
June, 1941

Fourth International

The "Tanaka Memorial"

Proof That It Is Japan's Real Program

By Leon Trotsky

The Negro March on Washington

By Albert Parker

The New American Army James Cadman
How Paris Fell Terence Phelan
Jan Valtin John G. Wright
Burnham's "Revolution" Joseph Hansen
The Balkans Jack Weber

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

The avidity with which our comrades in every part of the country — and even elsewhere in the world — have devoted themselves to the important problem of mass distribution of Trotskyist literature has borne fine fruit. The recent highly successful drive for subscribers placed the magazine in the hands of more than a thousand new readers in the course of two short months. And the stimulus thus given to our circulation has had a natural reflex in the attention paid to financial obligations.

The promptness and thoroughness of the response made by most of the cities receiving bundles of the magazine has been highly gratifying to the business office. Detroit, Quakertown and Toledo have actually got ahead of themselves and established credits with us on future issues. Boston, Chicago, Fresno, Kansas, Louisiana, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, St. Louis and St. Paul owe nothing either on the current issue or on back-bills. For some of them this accomplishment has meant Spartan effort, but the same iron tenacity which sends them out week after week to sell literature at factory gates and trade-union halls made the accomplishment of apparently insurmountable tasks possible.

A number of other places owe nothing on the current bundle and have come very close to cleaning up old debts completely. Of these cities, Portland, Reading, Newark and San Diego deserve special notice.

Cleveland reports that a number of comrades there who were long unemployed have succeeded in finding work and one of the first indices of an improved economy has been a substantial payment on an ancient inherited debt to **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**. Akron and Flint have shown the same eagerness to stand before their fellow-workers unblemished by debt. Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, San Francisco and Youngstown are working hard to climb into what San Diego calls the "circle of nice, cooperative branches."

But we wonder what has happened to a few other places, among them Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Texas and New Haven. We admit that a few months ago,

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Published by the Fourth International Publishing Association

Volume II

June 1941

No. 5 (Whole No. 12)

118 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: Algonquin 4-8547.
Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 14c for 5 copies and up.
Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up.
Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Board:

JAMES P. CANNON
ALBERT GOLDMAN

JOSEPH HANSEN
FELIX MORROW

WILLIAM F. WARDE

Business Manager:

LYDIA BEIDEL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The "Tanaka Memorial"	By Leon Trotsky	131
Jan Valtin: Out of the Fight . .	By John G. Wright	135
After the Blitzkrieg:		
The New American Army . .	By James Cadman	138
The Balkans	By Jack Weber	142
How Paris Fell	By Terence Phelan	146
Pages from Trotsky's Journal	By Leon Trotsky	150
The Negro March on Washington		
	By Albert Parker	154
Burnham's "Managerial Revolution"		
	By Joseph Hansen	157
MANAGER'S COLUMN	Inside Front Cover	267

with the records they now have, these cities would have looked quite normal; but everyone has reformed so much since then that the ones who haven't moved forward seem to have slipped back. It is a relative matter and only proves that, dialectically speaking, one may look pretty good and at the same time be not so hot.

NEWS FROM ABROAD

Some of our rival political groups have been suffering for some time from a sick, unscientific despair which is entirely unknown in our ranks. This decay of morale shows itself most viciously in the attitude of these fair-weather "revolutionaries" toward the proletariat of the rest of the world. In effect, these people accuse the victims of fascism and war in other parts of the world of having deserted the cause of the revolution and left the American worker to assume the full burden of carrying on the struggle.

This month's correspondence of the **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** deals another resounding body-blow to this false and vicious attitude. Once again we can judge by the consistency of response from widely-separated regions of the world that Trotskyist literature cannot be prevented from finding its way into

the hands of ever-extending circles of co-thinkers.

Our friends write us not only to assure us of the arrival of our material at its destinations, despite the numerous difficulties which the war throws in its path, but to implore us to increase the supply so that a constantly growing audience can be accommodated.

We hear from South Africa, for instance. Here the state of war has meant the establishment of well-populated internment camps with reserved sections for political thinkers. Yet we are informed that our publications have not only been received and welcomed but have been duplicated for wider dissemination and that translations have been made of our most important articles for non-English speaking workers.

Our greatest joy came from the news from Switzerland. Friends there inform us that all of our material, sent to diverse parts of the little republic through a triple censorship, has arrived safely and is being avidly read. They urge us to increase their supply since the growth of interest in Trotskyism has put too great a demand upon the limited quantity of material we have heretofore sent.

From numerous bits of correspondence we glean that copies or

translations of our most important documents have penetrated into every part of the German-occupied territory of southern Europe and the Baltic countries.

But the news of greatest political interest concerns the translation and republication of the *Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War* for wide dissemination in the countries engaged in the war. One of our German letters, dealing with the arrival of this important document, says: "We got your business folders which we promptly mimeographed and distributed widely. You have no idea how they revived our business."

It is always heartening to have proof again of the resiliency of the revolutionary political movement. And it is good to have repeated evidence that the accumulated wealth of political understanding which the workers' struggle for freedom has brought for the class-conscious proletariat is never lost. Our news from the concentration camps and secret meeting-places of workers in numerous parts of Europe brings a wealth of reassurance that the lessons of the great defeats of the last decade have not been lost on the advanced workers.

A few crumbs of information concerning the great political discussions over the nature of the Soviet state and the defense of the Soviet Union found their way into the almost hermetically sealed political circles of workers on the continent of Europe. These workers, ground down to the very bottom by the war-mill of capitalism, recognized the significance of this political discussion, took part in it in their own manner and reported finally to us in the outside world. They had found their ideas to be in consonance with those of Trotsky and the Socialist Workers Party.

If the number on your wrapper reads:

N 53 or F 12

your subscription expires with this issue. In order to avoid missing a single issue of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**, be sure to send in your renewal order immediately. \$2.00 for one year, \$3.00 for one year in combination with the Militant.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 2

JUNE 1941

NUMBER 5

The "Tanaka Memorial"

By LEON TROTSKY

The famous "Tanaka Memorial" was a document submitted to the Japanese emperor in 1927 by Baron Tanaka, the premier of Japan. This document outlined in detailed steps a program of Japanese imperialist expansion, beginning with establishment of Japanese control in Manchuria and leading eventually to domination of all China, Indonesia, the South Sea Islands, the Maritime Provinces of USSR and, eventually, India and the whole Pacific basin. Baron Tanaka even visualized ultimate Japanese control of Europe.

When the document came to light, its authenticity was denied in Japan. But beginning in 1931 with the invasion of Manchuria, Japan proceeded along precisely the lines laid down in the "Tanaka Memorial."

Yet the chancelleries of all the great imperialist powers, and the Kremlin too, al-

though certain of the authenticity of the "Tanaka Memorial," have remained silent while Japan has continued to deny its authenticity. Washington and London, engaged in "appeasing" Japan — i.e., preparing for the most propitious moment for war in the Pacific — have discouraged publication of material on the "Tanaka Memorial." The Soviet press likewise remains silent.

In the following article Leon Trotsky has told for the first time the story of how the "Tanaka Memorial" was secured by the Soviet intelligence service from the archives of the Japanese government. Comrade Trotsky had not quite finished this article when he was assassinated by Stalin's GPU.

The article was written for publication for the general public. Comrade Trotsky was still attempting to establish more spe-

cific dates for certain of the events. Although his memory was excellent, he was never satisfied, in anything he wrote, until he secured documentary verification. The editors have not been able to supplement Trotsky's own tentative dates with further verification.

In an article published in *Liberty*, January 27, 1940, Comrade Trotsky predicted that a forthcoming Kremlin-Japan pact "would constitute a symmetric supplement to the pact between Moscow and Berlin." Such a pact was actually signed on April 13, 1941. The Kremlin would scarcely vouch for the authenticity of the "Tanaka Memorial" today, for then it would be hard put to justify to the world working class the signing of the pact with Japan in the midst of China's struggle against Japanese imperialism.—THE EDITORS.

The American press has up to now considered the "Tanaka Memorial" a dubious document.

On April 23, 1940, Rear Admiral Taussig referred to the "Tanaka Memorial" in his extremely interesting report to the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. Rear Admiral Taussig was disavowed by his own department. It is not my intention to enter into this controversy. I believe that Rear Admiral Taussig had his own reasons for speaking, and the Navy Department had its own reasons for disavowing his views. Quite possibly the disavowal did not come as a surprise to the Rear Admiral. But, I repeat, this does not concern me. So far as I am able to judge, Rear Admiral Taussig is a qualified expert on the morals, tasks and politics of the Far East. He does not doubt the authenticity of the "Tanaka Memorial." The New York Times, however, in reporting this session of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, found it necessary to remind its readers once again that the "Japanese have always insisted that the so-called 'Tanaka Memorial' was a Chinese forgery." Thus even today, some sixteen years after the publication of the "Memorial," it still remains a suspect and controversial document.

The "Tanaka Memorial" is not a forgery. A careful analysis of its contents and text in and of itself testifies adequately to this. Moreover, the author of these lines is in possession of facts which verify completely and incontrovertibly the authenticity of the "Tanaka Memorial."

Its Internal Validity

A genius in the fabrication of forgeries would have been required to execute so complex a forgery with such penetration into the objective situation and the political psychology of Japan's ruling circles. However, geniuses do not as a rule

occupy themselves with forgeries but devote their energies to other pursuits. To be sure, there was no scarcity of forgeries during the last war and the ensuing post-war years. Suffice it to recall the notorious Sisson documents on the Soviet Republic. As a general rule—and I know of no exceptions—documents of this type are extremely crude. They tend to reveal the psychology of the forgers themselves or of the circles for whom they are intended rather than the psychology of those individuals or groups in whose name the forgeries are committed. If such documents meet with credibility, it is only because of lack of familiarity with the milieu from which they reportedly emanate. The Soviet Government consisted of individuals completely unknown to world public opinion. Small wonder that it was possible to ascribe to them any goal or aim whatsoever, and depict these things in any kind of language.

It is otherwise with the Imperial Government of Japan. It constitutes an ancient and traditional milieu. Whoever has carefully followed the evolution of Japanese politics cannot fail to acknowledge that the document, with its cynical realism and icy fanaticism of the ruling caste, originates in this milieu. The document is credible. The text is valid. The contents gain credence because they speak for themselves.

Japan is today the weakest link in the imperialist chain. Her financial and military superstructure rests on a foundation of semi-feudal agrarian barbarism. Periodical explosions within the Japanese army are only a reflection of the intolerable tension of social contradictions in the country. The regime as a whole maintains itself only through the dynamics of military seizures. The programmatic basis for these seizures is supplied by the "Tanaka Memorial."

As I recall it, the "Memorial" is based on the testament

of Emperor Meiji. This testament itself is of course a myth. But Japanese aggression is interlaced with traditionalism. While creating a gigantic fleet of the most modern type, the Japanese imperialists prefer to base their activities on ancient national traditions. Just as priests put their pronouncements and desires into the mouths of deities, so the Japanese imperialists palm off their very modern plans and combinations as the will of the august progenitors of the reigning Emperor. Similarly Tanaka covered up the imperialist aspirations of the ruling cliques by reference to a non-existing testament of an Emperor.

The document did not leap full-blown from Baron Tanaka's brow. It constitutes a generalization of the plans formulated by the Army and Navy leaders and, in a certain sense, a reconciliation and a theoretical summation of these plans. It is to be assumed that many variants preceded the final draft; and that many discussions were held in intimate, "non-official" and hence all the more influential circles. The task was to affix the seal of imperial will upon these aspirations of the Army and Navy circles. The old Emperor's physical and mental condition was such that his signature could not prove authoritative for the initiated. That is why the imperialist conspirators waited for the enthronement of Emperor Hirohito before presenting for his signature the document, which from all indications had received its final formulation under General Tanaka's direction.

Why I Can Verify Its Authenticity

However, apart from these general considerations, the writer of these lines is able to vouch for the following facts. The "Tanaka Memorial" was first photographed in Tokio in the Ministry of Naval Affairs and brought to Moscow as an undeveloped film. I was perhaps the very first person to become acquainted with the document in English and Russian translations of the Japanese text.

* * *

At that time relations with Japan were extremely alarming for Soviet foreign policy. The Far East was defended poorly. The defenses of the Chinese Eastern Railway were even worse. There was no talk in those days of selling the railway to the Japanese. Not so much because Moscow was not ready to sell, but primarily because Tokio had no inclination to buy: they were preparing to get it free of charge.

Throughout that period Moscow made persistent offers to conclude a mutual non-aggression pact with Tokio. These proposals were diplomatically evaded by Tokio on the pretext that the time was not yet ripe for such a treaty. In those days treaties were still approached with a semblance of seriousness. In a few years it was already to become the rule that a mutual non-aggression pact was the best prelude to military invasion. In those years, however, Japan at all events preferred to evade.

Moscow never removed its eyes from the East. On the one hand there was the constant threat of Japanese plans. On the other hand, the Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927 was germinating. Great hopes were bound up with the Chinese Revolution, including the security of the Soviet Far Eastern possessions and the Chinese Eastern Railway. The writer was not among those on the government staff who believed that the Chinese Eastern Railway must be handed over to the Japanese as soon as the latter succeeded in gaining control of Manchuria.

But neither the duration of the Chinese Revolution nor its success was guaranteed in advance. Japanese militarism was an existing fact, very palpable, very aggressive. The

Chinese Revolution was a question of the future. It is hardly astonishing that the Soviet Intelligence Service in both its branches—that which fulfilled military assignments and that of the GPU—were under orders to watch carefully every Japanese move in diplomatic as well as military fields.

The Military Intelligence Service was under a two-fold jurisdiction: subject on the one hand to the War Department and on the other to the GPU. The Foreign Department of the GPU was headed by an old Bolshevik, Trilisser, who was later removed and apparently liquidated along with many others. The Military Intelligence was headed by Berzin, an old Lettish Bolshevik. I was not closely acquainted with the organization of our agency in Japan, being little interested in the technical aspects of the matter. I handed this over to my aides, first Sklyansky, later Unschlicht and, to a certain extent, Rosenholtz. Permit me to recall that Sklyansky, one of the outstanding and most meritorious organizers of the Red Army, was drowned in 1924 or 1925 in America while taking a boat ride on a lake. Unschlicht disappeared, and was evidently liquidated. Rosenholtz was shot by verdict of the court.

Questions relating to the Intelligence Service were thus brought to my attention only in exceptional cases involving issues of great military or political importance. This is precisely what happened on the occasion to which I have referred.

Early Soviet Advantages in Intelligence Work

The successes of which the Soviet Foreign Intelligence could already boast at that time were by no means accidental. The party had at its disposal not a few people who had passed through a serious conspiratorial school and who were well acquainted with all the methods and subterfuges of the police and counter-espionage. They brought into their work an international experience, many of them having been emigres in various lands and possessing a broad political outlook. They had personal friends in many countries. Nor was there any lack of self-sacrificing support on the part of the revolutionary elements in different countries. In many government institutions of capitalist countries the lower functionaries were sympathetic to a considerable degree to the October revolution. Provided one knew how, their sympathy could be utilized in the interests of the Soviet power. It was so utilized.

The network of foreign agencies was still very little developed, far from complete but, by way of compensation, lucky individual connections sometimes produced unexpected and extraordinary results.

Dzerzhinsky, the then head of the GPU, used to refer with satisfaction on more than one occasion to the extraordinary sources of information at his disposal in Japan.

Despite the shut-in character of the Japanese, and their ability to keep secrets—which arises from the specific, special conditions of their national milieu and the inaccessibility of the Japanese language to the overwhelming majority of foreigners—it must be said that this ability is nevertheless not absolute. The decomposition of the old system finds its expression not only in the fact that young officers and officials from time to time shoot Ministers whom they find inconvenient but also in this, that other less patriotic officers and officials, wearied of Spartan customs, seek for sources of revenue on the side. I know of cases of important Japanese functionaries, assigned to work in Japanese Consulates in European countries, who gave up important secrets for relatively modest sums of money.

Dzerzhinsky was brought into the Political Bureau after Lenin's death. This step was taken by Stalin, Zinoviev and

Kamenev in order to attract to their side the honest but vain-glorious Dzerzhinsky. They succeeded completely.

Dzerzhinsky was very talkative, very hot-tempered and explosive. This man of iron will who had served terms of hard penal labor possessed traits which were absolutely childlike. Once during a session of the Political Bureau he boasted of his hopes shortly to lure Boris Savinkov to Soviet soil and arrest him. My reaction to this was highly skeptical. But Dzerzhinsky proved right. Savinkov was lured by agents of the GPU to Soviet territory and arrested there. Shortly thereafter Dzerzhinsky expressed his hopes of apprehending Wrangel in the same way. But this hope did not materialize because Wrangel proved more cautious.

Very often, without giving any technical details, into which no one even inquired, he would boast of the successes of our foreign espionage, especially in Japan.

One day in 1925, in the summer or early autumn, Dzerzhinsky talked excitedly about his expectations of obtaining an extremely important document from Japan. He stated ecstatically that this document in and of itself could provoke international upheavals, events of vast importance, war between Japan and the United States, etc. I remained, as always in such cases, even more skeptical.

"Wars are not provoked by documents," I objected to Dzerzhinsky. But he insisted: "You have no conception of the importance of this document; it is the program of the ruling circles, approved by the Mikado himself; it embraces the seizure of China, the destruction of the United States, world domination."

"Mightn't your agent be duped?" I asked. "No one writes such documents as a rule. Why should such plans be put down on paper?"

Dzerzhinsky was himself not very sure on this point. He replied, as if to dispel the doubts in his own mind: "In their country they do everything in the name of the Emperor. In order to justify risky measures, risky politics and vast army and naval expenditures the military men and the diplomats have been seeking to tempt the Mikado with a colossal perspective which is equally indispensable to themselves for the political adventures in which they are engaging. That is why Tanaka has written down the plans of the military circles in a special report to the Emperor, and this report has met with the Emperor's approval. We will receive a photographic copy of the document directly from the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs."

How the Document Was Secured

I remember that Dzerzhinsky mentioned a sum to be paid for the photographic copy. It was relatively modest, about three thousand American dollars.

From Dzerzhinsky I learned that the GPU enjoyed the services of a very trusted functionary who had direct access to the secret archives of the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In a period of more than a year he had already provided some very valuable information and was marked by great precision and conscientiousness in fulfilling his obligations as a foreign spy. He was quite familiar with the archives and with the relative importance of the various documents. This functionary had proposed to copy the document but the GPU representative, upon instructions from Moscow, demanded photographic copies. This was much more difficult. It was necessary to introduce a GPU technician into the premises of the Ministry or to teach the functionary the art of photography. These technical difficulties caused a delay in obtaining the document. Several copies of each page were taken, and

the film was then forwarded by two or three different routes. All the copies arrived safely in Moscow.

I must admit that I am unable now to recall—perhaps I was not interested in this at the time—whether the Japanese agent was one among the volunteers sincerely devoted to the new Soviet regime, or one of a number of hired agents or, finally, a type representing a combination of the two. This last type was probably the most prevalent. The number of sympathizers in Japan was very small.

"The document has arrived!" Dzerzhinsky announced joyously. Where was it? It had arrived as a film which was being developed. The developing was coming out successfully and the document was being translated by our Japanese experts as it was developed. They were all staggered by the contents of the very first few pages. I would get my report from Trilisser. (It might have been Unschlicht.)

As the head of the War Department, I was naturally interested in Far Eastern questions, but there was still another connection. During the first period of the Soviet regime, in the initial months up to February, 1918, I was in charge of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs. Upon arriving from England, Chicherin, whom we had exchanged for several arrested Englishmen, became my deputy. When I shifted to the War Department, Chicherin, who had been coping successfully with his assignment, was appointed as the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs on my motion in the Council of People's Commissars and in the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets. As a member of the Political Bureau I frequently used to draft together with Chicherin the more important diplomatic documents. On the other hand, in all cases where I required the aid of diplomacy during the civil war, I would get in touch directly with Chicherin.

In 1923 the "Troika" (Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin) made an attempt to remove me from all supervision of foreign policy. This function was formally assigned to Zinoviev. Nevertheless the old relationships and, so to speak, the old unofficial hierarchy continued to remain in force. Even in 1925, after I had already left the War Department and was placed in charge of the modest Concessions Committee, I was, as a member of the Political Bureau, appointed head of the Committee on Far Eastern Affairs, Japan and China. Among the members of this Committee were Chicherin, Voroshilov, Krassin, Rudzutak and others.

