities of the foreign elite.

As part of the Centennial celebration, Porfirio Diaz had for the first time permitted the formation of opposition political parties and announced that there would be free elections. The old Dictator wasn't worried about any serious opposition and the campaign would bring his enemies out in the open to be picked off by various Porfirian methods.

Zapata's little group of revolutionaries plunged boldly into

the electoral campaign. Zapata said they would take the old Dictator at his word and rouse the people to use their ballots.

"We'll rouse up the people to such a hope and enthusiasm that if he goes back on his word, then overnight the state will be in arms... Since we can't be sure ourselves that Don Porfirio is just playing a trick, we ought not to take the heart out of the people by telling them that it is... They must believe sincerely that the doors are opening; they must be encouraged to march to the polls to the last man. And we shall not be fooling them, because it is our determination that the doors shall be opened. If we find we cannot open them with ballots, then, por Dios! we will open them with bullets..."

In the northern part of Mexico, the liberal son of a wealthy hacendado had published a sensational book, *The Presidential Succession*, an expose of the Diaz administration, and had organized a new opposition party under the name of "Anti-Re-electionist Party." He was Francisco Innocente Madero, a liberal lawyer, spiritualist, vegetarian, experimenter in cooperatives. It was said that he was dissipating his portion of the Madero estates in the interests of the Mexican people.

Liberals and revolutionaries of all shades flocked to the banner of Madero, who demanded constitutional government, social reforms, and the return of the village lands to the people.

Madero's campaign was too successful. He was thrown into jail and the Maderistas were driven underground. Madero escaped and fled across the border, where he continued his activities.

So! The old Dictator was going back on his word...

Little bands were gathering and becoming bigger bands—Maderistas. In the North the rebels were led by Pancho Villa and Venustiano Carranza; in the South, by Emiliano Zapata. In Zapata's home state, the Morelenses were responding to the staccato roar of the teponaztli, long-forbidden drum of war.

The armies of Carranza and Villa were backed by the Constitutionals of the North, the Mexican middlemen, who wanted to break up the American monopoly and let the Mexican business men and industrialists have a chance. Madero was their man.

Zapata's army was the Liberator Army of the South. They fought only for land and liberty. Madero was their man, too. Wasn't he demanding the restoration of the village lands?

The Maderistas were guerrillas. They had no supply line, no real organization. They provided themselves with supplies and ammunition as they went along. The armies of Villa and Carranza were, of course, much better equipped than the Zapatistas. Some of Villa's and Carranza's men even wore uniforms. The Zapatistas wore their simple peasant garb, or like Zapata, the flashy costume of the rodeo rider.

Both armies took along their women, even whole families. The women looked after the wounded, cooked and foraged for food. The women fought too. If a woman's husband fell in battle, she had the right to take his equipment and replace him on the field.

The foreign capitalists were frantic. This revolution was very bad for their business. And who could tell how far it would go? American troops stood menacingly at the border. Diaz sent messengers with orders to make some deal that would prevent trouble with the United States and stop the flight of foreign capital.

A provisional government was agreed upon. Diaz was to be out. One of his reactionary appointees, Francisco de la

Barra, Mexican ambassador to Washington, would head a cabinet composed partly of Maderistas and partly of Diaz men. The provisional government was to function for a year, call elections, and demobilize the revolutionaries.

In the first free elections ever held in Mexico, Francisco Madero was elected president. Madero, the compromiser, pursued a policy of attempting to reconcile his enemies rather than supporting his friends. The land, the wealth, and the power remained in the hands of the hacendados and the foreigners. Madero, the mild idealist, was caught between the demands of the foreign investors for damages for property and life lost during the Revolution, and the demands of the peasants for the land he had promised them. Seemingly without his volition, Madero's policies constituted a monstrous betrayal of the humble folk who had put him in office.

Madero was president. The Revolution had gone far enough for the time being. Order must be restored. Nothing must be done too hurriedly. The division of the land would have to wait. The Zapatistas waited, still armed. They were for the distribution of the land now. What else had they been fighting for?

Trouble broke out. Disgruntled generals rebelled. The Federal troops attacked the Zapatistas. Madero was helpless, irresolute. He praised the Federal troops for trying to maintain order and explained to Zapata that he had to avoid the appearance of seeming to favor the radical elements.

Violent struggles continued. Just 15 months after Madero had taken office, the reactionary general, Huerta, was escorted to the Presidential Chair by the American Ambassador to Mexico, Henry Lane Wilson. Madero had been murdered as a part of Huerta's plot. Big Business heaved a sigh of relief. In President Huerta, Mexico had another Strong Man.

But the Revolution was not finished. Four great guerrilla chieftains, Carranza, Villa, Obregon, and Zapata, united in a common drive against their common enemy, Huerta.

## Plan de Ayala

Zapata operated in complete independence of the other revolutionaries. His slogan of Land and Liberty meant land and liberty now—and direct action to get it. Zapata's formal revolutionary program, the Plan de Ayala, instructed the villagers to enter upon the lands they had lost and to hold them by force of arms. Those who had proof of ancient titles were to take their own lands. For the benefit of those who had no proof of title, one third of all the hacendados' land was to be immediately confiscated and divided. Wherever an hacendado should resist, his entire estate was to be confiscated and used to support the Revolution and the widows and orphans of the revolutionaries.

The Plan de Ayala, named for the mountain meeting place of Zapata's men, invoked "the precedent and procedure previously established by Benito Juarez and the Revolutionary Congress under like circumstances."

It condemned as traitors all those military chieftains who arose at the call of Madero to "shed the blood of their brothers who still dare to demand the fulfillment of the promises made by Francisco Madero."

It called for a council of revolutionary chieftains who would, upon the triumph of the Revolution, "appoint an interim president of the Republic, with power to call an election of the true representatives of the people for the purpose of casting the demands of this plan into permanent form."

\* \* \*

Within a year, the forces of the four guerrilla chieftains,

who were all popularly called Constitutionalists, had wiped out Huerta's Federal troops and marched into the Capital.

Carranza, who during the campaign had given himself the title of First Chief, declared that the Revolution was over and that he, as Supreme Chief, would restore order and prosperity to Mexico. Elections would be held soon, but meanwhile the fighters could start turning in their guns and go back to work. "The lawless elements who had moved in on the haciendas would have to get out and settle their grievances in court. Industrial workers who had been calling strikes and making demands would have to realize that labor could not be allowed to dictate to management." (Anita Brenner, *The Wind That Swept Mexico*.)

Zapata and Villa had different ideas on the subject. Zapata said his troops would demobilize as soon as the land was divided, and as soon as the Plan de Ayala became the basis of the new government program. Five more years of warfare followed, with Carranza and Obregon on one side and Zapata and Villa on the other. For a brief moment in 1914, Zapata and Villa were in possession of the Capital, and victory seemed to be theirs. But they had no experience in national affairs and they could not consolidate their gains. For them the Revolution was just a matter of dividing up the land—of finding a man for president who *would* divide the land. They could find no suitable candidate for president. They took to the fields again in an attempt to wipe out the armies of Carranza and Obregon, who had retreated but were still powerful foes.

The Zapatistas swarmed over the state of Morelos, seizing haciendas, breaking open safes, burning the deeds and papers of the hacendados. But Zapata permitted no destruction of property or looting. The property, he said, belonged to the people. They must preserve it for the future. He took only what was needed in the way of food and supplies.

