

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL NEWS

VOL.2 NO.2

FEBRUARY 1939

TWOPENCE

THE DECISIVE HOUR IN FRANCE

by LEON TROTSKY

Each day, whether we wish it or not, we convince ourselves anew that the earth continues to revolve upon its axis. Likewise, the laws of the class struggle act independently of the fact that we recognise them or not. They continue to operate despite the politics of the Popular Front. The class struggle makes the Popular Front its instrument. After the experience of Czechoslovakia it is now the turn of France: the most hidebound and the most backward have a new occasion to teach themselves.

The Popular Front is a coalition of parties. Every coalition, that is, every durable political alliance, has by necessity as its programme of action the programme of the more moderate of the coalesced parties. The French Popular Front has signified, since its debut, that the Socialists and Communists placed their political activity under the control of the Radicals. The French Radicals represent the left flank of the imperialist bourgeoisie. On the banner of the Radical party are inscribed "patriotism" and "democracy." Patriotism signifies defence of the colonial empire of France; "democracy" signifies nothing real, but serves solely to enchain the petty bourgeois classes to the chariot of imperialism. It is precisely because the Radical unite plundering imperialism with verbal democratism that more than any other party they are constrained to lie and to betray the masses.

One can say without exaggeration that the party of Herriot-Daladier is the most corrupt of all the French parties, representing a sort of culture for careerists, venal individuals, stock manipulators of the Bourse, and in general adventurers of all kinds. Since the parties of the Popular Front could not reach beyond the programme of the Radicals, this signified in reality the submission of the workers and the peasants to the imperialist programme of the most corrupt wing of the bourgeoisie.

In order to justify the politics of the Popular Front they invoked the necessity for an alliance between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie. It is impossible to imagine a more scurrilous lie! The Radical party expresses the interests of the big bourgeoisie, and not of the petty. By its very essence it represents the political machinery of the exploitation of the petty bourgeoisie by imperialism. The alliance with the Radical party is, consequently, an alliance not with the petty bourgeoisie, but with their exploiters. To realise a genuine alliance between the workers and the peasants is not possible except by teaching the petty bourgeoisie how to emancipate themselves from the Radical party, how to cast off once and for all its yoke from their necks. Meanwhile the Popular Front acts in a directly opposite manner; entering into this "front," Socialists and Communists take upon themselves the

responsibility for the Radical party and thus help it in this way to exploit and to betray the masses.

In 1936, Socialists, Communists, and Anarcho-syndicalists aided the Radical party in slowing down, and in crumbling the powerful revolutionary movement. Big capital has succeeded during the last two years and a half in recovering a little from its fright. The popular Front, having fulfilled its role as brake, now represents nothing more for the bourgeoisie than a useless hindrance. French imperialism has also changed its international orientation. The alliance with the U.S.S.R. was recognised as of little value and of great risk—the accord with Germany, necessary. The Radicals received from finance capital this order: break with your allies, the Socialists and the Communists. As always, they carried out the order without hesitation.

The absence of opposition among the Radicals at the time of the change in course demonstrated once more that this party is imperialist in essence and "democratic" in words only. The Radical government, rejecting all the lessons of the Comintern on the "united front of the democracies," reconciled itself with fascist Germany and, in passing, took back naturally all the "social laws" which had been the by-product of the workers' movement in 1936. All this was accomplished in accordance with the strict laws of the class struggle, and that is why this could be predicted, and was in fact predicted.

But the Socialists and the Communists, petty bourgeois blind men, found themselves caught unawares and covered their confusion with a hollow declamation: What? They, patriots and democrats, who helped re-establish order, curbed the labour movement, rendered inestimable service to the "republic," that is, the imperialist bourgeoisie, are now booted out the door without ceremony! In fact, if they have been booted outside, it is precisely for having rendered to the bourgeoisie all the services enumerated above. Gratitude has never yet been a factor in the class struggle.

The discontent of the betrayed masses is immense. Jouhaux, Blum, and Thorez are constrained to do something in order not to lose their credit definitively. In response to the spontaneous movement of the workers, Jouhaux proclaims a "general strike," a protest of "crossed arms." Legal, peaceful, completely inoffensive protest! For twenty-four hours only, he explains with a deferential smile in the direction of the bourgeoisie. Order will not be disturbed, the workers will conserve a "dignified" calm, not a hair will tumble from the head of the ruling class. He gives a guarantee, he, Jouhaux. "Don't you know me, Messrs. Bankers, Industrialists, and Generals? Have you forgotten that I saved you at the time of the war of 1914-1918?" Blum and Thorez second from their side the general secretary of the C.G.T.: "Only a peaceful protest, a little protest, sympathetic, patriotic!"

Meanwhile, Daladier militarises the important

categories of workers and prepares the troops. In the face of a proletariat with crossed arms, the bourgeoisie, recovering from its panic thanks to the Popular Front, prepares not at all to cross its arms; it intends to utilize the demoralisation engendered by the Popular Front in the workers' ranks in order to carry out a decisive coup. Under these conditions the strike could not end except by defeat.

The French workers have recently passed through a tumultuous strike wave including the occupation of the factories. The subsequent stage for them could not be anything but a genuine revolutionary general strike which poses on the order of the day the conquest of power. No one indicates nor is able to indicate to the masses any other way out of the internal crisis, any other means of struggle against growing fascism and the war which draws near. Every French worker who reflects understands that the day following a theatrical strike of twenty-four hours with "arms crossed" the situation will not be better, but worse. Nevertheless, the important categories of workers risk paying for it cruelly—by loss of jobs, by fines, by punishment in prison. In the name of what? Order will in no case be disturbed, swears Jouhaux. Everything will remain in place: property, democracy, colonies, and with them misery, high cost of living, reaction and the danger of war. The masses are capable of enduring great sacrifices, but they wish to have before them a great political perspective. They must know clearly what is the goal, what are the methods, who is the friend, who is the enemy. Yet the leaders of the workers' organisations have done everything in order to mislead and disorient the proletariat.

Yesterday the Radical party was still glorified as the most important element of the Popular Front, as the representative of progress, of democracy, of peace, etc. The confidence of the workers in the Radicals was not, certainly, very great. But they *tolerated* the Radicals to the extent to which they *grant confidence* to the Socialist and Communist parties and the trade union organisations. The rupture in the top circles (with the Radicals) came about as always in such cases unexpectedly. The masses were kept in ignorance until the last moment. Worse yet, the masses were given information designed to permit the bourgeoisie to take the workers unawares. And still the workers made ready to enter into struggle. Entangled in their own nets, the "leaders" called the masses—don't laugh!—to a "general strike." Against whom? Against the "friends" of yesterday. In the name of what? No one knows. Opportunism is always accompanied by the contortions of adventurism.