Stalin was at that time still wary of venturing on the slippery ice of international politics. For the most part, he would listen and look on, formulate his opinion, or merely vote after others had expressed themselves.

Zinoviev, who was formally in charge of diplomatic affairs, was inclined, as everybody knew, to fall into a panic whenever a difficult situation arose. All this explains amply why the document received from Tokio was transmitted directly to me.

We Study the Document

I must acknowledge that the vast scope of the plan, the cold and ruthless messianism of the Mikado's bureaucratic clique, astounded me. But the text of the document did not arouse in my mind the slightest doubt, not only because I was acquainted with the document's history but also because of its internal validity.

If we grant that the Chinese did manage to find an ideal forger who fabricated this document, then the question still remains just how did this Chinese forgery turn up in the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a special, secret document? Did the Ministry of Foreign Affairs itself arrange

to transmit the falsified Chinese document and pass it off as a genuine Japanese document? This supposition is utterly fantastic. The Japanese could not have been in the least interested in circulating such a document and arousing belief in it. They demonstrated this most graphically by branding it as a forgery the moment it was published.

The film was developed and the translation made at once in the offices of the Intelligence Service, and both were rushed immediately to the Kremlin. The photostats were still wet and the translation was in the shape of the first rough draft. Many corrections were later required.

Did the other members of the Political Bureau become acquainted with the document at the same time as I did, or was it shortly after? I have no definite recollection on this point. In any case, when the Political Bureau met, all the members were acquainted with the document. Although personal relations were already very strained at that time, all the members of the Political Bureau seemed temporarily to draw closer together because of the document. In the preliminary discussion the main topic was naturally the voracity of the Japanese. The megalomania in which mysticism and cynicism remarkably supplemented each other was spoken of with astonishment tinged with grudging admiration.

"Isn't this perhaps a poem, a forgery?" asked Bukharin who with all his childlike gullibility loved, whenever a propitious occasion offered itself, to play the part of a cautious statesman. Dzerzhinsky exploded, as usual.

"I have already explained to you," he said, speaking with a Polish accent which always became thicker as he grew excited, "that this document is supplied by our agent who has proved his complete trustworthiness; and that this document was kept in the most secret section of the archives of the Naval Ministry. Our agent introduced our photographer into the premises. He himself didn't know how to operate a camera. Is it perhaps your opinion that the Japanese Admirals themselves placed a forged document in their secret archives? The Naval Ministry originally had no copy of this document. It was at first kept only in the Emperor's personal archives, with a copy in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Then the Army and Navy Ministries asked for their own copies. Our agent learned the exact time when a copy would arrive from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Extreme precautions were taken with its delivery. Our agent was able to gain access to it only thanks to the fact that a copy finally got into the archives of the Naval Ministry. Are you perhaps of the opinion that all this was done specially for purposes of fraud?"

As for myself, I had, I repeat, no doubts about its authenticity, if only on the basis of its internal validity. "If we granted for a moment," I said, "that this document is a forgery then we must also grant that the forgery is the work of the Japanese themselves. What for? To sell it to us for two or three thousand dollars? Enrich the treasury of the Naval Ministry by three thousand dollars? Or do they desire in this way to provoke us, frighten us? But we are already aware of their appetites, although, to be sure, not on such a scale. They know that despite a whole series of provocations we are doing everything in our power to avoid a conflict. A programmatic document could not in any way cause a change in our policy."

Discussion on this point ended quickly. All the circumstances and all the technical details, which have not of course been retained in my memory, left no room for doubts about the authenticity of the document.

What to Do With the "Memorial"?

The question next arose: What to do? We had in our

possession a charge of great explosive power. There was naturally danger that we might blow ourselves up. From every standpoint it was not expedient to publish it in the Soviet press. In the first place, this would reveal to the Japanese authorities that an agent of extraordinary value was at the disposal of our espionage. Dzerzhinsky would not agree to this in any case. Far more important were considerations of a political nature. Japan's plans were calculated for a number of decades. The Kremlin was concerned with gaining a few years, even a few months. We were sparing the Japanese in every way. We made very great concessions. Our wisest, most careful and mildest diplomat, Joffe, was functioning in Japan. The publication of this document in Moscow would be tantamount to saying openly to the Japanese that we were seeking a conflict. The scales would immediately tip in favor of the most bellicose circles in the Japanese army and navy. It was absolutely irrational to provoke Japan by publishing this document which, moreover, might not gain credence abroad.

Zinoviev at first made the proposal that the document be published in the periodical, *Communist International*. This method of publication would still leave the government itself on the side-lines. But no one would hear of it, nor did Zinoviev insist on his hasty proposal.

I offered a plan which I had elaborated before coming to the session of the Political Bureau. It was necessary to publish the document abroad, and avoid any link whatever between the document and Moscow, without lessening its effect, without arousing mistrust, without compromising the GPU agents in Japan. But where? The place of publication literally offered itself, namely, the United States. I proposed that, after the document was translated into English, it should be transmitted to the press by a trustworthy and authoritative friend of the Soviet Republic in the United States. At that time the calling of a friend of the Soviet Union had not yet become a profession. The number of friends was not large; important and influential personalities were all too scarce. In any case the task turned out much more difficult than I had presumed.

We were under the impression that the document would literally be torn from our hands. Dzerzhinsky had hopes of easily recouping the expenses of our Japanese agency. But things did not turn out that way at all. It was not easy to provide a credible version of how the document was obtained from Tokio. Any reference to the real source, i.e., the GPU, would arouse additional mistrust. In America the suspicion would naturally arise that the GPU itself had simply manufactured the document in order to poison relations between Japan and the United States.

The English translation was painstakingly made in Moscow. The photostats together with the English text were forwarded to New York, and in this way any trace of a connection between this document and Moscow was eliminated.

It should not be forgotten that this took place during the administration of President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes, that is, an administration very hostile to the Soviet Union. There was every justification to fear that hostile experts would simply pronounce the document a Moscow fabrication. It is a fact that fraudulent documents are sometimes acknowledged to be genuine while authentic documents are not infrequently labelled as forgeries.

To my knowledge the American press made no references to Moscow as the key point from which the document was forwarded from Tokio to New York. However, there was no "malice" on the part of Moscow in this affair, unless of course it is considered as malicious to obtain a document from the secret archives of a hostile power. We were simply unable

to devise any other way of bringing the document to the attention of world public opinion except by publishing it in the American press, without indicating the source, or rather by camouflaging the actual source as much as possible.

In those years the Soviet republic did not as yet have its own diplomatic representative in the United States. At the head of the Amtorg was the engineer, Bogdanov. He and his colleagues, who are today better known and more influential, fulfilled all sorts of diplomatic missions. I cannot now recall just who among them was entrusted with the task of finding a competent person among the Americans and putting the document in circulation through him. In any case it should not be difficult to verify this, since the document was offered to the most influential publications in the order of their importance.

* * *

According to certain indications the "Tanaka Memorial" was signed by the Mikado in July 1927. In that case it is quite obvious that the document was forwarded to Moscow prior to its being actually signed by the Mikado. The document, as has already been stated, had been under discussion among the close summits of the Japanese Army, the Navy and the diplomatic corps. It was precisely during this period that copies had to be made available to the Ministries concerned. Tanaka became premier in April, 1927. He might have well obtained the post of Premier precisely because of undertaking to win the Emperor's sanction for this program of the extreme wing of the militarists and imperialists.

Why do the Japanese authorities pronounce the "Tanaka Memorial" a *Chinese* forgery? They were obviously unaware of Moscow's role in the publication of this document. The appearance of the "Memorial" in the American and not the Soviet press naturally inspired the idea that the "Memorial" had in some way fallen into Chinese hands who hastened to forward it to the United States.

Why Is the Kremlin Silent?

It is hard to understand why Moscow, which is best informed on this matter, persists in maintaining silence about the "Tanaka Memorial." The original photographic copy was received in Moscow under circumstances precluding any doubts whatever about its authenticity. This remarkable document was sent abroad, i.e., to the United States from Moscow, from the Kremlin. The authenticity of the document is strangely enough suspect even today. Moscow keeps quiet.

To be sure Moscow had ample reasons in its day to hide its participation in publishing and exposing the "Tanaka Memorial." The prime consideration was not to provoke Tokio. This explains why the Kremlin took the round-about way in making it public. But the situation has drastically changed in the decade and a half that have since elapsed. Moscow is very well aware that the technical conditions, the conspiratorial considerations which originally impelled the hiding of the source of information have long since disappeared: The individuals involved have been replaced (mostly shot), the methods have changed. The flight to Japan of General Luchkov, an important GPU functionary, marks a dividing line between two periods of espionage direction. Even if Luchkov did not surrender his former agents into the hands of the Japanese—and his conduct leads me to believe that he revealed everything he knew—Moscow must have hastily eliminated all agents and changed connections long ago, in view of the danger from Luchkov. From every aspect, the silence of the Kremlin is well-nigh incomprehensible.

One has to assume that operating here is the excessive caution which often drives Stalin to ignore major considerations for the sake of secondary and petty ones.

It is more than likely that this time too Moscow does not wish to cause any annoyances to Tokio in view of the negotiations now under way in the hope of reaching a more stable and lasting agreement. All these considerations, however, recede to the background as the world war spreads its concentric circles ever wider and as Japan awaits only an opportune moment in the Far East before taking the next step toward the realization of the "Tanaka Memorial."

* * *

I ask myself: Why didn't I relate this episode before, an episode which throws light on one of the most important political documents of modern history? It was simply because no occasion arose for it. In the interval between the meeting of the Political Bureau in 1925 when the question of the Tanaka document first came up, and the period when I found myself in exile abroad and had the opportunity of following international affairs more accurately—in this interval there intervened the years of the cruel internal struggle, arrest, exile to Central Asia, and then Turkey. The Tanaka document remained dormant in the recesses of my memory.

The course of events in the Far East in recent years has corroborated the Tanaka program to such a degree as to preclude any doubts about the authenticity of this document.

Jan Valtin: Out of the Fight

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

Jan Valtin's autobiographical narrative, "Out of the Night," belongs to the writings of a lost generation of European revolutionists. The leading characters that pass through the pages of his book are semi-fictionalized, semi-factual thumb-nail sketches of men and women who—in the interval between World War I and World War II—began as revolutionists. Confronted by history with the task of leading society toward new beginnings and a new life, they tried to assume the responsibilities of participating in and guiding the revolutionary struggle of the working class against capitalism. When that struggle was led by the parties of the Second and

Third Internationals to catastrophic defeats, Valtin and his friends failed to carry on. Originally, they had gravitated toward communism (Bolshevism) but instead of Bolsheviks they became demoralized agents and dupes of the GPU (Stalinism). Neither Valtin nor any of the chief characters in this book proved capable of rising to the level of the historic tasks.

Each defeat left in its wake a quota of deserters. Some deserted to Fascism; others, Valtin among them, to the camp of bourgeois democracy. As against the relatively few who died physical deaths, a great many found themselves plunged into a darkness worse than death, drained of all capacity to

struggle, robbed of all will to victory, sustained by nothing except the biological urge to survive. To call the roll of Valtin's characters is to run the gamut of human bankruptcy and degradation. This is the picture he presents of his generation.

Only philistines who expect to engage in great struggles without incurring any defeats would seek to explain the terrible fate of this lost generation solely on the basis of the defeats. To be sure, all defeats take their toll. But unprecedented as were the defeats of the last quarter of a century, they far from explain the tragedy of Valtin's generation.

They Separated Practice from Theory

The tragedy of Valtin—who in this book rises to the stature of a social symbol—is the tragedy of the activist who never bothers his head about theory.

Drawn towards Bolshevism by his emotions, he failed to develop beyond this initial and elementary stage of revolutionary activity. Emotions may suffice for art, but never for revolution. He engaged in political struggles and yet it never once occurred to him that he owed himself a political accounting. He believed that only "counter-revolutionists," only Trotskyists bother with such things. He idealized the Stalinist bureaucracy. He identified Stalinism with Leninism, the defense of the Stalinist bureaucracy with the defense of the Soviet Union.

The strategy and tactics of the class struggle, the theory and practice of the class doctrine—Marxism—its decisive importance in his own work and in the destinies of his class—all this remained for Valtin, as for thousands of activists like himself, a closed book sealed with the seven seals of the GPU.

He had the emotional urge to become a Bolshevik but he never became one because he never learned the cardinal lesson of Bolshevism, tested in the entire experience of modern history. "Marxist cadres capable of leading the proletarian revolution," wrote Trotsky in the very heat of the struggle against Hitler in 1932, "are trained only by the continual and successive working out of problems and disputes." Bolshevism developed under Lenin only in constant and irreconcilable struggle against the ideologies and programs of the Social Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks in whose ranks there were many sincere, devoted but misled revolutionists. Lenin and Trotsky never tired of warning and teaching the activists that loyalty to principles is the first loyalty of a Bolshevik. Only those who can assimilate into the very marrow of their bones the primacy of the ideological struggle can ever hope to emulate the example of the Russian Bolsheviks. Valtin never learned this lesson, that is why he remained for so long only a cog in the most monstrous apparatus of repression in history, Stalin's GPU and then became, not a revolutionist but a vulgar bourgeois democrat.

* * *

Valtin joined the German Communist party in 1923, became integrated in the apparatus of the GPU in 1926 and served the Kremlin as a loyal and trusted agent for the next eleven odd years until 1937—when he not only broke with Stalin but with the labor movement as well. His chief arena of activity was in the maritime industry. He sailed the seven seas. He was active in many parts of the world, including the Pacific coast of the United States. He participated in demonstrations, engaged in strikes and tested himself in military actions on the barricades (Hamburg events of 1923). He spent three years in the San Quentin penitentiary and three more years in Hitler's prisons. Each time he went to jail in the service of the Comintern. He escaped from the Fascist butchers by entering, on the instructions of the GPU, into

the service of the Gestapo for the purpose of counter-espionage. In point of activity his experience was intense and varied beyond the common run. It brought him nothing except disillusionment, disintegration and disaster.

He Drew No Political Lessons

Among the events to which he refers in his book are: the post-war crisis of capitalism (1918-21); the German revolution of 1923; the Chinese revolution of 1925-27; the periods of the First and Second Five Year Plans in the Soviet Union; the mass purges of the Comintern; the German events (1931-33) and Germany under Hitler; the Stalinist shift to the People's Front policy; the Spanish Civil War; the Moscow Frameup Trials, and so on.

Yet throughout his narrative Valtin does not so much as attempt to draw a single political lesson. There is no answer to any of the burning questions. No hint of any desire to seek for a political evaluation of any of the experiences. No matter what happens—there is always a blind, cynical acceptance of the Kremlin's orders.

What caused the debacle in Germany in 1931-1933? Valtin reports a conversation with Arthur Ewert, one of the Comintern leaders at the time. The Stalinists were then recklessly pursuing the policy of "Social-Fascism." No united front with the "social-Fascists," i.e., the Socialist Party which dominated the German trade union movement! No program for a joint struggle against Hitler! The ranks of the German working class remained split at a time when unity of front was a life-and-death issue. Stalin's policy played directly into Hitler's hands. It paralyzed the masses. It led, as Valtin correctly reports, to united actions between the Stalinists and the Nazis. Ewert expressed himself in opposition to this false and fatal course. What did Valtin do? "I did not ask myself," he writes, "who was right and who was wrong." The fate of Germany, and not Germany alone depended on the answer. In his eyes, it was unimportant. His "duty" was to denounce Ewert to his superiors in the Kremlin.

"My duty as a Communist," he explains, "was to betray Arthur Ewert, my respected teacher." Valtin has broken with Moscow but he still continues to vilify the name of communism. If he was taught such "duty," it was never in the school of Bolshevism. The first duty of any man who aspires to call himself a communist is to fight for a correct political line. The only duty Valtin ever learned or performed, as a docile and unscrupulous police agent, was to obey. He still helps to cover up all the abominations and crimes of Stalinism by this and many other assertions to the effect that in the rigid observance of "communist" duty is to be found the explanation for GPU treachery, GPU corruption, GPU infamy. It has become second nature with Valtin to think as a GPU'er.

With Hitler's victory there came as usual a change of line, a complete somersault. From the refusal to guarantee the unity of the working class confronted by its mortal enemy, Stalin turned to the acceptance of unity with the "democratic" section of the bourgeoisie, and diplomatic alliances with the democracies. Valtin first learned the news in Hitler's jail. Through the lips of one of his comrades, also in jail, he reports: "The Comintern policy has been modified. Now it's *Front Populaire*, we defend democracy because democracy gives us the best chance of organizing the armed insurrection. An important tactical maneuver, though many of the comrades here are bitter about having gone to prison for a policy that's now declared erroneous by Moscow."

As is to be expected, Valtin himself does not express any "bitterness" or surprise at the change. He raises no doubts

about the policy pursued prior to the turn. Nor is he impelled to evaluate the new policy for what it is. He passes on the Stalinist lie that the change involved only questions of "tactic."

As a matter of fact he accepted the policy of the People's Front all the more unquestioningly because his own degeneration was in its final stages. In explaining how he wormed his way into the Gestapo, he candidly avows: "Many of the things I said (to the Gestapo) were not lies, they were conclusions I had arrived at in the self-searching and digging which many thousand lonely hours had invited." These "conclusions" were his first steps on the road of capitulation to the democratic wing of the imperialist bourgeoisie—a capitulation he was to consummate later on.

His break with the GPU and his capitulation to the bourgeoisie were two sides of Valtin's process of degeneration. The fate of Firelei, his wife, whom his superiors betrayed to the Gestapo, served to speed up this evolution of the blind tool of Stalinism into an equally blind tool of "democratic" imperialism.

Campaign after campaign led only to defeats. "Like most communist campaigns," writes Valtin, "this one, too, left a wake of shattered hopes, broken homes, and misery for its guileless participants." Each defeat was hailed as a victory.

But why Stalinism led and can lead only to defeats—this was none of Valtin's business while he himself participated in these campaigns. All the freer does he therefore feel now to leave the reader with the impression that the fault really lies with Bolshevism, that Bolshevism can lead only to defeats.

The Mind of a GPU Agent

Valtin looks back on all past experience through the mind and eyes of a GPU'er who himself remained unaware of the stages of his own degeneration as a revolutionist. To believe Valtin, the German Communist Party of 1923 did not differ essentially from the same party in later years. To the diseased GPU mind the Comintern of Lenin appears as if it were the corrupt, treacherous agency of Stalin. The Comintern underwent a profound transformation. Valtin reports these "changes" as if they were really of slight importance.

For instance, when he is freed from San Quentin in 1929 and returns to party activity, he is warned by one Soeder: "Be careful about what you say when you meet the comrades higher up. You've been away a long time." "The Comintern," continues Soeder, "has changed its face. It has been unified. It is now going like a torpedo. One direction only. No more vagaries. No internal discussion. No compromises."

"I was to learn," comments Valtin, "much more about this change of face during the coming weeks. Zinoviev and Trotsky had been purged. Bukharin was pushed away from the helm of the Comintern. Stalin now dominated Russia and, therefore, the Comintern as well." Why the purges? Why the complete suppression of internal party democracy? Had nothing changed about the Comintern except its "face"? What was happening in the Soviet Union? Valtin never bothered to find out. On leaving Hitler's jail, he learned about the Moscow Frameup Trials. He was no more curious and questioning then than in 1929. This is what destroyed him and not the defeats.

Real Bolsheviks, as we have already said, are tempered not only in day-to-day struggles, not only in learning self-discipline, not only in becoming skilled in organization but, above all, in fighting for a political line, and assimilating the political lessons of the past. Only in this way can they inculcate in themselves loyalty to principles and an unswerving

devotion to the historical interests of their class. Nothing can substitute for this. The most indomitable will in the world is powerless to compensate for the inability to learn and assimilate proletarian politics.

Without a correct program, without a correct political line, organizations which appear so imposing in point of numbers, votes, parliamentary seats, agents, resources, etc. invariably reveal themselves under the impact of events to be hollow shells. Conversely, those organizations which in the eyes of philistines seemed insignificant and hopeless enter the arena of history as irresistible, world-shaking forces. But this does not happen overnight, nor by wishful thinking. It comes only as a result of years of gruelling, unswerving political struggle against terrible obstacles and the most powerful enemies. Only in this way can a Bolshevik party be built. It takes time to build a party. It took more than thirty years of struggle to build the party which made the Russian revolution.

