

WORKERS' INTERNATIONAL NEWS

VOL.2 NO.12

DECEMBER 1939

TWOPENCE

FINLAND - STALINISM OR SOCIALISM

Three months have passed since the outbreak of the Second World War. Months which, while uneventful and calm on the surface, have marked an epoch in world history. September 3rd inaugurated a period of storms and cataclysms in the relations between nations and classes.

Following hot on the heels of the German invasion came the onslaught of the Red Army in the Polish Ukraine and the subjugation of the Baltic States. These dealt the world proletariat a series of staggering blows. For years the Kremlin clique and its agency, the Communist International, had deliberately confused and befuddled the workers of the entire world with the policy of "collective security", of a "front against the aggressor", the fight of "democracy" against fascism, etc. Thus the revolutionary will of

the proletariat was paralysed, the struggle against war rendered innocuous and impotent, the anti-war strivings of the masses switched into the service of the war mongers, and the ideological basis created for the imperialists to take to arms.

The Communist International has been dealt a mortal blow and the Soviet Union has lost the trust and support of the masses in all lands. Stalin, for small gains, has squandered the heritage of October. The glory of the victorious revolution has grown dim and a mood of scepticism pervades the ranks of the advanced guard of the workers.

Now in the fourth month of the war Stalin and the bureaucratic rulers in Moscow have dealt yet another blow to the world proletariat and the Soviet

State. Completely indifferent to the opinion of the masses, they have launched an assault by land, sea and air on Finland. By the flames in the burning buildings in Helsinki is revealed the counter revolutionary role of Stalinism. Stalin has joined the company of the "aggressors". Both the internal situation and the discrediting in recent years of the Soviet Union have brought nearer the nightmare possibility of an attack by imperialism. The bureaucracy, in its frantic search for national security and its frenzied attempts at self preservation, has been forced to seek the road of salvation by the complete locking of the Baltic to any hostile move by the fleets of the capitalist countries. This could only be accomplished by the subjugation of Finland.

Stalin was not unaware of the moves which Britain was making for a change of government in Germany and the switching over of the war from Western Europe to the East. It was these attempts which led the Finnish capitalists in the last few weeks to resist the overtures of the Kremlin and to assume the position of vassalage of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. After a period of apparent compliance, the Finns, secretly encouraged and abetted by the imperialists of Britain and France, stiffened their resistance and refused to concede the strategic and naval bases demanded from them.

The Finns had thought that the coming of winter and the difficulty of military operations would leave them safe till the spring when succour might possibly come from the west. But it was decisive political considerations overriding all others which compelled the Kremlin to move now while the hands of their potential opponents are tied. Having abandoned all possible support of the international

working class, Stalin was forced into an attempt to crush the resistance of the Finnish bourgeoisie by force of arms.

The apologists of the Kremlin have attempted to justify their actions in three ways. First by explaining away the invasion as an attack by Finland on Russia. Second, by describing this as a revolutionary war, an extension of the boundaries of socialism, and therefore justified as being in the interests of the Finnish people. Third, that these acts were necessary for the defence of the Soviet Union against the impending imperialist attacks.

Only the hardened sycophants of the Comintern could hope to get even their own deluded ranks to believe a story so transparently false as the first. The idea that the capitalists of Finland with a population of three million would be mad enough to provoke a nation with a population of over 150 million, without the hope of any substantial aid from outside in the immediate future, is quite fantastic. The second argument, when examined, holds even less water than the first. Stalin's acts on an international scale have consistently been directed against the outbreak of a social revolution in any country. It was precisely this that made the pact with Hitler possible. In the case of the Baltic States, Stalin found it quite easy to come to an agreement with the bourgeoisie which would leave them, although completely under the domination of Russia, undisturbed in their freedom to exploit the workers and peasants. He tried to come to such an agreement with the Finnish bourgeoisie too, but relying on the geography of their country, the Finns proved intractable and preferred to remain a puppet of Britain and America, as an

"independent state." It was this possibility which represented a military menace to Russia and not at all, the concern for the oppressed Finnish workers and peasants, that precipitated the Russian invasion.