The general strike is, by its very essence, a revolutionary means of struggle. In a general strike the proletariat assembles itself as a class against its class enemy. The use of the general strike is absolutely incompatible with the politics of the Popular Front which signifies alliance with the bourgeoisie, that is

to say, the submission of the proletariat to the bourgeoisie. The miserable bureaucrats of the Socialist and Communist parties as well as of the trade unions consider the proletariat as a simple auxiliary instrument in their combinations behind the scenes with the bourgeoisie. They propose that the workers pay for a simple demonstration with sacrifices which cannot have any meaning in the workers' eyes unless it is a question of a decisive struggle. As if the masses of millions of workers could make turns to the right and to the left at will, according to parliamentary combinations!

At bottom, Jouhaux, Blum and Thorez have done everything possible in order to assure the defeat of the strike: they themselves fear the struggle not less than the bourgeoisie; at the same time they are forced to create an alibi for themselves in the eyes of the proletariat. That is the habitual war strategem of reformists; to prepare the defeat of action by the masses and then accuse the masses of the defeat or, no better, praise themselves with a non-existent success. Can one be astonished that this opportunism, supplemented with homeopathic doses of adventurism, brings nothing else to the workers but defeat and humiliation?

On June 9, 1936, we wrote: "The French revolution has begun." It must seem that events have refuted this diagnosis. The question is in reality more complicated. That the objective situation in France has been and still is revolutionary, there cannot be the least doubt. The crisis in the international situation of French imperialism; linked with it, the internal crisis of French capitalism; the financial crisis of the state; the political crisis of democracy; the extreme confusion of the bourgeoisie; the manifest absence of escape through the old traditional channels.

Nevertheless, as Lenin already indicated in 1915: "It is not from every revolutionary situation that revolution surges but only from a situation such that, to the objective change is joined a subjective change—that is, the capacity of the revolutionary class to carry out revolutionary mass actions sufficiently powerful to crush . . . the old government, which never, not even in the period of crisis, 'falls' if one does not 'make' it fall." Recent history has furnished a series of tragic confirmations of the fact that it is not from every revolutionary situation that a revolution surges, but that a revolutionary situation becomes counter-revolutionary if the subjective factor, that is, revolutionary offensive of the revolutionary class, does not come in time to aid the objective factor.

The vast torrent of strikes in 1936 demonstrated that the French proletariat was ready for revolutionary struggle and that it had already entered on the road of struggle. In this sense we had the full right to write that "the revolution has begun." But "if it is not from every revolutionary situation that revolution surges," neither is every *beginning*

revolution assured a subsequent uninterrupted development. The beginning of a revolution, which hurls the young generation into the area, is always coloured with illusions, with naive hopes and with credulity. The revolution needs usually a harsh blow from the side of reaction in order to take a more decisive step forward.

If the French bourgeoisie had responded to the demonstrations and to the sit-down strikes, with police and military measures—and this would inevitably have been done if it had not had in its service Blum, Jouhaux, Thorez and Co.—the movement at an accelerated tempo would have reached a more elevated level; the struggle for power would have posed itself indubitably as the order of the day. But the bourgeoisie, utilising the service of the Popular Front, responded by an apparent retreat and by temporary concessions; to the offensive of the strikers they opposed the ministry of Blum which appeared to the workers as their own, or almost their own, government. The G.C.T. and the Comintern supported this betrayal with all their strength.

In order to lead the revolutionary struggle for power, it is necessary to see clearly the class from whom the power must be wrested. The workers did not recognise the enemy because he was disguised as a friend. In order to struggle for power, it is necessary moreover to have the instrument of struggle, the party, the trade unions, the soviets. The workers found these instruments rubbed out, because the leaders of the workers' organisations formed an enclosure around the bourgeois power in order to mask it, to render it unrecognisable and invulnerable. Thus the revolution that began found itself braked, arrested, demoralised.

The past two and a half years since then have revealed step by step the impotence, the falsity, and the hollowness of the Popular Front. What appeared to the labouring masses as a "popular" government is revealed to be simply a temporary mask of the imperialist bourgeoisie. This mask is now discarded. The bourgeoisie apparently think that the workers are sufficiently deluded and weakened; that the immediate danger of a revolution has passed. The ministry of Daladier is only, in accordance with the design of the bourgeoisie, an unavoidable stage in passing over to a stronger and more substantial government of the imperialist dictatorship.

Is the bourgeoisie correct in its diagnosis? Has the *immediate* danger to it really passed? In other words, has the revolution really been deferred to an indefinite, that is to say, remote future? Nothing demonstrates this. Assertions of this type are, at the least, hasty and premature. The last word in the *present* crisis has not yet been said. In any case to be optimistic over the accounts of the bourgeoisie is not at all the way of the revolutionary party, which is the first to sally forth on the field of battle and the last to leave it.

Bourgeois "democracy" has now become the privilege of the most powerful and the wealthiest exploiting and slave-holding nations. France belongs to this category, but among them she is the weakest link. Her specific economic weight has not corresponded for a long time with her world position inherited from the past. That is why imperialist France now falls under blows of history that she will not escape. The fundamental elements of the revolutionary situation not only have not disappeared in the last two or three years but have been, on the contrary, greatly strengthened. The international and internal situation of the country has grown worse. The war danger draws near. If the fear of the bourgeoisie before the revolution has been lessened, the general consciousness of an impasse has increased.

Nevertheless, how shall we present matters concerning the "subjective factors," that is, concerning the will of the proletariat to struggle? This question—precisely because it concerns the *subjective* sphere and not the *objective*—cannot be resolved by a precise *a priori* investigation. What decides in the final score is living action, that is, the real movement of the struggle. But there do exist certain criteria, not without importance, for the evaluation of the "subjective factors;" even from a great distance one can deduce them from the experience of the last "general strike."