Valtin never learned the lessons of the Russian experience. He was still a child when the October revolution occurred. Most people are able to learn only from their own experiences. Individuals gifted with the capacity of learning from the experiences of history or from the experience of others are rare. But in politics as in personal life those men and women who for one reason or another fail to learn anything at all from their own rich, even if cruel, experiences become invariably transformed into dupes, frauds or bankrupts.

* * *

He Lived Between Two Worlds

Valtin dreamed two dreams. "I dreamt," he writes, "of being able some day to lead vast armies of workers in the fire-lines of revolution. I also dreamt of being, some day, master on the bridge of the finest liners afloat."

To many individuals life thus appears as a choice between rising with their class or making a career for themselves in the bourgeois world. There is no bridging the abyss between these two "dreams."

The international network of the Kremlin drew a great many of its recruits from among those who found themselves caught like Valtin between two worlds: the one, the dead world of capitalism, the other, the still unborn world of socialism. The sharper their sense of personal frustration, all the more eagerly did they accept Stalinism as their salvation and unconditional subservience as their duty.

The masses are confronted with a different choice. Millions of workers the world over must either lead mankind out of the terrible chaos of capitalism, with its bigger and better super-bombs, or endure ever greater slavery, suffering and degradation. The way "out of the night" for the masses is to struggle for socialism.

It was this historic necessity that Valtin translated into a dream. His avowed desire today is to expose the GPU and the Gestapo, in order to save not only other "dreamers" but bourgeois democracy to boot. He has learned nothing.

He does not know that really to expose the GPU or the Gestapo it is necessary to do more than compile a catalogue of their violence and deceit, their perfidy and bestiality, their cynicism and ruthlessness, etc. etc. It is necessary to lay bare the social and political roots of these organizations; to show what historical forces brought them into existence; to explain whence they derive their terrible power for evil; what their goal is. Above all, it is necessary to point the real way out, to provide a program of struggle against them and the system that breeds all such monstrosities.

This is impossible for Valtin. That is why his book is so suitable for the purposes of reaction.

The enormous publicity which has attended the publication and sale of this book is unquestionably inspired in large part by the interests of the bourgeoisie. They can use much of Valtin's material for building up a hysteria about "spies," "Fifth Columnists," "subversive activities," etcetera. Furthermore, the American imperialists would like nothing better than to smear the entire labor movement with the crimes of Stalinism.

We have nothing but contempt for those cynical lackeys of imperialism who raise their hands in hypocritical horror at the infamies and bestialities of the GPU or the Gestapo. They want to utilize the revulsion and indignation of the masses in order to harness them to the war machine. The entire history, past and present, of "democratic" imperialism is written in blood and filth, violence and deception, oppression and ruthlessness. Those who, like Valtin or Eastman, tell the workers

otherwise are only deceiving them. Still more, they aid *all* the imperialists to carry capitalism successfully through the gravest crisis in its history since the first World War.

The Stalinists, for their part, have attacked this book, and clamor for the deportation of the author. They "criticize" Valtin not because of the use to which the American warmongers are seeking to put his book, but because it contains a mass of obviously authentic information concerning the operations of the GPU and its role in the labor movement. He names names, cites places and dates. They fear the effect of these revelations not only on the more recent recruits to the GPU and the rank and file of their party, but on the mass of the workers, for instance those in the maritime industry. The Kremlin has good grounds to fear lest the American workers prove capable of thinking for themselves, and of drawing correct conclusions from concrete data which dovetails with their own experience.

After The Blitzkrieg: The New American Army

By JAMES CADMAN

The American war machine now in the process of creation is planned to reach its peak in 1945. It will be a product of the military lessons now being gained from the German campaigns—plus the greatest industrial machine in the world.

Perhaps the profoundest difference between the army of today and its predecessors is that now the army is completely integrated with the industrial capacity of the country. The army has become the most concentrated expression of the most advanced technological development. This, coupled with the absolute necessity in modern armies for a highly trained and mechanically skilled body of soldiers to cope with the new techniques and modes of war, has fostered a growing contradiction between the needs of the army and that of the home industries. The increased need of the army for many more technicians, engineers and mechanics throws a constant strain on the industrial machine which itself requires this same personnel if it is to operate efficiently. This means that, in both the army and industry, the industrial proletariat is now, far more than ever before, the decisive factor.

The new army necessitates a different conception of the training of the soldier and his position in the new army, as compared to that in the old. This is particularly evidenced in the changes in the infantry division, this being the largest self-contained army unit, composed of foot soldiers, the largest numerical body in any army.

The Old Infantry and the New

The old infantry division was quantitatively large and bulky; and its artillery and transportation facilities were greatly limited. The troops were trained chiefly in the old parade-ground "drill 'em till they drop" methods. One typical American infantry company in 1935-36, for example, out of a total of 334 hours of instruction, spent 280 hours on parade drill, 50 on bayonet instruction, three on attack drill and one on combat tactics.

The infantry was trained to operate in large bodies under

the constant supervision of their officers. They attacked in on-rushing masses with the bayonet and rifle as their principal weapon, incurring severe casualties. If repulsed, they fell back on their own line to "dig in" and wait perhaps several weeks or months until slow-moving reinforcements and supplies reached them. The soldiers, not being equipped very extensively, knew little or nothing of any other kind of weapon except the rifle and bayonet; thus the soldier did not have to be highly skilled or resourceful. In the officers corps initiative and enterprise were squelched and discouraged. Promotion was gained either through seniority or social status and bureaucratic conservatism was rampant.

An entirely different set of concepts is demanded by modern war. The speed and scope of modern military operations necessitates in actual combat the breaking up of large units into small groups, and the dispersal of these groups over wide areas, often far behind the enemy's own front. Fighting thus in small units, often without being led by commissioned officers, infantrymen must be trained to manifest more individual initiative in action. They must, indeed, know as much as officers in the old army concerning combat tactics.

Furthermore, they are being equipped with and trained in the most effective use of new types of small arms (semi-automatic rifles, sub-machine guns, etc.) and even flame throwers and dynamite. They are being encouraged to improvise weapons (e.g. hand grenades out of gasoline bottles) in the event that they lack them, and finally they are being taught to march prodigious distances under full pack and the pack, unlike the old, is primarily armament. Infantry field manuals have already been revised to include instructions in the new tactics. Some of the old commands—"Squads Right," "Parade Rest," "Port Arms" and "Right Shoulder Arms" etc.—which have been the bane of many a soldier's existence, have been vastly simplified, and others entirely cast aside. Troops must be trained in the art of anti-aircraft protection, in the field through equipping them with the necessary weapons to repel air-strafting; and on the march by the new

two-column formation which facilitates the easy taking to cover in the event of enemy aerial attack. Training, in a word, is almost entirely confined to combat tactics.

The structure of the different parts of the infantry division has also been altered to conform with the new theories. The company has been divided into three squads of 36 men each, including light machine guns and trench mortar groups. These changes have resulted in the increase of the company's fire power and in its ability to operate independently of the main body. Other parts of the infantry division have undergone similar changes. Changes in divisional artillery have been most significant, with the introduction of numerous powerful new weapons, the value of which have been confirmed on European battle-fields and American testing-grounds. Among these are the new 105 mm. howitzer, the 88 mm. anti-aircraft gun, and the powerful M-1 infantry rifle.

The old division has been superseded by the adoption of the "triangular division" (so-called because of its three regiments) of 14,500 men, the addition of special motorized facilities to augment its mobility (under ideal conditions the division can cover 75 miles a day) and the inclusion of a special chemical-warfare battalion equipped with 32 chemical mortars together with the deadliest flame-thrower and poison-gas devices.

On the march, the infantry and its equipment train now move in parallel lines with adequate anti-aircraft and aerial protection at all times. March outposts must be constantly maintained and there must be no cessation of direct communications between unit commanders and field headquarters.

In action, artillery fire must be coordinated with the infantry advance and these, together with their reserves and motorized vehicles, must move by "leaps." That is, they are literally to "leap" from position to position under aerial or artillery protection. Infantry attacks now follow the pattern of the "Infiltration Tactics" first made famous by Ludendorff during the Picardy Offensive in March, 1918. This calls for small combat groups of superbly trained and equipped storm troops whose task it is, on the one hand, to follow up tank advance to penetrate the enemy line at numerous points, feeling out weak spots; on the other hand, to storm and capture hostile pillboxes and fortified positions. This new type of warfare requires new forms of training and, indeed, mental and physical requirements far higher than ever before. The very flower of the population, the most superior youth, are now indispensable.

The Problem of Officers and Discipline

The new warfare also demands an officers corps capable of adapting itself to new conditions, ready to adopt new weapons and tactics and ready to engage in radical, audacious experimentation. The Nazis have met this problem by drawing into the officers corps—formerly limited to the Junker aristocracy and the big bourgeoisie—large numbers of the petty-bourgeois Nazi party members. The American army has attempted to secure similar results by appointing younger and more capable men to high posts. The American officers corps, however, still remains encumbered by old-time bureaucrats with antiquated ideas. By and large it is still a body of men drawn from the bourgeoisie.

The question of training new officers constitutes a major problem. It is one thing to instruct thousands of draftees in the rudiments of military tactics; it is an entirely different thing to produce thousands of well-rounded army officers thoroughly versed in methods which German officers have

absorbed through actual experience under fire. Both the facilities and the instructors to train them are at the present time lacking and not much hope is placed in the Reserve Officers Training Corps whose training can never be expected to produce officers measuring up to the high standards required under modern conditions of war.

Probably the most formidable problem with which American military experts must cope is that of teaching the infantryman to rely on his own judgment and initiative—and yet at the same time to keep him under domination of the officers. The fear of the bourgeoisie of arming the proletariat was counter-balanced in the past by the superior position of the officer who was to continually control and watch his men, command them, and think for them. To the army officer the new form of war poses the question of how to preserve his control while at the same time fostering the use of individualized tactics.

The Nazis have two major advantages over bourgeois democracy in working out this officer-soldier relationship. First of all, the Nazis destroyed the labor organizations and political parties; i.e., the organized sources of "infection" of troops. The Nazi army can thus permit a narrowing of the old gap between officers and men—in knowledge, initiative, training, etc.—with more impunity than the bourgeois democrats. Secondly, the mass base of fascism provided the German army with big cadres of youth who, even before Hitler's assumption of power, were trained in the Nazi military formation, and then were trained for seven years as a vast reservoir of officers. These Nazi officers, able to call many of the men under them their "party comrades," are an important factor in maintaining discipline by a relation to their men different from that in the traditional bourgeois army.

We must leave for another time a full discussion of the gravity of this problem facing the American General Staff which, under cover of lip-service to democracy, is seeking ways and means to imitate the Nazis in wiping out all possible sources of "infection."

The Mechanized Divisions

The most striking and certainly the most publicized of the new army installations are the mechanized *Panzer* (armored) divisions. The maxim, "Get thar fustest with the mostest," enunciated by General Bedford Forrest, is no longer quite true, if Forrest meant the most men. The concentration of numerically superior forces at the field of battle was at one time almost certain to insure victory. Now, however, Forrest's principle must be modified to state: "Get thar fustest with the most fire power." For in the mechanized division is accumulated an aggregation of war materials sufficient to render impotent the resistance of any foe not so equipped.

The personnel of such a division is composed almost entirely of highly skilled industrial workers and technicians. The mechanized divisions that the United States is organizing each require more than 200 fully trained engineers, and almost 2,000 mechanics and technicians among a total force of 9,000 men, all skilled in one or more mechanical trades. Thus one modern mechanized division, besides having more than four times the equipment and 30 times the fire-power of the old infantry division, requires more than nine times as many skilled men.

America's mechanized divisions (there are two now, and there will be eight by the time the present program is completed) are based on their German counterparts of which they are probably the closest existing reproductions. But they are founded for the present on different tactical considera-

tions. The task of penetrating vast systems of fortifications, and the problem of having to contend with hostile powers on every flank, were the tactical considerations motivating the structure of the German *Panzer*. The American General Staff does not visualize itself facing such problems and finds it unnecessary to create mechanized divisions of equal size and striking power to those of Germany. Thus the American *Panzer*, while proportionally more motorized than the German, is decidedly inferior in the quantity of its tanks and heavy artillery, although somewhat stronger in its light mechanized and light artillery sections. Its principal unit is the tank brigade, composed mainly of 287 small 3-10 ton machines, used for reconnaissance and pursuit or in attacks on lightly-held outposts. For thrusts at heavily fortified positions or clashes with hostile mechanized forces, the remainder of the tank brigade consists of 110 machines of 10-30 tons. Because available data concerning the huge German monster tanks of 50-80 tons is still indefinite and vague and because their value has as yet not been completely ascertained, the War Department has till now awarded no contracts for their construction.

The American mechanized division includes also motorcycle and light armored-car patrols for scouting and reconnaissance, a motorized infantry regiment composed of "shock" troops, numerous batteries of mortars, howitzers, field pieces and anti-tank guns and, what is absolutely indispensable for transport and supply purposes, 1,008 trucks.

The mechanized division is (like the infantry division) divided and sub-divided into brigades, regiments, battalions and companies. These sections are self-contained, have their own tanks and artillery (in proportion to their size) and, while capable of operating independently of one another, function as a unified force if maximum striking power is desired or if stiff resistance is encountered.

The *Panzer* advances not, as is commonly supposed, in waves, but in columns across flat country, along roads, through valleys, or over plateaus. In Yugoslavia they went through mountain passes and valleys. Preceding the armored division are light scouting and patrol forces which fan out in all directions in order to keep the main body informed of the whereabouts of the foe and to feel out weak spots in his lines. If the enemy is encountered in weak strength, or if his positions are not easily defensible, he will be dispersed with ease. If a formidable and strongly entrenched foe is contacted, the main body of the armored division will strive either to out-flank and envelop him, cutting his communications and striking him in the rear or, if this is impossible, attempt to crash directly through.

This latter alternative is not preferable from the point of view of the *Panzer's* objective which is, if at all possible, to avoid head-on engagement which, if the foe is formidable, can result, even if successful, in slowing up advance and in suffering severe losses. Rather, the *Panzer* aims to sweep the enemy's flanks, depending on momentum to carry the offensive deep into the interior, and on speed and surprise to disorganize the enemy's troop concentrations. If the momentum is maintained and the opponent is out-flanked and enveloped, his communications harassed and insecure, the opponent will be forced to retire under continual air bombardment. Should the retreating force be unable to reorganize and reform behind some natural or man-made barrier, it will probably disintegrate and lose all semblance of order.

It cannot be repeated too often that to carry out such operations successfully requires more than material strength. It requires the highest form of training and physical fitness

among both men and officers for tasks which will strain their mental ingenuity and physical capabilities to the utmost. In the recent mechanized maneuvers of Fort Benning, Georgia, the War Department was more interested in testing the endurance and dexterity of the men and officers than in the physical properties of the machines.

Modern tactics can be successfully carried out in Blitzkrieg fashion only in the case where two armies of unequal strength are engaged. In the event of the clash of two military forces approximately equally supplied in mechanized divisions, air forces and all the other paraphernalia of war, the struggle may very well degenerate into a stalemate, to be decided eventually by the industrial and economic strength which the combatants possess.

The Changes in the Cavalry

Another ancient and hallowed military institution which has come in for total reorganization has been the cavalry. The mistaken idea is held that modern war has rendered cavalry obsolete and antiquated. Actually, military operations are shaped by many factors among the most important of which is the topography and terrain of the theaters of battle, and the Western Hemisphere is especially adapted to the use of horse troops. Another misconception is that a cavalry division is entirely mounted and that the personnel is equipped with sabres and lances with which to cut down their foes in Hollywood fashion. This is not at all true.

The new theories on fire-power have resulted in the introduction into the cavalry division of motorized and mechanized squads plus several light artillery and machine gun batteries. This reorganization was undertaken when American military officers observed with what astonishing ease Poland's picturesque but futile sabre-slashing cavalry was routed by the Nazi mechanized columns. The War Department decided that cavalry forces must be adequately equipped to defend themselves against such tactics. With its new equipment the cavalry division is enabled to carry out its tasks of scouting, reconnaissance, pursuit and screening the main force.

Just as in other parts of the army, cavalry squads have been taught to fight with greater elasticity and initiative and the fire-power of even the smallest units has been greatly increased. What is even more striking, however, is the fact that American cavalymen are instructed and equipped to fight also as infantry in the event they are forced to dismount on encountering strong resistance.

The Engineers, Backbone of Blitzkrieg

An arm which has never figured so prominently in previous campaigns as it does today is the engineering corps. Concerning its newly acquired importance, it suffices to say that without it mechanized warfare would be absolutely at a standstill. This much has been stated by the German high command, which unquestionably possesses the finest engineering corps in the world. The watch-word of mechanized warfare is speed, speed which must remain unchecked throughout all operations. It would be impossible for armies to advance with equipment and supplies at a great rate, if they were continually encountering blown up bridges, blocked roads, and numerous other obstructions set up by the retreating foe to hinder their movements. It is the task of the engineering corps to keep these vital arteries clear at all times.

Engineering battalions are now being assigned to all parts of the American Army, equipped with pontoon bridges, inflated rubber boats, and countless tools and devices, as well as being armed with rifles and pistols to defend themselves.

from attack. The increased use of engineers again demonstrates to what degree modern warfare has become dependent on the industrial apparatus of the nation—that is, on the industrial proletariat.

Parachutists and Air-Borne Troops

Another recent development in the fighting forces, but one whose possibilities have not yet been wholly tapped, has been the introduction of parachute troops. Here is a weapon so radical and unconventional in conception and design that, if used expediently and expeditiously against a foe unprepared to take measures, it can cause irrevocable damage to both materials and morale. While its tactical and strategic potentialities are extremely vague and still cloaked largely in speculation, the American General Staff considers it potent enough to have already instituted parachute training within the regular army.

One thing is already clear. Only if large home defense units on the pattern outlined by Tom Wintringham in his "New Ways of War" are organized among the civilian populations, can parachutists be quickly and easily dispatched before they can do their work. The parachutists wipe out the distinction between front and rear.

Parachutists are usually the cream of the army both as far as physique and intelligence are concerned. They are trained and instructed in the language of the country against which they must operate, in the handling of their own and their enemy's weapons and in their repair and improvisation.

The utilization of planes for carrying parachutists has also raised the possibility of ferrying entire infantry divisions and their supplies. The successful use of this mode of transportation during the Norwegian campaign has induced the American Army to experiment with it. Today the General Staff is organizing its first air-transport division, smaller and lighter-equipped than the normal infantry division, which will be the first of six.

The value of transporting troops by air arises chiefly where other means of transportation are unavailable, and where speed and reinforcements are essential. These troops are not landed behind the enemy front as are the parachutists (although this possibility is now under consideration *) but at airports and bases near the battle front to which they can be quickly moved. The use of planes to land or drop food and light equipment to troops in action was most effectively demonstrated by the Italians in Ethiopia in 1935-36, and has been tested by the American Army at the Fort Benning maneuvers.

New Developments in Artillery

The artillery has been doing its work for almost five centuries and each new development in the military field has served only to confirm its indispensability and its ability to fit harmoniously into any new pattern of warfare. The great General Clausewitz once said that infantry and cavalry together were a weaker combination than either one combined with artillery.

The artillery differs in organization from the other sections of the army in that it is not a separate or distinct force, but is assigned to every branch of the fighting forces in greater or lesser degree, depending on the size of these branches and their arms. The word "artillery" itself is a general term comprising every type and caliber of howitzer, mortar, and gun, whether in the Army, in the Coast Defense, or in the Navy. The use of artillery on the battlefield, both light and heavy, has five major purposes:

1. To pound one point in the enemy line until it cracks, following which the infantry attacks ("Concentrated Fire").

2. To clear the battlefield of enemy field posts, pill-boxes, and forts before the infantry attacks ("Clearing Barrage").

3. To box in one specific area in order to cut it off and isolate it from the rest of the line ("Box Barrage").

4. To clear the path of the advancing infantry by firing in front of them as they advance ("Creeping Barrage").

5. To support infantry in repulsing enemy tank attacks or other enemy onslaughts.

These tasks entail the use of several different types of guns which are in turn divided into different calibers. Briefly, the main difference between a gun, a howitzer, and a mortar, is one of trajectory, or height of fire. Its caliber (the diameter of the shell) determines the range of its fire.

