

Fourth International

The Vatican in World Affairs

By Li Fu-jen

Paris Peace Conference

★

SWP Election Campaigns

★

Palestine and the Jews

★

Stalin's Latest Purge



The Jewish Question

By A. Leon

October 1946

25 Cents

Manager's Column

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL agents in two areas have requested increased bundle orders.

Clara Kaye of Seattle writes: "Would you please increase our bundle order by five FI's monthly. The reason for this is the renewal of our newsstand work in conjunction with the election campaign."

L. Lynn of Minneapolis writes: "We are completely out of copies of the March 1946 FI. This issue carries Warren Creel's article on the Farmer-Labor Party and now and then we receive requests for it. If possible, would you send us 10 copies of this issue, or if you don't have that many on hand, as many as you can spare."

We received 25 cents from *O. D. Kankakee, Ill.*, for a copy of the September issue. He states, "I intend to subscribe later."

Belle Montague of Cambridge ordered 50 copies of the June FI, commenting as follows: "I will send you the money as I can, but it may not be very prompt as my friends are poor. We will all do our best and you will get the money in a few weeks anyway."

"You might save even more copies for us, if you are willing, and we will send for them, after we have paid you for the first 50. I think I could sell more than 100 copies in the end."

"I am so glad there is some way to place this article (on Conference of the Fourth International) in the hands of the people I know, but I am still hoping you will reproduce it word for word in pamphlet form as it will never be outdated while the Wall Street cannibals rule the USA and I feel it should be in the home of every worker and poor farmer in this nation."

Numerous letters from friends in other countries also attest to the growing interest in FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

Den Haag, Holland: "I often receive two copies of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL. I hope that I am not too indiscreet when I ask you to send me two copies always. I have a friend here who likes reading the magazine very much and it is difficult for us with our faulty English and little time together to read the magazine in a month."

Zutphen, Holland: "I am a reader of your very interesting monthly. And I must tell you that it gives

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 7 October 1946 No. 10 (Whole No. 71)

Published monthly by the
Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-9330. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 20c for 5 copies and up. Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles, 21c 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.
Managing Editor: E. R. FRANK

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	
Significance of the SWP Election Campaigns.....	291
The Paris "Peace" Conference.....	292
Zionism and the Jewish Question in Near East.....	293
Stalin's Latest Purge.....	294
The Vatican in World Affairs.....	By Li Fu-jen...296
The Jewish Question	
The Bases for a Scientific Study of Jewish History	
By A. Leon....	301
Behind the Scenes of the World War II	
By Ralph Graham....	307
Indian Correspondence.....	By K. Tilak...310
From the Arsenal of Marxism	
A Documentary History of the Fourth International	
By Leon Trotsky....	312
The Program for Ceylon	
Appendix to the Program of the Bolshevik-Leninist	
Party of India on the Tasks of Ceylon.....	316

Printed by Criterion Linotyping & Printing Co., Inc.

me a good survey of the labor movement in America and especially a view of the Trotskyists in America. It is sure the best of all Trotskyist magazines which appear in the English language.

"I will tell you that not only we in Holland but also those in the other sections of Europe need such a magazine.

"About a month ago there was a

strike in Holland of sailors and dockers. The strike was lost because of the treason of the Stalinists and reformists. When we look at America and see the struggle of the steel workers, the GM strikers, the rail and mine workers, then we say to ourselves that your struggles have a mass character—they will not be so quickly destroyed by the Stalinists.

Subscription Blank

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

I am enclosing \$..... Send me

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

() 6 months\$1.00

() 1 year\$2.00

Name

Address Zone

City

"But we will promise that we shall fight against all those influences who try to degenerate the revolutionary nature of the struggle in Europe."

* * *

Canada: "As I have not received FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, nor THE MILITANT, for July and August I presume my subscription must have run out. I am enclosing a renewal. I would appreciate it very much if you could date my renewal back to July and send me the July and August numbers. I don't want to miss any of such necessary information as these publications contain."

* * *

Paris: "I thank you for sending me regularly your publication. I am following your movement in the United States with a great deal of interest. I applaud all your efforts and I hope that we will be able to lead together—you in the new world and I in the old continent—a successful struggle in the cause of peace which is so dear to us."

* * *

Glasgow, Scotland: "Early this week I received from you the parcel of eight magazines ordered. May I thank you for your cooperation. You can only imagine the profound pleasure this brings. Here there is a deep respect touching awe for the wisdom and advice which one finds in those truth-loving pages. They are a tremendous weapon in the struggle for the liberation of man and society, the finest weapon in the service of the socialist movement. With many others I join in wishing the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL success."

* * *

We again call to the attention of all agents that FI circulation can be substantially increased if special attention is paid to placing the magazine on new newsstands, in bookshops, and university libraries.

The present average circulation of the magazine has increased 50 per cent over two years ago. We are confident that a further circulation boost can be achieved if our agents pay closer attention to the circulation problem and make all FI readers circulation conscious.

* * *

Back issues of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL for 1940 and 1941 are needed to complete our files for binding. If you have any issues in your file for either 1940 or 1941, which you are willing to give up, will you communicate with the Business Manager, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 7

OCTOBER 1946

NUMBER 10

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Significance of the SWP Election Campaigns—The Paris "Peace" Conference—Zionism and the Jewish Question in the Near East—Stalin's Latest Purge

Significance of the SWP Election Campaigns

TROTSKYISTS RUN IN SIX STATES

The entrance of the Socialist Workers Party into this year's election arena in six states is a most significant development in the American labor movement. It marks the growing strength of revolutionary socialism in the United States, and constitutes a milestone in the history of American Trotskyism. The Socialist Workers Party has undertaken election campaigns in the following states for the posts indicated:

Minnesota: Grace Carlson, United States Senator; Warren Creel, 3rd District Congressman; Dorothy Schultz, 4th District Congresswoman.

New Jersey: Alan Kohlman, Governor; George Breitman, United States Senator; William E. Bohannon, 11th District Congressman; Arlene Phillips, 13th District Congresswoman.

New York: Farrell Dobbs, Governor; Milton Richardson, Lieutenant Governor; Joseph Hansen, United States Senator; William Kitt, Comptroller; Sylvia Blecker, Attorney General.

Ohio: Malcolm Walker, 9th District Congressman; Paul Wylie, State Assemblyman.

Washington: Charles Swett, United States Senator; Dan Roberts, 31st District State Senator.

SUCCESSFUL IN PETITION CAMPAIGN

Since the Socialist Workers Party has not yet succeeded in gaining a permanent place on the ballot, it was necessary in each of these States except Washington to file nominating petitions supported by the legally-required number of signatures of qualified voters. The capitalist political machines have set up arbitrary and harsh legal requirements that in practice virtually bar small parties from the ballot. At this writing, however, it appears that the Socialist Workers Party will succeed in getting on the ballot in all the states except Ohio. (In California, the SWP is conducting a write-in campaign.)

In Ohio, the announcement that the Socialist Workers Party intended to take part in the election created something of a sensation among the bosses of both the Democratic and Republican machines. The word "Trotskyism" became an issue in the preliminary bouts of the old-line political bosses of the Toledo area. But these political bosses were determined to dis-

courage the appearance of a third set of candidates on the ballot.

Walker and Wylie, the two candidates of the SWP, filed their petitions in strict accordance with the Ohio election laws. They had far more than the number of supporting signatures legally required. But the Lucas County Board of Elections ruled against the Socialist Workers Party. The reason—the petitions had been filed in two batches instead of one! The flimsiness of this technicality can be judged from the fact that this is the first time this rule has ever been invoked. For the 17 years that the rule has been in existence, Republicans and Democrats have regularly filed petitions in more than one batch. A petition protesting the discriminatory ruling has already been signed by the leading trade union, Negro and civic figures of Toledo.