Unfortunately we cannot give here a detailed analysis of the struggle of the French workers in the second half of November and the first days of December. But even the most general data are sufficient for the question which interests us. The participation in the demonstration strike of close to two million workers, with five million members in the C.G.T. (at least on paper), is a defeat. But upon taking into account the political conditions already indicated and, above all, the fact that the principal "organisers" of the strike were at the same time the principal strike-breakers, the figure of two millions testifies to the spirit of struggle evinced by the French proletariat. This conclusion becomes even more evident and more clear in the light of previous events—the tumultuous meetings and demonstrations, the encounters with the police and the army, the strikes, the occupation of factories commencing November 17 and tending to increase with the active participation of the rank and file Communists, Socialists and syndicalists. The C.G.T. manifestly commences to lose footing in the events. On November 25th the trade union bureaucrats called a "non-political" peaceful strike for November 30. That is, five days later.

In other words, *instead of developing, extending, and generalising the genuine movement which took on more and more combative aspects, Jouhaux and Co. countered to this revolutionary movement with the hollow idea of a platonic protest.* The delay of five days, at a moment when each day is a month,

was necessary to the bureaucrats in order to paralyse, wipe out, in tacit collaboration with the authorities, the movement which was developing spontaneously and which they feared no less than did the bourgeoisie. The police and military measures of Daladier could not have had serious effect unless Jouhaux and Co. had driven the movement into an impasse.

The non-participation (or weak participation) in the "general strike" by the railway workers, workers in the war industries, metal workers, and other advanced layers of the proletariat was in no case due to indifference on their part; during the previous two weeks the workers of these categories had taken an active part in the struggle. But precisely the advanced layers understood better than the others, above all after Daladier's measures, that now it is not a question of demonstrations nor of platonic protest but of the struggle for power. The participation of the most backward or, from a social point of view, less important layers of workers, in the demonstration-strike testifies on the other hand to the profound crisis of the country and to the fact that in the toiling masses revolutionary energy still exists despite the years of disintegrating Popular Front politics.

History has shown certainly that even after a decisive and definite defeat of the revolution the most backward layers of the workers have undertaken the offensive, the railway workers, the metal workers, etc., remaining passive. This, for example, happened in Russia after the crushing of the insurrection of December 1905. But that situation was the result of the fact that the advanced layers had already consumed their strength in the long previous battles: strikes, lockouts, demonstrations, encounters with the police and the army, insurrections. One cannot say this for the French proletariat. The movement of 1936 has not in any way consumed the forces of the vanguard. The deception invoked by the Popular Front has been able, certainly, to bring about a temporary demoralisation in certain layers; but this is balanced by the exacerbation of revolt and impatience in other layers. At the same time the movements of 1936 as well as 1938 have enriched the entire proletariat with an invaluable experience and developed thousands of local workers' leaders independent of the official bureaucracy. It is necessary to understand how to find access to these leaders, to link them with one another, to arm them with a revolutionary programme.

We have not the least intention of offering from afar counsel on tactics to our French friends who find themselves on the scene of action and who can feel much better than we the pulse of the masses. Nevertheless, for all revolutionary Marxists it is now more than ever evident that the only serious and definitive measure for drawing a balance of the forces, among them the willingness of the masses to struggle,

is action. Pitiless criticism of the Second and of the Third International has no revolutionary value except to the extent that it aids in mobilising the advance guard for direct intervention in the events. The fundamental slogans for the mobilisation are given in the programme of the Fourth International, which has in the present period a more timely character in France than in any other country. On

our French comrades there rests an immense political responsibility. To aid the French section of the Fourth International with all our forces and with all our means, moral and material, is the most important and most imperious duty of the international revolutionary vanguard.

Coyoacan, D. C.

December 14, 1938.

'Peace-Moves' in China

The defection of Wang Ching-wei marks the first serious split in the Kuomintang party since the beginning of the war with Japan. It is very unlikely that it will be the last. The Chinese bourgeoisie has by now had more than enough of the war, and has no stomach left for the "prolonged hostilities" with which Chiang Kai-shek hopes to wear out the Japanese by a date not specified. The divisions of interest and opinion which were manifest before the war began are once more making themselves felt. China has hitherto shown a remarkable degree of unity in the face of the Japanese invasion—much greater than the Japanese expected. But this cannot go on for ever; the tensions inside Chinese society are too great to allow such a harmony to endure after the early war-time ardour has disappeared. So now the bourgeois leaders must make up their minds what they are going to do. At the outset there were three groups among them; one believed that China could bring about Anglo-American intervention and thus crush Japan, a second held that it was worth while fighting, even unsuccessfully, in order to impress Japan with the Chinese will to resist and thus get a better bargain than could be got without fighting, while a third considered that it was better to play for time and make concessions to Japanese imperialism. To-day the first group is deeply disillusioned, the second thinks that honour is satisfied and that the time has come to talk business with the Japanese, and the third can say "I told you so!" The younger army officers, who have always formed the nucleus of the war party, still have plenty of fighting spirit, but they are no longer as bellicose as they were. What else is there? Only the masses of the Chinese people. But it is they who are putting the Chinese bourgeoisie in a very uncomfortable position. For they have borne the brunt of a devastating war for the sake of national independence, and if their "nationalist" leaders come to terms with Japan on the basis of sharing out the profits of Chinese industrialisation at the expense of the Chinese masses, they may begin to realise that they have been betrayed. If, on the other hand, the Kuomintang politicians try to retain their leadership of the masses by continuing the war, the prospects are

rather bleak for all those who have been accustomed to comfortable lives. The Japanese hold six out of seven of the largest cities in China and control the whole of the coastline; the unsubdued inland provinces are overcrowded with refugees, deficient in all kinds of industrial equipment, and almost entirely cut off from foreign trade. In these circumstances the Chinese bourgeois naturally feels that being a compradore to Japanese enterprise in Shanghai or Canton would be preferable to trying to make bricks without straw in Chengtu or Kweiyang. Only at present he dare not say so—not inside the domain of Chiang Kai-shek. Wang Ching-wei prudently crossed the frontier into French Indo-China before issuing his peace proclamation. But his message has doubtless given a lead to many who do not yet admit their desire for making peace with Japan.

What will be the reaction of the Chinese masses when it becomes clear that at any rate a large section of the bourgeoisie is deserting the national cause? Will they simply be thankful that the long slaughter is over and welcome a chance to rebuild their bomb-smashed homes? Or will they turn against those who have caused them to endure unspeakable misery for a year and a half only to sell out on them in the end? The devotion with which they have so far endured the sacrifices they have been called on to make suggests the latter answer, for only a real loyalty to a cause could have kept the people steadfast for so long in such an unequal struggle. Their sense of betrayal will be in proportion to the intensity of patriotic feeling which has been aroused in them by nationalist propaganda.