Artillery is divided into three categories: field pieces, consisting of those small and light enough to be moved quickly and easily with the troops; siege pieces, consisting of those whose cumbersome size makes it necessary to keep them a certain distance behind the front; and finally, the huge railroad pieces which are brought up by railroad and situated far in the interior whence they carry out long distance shelling.

Under the old conditions, the siege and railroad guns were extensively used. The slowness and rigidity of the old time battle front made it possible to bring these unwieldy monsters into position behind the lines. These intensely pounded the enemy lines before the troops attacked, and during the infantry advance they gave as much support as possible, considering their clumsiness and the great trouble of moving them to keep up with the advance. Light artillery such as the famous French "75's", were only occasionally used, and then to clear enemy battlefields of pill-boxes, etc., or to aid in repulsing enemy infantry attacks. Infantry regiments, moving slowly, had little use for light artillery, and were seldom even equipped with it. The huge, heavy, siege guns were the mainstay of fire-power.

Now, however, the speed and fluidity of modern war has greatly limited the use of heavy guns (except in cases of naval bombardment, coast defense, or where cities are under protracted siege) and has made it necessary to equip even the smallest infantry units with mobile but high caliber guns which can keep up with the breakneck speed of the mechanized and motorized divisions. These guns have been used with such telling effect by the Germans that America's artillery force has been reorganized to include many of the German types. Several of these, such as the 105 mm. howitzer, the 61 mm. mortar, and the 37 mm. anti-tank gun, have enormously increased the fire-power of individual army units.

New tactical ideas for the use of mobile artillery have also been evolved. More discretionary powers are allowed to the battery commander, but at the same time coordination between batteries must be increased in the highest degree. More individual and scattered artillery posts are set up to eliminate the old rigidity of the front and to lessen the danger of direct hits being scored on the battery. Mortar commanders are instructed to concentrate more on enemy communications. Mortars are attached even to infantry companies to enhance the independence and effectiveness of these units.

Anti-tank units must be mobile as well as of high caliber to facilitate their easy distribution to any sector where needed. Artillery men must also be trained and equipped with rifles, because the swiftly changing scene of battles might find them under assault by hostile infantry. Bicycles and motorcycles

* This appears to have been done by the Germans in Crete.

must be issued to artillery personnel to strengthen coordination between batteries. Artillerymen must be trained in the use of camouflage and natural obstacles to improve their defensive position. Thus, like all the other soldiers, the artilleryman—always a skilled worker—must now be trained in many fields.

Revolutionary as are the developments in artillery that we have described, they constitute developments *within* the old conception of artillery. But that old conception can hardly be expanded to include dive-bombing or, for that matter, any form of airplane bombing. Yet, it is plain, air-bombers are being used in this war to carry out tasks hitherto assigned to artillery. All the major purposes traditionally associated with artillery, which we have listed above, are now being attempted, and with great success, by air-bombers, with the possible exception of the "creeping barrage." In no sense, however, have air-bombers displaced any form of artillery. On the contrary, this revolutionary development has given an entirely new importance to the role of artillery—if by that term is meant the old conception of artillery combined with the air-bombers.

It must be emphasized at this point that any separation between "army" and "air force," even for purposes of discussion, is quite artificial. So, too, any separation between "naval power" and "air power." The new army and navy are, in reality, extremely complex coordinations of the various weapons—and included in these coordinations are not only weapons but the economic power of the nation.

Coordination is, indeed, the key to understanding the new warfare. Coordination has a new meaning. Coordination of infantry, cavalry and artillery was understood very well in the past. The new coordination, however, produces something quantitatively and qualitatively different from the old. The

new seeks coordination into one perfectly functioning machine of infantry and mechanized divisions, artillery, parachutists and air-borne troops, the various types of airplanes,—coordination of all this with naval power—and coordination of all this with the home front. In a word: *totalitarian* war, whether waged by totalitarian or "democratic" state.

The Illusory Dream of a Small Army

None of the ruling classes of the world desired to bring about totalitarian war. On the contrary, the general staffs of all the great powers dreamed, in the interval between the two world wars, of finding a system of "limited warfare" (Liddell Hart), or a speedy and conclusive decision by a single arm (the air force, in Italian General Douhot's theory) or a small, professional army (Von Seeckt). All the general staffs have feared what one American military writer, Hoffman Nickerson, has called "the armed horde"—the mass army which began with "the people in arms" of the French Revolutionary Armies of 1793. They hoped to find in mechanization a professional, specialized and smaller army which would be immune from the mutinies and revolutions which came everywhere in Europe in 1917 and 1918.

Instead, what is loosely called mechanization has served to integrate the military and home fronts into what must be a coordinated whole if war is to be waged at all. The dream of a small and "safe" army proved to be the most childish wishful thinking on the part of ruling classes fearful of the great masses whom they exploit and oppress. Far more than ever before the most decisive factor in warfare is the industrial proletariat.

(This discussion of the new warfare will be continued in succeeding issues of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. The next article will deal with air power.)

The Balkans

By JACK WEBER

The Balkans epitomize better than any other spot on earth the bloody rivalry of the imperialist powers for world domination. Every great war among the powers is bound to involve the Balkans. The First World War exploded at the beginning in the Balkan powder keg. In the Second World War the small Balkan countries were drawn into the maelstrom at the second stage.

In Southeast Europe are the crossroads of the Old World, the bridge from Europe to Asia and Africa. In early history every great invasion of the primitive races swept over the Balkans. The last of these invasions, covering the later middle ages, led to a period of centuries-long domination by the Turks. The growth of the European nations, the triumph of the bourgeoisie in the French Revolution, set in motion forces that gradually undermined the Ottoman Turkish Empire. The modern history of the "cockpit of Europe" began with the disintegration of this Empire.

The European states hovered like vultures over the carcass of European Turkey. All the appetites of conquest were whetted by this Mediterranean decay. For centuries the Balkans remained "unfinished business" for the powers. The Concert of Europe—was there ever a more ironic name?—moved cautiously, each one watchful of the others, while they carved up the slices. The bargaining for mutual grabbing went on in conjunction with the imperialist sharing of spheres of in-

fluence in all parts of the world. When the bargaining process was not satisfactory, or where one saw the chance to double-cross the other, war continued the diplomacy and politics of imperialist looting.

The break-up of the Mediterranean Empire went on from within and from without. Nationalities submerged under the yoke of the sultan's janissaries for untold centuries suddenly stirred into life. The great powers of Europe "sympathized" with these struggling new nations. In the Greek revolt of 1821-1829 the English gave aid as well as sympathy. The romantic aura of Byron's poetry veiled the real nature of this sympathy, the same kind of sympathy shown by the United States today for the Chinese struggle against Japan, or for India against England. It is the attraction of the imperialist to its prey.

No sooner was the liberation of the Balkan countries from the Turks accomplished, than they fell into the clutches of these self-same European sympathizers. The aid given the small nations in their battle for freedom proved to be the cloak under which they were brought into the orbit of one or the other of the powers. Anybody who today thinks that the problem of the independence of small nations has any primary or independent character or that the questions of national unity in Europe can be settled within capitalist frameworks should be set to studying the history of European diplomacy in connection with the Sick Man of Europe.

Bourgeois writers of history, when they speak unguardedly and therefore frankly, call the Eastern Question "the problem of filling up the vacuum created by the gradual disappearance of the Turkish Empire from Europe." Here there is no trace of a thought given to the Balkan peoples. The problem concerned not these Balkan inhabitants but the powers of Europe: who was to inherit the pieces of the Empire?

Imperialist Rivalries in Balkans

The first great rivals for this inheritance were Czarist Russia and England. Russia wanted Constantinople and an outlet to the Mediterranean Sea. England wouldn't have minded that—but it already possessed India and could not tolerate having any great power on its lifeline through the Mediterranean to India and the East. The Czar's seizure of Constantinople would have been merely the preliminary to a later seizure of India.

Each power, while denouncing the Terrible Turk, was most anxious to become his protector. The Czar was the first protector, and gangster-like, exacted his price. In the Crimean War, England muscled in and took over the protection. Russia thereupon played the opposite game, and in 1877-78 sympathized so deeply with the poor Bulgarians that she intervened to help them gain "independence."

Germany was at first not concerned with the Balkans. Of course, when Austria helped Bismarck in the War of 1870 against France, Bismarck reciprocated and helped Austria seize its share of the Balkans: Bosnia and Herzegovina. But the moment Germany became a united nation, she too cast eyes on the Balkans. Germany became the friend of Turkey in place of the other powers. The great Berlin-to-Baghdad Railroad was projected in order to bring all of Central and Southeastern Europe under German domination. German capitalism was now demanding its "living space." Bismarck and those after him saw that if Germany was to become the dominant world power, it must first dominate Europe, and particularly the Balkans. Not merely because the Balkans economically complemented Germany's industrialism, offering an outlet for manufactured goods in exchange for food and raw materials, but also because it would start German expansion into the Eastern Mediterranean. Bismarck agreed with Napoleon who, in order to conquer England, had tried to break its connections with India and the East. Napoleon said: "Really to conquer England we must make ourselves masters of Egypt."

The first world war was fought around this issue. Who was to dominate the Mediterranean and thus the route to India? For this purpose the Balkans were stepping stones. The Baghdad Railroad was far more a strategic than an economic undertaking.

Hitler Carries On

Hitler, carrying out the policies of German imperialism, was inevitably driven to take over this same scheme in the second world war. No doubt Hitler had not banked on so quick a conquest. The ease with which he overran and defeated France placed before him even earlier than he had hoped his next step. He chose the same old Balkan route to Egypt and the Suez Canal for the purpose of breaking the British Empire. This time, due to technological changes, he did not have to wait for a Baghdad Railroad. Mobile transport and tanks have obviated the necessity for railroads in the first stages.

The quick change in aims after the conquest of France

is seen in Hitler's speeches. He threw off the whining mask of Germany's freedom from the chains of Versailles necessary in the period of rearmament. He became openly imperialist and boasted of the conquests to come.

German economy had of course prepared the way for military conquest. Even before Hitler came to power in Germany, her emissaries in the Near East have pursued the game of power politics, of economic penetration so as to gain a measure of internal control before actual absorption of the country. In this Germany merely followed the other powers.

Disunion and Intrigue

If the Balkan countries had been able to unite with each other at any time in an economic and military federation, they might have jointly held off all the imperialists. Many a Balkan statesman, even among the bourgeoisie, has understood and dreamed of this. But the history of the Balkans shows nothing more clearly than the impossibility of the Balkan peoples to live their own lives while capitalist imperialism exists. Imperialism reaches into the very heart of the small countries of Europe. It lays hold of their internal structure, of their financial and banking interests which are tied up with the interests of the bigger bankers of the great powers. Through complete economic domination of the native bourgeoisie, imperialism controls political parties and the governments set up on the basis of these political parties. The only recourse open to the national bourgeoisie is to gravitate from the orbit of one of the powers to that of another. Its bargaining power lies only in the fact that rival imperialists bid against each other for influence.

To prevent any Balkan union, the powers have made clever use of the national hatreds engendered in the course of the centuries of oppression. They could do this because of the class structure of the Balkan states, because of the domination in these states of a combination of feudal and capitalist elements interested solely in maintaining power over their exploited populations. Even the weakest attempts at union were frustrated. In the first Balkan War (1911) the Balkan countries were united against Turkey in the Balkan League. This League threatened Germany's plans which depended on overrunning at the proper time each small weak nation standing alone. Hence German diplomacy worked successfully to destroy the League by encouraging Greece to seize Macedonia which was mostly Bulgarian in nationality. Serbia was encouraged to turn in the same direction and away from the Adriatic coast which had been promised to Italy in the Triple Alliance. Thus the moment the countries in the Balkan League had gained the victory against Turkey in their war of independence, they promptly turned upon each other and the second Balkan War of 1912-13 took place. Macedonia was the bone of contention, the outlet to the Aegean Sea and to ports like Salonica. In that war Bulgaria was defeated and Greece and Serbia became the oppressors of national minorities.

Germany, the actual instigator of this war and of Bulgaria's loss, thereupon used this result to bring Bulgaria into the first World War on the side of Germany—by the promise that Germany would right the wrong!

After Versailles

The Versailles Treaty redoubled the pace of Balkan intrigue. France, bolstering up the status quo to maintain its artificial domination over Germany and Europe, created the Little Entente of Rumania, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia to encircle Germany. All of these states had artificial borders

which included minorities torn from other nations. These other nations, created jointly in the process of the Balkanization of Europe after the first World War by the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, dreamed of nothing but revision of the oppressive status quo. In the first period, between 1924 and 1932, these nations came under Italian influence, since Italy felt itself the natural successor to Austria in the Balkans. In this period Italy led Hungary and Bulgaria and had considerable influence in Austria.

When the peasant governments of Stambuliski in Bulgaria and Raditch in Yugoslavia tried to get together to settle their differences, Mussolini became greatly alarmed since this threatened Italy's ambitious schemes. The assassination of Stambuliski by the Macedonian terrorists was in part Mussolini's work to break up this new alliance. Italy sought to isolate Yugoslavia and to break up the Little Entente so as to get what she wanted later. Part of this same game was the assassination of Barthou and King Alexander by the terrorist hirelings of Italy, the IMRO and the Ustachis. The assassinations were aimed to keep France from cementing a closer alliance and thus putting another obstacle in the way of revision.

The moment Hitler gained power, he took over from Italy leadership of the movement against the Versailles Treaty. The Balkan countries, seeing the future, tried desperately to come to agreements and to unite. But each was powerless to correct the wrongs of the others. When the others refused to right the wrongs done her, Bulgaria stood in the way of union. The Balkan countries are now paying dearly for their own past. If Hitler was able to isolate one country after the other, he merely "inherited" the benefits of all the imperialist intriguing in the Balkans. The Munich Pact, which ended the Little Entente and laid the Balkans open for Hitler's next step, made his task that much easier.

Imperialist intrigue not only made it impossible for the Balkan countries to unite in any way. It has also made of these countries the most unstable section in the world. Internal stability is unthinkable in small countries where all the complicated lines of imperialist diplomacy cross and recross. The bewildering and rapid changes in governments and ministries that took place, have also, of course, their native reasons. But internal instability is prevented from reaching any kind of equilibrium by the enormous pressures from outside that cannot be withstood.

Life in the Balkans

The Balkans are backward peasant countries under the yoke of feudal landlords combined with a small native bourgeoisie. The Balkans account for no more than 2½% of the industrial production of Europe. Most of this is closely connected with agriculture—milling, wine-pressing, manufacture of vegetable oils. The situation of the peasants is not identical in every country, but is enough alike so that it can be easily summarized. The peasants form from 70 to 80% of the various populations. The land, except for Bulgaria, is in the hands of a few great landowners. What the peasants themselves possess is so divided that they live at the lowest level of all Europe. At the same time the agricultural per capita tax is the highest in the world. The mortgage and loan debts of the peasants is enormous. Interest rates for seed and tools run, depending on the country, anywhere from 30 to 80%.

Rumania may be taken as an example. The peasant's meat consumption per day—of course he does not eat meat every day—is one-third of an ounce, equivalent to a thin slice of ham. He has to work 45 days to pay for a pair of shoes. 40% of the peasant families possess no draft animals at all.

They must drag the plows themselves! More than half the population is illiterate.

The Balkans are the sore spot of Europe. Disease epidemics are common. Pellagra, tuberculosis and dipsomania, leprosy and trachoma are endemic. In this backwardness it is natural to find that Church and State are still one. In Yugoslavia the Greek Orthodox Church of the Serbs was subsidized, and one of the last proposals of the old government was to subsidize the Roman Catholic Church of the Croats. In Yugoslavia out of a population of fifteen million there are one million peasants who possess no land whatsoever and who must work as migratory, seasonal proletarians. In Bulgaria the land is well divided, but in such small parcels that the peasant cannot farm it efficiently. Is there any wonder that the Balkans are the seat of a constant *jacquerie*, a constant peasant struggle of despair?

Balkan Politics

The Balkans are a region of want and famine. Under these circumstances, under class domination, it is readily understandable that the government bureaucracy must exercise the most cruel repressions to keep the mass of the people in subjection, to prevent them from laying hands on food, clothing and the bare necessities of life. Considering the size of the countries, the size of the bureaucracy is extremely disproportionate and frightfully costly, which accounts for the enormous taxes.

The facade of parliamentary democracy in the Balkans before Hitler took over fooled nobody. Balloting took place with a gendarme on each side of the voter to see that he voted right. Behind this facade stood the army and the monarchy. The constant turmoil in the Balkans, since it did not lead to proletarian revolution, led instead to reactionary dictatorship. Nowhere else is the meaning of monarchy as the last resort of reaction so clearly visible as in the Balkans.

The struggle of parties in the various parliaments, each party under a different foreign imperialism, is primarily that between the landed gentry and the capitalist elements, each desiring control of the nation for its own class interests. The native bourgeoisie is weak owing to the fact that what big industry does exist—oil in Rumania, tobacco in Greece, textiles in Yugoslavia—is dominated by foreign capital.

To the left are the peasant parties, parties similar to the Socialist Revolutionaries of the pre-revolutionary period in Russia. On these parties the Russian Revolution had a tremendous impact. The Pan-Slavism that reflected the influence of the Czarist regime on the South Slavs became transformed into Bolshevik influence. The seizure of the land by the Russian peasants gave joy to the Balkan peasants. Thus the left elements of the small proletariat found it possible to exert influence on the peasants and to found communist parties more peasant than proletarian in origin.

The ruling class in the Balkans was driven mad with fear at the outbreak of the Russian Revolution. Everywhere it hastened to try and placate the peasants by talking in terms of agrarian reform and of division of the big landed estates. In fact a certain amount of reform became inevitable. This reflected itself in the coming into power for the first time of the peasant parties. In Bulgaria Stambuliski became the head of the government. This was called the Green Revolution. But the ruling class used this leftist government to give itself time to prepare a counter-stroke. In 1923 it was ready to move. Its plans coincided with those of Mussolini who had hired the IMRO to assassinate Stambuliski. The army under Tsankov promptly seized control, engendering a civil war.

Stalinism Betrays the Balkan Masses

What attitude did the Bulgarian Communist Party take? It had a long history and its influence was the greatest in the Balkans. But it failed to understand the situation. The Communist Party stated that it was indifferent to this quarrel between different sections of the bourgeoisie. It stood aside while Tsankov seized power. The latter at once proceeded to suppress in bloody fashion both the peasant party and the workers' party. Leaders were thrown into prison, many murdered outright. Too late the Bulgarian communists realized what was happening. Too late, after the masses had become discouraged, it staged an uprising. This uprising, intended as a signal for the Germans in 1923, became instead the herald of defeat. Hitler today marches into the Balkans as a result.

It was in the Balkans thereafter that Stalin turned for his peasant allies, like Raditch of Yugoslavia. The Croat Peasant Party of Raditch was the backbone of the so-called Peasant International. But the peasants have no independent policies of their own. They had gravitated towards the proletariat, and in this period Raditch used the Comintern as a red covering to give himself more bargaining power with the bourgeoisie. In 1925 he threw aside the mask and joined a reactionary government under King Alexander. Stalinist policies have been as disastrous in the Balkans as everywhere else. The Balkans presented a number of occasions where a correct policy could have brought about the proletarian revolution supported by the peasants. But Stalin was incapable of directing a revolutionary policy even in Bessarabia, torn from Russia in the period of allied intervention and subjected to the most brutal white terror. Bessarabia had to be won by Stalin, not by a revolution that was perfectly possible, but by a bargain with Hitler that turns sourer every day.

Without the proletarian revolution the Balkan countries can act merely as satellites grouped about the great powers. Their rulers live off the rivalry between these powers. Only the proletarian revolution could bring stability to the Balkans and Europe. The capitalist states of Europe fight now not for their nationality, but to see which of the great powers shall dominate the whole world. Self-determination for small nations is unthinkable while capitalism is dominant in Europe.

In the place of the domination of Europe by an imperialist world power, the workers place on their program the Soviet United States of Europe. Capitalist imperialism poses war as its solution to the Balkan and every other question. The working class poses the social revolution as its solution. But Stalin has long ago discarded the prospect of the Soviet United States of Europe. He thought he could rely on a Balkanized Europe, a whole series of buffer states created by the Allies in the first World War to protect themselves from attack by the defeated nations. Hitler has swept aside these artificial creations, using in the process the very forces of internal corruption and disharmony that should have been made the basis for the success of the proletarian revolution. For the moment, instead of the workers razing the rotten walls between the national states for progressive purposes, Hitler has kicked them down for imperialist purposes.