The satisfaction of the bourgeois world press at this so-called "Soviet Imperialism" represents the gain which the imperialists balance against the loss in strategic position and what, in effect was a colonial possession or sphere of influence. Weighing them one against the other the bourgeoisie does not seem to be altogether displeased. Faced with a revolutionary Russia based on extending the power of international socialism and not the purely "Russian" aims and interests of the bureaucracy, such a situation would have been impossible.

On the third point, the invasion, while temporarily strengthening the bureaucracy, severely weakens the defence of the Soviet Union as a workers state. Further extensions of territory under the domination of the Kremlin cannot but accelerate the pace of degeneration. The real defence of the Soviet Union, by the strengthening of the movement of the world proletariat towards the overthrow of capitalism, is the only means whereby the workers' state could hope to survive. The fate of the Soviet Union is bound up with the fate of the workers of all Europe.

Leaving the Stalinists unwinning their hopelessly tangled skein, let us see the reactions in the imperialist camp to events in Finland. The bourgeoisie of Britain and France have denounced Stalin in stronger terms than Hitler. The technique to the last detail, they tell us, is borrowed from the Nazis. But beyond an impotent and harmless press offensive this "flagrant and unashamed aggression" is for

the moment at any rate, to go completely unpunished. The imperialist governments have little reason to love the regime of collective ownership which still exists in Russia. They would jump at any opportunity which offered them the possibility of mass support for its destruction. They have not taken any action because, of course, their hands are tied by the war with Germany, but this fact alone converts the ideological cover for their real aims in the present war into a farce. To add the final touch of comedy we have the suggestions by the newspapers that Mussolini, recent "Liberator" of the Abyssinians and Albanians, is the most fitting candidate for the job of defender of small nations, of a champion for "poor little Finland," a role which he graciously suggests should be taken by the Allies.

The international social democracy while holding up their hands in horror faithfully reflect the opinions of their masters. The Labour Party through its spokesmen can only stammeringly follow the lead of Chamberlain. None have even dared to suggest war against the new "aggressor." All, of course, gleefully acclaim the failure of Bolshevism.

The revolutionary socialist can only condemn the actions of Stalinism as contrary to the interests of the workers. But what should decide the attitude of the international proletariat is not who is the aggressor, but in whose interests the war is being fought.

The hypocritical struggle of the Finnish capitalists for national independence has rallied behind them the masses of workers and peasants, and this is the direct outcome of Stalin's methods. Such leadership, where the

bourgeoisie is merely the tool of international finance capital, cannot bring a genuinely free Finland.

We call for the defence of the Soviet, because the Soviet Union still remains a workers' state despite the dictatorship of the counter-revolutionary bureaucracy. By the defence of the Soviet Union we mean the defence of the system of collective ownership, the heritage of the October Revolution. But are we not in effect defending Stalinism? we are asked. No, our method of defending the U.S.S.R. is a revolutionary method. We defend the Soviet Union by intensifying our struggle against our capitalists at home by striving for Soviet power and

by fraternising with the Soviet Army. Every blow against our own capitalists is a blow against the Stalinist regime. There is no other method of fighting Stalinism.

It is now clear that the problems of the small nations and the problem of the Soviet Union is bound up with the struggle of the proletariat for power. Self determination of nations can only be achieved by the overthrow of capitalism. We stand for an independent Soviet Finland as part of a Soviet Union which can only be achieved in the struggle against Stalin and for the Socialist United States of Europe.

Labour's "Peace" Aims

Under the pressure of growing discontent and restiveness of the rank and file in the Labour Party and Trade Unions, at long last we have a pronouncement on "Labour's Peace Aims" by the leader of the Labour Party. The war has been proceeding for only three months but already the alarm and suspicion of the masses as to the real purpose of the conflict has grown so strong that the Labour leaders are compelled to give an authoritative explanation of the policy of the party in supporting the war, if this opposition is not to get out of their control and assume proportions menacing the smooth and efficient waging of the war by the British Government.

The article in the "Daily Herald" of November 9th, by C.R. Attlee is one which must be carefully studied and analysed by the advanced workers in the Labour movement to see what it is

the labour leaders are putting over as their war, or as they prefer shamefacedly to suggest, their "peace aims" because it is on these grounds that they justify their support of the war. He enunciates six principles which he then expands and explains.