The accounts of the Far Eastern war appearing in the press have given very little idea of the degree to which the Chinese masses have been made to bear the brunt of the war, while the rich have looked after their own interests. In the first place, nearly all wealthy Chinese have for many years been accustomed to keep a large part of their money in foreign banks; this money is beyond the reach either of the Chinese Government or of Japanese looters, and is always available for the owners should they find it healthy for them to leave China—as some of them have already done. The main stress both of

war-time taxation and of Japanese plundering in the occupied areas has fallen, therefore, not on the wealthy classes, but on the middle and poorer sections of the people. The poorest, who might seem to have nothing worth taking, have often suffered the most, for the Japanese troops, in parts of China where there is a shortage of fuel, carry off any wooden implements or furniture they can lay hands on—even wheelbarrows—for their camp fires.

Secondly, and even more, the Chinese masses have suffered in unequal degree from the famous "scorched earth" policy. We are told by *China Information Service*, a Chinese propagandist organ published in America, that "to complete the programme of leaving nothing to the Japanese, the Chinese authorities in Kiangsi have decided to lay waste the entire countryside, whenever they should find it necessary to withdraw therefrom. They have a plan of burning all houses so that the Japanese would not find a single roof to take shelter under. This would entail the wholesale destruction of thousands upon thousands of houses both in towns and in villages." Such measures as there are admirably quoted by pro-Chinese enthusiasts as evidence of China's heroism. And so indeed they would be if they involved an equal sacrifice for all concerned. But there is good reason to believe that the "scorched earth" policy in many areas has developed into a gigantic "racket" for filling the pockets of commanding officers. Unless the local military authorities are unusually strict, a landlord or merchant can pay to have his property forgotten by the scorchers; it is only the poor, who cannot pay bribes, who must always sacrifice themselves for the good of their country. Moreover, the peasant, evicted from his home, becomes an unconsidered refugee, while the well-to-do, even if their houses are scorched, can afford to take lodgings in other places.

If the Chinese peasants put up with conscription, increased taxes, forced labour, requisitions and "scorched earth," it is partly because of their traditional, fatalistic resignation to official exactions, but partly also—with the more politically conscious among them—because they have been exhorted to give of their best in this war by that power to which alone in the past they have looked for a way out of their troubles—the Chinese Communist Party. They remember how the Communists in Kiangsi and elsewhere divided the landlords' estates among the peasants and how the armies of Chiang Kai-shek drove them out and put the landlords back. They remember how the Communists combined the slogans of social revolution and anti-imperialism—"redivide the land and fight Japan." Then at the beginning of 1937 the Communists dropped the slogan "redivide the land" and explained to the peasants that in order to fight the Japanese it was necessary to have a national, united front under the officers of the Nanking Government army, who were mostly drawn from the landed gentry. For the officer-landlords could not be expected to fight for China if the peasants tried to take their land away from them. So the peasants must go on paying anything up to three-quarters of the produce of the land to its legal owners in order that they might be patriotic and help drive out the Japanese, and then

later on in the future, one day, some day, after the power of the Kuomintang had been consolidated by victory, the peasants could take the land—or maybe, the landlords would give it to them out of philanthropy.

If Lenin had followed this sort of logic, he would presumably have called upon the Russian peasants not to seize the estates of the landlords, and would have placed the Bolshevik Party under the orders of Kornilov, Kolchak, Denikin or some other general who might have seemed capable of freeing Russian territory from German or British invaders. Lenin, of course, did nothing of the kind. But then Lenin did not yet understand Marxism; the final revelation was withheld from him. It was left to Stalin to discover the art of making a proletarian revolution through collaboration with the bourgeoisie. He tried out his method in China in 1925-1927, with the result that the vanguard of the Chinese proletariat was massacred by the Comintern's "ally" Chiang Kai-shek. Since 1937 he has been trying it out again in favour of the same Chiang Kai-shek—with results which we are about to see.

The Chinese Communists have certainly not had much option as to their policy. They have never had any arms to speak of, except what they have been able to capture from their enemies. When they made their "Long March" from South China up to Shensi, they seem to have thought that by breaking through to the borders of Mongolia they would be able to get supplies from the Soviet Union. But sending arms to the Chinese Communists would have made it harder for Stalin to fix up a new alliance with Chiang Kai-shek, so the Kremlin discovered insuperable difficulties in conveying arms across the Gobi desert. Since the completion of the road by way of Hami and Lanchow fairly large quantities of munitions have been coming into China from the Soviet Union, but they do not go to the ex-Communists, now the Eighth Route Army; according to reliable information, the Soviet lorries take the stuff direct to centres under control of the Chungking Government, which distributes to the various fronts as it thinks fit. It may be imagined that under this system the former Red armies do not get an unduly large share.

On the political side the Chinese Communists, having agreed to say no more about the agrarian question, can do nothing but compete with the Kuomintang in "anti-Japanism." Undoubtedly, they have gained a strong hold over the masses in North China by the energy of their struggle against the invaders. But merely by being anti-Japanese they will never be able to "take away the soldiers" from the Japanese generals. If they could confront the Japanese army with a landlordless countryside, it would certainly put "dangerous thoughts" into the heads of Japanese peasant soldiers; their minds would turn to their own fields back home in Owari or Echigo. But as long as the invading columns see no example of social revolution, but only evidences of anti-Japanism, the rank and file are merely confirmed in the beliefs taught them by their officers—that the Chinese, jealous of Japan and egged on by sinister influences from London, Washington and Moscow, have been seeking to ruin the Mikado's islands by boycotts, tariffs and em-

bargoes.

There can be no real revolutionary war without a spirit of internationalism; with a propaganda of national chauvinism it is only possible to fight as nation against nation. But here again the Stalinists know better than Lenin and Trotsky. Tukhachevsky conceived the Red Army as "the army of the international world proletariat" and not a national force. How far the Soviet Union has retreated from internationalism towards traditional Muscovite arrogance can be seen from a talk broadcast to the Soviet Union by a Red Army officer from the trenches during the battle at Changkufeng last August. Since nothing can be said over the air in the Soviet Union without official approval, his words must be regarded as expressing the Stalinist line with regard to Japan. He referred to the Japanese troops as "the yellow bandits." The epithet is significant when we remember that at the time of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 the Tsarist Russians spoke of the Japanese as "yellow monkeys." A Bolshevik bases propaganda on something better than an appeal to race prejudice worthy of Nazi Berlin. The skin of a Japanese peasant is as yellow as that of the Mikado; so also for that matter, are

the skins of many of the "inferior" nationalities of the Soviet Union, such as the Buryats, Yakuts and Oirats. What is left of Marxism if Soviet citizens are only to contend with Japanese imperialists because of the colour of their skins?