The campaign in the key state of New York has revealed the growing strength of the Socialist Workers Party in this State. A minimum of 12,000 signatures is required in the Empire State. Of this number, a minimum of 50 signatures must come from each county in the state. Since many of these 62 counties are sparsely populated and have a record of political conservatism and backwardness, it is not easy for a working class party to meet the requirements, even though it may have considerable strength in the metropolitan centers. On top of this, the total time allowed is only a bare five weeks. However, the members of the Socialist Workers Party who circulated the petitions reported a very warm reception in all the upstate counties. They finished the campaign well in advance of the deadline with a total of 23,727 signatures.

This record is all the more noteworthy, as the Communist Party (Stalinists), who have been running election campaigns in the State for two decades, were able to submit no more than 20,000 signatures. As for Norman Thomas's Socialist Party—that hollow shell of a once powerful electoral machine—their petitions, according to their own claims, bore no more than 15,000 signatures.

RELATION TO LABOR PARTY

The election campaigns of the Socialist Workers Party are important not only because they are the most ambitious electoral undertakings of the Trotskyist movement in America, but also because of their relation to the whole nascent labor party movement in this country. The truth of the matter is that the United States has been ripe for the formation of a labor party for the past ten years. Ever since the great sit-down strikes and the emergence of the CIO as a mass

movement, the working class has been ready to throw its support behind a labor party.

But it is a further fact that despite the existence of this sentiment, no national labor party has yet been formed. John L. Lewis, with the help of the Stalinists, was successful in 1936 in channelizing this movement into the Roosevelt camp through the instrumentality of a fake independent political organization, Labor's Non-Partisan League. And more recently, Sidney Hillman, in alliance with the Stalinists, accomplished the same thing again, by almost identical methods through the CIO-PAC.

But the world has not been standing still in these last ten years, and neither has the American working class. First, the war produced a considerable politicalization in America; one can even say, a significant radicalization. Furthermore, Roosevelt, the astute strategist of American capitalism, the man who had the big prestige with the workingman, is dead. The Democratic Party, the instrument through which the trade union bureaucracy forged the capitalist-labor alliance on the political field, is torn by internal conflicts. Its antipathetic class groups are pulling in opposite directions and may soon rend the party asunder. In addition, capitalist politicians and capitalist politics are generally growing more and more discredited in the eyes of the masses.

Under these circumstances, the delay in organizing a labor party—a party which the times literally cry out for—signifies that the trade union bureaucrats are so tied up and wound up in the machinery of the capitalist state, that they cannot free themselves from its toils, that they stand in deadly terror of having to strike out on an independent path. If a new party is formed, in the near future, it will obviously be only because circumstances have forced the bureaucrats to go along with such a movement—and not because of their independent initiative.

But the longer the launching of a labor party is delayed, the more complicated and unsolvable (within capitalism) become the problems of the working masses, the more uncontrollable and sweeping will be the forces of political revolt when they finally burst through the artificial barriers that have been erected by the Murrays, Hillmans and Stalinists.

We have never been among those who always believed that the American working class was predestined to pass through the labor party stage, before it would be ready to support a genuinely revolutionary movement. It was only about nine years ago, when we saw how the awakening American working class movement had built up unions numbering into the millions, and had by-passed the radical parties, which still remained woefully small, that we came to the conclusion that the creation of a labor party would represent a big step forward in the political education and advancement of American labor.

LABOR PARTY PROGRAM STILL APPLICABLE

This programmatic position adopted by the SWP almost nine years ago remains fully applicable today. But as we stated before, many things have changed in the interim: The working class is more advanced politically; capitalist politics is more discredited; and the party of revolutionary socialism is more influential, is stronger in numbers, and is growing.

The revolutionary tendency is therefore in a stronger position in relation to the labor party movement than it was in 1937-38. Thus the elections campaigns of the SWP take on added meaning and importance. First, they are a powerful blow struck in the cause of independent labor political action, the rapid formation of a mass labor party. In addition, they signal-

ize that the voice of revolutionary socialism is beginning to speak with new vigor and clarity on the American scene; that it is calling, in its own name, for the allegiance of the American masses; that regardless of the exact mechanics of labor political developments in the days ahead, American Trotskyism is going to be a potent force in the political arena—and in organizing the masses for the socialist emancipation.

The Paris "Peace" Conference

TWO MAJOR POWER BLOCS

No one who has followed press reports of the daily proceedings of the Conference of Paris can possibly entertain the illusion that this is a genuine peace conference. From the very first, the conference was split into two major power blocs—the Soviet Union and its satellites versus the Anglo-American imperialists and their satellites. Because of its greater strength and its superior international position, the Anglo-American bloc has been able to utilize the Paris Conference as a forum from which to mobilize world public opinion against the USSR in preparation for a third world war.

The conflict between the two power blocs, the *New York Times* noted in an editorial on September 4, has become "the dominant factor in the whole international situation." Hope for a common program of peace, declared this organ of the American moneybags, "have been dimmed to the vanishing point." Everywhere it is recognized that the period in which we are now living is merely an interval between wars. Neither the imperialists nor the Kremlin gang expects to avert an armed conflict for very long. Both are preparing for a showdown at arms.

Byrnes and Bevin have displayed extraordinary skill in converting the Paris Conference into a medium for the ideological preparation of the coming war. In every dispute that has arisen they have been able to portray the Soviet Union in an unfavorable light, as an obstructionist force engaged in devious and sinister maneuvers, holding up the peace, seeking world domination. Themselves they represent as paragons of international virtue, without any sordid motives, seeking the establishment of a just and durable peace.

In this work of ideological preparation for war, the Anglo-American imperialists are helped at every turn by the Kremlin oligarchy. The Bolsheviks in the days of Lenin and Trotsky would have exposed and denounced this dirty imperialist conclave before the international working class, as they exposed world imperialism even at the Brest-Litovsk conference. Stalin's reactionary policies impel him to become a full-scale participant in the sordid business. And as a participant, he must follow the established rules and try to beat the imperialists at their own game. Thus he sullies the reputation of the USSR, destroys what remains of its prestige with the world working class, and thereby makes the task of the imperialists that much easier.

KREMLIN DEMANDS HUGE REPARATIONS

With the experience of Versailles behind them, the Anglo-American imperialists have astutely refrained from making heavy reparations claims against the defeated Axis countries. But Stalin rushes in to claim \$10,000,000,000 from ruined Germany and \$600,000,000 from bankrupt Italy. Stalin's Yugoslav puppet, Tito, levies an additional preposterous reparations claim against Italy. The Soviet Union appears as a rapacious bandit intent on slitting the throats of helpless victims, or a heartless Shylock determined to get his pound of flesh. In addition,

the Kremlin gang has carried out a campaign of shameless looting in the countries occupied by the Red Army, thus deepening the economic ruin and rendering more difficult the recovery of those countries. Austria in Europe and Manchuria in the Far East have been stripped of their industrial plants. The imperialists have had a field day making full propaganda use of these facts to discredit and isolate the Kremlin.

While the bickerings at Paris, the disputes and disagreements, the snarling language, mark the development of the antagonism of the two big power blocs on the diplomatic level, the conference was punctuated by a real international incident indicating how tenuous is the "peace" which was won at the sacrifice of millions of lives. The shooting down of American planes over Stalinist-dominated Yugoslavia, and the U.S. ultimatum to Belgrade which followed, enabled the imperialists to portray the Soviet Union as a violator of the peace, a danger to "world order."