Firstly, "there should be no dictated peace", no revenge or punishment on the German people but restitution to the victims of aggression. Accepting this at its face value, how is this pious principle to be carried out? Attlee in pedantic tones explains that it was "the neglect of this principle" in the treaties after the last war which has resulted in the present conflict. There is nothing to show that the British and French Governments under their present leadership will not carry out an even more vicious version of Versailles if they win the war. On the contrary the vague and nebulous

declarations of their aims proves beyond a doubt that this is precisely what they intend. Churchill of 1939 remains faithful to the Churchill of 1914-1918. Labour leaders in those days were making the same vaporous declarations as today, but did not influence in the slightest degree the terms which were imposed on a defeated Germany. In 1914 they acted as a screen for the greedy aims of the bourgeoisie. Why do not Attlee and Co, if they are sincere, denounce the real aims of the Chamberlain Government now instead of waiting until it is too late?

The second principle is broadly speaking the right of self-determination of nations. Attlee, under pressure, is compelled to demand freedom for India as well as for Poland. But if the Labour Party cannot get freedom for India from the Government now, how can it be expected that when they can turn their full attention to affairs at home without their hands being tied by war in Europe, the capitalists will be any readier to give the Indian or other peoples in the Empire their freedom? Or for that matter that freedom for the oppressed peoples in Austria, Poland, etc, is or can be in any way the concern or the aim of the National Government when they are busy plundering and oppressing the colonial peoples for the purpose of financing the present war? Incidentally the sorry record of the two Labour Governments with respect to India, when the oppression was even worse than under Conservative administration does not inspire confidence, to say the least, in the capacity of the labour leaders to get this principle adopted. It is true that they were a minority administration, but in that case, as they are a minority in Parliament now, how will this principle be put into practice when the war ends?

The third principle, "the complete abandonment of aggression and of the use of armed force as an instrument of policy" reveals its farcical character when considered in the background of the history of the past twenty years. The failure of the League of Nations to regulate the insoluble contradictions between different capitalist states shows clearly what the fate will be of all such "idealist" babbling within the framework of capitalism-imperialism.

The fourth principle, the "recognition of rights of national, racial and religious minorities" was recognised in the Statutes of the League of Nations. The nations which were "liberated" by the Allies after the last war and for whom the present war is being waged, are to be "free" once again. Poland and Czechoslovakia were notorious for their persecution of the minorities within their borders. The futility of any such safeguards, while it is in the interests of the capitalists of the dominant races to plunder and oppress minorities, has been so clearly revealed that it requires no further elucidation.

The fifth principle, that of "European federation" is a recognition of the fact that mankind has long outgrown the old national boundaries which are now a fetter on the further development of civilisation. "Europe must federate or perish" contains a certain kernel of truth. But under capitalism such a proposal "is either impossible or reactionary" as Lenin retorted to the phrase-mongers who put this forward in the last war. England and France might agree to some sort of "federation" as a form of joint Franco-British domination of Europe. One of the reasons why Britain paralysed the resistance of France to German rearmament was to destroy the

French hegemony of Europe which had been established by Versailles. Hitler rearmament which led to the present war was carried out with the full support of British imperialism precisely for this purpose, among others. It is true that the imperialists do not want to repeat the "mistake" of Versailles. Simultaneously British imperialism wishes to settle with its German rival forever (the present conflict must not happen again), and at the same time make sure that their "dear ally" France does not secure a decisive position on the Continent once again. In so far as federation could be realised under capitalism, it would merely be a cloak for the plundering of the peoples of Europe by the Bourse and the City of London jointly. That is the meaning of the support for this proposal, cloudy and undefined, which emanates from Whitehall.

The sixth principle, the "abandonment of imperialism" is a worthy crowning of the whole structure of Labour's peace aims. Without the overthrow of capitalism, squaring the circle would be a comparatively easy task compared to the suggestion so glibly put forward by the labour programme. To expect capitalism to exist without its inevitable consequences - imperialism and war - is like expecting the magnetic mines that have caused so much indignation in the labour press, not to be attracted by the steel hulls of ships, simply because of the moral disgust expressed. Physical and economic laws work themselves out, given the requisite basis, irrespective of the desires and wishes of people who are affected thereby.