But the Chinese Revolution is not yet dead, and it may yet break loose from the fetters with which the Comintern of Stalin has sought to bind it. If the Chinese bourgeoisie embraces the Anti-Comintern Pact—as they must do in the long run, unless world war or internal social revolution destroys the power of the Japanese Imperialists—the Chinese masses will have no choice but to return to the way of revolution. And in that hour the consequences of a *second* submission to the Kuomintang will be too obvious to leave any credit for the present leadership either of the Chinese C.P. or of the Comintern.

The nucleus for the revolutionary party which will lead the mass struggle exists in the small but well-tempered cadres of Chinese Bolshevik-Leninists. Struggling against the stream, harried with the customary Stalinist slander, abuse and terror, they represent the sole hope for the Chinese masses of emancipation from their chains.

Barcelona Betrayed

The military prosecution of the Spanish Civil War has never been distinguished by brilliance on the part of the Republican High Command, for apart from the victory of Guadalajara, the much boosted Peoples Army has been singularly proficient only in the handing over of important towns with a minimum of resistance. This, of course, is no reflection on the fighting capabilities of the Spanish workers and peasants, on the contrary, the very existence of the Republic testifies to the courageous tenacity of the proletarian fighters, but the undeniable facts that emerge from a survey of the purely military aspect of the war, point unerringly to the High Command as the source of the major defeats suffered by the Republic since the liquidation of the workers militias.

Since it would be politically incorrect to ascribe military defeat wholly to military men, without attempting to gauge the effect of political capitulation on military strategy, it is unavoidable to connect the visit of Sr. Del Vayo to Geneva with the fall of Barcelona.

The Popular Front has as its foremost requisite the strangulation of the proletariat revolution and is consequently obliged to depend upon the imperialist recognition for its very existence. Del Vayo, having spent a whole week on his knees before the British, French and Russian delegations, was forced to transmit the news of the "democrats" refusal to mitigate their declared policy of non-intervention to a quaking Government which was depending upon those same "democrats" to send aid, if only to protect their own imperialist interests; in the case of France, the Pyrenees, in the case of Britain, the Mediterranean sea route, and in the case of Russia, the hope of reviving the Franco-Soviet Pact.

Barcelona was defended in reality by this hope alone, and the bravery of the workers was of no

avail, for it became obvious that political capitulation was the precursor of military capitulation.

On January 15th, Franco captured Tarragona and thereby shortened the front by over 75 miles, enabling him to converge upon the Catalan capital and to take the key-point of Iguelda just seven days later. The Republicans, having been frustrated in their badly conceived counter-offensives on the Ebro and in Estremadura, were forced back to the fortified line between Solsona and Manresa. It became obvious to everyone that Barcelona must prepare for a siege comparable to that of Madrid.

If any doubts were entertained by the Government on this issue they were speedily removed by the infliction of 19 air raids within the space of 31 hours, thus intensifying the aerial blockade of the city and demolishing any hope of relief by overland methods. The Fascist superiority in the air was never more ably demonstrated than by their use of aircraft during the week before the city fell, and the Republican's aerial inferiority was such that complete batteries of Fascist field guns were able to pulverize the city's defences without fear of hindrance from the enemy.

The aerial defences of Barcelona have been sufficient in the past to at least provide a formidable challenge to the Fascist aviators, and one of the charges which Negrin and Co. will be called upon to answer is the fact that over 100 modern American planes were actually found by the Fascists in their crates UNPACKED!

By calling up the men of the 1921-1915 classes, an army of 350,000 men was speedily mobilised. Through the open seaboard, contact with the severed southern half of the Republic was assured, to say nothing of the South Coast of France. With these

gentlemen who were determined to fight inch by inch against Franco were so aghast at the peril to their own skins, that they bolted, and with such haste that Franco was unable to find them with advanced cavalry patrols, being compelled to send aircraft as far as Figueras before contacting his valiant enemies.

The full facts are not completely known at the time of going to press, but the very eagerness on the part of the Stalinists to exaggerate and invent the subsequent stand made by the scattered Republicans, is significant of the magnitude of the disaster.

The Fascists occupied a city that functioned perfectly. The great "Telefonica," so ably "defended" against the workers in May 1937, was incontinently abandoned to Franco, thus presenting him with the centre of communications in Northern Spain. Was it asking too much to expect the Government to at least blow up this vital building before retreating?

Barcelona is the terminus for the coastal and northern railroads. Could not these have been demolished? Apparently not, for the Fascists captured 800 trucks filled with war material. Could not the 800 lorries have been driven North with the retiring Republicans, or was it desired that they should fall into Franco's hands.

Would it not have been better to fire the 4,000,000 gallons of petrol rather than let it be used to reinforce the Fascist supplies?

What of the 70 field guns, the hundreds of machine guns, the Boeing and Curtiss-Wright X aeroplanes, the arsenals, the bridges, the harbour and docks . . . was it impossible to render these things useless before retreating?

Barcelona, the home of the Spanish Revolution, the seat of the proletarian organisations, the very heart of the working class, was SURRENDERED.

The betrayal of such towns as Malaga, Bilbao, Santander, Gijon—all surrendered without serious contest—pales into insignificance beside this latest and greatest disaster. When the truth emerges—if it ever does—the workers will be able to see to the full, the utter treachery of the Popular Front.

Until then, the Republican territory will dwindle to a smaller and smaller size, and the valour of the workers notwithstanding, will be ultimately swallowed by the Fascists. Thus will the Popular Front have fulfilled its role of traitor.

Never more clearly than in the fall of Barcelona shall we see that political capitulation to the bourgeoisie leads to the defeat of the proletariat, never more urgent therefore is our task to expose the treacherous mendicants of the Popular Front in this country, to build up the Fourth International in Britain, that we might not be mute in the face of Fascism, that we shall be able to provide a Party to lead the workers away from the bastard policies of the Second and Third Internationals, onto the road to Socialism.

Labour and War

A FRESH LESSON

by Leon Trotsky

Continued

In order to understand the present rôle of the social democracy and of the ex-Comintern, it is necessary once again to recall the economic foundation upon which opportunism in the world labour movement rests.