Also in the midst of the conference, the Kremlin served a demand on Turkey for a change in the status of the Dardanelles. Stalin wants to confine the control of the Straits to the Black Sea powers and to acquire Soviet bases on Turkish soil. It is by such pitiful measures that the Kremlin seeks safety for the Soviet Union! Britain and the United States openly backed Turkey in its rejection of the Soviet demand. Once again the Soviet Union appeared in an unfavorable light—as a state which is bent on territorial expansion, a state with warlike intentions, a state which does not respect the independence of its neighbors. The whole world imperialist press took up the hue and cry against Russia.

Shortly thereafter, on September 6, Secretary of State Byrnes took the diplomatic offensive against the Kremlin in his much-publicized Stuttgart speech. This concerned the future of Germany, heart and nerve-center of Europe, where the aims of the two big power blocs clash most sharply. Byrnes declared it was American policy to make peace with a central German government and to establish a unified Germany by amalgamating the four separate occupation zones. American troops, he announced, would be kept in Germany as long as the other occupying powers maintained forces there.

The Kremlin has every reason to fear a Germany unified under Anglo-American control, a Germany that would become a satellite of the imperialist foes of the Soviet Union. Lenin and Trotsky would have sought a way out of this danger by encouraging and helping the German working class to take power, expel the imperialists, and join their country to the Soviet Union, thereby weakening the whole world front of imperialism by extending the revolution. Stalin, fearing the proletarian revolution at least as much as he fears imperialism, seeks safety in a divided and lacerated Germany. By this reactionary, anti-socialist policy he repels the German masses and drives them into the imperialist camp. He facilitates the work of Byrnes and Bevin.

BANKRUPTCY OF STALINIST STRATEGY

Through diplomatic maneuvers and struggles over boundaries, strategic areas, corridors and bases, Stalin strives to keep the imperialists as far away as possible from the Soviet borders. This is the only kind of "defense" he can engage in. But what bankruptcy—in this era of rocket planes and the atomic bomb! It was without doubt to impress Stalin with the futility of such methods that the Bikini atom bomb tests were staged in the very midst of the Paris "peace" conference and the films flown to the French capital for the edification of the conferees.

Through diplomatic maneuvers and struggles over boundaries, strategic areas, corridors and bases, Stalin strives to keep

The imperialists are not yet ready for war with the Soviet Union. First comes the ideological preparation. That is now going forward apace through such ostensibly idealistic enterprises as the Paris Conference and the United Nations, and by intensive campaigning in the world press. The imperialists are now busy persuading the world that the Soviet Union is the source of all the difficulties and troubles. That without Stalin the world would bloom like a garden!

Destruction of the Soviet Union would not only open an immense new market to capitalism. It would deliver a jolting blow to the revolutionary aspirations of the working class and the colonial peoples. That is why class conscious workers continue to defend the Soviet Union, in any military conflict between the USSR and imperialism. With the growing world hegemony of Wall Street, and the consequent contraction of the Kremlin's possibilities for maneuvering between the rival imperialist groups, the Kremlin is becoming more and more isolated on a world scale. That is why the development of the socialist movement, and the preparations for decisive revolutionary struggles—now more than ever before—constitute the only hope for tortured humanity, and by the same token, the most effective protection and defense for the USSR.

This is the true lesson of the Paris "Peace" Conference.

Zionism and the Jewish Question in the Near East

THE BANKRUPTCY OF ZIONISM

The present outrages of British imperialism against the Jews in Palestine emphasize again the bankruptcy of Zionism as a program of solving the Jewish problem. After so many years of untold sacrifice, after the expenditure of so many millions of dollars, after the Jewish section in Palestine was built up brick by brick with such painful effort, the tiny Jewish community there finds itself helplessly entrapped, the victim of British tyranny and rapacity. Furthermore, the Palestinian Jews find themselves isolated, feared, despised and hated by the peoples of the Near East—the Arabs.

We Marxists, that is, scientific socialists, understand that Palestine is an integral part of the Near East; that the fundamental social force in the Near East is the 35-odd million Arabs, who are weighed down under the double oppression of their semi-feudal rulers and the British overlords. The Arab countries are semi-colonies of British imperialism. Their struggle for national freedom, for the expulsion of the British, is therefore doubly progressive: It clears the ground for the industrial growth and cultural advancement of these backward countries, and it shakes to its very foundations the British Empire, the imperialist system—the main foe of mankind on a world scale, the main obstacle to its Socialist advance.

Zionism is a reactionary philosophy because it seeks to achieve the salvation of the tortured Jewish peoples by forging an alliance with British imperialism—against its victims, the Arabs. But Zionism is not only reactionary; it is also utopian. The present events have demonstrated—so that even the blind should be able to see—that the British imperialists make use of the Jews only as a pawn of their own imperial strategy of "divide and conquer." Thus thirty years after the Balfour declaration, the Palestinian Jews find themselves hunted down, like wild beasts, by the British soldiery, in their own "homeland," while the whole Arab world is up in arms against the Jews.

ARAB OPPOSITION TO THE JEWS

The source of the suspicions and fears of the Arabs is not difficult to understand. The Arabs cannot help but view the Jewish community —under present Zionist domination— as a tool of British imperialism against their own national aspirations. The Zionists keep this Arab fear at white heat by their demonstrative pro-imperialist policy, by their cooperation with and reliance upon British and U.S. imperialism. Thus the Arab community views and must view Jewish immigration, not as a humanitarian project to relieve the plight of helpless, persecuted people, but as a Jewish invasion, designed to wrest Palestine from Arab hands and impose Jewish sovereignty.

Marxists have pointed out for many years that the only solution for Palestine is a decisive break with Zionism and a policy of forging Arab-Jewish unity for joint struggle to oust the British overlords. Once the Jews abandon the mirage of a Jewish state in Palestine, once Arab fears are dispelled concerning the Jews' predatory intentions, the way would be paved for the establishment of Arab-Jewish unity, and the whole question of Jewish immigration into Palestine could be decided amicably, by agreement between the Jews and Arabs.

Zionists, however, have scoffed at this policy as a "fantasy" emanating from the brains of "socialist dreamers." In contrast to this "fantastic" policy, they were pursuing a "realistic" course. The present tragic events in Palestine are convincing proof of just how realistic Zionism really is! There existed a considerable difficulty in the past, however, in explaining just how the Arab-Jewish national animosities could be eliminated and unity achieved. The Zionists correctly pointed out that the Arabs were backward, ignorant and under the thumb of the *effendi* rulers; that the Arab feudal princes stood in deadly fear of the Western culture brought in by the Jews and would be opposed to Arab-Jewish cooperation. This factor, while no argument for Zionism, may have had a certain superficial validity in the twenties. But it has absolutely no validity today. The Arab Near East today is not the Near East of twenty years ago, with its populations of backward, downtrodden *felaheen*, exploited and oppressed by reactionary landlord princes.

All these countries have experienced considerable industrialization in recent years, and this process has received a further, mighty impetus in the war. With the growth of industry has come the growth of the working class, the emergence of trade unions, of socialist organizations, of working class newspapers. The old feudal princes, trembling before this new working class spectre, have flung themselves into the arms of the British "protectors." Thus the new times have brought new developments. The old struggles are receding in the Near East and giving way to the struggle of the working masses against the British imperialists and their native landlord and capitalist allies. This is a fact of towering importance and it is incumbent on the Jews, as wise people, to recognize the changed conditions and to shape their policies accordingly.