The publication of this world shattering document, in reality a stale plagerism of the empty programme of labour in the last blood-bath, has not aroused any trepidation whatsoever in

the gentlemen who rule the destiny of the French and British Empires. The "Times" assures its readers, "in no essential particular is there any divergence of opinion" between Attlee and the declarations of Lord Halifax, spokesman of the British Government.

The same division of labour proceeds as in the last war. In order to keep the working masses welded firmly to the war machine of British imperialism the bourgeoisie indulgently allows the labour leaders to prattle the fairy-tales of how the prince lived happily ever after, into the ears of the workers. In the meantime behind the scenes the "wicked fairy" prepares for the accomplishment of the real aims of British imperialism. The labour leaders reveal their true role by soothing the masses and holding their resistance in check while in practice continuing their co-operation with the National Government. Attlee finishes his speech by declaring "we are ready whenever we are called upon to take responsibility for the government of the country, to do our utmost to get these principles accepted and put into effect."

Here exactly is the heart of the problem. Millions of British workers are passively supporting, or rather acquiescing in the war because they believe it is a just one being waged for the overthrow of Hitlerism. It is to reassure these masses that Labour's Peace Aims have been published. It is a programme designed to appeal to them.

But after proclaiming these utopian principles for which the war should be fought, the labour leaders step back and aid a government, which by its very nature cannot and does not want to fight for such aims. The Chamberland Government has itself proclaimed

that the war can only be carried on with the "support of organised labour!" Without the help of the trade union and labour leaders the national government could not carry on the war for a single day.

We demand that the labour leaders break off all relations with the National Government. For them to say they are ready when called upon to take over the government is not enough. If they sincerely believe in the programme which they have announced, let them take steps to see that it is implemented by the only means possible, the taking over of power by labour. Making a political and industrial truce with the capitalist enemy is a flagrant betrayal. An irreconcilable campaign against the National Government must be waged on the Home Front. Labour must take power! That is the slogan which must be carried to the workers in every corner in Britain.

The refusal of the labour leaders to take this road, indicates the extent to which they believe their aims to be practicable. The workers will be convinced by their own experience, either in the realisation of the Labour Government itself or in the struggle to win a labour majority, that reformism can lead only to disaster; it will be exposed in all its hollow futility.

Then the workers will understand that the overthrow of capitalism is the only road to a "Just peace", to "social advance". The cadres of the Fourth International stand shoulder to shoulder with the masses in the fight to realise these aims. Only the building of the Fourth International, indissolubly bound up with the needs, experiences and aspirations of the masses can lead to victory, to the establishment not of a "federal union", but of the Socialist United States of Europe as the sole means of securing a lasting peace.

Will the Communist Party go Communist?

In our last issue we published a statement from a member of the Communist Party which typified the reactions of a section of the membership and supporters of this party to the latest turns. We do not pretend that this reaction is common to the majority of the militants who remain in its ranks. Unfortunately this is not the case. There still remains a section which, out of a blind loyalty, is prepared to accept anything which is put before them by the leadership.

These people resemble those who attend a music hall regardless of its programme, retaining faith in the management to produce a star turn which will please them. They accept the preceding turns complacently whether good or bad, applauding those which are to their liking and tolerating those which are not. But always awaiting their reward in the shape of the supreme act.

So it is with the loyal members of

the Communist Party. When on August 23rd., the "Daily Worker" called for their financial support because "In the present situation, the first duty of all who are genuinely concerned for the defence of their country is, clearly to give the utmost assistance...." so that they could "get the issues clear in order that our people actively and keenly defend their homeland...." They did so and prepared to pay the supreme price. On September 30th, again in answer to the same call, they prepared, however, to give this matter their "serious consideration" and on November 4th, at the request of the long silent Dimitrov, to relinquish the historic role of "defending their homeland", the task so recently assigned to them by the party leadership. Thus did the "Peace Front" act retire from the scene and the "fight against imperialist war" take the stage.