The flowering of capitalism which lasted, with inevitable oscillations, up to 1913, enabled the bourgeoisie on the one hand to raise slightly the living standard of certain proletarian layers, and on the other to throw rather juicy sops to the bureaucracy and aristocracy of labour, thus raising them above the masses. The trade-union and parliamentary bureaucracy, whose "social problem" appeared close to a solution, was in a position to point out to the masses the beginnings of a change for the better in their own lives. This is the social basis of reformism (opportunism) as a system of *illusions* for the masses and a system of *deceit* on the part of the labour bureaucracy. The reformist optimism of the

Second International reached its most luxuriant flowering in the years of the last economic boom prior to the war (1909-1913). For this reason, the leaders hailed the war and depicted it to the masses as an *external* calamity that threatened the bases of growing national welfare. Hence, the policy of "defence of the Fatherland" which was in actuality on the part of the masses an unconscious, and on the bureaucracy's part a conscious or semi-conscious defence of the imperialist interests of their respective bourgeoisies.

The war proved in reality to be not an "external" calamity which had temporarily disrupted national progress but rather the explosion of internal contradictions of the imperialist system at a moment when further progress on the basis of this system had become practically impossible. And since the war could neither enlarge our planet nor restore youth to capitalism, it ended by accelerating and aggravating in the extreme all the processes of capitalist decay. With the decline of democracy set in the decline of

the labour bureaucracy. Fascism brought the workers "only" redoubled enslavement; to the reformist bureaucracy it brought utter ruin.

The political form of democracy, even if in an extremely mutilated condition ("emergency power," immigration laws, abandonment of the right of asylum, etc.), has been preserved among the great powers only by Great Britain, France, and the United States, the richest, traditionally the most predatory and privileged capitalist countries which have long since concentrated in their hands a lion's share of the colonial possessions and the chief natural resources of our planet. It is not hard to find the explanation for this "natural selection." Democracy can be maintained only so long as class contradictions do not reach an explosive state. In order to mitigate social frictions the bourgeoisie has been compelled to provide feed for a broad layer of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, and the bureaucracy and aristocracy of labour. The bigger the feeding-trough the more ardent is social-patriotism. The reformist feeding-trough has nowadays been preserved only in those countries which were able in the past to accumulate vast wealth, thanks to the exploitation of the world market, and their pillage of the colonies. In other words, in the condition of capitalist decay a *democratic régime* is accessible (up to a certain time) only to the most *aristocratic bourgeoisie*. The basis of social-patriotism remains colonial slavery.

In countries like Italy and Germany, which have not inherited from the past vast accumulations of riches and which are deprived of the opportunity of obtaining super-profits from their colonies, the bourgeoisie has destroyed the parliament, dispersed the reformist bureaucracy and placed the workers in an iron vice. To be sure, the Fascist bureaucracy devours not less but more than the reformist bureaucracy; but, in return, it is not compelled to make concessions to the masses nor to issue drafts which decaying capitalism can no longer pay. Deprived of its feeding-trough, the retired social-democratic bureaucracy of Italy, Germany and Austria holds high the banner of defeatism—in emigration.

The chief source of the strength of the social-patriotic, or more exactly, the social-imperialist parties is the protection of the bourgeoisie which through the parliament, the press, the army and the police, protects and defends the social democracy against all kinds of revolutionary movements and even against revolutionary criticism. In the future war, owing to the sharpening of national and international contradictions, this organic bond between the bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie will be revealed still more openly and cynically, or to put more exactly, it is already being revealed, especially in the treacherous policy of the People's Fronts which were absolutely inconceivable on the eve of the last war. However, the initiative for the People's Fronts originates not from the Second but the Third International.

COMMUNO-CHAUVINISM

The monstrous and rapid development of Soviet opportunism finds its explanation in causes analogous to those which, in the previous generation, led to the flowering of opportunism in capitalist countries, namely, the parasitism of the labour bureaucracy which had successfully solved its "social question" on the basis of a rise of the productive forces in the U.S.S.R. But since the Soviet bureaucracy is incomparably more powerful than the labour bureaucracy in capitalist countries, and since the feeding-trough at its disposal is distinguished by its almost unlimited capacity, there is nothing astonishing in the fact that the Soviet variety of opportunism immediately assumed an especially perfidious and vile character.

As regards the ex-Comintern, its social basis, properly speaking, is of a twofold nature: on the one hand, it lives on the subsidies of the Kremlin, submits to the latter's commands, and, in this respect, every ex-communist bureaucrat is the younger brother and subordinate of the Soviet bureaucrat. On the other hand, the various machines of the ex-Comintern feed from the same sources as the social democracy, that is, the super-profits of imperialism. The growth of the communist parties in recent years, their infiltration into the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie, their installation in the state machinery, the trade unions, parliaments, municipalities, etc., have strengthened in the extreme their dependence on national imperialism at the expense of their traditional dependence on the Kremlin.

Ten years ago it was predicted that the theory of socialism in one country must inevitably lead to the growth of nationalist tendencies in the sections of the Comintern. This prediction has become an obvious fact. But until recently, the chauvinism of the French, British, Belgian, Czechoslovak, American and other communist parties seemed to be, and, to a certain extent, was a refracted image of the interests of Soviet diplomacy ("the defence is the U.S.S.R."). To-day, we can predict with assurance the inception of a new stage. The growth of imperialist antagonisms, the obvious proximity of the war danger and the equally obvious isolation of the U.S.S.R. must unavoidably strengthen the *centrifugal nationalist tendencies* within the Comintern. Each one of its sections will begin to evolve a patriotic policy on its own account. Stalin has reconciled the communist parties of imperialist democracies with their national bourgeoisies. This stage has now been passed. The Bonapartist procurer has played his rôle. Henceforth the communo-chauvinists will have to worry about their own hides, whose interests by no means always coincide with the "defence of the U.S.S.R."

When the American Browder deemed it possible to declare before the Senatorial committee that in case of a war between the United States and the Soviet Union his party would be found on the side

of its passionately beloved Fatherland, he himself might have possibly considered this statement as a simple stratagem. But in reality, Browder's answer is an unmistakable symptom of a change from a "Moscow" to a "national" orientation. The "stratagem" arose out of the necessity of adaptation to imperialist "patriotism." The cynical grossness of this stratagem (the turn from the "Fatherland of the toilers" to the Republic of the Dollar) reveals the profound extent of degeneration that has occurred and the full extent of the dependence of the sections of the Comintern on the public opinion of the bourgeoisie.