A NEW FACTOR IN MIDDLE EAST

Signs of the new working class awakening can be seen everywhere. Egypt, for the past three months, has been convulsed by strikes of all kinds, of railroad workers, telephone workers, etc. In Iraq, the Kirkuk Petroleum workers have been on strike. In Persia, the May strike at the new Agha Pani field was followed soon afterward by a general strike in the fields of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. Lebanon has seen a prolonged railway strike, etc., etc.

The unions and working class parties are everywhere growing apace. In Transjordan, the new King Abdullah finds his royal prerogatives challenged by demands for greater democratization. In Iraq, Communism is growing by leaps and bounds. Four Communist daily newspapers and one Kurdish Communist daily circulate, while the party has a large following among railwaymen, teachers, officials and even in the army. (It is not clear from the reports whether all these papers are Stalinist-controlled.)

In Egypt the working class opposition is growing so strong, that the King has responded by mass arrests, terror and the like.

Even in Palestine, the Arab newspaper *El Hurrieh*, published in Jaffa, enjoys a striking success by giving chief prominence to social questions and attacking the old gangs of all the old parties and cliques. The London *Economist* reports that "earlier this year when Jamal el Husseini, the Palestine Arab leader, returned from exile, communist, trade union and socialist ideas had made striking headway among Palestine Arabs, and he found it necessary first to give attention to this domestic development." But, the *Economist* concludes, "though his headquarters were in Jericho, he could not stay the rising sun."

Such then is the new movement that has arisen throughout the Middle East and has thrust fear into the hearts of the feudal princelings and their British imperialist allies. The problem of achieving unity with the Arabs, does not involve today the reaching of agreements with the Arab *effendis*. The policy of Arab-Jewish unity means holding out the hand of solidarity and brotherhood to the Arab working classes, and the latter will surely respond. Arab-Jewish unity today *can* be forged, if the Jewish people break with Zionism and embark on a joint struggle with the Arab masses against the imperialists and their native tools.

Such unity would signify the dawning of a new day in the emancipatory struggles of both the Arab masses and the Jews. It points the only way toward a solution of the Jewish problem in the Near East.

Stalin's Latest Purge

STALIN'S NEW GIANT PURGE

Stalin's latest purge first became known to the outside world late in June of this year. Since then scarcely a week has passed without a report that some additional phase of Soviet life and activity was being sucked into the whirlpool of Stalinist totalitarian "house-cleaning." As in the great purges of 1936-38, the frightened men in the Kremlin are making a thorough sweep of the country. The hand of the purgers has descended on industry and agriculture, the army, the Communist Party, the youth, every branch of social and cultural life.

In the case of the economy, we have again heard the familiar charges of speculation and embezzlement, faking of production statistics, misappropriation of state property. The theater and the arts are found to be nests of bourgeois ideology and nationalism. The same is said to be true of the Communist Party units, especially in the Ukraine. In the armed forces we are told there was insufficient discipline.

The new purge was under way long before the outside world received news of it. As a matter of fact, purges have become a permanent and continuous feature of Soviet life under the Stalin regime. The tempo changes, rising or falling according to cir-

cumstances, but the purge itself is in reality unending. After 1938, it appeared to taper off. So great was the chaos which it had created, that Stalin himself had to promise that there would be no more of it. But the hounds of the NKVD were in full cry again during the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union, as Kravchenko has reported in his book.

In the Ukraine, in particular, the tempo of the purge was stepped up after the war had ended. On August 23, Nikita S.



The War: The Mothers by Kaethe Kollwitz

Khrushchev, reporting to the central committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, revealed that the purge had been going on there during the preceding eighteen months and perhaps longer. It resulted, he said, in the removal from office of half the leading Party workers. Those purged included 64 percent of the presidents of executive committees of regional Soviets, 38 percent of all secretaries of regional committees of the Party, and two-thirds of the directors of machine-tractor stations. In particular localities the percentages were much higher. Thus in Sumi district in the northern Ukraine, Khrushchev reported, 91 percent of the presidents of executive committees of regional Soviets were "changed." In the Nikolaev and Rovno districts, 83 percent were cut down by the bureaucratic axe.

DRASTIC HOUSECLEANING OF THE MILITARY

restricting itself to reports of measures for "strengthening discipline." The extent of the purge in the armed forces, however, may be judged by the large-scale new appointments to the highest military posts. The newspaper *Pravda* reported in a single day (July 6, 1946) a total of 68 such appointments: 12 lieutenant-generals, 52 major-generals, 1 vice-admiral, 3 rear-admirals.

The most highly-placed purge victim to date was B. L. Vannikov, Minister for Agricultural Machine-Building, whose dismissal and transfer to another unspecified post was announced by the Moscow Radio on June 27. Vannikov's department, it was stated, was involved in widespread record-faking and mis-

For obvious reasons, the Kremlin clique has endeavored to conceal the purge in the army, by

appropriation of funds, and two of the Minister's subordinates were reported held for trial.

Thus far we have not heard the once-familiar charges of "sabotage," "wrecking" and "diversionary activities" in behalf of a foreign power. And since all the Old Bolsheviks were long ago framed up and murdered by Stalin, there are no illustrious political figures who can be tortured into making "confessions" and then hauled into court for show trials in which they make themselves scapegoats for the incompetence, the blunders and the crimes of the top Kremlin clique.

Evidently the Kremlin clique still needs scapegoats, but must content itself with the nonentities and the bureaucratic small-fry who now manage Soviet affairs. That there are real thieves and scoundrels among those now purged one cannot doubt. A totalitarian regime, free of any popular democratic control; a bureaucratic ruling clique which is tyrannical, corrupt and parasitic, cannot inspire honesty and incorruptibility, or even administrative efficiency, in the ranks of its handpicked servants. It is itself the fountain-head of thievery, corruption and bungling.

There is abundant evidence that the Soviet Union is beset by terrible economic crisis, which forms the background to the latest purge. The war is over, but its heritage of ruin and dislocation remains. The bureaucracy, from the highest levels to the lowest, continues as always to enjoy the "good life." Press dispatches tell of Moscow stores whose show windows are filled with every conceivable type of consumers' goods, from luxuries to necessities, including the best of food and clothing, much of it imported from abroad. But fantastic prices place these goods well beyond the reach of the mass of the people. They are intended for the Soviet "elite." The workers are ragged and ill-nourished.

The parasitic bureaucracy, consuming an inordinate part of the social wealth and stifling the economic forces by its bungling control, is the main obstacle to industrial and social rehabilitation and the development of an all-sided economy which could satisfy the needs of the masses. Continuing hardships, with no relief in sight, breed discontent and rebellion. Stalin and the Kremlin clique know only one remedy: the purge. Throw the discontented populace a few hundred or a few thousand scapegoats! Divert the accumulating social anger to the little bureaucrat—the local Soviet or Party official, the factory administrator, the manager of a machine-tractor station. And for good measure, throw in the head of one of the top bureaucrats at the center of government. It was done before. Why not again?

SOCIAL BASE CONSTANTLY NARROWED

becomes more shaky. This social base was narrow to begin with, consisting of the stratified bureaucracy itself, the army, and the small minority of privileged workers, technicians and specialists. As Kravchenko revealed, many of these Soviet "elite" have come to hate the Kremlin oligarchy. They have, it is true, a standard of living far above that of the mass of Soviet citizens. But the enjoyment of their material privileges is tainted by ever-present fear and uncertainty. Always in the background lurks the omnipresent shadow of the NKVD. The regime needs ever more scapegoats. Heads are forever rolling. No one knows what tomorrow will bring.