In the North, Villa was defeated. But in the South, Zapata continued his independent struggle for land and liberty. In between the fighting, the Zapatistas tilled their land. They seemingly could spring from the ground at will, or melt away into nothing but handfuls of peaceful peasants tilling their little plots. How, complained the generals, could you defeat an enemy whom you could never find?

In desperation, the government sent General Pablo Gonzalez to get Zapata. Using the scorched earth method, Gonzalez destroyed every village suspected of harboring Zapatistas. The inhabitants were slaughtered; the houses were burned. But still the Zapatistas fought, and still they were led by Zapata.

Carranza offered a reward of 100,000 pesos for Zapata's head. Jesus Guajardo, a colonel under Gonzalez pretended he wanted to desert the Federals and join the agrarians. A conference was arranged. Guajardo's men lined up as if to present arms and fired a broadside at Zapata.

Zapata, the Unconquerable, was dead. His body was exhibited in the village plaza at Cuautla. His head was fastened to the back of a mule and sent, under heavy guard, throughout the state of Morelos to prove to the Zapatistas that their leader was dead. But still some say today that he is not dead. Superstitious peasants say that he has been seen in the mountains... He is not dead... He is the Unconquerable...

Various land and social reforms have been carried out in Mexico since the beginning of the Revolution of 1910. But the land problem has not been solved. At the beginning of the Revolution in 1900, 2 percent of the population owned 80 percent of the land. In 1938,  $\frac{1}{4}$  of 1 percent of the people

owned 65 percent of the land, while 65 percent of the rural population had nothing.

We can see in Mexico's history—as a colony of feudal Spain and as a semi-colony of United States and British imperialism, an illustration of one of the aspects of Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution—that part of the theory which pertains especially to those countries which have a backward development.

## Why Zapata Failed

In the backward colonial and semi-colonial countries, the native bourgeoisie arrives too late on the scene to solve its historical tasks, the destruction of feudalism and the division of land to clear the ground for capitalist development. The backward peasantry is also incapable of solving the problem. The division of the land is for them the whole task, and it is not enough.

We are living in the period when capitalism has reached the highest stage of its development—imperialism, with an international economy. Today, private property and national boundaries stand in the way of progress. It is no longer possible to solve the problem in the old way. There is no room in a world already divided up among monopoly capitalists for the development of new capitalist classes on the old competitive, free-enterprise basis.

In the backward countries, the problems of the bourgeois revolution cannot be solved without going over into the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

We can see proof of this theory negatively in Mexico's unfinished revolution, just as we see it positively in the successful October 1917, Revolution in Russia. Trotsky's prognosis of the Russian Revolution, and it proved to be the correct one, was:

"All the tasks of the bourgeois revolution facing it, the proletariat will come to power and launch the dictatorship of the proletariat, supported by the peasantry."

Some of the same elements were present in the pre-revolutionary situations in the Mexico of 1910 and the Russia of 1917. There were in both the semi-feudal elements, the great masses of the backward, landless, illiterate peasantry, and the dependence on foreign capital.

But there were also two important differences, and those were the decisive factors. In Czarist Russia, in 1917, there was a highly developed and highly politicalized industrial proletariat. Petrograd was one of the great industrial centers of the world. And there was also a revolutionary working-class party, the Bolshevik Party, with a correct political program. The Bolshevik Party launched the slogan "*All Power to the Soviets!*" and wrested the state power from the Menshevik and Social Revolutionary Compromisers under Kerensky, in whose hands the Revolution had reached an impasse. Under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky, the Bolsheviks established the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In Mexico, on the other hand, the two decisive factors were lacking. At the time of the Revolution of 1910, there was only the smallest beginning of an industrial proletariat, and it was very backward and scattered. And there was no revolutionary working-class party with a correct political program. Uncompromising revolutionary that he was, Zapata had no conception of the real task, and his class—the peasantry—was incapable of taking the power. The Revolution in Mexico is still unfinished.

In Mexico, the native capitalists have been shackled by a combination of feudal remnants and advanced imperialist

capitalism. From the beginning of its development, the Mexican capitalist class was tied up with the great landowners, the semi-feudal elements, and together they depended on imperialist capital. The birth of the native bourgeoisie was a by-product of the industrial development which resulted from the penetration of Mexico by European and American imperialist capital.

The ruling class of Mexico is petty-bourgeois, middle class, and so incapable of playing an independent role. It is too weak numerically and economically to carry forward a struggle for real national independence against the foreign imperialists. It cannot unite with the Mexican workers against the foreign imperialists, for such a united struggle would threaten the very existence of the capitalist class itself. Who can say that the Mexican workers would consider their task completed at the moment the foreign exploiters were driven out?

Today in Mexico there is a new revolutionary power—the industrial proletariat, with a revolutionary tradition. The development of the Mexican working class economically and politically has necessarily accompanied the industrial development which has been going on since the turn of the century. It was too weak and too young to play a decisive role in the Revolution of 1910. The industrial proletariat is still small, but it is rapidly increasing in importance. The workers in nearly all the important extractive, manufacturing industries are unionized.

The task of the Mexican industrial proletariat is to form a revolutionary working-class party with a correct political program and, united with the Mexican peasantry, to complete the Revolution.

Speaking of the nature and tasks of the colonial revo-

lution, Lenin, after October, 1917, described them as follows:

“There are to be found in the dependent countries two revolutionary movements which every day grow farther apart from each other. One is the bourgeois-democratic movement. The other is the mass action of the poor peasantry and workers for their liberation. The former endeavor to control the latter, but the Communists must struggle against such control and help to develop class consciousness. The cooperation of the bourgeois national elements is useful, but the foremost task is the formation of Communist Parties, which will lead them to the revolution. Thus they will accomplish the task, being led by the advanced proletariat.

“The parties in the colonies are not very large, but they reflect the attitude of the workers in these countries. The International must work with all these parties. The leadership is in the hands of the Communist vanguard. The first step in the revolution in the colonies must be carried out with a program that will include many petty-bourgeois reforms such as the division of the land. But from this it does not follow at all that the leadership of the revolution will have to be surrendered to the bourgeois democrats. On the contrary, the propaganda must be carried on to the Soviet idea, and carried forward to the ultimate overthrow of the capitalist system throughout the world.”

The collapse of the Third International and the Stalinist betrayal of the workers in Mexico, as elsewhere, with their slogans of national unity and support of the imperialist democracies, has cleared the way for the organization of a *real* Communist vanguard.

In Mexico, the formation of a powerful revolutionary working-class party, united with the workers of America and the workers of the world, under the banner of the Fourth International, is on the order of the day.

Reviewed by *Donna Kent*

## From the Arsenal of Marxism

# The Program of Peace

## The Socialist United States of Europe

By LEON TROTSKY

EDITOR'S NOTE: “The Program of Peace” was originally written as a series of articles by Trotsky in 1915-16 in the internationalist newspaper *Nashe Slovo* which he edited in Paris. Trotsky revised these articles in May 1917 and reprinted them in form of a programmatic pamphlet in the Bolshevik press in Russia in June 1917. The complete text has not appeared in English. An abridged version was first made available in this country in the volume “The Proletarian Revolution in

Russia, by Lenin and Trotsky,” published in 1919 under the editorship of Louis C. Fraina. A revised but likewise abridged version appeared in the May 1942 issue of *Fourth International*. This time we take the opportunity to supply our readers with an unexpurgated text. The basis of this new translation by John G. Wright is the Russian text as given in the 1923 edition of Trotsky's *Collected Works* (Volume II, pp 462-482) issued by State Publishers in Moscow.