Despite the undoubtedly more popular policy of "opposition" to war, the sudden change was, to say the least, disturbing and even the most backward members required an explanation of this amazing contortion. But more important, Dimitrov's statement that; "the proletariat, the working people have nothing to defend in this war.... Were they to support such a war, they would merely defend the interests of their enslavers and oppressors, would be supporting capitalist slavery." (D.W. November 4th) signified that the paymaster of the Comintern in Moscow too demanded an explanation, not of why they changed the line, but why the luckless leaders did not change it sooner in accord with their interests. And so the leadership of the British section, having committed itself up to the hilt in support of "capitalist slavery" had to declare that it had made a "mistake" and produce scapegoats in the form of Harry Pollitt,

the party secretary and J.R. Campbell, in the same way that Stalin a few weeks previously dispensed with the services of the Foreign Minister, Litvinov.

The leadership of the Communist Party has received a nasty jolt over this affair and has learned a lesson. Palme Dutt, Pollitt's successor reveals this by his extreme caution at the present time.

The reason for this must be clearly understood and it is to be found in the fact that the policy of the Communist Party is not in the hands of the Palme Dutts and the Pollitts. It is not determined either by the national interests of any section of the proletariat nor by the international interests of the workers and peasants as a whole, but it is directed from Moscow and is motivated by the nationalist self interests of the ruling bureaucratic clique headed by Stalin. In order to drive a better bargain with his fellow executioner of the German Communists, Stalin uses the "democratic alliance" deception and, having achieved this objective, cynically abandoned this manoeuvre together with his mercenary lackeys who had advocated it and the dupes who had supported it. But in each instance he has given an indication of his intentions. Indications which have been more readily understood by the bourgeoisie than by his own spokesmen.

Before the deal with Hitler was clinched, Litvinov was removed from his position. The pact which was construed by the King Street quacks as "a victory for peace and socialism", was an obvious signal to the Communist Parties of Britain and France to change their attitude towards the bourgeoisie whom they were supporting. The Soviet Union's participation in

the Polish adventure, was an even more obvious sign that they should revise their whole attitude. But under the guidance of Pollitt and Campbell they consistently misunderstood every signal. That is the extent of the "mistake" which they so humbly confess to having made.

Where does this organisation stand today? And what is its future perspective? At the present time they are vociferously opposing the war but in a pacifist manner, by appealing to the ruling class to call a conference and "negotiate a peace." They are playing a careful role. Palme Dutt is proving more astute than the unhappy Pollitt. He is reluctant to adopt a decisive position at the present period, from which it will be difficult to withdraw should the occasion arise. And not without good reason. With the peculiar course which is at present being pursued by the belligerents and neutrals alike, it is extremely difficult to predict with any assurance, the outcome of the subterranean manoeuvres and intrigues on the diplomatic field, and most of all, the future role of Stalin.

Britain and France have clearly indicated to the German bourgeoisie that if the section of the Nazi and military leadership which favours an abandonment of the present campaign and a turn to the East is given control, their support will be forthcoming. In an attempt to enforce this development they endeavour to apply pressure by negotiating with Germany's erstwhile allies, Mussolini and Franco. Stalin, having threatened the Western powers by the conclusion of the Trade Agreement and the Amity and Frontier Treaty with Nazi Germany, nevertheless indicates that the door is not yet closed against the "Democracies." The parading of Litvinov in person and Thael-

mann pictorially at the anniversary celebrations of the October Revolution is an indication of this. The Communist Party leaders have heeded this warning and as a consequence, are stalling and playing for time by joining in the chorus of the I.L.P., the P.P.U. and the Mosley fascists for an immediate cessation of hostilities.