In his attempt to bolster the status quo, Stalin placed reliance on these same small states with their crumbling boundary walls. Their disappearance gives Stalin less and less possibility for maneuvering. His weak bluff in the Balkans, the warning to Bulgaria, the meaningless pact with Yugoslavia, was promptly called by Hitler, Hitler, to give the devil his due, pursues a persistent policy. He aims to crush England by marching through the Balkans, over Asia Minor and round to Suez. His actions are coordinated for this purpose. If he suc-

ceeds he will not only have all Europe at his mercy, but the British Empire will begin to crumble.

What's Ahead?

The Balkan problem of this moment is the problem of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus. Hitler aims at complete domination of this passage-way to Suez. That brings him face to face with Stalin. The latter played the game of power politics in order to maintain his clique in power in Russia. But Hitler played that game infinitely better. All the Stalinist diplomatic successes of the past are turning into their opposites. By his entire policy of sacrificing the historic interests of the proletarian revolution to the momentary interests of his clique, he has undermined and weakened the Soviet Union. Its greatest weapon would have been the ability to evoke stormy waves of revolution among the oppressed workers and peasants the moment any threat existed against the Soviet Union. Instead Stalin alienated both the workers and the peasants. The Balkans yielded to Hitler because their ruling classes were incapable of resisting. Their choice of one side or the other was merely a gamble on the future. Even if beaten now, they hope to be restored later. A real revolutionary resistance was made impossible not by the ruling class, which could not possibly have wanted that, but by Stalin. The peasants of South Europe at first looked to Russia with enthusiasm. But the forced collectivization and the merciless war against the Russian peasants in Russia was not lost on them. They no longer saw their future in Soviet Russia. Only the revived revolution could attract them again.

Will Hitler be able to unite the Balkans under his domination? That is not likely. He cannot, any more than the "democracies," solve the problem of nationalities. He can merely shuffle the cards anew. Can he put the peasants to work? Hitler cannot alleviate the poverty and oppression of the Balkans. On the contrary he can only add a further and even greater oppression of his own to the burdens already existing. His first efforts everywhere are directed to robbing the countries of occupation for Germany's sake. But to despoil the Balkans means to bring stark starvation to people who have always lived on its verge.

What then will happen in the Balkans? It is probable that sooner or later a guerrilla warfare, a revival of the Balkan *jacquerie*, will take place. This can find a healthy basis only if it is combined with the struggle of the proletariat. The IMRO movement (Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization) was a perfect example of the degeneration of a peasant movement which began as a real revolutionary movement but whose leaders, instead of accepting help for the pursuit of their own policies, became willing to take such help and to pursue the policies of the giver of aid. The Comintern tried originally to steer the IMRO movement into proper channels, away from individual terror and into an alliance with the mass movement of the workers. The terrorists fell out among themselves over this policy and murdered each other. Then the movement degenerated completely and became a bandit racket.

But under the conditions of present-day national oppression, the agrarian revolution could be united with the proletarian movement against the foreign oppressor. Clearly the salvation of the Balkans, the ending of social and political instability, can be achieved only through the social revolution under the leadership of the proletariat. Such leadership would set as its aim the establishing of the Soviet United States of Europe. Hitler has conquered the Balkans, but the Balkan problem remains.

How Paris Fell

By **TERENCE PHELAN**

As bourgeois culture goes, it is indisputable that Paris was the heart of civilization. It was "the city of light," the world's artistic Mecca. In the amenities of daily living, in poetry, painting and music, it was unsurpassed. Lenin, no sentimentalist, loved Paris and called it "the capital of the world."

For a rare once, then, we can agree with the petty-bourgeois intellectuals the world over to whom the fall of Paris symbolized the end of an era of civilization.

They mourn, they lament and they weep, but they refuse to face the question of greatest importance. Why was the foremost citadel of bourgeois culture abandoned to Nazi barbarism without a shot being fired in its defense? Let us try to answer it for them. This is how I saw Paris as it fell.

The Breakdown of the French Bourgeoisie

Paris as it fell was tragically beautiful. Late on the afternoon of Wednesday, the 12th of June, the petroleum and gasoline reserves in all the suburban refineries were set on fire by retreating French troops. Paris was ringed with monumental and sinister columns of jet, oily smoke. These, meeting at the zenith, far above the white cumulus clouds, slowly blotted out the sun, and spread a black pall over the doomed and deserted city. The blotting out of "the city of light" by that cloud was a sort of grim apocalypse.

Many bourgeois foreign correspondents have compared this to the black onrush of Nazis. It reminded me just as strongly of another obfuscatory cloud; that of the fleeing French censorship which, until the very last, characteristically refused to disclose the truth to its people. At the very moment that the surrender of Paris was being arranged at its own gate, the censor was still reporting that German troops were being held 40 kilometers away. Through that black, foreboding sky, Parisians who sat by their radios (newspapers having ceased publication) first came in contact with German technique. The German advance had left the French government without enough broadcasting stations to broadcast news itself or to continue its war-long practice of "jamming" German broadcasts. Thus, for the first time, the French heard the cold, accurate account of the Germans' advance from the Germans themselves. It was a sobering shock.

No less characteristic was the behavior of the upper classes. The Paris correspondent of a Chicago paper, with a taste for statistics, calculated that 71% of the metropolitan Parisians and 68% of the suburban Parisians who fled southward were bourgeois and petty-bourgeois. The wealthy quarters were entirely empty as their inhabitants piled into their expensive cars and deserted their capital in panic. This same correspondent aptly called this flight "The Great Bugger-Out."

Most characteristic of all was the indecision about Paris on the part of the government. Contradictory orders were piled on top of one another. An order that all men above 17 were to leave the city at once for the south was followed by a countermanding order whereby they must, under penalty of being considered deserters, remain with the factories in which they had been requisitioned. In a burst of heroic bombast, the government announced that Paris would be defended "street by street and house by house." Three days later came the formal declaration that Paris was to be an open city.

The Nightmare of the Bourgeoisie

What lay behind such conflicting orders? Why was Paris not defended?

No modern city which is seriously defended can be taken until it is either razed to the ground or starved and thirsted out. Madrid was defended for two years against overwhelming odds. Why, then, was Paris, not only the capital, but the economic nerve center of all France, abandoned at the last minute without a semblance of struggle?

Was it because the French forces were, as they stated, so devoted to the artistic monument of Paris, so tender toward its populace? Nonsense! If that would have furthered its own ends, the French bourgeoisie of 1940 would have reduced Paris to rubble, as it came close to doing in 1871. Was it, as some Anglo-American editors suggested, that France had "degenerated," and French soldiers were cowards? The British Ministry of Information may spread such an explanation, but the French bourgeoisie knew better. It knew that the ordinary poilu was, and remains, as good a fighting man as there is in the world, provided he had something to fight for. In fact, the contrary was the truth. The French rulers were not so much afraid that the poilu *lacked* courage; it was afraid that he would *show* it—in other ways than ordered.

The French government and the French bourgeoisie was plagued by a nightmare, a nightmare so terrifying that it thought anything, even the yielding of its capital, preferable. That nightmare was a second Paris Commune.

The heroic proletarian ghost of 1871 rose from the streets of its slaughter to make the French bosses jibber. A Commune! Anything, anything—rather than that!

As a matter of fact, the possessing classes need not have worried so much. Stalinism and reformist socialism had done their dirty work only too well, during the Popular Front period. The workers of Paris were comparatively apathetic, virtually leaderless, wholly disorganized. There was no revolutionary party of mass strength to evoke and direct a proletarian defense. Under the prevailing circumstances, a Commune would have been an almost impossible improvisation. But even that extremely remote possibility was too much for the French bourgeoisie to bear; they were determined that no interlude should intervene long enough to permit the creation of any proletarian defense of their capital. To avoid that greater evil, they raced against time to deliver their city to the "lesser evil"—the oncoming Nazis.

The Transfer of Power

No aspect of the collapse of France has been more obscured than this, in the official report. The reason is not hard to find. The cowardly betrayal strips from the French ruling class its masquerade costume of classless "national patriotism," which helped it deceive the nation. Its voluntary gift of Paris to the Nazis reveals in all its foul *class* nakedness the bourgeoisie's preference for an enemy imperialism to defense by its own people.

The delivery of the capital, the transfer of power, was accomplished with a smoothness beyond the French bosses' most optimistic expectations. They were really frightened of their own people. When the ministry fled southward, police

began to disappear from the streets, and to be concentrated in barracks in genuine fear of their lives. For 20 years they had snarled at the Paris populace unchecked, ridden it down, arrested it and smashed it over the head. They had good reason to fear that, in any interregnum between the government's flight and the Germans' arrival, the long-abused masses might hunt them down like rats. It was both comical and dream-like to see how few "flics" still showed their ugly mugs as they stood in timid pairs at a good distance from and in obvious terror of groups of discussing Parisians, especially workers massed around closed factory doors. Even those most vicious of professional strike-breakers, the black helmeted and black-hearted "gardes mobiles" went into terrified hiding. I saw one of them, caught in the open, ostentatiously helping an old lady across a completely traffic-less street in a ridiculous attempt to make himself out as kind-hearted.

Meanwhile, the French army emissaries were engaged in hasty parleys with a German Army commission in a villa outside Paris. Working against time, against the fear that the Parisians might take matters into their own hands, they were successful; the military arrangements were agreed to. At 6 P. M., the night before the occupation, the civil and police arrangements were likewise being completed at the eastern gates. When late-sleeping Parisians awoke on the morning of Paris' fall, the first thing they saw was the Paris police out in full force again, hauling down the tricolor and running up the swastika on public buildings and boulevard flag-posts.

Within three days the comforting presence of their new masters restored the spirits of the police enough to bring forth their old bullying selves. They demanded "papers" for the purpose of catching political refugees, turning over their archives to the Gestapo, and enforcing the new German regulations. The old blood-hounds who had hunted down revolutionaries and working class militants so long for the French bourgeoisie, went down on all fours before their new masters.

The heart of the French police system is the Prefecture on the Isle de la Cité. Essentially unchanged since the days of the sinister Fouche, this great gray building, grim and grimy, has been the French symbol of secret police terror. There each week went thousands of refugees, driven from their own countries because they struggled against reaction, each with a pathetic ragged purple paper informing him that he must leave France within one week. They came to have this lease on life extended for one week more. This is how the emigré workers and democrats really lived in the greatest and most cultured of bourgeois democracies, renowned for "political asylum."

By the Monday before occupation, the Prefecture was unrecognizable. Amid an atmosphere of burning documents and impending disaster, I saw running about the corridors those powerful functionaries from secret inner offices whose special delight it had been to remain invisible and unapproachable, to condemn a helpless petitioner without ever permitting him to plead his case face to face with them. These formerly omnipotent individuals were scurrying about in a panic that swung between a speechless impatience to get away, and a propitiatory politeness for self-protection. The notorious purple papers, still humbly presented for extension were waved aside with a hasty but significant statement—"papers don't matter any more, we are beyond the stage of papers."

They spoke the simple truth. The Prefecture's "paper" was worthless, like that of a bankrupt business or financial concern, because it had no material backing. The whole

system of state repression had fallen to pieces, was powerless. Only a week before it had been sending men to death, to long imprisonment. It had the power of seizure, of holding incommunicado, of secret torture, of frameup. It had all the terrifying prestige of state power behind it. And now, here it was, dissolving like sugar in water.

The Hollow Shell

I had read about the breakdown of Czarism and the collapse of Kerensky's regime. But the dissolution of the French State was a sight—and a lesson—never to be forgotten. Literary descriptions can give a theoretical understanding of the process and its significance, but it is quite a different thing to see the state structure crumble before your very eyes.

The experience is overwhelming. We do not realize how much we are hypnotized by the apparent power and permanence of the boss state. I thought of the hundreds of good American union members I knew, who were ready to fight any private corporation to a standstill, but who thought that the State was something quite different, something too big and too enduring to struggle against and overthrow. I wish they had been standing beside me and could see with their own eyes what a hollow shell the whole monumental-looking system of boss state repression really is, once it has been shaken to its foundations by a real blow.

It was tragic that in the case of France it had to be another imperialism—a rival bourgeois repression machine—that the French Prefecture was giving way to. But that nowise affected the fundamental lesson of the collapsibility of the decadent bourgeois state.

For the first time I then realized with my own eyes, ears and heart the profound meaning of the revolutionary cry; "we are so many; they are so few!" I then understood that once the determining sector of the working class takes the revolutionary road and moves against the capitalist state, that state will crumple with an ease that will surprise the workers. Under sufficient pressure, the entire apparatus—its cops, its sheriffs and deputies, its army officers, its governors and judges and cabinet ministers and presidents—will run like so many scared rabbits.

In an hour like this one really feels, in his own skin, the absolute rightness of the Marxist analysis of the state as the executive committee of the ruling class, of government as an instrument of armed repression. One sees how the ruling class maintains itself by bribing a thin segment of the workers to act as mercenary police against its own class struggle; and realizes how thin that segment is.

The Unknown Soldier

Returning home at midnight, between Thursday the 13th and Friday June 14th, through a black and empty Paris, I noticed that the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier under the Arc de Triomphe, was deserted. The French government had fled, the plutocrats had fled, even the paid guards of the Tomb had fled. There, yesterday, the French rulers had skillfully and shamelessly exploited the genuine popular mourning for the unknown dead of the last war. On the morrow the army of German imperialism, using the same skillful means of propaganda, were going with their ostentatious orders, to pick up where the French imperialists had left off.

But at the moment, between the regime of capitalist repression that had gone and the regime of imperialist oppression that was marching in on the morrow, the unknown soldier lay, as the perfect symbol of the completely forgotten man, the plain ordinary guy who gets killed so that one gang of

exploiters rather than another can make his widow and children work for less pay and live in more misery. At that moment neither of the gangs had any real interest in him. For a brief hour, the unknown soldier was left alone, with only a stray foreign revolutionist standing by to honor him, with pity and vengeance in his heart.

The Entry of the German Troops

A vague terror pervaded the city before the German troops arrived. The people left in Paris would not have been surprised to see columns of mechanized men marching into the city, after the swift speed of the Nazis' advance. Instead they saw battalion after battalion of robust farm boys on sleek, fat horses. The troops entered as though they expected to be received, not as conquerors but as deliverers. Every detail of the capture of Paris was executed with the calculated political aim of at least neutralizing the French, if not gaining them as allies.

The Parisians had had reason to be frightened. The colonial troops, who fell back to the region around Paris, had looted and destroyed in a terrifying manner. These troops were sacrificed by their French commanders with a brutal carelessness beyond belief, and it can well be imagined with what rage and hatred toward the French, these colonials had retreated, through northeastern France. French propaganda led the people to expect the same treatment from the Germans.

It can readily be imagined, then, what effect the agreeable occupation of the city by the Germans had upon the people. By passing their mechanized divisions around Paris to the south, the Nazis took over the city with the cheeriest, politest, most fraternizing of available troops. Contrasted with the looting of the French colonials, the behavior of the occupying Germans was almost comic in its correctness, so far did they lean over backward in observing legality. Reichswehr squads went about making inventories of damages, duly witnessed by French civil authorities. They, themselves, did no damage at all. Except for such big hotels and chateaux as were needed for officers' quarters, there were very few requisitions. Rare occasions of illegal requisitions or thefts by German soldiers were punished by immediate and ostentatious execution of the soldier involved in the presence of the aggrieved French civilian. An acquaintance of mine witnessed such an execution for the theft of six cakes and 100 francs' (\$2.25 in American currency) worth from the woman proprietor of a bake-shop.

During the first week of the occupation, about as many German soldiers were executed for such misdeeds as were French civilians for their resistance to German repression: about 10 Frenchmen were executed; two of them, to give the devil his due, were policemen.

As soon as the parades needed for movie consumption at home in Germany were duly completed, the bulk of the occupying troops, given leave, started to visit artistic monuments and talk to the civilians. Most spoke French; all were polite. They were full of their own brand of anti-capitalism and they were perpetually apologizing to the French for being there at all.

I overheard one soldier talk as follows: "You Parisians are so polite; we have always heard you were. But we Germans know that you don't like to have us here. We are embarrassed too, you know. How can you be expected to like us, when we had to destroy large sections of your country to the north and east and when we have to take over your capital? We don't want to, but we have to, until we have beaten the capitalistic, imperialistic England, which starved and stifled

Germany until National Socialism made us strong enough to fight back. But you French will administer Paris; we Germans will try to efface ourselves as much as possible."

The Parisians had expected almost anything except this type of fraternization.

While this source of well-rehearsed and, it is not at all unlikely, sincere declarations, were being made by the German soldiers to the people of Paris, the British Broadcasting Co. was accusing the French of cowardice and betrayal, just after the British had scammed out of the Dunkerque pocket, abandoning therein the 84,000 French poilus who had covered their retreat. It can be readily understood why the French people didn't become enthusiastically pro-British after the fall of Paris.

"Kill Them with Kindness"

On the road south of Paris, the humanitarianism of the German troops was as striking as their previous terrorism which had originally caused the chaos. The great columns of German trucks, rushing supplies to the fighting in the south became, as they sped northward again for further supplies, the surest transport for returning French refugees. Loaded with women and children, they could almost always spare a bit of food for the hungry or a litre of gasoline for a stalled car. They spread good-nature and puzzlement everywhere. Was this the Hun that the French radios and press had taught them to expect? the people asked. It was, but not at the moment. Mixing their methods, the clever Nazis outwitted the French by treating them in a totally different fashion than they had anticipated. By "killing them with kindness," the Nazis succeeded in dumbfounding and immobilizing any potential resistance. The conduct of the Germans stood in particular contrast with the attitude of the British old-school-tie officers, who in the pre-Blitz days treated the French in the same lordly way as they were accustomed to treat Gold-Coast natives or Indians.

The sole exception was the fascist Italian residents in Paris, who emerged from hiding after the Germans came, and strutted about like pouter-pigeons, arousing great popular resentment.

Most skillful of all instruments were the news-broadcasting trucks which the Germans sent to every quarter of Paris. The Parisians had begun to discard as useless their home radios, from which they received either regular insults from the British or irregular lies from their own fleeing government. To their surprise and sorrow, they received from the German newscasting apparatus restrained and accurate information on the progress of the fighting and the French governmental crisis which ended in the Petain-Laval-Marquet *coup d'etat*. There is no weapon so strong as truth, even when it is pressed into the service of the worst reaction.

Newspapers were encouraged to resume publication; censorship was, in actual fact, milder than under the French regime. Typical was a new daily called *La France au Travail*. Its slogan was "national communism." It was of course 200 per cent patriotic French. While "admitting" that the Germans, having beaten the French in fair fight, had a right to occupy the strategic north until the campaign against England was completed, it "pressed" for the retirement of the invader at "the earliest possible moment." With obvious access to police archives, it ran a devastatingly documented series of attacks on the late Reynaud government, proving to the hilt its suppression of civil liberties, its graft, frameups, anti-labor policy, etc. It attacked capitalism savagely, and called for a French renaissance under nationalist slogans. It even

discreetly criticized Germany. (The only place the German cloven hoof showed through was in the paper's unremitting attacks against the Vichy government.)

The Failures of Fascist Propaganda

It is difficult to conceive a more accurately aimed, psychologically skillful kind of propaganda than *La France au Travail*. And how did the Paris workers react to this super-French press? To their eternal credit be it reported: they called it "the German press" and used it to wrap potatoes in when they could find potatoes.

One must report that the French working class has grown to some extent politically cynical; it has been sold but so many times by the socialists and Stalinists, that it tends to distrust all politics, including correct politics. But the vast political experience which the French working class has undergone has not been in vain as shown by its immediate hostility to such papers as *La France au Travail*.

The very first weeks of German occupation showed, too, that a successful invasion by a fascist power brought no prestige to native fascism. On the contrary. The main fascist group, the Doriot followers, failed to gain any adherents. Under Marchale (Doriot himself being still in the unoccupied territory) the French fascists rushed into print with a new weekly, *La Vie Nationale* and, under German protection, began a drive for membership. But they were soon chased out of workers' districts and finally wandered miserably about in front of fashionable cafes, happy to sell a paper here and there.