### I. What Is a Program of Peace?

What is a program of peace? From the viewpoint of the ruling classes or of the parties subservient to them, it is the totality of those demands, the realization of which must be ensured by the power of militarism. Hence, for the realization of Miliukov's “peace program” Constantinople must be conquered by force of arms. Vandervelde's “peace program”

\* \* \* requires the expulsion of the Germans from Belgium as an antecedent condition. From this standpoint the peace clauses merely draw the balance sheet of what has been achieved by force of arms. In other words, the peace program is the war program. But that is how matters stood prior to the *intervention of the third power*, the Socialist International. For the revolutionary proletariat, the peace program does not mean the demands which national militarism must fulfill,

but those demands which the international proletariat intends to impose by its revolutionary struggle against militarism of all countries. The more the world revolutionary movement unfolds the less do the peace questions depend on the purely military position of the belligerents, the less becomes the danger that peace conditions may be understood by the masses as war aims.

This is rendered most clear to us by the question of the fate of small nations and weak states.

The war began with a devastating invasion of Belgium and Luxembourg by the German armies. In the echo created by the violation of the small country, beside the false and egotistic anger of the ruling classes of the enemy, there reverberated also the genuine indignation of the popular masses whose sympathy was attracted by the fate of a small people, crushed only because they happened to lie between two warring giants.

At that first stage of the war the fate of Belgium attracted attention and sympathy, owing to its extraordinary tragic nature. But thirty-four months of military operations have proved that the Belgian episode constituted only the first step towards the solution of the fundamental problem of the imperialist war, namely, the *subjection of the weak by the strong*.

Capitalism has transferred into the field of international relations the same methods applied by it in "regulating" the internal economic life of the nations. The path of competition is the path of systematically annihilating the small and medium-sized enterprises and of achieving the supremacy of big capital. World competition of the capitalist forces means the systematic subjection of the small, medium-sized and backward nations by the great and greatest capitalist powers. The more developed the technique of capitalism, the greater the role played by finance capital, and the higher the demands of militarism, all the more grows the dependency of the small states on the great powers. This process, forming as it does an integral element of imperialist mechanics, flourishes undisturbed also in times of peace by means of state loans, railway and other concessions, military-diplomatic agreements, etc. The war uncovered and accelerated this process by introducing the factor of open violence. The war destroys the last shreds of the "independence" of small states, quite apart from the military outcome of the conflict between the two basic enemy camps.

*Belgium* still groans under the yoke of German militarism. This, however, is but the visible sanguinary and dramatic expression of the collapse of her independence. The "liberation" of Belgium does not at all confront the Allied governments as an independent task. Both in the further progress of the war and after its conclusion, Belgium will become but a pawn in the great game of the capitalist giants. Failing the intervention of the third power—the *revolution*—Belgium may as a result of the war remain in German bondage, or fall under the yoke of Great Britain, or be divided between the powerful robbers of the two coalitions.

The same applies to *Serbia*, whose national energy served as a weight in the imperialist world scales whose fluctuations to one side or the other are least of all influenced by the independent interests of the Serbian people.

The Central Powers drew *Turkey* and *Bulgaria* into the whirlpool of the war. Whether both these countries will remain as the southeastern organ of the Austro-German imperialist *bloc* ("Central Europe") or will serve as small change when the balance sheet is drawn up, the fact remains

that the war is writing a final chapter of the history of their independence.

Before the outbreak of the Russian revolution, the independence of *Persia*, which had been terminated in principle by the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907, was most obviously liquidated.

*Rumania* and *Greece* furnish us with a sufficiently clear example of how limited a "freedom of choice" is given to small-state firms by the struggle of the imperialist trust companies. *Rumania* preferred the gesture of an apparently free choice, when she sacrificed her neutrality. *Greece* tried by means of passive opposition to "remain at home." As if to show most tangibly the futility of the whole "neutralist" struggle for self-preservation, the whole European war, represented by the armies of Bulgaria, Turkey, France, England, Russia and Italy, shifted on to Greek territory. Freedom of choice comes down at best to a *form* of self-elimination. In the end, both *Rumania* and *Greece* will share the same fate: they will be the stakes in the hands of the great gamblers.

At the other end of Europe, little *Portugal* deemed it necessary to enter the war on the side of the Allies. Her decision might seem inexplicable if, in the question of participation in the dog fight, *Portugal*, which is under English protection, had had greater freedom than the government of *Tver* province or *Ireland*.

The capitalist summits of *Holland* and of the three *Scandinavian* countries are accumulating mountains of gold, thanks to the war. However, these four neutral states of northwestern Europe are the most aware of the illusory character of their "sovereignty," which, even if it survives the war, will nevertheless be subject to the settlement of the bills advanced by the peace conditions of the Great Powers.

"Independent" *Poland* will be able, in the midst of imperialist Europe, to keep hanging her shingle of independence only by submitting to a slavish financial and military dependence on one of the great groups of the ruling powers.

The extent of the independence of *Switzerland* clearly appeared in the compulsory and restrictive measures adopted regulating her imports and exports. The representatives of this small federative republic who, cap in hand, go begging at the entrances of the two warring camps, can well understand the limited measure of independence and neutrality possible for a nation which cannot muster several millions of bayonets.

If the war, in consequence of the ever increasing number of combatants and of fronts, has become an equation with many unknowns thus rendering it impossible for the different governments to formulate the so-called "war aims," then the small states still have the doubtful advantage that their historical fate may be reckoned as predetermined. No matter which side proves victorious, and however far-reaching the influence of such a victory may be, the fact remains that there can no longer be a return to independence for the small states. Whether Germany or England wins—in either case the question to be determined is *who* will be the direct master over the small nations. Only charlatans or hopeless simpletons are capable of linking up the question of the freedom of the small peoples with the victory of one side or the other.

Exactly the same result would follow the third and most likely outcome of the war, that is, its ending in a draw. The absence of pronounced preponderance of one of the warring camps over the other will serve only to disclose all the more clearly the preponderance of the strong over the weak within each of the camps, and the preponderance of both over the "neutral" victims of imperialism. The termination of the war without conquerors or conquered is by itself no guarantee

for anybody: all small and weak states will none the less be *conquered*, and the same applies to those who were bled white on the battlefields as to those who tried to escape that fate by hiding in the shadows of neutrality.

The independence of the Belgians, Serbians, Poles, Armenians and others is regarded by us not as part of the Allied war program (as treated by Guesde, Plekhanov, Vandervelde, Henderson and others), but belongs to the program of the international proletarian struggle against imperialism.

## II. Status Quo Ante Bellum

But the question is: Can the proletariat under the present circumstances advance an independent "peace program," that is, its own solutions of the problems which caused the current war or which have been disclosed in the course of this war?