Fifteen years of uninterrupted purges, degradation and corruption have brought the bureaucracy of the ex-Comintern to such a degree of demoralisation that it has become able and anxious to openly take into its hands the banner of social-patriotism. The Stalinists (we shall soon have to say, the ex-Stalinists) have not, of course, set the Thames on fire. They have simply picked up the well-worn banalities of petty-bourgeois opportunism. But in propagating them, they have injected into them the frenzy of "revolutionary" *parvenus*, who have turned totalitarian slander, blackmail and murder into normal methods of "defending democracy." As for the old classic reformists, washing their hands in innocence after every embarrassing situation, they have known how to use the support of the new recruits to chauvinism.

In that imperialist country which happens to be in the same camp with the U.S.S.R. during the war (if any such is found), the section of the ex-Comintern will, naturally, "defend" Moscow. This defence, however, will be of no great value, for in such a country all parties will "defend" the U.S.S.R. (In order not to compromise itself with its imperialist ally, Moscow would probably order the communist party not to shout too loudly, and might possibly try to dissolve it altogether). On the contrary, in countries of the hostile camp, *i.e.*, precisely where Moscow will be in greatest need of defenders, the ex-communist parties will be found completely on the side of their imperialist Fatherland: this course will be infinitely less dangerous and far more profitable. The ruling Moscow clique will reap the just fruits of fifteen years' prostitution of the Comintern.

THE SECOND AND THIRD INTERNATIONALS IN COLONIAL COUNTRIES.

The true character of the social democracy as a party whose policy rested and still rests on imperialist exploitation of backward peoples appears most clearly in the fact that in colonial and semi-colonial countries the Second International has never had any influence. The labour bureaucracy of imperialist countries feared either consciously or semi-consciously to set in motion a movement in the colonies that might have undermined the basis of its own

prosperity in the metropolitan centres.

It was otherwise with the Comintern. As a genuinely internationalist organisation, it immediately threw itself upon the virgin soil of the colonies and thanks to the revolutionary programme of Leninism gained important influence there. The subsequent bourgeois degeneration of the Comintern transformed its sections in colonial and semi-colonial countries, especially in Latin America, into a left agency of European and American imperialism. Parallel with this, a change occurred also in the social basis of the colonial "communist" parties. Mercilessly plundering its Asiatic and African slaves and its Latin American semi-slaves, foreign capitalism is at present compelled in the colonies to feed a thin layer of aristocracy—pitiful, pathetic but still an aristocracy amid the universal poverty. Stalinism has in recent years become the party of this labour "aristocracy" as well as of the "left" section of the petty bourgeoisie, the office-holders in particular. Bourgeois lawyers, journalists, teachers, etc., adapting themselves to the national revolution and exploiting the labour organisations to make careers for themselves, find in Stalinism the best possible ideology.

The revolutionary struggle against imperialism demands courage, resolution and the spirit of self-sacrifice. Where are the petty-bourgeois heroes of the phrase to find these qualities? On the other hand, adaptation to "democratic" imperialism permits them to carve out placid and pleasant careers on the back of the toilers. The best possible way of hiding this adaptation from the workers is provided by the slogan of "Defence of the U.S.S.R.", *i.e.*, friendship with the Kremlin oligarchy. This opens up an opportunity of publishing newspapers without readers, arranging pompous congresses and all sorts of international publicity. This corporation of professional "Friends of the Soviet Union," fake "socialists" and "communists" who by their noisy declamation against Fascism cover up their social parasitism and their subservience to the imperialists and the Kremlin oligarchy has become a veritable plague of the labour movement in colonial and semi-colonial countries. Stalinism—under all its masks—is the chief obstacle in the path of the liberating struggle of backward and oppressed peoples. The problem of colonial revolutions has henceforth become indissolubly linked with the historic mission of the Fourth International.

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SQUEEZED LEMONS (No. 34)

The London Bureau of incurable centrist. (Fenner Brockway, Walcher and Co.) jointly with Brandler, Sneeveliet, Marceau Pivert, and with the participation of "sections that have split from the so-called Fourth International," have united in view of the war danger to create—please do not smile!—the War Emergency Fund. These gentlemen did not

bother their heads about a "fund" of ideas. Thank Heaven, they are materialists and not idealists. It is open to doubt whether this new "unification" represents a danger to imperialism. But it does perform a great service to the Fourth International, for it brings together the shallowness, the hybridity and inconsistency of all varieties and shades of centrism, *i.e.*, that tendency which is in sharpest contradiction with the spirit of our epoch. Like all similar mechanical "unifications," it will become a source of new internal conflicts and splits and will fall to pieces at the very moment that the hour for action arrives.

Could it be otherwise? The organisations occupied with the heroic creation of the "Fund" did not arise on the basis of a common programme, but have arrived from all the corners of the political map of centrism as the homeless splinters of old opportunist parties and factions, continuing even to-day to play with all the colours of the opportunist rainbow, and to evolve in different directions. All of them have steadily declined and grown weaker in recent years, with the exception of the newly-split party of Marceau Pivert, for which the same unenviable fate may be predicted. In no country in the world did the London Bureau succeed in creating a new organisation, from young fresh elements on the basis of its own programme. No revolutionary group will rally to this banner which has neither a past nor a future. In the colonial countries the London Bureau does not possess even a shadow of influence. It may be regarded as a law that the "revolutionary" organisation which in our imperialist epoch is incapable of sinking its roots into the colonies is doomed to vegetate miserably.

Each of these outlived groups holds together by force of inertia and not by the strength of ideas. The one organisation with a more serious revolutionary past in this quarter, the P.O.U.M., has to date proved incapable of courageously revising its centrist policy, which was one of the main reasons for the collapse of the Spanish revolution. The remaining members of the group are even less capable of criticism and self-criticism. The spirit of senile dillitantism hovers over this whole enterprise.

Assuredly not a few "remnants" had gathered in the beginning around the banner of the Fourth International. But the enormous work of selection, cleansing and re-education was accomplished here on the basis of a scientific theory and a clear programme. This work, the meaning and importance of which philistines have never understood, has gone on and is still going on in an atmosphere of free, open and patient discussion. Whoever had failed to pass *this* test has proved in action his organic inability to contribute anything to the building of a revolutionary International. It is these winnowed, worn and rejected "remnants" that have been incorporated to-day into the "fund" of international centrism. This fact alone places on the entire enterprise a stamp of hopeless disability.

In a lucid moment Marceau Pivert declared a few years ago that any tendency in the working class conducting a struggle against "Trotskyism" thereby characterises itself as a reactionary tendency. This did not, we notice, prevent Pivert, as a congenital centrist whose words are always contrary to his deeds, from joining the London Bureau which seeks to create a physiognomy of its own by convulsively shying away from "Trotskyism."