Anti-Semitism looked menacing for just a moment, after the occupation, when "Aryans only" signs appeared on some cafes and restaurants and the kept press started a violent campaign of the most vulgar Jew-baiting. But Anti-Semitism won no converts, did not spread, and was by most people treated as a joke. Students of fascist methods were expecting some frameup, like planting a Jewish grocery full of food-stuffs and then spreading word in the neighborhood that the Jew was hoarding. But the contempt with which the ordinary Parisian treated the anti-Semitic campaign apparently made the Nazis and their French friends decide it was useless to attempt such a tactic.

As a matter of fact, the only propaganda campaign that had any success was that against the British. The ground it fell on was not barren. There was a widespread feeling among all classes that it was British imperialism which had dragged France into the war and that in military support the British had let them down badly. Still, it is to be doubted whether the anti-British campaign would have had the success it did have, had it not been for Churchill's order to attack the French fleet at Oran. The French were sick of the war, they felt they were out of the war; they believed that preparations had been made to sink the fleet rather than to turn it over to the Germans should the latter violate the armistice terms. It was simply too much then, they felt, when the British, alleging that Hitler was *thinking* of seizing the French fleet in violation of the armistice terms, tried to sink the semi-disarmed fleet, killing some 2,000 French sailors in the process. Fortunately for Churchill, not even the Oran murders could make the French proletariat agree to support of the German war against England. The workers want no more of the bloody and meaningless imperialist war on either side.

Hitler's "New Order" Blossoms

In the defeated nation, class distinctions remained sharper than ever. Till at least as late as October, anyone who had the price of 100 francs (\$2.25) per head, could stroll into, say, the Restaurant Chez Pierre and have himself a little snack

consisting of caviar, langouste, chateaubriand marchand de vins with pommes souffles, salad, wild strawberries with thick creme d'Isigny, the whole washed down with Montrachet Goutte d'Or 1934 and Chambolles-Musigny Clos Comte de Vogue 1915, followed by plenteous coffee with accompanying Grand Marnier Cordon Rouge or a good 50-year-old fine-champagne. But in the workers' suburbs hundreds of women stood in hundreds of interminable lines waiting to buy a single cabbage, swapping tips on where to get a tiny piece of laundry soap or trying to figure out how much truth there was in the rumor that such and such a market would sell one-half pound of potatoes per customer the following day. And those in these lines were the ones who still had some few pitiable savings; far more were standing in other long lines in front of soup-kitchens, waiting for their pint of weak and nearly meatless pot-au-feu. This was Hitler's New Order.

Nearly two million unemployed haunted the closed factories of Paris. What work there was, was mostly at the Citroen plant—completely wiped out by astonishingly accurate German bombing during the one big air-raid on central Paris—helping in wrecking and salvaging operations, or loading immense quantities of heavy industrial machinery on flat-cars for Germany. Because, much more significant than the rather childish lies of British propaganda, it was not of food that Germany was stripping France, but of all machinery for heavy industry, in accordance with the long-range Nazi plan of reducing France to an agricultural and light-conversion-industry economy.

The Nazis from the first showed little confidence of being able to secure enthusiastic acceptance from the Parisian masses for a perspective of a vassal agricultural state. Even in the first days when the German troops were fraternizing with the population, arrests began. They were carried out in the skillful nibbling tactics of the Gestapo. Very secretly, a few at a time, so as not to arouse the masses, the Gestapo began rounding up revolutionists, Stalinists, and militant trade unionists.

No matter how many they may arrest, however, they cannot behead the growing movement against Hitler's "New Order." As the months have passed since the writer's departure, he has had indications that the situation has sharpened still further. Nor should one believe the fabrications about France in the American and British press: the resistance against the invader has nothing in common with the "Free France" movement of the segment of French imperialists led by De Gaulle. There is as little hope for France under a restoration of the old national capitalism as there is under Hitler. If Hitler is obliged to reverse the historic process and de-industrialize France, the De Gaullists would do no better. Two wars, the first of which ruined even a victorious France, and the second of which finally destroyed her as an independent nation, have amply proved that the nationalistic anarchy of a divided Europe cannot solve anything, even if it could be restored.

To avoid more such wars and to save and expand the productive forces—that can only be done by the Socialist United States of Europe. That is the only conceivable perspective for the French people. And small but significant beginnings in France today show that history is inevitably moving that way: as a national liberation movement arises, in the form of thousands of little isolated underground committees, they tend to slip over from national movements into social movements, for the reason that there is obviously no longer any economic base in French national capitalism.

(This is the second article by Comrade Phelan on the fall of France. The first, "The End of French Democracy," appeared in the March, 1941, FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.)

Pages From Trotsky's Journal

By LEON TROTSKY

NOTE: The following pages consist of excerpts from the journal kept by Leon Trotsky during December 1936 and January 1937. The journal deals with the main events in his life during this period: the Zinoviev-Kamenev trial, his internment in Norway, his voyage to Mexico and the second Moscow Trial of Radek-Piatakov. Aside from their intrinsic interest, Trotsky's observations are remarkable for their precise anticipation of his death at the hands of Stalin's assassin three and a half years later.

"He seeks to strike, not at the ideas of his opponent, but at his skull." In these prophetic words Trotsky branded in advance not only his killer Jacson but Jacson's master, Stalin.

These excerpts formed part of Trotsky's book, "The Crimes of Stalin," which was published in 1937 in French but has not in its entirety been translated into English.—The Editors.

Departure from Norway

December 28, 1936.

These lines are being written aboard the Norwegian oil tanker *Ruth*, sailing from Oslo to Mexico, with the port of destination as yet unknown. Yesterday we passed the Azores. For the first few days the sea was agitated; it was difficult to write. I avidly read books about Mexico. Our planet is so tiny but we know so little about it! After the *Ruth* left the straits and turned to the southwest, the waters of the ocean became calmer and calmer and I could now busy myself with setting in order my notes on our stay in Norway and my deposition in (the Norwegian) court. Thus the first eight days were spent in intensive work and in speculations about mysterious Mexico.

Ahead of us are not less than twelve days' sailing. We are accompanied by a Norwegian police officer, Jonas Lie, who at one time served in the Saar district, under the jurisdiction of the League of Nations. At the table we make a foursome: the Captain, the police officer, my wife and I. There are no other passengers. The sea is extraordinarily calm for this season of the year. Behind are four months of captivity. Ahead—the ocean and the unknown. However, on the ship we still remain under the "protection" of the Norwegian flag, in the status, that is, of prisoners. We are not permitted to use the radio. Our revolvers remain in the custody of the police officer, our neighbor at the dinner table. The conditions for landing in Mexico are being arranged by radio without our knowledge. The socialist government does not trifle when the principles of . . . internment are involved!

In the elections, held shortly prior to our departure, the Labor Party obtained a considerable increase in votes. Konrad Knudsen, against whom all the bourgeois parties combined for being my "accomplice" and who was hardly defended from attacks by his own party, was elected by an impressive majority. In this was expressed an indirect vote of confidence in me . . . Having obtained the support of the population who voted against the reactionary attacks upon the right of asylum, the government, as is proper, proceeded to trample decisively upon this right so as to curry favor with reaction. The mechanics of parliamentarianism is wholly constructed upon such *quid pro quo* between the electorate and the electors.

The Norwegians are justly proud of Ibsen, their national poet. Thirty-five years ago Ibsen was my literary love. One of my earliest articles was devoted to him. In a democratic jail, in the poet's native land, I once again re-read his dramas.

A great deal in them seems nowadays naive and old fashioned. But how many pre-war poets are there who have completely withstood the test of time? All of history prior to 1914 appears to be soft-headed and provincial. But on the whole Ibsen seemed to me fresh, and, in his northern freshness, attractive. I re-read "An Enemy of the People" with particular satisfaction. Ibsen's hatred of Protestant bigotry, provincial sottishness, and stiff-laced hypocrisy became more comprehensible and closer to me after my acquaintance with the first socialist government in the poet's native land.

"There are any number of ways of interpreting Ibsen," said in his own defense the Minister of Justice, as he descended upon me in Sundby with an unexpected call.

"Whatever the interpretation, he will be always found against you. Recall the Burgomaster Stockmann . . ."

"Do you imply that I am Stockmann?"

"To make out the best case for you, Mr. Minister: Your government has all the vices but none of the virtues of a bourgeois government."

Notwithstanding their literary flavor, our conversations were not remarkable for excessive courtesy. When Dr. Stockmann, the brother of the Burgomaster, came to a conclusion that the prosperity of his native town was based upon infected mineral baths, the Burgomaster had him dismissed from service; the columns of the newspapers were closed to him; his fellow citizens proclaimed him an enemy of the people. "Now we shall see," exclaims the doctor, "whether baseness and cowardice can stop the mouth of a free and honest man." I had my own reasons for repeating this quotation against my socialist jailors.

"We committed a stupidity by granting you a visa!" I was unceremoniously told by the Minister of Justice in the middle of December.

"And, are you preparing to rectify this stupidity by means of a crime?" I replied, repaying frankness with frankness. "You are behaving towards me in the same way that Noske and Scheidemann behaved toward Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. You are paving the road for fascism. If the workers of Spain and France don't save you, you and your colleagues will be emigres in a few years like your predecessors, the German Social Democrats." All this was true enough. But the key to our prison remained in the hands of Burgomaster Stockmann.

I did not entertain any great hopes about the possibility of finding a haven in some other country. Democratic countries ward themselves against the danger of dictatorships by this, that they borrow certain worst aspects of the latter. For revolutionists the so-called "right" of asylum has long been converted from a right into a question of indulgence. Coupled with this were: the Moscow trial* and my internment in Norway.

It is not hard to understand how welcome a piece of news was the cable from the *New World* stating that the Government of distant Mexico would extend to us its hospitality. There loomed a way out of Norway and the impasse. On the way back from court, I said to the police officer accompanying me: "Kindly inform the government that my wife and I are ready to depart from Norway at the earliest possible mo-

* The first of the Moscow frame-ups, that of Zinoviev-Kamenev et al., in August 1936.

ment. However, before applying for a Mexican visa I should like to make arrangements for a safe voyage. I must consult my friends—the deputy Konrad Knudsen, the director of the National Theatre in Oslo, Haakon Meyer, and the German emigre, Walter Held. With their assistance I shall be able to secure an escort, and to assure the safety of my archives.” The Minister of Justice who arrived on the following day in Sundby, chaperoned by three of the highest police officials, was obviously staggered by the extremism of my requests. “Even in Czarist jails,” I told him, “the exiles were allowed to see their relatives or friends in order to arrange their personal affairs.”

“Yes, yes,” replied the Minister of Justice philosophically, “but times have changed . . .” He refrained, however, from specifying in greater detail the difference between the times.

On the 18th of December the Minister once again made his appearance but only to announce that I had been refused the visits, that the Mexican visa had been obtained without my participation (how this was done remains a mystery to this day); and that tomorrow my wife and I would be deposited on the freighter *Ruth*, on which we would have the ship’s infirmary. I will not conceal that when we parted I did not give the Minister my hand . . . It would be unfair not to mention that the government was able to pursue its course only by directly violating the judgment and the conscience of the party. And they thus came in conflict with the liberal or merely conscientious representatives of the administration and the magistracy, and found themselves compelled to rely upon the most reactionary section of the bureaucracy. At all events, the police ardor of Niegorsvold did not arouse any enthusiasm among the workers. I take the opportunity here to mention with respect and gratitude the efforts of such worthy activists in the labor movement as Olav Scheflo, Konrad Knudsen, Haakon Meyer to effect a change in the government’s policy. I cannot but take this occasion to mention once again the name of Helge Krog who found words of passionate indignation to stigmatize the conduct of the Norwegian authorities.

In addition to a night of anxiety, we had only a few hours in which to pack our belongings and books. Not one of our numerous migrations ever took place in such an atmosphere of feverish haste, such feeling of utter isolation, uncertainty, and suppressed indignation. Amid the helter-skelter, my wife and I would exchange glances from time to time. What does it all mean? What lies behind it? And each of us would rush off again with a bundle of our possessions or a packet of papers. “Mightn’t it be a trap on the part of the government?” my wife asked. “I hardly think so,” I replied with none too great assurance. On the veranda policemen, with pipes clenched in their teeth, were nailing down the book cases. Over the fiord, fog was gathering.

Our departure was surrounded with greatest secrecy. In order to divert attention from the impending journey a false dispatch was issued to the papers to the effect that we were shortly to be transferred elsewhere. The government was also afraid that I would refuse to depart and that the G.P.U. would succeed in planting an infernal machine on the ship. My wife and I could by no means consider the latter fear as unfounded. Our own security coincided in this instance with the security of a Norwegian vessel and its crew.

On board the *Ruth* we were met with curiosity but without the slightest animosity. The elderly shipowner arrived. On his polite initiative we were assigned not to the semi-dark infirmary with its three cots and without a table, as had been for some unknown reason ordained by the ever vigilant government, but to a comfortable cabin of the shipowner himself,

which adjoined the captain’s quarters. Thus I obtained the possibility of working during the voyage . . .

All this notwithstanding, we carried away with us warm remembrances of the marvelous land of forests and fiords, of the snow beneath the January sun, skis and sleighs, children with china-blue eyes, corn-colored hair, and of the slightly morose and slow-moving but serious and honest people. Norway, good-bye!

An Instructive Episode

December 30

The greater part of the journey lies behind. The captain surmises that we will be in Vera Cruz on January 8, provided the ocean does not deprive us of its benignity. The 8th or the 10th, does it really matter? Aboard the ship all is tranquil. There are no Moscow cables, and the air seems doubly pure. We are in no hurry. But it is time to return to the trial . . .

It is astounding how persistent Zinoviev was, as he pulled Kamenev along, in preparing over a number of years his own tragic finale. If not for Zinoviev’s initiative, Stalin would have hardly become the General Secretary of the Party. Zinoviev was bent on utilizing the episodic trade union discussion in the winter of 1920-21 for a further struggle against me. Stalin appeared to him—and not without foundation—the man most suitable for the behind-the-scenes work. It was during these very days that Lenin, objecting to the appointment of Stalin as General Secretary, made his famous remark: “I do not advise it—this cook will prepare only peppery dishes.” What prophetic words! However, the Petrograd delegation, led by Zinoviev, won out at the Party Congress. The victory came all the easier since Lenin did not give battle. He himself did not wish to invest his warning with any exaggerated meaning. So long as the old Political Bureau remained in power, the General Secretary could remain only a subordinate personage.

After Lenin’s attack of illness, the very same Zinoviev took the initiative in launching an open struggle against me. He calculated that the cumbersome Stalin would remain his Chief-of-Staff. In those days the General Secretary picked his way very cautiously. The masses did not know him at all. He had authority only among a section of the party apparatus, but even there he was not loved. In 1924, Stalin vacillated sharply. Zinoviev prodded him on. Stalin needed Zinoviev and Kamenev as a political cover for his behind-the-scenes work. This provided the basis for the mechanism of the “triumvirate.” It was precisely Zinoviev who evinced the greatest ardor. He carried his future hangman in tow behind him.

In 1926 when Zinoviev and Kamenev, after upwards of three years of conspiring jointly with Stalin against me, went over to the opposition to the apparatus, they imparted to me a number of very instructive tidings and admonitions.

“Do you think,” said Kamenev, “that Stalin is now busy thinking how best to refute your criticism? You are mistaken. He is thinking of how best to destroy you . . . First morally, and then, if possible, also physically. By covering you with slander, by organizing a provocation, by laying a military conspiracy at your door, by staging a terrorist act. Believe me, this is no guess-work. In our triumvirate we had many occasions to be frank with one another, although even at that time our personal relations more than once verged upon an explosion. Stalin wages a struggle on a totally different plane from yours. You don’t know this Asiatic . . .”

Kamenev himself knew Stalin very well. Both of them began their revolutionary work in the Caucasian organization, in their youth, at the turn of the century; they were to-

gether in exile; they returned together to Petrograd in March 1917, and together they gave to the central organ of the party the opportunist orientation which it retained until Lenin's arrival.

"Do you recall the arrest of Sultan-Galiev, the former Chairman of the Tartar People's Commissariat in 1923?" continued Kamenev. "That was the first arrest of a prominent party member, carried out on Stalin's initiative. Zinoviev and I unfortunately assented to it. Since that time Stalin has behaved as if he had tasted blood... The moment we broke with him, we drew up something in the nature of a testament, warning that in the event of our 'accidental' deaths, the one person responsible for it would be Stalin. This document is being kept in a safe place. I advise you to do the same thing. You can expect anything from this Asiatic..."

In the first weeks of our short-lived bloc (1926-1927) Zinoviev said to me: "Do you think that Stalin hasn't weighed the question of eliminating you physically? He has, and on more than one occasion. He was deterred by one and the same consideration, namely, that the youth would place the responsibility upon the 'triumvirate' or upon him personally, and resort to terrorist acts. Stalin therefore considered it necessary to crush beforehand the cadres of the opposition youth. And then, you know, we shall see... He hates us and especially Kamenev, because we know too much about him."

Trotsky Anticipates Assassination

Let me skip an interval of five years. On the 31st of October, 1931, the central organ of the German Communist Party, the *Rote Fabne*, carried a dispatch to the effect that the White Guard general, Turkul, was planning to assassinate Trotsky in Turkey. Such information could have emanated only from the G.P.U. Inasmuch as I had been banished to Turkey by Stalin, the warning by the *Rote Fabne* looked very much like an attempt to provide Stalin with a moral alibi in the event that Turkul's designs were carried to a successful conclusion. On January 4, 1932, I addressed a letter to the Political Bureau in Moscow. The substance of my letter was that Stalin would not succeed in white-washing himself with such cheap measures: The GPU, through its agent provocateurs, was quite capable on the one hand of spurring on White Guards to a terrorist attempt, while on the other hand it exposed them through the organs of the Comintern against any possible contingency.

I wrote: "Stalin has come to the conclusion that it was a mistake to have exiled Trotsky abroad. He had hoped, as is well known from his declaration in the Political Bureau at the time, that Trotsky, deprived of a secretariat, and without any resources, would be a helpless victim of bureaucratic slander organized on a world scale. The bureaucrat was mistaken. Contrary to his expectations, it was revealed that even without an apparatus and without any resources, ideas have a power of their own... Stalin excellently understands the terrible danger which the ideological irreconcilability and the stubborn growth of the International Left Opposition represents to him personally, to his puffed up authority, to his Bonapartist omnipotence. Stalin thinks: It is necessary to rectify the mistake." To be sure, not by any ideological measures: Stalin conducts a struggle on a totally different plane. *He seeks to strike not at the ideas of his opponent, but at his skull.*

Already in 1924 Stalin was weighing in his mind the arguments pro and con on the question of my physical liquidation. I wrote: "I have received this information from Zinoviev and Kamenev in the period when they came over to the

Opposition, and furthermore; under such circumstances and with such details as leave no room for doubt about its veracity... *If Stalin were to compel Zinoviev and Kamenev to deny their own former declarations no one would believe them.*" Even at that time the system of false confessions and of made-to-order denials was flowering luxuriously in Moscow.

Ten days after I posted my letter in Turkey, a delegation of my French co-thinkers, headed by Naville and Frank, addressed to the then Soviet ambassador in Paris, Dovgalevsky, a written declaration: "The *Rote Fabne* has published a report about the preparation of an attempt against Trotsky: Thereby the Soviet Government itself confirms formally that it is aware of the dangers that threaten Trotsky." And inasmuch as the plan of general Turkul, according to the same semi-official communication "is based upon the fact that Trotsky is poorly protected by the Turkish authorities," the Naville-Frank declaration placed in advance the responsibility for any consequences upon the Soviet Government and demanded that it take immediate practical measures.

Denials from Moscow

These steps alarmed Moscow. On March 2 the Central Committee of the French Communist Party circulated among the most responsible activists, as a confidential document, the reply of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party of the U.S.S.R. Stalin not only did not deny that the communication in the *Rote Fabne* emanated from him but claimed credit for this warning as a special service and accused me of... ingratitude. Without saying anything essential on the question of my security, the circular letter asserted that by my attacks upon the Central Committee I was preparing my "alliance with the social-fascists" (that is, with the Social Democrats). Stalin did not think fit at the time to accuse me of an alliance with fascism, nor did he foresee as yet his own alliance with the "social fascists"

To Stalin's reply there was appended a denial by Kamenev and Zinoviev, dated February 13, 1932 and written, as the denial itself incautiously states, upon the demand of Yaroslavsky and Shkiriakov, members of the Central Control Commission and the then Inquisitors-in-Chief in the struggle against the Opposition. In a style customary for such documents, Kamenev and Zinoviev wrote that Trotsky's communication was "an unconscionable lie, whose sole aim is to compromise our Party... It goes without saying that there could be no talk of even discussing such a question... and we never said anything of the kind to Trotsky." The denial ended upon a still shriller note: "The declaration of Trotsky alleging that we could be forced to make false statements in a party of Bolsheviks is in itself a notorious dodge of a black-mailer."