We have been told that the proletariat does not now command sufficient forces to bring about the realization of such a program. Utopian is the hope that the proletariat could realize its own peace program as a consequence of the present war. Something else again is the struggle for the cessation of the war and for a peace without annexation, i.e., a return to the *status quo ante bellum*, to the state of affairs prior to the war. This, we are told, is by far the more realistic program. Such were, for example, the arguments of Martov, Martynov and the Menshevik-Internationalists generally, who hold on this question as on all others not a revolutionary but a conservative position (*not* a social revolution, but the restoration of the class struggle; *not* the Third International, but the reestablishment of the Second International; *not* the revolutionary peace program, but a return to *status quo ante bellum*; *not* the conquest of power by the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, but proffering the power to bourgeois parties...). In what sense, however, may the term realistic be applied to a fight for ending the war and for peace without annexations? That the war must end sooner or later is incontestable. In this *anticipatory* sense the slogan of ending the war is unquestionably very "realistic," for it banks on a certainty. But what is it in the revolutionary sense? It may be objected: isn't it utopian to hope that the European proletariat, with its present forces, will succeed in halting military operations *against* the will of the ruling classes? Furthermore, we ask: under what circumstances can the end of the war be brought about? Theoretically, three typical possibilities may here be considered: (1) a decisive victory of one of the belligerent sides; (2) a general exhaustion of the opponents without a decisive preponderance of one over the other; (3) the intervention of the revolutionary proletariat, which interrupts the "normal" development of military events.

It is quite obvious that in the first case, if the war is ended by a decisive victory of one side, it would be naive to dream of a peace without annexations. If the Scheidemanns and Landsbergs, the staunch supporters of the work of their militarism, make speeches in parliament in favor of an "annexationless" peace, it is only with the firmest conviction that such protests can hinder no "useful" annexations. On the other hand, one of our former Czarist commanders-in-chief, General Alexeiev, who dubbed the annexationless peace as "a utopian phrase," concluded quite correctly that the offensive is the chief thing, and that in case of successful war operations everything else would come of itself. In order to wrest annexations from the hands of the victorious side, which is armed to the teeth, the proletariat would naturally require, in addition to its good intentions, a revolutionary force, which it will have to be ready to use openly. In any case, it possesses no

"economic" means whatever to compel the victorious side to renounce the advantage of the victory gained.

The second possible outcome of the war, on which those who seek to promote the narrow program "annexationless peace and nothing more" principally depend, presupposes that the war, exhausting as it does all the resources of the warring nations will, without the revolutionary intervention of the third power, end in general exhaustion—without conquerors or conquered. To this very situation, where militarism is too weak for effecting conquests, and the proletariat for making a revolution, the passive internationalists have adapted their lame program of "annexationless peace," which they frequently denote as a return to the *status quo ante bellum*, i.e., the order of things prior to the war. Here, however, this pseudo-realism lays bare its Achilles heel, for actually a military stalemate, as already shown, does not at all exclude annexations, but on the contrary *presupposes them*. That neither of the two powerful groups wins, does not mean that Serbia, Greece, Belgium, Poland, Persia, Syria, Armenia and others would be left intact. On the contrary, it is precisely at the expense of these third and weakest parties that annexations will in this case be carried out. In order to prevent these reciprocal "compensations" the international proletariat must needs set afoot a direct revolutionary uprising against the ruling classes. Newspaper articles, convention resolutions, parliamentary protests and even public demonstrations have never prevented the rulers from acquiring territories or from oppressing the weak peoples either by way of victory or by means of diplomatic agreements.

As regards the third possible outcome of the war, it seems to be the clearest. It presupposes that while the war is still on, the international proletariat rises with a force sufficient to paralyze and finally to stop the war from below. Obviously, in this most favorable case, the proletariat, having been powerful enough to stop the war, would be least likely to be able or willing to limit itself to that purely conservative program which goes no further than the renunciation of annexations.

A powerful movement of the proletariat is thus *in each case* a necessary prerequisite of the actual realization of an annexationless peace. But again, if we assume such a movement, the foregoing program remains quite miserly in that it acquiesces in the restoration of the order which prevailed prior to the war and which gave birth to the war. The European *status quo ante bellum*, the product of wars, robberies, violations, legitimism, diplomatic stupidity and impotence of peoples, remains as the only positive content of the slogan "without annexations."

In its struggle against imperialism, the proletariat cannot set up as its political aim the return to the map of old Europe; it must advance *its own program of state and national relations*, corresponding to the fundamental tendencies of economic development, corresponding to the revolutionary character of the epoch and the socialist interests of the proletariat.

The isolated slogan "without annexations" gives, first of all, no criterion for a political orientation in the various problems posed by the course of the war. Assuming that France later on occupies Alsace-Lorraine, is the German Social Democracy together with Scheidemann bound to demand the return of these provinces to Germany? Shall we demand the restitution of the kingdom of Poland to Russia? Shall we insist upon Japan's giving Chio-Chau back to—Germany? Or that Italy yield back to its owners that part of Trentino now occupied by her? That would be nonsense! We

should be fanatics of legitimism, i.e., defenders of dynastic and "historic" rights in the spirit of the most reactionary diplomacy. Besides, this "program" likewise demands a revolution for its fulfilment. In all these enumerated and in other similar cases we, confronted with the concrete reality, shall naturally advance only one principle, namely, *consultation of the peoples concerned*. This is certainly no absolute criterion. The French "socialists" of the majority reduce the consultation of the population of Alsace-Lorraine to a shameful comedy: first occupying (that is, acquisition by force of arms) and then asking the population's consent to be annexed. It is quite clear that a real consultation presupposes *revolutionary conditions* wherein the population can give their reply without being threatened by a revolver, be it German or French.

The only acceptable content of the slogan "without annexations" is thus a protest against new *violent acquisitions*, which amounts to giving a negative expression to *the right of nations to self-determination*. But we have seen that this democratically unquestionable "right" is being and will necessarily be transformed into the right of strong nations to make acquisitions and impose oppression, whereas for the weak nations it will mean an impotent wish or a "scrap of paper." Such will be the case as long as the political map of Europe forces nations and their fractions within the framework of states separated by tariff barriers and continually brought into conflict by the imperialist struggle.

It is possible to overcome this regime only through the proletarian revolution. *Thus, the center of gravity of the question lies in combining the peace program of the proletariat with that of the social revolution.*

### III. The Right of Nations to Self-Determination

We saw above that the Social Democracy in the solution of concrete questions in the field of the regrouping and new formations of national state groups, can make no step without the principle of national self-determination, which latter in its last instance appears as the recognition of the right of every national group to decide its *state fate*, hence as the right of peoples to sever themselves from a given state (as for instance from Russia or Austria). The only democratic way of getting to know the "will" of a nation is the referendum. This democratic obligatory reply will, however, in the manner described, remain purely *formal*. It does not enlighten us with regard to the real possibilities, ways and means of national self-determination under the modern conditions of capitalist economy; and yet the crux of the matter lies precisely in this.

For many, if not for the majority of the oppressed nations, national groups and sections, the meaning of self-determination is the cancellation of the existing borders and the dismemberment of present states. In particular, this democratic principle leads to the emancipation of the colonies. Yet the whole policy of imperialism, regardless of the national principle, aims at the *extension* of state borders, at the compulsory incorporation of weak states within the customs border, and the acquisition of new colonies. Imperialism is by its very nature both expansive and *aggressive* and it is this quality that characterizes imperialism, and not the changeable maneuvers of diplomacy.