At the present time they dare not go further, but they cannot remain suspended in mid-air indefinitely. They will be forced to adopt a positive attitude towards the war makers. For the present they continue to fly their kites. With regard to the Labour Party, the leadership of the Communist Party applies for affiliation whilst the "Daily Worker" (November 23rd) points out that it "is in no sense a demand for a united front with the upper leadership of the Labour Party but a lever of struggle against the upper leadership and policy...." In the same statement they declare: "The Communist Party takes up the fight in the electoral field against the coalition of the official leaderships of the Conservative, Liberal and Labour Parties who support the war." From this it can be deduced that the policy of collaboration with the rank and file and the recalcitrant leaders of the CONSERVATIVE and LIBERAL parties has not been abandoned but is still being held in reserve. This position finds its basis in Dimitrov's statement: "Millions of working people in the capitalist world, and above all, in the warring countries, are vitally interested in bringing about militant working class unity, and establishing a real popular front against war....." Consistent only in his inconsistency, the Secretary of the Communist International stresses in the same declaration the necessity for a "united front from BELOW", the ultra-left policy pursued by the Communist Party

in Germany with such disastrous results.

The nebulous declarations of "opposition to war" continue to be traded before the masses. Pollitt and Campbell, who voted on the Central Committee against the change of line, publish statements in the "Daily Worker" on November 3rd, declaring that they were "misled" by their "hatred of fascism" into supporting the war but they now accept the revised policy of the Party, so revealing that their "hatred of fascism" was not sufficiently intense to cause them to break with Stalin when he embraced Hitler! These statements, however, mean nothing. They are merely for the benefit of the party members who are quering the position of these people. If necessary the policy of Pollitt and Campbell will be brought out of cold storage and Palme Dutt will don the dunce's cap in their stead. This course would be necessitated in the event of a turn of the "democratic imperialists to the Soviet Union. They are, however, at the moment reluctant to adopt this course as is evidenced by the limited political control of the advocates of this policy - Churchill, Eden and Duff-Cooper.

If, on the other hand, the Western powers are successful in turning the German war machine on the U.S.S.R., then the Comintern will turn accordingly to a position which they will demagogically identify with revolutionary defeatism, but which will in fact have nothing in common with Lenin's policy. The third variant is that of the present status quo - German imperialism plus any allies it can acquire against British imperialism and its allies, with Moscow desiring neither victory nor defeat for either side. Under these circumstances the present position of the Stalinist will be maintained. They will continue to demand that workers action be limited to influencing their ruling class to cease hostilities and call a conference with Stalin as a participant in the "negotiations", thus abandoning the toiling masses to their imperialist slave-masters.

Whatever course events may take, the treacherous policy of the mercenary flunkies of the Kremlin bureaucracy will remain a barrier on the road of proletarian and colonial struggle for emancipation from the strangling fetters of the decayed capitalist system.

India and the War

The period of three years which intervened between the coming into operation of the 1935 Constitution for India and the outbreak of the Second World War was characterised by extreme political instability. The gradual accumulation of capital in their hands made it increasingly difficult for them to remain reconciled to a system under which the financial and economic policy of India would rest with a fed-

eral government which, as it is constituted, could never hope to see a Congress majority and would always remain an instrument of British finance-capital.

The leaders of the Indian National Congress (who incidently are looked upon as revolutionary leaders both by the I.L.P. and the Stalinist International) who represent the economic and

political interests of the discontented Indian bourgeoisie, hoped that the outbreak of war and the consequent difficulties of the Imperial Government would enable them to obtain vital reforms. Under conditions of peace they could hope to obtain these reforms only by a renewal of a mass movement which from their previous experience they have learned to dread.

That expectation has not been fulfilled. The British ruling class has declared that the war is no time for reforms and that Mr. Gandhi and his class must wait until the war is over. Mr. Chamberlain is well aware of the advantages of full support from the Indian Congress. But his difficulty is that he cannot rely upon the Indian capitalists to remain satisfied with only a few definite concessions. What guarantee is there, that having received something today, they will not, like Oliver Twist, ask for more tomorrow? That is the principal reason why the protracted negotiations between the Viceroy and the Congress leaders have borne no fruits.