It is this uneasy, fear-laden stratum which constitutes the social base of Stalin's rule. There is no way of strengthening or stabilizing it. On the contrary, all the policies of the Kremlin

But each successive purge creates added danger for the regime. The social base upon which it rests

tend to weaken it still further. For the Kremlin has at its disposal but one method of dealing with problems: bureaucratic command backed by police-state coercion and violence. As a result, the regime staggers from one crisis to another, creating new multitudes of enemies, becoming ever more isolated. How pitiful is the "theory" of those who maintain that this hated and isolated regime represents a new ruling class! For the alleged new ruling class is none other than the narrow social stratum which, because of the conditions of its political existence, is driven to hate the regime of which it is the social beneficiary.

The current purge, piled upon all the previous purges, and coming in the midst of a growing international crisis, marks the Stalin regime, once again, as a regime of acute and per-

manent crisis. It is precisely now, when the imperialist foes of the Soviet Union are readying themselves for attack, that internal stability becomes a crying necessity. Yet all Stalin can do is to weaken the Soviet Union in the face of its implacable enemies.

Historically, the Stalin regime is doomed. It never had any progressive historic mission. Coming to power in a period of reaction as the destroyer of Bolshevism, its life-span is drawing to a close. It is helping to dig its own grave. Either it will be wiped out by the Soviet proletariat, which would then proceed to restore genuine Bolshevism and move forward to socialism in alliance with the European working class—or it will be destroyed by imperialism, together with the remaining conquests of the October Revolution, in a third world war.

The Vatican in World Affairs

By LI FU-JEN

Significant of the times in which we live—an epoch characterized by the deepening chaos of decayed capitalism and the social-revolutionary movement to which it gives rise—is the growing intervention of the Roman Catholic Church in politics. Never in all its history has this church been more active both in national and international politics than it is today.

When the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie first assumed conscious political form with the publication of the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848, Pope Pius IX publicly denounced the doctrine of Marx and Engels. Proclaiming itself the guardian of capitalist private property and the profit system, the Vatican joined forces with all the representatives of reaction to exorcise the spectre of Communism which began to haunt Europe.

However, the nineteenth century was a period of relative social stability. Capitalism was completing the last stage of its growth as a world system. There were, to be sure, the conjunctural or cyclical economic crises which are an integral feature of the system of commodity production. But the *general crisis* of capitalism, the period of its decay, did not set in until after the turn of the present century, when all its progressive potentialities had gone. In the last half of the nineteenth century capitalism had still some way to travel before completely exhausting its progressive historical role. In these circumstances, papal opposition to Communism could be confined to occasional dogmatic strictures. The Catholic Church had no need to campaign against Communism in season and out. But whenever capitalist society was threatened by revolution—as in the Paris Commune of 1871—the Vatican thundered its condemnation of those who sought to change the social scheme of things.

In recent years, the Vatican has emerged more actively as a political force taking sides in the class struggle. Its political activity has been placed on a campaign basis. Indeed, this activity transcends by far the activity of the church in the "spiritual" realm. A veritable mountain of facts attests the role of Roman Catholicism as that of a defender of the capitalist *status quo* and a pillar of world reaction. The explanation for this development is the fact that the material interests of organized religion, like those of the world bourgeoisie, have come into sharp and irreconcilable conflict with the urgent need for social

change. These interests are closely interwoven with the capitalist system of private property, of which they form a part. In stepping forth boldly as the defender of rotted capitalism, the church is defending its own property and income which are threatened with liquidation by the socialist revolution. The scope and vigor of its intervention in politics is a measure of the depth of the crisis of capitalist society.

When the Pope denounces "atheistic Communism" and "godless Bolshevism," it might appear as if he were concerned only to excoriate the unfaithful who spurn the spiritual leadership of the church. This is far from being the case. According to Catholic teaching, the Pope is the Holy Father, the Supreme Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on Earth. As the sole authorized spokesman of the Deity, he is infallible. Anyone, consequently, who rejects the papal church and its dogmas, also rejects God and is eternally damned. This is true not only of atheists and such benighted heathen as Jews, Buddhists, Moslems, etc., but even of Protestant Christians. Yet the Vatican does not engage in stirring crusades against these doctrinal rivals. Hence it is obvious that Communism and Bolshevism are targets of papal denunciation, not merely and not principally because of their atheism, but because of the social content of their doctrines. Indeed, the Vatican makes no attempt to conceal the temporal aspect of its opposition to the modern revolutionary movement, as reference to any of the recent papal encyclicals will show. The Pope inveighs against Communism because it means the disestablishment of the church, the separation of church and state. Because it means the withdrawal of state subsidies to the church. Because it means confiscation of the secular properties of the church. Because it means abrogation of the parasitic privileges of the legions of ecclesiastics. Because it means the banishment of religious obscurantism from the schools. Deprived of its wealth and cut off from state aid, the church would quickly wither and be reduced to the dimensions of an inconsequential sect, finally to be dissolved altogether in a rational socialist society. In order to survive, therefore, the church must defend the social order upon which its very life depends.

The Roman Catholic Church is a mighty world institution. It has a constituency of 385,000,000 devotees, more than the combined populations of the United States and the USSR and

equal to about one-sixth of the inhabitants of the entire earth. It embraces about half the population of Europe and half that of the Americas. There is scarcely a country where it is not represented. Tribute flows into its coffers from the most advanced lands and from the most backward. The Vatican publishes no balance sheets, gives no financial accountings. Only the inner circle of the top hierarchy know the extent of its enormous properties and income. In addition to cathedrals and churches, monasteries and convents, seminaries and schools and mission establishments, the Catholic Church is the owner of vast secular properties which make it the greatest real estate owner on earth. Among Catholic properties are to be found commercial structures of various kinds (including even movie palaces), apartment buildings and slum tenements. As owner of slum dwellings in Europe, Asia and elsewhere, the Catholic Church squeezes rents from the poorest of the poor. Owning great tracts of plantation and farm lands in colonial countries (e.g., the Philippines, French Indo-China, North Africa, Latin America), it wrings profits from the labor of the most exploited among rural workers. The huge income from all this property, not to speak of the property itself, is imperiled by the rising revolution. This constitutes the explanation, the whole explanation, for the "moral crusade" of the Vatican against Communism and Bolshevism. It explains the intense hatred of the Vatican for the Soviet Union, the first country successfully to breach the system of capitalist private property.

It was during the crisis in Europe which followed the first World War that the Vatican entered the arena of the class struggle after many years of what might be described as political hibernation. Revolutionary upheavals were shaking Europe. Capitalism was tottering. Bolshevism had triumphed in Russia. The revolutionary crisis in Italy, on the Pope's own doorstep, was of especially grave concern to the Vatican. To save Italian capitalism, Pope Pius XI threw his support to Mussolini. On January 20, 1923, Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, the Pope's secretary of state, had a secret interview with Mussolini, the results of which became known later. The Bank of Rome, which was controlled by Catholics, and to which Italian Catholics, Vatican prelates and the Holy See had entrusted a large part of their funds, faced imminent bankruptcy, together with the rest of the banking system. Mussolini pledged himself to save the bank by state intervention once he had seized power. He kept his word and bankruptcy was avoided at a reported cost of 1,500,000,000 *lire*, which Mussolini subsequently squeezed out of the poverty-stricken Italian masses.