From which flows the perennial conflict between the principle of national self-determination, which in many cases leads to state and economic decentralization (dismemberment, separation), and the powerful centralist tendencies of imperial-

ism which has at its disposal the state organization and the military power. True, a national-separatist movement frequently finds support in the imperialist intrigues of a *neighboring* state. This support, however, can become decisive only through the application of military force. And as soon as matters reach an armed conflict between two imperialist organizations, the *new* state boundaries will not be decided on the basis of the national principle, but on the basis of the reciprocal relation of military forces. To *compel* a victorious state to refrain from annexing newly conquered lands is as difficult as to force it to grant the freedom of self-determination to previously acquired provinces. Finally, even if by a miracle Europe were divided by force of arms into fixed national states and small states, the national question would not thereby be in the least decided and, the very next day after the "just" national redistributions, capitalist expansion would resume its work. Conflicts would arise, wars and new acquisitions, in complete violation of the national principle in all cases where its preservation cannot be maintained by a sufficient number of bayonets. It would all give the impression of inveterate gamblers being forced to divide the gold "justly" among themselves in the middle of the game, in order to start the same game all over again with redoubled frenzy.

From the might of the centralist tendencies of imperialism, it does not at all follow that we are obliged passively to submit to it. A national community is the living hearth of culture, as the national language is its living organ, and these will still retain their significance through indefinitely long historical periods. The Social Democracy is desirous of safeguarding and is obliged to safeguard to the national community its freedom of development (or dissolution) in the interests of material and spiritual culture. It is in this sense that it has taken over from the revolutionary bourgeoisie the democratic principle of national self-determination as a political obligation.

The right of national self-determination cannot be excluded from the proletarian peace program; but it cannot claim *absolute* importance. On the contrary, it is delimited for us by the converging, profoundly progressive tendencies of historical development. If this "right" must be—through revolutionary force—counterposed to the imperialist methods of centralization which enslave weak and backward peoples and crush the hearths of national culture, then on the other hand the proletariat cannot allow the "national principle" to get in the way of the irresistible and deeply progressive tendency of modern economic life towards a *planned organization* throughout our continent, and further, all over the globe. Imperialism is the capitalist-thievish expression of this tendency of modern economy to tear itself completely away from the idiocy of national narrowness, as it did previously with regard to local and provincial confinement. While fighting against the imperialist form of economic centralization, socialism does not at all take a stand against the particular tendency as such but, on the contrary, makes the tendency its own guiding principle.

From the standpoint of historical development as well as from the point of view of the tasks of the Social Democracy, the tendency of modern economy is *fundamental*, and it must be guaranteed the fullest opportunity of executing its truly liberationist historical mission: *to construct the united world economy*, independent of national frames, state and tariff barriers, subject only to the peculiarities of the soil and natural resources, to climate and the requirements of division of labor. Poles, Alsations, Dalmatians, Belgians, Serbians and other

small weak European nations not yet annexed, may be reinstated or set up for the first time in the national configurations towards which they gravitate, and, above all, will be able to remain within these configurations and freely develop their cultural existence only to the extent to which as national groupings they will cease to be economic groupings, will not be bound by state borders, will not be separated from or opposed to one another, economically. In other words, in order that Poles, Serbians, Rumanians and others will be able actually to form untrammelled national unifications, it is necessary that the state boundaries now splitting them up into parts be cancelled, that the framework of the state be enlarged as an economic but not as a national organization, until it envelops the whole of capitalist Europe, which is now cut asunder by tariffs and borders and torn by war. *The state unification of Europe* is clearly a prerequisite of self-determination of great and small nations of Europe. A national-cultural existence, free of national economic antagonisms and based on real self-determination, is possible only under the roof of a democratically united Europe freed from state and tariff barriers.

This direct and immediate dependence of national self-determination of weak peoples upon the collective European regime excludes the possibility of the proletariat's placing questions like the independence of Poland or the uniting of all Serbs *outside the European revolution*. But, on the other hand, this signifies that the right of self-determination, as a part of the proletarian peace program, possesses not a "utopian" but a revolutionary character. This consideration is directed to two addresses: against the German Davids and Landsbergs who from the heights of their imperialist "realism" traduce the principle of national independence as reactionary romanticism; and against the simplifiers in our revolutionary camp who proclaim this principle to be realizable only under socialism and who thereby rid themselves of the necessity of giving a principled answer to the national questions which have been posed point-blank by the war.

Between our present social condition and socialism there still lies an extended epoch of *social revolution*, that is, the epoch of the open proletarian struggle for power, the conquest and application of this power with the aim of the complete democratization of social relations, and the systematic transformation of capitalist society into the socialist society. This is the epoch not of pacification and tranquility but, on the contrary, of the highest intensification of the class struggle, the epoch of popular uprisings, wars, expanding experiments of the proletarian regime, and socialist reforms. This epoch demands of the proletariat that it give a practical, that is, an immediately applicable answer to the question of the further existence of nationalities and their reciprocal relations with the state and the economy.

#### IV. The United States of Europe

We tried to prove in the foregoing that the economic and political unification of Europe is the necessary prerequisite for the very possibility of national self-determination. Just as the slogan of *national independence* of Serbs, Bulgarians, Greeks and others remains an empty abstraction without the supplementary slogan *Federative Balkan Republic*, which played such an important role in the whole policy of the Balkan Social Democracy; so on the all-European scale the principle of the "right" to self-determination can be invested with flesh and blood only under the conditions of a European Federative Republic.

But if on the Balkan peninsula the slogan of a democratic federation has become purely proletarian, then this applies all the more to Europe with her incomparably deeper capitalist antagonisms.

To bourgeois politics the destruction of "internal" European customs houses is an insurmountable difficulty; but without this the inter-state courts of arbitration and international law codes will have no firmer duration than, for instance, Belgian neutrality. The urge toward unifying the European market which, like the effort towards the acquisition of non-European backward lands, is caused by the development of capitalism, runs up against the powerful opposition of the landed and capitalist classes, in whose hands the tariff apparatus joined with that of militarism (without which the former means nothing) constitutes an indispensable weapon for exploitation and enrichment.

The Hungarian financial and industrial bourgeoisie is hostile to economic unification with capitalistically more developed Austria. The Austro-Hungarian bourgeoisie is hostile to the idea of a tariff union with more powerful Germany. On the other hand, the German landowners will never willingly consent to the cancellation of grain duties. Furthermore, the economic interests of the propertied classes of the Central Empires cannot be so easily made to coincide with the interests of the English, French, Russian capitalists and landed gentry. The present war speaks eloquently enough on this score. Lastly, the disharmony and irreconcilability of capitalist interests between the Allies themselves is still more visible than in the Central States. Under these circumstances, a half-way complete and consistent economic unification of Europe *coming from the top* by means of an agreement of the capitalist governments is sheer utopia. Here, the matter can go no further than partial compromises and half-measures. Hence it is that *the economic unification of Europe*, which offers colossal advantages to producer and consumer alike, and in general to the whole cultural development, becomes the revolutionary task of the European proletariat in its struggle against imperialist protectionism and its instrument—militarism.

*The United States of Europe—without monarchies, standing armies and secret diplomacy*—is therefore the most important integral part of the proletarian peace program.