While the Congress leaders were wining and dining with the Viceroy and his officers, the discontent of the Indian masses against the poverty and destitution in which they are forced to live was steadily gathering strength. The new Constitution has fostered illusions among them. They had hoped that under the Congress administrations an era of radical reforms would be instituted in industry as well as in agriculture. But Indian capitalism which had grown up under the sheltering protection of imperialism and in intimate association with feudalism, proved itself as bankrupt in the field of social reform as the old bureaucratic administrations. The

Congress ministers neither would nor could attack the privileges of the landlords or the rights of the mill-owners. Even before the world conflagration started, the masses were beginning to take independent action without waiting for the ministries. The famine conditions which prevail today over large areas of India and the new attacks initiated by the mill-owners upon the workers' standards of living, in the form of wage-cuts, mass dismissals and rationalisation, can only fan the flame of popular discontent. The October General Strike in Cawnpur, the strike in Calcutta of the jute workers, the sporadic strikes among Indian seamen are indications that in spite of rotten leadership, the workers are striking back and are even taking the offensive. In the following press report is revealed the temper of the working class. The Associated Press has reported that "several workers dissatisfied with the settlement arrived at in connection with the General Strike yesterday, raided and captured the Victoria Mills Mazdur Sabha (Labour Union) office and later they mobbed and assaulted Mr. Kapoor, General Secretary of the Mazdoor Sabha. The mob held a meeting near the Mazdoor Sabha Office and passed a vote of no confidence in the present labour leaders."

The conflict between the interests of the toiling masses and those of imperialism can find no solution along the road of reformism. Far from being able to make concessions to the masses, the British capitalist class will be forced to impose heavier burdens on their overloaded shoulders. In anticipation of the inevitable resistance of the masses to these impositions, the Government is preparing well ahead to meet it in the future.

Faced with this rising tide of anti-imperialism among the masses on the one side, and with a blunt refusal from the Viceroy on the other, the leaders of the Indian National Congress are beginning to talk about a new Civil Disobedience Movement. Their present attitude of waiting for events is becoming increasingly untenable. Their bargaining power depends to a large extent on their hold upon the masses and their capacity to rally them behind their own demands. An abject surrender at this stage would divorce them completely from the masses and would facilitate the emergence of revolutionary ideas and a revolutionary leadership.

Moreover, the native bourgeoisie cannot fail to see a menace to its own rights and liberties in the new imperialist assault on the working class. Opposed as they are to the demands of the Indian masses, they yet must preserve their own right to oppose imperialism.

Mr. Gandhi may therefore start another Civil Disobedience movement.

But the revolutionary content of the struggle of the masses cannot receive its full expression under his leadership. Inevitably, as in the Civil Disobedience movements of 1920 and 1931, the masses will tend to outgrow the bourgeois leadership. As wider and wider sections of the exploited masses enter the fray, the struggle will overflow the bounds of "peaceful and legitimate" means set by the Congress leaders. The movement which began as one for the augmentation of the rights and privileges of the Indian exploiters, will begin to formulate itself as one against the entire system of exploitation and privileges. The dynamics of the anti-imperialist struggle will bring to the fore the inherent class contradictions and the Indian bourgeoisie who began by leading the movement will end by betraying it. Without a consistent revolutionary leadership the Indian masses will meet with only defeat and demoralisation. A revolutionary party of the Fourth International which today leads the struggle of all oppressed and exploited humanity, is the call of the hour.

Stalinists go Anti-Semitic

The October 18th issue of "La Voz de Mexico" organ of the Communist Party of Mexico, carries the following headline on page 2: "Trotskyist Jews Support Almazan." The fact that no Trotskyists, Jewish or otherwise, are supporting Almazan (a reactionary Presidential candidate) is here comparatively unimportant. What is important is the anti-Semitic note in the propaganda of the Stalinist wing of the Stalin-Hitler bloc.

The article reads as follows: "A

group of Trotskyists that meet at No. 15 Tacuba Street, composed in its majority of Jewish and capitalist elements, has dedicated itself to attacking the regime of President Cardenas and supporting Almazan. The last meeting of the afore-mentioned individuals, on the Polish situation, produced a scandalous affair. Not everyone present agreed with the way the leaders of the group treated the Polish problem: having protested energetically, the dissenters were in-

sulted and, an attempt to throw them out of the room being violently resisted by them, the meeting broke up in blows.