It is not hard, however, to forecast that the bourgeoisie, the reformists and the Stalinists will continue to label these creators of the "Fund" as—"Trotskyists" or "semi-Trotskyists." This will be done in part out of ignorance but chiefly in order to compel them to excuse, justify, and demarcate themselves. And they will actually vow, with might and main, that they are not at all Trotskyists, and that if they should happen to try to roar like lions, then like their forerunner, Bottom the weaver, they succeed in "roaring" like sucking doves. We know them: they are no fledglings. The Fenner Brockways, the Walchers, the Brandlers, the Sneevliets, the Piverts, as well as the rejected elements of the Fourth International have managed in the course of many long years—for some, decades—to evince their hopeless eclecticism in theory and their sterility in practice. They are less cynical than the Stalinist and a trifle to the left of the left social democrats—that is all that can be said for them. That is why in the list of the Internationals they must therefore be entered as No. 3½ or 3¼. With a "fund" or without one, they will enter into history as an association of squeezed lemons. When the great masses, under the blows of the war, will be set in revolutionary motion, they will not bother to inquire about the address of the London Bureau.

PERSPECTIVES

All the forces and mainsprings of the last war are again being set in motion but in an incomparably more violent and open form. The movement follows well-worn grooves and consequently proceeds at a swifter pace. Nobody believes at present, as they did on the eve of 1914, in the inviolability of frontiers or the stability of régimes. This is an enormous advantage to the revolutionary party. If on the eve of the last war, the sections of the Second International themselves did not know as yet what their conduct would be on the morrow, and adopted super-revolutionary resolutions; if the left elements only gradually freed themselves from the pacifist swamp and groped for their road, then to-day *all the starting positions have been occupied with precision prior to the war*. Nobody expects an international policy from the social-democratic parties which themselves do not promise anything but the "defence of the Fatherland." The departure of the Czech social-patriots from the Second International is the beginning of the latter's official disintegration along national lines. The policy of the Third International is fixed in advance almost as distinctly; the

prognosis in this case is only slightly complicated by an element of adventurism. If the German and Italian social democrats and ex-communists will be platonically defeatists, it is only because Hitler and Mussolini forbid them to be patriots. But wherever the bourgeoisie still continues to feed the labour bureaucracy, the social democrats and ex-communists will be found completely on the side of their General Staffs, and, what is more, the first fiddle of chauvinism will be in the hands of the musicians of the Stalin school. Not only the fiddle, but also the revolver aimed at the revolutionary workers.

At the beginning of the last war, Jean Jaurès was assassinated, and at the end of the war, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. In France the assassination of the leader of the French socialist party did not deter other leaders from entering the government of imperialist war. In Germany the murder of two great revolutionists was accomplished with the direct participation of the social-democratic government. The actual murderer in France was an obscure petty-bourgeois chauvinist, while in Germany counter-revolutionary officers did the killing. The situation to-day even in this respect is incomparably clearer. The work of exterminating the internationalists has already commenced on a world scale prior to the outbreak of the war. Imperialism no longer has to depend on a "happy accident." In the Stalinist Mafia it has a ready-made international agency for the systematic extermination of revolutionists. Jaurès, Liebknecht, Luxemburg enjoyed world fame as socialist leaders. Rudolf Klement was a young and as yet little known revolutionist. Nevertheless the assassination of Klement because he was the secretary of the Fourth International is of profound symbolic significance. Through its Stalinist gangsters imperialism indicates beforehand from what side mortal danger will threaten it in time of war.

The imperialists are not mistaken. If they succeeded, after the last war, in maintaining themselves everywhere except in Russia, it was only because of the absence of revolutionary parties. Freeing themselves with difficulty from the web of the old ideology, with its fetishism of "unity," most of the oppositional elements in the social democracy did not go further than pacifism. In critical moments such groupings proved more capable of checking the revolutionary mass movement than of heading it. In this sense, it is no exaggeration to say that the "unity" of the parties of the Second International saved the European bourgeoisie.

At present, sections of the Fourth International exist in thirty countries. True, they are only the vanguard of the vanguard. But if to-day, prior to the war, we had mass revolutionary organisations, then revolution and not war would be on the order of the day. We lack this, of course, and we hold

no illusions on this score. But the position of the revolutionary vanguard is far more favourable to-day than it was 25 years ago. The main conquest is that before the war there already exist in all the most important countries of the world tested cadres, numbering hundreds and thousands of revolutionists in growing numbers, welded together by the unity of a doctrine, and tested in a school of cruelest persecutions by the imperialist bourgeoisie, the social democracy, and, particular, the Stalinist Mafia. The Second, the Third, and the Amsterdam Internationals cannot at present convene their congresses, because they are paralysed by their dependence on imperialism and because they are torn asunder by "national" contradictions. On the contrary, the sections of the Fourth International, despite their extremely meagre resources, the difficulties of obtaining visas, the murder of their secretary and the hail of repressions, were able in the most critical moment to convene their international congress and adopt unanimous decisions in which the tasks of the present titanic struggle are formulated precisely and concretely, on the basis of all historic experience.

These precious cadres will not be swerved from their road by any wave of chauvinism, nor intimidated by Stalinist Mausers and knives. The Fourth International will enter the next war as a tightly-welded unit, whose sections will be able to follow one and the same policy, irrespective of the boundaries and trenches dividing them. It is quite possible that at the beginning of the war, when the blind instinct of self-preservation combined with chauvinist propaganda will push the popular masses towards their governments, the sections of the Fourth International will find themselves isolated. They will know how to withstand nationalist hypnosis and the epidemic of patriotism. In the principles of internationalism they will find a bulwark against the herd panic below, and the terror from above. They will view with contempt the oscillations and vacillations of philistine "democracy." On the other hand, they will listen closely to the most oppressed sections of the population and to the army pouring out its blood. Each new day of war will work in our favour. Mankind has become poorer than it was 25 years ago, while the means of destruction have become infinitely more powerful. In the very first months of the war, therefore, a stormy reaction against the fumes of chauvinism will set in among the working masses. The first victims of this reaction, along with Fascism, will be the parties of the Second and Third Internationals. Their collapse will be the indispensable condition for an avowed revolutionary movement, which will find for its crystallisation no axis other than the Fourth International. Its tempered cadres will lead the toilers to the great offensive.

COYOACAN, D.F., Oct. 10, 1938