The ideologists and politicians of German imperialism frequently came forward, especially at the beginning of the war, with their program of a European or at least a Central European "United States" (without France and England on the one side and Russia on the other). The program of a violent unification of Europe is just as characteristic of the tendencies of German imperialism as is the tendency of French imperialism whose program is the forcible dismemberment of Germany.

If the German armies achieved the decisive victory reckoned upon in Germany during the first phase of the war, the German imperialism would have doubtless made the gigantic attempt of realizing a compulsory military-tariff union of European states, which would be constructed completely of exemptions, compromises, etc., which would reduce to a minimum the progressive meaning of the unification of the European market. Needless to say, under such circumstances no talk would be possible of an autonomy of the nations, thus forcibly joined together as the caricature of the European United States. Certain opponents of the program of the United States of Europe have used precisely this perspective as an argument that this idea can, under certain conditions, acquire a "reactionary" monarchist-imperialist content. Yet

it is precisely this perspective that provides the most graphic testimony in favor of the revolutionary viability of the slogan of the United States of Europe. Let us for a moment grant that German militarism succeeds in actually carrying out the compulsory half-union of Europe, just as Prussian militarism once achieved the half-union of Germany, what would then be the central slogan of the European proletariat? Would it be the dissolution of the forced European coalition and the return of all peoples under the roof of isolated national states? Or the restoration of "autonomous" tariffs, "national" currencies, "national" social legislation, and so forth? Certainly not. The program of the European revolutionary movement would then be: The destruction of the compulsory anti-democratic *form* of the coalition, with the preservation and furtherance of its foundations, in the form of complete annihilation of tariff barriers, the unification of legislation, above all of labor laws, etc. In other words, the slogan of the United States of Europe—*without monarchies and standing armies*—would under the indicated circumstances become the unifying and guiding slogan of the European revolution.

Let us assume the second possibility, namely, an "undecided" issue of the war. At the very beginning of the war, the well-known professor Liszt, an advocate of "United Europe," argued that should the Germans fail to conquer their opponents, the European unification would nevertheless be accomplished, and in Liszt's opinion it would be even more complete than in the case of a German victory. By the ever growing need of expansion, the European states, hostile to one another but unable to cope with one another, would continue to hinder each other in the execution of their "mission" in the Near East, Africa and Asia, and they would everywhere be forced back by the United States of North America and by Japan. Precisely in case of a stalemate in the war, in Liszt's opinion, the indispensability of an economic and military agreement among the European great powers would come to the fore against weak and backward peoples, but above all, of course, against their own working masses. We pointed out above the colossal obstacles that lie in the way of realizing this program. Even a partial overcoming of these obstacles would mean the establishment of an imperialist trust of European States, a predatory share-holding association. And this perspective is on occasion adduced unjustifiably as proof of the "danger" of the slogan of The United States of Europe, whereas in reality this is the most graphic proof of its realistic and revolutionary significance. If the capitalist states of Europe succeeded in merging into an imperialist trust, this would be a step forward as compared with the *existing* situation, for it would first of all create a unified, all-European material base for the working class movement. The proletariat would in this case have to fight not for the return to "autonomous" national states, but for the conversion of the imperialist state trust into a European Republican Federation.

However, the further the war progresses and reveals the absolute incapacity of militarism to cope with the questions brought forward by the war, the less is spoken about these great plans for the uniting of Europe *at the top*. The plan of the imperialist "United States of Europe" has given way to the plans, on the one side, of an economic union of Austria-Germany and on the other side of the quadruple alliance with its war tariffs and duties supplemented with militarism directed against one another. After the foregoing it is needless to enlarge on the great importance which, in the execution of these plans, the policy of the proletariat of both state "trusts" will assume in fighting against the established tariff and military-diplomatic fortifications and for the eco-

nomie union of Europe.

Now after the so very promising beginning of the Russian revolution, we have every reason to hope that during the course of this present war a powerful revolutionary movement will be launched all over Europe. It is clear that such a movement can succeed and develop and gain victory only *as a general European one*. Isolated within national borders, it would be doomed to disaster. Our social-patriots point to the danger which threatens the Russian revolution from the side of German militarism. This danger is indubitable, but it is not the only one. English, French, Italian militarism is no less a dreadful enemy of the Russian revolution than the Hohenzollern war machine. The salvation of the Russian revolution lies in its propagation all over Europe. Should the revolutionary movement unfold in Germany, the German proletariat would look for and find a revolutionary echo in the "hostile" countries of the west, and if in one of the European countries the proletariat should snatch the power out of the hands of the bourgeoisie, it would be bound, be it only to retain the power, to place it at once at the service of the revolutionary movement in other countries. In other words, the founding of a stable regime of proletarian dictatorship would be conceivable only if it extended throughout Europe, and consequently in the form of a European Republican Federation. The state-unification of Europe, to be achieved neither by force of arms nor by industrial and diplomatic agreements, would in such a case become the unpostponable task of the triumphant revolutionary proletariat.

*The United States of Europe* is the slogan of the revolutionary epoch into which we have entered. Whatever turn the war operations may take later on, whatever balance-sheet diplomacy may draw out of the present war, and at whatever tempo the revolutionary movement will progress in the near future, the slogan of the United States of Europe will in all cases retain a colossal meaning as the political formula of the struggle of the European proletariat for power. In this program is expressed the fact that the national state has outlived itself—as a framework for the development of the productive forces, as a basis for the class struggle, and thereby also as a state form of proletarian dictatorship. Our denial of "national defense", as an outlived political program for the proletariat, ceases to be a purely negative act of ideological-political self-defense, and acquires all its revolutionary content only in the event that over against the conservative defense of the antiquated national fatherland we place the progressive task, namely the creation of a new, higher "fatherland" of the revolution, of republican Europe, whence the proletariat alone will be enabled to revolutionize and to reorganize the whole world.

Herein, incidentally, lies the answer to those who ask dogmatically: "Why the unification of Europe and not of the whole world?" Europe is not only a geographic term, but a certain economic and cultural-historic community. The European revolution does not have to wait for the revolutions in Asia and Africa nor even in Australia and America. And yet a completely victorious revolution in Russia or England is unthinkable without a revolution in Germany, and vice versa. The present war is called a world war, but even after the intervention of the United States, it is Europe that is the arena of war. And the revolutionary problems confront first of all the European proletariat.

Of course, the United States of Europe will be only one of the two axes of the world organization of economy. The United States of America will constitute the other.

The only concrete historical consideration against the slogan of the United States of Europe was formulated by the Swiss *Social Democrat* as follows: "The unevenness of economic and political development is the unconditional law of capitalism." From this the *Social Democrat* draws the conclusion that the victory of socialism is possible in one country and that it is needless therefore to make the dictatorship of the proletariat in each isolated State conditional upon the creation of the United States of Europe. That the capitalist development of various countries is uneven is quite incontestable. But this unevenness is itself extremely uneven. The capitalist levels of England, Austria, Germany or France are not the same. But as compared with Africa and Asia all these countries represent capitalist "Europe," which has matured for the socialist revolution. It is profitable and necessary to reiterate the elementary thought that no single country in its struggle has to "wait" for the others, lest the idea of parallel international action be supplanted by the idea of procrastinating international inaction. Without waiting for the others we begin and we continue the struggle on our own national soil in complete certainty that our initiative will provide the impulse for the struggle in other countries; and if this were not so, then it would be hopeless to think—as is borne out both by historical experience and theoretical considerations—that revolutionary Russia, for example, would be able to maintain herself in the face of conservative Europe, or that Socialist Germany could remain isolated in a capitalist world.