"Among the Trotskyist Jews who distinguished themselves by their attacks on the Soviet Union, the Communist Party, the PRM and President Cardenas were the music critic Khan, the dry goods merchant, Zaharias, and two of the editors of La Voz isrealita named Rubenstein and Abrahams.

"These individuals, openly intervening in national political questions (What "comrades"? Aren't Jews a legitimate part of the Nation?), also attacked General Manuel Avila Camacho calling him an agent of Stalin, and declaring that the candidate who should be supported is General Andreu Almazan."

The article then ends, in the typical style of the Nazi demagogue, with whom their master Stalin has now allied himself, with an attack on the "capitalist Jews". The last paragraph reads:

"The Mexican people must know who are the new friends and partisans of Almazan: the capitalist Jews, exploiters of the Mexican working men and women, rich monopolistic merchants who starve the people. (Our emphasis.)

For four years, until a few weeks ago, the Latin-American agents of Stalin were licking the boots of the "democratic" imperialists and their native allies. In the last few weeks Latin-America's startled eyes saw the same Stalinists, ever obedient to their master's newest wish, swing over to justification of the alliance with the fascist beast. And just as formerly they spoke the language of their democratic capitalist allies, so now they are beginning to use the language

of Hitlerism down to and including the anti-Semitic note!

Naturally the Stalinists join this scandalous anti-Semitic note with their slanderous anti-Trotskyism. For some time, both in Mexico and in the United States, the Stalinists have been peddling the lie that the Trotskyists are supporting the candidacy of the reactionary General Almazan. Time and again the Mexican section of the Fourth International, the Partido Obrero Internacionalista (Internationalist Workers' Party), has denounced that slander and pointed out that since there is no independent working class candidate the POI supports no candidate but utilises the occasion of the campaign to spread its programme. One of the POI statements to that effect was reprinted in English in the "Socialist Appeal" of October 10th. But a little thing like the truth doesn't deter the pen-prostitutes of "La Voz isrealita" and the American "Daily Worker" from repeating their slanders.

Yesterday the ~~same~~ articles repeated stories about Trotskyists supporting the reactionary Almazan and about Almazan supporters being Trotskyists, calling them all "fascists" and "allies of Hitler." Today the same Stalinists are still at their dirty work, but now that they themselves are allied to Hitler they must talk instead of "Jewish elements" "capitalist-Jews", etc. Gone is the cry of "fascist!" the word isn't even mentioned in the article.

It is clear by now that the people referred to in the article are not Trotskyists at all; - but that is just a little detail. The names are obviously Jews (such names! - Abrahams - Rubenstein, etc), - and vociferously anti-Stalin Jews at that.

Right of Revolutionary Optimism

BY LEON TROTSKY

In the weekly of the well-known newspaper Paris-Soir of August 31, 1939, an extremely instructive conversation is reported between the French ambassador Coulondre and Hitler on August 25, at the time of their last interview. (The source of the information is undoubtedly Coulondre himself.) Hitler sputters, boasts of the pact which he concluded with Stalin ("a realistic pact") and "regrets" that German and French blood will be spilled.

"But," Coulondre objects, "Stalin displayed great double-dealing. The real victor (in case of war) will be Trotsky. Have you thought this over?"

"I know," Der Fuehrer responds, "but why did France and Britain give Poland complete freedom of action?" etc.

These gentlemen like to give a personal name to the spectre of revolution. But this of course is not the essence of this dramatic conversation, at the very moment when diplomatic relations were ruptured. "War will inevitably provoke revolution;" the representative of imperialist democracy, himself chilled to the marrow, frightens his adversary.

"I know," Hitler responds, as if it were a question decided long ago. "I know." Astonishing dialogue!

Both of them, Coulondre and Hitler, represent the barbarism which advances over Europe. At the same time neither of them doubt that their barbarism will be conquered by socialist revolution. Such is now the awareness of the ruling classes of all the capitalist countries of the world. Their complete demoralisation is one of the most important elements in the relation of class forces. The proletariat has a young and still weak revolutionary leadership. But the leadership of the bourgeoisie rots on its feet. At the very outset of the war which they could not avert, these gentlemen are convinced in advance of the collapse of their regime. This fact alone must be for us the source of invincible revolutionary optimism!