The Vatican was duly grateful for Mussolini's services in rescuing Italian capitalism and therewith the fortunes of the Catholic Church in Italy, not to speak of the Vatican itself. On October 31, 1926, Cardinal Merry del Val said:

My thanks also go to him [Mussolini] who holds in his hands the reins of the government of Italy, who with a clear insight into reality has wished and wishes religion to be respected, honored, practised. Visibly protected by God, he has wisely improved the fortunes of the nation, increasing its prestige throughout the world.

In an address in December of the same year, Pope Pius XI himself referred to Mussolini as "the man sent by Providence." Five years later, although engaged in a quarrel with Mussolini over the interpretation of the Lateran Treaty, the Pope nevertheless gushed forth his appreciation of what Mussolini had done for the Catholic Church:

We preserve and shall preserve memory and perennial gratitude for what has been done in Italy for the benefit of religion, even though not less and perhaps greater was the benefit derived by the [Fascist]

party and the [Fascist] regime. . . . We have always refrained from formal and explicit condemnation [of Fascism]; we have come to such a point as to believe possible and to favor compromises which seemed inadmissible to others.

In 1929, when Fascism was already firmly established in the seat of power, the Pope and Mussolini concluded the Lateran Treaty and a Concordat. Under the treaty, the Vatican State became a temporal power, entitled to exchange diplomatic representatives with other states. Vatican City, an enclave within Rome, was now the capital of a priestly empire. The Pope became the head both of a church and a state organization. The Concordat regulated relations between the Fascist state and the Italian branch of the church. Upon signature of the Lateran Treaty, Mussolini paid the Pope 750,000,000 *lire* in cash and 1,000,000,000 *lire* in Fascist state bonds. This sealed the Vatican's alliance with the Fascist state.

Seeing in Fascist dictatorship and totalitarianism the only alternative to the revolutionary destruction of capitalism by the working class, the Pope and the Catholic hierarchy gave it their unstinted support. When Hitler seized power in Germany in January 1933, the Vatican was the first sovereign power to enter into formal negotiations with the Nazi government. On July 20 of that year, Cardinal Pacelli (the present Pope Pius XII) put his signature as Papal Nuncio in Germany alongside that of Franz von Papen to the Vatican's Concordat with Hitler's Third Reich. Continuing along the same political line, the Vatican gave all possible support to Franco in the Spanish civil war in 1936-38, after the Pope, the previous year, had given his pontifical blessing to Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia. On a world scale, the Roman Catholic Church was deploying both its "spiritual" and material forces to aid capitalist reaction.

Fake Neutrality

Formally, the Vatican has pretended to neutrality in international affairs. Article 24 of the Lateran Treaty reads:

The Holy See in relation to the sovereignty which belongs to itself also in the international field, declares that it wishes to remain and will remain extraneous to all temporal conflicts among other States and to all international Congresses held for such objects unless the contending parties make concordant appeal to its mission of peace; [the Holy See] reserving, however, in any case, [its right] to make effective use of its moral and spiritual power. As a consequence of this declaration Vatican City will always and in every case be considered neutral and inviolable territory.

The Vatican violated its proclaimed neutrality both in the Ethiopian war and in the Spanish civil war. With that sharp political discernment which comes of a refined class instinct, the Pope quickly grasped the real, underlying significance of the Spanish civil war. While the clamor of liberal muddleheads, and the people's front policies of the leaders of the Spanish workers' parties, made it appear that the issue was one of bourgeois democracy *vs* fascism, the Holy See appraised it as a *class* fight, the socialist revolution *vs* capitalism. Spain is one of the important Catholic strongholds in Europe. The Pope saw in the Spanish civil war the dread spectre of Bolshevism casting its shadow over the Mediterranean. The church and its property were in danger. It was of vital importance to the Vatican to insure Franco's triumph. Hitler and Mussolini were doing all they could to help the Spanish Falange. But it was imperative to isolate the Spanish Loyalists, to cut off the Republican government from all outside aid. The big danger was the United States, where there had arisen a great popular demand for aid

to the fighters against Franco. Neither Hitler nor Mussolini could bring any pressure to bear in Washington. The Vatican assumed this task. Using to the full the influence of the Catholic Church in America, it unleashed a tremendous propaganda in its press, in the pulpit and in the schools to pressure Washington into placing an embargo on arms shipments to Spain.

The Spanish civil war was, however, only the largest facet of a world situation which was moving rapidly in the direction of a second world war. By the fall of 1936 a succession of events had made it clear that the era of imperialist "peace" after the first World War was drawing to a close. The assassination of the Austrian Chancellor Dollfuss, the Italian invasion of Ethiopia, Hitler's march into the Rhineland, and, finally, the Spanish civil war, were all evidences of the approaching storm. In a world of growing turmoil and uncertainty it seemed to the Vatican to be indispensable that an official understanding be reached with the United States as the pre-eminent world power and the strongest bastion of capitalism. For a long time the Vatican had desired official relations with the United States. It seemed anomalous that a country with such a large Catholic constituency, where the Catholic Church is so powerful and wealthy, should maintain no diplomatic relations with the central government of the Catholic Church. The United States had officially ignored the Vatican since 1867. The principle of separation between church and state and the strong anti-papal sentiments of the Protestant majority of the population were obstacles to any official understanding. The obstacles were formidable, but not insurmountable, for the reason that both the Vatican and American imperialism had need of such an understanding. Each desired the aid and support of the other in the defense of common interests.

In the fall of 1936 Cardinal Pacelli (now Pope Pius XII), secretary of state to Pope Pius XI, landed in the United States. After touring the country to kill time until the Presidential election was over, he was received by President Roosevelt at Hyde Park on November 6. The papal secretary of state does not usually visit a foreign country except for important reasons. Nor, it can be presumed, would he have come without Roosevelt's prior consent or invitation. What he and Roosevelt talked about has been kept a closely-guarded secret, like the rest of Roosevelt's secret diplomacy. But in the light of what occurred subsequently it can be deduced that they discussed (1) United States policy in the Spanish civil war and (2) a plan for the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican. Shortly after Pacelli's visit the United States clamped down the arms embargo on Spain. But almost three years were to elapse before the Vatican gained its second point. Roosevelt understood the value of having an ally in the Holy See, but in order not to excite religious animosities and spoil the whole plan, he had to prepare the way carefully and await the propitious moment.

On July 29, 1939, Cardinal Enrico Gasparri (nephew of Cardinal Pietro Gasparri, who had been secretary of state to Pope Pius XI) arrived in the United States. Continuing the work of his forerunner, Cardinal Pacelli, it was his mission, according to a report in the *New York Times*, to

... prepare the juridical status for the possible opening of diplomatic relations between the State Department and the Holy See. . . . He is not authorized to negotiate for the establishment of relations; he is to work out a legal framework within which such a relationship could be placed, if established.

The obstacle to arranging for a Papal Nuncio in Washington and an American ambassador at the Vatican was the need to

submit such a plan to Congress, which alone has the power to appropriate funds for the maintenance of diplomatic establishments. Moreover, all U.S. ambassadorial appointments must be confirmed by the Senate. A predominantly Protestant House and Senate would almost certainly reject such a plan. Consequently, if it was to be done at all, it could only be done over the head of Congress.

It was, remember, the late summer of 1939. Threatening clouds of war were gathering on the European horizon. The propitious moment for establishing a tie between the United States and the Vatican was at hand. Who could object to Roosevelt the "peace-lover" joining hands with the Pope to save the peace? But there was need for haste. Roosevelt resorted to a characteristic subterfuge. By-passing Congress, he wrote to the Pope on December 23, 1939, asking the latter's assent to the appointment of a "personal representative" to the Vatican. For this new and unprecedented post he chose the multi-millionaire Myron Taylor, former president of the finance committee of the United States Steel Corporation. Since Taylor was not to be an ambassador proper, there was no need to get Senate approval of his appointment. And since the envoy could easily pay his own expenses, there was no need to ask Congress for an appropriation.