To view the perspectives of the social revolution within a national framework is to succumb to the same national narrowness that forms the content of social-patriotism. Vailant, until the close of his life, regarded France as the chosen country of the social revolution, and precisely in this sense he insisted upon its defense to the end. Lentsch and others, some hypocritically, others sincerely, believed that the defeat of Germany means above all the destruction of the very foundation of the social revolution. Lastly, our Tseretellis and Chernovs who, in our national conditions, have repeated that sorry experiment of French ministerialism, swear that their policy serves the cause of the revolution and therefore has nothing in common with the policy of Guesde and Sembat. Generally speaking, it must not be forgotten that in social-patriotism there is active, in addition to the most vulgar reformism, a national revolutionary messianism, which regards its national state as chosen for introducing to humanity "socialism" or "democracy," be it on the ground of its industrial development or of its democratic form and revolutionary conquests. (If a completely triumphant revolution were actually conceivable within the limits of a single, better prepared nation, this messianism, bound up with the program of national defense, would have its relative historical justification. But in reality, it does not have it.) Defending the national basis of the revolution which such methods as undermine the international connections of the proletariat, really amounts to undermining the revolution, which cannot begin otherwise than on the national basis, but which cannot be completed on that basis in view of the present economic and military-political interdependence of the European

states, which has never been so forcefully revealed as in this war. The slogan, the United States of Europe, gives expression to this interdependence, which will directly and immediately set the conditions for the concerted action of the European proletariat in the revolution.

Social-patriotism which is in principle, if not always in fact, the execution of social-reformism to the utmost extent and its adaptation to the imperialist epoch, proposes to us in the present world catastrophe to direct the policy of the proletariat along the lines of the "lesser evil" by joining one of the warring groups. We reject this method. We say that the European war, prepared by the entire preceding course of development, has placed point-blank the *fundamental problems* of modern capitalist development as a whole; furthermore, that the line of direction to be followed by the international proletariat and its national detachments must not be determined by secondary political and national features nor by problematical advantages of military preponderance of either side (whereby these problematical advantages must be paid for in advance with absolute renunciation of the independent policy of the proletariat), but by the fundamental antagonism existing between the international proletariat and the capitalist regime as a whole.

This is the only principled formulation of the question and, by its very essence, it is socialist-revolutionary in character. It alone provides a theoretical and historical justification for the tactic of revolutionary internationalism.

Denying support to the state—not in the name of a propaganda circle but in the name of the most important class in society—in the period of the greatest catastrophe, internationalism does not simply eschew "sin" passively but affirms that the fate of world development is no longer linked for us with the fate of the national state; more than this, that the latter has become a vise for development and must be overcome, that is, replaced by a higher economic-cultural organization on a broader foundation. *If the problem of socialism were compatible with the framework of the national state, then it would thereby become compatible with national defense.* But the problem of socialism confronts us on the imperialist foundation, that is under conditions in which capitalism itself is forced violently to destroy the national-state frameworks it has itself established.

The imperialist half-unification of Europe might be achieved, as we tried to show, as a result of a decisive victory of one group of the great powers as well as a consequence of an inconclusive outcome of the war. In either instance, the unification of Europe would signify the complete trampling underfoot of the principle of self-determination with respect to all weak nations and the preservation and centralization of all the forces and weapons of European reaction: monarchies, standing armies and secret diplomacy.

The democratic republican unification of Europe, a union really capable of guaranteeing the freedom of national development, is possible only on the road of a revolutionary struggle against militarist, imperialist, dynastic centralism, by means of uprisings in individual countries, with the subsequent merger of these upheavals into a general European revolution. The victorious European revolution, however, no matter how its course in isolated countries may be fashioned can, in conse-

quence of the absence of other revolutionary classes, transfer the power only to the proletariat. Consequently the United States of Europe represents the form—the only conceivable form—of the dictatorship of the European proletariat.

### A Postscript (1922)

The assertion, repeated several times in the *Program of Peace*, to the effect that the proletarian revolution cannot be victoriously consummated within a national framework may perhaps seem to some readers to have been refuted by the five years' experience of our Soviet Republic. But such a conclusion would be unfounded. The fact that the workers' state has maintained itself against the entire world in a single and, moreover, backward country testifies to the colossal power of the proletariat, a power which in other more advanced, more civilized countries, will truly be able to achieve miracles. But having defended ourselves as a state in the political and military sense, we have not arrived at, nor even approached socialist society. The struggle for revolutionary-state self-defense resulted in this interval in an extreme decline of productive forces, whereas socialism is conceivable only on the basis of their growth and blossoming. Trade negotiations with bourgeois states, concessions, the Geneva Conference and so on are far too graphic evidence of the impossibility of isolated socialist construction within a national-state framework. So long as the bourgeoisie remains in power in other European states we are compelled, in the struggle against economic isolation, to seek agreements with the capitalist world; at the same time it can be stated with certainty that these agreements, in the best case, will help us heal this or that economic wound,

make this or that step forward, but the genuine rise of socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe.

That Europe represents not only a geographic but also an economic political term is graphically evidenced by the events in recent years: the decline of Europe, the growth of the power of the United States, the attempt of Lloyd George to "save" Europe by means of combined imperialist and pacifist methods.

Today the European labor movement is in a period of defensive actions, of gathering forces and making preparations. A new period of open revolutionary battles for power will inexorably push to the fore the question of the state interrelationships among the peoples of revolutionary Europe. To the extent that the experience in Russia has projected the Soviet State as the most natural form of the proletarian dictatorship, and to the extent that the proletarian vanguard of other countries has adopted in principle this state form, we may assume that with the resurgence of the direct struggle for power, the European proletariat will advance the program of the Federated European Soviet Republic. The experience of Russia in this connection is very instructive. It testifies to the complete compatibility under the proletarian regime of the broadest national and cultural autonomy and economic centralism. In this sense, the slogan of the United States of Europe, translated into the language of the Soviet State, not only preserves all its meaning but still promises to reveal its colossal significance during the impending epoch of the social revolution.

## U.S. and England: Imperialist Rivals

By CHARLES HACKETT

As the war against Germany enters its final phase, the smoldering conflicts in the camp of the Allies gains more and more overt expression. One of the main antagonisms is, of course, that between the United States and Great Britain. As Trotsky pointed out nearly twenty years ago, "England is still, after the U. S., the richest and most powerful country. It is the principal rival, the main obstacle" to the drive of the American imperialist colossus for world hegemony.

The war has revealed Nazi Germany and Japan as pretentious upstarts, whose over-developed military machines proved to be in no way commensurate with the tasks of imperialist plunder they set themselves because of their inferior economic potential. They have risked a desperate military gamble to avoid being wiped out as factors in the domination of world markets. The gamble has turned out to be futile. America's productive might weighed more in the scales of war than all the German and Japanese military installations prepared painstakingly over long years.

Aside from the explosive problems arising out of a revolutionary Europe and the existence of nationalized property on that sixth of the earth's surface incorporated into the Soviet Union—both of which hang as a permanent threat over the head of Yankee imperialism—the only serious obstacle to American domination of the world now resides in the rivalry of Great Britain, in the existence of the British Empire.