This entire episode, which at first glance appears to be far removed from the trial itself, is, however, if observed more closely, of exceptional interest. According to the indictment, I had conveyed, as far back as May 1931 and then in 1932 to Smirnov, through my son Leon Sedov and through Georgi Gaven, the following instruction: To proceed to a terrorist struggle and to conclude a bloc with the Zinovievites on this basis. All my "instructions," as we shall observe more than once, were straightway fulfilled by the capitulators, that is, by people who had long broken with me and were conducting an open struggle against me.

According to the official version the capitulation of Zinoviev-Kamenev and the others was merely a military ruse, for the purpose of gaining entry into the sanctuary of the bureaucracy. If we accept for a moment this version, which,

as we shall presently see, falls to pieces alongside of several hundred facts, then my letter to the Political Bureau for January, 1932 becomes an enigma absolutely not to be grasped by the mind. If in 1931-32 I was really directing an organization of a "terrorist bloc" with Zinoviev and Kamenev, naturally, I should not have compromised my allies so irremediably in the eyes of the bureaucracy. The crude denial of Zinoviev-Kamenev, intended to deceive the uninitiated, could not of course have fooled Stalin for a moment. He, in any case, was aware that his former allies had told me the naked truth. This single fact would have been more than sufficient in itself to have deprived Zinoviev and Kamenev forever of the slightest possibility of restoring themselves in the confidence of the ruling tops. What, then, remains of the "military ruse"? I must have lost my senses to have undermined in this manner the chances of the "terrorist center."

In its turn the denial of Kamenev and Zinoviev, by its content and tone alike, testifies to anything you please except collaboration. Furthermore, this document does not stand alone. We shall presently see, especially in the case of Radek, that the chief function of the capitulators consisted, year in and year out, from month to month, in defaming and blackening me in the eyes of the Soviet and world public opinion. It remains perfectly incomprehensible how these people could have hoped to achieve victory under the guidance of a leader discredited by themselves. Here the "military ruse" clearly turns into its own opposite.

The denial of Zinoviev-Kamenev for February 13, 1932, sent out to all the sections of the Comintern, represents, in very essence, one of the countless rough drafts of their future depositions for August 1936: the self-same foul invective against me as the opponent of Bolshevism and especially the enemy of "Comrade Stalin"; the self-same reference to my urge to serve the "counter-revolution"; and finally the self-same vows that they, Zinoviev and Kamenev, are giving testimony out of good will, free from any kind of compulsion. Of course, of course! And could it have been otherwise? Only "blackmailers" can allow the mere possibility of constraint in Stalin's "democracy." The very excesses of style unmistakably testify to the source of inspiration.

Truly, a precious document! It not only cuts the ground from under the fiction of a Trotskyite-Zinovievite center in 1932 but it also enables us in passing to peer into that laboratory where the future trials with their made-to-order recantations were prepared.

In Mexico

January 9

In the hot tropical morning our tanker entered the harbor of Tampico. We were still in ignorance of what was awaiting us. Our passports and revolvers remained, as hitherto, in the hands of the fascist policeman, who even in the territorial waters of Mexico maintained the regime established by the "socialist" government of Norway. I forewarned the policeman and the captain that my wife and I would land voluntarily only if we were met by friends. We had not the slightest grounds for trusting the Norwegian vassals of the GPU, alike in the tropics as in the Oslo parallel.

But everything had been safely arranged. Shortly after the tanker halted, a government cutter approached carrying representatives of the local federal authorities, Mexican and foreign journalists, and, most important of all, true and reliable friends. Here were Frieda Rivera, wife of the famous artist whom illness had detained in a hospital; Max Shachtman, a Marxist journalist and close co-thinker who had previously visited us in Turkey, France and Norway; and, finally

George Novack, secretary of the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky. After four months of imprisonment and isolation, this meeting with friends was especially cordial. The Norwegian policeman, who finally handed us our passports and revolvers, looked on with embarrassment at the courteous behavior of the Mexican police-general.

Leaving the tanker, we stepped, not without excitement, onto the soil of the New World. Despite it being the month of January, this soil breathed warmth. The oil derricks of Tampico reminded us of Baku. At the hotel, we immediately felt our lack of knowledge of the Spanish language. At 10 o'clock in the evening we left Tampico for the capital in a special train provided by the Minister of Communications, General Mujica.

The contrast between northern Norway and tropical Mexico was felt not only in the climate. Torn free from the atmosphere of revolting self-will and enervating uncertainty, we encountered hospitality and attentiveness at every step. Our New York friends optimistically recounted the work of the Committee, told of the growing disbelief in the Moscow trial and of the prospects for a counter-trial. The general conclusion was that a book was necessary, and as soon as possible, on Stalin's judicial frameups. A new chapter of our life was opening very favorably. But... What would be its subsequent development?

We observed the tropical landscape from the windows of our car with keen interest. At the village of Cardenas, between Tampico and San Luis Potosi, two locomotives began hauling our train up the plateau. The air became cooler and we soon rid ourselves of the northerner's fear of the tropics which had seized us in the steamy atmosphere of the Gulf of Mexico. On the morning of the 11th, we alighted at Lecheria, a tiny station on the outskirts of the capital, where we embraced Diego Rivera, who had left the hospital. It was to him above all that we were indebted for our emancipation from captivity in Norway. With him there were several friends: Fritz Bach, a former Swiss communist who had become a professor in Mexico; Hidalgo, participant in the Mexican civil war in the ranks of Zapata's army; and a few young men. At noon, we arrived by automobile in Coyoacan, a suburb of Mexico City, where we were lodged in the blue home of Frieda Rivera, which has an orange tree in the middle of the courtyard.

In a telegram of gratitude to President Cardenas, dispatched from Tampico, I repeated that I intended rigidly to abstain from interfering in Mexican politics. I did not entertain a moment's doubt that responsible agents of the GPU would penetrate into Mexico, there to assist the so-called "friends" of the USSR to do all in their power to render difficult my stay in this hospitable country.

From Europe, meanwhile, warning after warning arrived. And could it have been otherwise? Stalin has too much, if not everything, at stake. His original calculations, based upon suddenness and speed of action, proved justified only by one half. My emigration to Mexico sharply changed the relationship of forces to the disadvantage of the Kremlin. I obtained the possibility of appealing to world public opinion. Where will this end? Those who were only too well aware of the fragility and rottenness of their judicial frame-ups must have asked themselves this question with alarm.

One symptom of Moscow's alarm fairly struck me between the eyes. The Mexican communists began to devote to me entire issues of their weekly newspaper containing old and new materials from the sewage system of the GPU and the Comintern, and even to publish special issues for this purpose. My friends said: "Pay no attention. This newspaper

enjoys a merited contempt." And I myself had no intention of entering into a polemic with flunkeys when ahead lay a struggle with their masters. Extremely unworthy was the conduct of the secretary of the National Confederation of Labor, Lombardo Toledano. Political dilettante and a lawyer by profession, alien to the working class and the revolution, this gentleman visited Moscow in 1935 and returned thence, as is befitting, an altruistic "friend" of the USSR. Dimitrov's report to the Seventh Congress of the Comintern on the policy of the "People's Front"—this document of theoretical and political prostration was hailed by Toledano as the most important production since the Communist Manifesto. From the time of my arrival in Mexico, this gentleman has been slandering me all the more unceremoniously since my non-intervention in the internal life of the country assures him complete immunity in advance. The Russian Mensheviks were genuine knight-errants of the revolution compared to such ignorant and pompous careerists!

Among the foreign journalists, Kluckhohn, correspondent of the *New York Times*, immediately distinguished himself. Under the pretext of an interview, he several times attempted to subject me to a police cross-examination. It is not difficult to understand what sources inspired this zeal. As regards the Mexican section of the Fourth International, I announced in the press that I cannot assume any responsibility for its work. I value my new haven too much to permit myself any kind of incaution. At the same time, I warned my Mexican and North American friends to expect absolutely exceptional measures of "self-defense" on the part of the Stalinist agents in Mexico and the United States. In the struggle for its international "reputation" and power, the ruling clique in Moscow will stop at nothing. And least of all at the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars for the purchase of human souls.

The Second Moscow Trial

I do not know whether Stalin felt any hesitation about arranging a new trial. I believe he must have hesitated. My departure for Mexico, however, must have ended his hesitation immediately. It now became necessary, at any cost, and as soon as possible, to drown the forthcoming revelations by the sensation of new accusations. Preparation of the Radek-Piatakov case was begun as far back as the end of August. As could have been foreseen, Oslo was this time chosen as the operating base of the "conspiracy." For it was necessary to facilitate for the government of Norway my deportation from that country. But into the geographical outline of the frame-up, which had already become antiquated, were hastily sketched new and fresh elements. Through Vladimir Romm, you see, I endeavored to acquire the secrets of the Washington government, while through Radek I was preparing to supply Japan with oil in the event that Japan went to war with the United States. Only because it lacked sufficient time, did the GPU find it impossible to arrange for me a meeting with Japanese agents in the Mexican park of Chapultepec.

On the 19th came the first dispatch regarding the impending trial. On the 21st I answered it with an article which

I consider it necessary to reproduce here. On the 23rd, the trial began in Moscow. Again, as in August, we lived through a week of nightmare. Despite the fact that, after last year's experience, the mechanism of the affair was clear beforehand, the impression of moral horror increased rather than decreased. The dispatches from Moscow seemed like insane ravings. It was necessary to re-read each line several times to force oneself to believe that behind these ravings were living men.

With some of these men I was intimately acquainted. They were no worse than other people. On the contrary, they were better than a great many. But they were poisoned with falsehood and then crushed by the totalitarian apparatus. They lie against themselves to enable the ruling clique to cover others with lies. Stalin has set himself the goal of forcing mankind to believe in impossible crimes. Again one had to ask himself: Is mankind really so stupid? Of course not. But the thing is that the frame-ups of Stalin are so monstrous that they likewise seem impossible crimes.

How can one convince mankind that this apparent "impossibility" is in fact an ominous reality? The struggle is being waged with unequal weapons. On the one side—the GPU, the court, the press, the diplomats, the hired agency, journalists of the Duranty type, attorneys of the Pritt type. On the other—an isolated "accused" who has hardly torn himself free from a socialist jail, in an alien, distant land, without a press or resources of his own.

Nevertheless, I did not for a moment doubt that the almighty organizers of the amalgam were heading for disaster. The spiral of Stalin's frame-ups, which has already succeeded in embracing far too large a number of people, facts and geographical points, continues to extend. It is impossible to fool everybody. Not all want to be fooled. The French League for the Rights of Man, with its virginal president Victor Basch, is of course capable of respectfully swallowing a second and a tenth trial, just as it swallowed the first. But facts are stronger than the patriotic zeal of the dubious champions of "right." Facts will clear a path for themselves.

Already in the course of the court proceedings I transmitted to the press a number of documentary refutations and posed to the Moscow court a number of precise questions which by themselves destroy the most important testimony of the accused. But the Moscow Themis not only blindfolded her eyes—she also put cotton in her ears. Naturally, I did not expect that my revelations would have any immediate wide effect. My technical possibilities for that are far too limited. The immediate task consisted in providing a factual point of support for the thought of the most penetrating minds, and to provoke criticism, or at least doubts, among the next layer. Having conquered the minds of the select, truth would unfold further and further. In the long run, the spiral of truth would prove stronger than the spiral of frame-up. Everything that has transpired since that nightmarish week at the end of January has only confirmed my optimistic expectations.

The Negro March on Washington

By ALBERT PARKER

A committee of prominent Negroes, headed by A. Philip Randolph, President of the Brotherhood of Pullman Porters, is now engaged in furthering a march on Washington, which is scheduled to take place on July 1st.

Randolph has correctly described the national industrial and military situation:

"The whole National Defense Set-up reeks and stinks with race prejudice, hatred and discrimination . . .

"Responsible committees of Negroes who seek to intercede in behalf of the Negro being accorded the simple right to work in industries and on jobs serving National Defense and to serve in the Army, Navy and Air Corps, are given polite assurance that Negroes will be given a fair deal. But it all ends there. Nothing is actually done to stop discrimination.

"It seems to be apparent that even when well-meaning, responsible, top government officials agree upon a fair and favorable policy, there are loopholes, and subordinate officers in the Army, Navy and Air Corps, full of race hatred, who seek its contravention, nullification and evasion."

Randolph has had to recognize the impotence and weaknesses of the current Negro leadership and their methods, even though he has many words of praise for them:

"Evidently, the regular, normal and respectable method of conferences and petitions, while proper and ought to be continued as conditions warrant, certainly don't work. They don't do the job."

And, on the same theme, in another article:

"Negroes cannot stop discrimination in National Defense with conferences of leaders and the intelligentsia alone. While conferences have merit, they won't get desired results by themselves."

Randolph states the need for organization and action by the Negro masses:

"Power and pressure do not reside in the few, the intelligentsia, they lie in and flow from the masses. Power does not even rest with the masses as such. Power is the active principle of only the organized masses, the masses united for a definite purpose."

And then he calls for action in the form of a march of 10,000 Negroes to Washington:

"On to Washington, ten thousand black Americans! Let them swarm from every hamlet, village and town; from the highways and byways, out of the churches, lodges, homes, schools, mills, mines, factories and fields. Let them come in automobiles, buses, trains, trucks and on foot. Let them come though the winds blow and the rains beat against them, when the date is set. We shall not call upon our white friends to march with us. There are some things Negroes must do alone. This is our fight and we must see it through. If it costs money to finance a march on Washington, let Negroes pay for it. If any sacrifices are to be made for Negro rights in national defense, let Negroes make them. If Negroes fail this chance for work, for freedom and training, it may never come again. Let the Negro masses speak!"

Why We Support the March

The Socialist Workers Party, the Trotskyist movement in this country, was among the first to hail the progressive character of the proposal to march on Washington.

It should be obvious, however, that our support of a march on Washington does not depend on any of Randolph's ideas at all. We support a militant action, not Randolph's reasons for it. We do this in the same way that we would support a strike of the union of which Randolph is president, in spite of our sharp differences with Randolph on many basic questions.

That is to say, our support of the march, while full and wholehearted, is not uncritical. We feel it our duty, as part of our fight for full social, economic and political equality for the Negroes, to indicate mistakes and shortcomings where we see them, and to urge Negro militants to correct them.

Randolph says again and again in his articles: "Let the masses speak." But the masses had nothing to say about the composition of the Committee or its functions. This Committee has taken on itself the sole right of determining the slogans to be used and the work to be done in Washington.

A representative conference should have been called together before the final plans were adopted. At such a conference, representatives of different organizations that want to participate in the march could have worked out policy and strategy and elected a leading committee. This would have enabled participating organizations to help work out the policy, instead of putting them in a position, as Randolph has done, where they have only the choice of carrying out the Randolph Committee's decisions or just not participating. Such a conference would have increased not only the publicity for the march, but it would also have improved the morale of those participating. The Negro workers would then really have felt that this was *their* march; something that is not truly accomplished by the mere device of excluding white workers.

Nor can Randolph object that "there wasn't time for that; we'd have wasted valuable time." This is not true. There was plenty of time for it between the time Randolph first presented the proposal in January and the time the hand-picked Committee issued the call in May.

Furthermore, at the time this is written, during the first week in June, less than a month before the march is to take place, there is no evidence that the masses, even on the eastern seaboard, have yet been reached and aroused by the organizers of the march. Most workers haven't even heard about it.

It is to be hoped that, in spite of the slow beginning, the masses and especially the workers in the trade unions, will be mobilized to support the march during the weeks that still remain. The Socialist Workers Party is doing what it can to influence advanced workers to participate in this action. But if the march fails because of lack of support from the workers, it will be directly attributable to the bureaucratic organization of the whole affair.

In spite of many militant words, the Committee's "Call To Negro America" suffers from the same half-heartedness that has characterized the other attempts by "respectable" Negro leaders to win concessions.

Certainly one of the key questions to be faced by any movement is the question of the war and the capitalist demand for "National Unity." The exploiters mean that the workers should stop asking for higher wages and better conditions until the war is over. For the Negroes "National Unity" means suspension of the fight for equal rights until after the war is over.

The Randolph Committee has no forthright answer to this question. Instead, it says:

"But what of national unity? We believe in national unity which recognizes equal opportunity of black and white citizens to jobs in national defense and the armed forces, and in all other institutions and endeavors in America. We condemn all dictatorships, Fascist, Nazi and Communist. We are loyal, patriotic Americans, all.

"But, if American democracy will not defend its defenders; if American democracy will not protect its protectors; if American democracy will not give jobs to its toilers because of race or color; if American democracy will not insure equality of opportunity, freedom and justice to its citizens, black and white, it is a hollow mockery and belies the principles for which it is supposed to stand."

Why all those ifs? Don't the Committee's members know very well what is going on? Is there any real doubt in their minds as to exactly what is happening to the Negro? Hidden behind the ifs is a potential surrender of the fight for the rights of the Negro people. The bosses will think: "Never fear; this is only another bunch of people who are urging us to be good, but who are pledging their loyalty in advance."

Because the Committee is afraid to take an out-and-out

position on this question, it weakens the effectiveness of the march. There can be only one correct answer to "National Unity": unity of the Negroes with the white worker against their common enemy and exploiter.

This is not the only instance of the Call for the march making concessions to the ideas looked on with favor by the ruling class. In another place it says:

"However we sternly counsel against violence and ill-considered and intemperate action and the abuse of power. Mass power, like physical, when misdirected, is more harmful than helpful.

"We summon you to mass action that is orderly and lawful, but aggressive and militant, for justice, equality and freedom.

"Crispus Attucks marched and died as a martyr for American independence. Nat Turner, Demark Vesey, Gabriel, Harriet Tubman and Frederick Douglass fought and died for the emancipation of Negro slaves and the preservation of American democracy."

Our criticism of this section of the Call should not be mistaken to mean that the Socialist Workers Party is in favor of "ill-considered and intemperate action" or anything of the kind. Not at all.

But who is served by this reassurance that everything is going to be nice and respectable and within the "lawful" bounds established by the ruling class and its anti-labor, Jim Crow legislatures and courts?

If we are going to talk about history, let us talk about it correctly. Did King George the Third think that Crispus Attucks' action was "lawful"? Did the slaveholders of Virginia think that Nat Turner was "orderly"?

The trouble is that the Randolph Committee members are too much concerned about what the powers that be may think about them. And as long as that is true, they lead a half-hearted fight, in spite of all their talk about aggressiveness and militancy.

What Shall the Marchers Demand?

The central demand of the Committee is that Roosevelt issue an executive order abolishing discrimination in all government departments, the armed forces and on all jobs holding government contracts. This Roosevelt will be asked to do when he is asked to address the marchers. The local demonstrations are supposed to ask their city councils to memorialize the president to issue such an order.

To fully understand this proposal, one should read the article written by Randolph himself, explaining the theory behind this demand. Printed in the April 12th *Afro-American*, it began this way:

"President Roosevelt can issue an executive order tomorrow to abolish discrimination in the Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marine, and on all defense contracts awarded by the Federal Government, on account of race or color, and discriminations against colored people would promptly end." (Our emphasis).

If Randolph's statement means anything at all, it means that discrimination and segregation continue to exist in the government, the armed forces and in industry, only because the President hasn't issued an order abolishing discrimination and segregation.

Can Randolph really believe that? He must know that Jim Crowism does not depend for its existence on the lack of executive orders abolishing it. Jim Crowism exists because it serves the interests of the capitalist ruling class to keep the working class divided and split along racial lines.

We are ready to support the Randolph Committee's demand for President Roosevelt to issue an executive order abolishing discrimination. To force him to issue such an order

would be a step forward in the struggle for abolition of racial discrimination. But only a step. Roosevelt's executive order would not be so very much more weighty than the laws and rulings and orders already on the books prohibiting discrimination. In spite of them, Jim Crow rides high.

Randolph should recall one of the statements he made when he first called for the march: "... even when ... top government officials agree upon a fair and favorable policy, there are loopholes, and subordinate officers in the Army, Navy, and Air Corps, full of race hatred, who seek its contravention, nullification, and evasion."