Myron Taylor went to Rome in February 1940 to take up his diplomatic post. He was *persona grata* not only with the Vatican, but also with Mussolini's Fascist regime. Taylor had always been an admirer of Italian Fascism and thought that a similar system should be established in America. Some three years earlier he had blabbed out his praise of Mussolini at a banquet in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York as a representative of the Italy-America Society and the American Society of Royal Italian Orders. The occasion was the feting of the Fascist ambassador, Fulvio Suvich. Waxing ecstatic over the murderous rule of Italian Fascism, Taylor declared that "the whole world has been forced to admire the successes of Premier Mussolini in disciplining the nation." He also endorsed the barbaric conquest of Ethiopia, declaring: "Today a new Italian Empire faces the future and assumes its responsibilities as guardian and administrator of a backward people of ten million souls." (*New York Times*, November 6, 1936.) This, then, was the representative whom the "democratic" Roosevelt sent to the Vatican.

Common Aims

For the Vatican, the understanding with Roosevelt paid handsome dividends after Italy became engulfed in the war. While Allied air forces devastated Naples, Genoa, Turin, Milan and other cities, the capital city of Rome with its Vatican enclave was spared. Important as this was to the Vatican, it is still only a minor aspect of the tie-up between the Vatican and American imperialism. Roosevelt and the Pope had set their sights on broad political goals. In his December 23, 1939 letter to the Pope, Roosevelt expressed the view that a "new order" was at hand and said "it is well that we encourage a closer association between those in every part of the world—those in religion and those in government—who have a common purpose." He desired, he said, to have his representative at the Vatican because, in the post-war period, "it is of the utmost importance that common ideals shall have a united expression."

In the light of actual post-war developments it is not difficult to distinguish the type of "new order" which Roosevelt had in mind. It proved to be nothing more than the old, decrepit capitalist order, resuscitated by Allied Military Govern-

ments and propped up with Allied bayonets. The "common purpose" and the "common ideals" were none other than the damming up of the revolutionary socialist currents that arose in Europe, the frustration of the popular will for social change, the rescue of an effete social system which was ready for the garbage heap of history. It was for this, above all, that American imperialism and the Vatican joined hands.

The Vatican rendered its first important service in the rescue of decayed European capitalism when, upon the collapse of Italian Fascism in 1943, the Pope used all his influence to keep the Italian masses from revolutionary action. Rumbblings of the approaching storm were audible some time before Fascism actually collapsed. First the Pope tried to save Mussolini's tottering regime. In June 1943 the Pope delivered an address declaring that the church,

while asserting and defending courageously the rights of the working class . . . has had to issue warning against letting oneself be deluded by the mirage of specious and fatuous theories and visions of future well-being and against the deceptive enticements and seductions of false prophets of social prosperity. . . . Such false prophets would have us believe that salvation must come from a revolution. . . . Salvation and justice are not to be found in revolution but in evolution through concord. . . . We need a spirit of true concord and brotherhood animating all, superiors and subjects, employers and workers. . . .

At the end of 1943, after the fall of Fascism, the Pope, in his annual Christmas message, devoted himself to a forthright attack on Socialism and an equally forthright defense of the system of capitalist private property. "The Church," he said, "condemns the various forms of Marxian Socialism because it is her permanent right and duty to safeguard men from currents of thought and influence that jeopardize their eternal salvation." With the collapse of the Mussolini regime, the Vatican used all its powers of exhortation, and its well-known threat of eternal damnation, to prevent the Italian workers and peasants from overthrowing capitalism.

Amidst the political ferment which set in throughout Europe with the military defeat of the Axis, the Vatican has worked with might and main to dam up the channels of revolutionary action and divert the masses from the socialist road. In this work it has collaborated closely with the Allied conquerors. Everywhere its hand is to be seen—in Italy, in France, in Poland, in Belgium, in Holland, in Spain and in other countries. Catholic intervention in politics, in the class struggle, has been most marked in Italy and France, centers of revolutionary development. An outstanding example was the public stand against the parties of the Left taken by the Catholic Church and the Vatican in the elections in those countries on June 2 of this year.

In an election-eve address broadcast from Vatican City on June 1, the Pope urged the voters to reject the Stalinist and Socialist candidates as "the wreckers of Christian civilization" and to vote for the reactionary candidates of the Right. The influence of the Vatican was exerted mainly through the Christian Democrats in Italy and the MRP (Popular Republican Movement) in France. These two parties were created after the war and are the organized expression of clerical-capitalist reaction. In the Italian elections, the voters were also called upon to vote for or against the retention of the Italian monarchy. The manner in which the church tried to persuade the masses not to vote down the detested House of Savoy was described in a Rome dispatch to the London *Economist*:

There were priests . . . in many parts of the country who endeavored to persuade their hungry flocks that if the Republic were voted UNRRA would deliver nothing more, and even that the Allies would

forcibly intervene. The clergy, further, missed few opportunities of declaring that to vote for the Republic was to vote against Christianity and to face the torments of hell, while the Bishops of Umbria and Abruzzi published a manifesto which was more or less an interdict upon voting Communist, Socialist or even Liberal. (*Economist*, June 22, 1946.)

Priestly intervention did not avail to save the Italian monarchy, but it did serve greatly to augment the vote of the Christian Democrats, the leading party of reaction, which became the largest party in the Constituent Assembly. In France, likewise, the leading party of reaction, the MRP, emerged from the elections as the largest political party. Both in France and Italy, the British *Economist* reported, "the Catholics fought the elections primarily as anti-Communists and now have behind them the inchoate and in part reactionary following that the cry of anti-Communism usually rallies." While the Pope occasionally excoriates totalitarianism for the benefit of his democratic clientele (though he only really commenced doing this after Fascism and Nazism had fallen), the Vatican maintains the closest and most cordial relations with Spanish fascism through the Franco regime in Spain. Its overriding purpose is to head off revolution and save capitalism. After the June elections in Italy and France, the *Economist* noted "the emergence of a loose Catholic Western bloc with a liberal pole—the Popular Republicans—and an authoritarian pole—the Franco regime in Spain." The character of this bloc, and its purpose, are manifest: to rally and unify all the forces of capitalist reaction to combat the revolutionary tide and to act as the ideological spearhead of the campaign for war against the Soviet Union. J. Alvarez del Vayo, in an article from Paris which appeared in the June 29 issue of *The Nation*, delineated its political role and its *modus operandi*:

Thus the Catholic Church has returned to the political struggle with the same aggressiveness it displayed in the last century—in 1830, 1848, and 1871, when the cause of the Pope-King fused with the cause of the other sovereigns of Europe who saw their thrones endangered. At the first sign of real estrangement between the West and East [the reference is to the imperialist powers and the USSR—L.F.J.] the Vatican has resuscitated the idea of a Western Catholic bloc. . . . Now, at least for the time being, the plan has been limited to Europe. But this in no way limits the ambitious ultimate goal. . . . As time passes, the Western Catholic bloc will reveal its true character. For the moment, however, it will continue to speak of democracy and the Four Freedoms. . . . In Eastern Europe, where it is a question of fighting the Russians on their own ground, direct action is justified. But not in the West. The Christian Democrats in Italy must continue to display the emblem of the Cross and the slogan *Libertas*. . . . The M.R.P. in France must continue under the leadership of a Maurice Schumann and a Georges Bidault. . . . The Catholic Party in Holland must keep its left wing. . . . The Christian Socialists in Belgium must continue to give the appearance of supporting higher standards for the workers. It is this deceptive double policy underlying its entire present strategy which makes the Western Catholic bloc so dangerous.