In the course of the war itself, both powers have been

jockeying for position, preparing for a showdown that must come after the war. Naturally, the preponderant wealth of the U. S. has already given the Yankee capitalists important new advantages in the subdued struggle. But British imperialism is still far from reconciled to the role of junior partner in the plunder of the world, in which she has so long held first place.

In 1924 after exposing the "American 'pacifist' program of putting the whole world under her control," Trotsky wrote:

"It is not very likely that the bourgeoisie of all countries will consent to be shoved into the background, to become vassals of America without at least trying to resist. The contradictions are too great, the appetites are too monstrous, the urge to preserve old rulership is too great, the habits of world domination are too powerful in England. Military conflicts are inevitable. The era of 'pacifist' Americanism... is only a preparation for new wars of unprecedented scope and unimaginable monstrosity."

Part of this prediction has already been verified in the case of Germany and Japan. Will it be verified also in the case of Great Britain?

Unless revolution threatens British capitalism first, it seems inevitable. Churchill has already declared that he "did not become the King's first minister in order to liquidate the British Empire." But that, in effect, is the demand made of him by the rapacious overlords of Wall Street as the price of continued peaceful collaboration.

The area of conflict between the two powers stretches over

the surface of the whole globe and penetrates every phase of economic, commercial and political activity.

In the Middle East, Anglo-American rivalry has been somewhat complicated by the presence of remnants of what was once French imperialist power. Both of the Anglo-Saxon powers are anxious to make a clear sweep of the beaten and bankrupt French "Ally"-rival before settling things among themselves. The methods are described in an interesting article on "The Explosive Middle East" which appears in the current *Fortune* by one of its editors who has been there.

"We have taken a hand," he relates blandly, "in neatly ousting the French from the Levant." The method is indicated in the writer's size-up of the region:

"In the Arab world sweetness and light and pretty idealism have not the slightest appeal if they compete with cash and force."

He goes on to give a few illustrations of "clever" British use of both cash and force and centers attention on an event that made headlines not so long ago: the revolt by which Lebanon gained "independence" from De Gaulle's French empire. Here is his uninhibited account.

"An election was held in the Lebanon in which a good deal of hard cash changed hands. The French administration spent certain sums of money to secure a parliament and cabinet relatively favorable to French influence and economic interests there. Meanwhile Sir Edward Spears, head of a somewhat ambiguous diplomatic and military British mission, was reputed to have sponsored the circulation of other considerable moneys.

"At any rate, and at whatever costs, the election went strongly anti-French, and a newly extremist government declared, unilaterally and without warning to the French, that the mandate was finished forever."

The French nullified the elections, arrested the government and put in their own appointees. An "armed rebellion" ensued. But let the author continue in his own words:

"Then the fun began... In Lebanon cities French tanks and Senegalese troops clashed with demonstrators. The British Ninth Army stood on the alert... Anglo-American pressure prevailed, with the consequence that France took a gratuitous beating—and a humiliating loss of prestige. *This coup d'etat was conducted in the name of the Atlantic Charter.*"

If in the "French" Lebanon the British and the Americans can both have great "fun" in playing with the aspirations of the masses for freedom, in toying with their very lives and blood, the British begin to lose their sense of humor in "British" Egypt. For, as the *Fortune* editor remarks, "Egypt is also likely to offer us some promising markets, *provided means are found to convert into dollars the dammed-up buying power now reckoned in pounds.*" That becomes ominous for the British. The British loss of wit is even greater in India. There they are downright angry at the very mention of the "Atlantic Charter," the mockery of which so tickled them in Lebanon. For in India, by compensation, American mirth grows even more expansive.

Only the other day Senator Chandler of Kentucky caused a new diplomatic uproar by charging that Roosevelt's plenipotentiary in India had been declared *persona non grata* by British officials there. After repeated denials from the state department, from Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador and other official sources, the Senator proved his charge by making public a secret note sent by officials in India to the Churchill government in England. The note commented: "It is regrettable to have to use censorship in defense of such attacks by our greatest ally." The attack referred to was con-

tained in a letter sent by Phillips to Roosevelt. Chandler also made public the Phillips letter. The evidence—access to such highly confidential material—indicates that the whole affair is inspired by the highest authorities who, of course, remain behind the scenes for the present.

What did the Phillips "attack" consist of? Here is what Roosevelt's plenipotentiary said in his letter, made public through Chandler:

"The British Prime Minister, in fact, has stated that the provisions of the *Atlantic Charter* are not applicable to India, and it is not unnatural therefore that Indian leaders are beginning to wonder whether the Charter is only for the benefit of white races."

Utilizing the military difficulties in the Far East, and declaring in support of his contention, that "General Stillwell has expressed his concern over the situation," Phillips draws his conclusion:

"While India is broken politically into various parties, all have one object in common—eventual freedom and independence from British domination. . . . It is time for the British to act."

Phillips' attack consists in resorting to the use of the Atlantic Charter against Britain in India, in the same way that the British (with American support) resort to it against the French in Lebanon. That's all. Only in the eyes of the Raj, what's good enough for others, is not cricket when applied to it.

The "pattern of colonial cooperation" is clear. The purpose of the Atlantic Charter no less so. In this respect the letter says:

"I feel strongly, Mr. President, that in view of our military position in India, we should have a voice in these matters. It is not right for the British to say this is none of your business, where we alone presumably will have the major part to play in struggle with Japan."

As long ago as 1934, the Trotskyist theses on "War and the Fourth International" said:

"Continuing by inertia the discussion on the liberation of the Philippines, the American imperialists are in reality preparing to establish themselves a territorial base in *China*, so as to raise at the following stage, in case of conflict with Great Britain, the question of the 'liberation' of *India.*"

The tours of Willkie and Wallace, the machinations of Phillips and Roosevelt demonstrate before our very eyes the power of Marxist prediction contained in that simple sentence written ten years ago.

In his effort to bolster the case for American intervention in India, Phillips in his letter feels compelled to reveal a very significant truth.

"*The peoples of Asia,*" he says, "*—and I am supported in the opinion by other diplomatic and military observers—cynically regard this war as one between fascist and imperialist powers.*"

Phillips wants to use the Atlantic Charter in order to cover up the fact that this is precisely the kind of war it is. But in the very course of the American dispute with Great Britain, the masses of Asia will see it only confirmed all the more. They will learn to recognize American imperialism in its full brigand's character. In that wider recognition of this truth, in the resulting distrust of *all* imperialist promises of freedom, in the development of their own independent struggle for liberation, the masses of India and of all Asia will upset the applecart not only for British imperialism but for its ambitious Yankee rival as well.

Just Published!

This book, appearing four years after the death of Leon Trotsky, testifies to the vitality of the movement founded upon the ideas of the great revolutionary Marxist. The volume is a history of the origin and development of Trotskyism in the United States. James P. Cannon, the author, is the founder of the American Trotskyist organization.  
**Cloth \$2.75, paper \$2.00**

The  
**HISTORY  
of  
AMERICAN  
TROTSKYISM**

*report of a  
participant*

by *James P. Cannon*

**PIONEER PUBLISHERS**

**PIONEER PUBLISHERS**

116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.