How can Randolph square his January statement with his statement in April that a presidential decree would "promptly" end discrimination?

An executive order abolishing discrimination would remain largely on paper, as long as control of industry, military training and the government remain in the hands of the enemies of the Negroes.

A movement that denies these facts or tries to ignore them cannot successfully lead the struggle for full equality. A movement that shuts its eyes or refuses to open them is good only for sleeping.

The Workers, Black and White, Must Control

Negroes must fight for more than a presidential executive order. They must fight for a program that will take control out of the hands of the enemies of the Negro people.

Employers controlling the war industries won't hire Negroes? Then have the government take those industries over, and let them be managed and operated without discrimination by committees elected by the workers!

Negroes need military training in this epoch when all major questions are decided arms in hand. But the army bureaucrats are bitterly anti-Negro and determined to "keep them in their place." Therefore, Negroes must join the fight for military training, financed by the government but under control of the trade unions, based on full equality for the Negroes!

The government and the capitalist parties aid the bosses in segregating and discriminating against the Negro people, refusing to pass such elementary legislation as punishing lynching and granting the Negroes in the South the right to vote. Therefore aid in the formation of an independent labor party pledged to carry on the Negroes' struggles. An independent labor party pledged to establish a Workers' and Farmers' Government that would create a new society that would forever abolish poverty, war and racial discrimination!

Such a program, aimed at putting control of their destiny into the hands of the workers themselves, black and white—in military training, in industry, in politics—this *must* become the program of the militant Negro workers. This is the road to jobs and equality.

The Negro misleaders will say that this program is impractical and utopian. That is what Uncle Tom said about freedom for the slaves.

But the fighting program we propose is infinitely more realistic than expecting Roosevelt—the partner of the Southern Democrats, ally of the British Empire which oppresses Negroes on every continent—to abolish discrimination.

The Socialist Workers Party supports the march on Washington. We call on the negro workers to bring forward in the march a really militant program. If this is done, the march on Washington, whatever its immediate results, would serve to be an important stage in the fight to change the world.

Burnham's "Managerial Revolution"

By JOSEPH HANSEN

Our readers will recall that James Burnham was the ideological leader of a faction which he led, in April, 1940, in a split from the Trotskyist movement. Burnham and his faction avowedly split from the Socialist Workers Party on the ground that they could no longer submit to the discipline of an organization which stood for the defense of the Soviet Union.

That was a basic-enough issue. However, the faction led by Burnham and Max Shachtman differed with us, not only on the Soviet Union, but on all basic questions of the revolutionary movement. It was a petty-bourgeois tendency driven by a profound social impulse, as Trotsky put it, to break with the proletarian party.

Scarcely had Burnham led the faction out of the Trotskyist movement when he dropped all pretense of adherence to the proletarian movement. Within a few short weeks he resigned from the "Workers Party" he had set up with Shachtman. In his letter of resignation (published in the Fourth International; incidentally, never published by the "Workers Party"!) he made no bones about the fact that the ideas motivating his abandonment of the Marxist movement were ideas he had held for some time. Specifically, that meant that these were his ideas during the period when he persuaded his faction to split from the Socialist Workers Party.

The theory which he carried around in his brief case at the time he launched a struggle against the Fourth International, Burnham has now expanded into book-length.* Burnham would scarcely have the grace to say it, but his theory is precisely that which Trotsky said would be the theory of the Burnham-Shachtman faction if it worked its ideas out to their logical conclusion: a denial of the possibility of socialism.

It is part of Shachtman's betrayal of Marxism that he did not join in smoking out Burnham and his "managerial" theory, but instead combined with Burnham to lead a number of young comrades away from Bolshevism, only to be abandoned by Burnham immediately afterward. But Burnham, though departing, left his mark on the "Workers Party": its anti-Soviet orientation, its hostility to Leninist organizational methods, its petty-bourgeois aversion to our proletarian military program, etc., etc. The current articles of Shachtman and MacDonald arguing that a new "bureaucratic class" has taken power in the Soviet Union, and the articles of MacDonald arguing that capitalism no longer exists in Germany, are mere variations of Burnham's views, as the master himself recognizes in his friendly polemic against these pupils in the closing chapter of his book.

Burnham's "Alternative" to Socialism

As Trotsky predicted, this petty bourgeois snob has swiftly completed his evolution into a rabid enemy of Marxism. The thesis that Burnham promulgates is that socialism "is not possible of achievement or even of approximation in the present period of history." His alternative to socialism is the "managerial" society. The essence of Burnham's alternative is borrowed—without acknowledging the source—from Bruno R., an Italian who developed the theory that capitalism is being replaced by a new kind of exploiting society. (Bruno R., *La Bureaucratization du Monde*, Paris, 1939).

* THE MANAGERIAL REVOLUTION. By James Burnham. John Day, 1941.

Bruno R. bases his theory on an asserted identification between the planned economy of the Soviet Union, the Fascism and Nazism of Italy and Germany, and the New Dealism of the United States. Burnham takes over this idea and labels it "managerial society" in contradistinction to Bruno R., who designated his society as "bureaucratic collectivism." The capitalists, says Burnham, tend everywhere now to be expropriated. Not, however, by the workers, but by the "managers"—the executive and engineering personnel.

Burnham equates the October revolution with Stalinism and the latter with Fascism-Nazism; he calls the October revolution the "first great abrupt jump toward managerial society," and finds Nazism-Fascism to be merely a more gradual evolution in the same direction.

To achieve these identifications, Burnham of course has to suppress all the facts which he once learned about the nature of Stalinism and the bourgeois character of fascism.

He Renders a Service to Stalinism

The crimes of Stalinism, it is true, have indeed served the ends of reaction. Hitler could never have come to power without the aid rendered him by Stalin. If it were not for Stalinism, the world working class could never have suffered the catastrophic defeats of the last twenty-five years. Moreover, there is a connection between imperialist reaction and the historical origin and development of Stalinism. In the last analysis Stalinism and Fascism both flow from the decay of capitalism. That is the connection between them. Both are mortal enemies of the working class.

But there the resemblance ends. Whereas Stalinist reaction has unfolded on the basis of a degenerating proletarian revolution in the Soviet Union, Fascism-Nazism and all the kindred phenomena of imperialist reaction have unfolded on the basis of capitalist decay and capitalist counter-revolution. All the points of similarity between the totalitarian bureaucracy based on the degenerated workers' state (Stalinism) and the totalitarian bureaucracies based on the rule of monopoly capital (Fascism) cannot be made to bridge the class gulf between them.

What Burnham actually does is to utilize the crimes of Stalinism as his main proof of the incapacity of the proletariat to establish a socialist society. But to utilize the crimes of Stalinism for that purpose, he must also mitigate those crimes. Instead of crimes against the international working class they are transmuted by Burnham into natural elements in the creation of a "managerial society." The GPU murder-machine becomes in Burnham's version a necessary "curb" on the masses. The Moscow Frame-up Trials which shocked the entire world become likewise part of this "historically necessary" process. Listen to the professor: "The great public trials gave, we might say, a formal flourish to the solution of the second part of the problem (i.e. the "managerial problem" of "curbing the masses"), which left the masses properly subordinated in the new social structure . . . in a sense, the mass purges were largely symbolic and ideological in purpose." (p. 211) What are the Moscow Frameups? "A formal flourish!" What is the significance of the mass purges which have taken a monstrous toll of thousands upon tens of thousands of Soviet revolutionists, workers and youth? "Largely symbolic!" He thus invests Stalin's monstrous crimes and abom-

inations with a historical justification: they are, if you please, "solutions" of problems posed by "history."

The struggle against Stalinism is a life-and-death question for the American workers as well as workers the world over. Like all struggles, this one demands above all a correct policy. If any persons still remain in the "Workers Party" who sincerely wish to continue the struggle against Stalinism, let them ponder seriously the logical conclusions flowing from the "theories" and method of their former ideological leader.

His Points of Agreement With Goebbels

And now we come to Burnham's points of agreement with the "anti-capitalist" demagoguery of the Nazis.

To believe Burnham is to believe the lie that Nazi "anti-capitalism" has already led to virtual expropriation of the capitalists in Germany. What proof does he offer? "A recent estimate," he writes, "by a New York statistician gives as a mere five per cent the share of the German national income going to profits and interests." The most zealous proponent of "hard facts" (empiricism) would hardly be stupid enough to rest his entire "inquiry" on a single "fact" such as the one adduced by the professor. Yet not another item of factual data in this connection is presented by him. ("The statistics," he explains, "which are, in any case, not reliable—fail to indicate the full meaning.")

Why, then, did he bother to cite the statistician from New York and this "mere five per cent?" Here we are initiated into the holy of holies of Burnham's method. If he refers to the "mere five per cent" it is in order to proclaim immediately on his own authority the following:

"Moreover, of the German capitalists' five per cent, the greater part is appropriated by the state as taxes and 'contributions.'" (p. 238)

This "mere five per cent" is typical of Burnham's whole book. We imagine that America's Sixty Families would not be unduly alarmed at such a type of "managerial society" in their own hemisphere.

Daniel Guerin wrote a book, "Fascism and Big Business." MacDonald, whom Burnham left to represent his interests in the "Workers Party," wrote a preface to the English edition in December 1938. MacDonald was not then a Burnhamite. "By means of a detailed examination," he insisted then, "of a large body of factual data—I am aware of no other book on Fascism which offers so systematic an exposition of so vast an amount of information—Guerin is able to demonstrate that fascism *does* serve the rulers of the big bourgeoisie." What refutation of Guerin's vast amount of information and factual data does Burnham offer? None.

In addition to the above cited "five per cent," Burnham offers the following six pieces of "*prima facie evidence*" that Germany is no longer capitalist. Let us examine them:

1. Germany "should have been bankrupt five years ago" and "its currency should have gone into a wild inflation." Ergo: German capitalists have been expropriated or are on the verge of expropriation. By what laws of political economy should Germany have been "bankrupt" and in "wild inflation" five years ago? By laws known only to Burnham, for he does not tell us what they are. That is, Burnham merely implies there are such laws, in order to conclude that the transcendence of these "laws" proves the non-capitalist character of German economy.

2. The territorial expansion of Germany has been "rapid." Ergo: German capitalists have been expropriated or are on the verge of expropriation.

In that case, following Burnham's logic, judging by the territorial expansion of Japan, the Japanese monopoly capital-

ists no doubt have all been expropriated by the "managers" led by the Divine Mikado.

3. Germany "makes war better than the undoubtedly capitalist nations." Ergo, it is not capitalist.

Then, to judge from Mussolini's successes in "making war," the Italian capitalists have surely recovered—during the operations in Albania, Libya, Ethiopia, etc.—all the property which had been "expropriated" by the "managers."

4. "Nazi Germany inspires fanatical loyalty in millions of persons." Ergo, it is a new social order.

At long last, then, the members of the "Workers Party" should be able to grasp the full "social-revolutionary" significance of the fanaticism of the millions of followers of the Holy Roman See, Voodooism and Mumbo-Jumbo.

5. "The outstanding political, military and economic leaders of Germany are much younger . . . than the leaders of France and Britain."

Ergo?

6. Elimination of unemployment is "in and by itself, a sufficient proof that Germany has left the basis of capitalism and entered the road of a new form of society."

America's Sixty Families are hereby informed that they had better beware of eliminating unemployment by means of the war boom, conscription, forced labor, concentration camps, prison, etc., on pain of suffering "expropriation." Q.E.D.

7. "Finally, there is the notorious Nazi 'Fifth Column.'"

Since he doesn't explain how this (7) proves his point, we reserve further comment until Burnham appears as a witness before the Dies Committee.

Such, then, is all the "prima facie evidence" presented by Burnham as "sufficient to refute the opinion that Nazi Germany is a type of capitalism and to show that it is on the contrary an early stage of a new type of society." (p. 235)

Like a good lawyer with a bad case, Burnham has avoided all the embarrassing facts. It would be amusing, if not instructive, to have him (or MacDonald of the "Workers Party") on the witness stand and see him try to explain—to mention but one piece of factual data—the very detailed description of the financial operations of Goering, Hitler's heir, which the May, 1941 *Social Research* publishes. We should like to see anyone find a semblance of "managerial society" in the great corporations owned by Goering, leader of the big capitalists in the Nazi machine.

How Burnham Serves Imperialism

Burnham's insistence on the non-capitalist character of German economy is undoubtedly pleasing to the Nazis, whose "anti-capitalist" demagoguery is essential to their rule. But the Nazis are not the only ones who deny the capitalist character of Germany. Some of the shrewder ideologists of the "war for democracy"—like Sidney Hook—also insist that Germany is no longer capitalist.

Such a characterization of Germany by "democratic" war-mongers like Hook does two things: (1) It serves to refute the Marxist conclusion that this is a war between imperialist powers; for if Germany is no longer capitalist-imperialist, the Marxist proposition cannot be true. (2) It rules out the Marxist conclusion that fascism is the expression of a decaying capitalist order, susceptible of being destroyed by the German proletariat, particularly if it is aided by the workers in the opposing countries carrying on a correct internationalist policy. By endowing Nazism with the character of a "new order," capable of indefinite length of life, Hook leaves to the capitalist governments of the "democracies"—and to them alone—the task of destroying Nazism.

Thus the "non-capitalist" concept of Germany, so useful

to the Nazis, also has its uses for the "democratic" imperialists. Like the latter, Burnham concludes from his theory that World War II is not an imperialist war. In language which Hook might well have written, Burnham claims that the "war of 1939" has nothing in common with the "war of 1914," that it is a struggle between "two ideologies," etc. Small wonder that the big metropolitan press has been so respectful and, indeed, friendly to Burnham's book!

We come now to Burnham's attempt to prove that the United States under the New Deal is moving toward expropriation of the big capitalists by those who hitherto served them as "managers." The road to the "managerial society," says Burnham is indicated by the growing separation between "ownership" and "control" of capital.

The actual phenomenon which he describes in these terms has been understood very well by Marxists. That phenomenon is part of the mechanism whereby finance capital dominates bourgeois society in the epoch of imperialism. Here is what Lenin had to say about it:

"It is characteristic of capitalism in general that the ownership of capital is separated from the application of capital to production, that money capital is separated from industrial or productive capital, and that the rentier, who lives entirely on income obtained from money capital, is separated from the entrepreneur and from all who are directly concerned in the management of capital. Imperialism, or the domination of finance capital, is that highest stage of capitalism in which this separation reaches vast proportions. The supremacy of finance capital over all other forms of capital means the predominance of the rentier and of the financial oligarchy; it means crystalization of a small number of financially 'powerful' states from among all the rest." (*Imperialism*, p. 59)

Burnham makes no attempt to challenge Lenin's analysis of this process whereby finance capital becomes predominant. Instead, Burnham, basing himself on Berle-Means' *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*, arbitrarily insists that this process signifies the expropriation of the big bourgeoisie by the "managers." To show how the "managers" accomplish their "struggle for power"—the quotation marks are his, it is only a "metaphor," he says,—Burnham uses the American Telephone and Telegraph Co., as the classic example of management-control. A "control group" rules the A. T. & T., the run of the mill stockholders have less and less say; gradually the "control group" cold-shoulders the stockholders right out of their "ownership." The "managers" are well on the road to expropriating the "owners." This will happen throughout American economy.

As we have said, Burnham evades disproving Lenin's analysis of what the process really is: the rule of finance capital. But one need not appeal to Lenin. Non-revolutionary students of economics agree with Lenin on the nature of this process.

Lundberg's Refutation of Burnham

In Appendix E of his book, *America's 60 Families*, Ferdinand Lundberg considers precisely the argument raised by all the Burnhams; and here is what Lundberg has to say:

"Now briefly, what is the Berle-Means book about, that it should be used to prove that big proprietors no longer have anything to do with industry? . . . The book's thesis is simply that non-ownership management control of corporations is on the increase, that myriad petty stockholders have nothing to say any more about running a company.

"What Messrs. Gannett (of the New York *Herald-Tribune*) and Clapper (of the Scripps-Howard chain) alike innocently overlook in this tendency described so fully by

Berle-Means is that control of corporations by legal device, while excluding small stockholders from a voice in affairs, *does not exclude the big interests*. What has happened is this: the big proprietors, unable to exercise as wide control over as many companies as they would like by means of simple ownership, have in certain instances abandoned ownership of a corporation as a means of control and have substituted for it control by legal device. The liquid capital they have by this means been able to repossess has then been used to obtain an ownership stake in other additional enterprises. Messrs. Clapper and Gannett are naive enough, apparently, to believe that those corporations controlled by legal device are directed by clever but unknown men who have succeeded by some hook or crook in wresting voting control from the big stockholders. *The fact is, however, that managers under the legal device have in virtually all cases been installed by big proprietors.*

"This last is not, to be sure, the thesis of the Berle and Means book. Their work is concerned chiefly with analyzing legal modes of procedure with respect to the control of the corporations. In no part of the book, however, do they suggest that a non-ownership management has wrested any corporation away from the big owners. *In nearly every one of the cases they cite concerning the two hundred largest corporations of the United States, it is big proprietors, present or former, that are in the saddle.*

"One can readily ascertain the facts by turning to page 116 of *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*. There a tabulation shows that out of 200 of the largest non-financial corporations of the United States, 21, or 10½ per cent, are under management control, and 44, or 22 per cent, are thought to be under management control. *However, the fact that they are under management control does not mean that the big hereditary proprietor families are excluded; management control by legal device was installed by just these proprietors, who now run the companies on the basis of shoestring investments.* Ninety-five companies, or 47½ per cent of the 200 largest companies, according to Berle-Means, are controlled through outright ownership, majority ownership, and minority ownership, while 40 companies, or 20 per cent, are controlled through legal device, joint ownership, or by uncatalogued special means.

"*Control of corporations by these means is merely a phase of the development of finance capital, whose newest methods make it possible for big proprietors to extend their control over a vast area ridiculously out of proportion to the amount of money actually owned.*" (p. 506)

In passing, Lundberg mentions that the A. T. & T., Burnham's "classic example," is actually under the rule of J. P. Morgan and Company.

In short, what is actually financial strategy, legal legerdemain, "merely a phase of the development of finance capital," is palmed off by Burnham for nothing less than a social revolution. Thus he bolsters the illusion that the Sixty Families do not rule America.

* * *

In a moment of awareness in the days when Burnham condescended to play the part of visitor in our movement he wrote, in collaboration with Shachtman, the following:

"The foulness of Stalinism and imperialism can today breed only maggots; in particular is it impossible for *intellectuals* to avoid degeneration not merely of their characters as human beings but also of their minds if for any length of time they give their allegiance to those allied monsters of the lie." (*Intellectuals in Retreat*, January 1939)

Here is a case where a maggot wrote his own epitaph.

BUILD Your Marxist Library NOW!

SPRING CLEARANCE OFFER

We offer the following combinations:

	List Price
WORLD REVOLUTION — 1917-1936 <i>By C. L. R. James</i> (429 pages)	\$3.50
RUSSIA TWENTY YEARS AFTER <i>By Victor Serge</i> (298 pages)	2.50
Total list	\$6.00

**NOW YOU CAN HAVE BOTH
FOR ONLY \$2.00!**

RUSSIA TWENTY YEARS AFTER <i>By Victor Serge</i>	\$2.50
REVOLUTION AND COUNTER- REVOLUTION IN SPAIN <i>By Felix Morrow</i> (202 pages)	1.00
Total list	\$3.50

BOTH FOR ONLY \$1.25!

WORLD REVOLUTION — 1917-1936 <i>By C. L. R. James</i>	\$3.50
FROM LENIN TO STALIN <i>By Victor Serge</i> ... (112 pages)	.50
Total list	\$4.00

BOTH FOR ONLY \$1.50!

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place New York City

For Our Spanish Readers

By Leon Trotsky

Los Gangsters De Stalin

(196 pages)

An analysis and documents on the Comintern
and the GPU

2 pesos (Mexican)

By Albert Goldman

Quien Esta Detras Del Asesino De Trotsky

Los hechos y los argumentos que prueban la
culpabilidad de Stalin.

50 centavos (Mexican)

Send orders to:

EDITORIAL CLAVE

Apartado 8942

Mexico, D. F.

Combination Subscription Offer

1 year of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

1 year of THE MILITANT

(Weekly Newspaper of the Socialist Workers Party)

together for only

\$3.00

Write: **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**

116 University Place

New York, New York