The Western Orientation

Construction of the Western Catholic bloc fits in with a sweeping reorientation of Vatican policy, directed toward the Western Hemisphere, which began back in 1939 with the establishment of official relations between the Vatican and American imperialism. This orientation is directed especially toward the 30,000,000 Catholics in the United States and Canada and the additional millions in Latin America. The disintegration of European capitalism, the revolutionary anti-capitalist mood of the European workers, combined with the occupation of all

eastern Europe by the Red Army, led the Vatican to conclude that Europe had lost its preeminent position in the world. Roman Catholicism set out to create a new world base for itself. The culminating point of the reorientation was the consistory in Vatican City in February of this year at which the Pope created 32 new cardinals. Of this number, 11 were named for the Americas, four of the eleven for the United States. What was the significance of this step?

Organized hierarchically, the Catholic Church represents a pyramid whose broad base is the mass of the laity and the lower order of prelates. From here it rises in gradations through the higher orders to the Sacred College of Cardinals. At the apex is the Pope, the Supreme Pontiff himself. The Sacred College of Cardinals—consisting of the Princes of the Church, as they are sometimes called—is at once the cabinet of the Vatican State and the international executive committee of Catholicism as a world movement. Membership in the Sacred College had declined to 37. The elevation of 32 new cardinals brought it up to 69, only one short of the constitutional limit.

By elevating 32 cardinals in one sweep the Pope took a step unprecedented in Catholic history. Its purpose was two-fold: to strengthen the executive arm of the church so that it may function more widely and more efficiently as an instrument of reaction, and to further the American orientation of the Vatican. Describing the ceremony at which the new cardinals were elevated as a “mobilization of world Catholicism against Communism,” Herbert L. Matthews, Rome correspondent of the *New York Times*, wrote:

So you have there two great forces lined up against each other and this week's Consistory was the most striking visible symbol of opposition that has been seen since the Communist Manifesto led Pius IX to issue his first condemnation of Marxism.

Remember that there is only one great totalitarian force left in the world today. [The reference is to the Soviet Union—LFJ.] It is war and open war, and this Consistory is a formal mobilization for the struggle. (*New York Times*, February 23, 1946.)

This was not just a correspondent's interpretation of the meaning of the medieval ceremony enacted at the Vatican. Its political purpose was implicit in the whole previous course of Vatican policy. The Pope himself made it quite explicit in his address during the ceremony at which he presented the scarlet birettas to the new Princes of the Church. Again and again he referred to the “supra-national character of the church and its world-wide unity,” coupling this with an attack on “modern imperialism.” By specifically exempting the British Empire from his strictures, the Pope made it amply clear that the “imperialism” he was attacking was the expansionism of the Kremlin. He also made explicit the reactionary role of the Catholic Church as a mainstay of capitalism in the concluding words of his address, when he said:

Venerable brethren, the church provides the greatest support of human society. Every day, from where the sun rises to where it sets, without distinction of race or nation, a pure conception rises. . . . We ourselves are the stable foundation of society.

It was not by any chance that after the ceremony the new cardinals, among them Cardinal Francis J. Spellman of New York, were entertained at a lavish banquet by none other than General Franco's ambassadorial envoy to the Vatican.

In the midst of pushing its new Western orientation, the Vatican observed that things were beginning to pick up in Europe from the point of view of the forces of reaction. The treacherous, week-kneed people's frontist policies of the Stalin-

ists and the Social Democrats, had diverted the masses from the revolutionary road and enabled capitalist reaction to redress its ranks and consolidate its forces. The electoral triumph of the British Labor Party seemed ominous, but the labor lieutenants of British capitalism soon made it clear that they had no intention of changing the social order. Moreover, they continued the Tory policy of backing the European monarchies and showed that they had no intention of doing anything to hasten the downfall of Franco in Spain. Europe could still be saved for “Christian civilization” by intense and consistent support of the post-war capitalist regimes and by building a wall against Stalinist expansionism. Hence the vigorous intervention of the Vatican in the European elections and the policy of the Western Catholic bloc.

Liberal critics of the Vatican have accused the Pope of violating Christian teachings and ethics in supporting the fascist regimes. They have pointed, also, to the endless superficial inconsistencies of the Vatican in politics. Much was made, for example, of the fact that when the war was in progress the Pope would receive Italian soldiers, give them his blessing, and enjoin them to fight bravely, and if need be give up their lives, for the Fascist fatherland. When the war was over and American occupation troops were received by the same Pope, they were praised for “liberating” Italy from that very fascist regime for which Italian soldiers had been urged to give up their lives. What the Liberal muddleheads fail to comprehend is that in temporal affairs, i.e., in politics, the Vatican follows no abstract moral principles. The Pope will support a monarchy in one country, a republic in another; fascism today, “democracy” tomorrow. Today the Vatican can proclaim its opposition to totalitarianism—now that Mussolini and Hitler are no more and it is necessary to do business with the “democratic” conquerors of Europe. But that does not prevent the Vatican from maintaining close and friendly relations with Fascist Spain and praising Franco as a worthy defender of Christianity. For the Catholic Church there is but one criterion in determining policy and selecting allies: the preservation of capitalism and the attitude of the given state toward the church, its interests and its properties.

Active Participant in Class Struggle

The “spiritual” activities of the Catholic Church are the cover under which it fights the battles of the bourgeoisie, with which its own fate and fortunes are closely bound up. It has become an active participant in the class struggle, employing its authority among the Catholic faithful to divide the ranks of the workers. It sets the Catholic worker against the Protestant and Jewish worker. It subjects the Catholic faithful among the workers to an ideological terror, confronting them with a conflict between devotion to the church and the vital urge of class needs. An example of this was the resurrection during the recent Italian and French elections of the 1931 papal encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, which contains the warning: “One cannot at the same time be a good Catholic and a true Socialist.” An even more striking example was the speech broadcast to the world by the Pope in the first week of September 1944, at a time when it seemed that Italian capitalism was about to be engulfed by the socialist revolution. Voicing the terror of the criminal rulers of Europe and their “democratic” imperialist allies, the Pope made a frantic appeal to the workers to respect the system of capitalist private property, urging them not to resort to “subversion and violence” in order to put an end to the outworn social system which was the cause of all their miseries. He declared that

. . . any legitimate economic and social order should rest on the indisputable foundation of the right to private property. The Church has always acknowledged the natural right to property. . . . Christian conscience cannot admit as right a social order that denies the principle or renders impossible and useless in practice the natural right to ownership of commodities and means of production.

The authority of the most powerful church on earth is thus invoked to rescue dying capitalism. This rotted social system with its unspeakable wars and chronic social misery is represented as the Divine Will and given the authority of Divine sanction. Woe unto those who flout the will of the Almighty! They are condemning themselves to everlasting perdition!

The Catholic Church even feeds the poison wells of race chauvinism in its efforts to divide the peoples and divert the Catholic faithful among them from the path of revolutionary action. Workers in America are familiar with the anti-Semitic propaganda of Father Coughlin. His obscene outbursts are by no means the aberration of a single priest. The fountain-head of Catholic anti-Semitism is the Vatican itself. In 1936, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, published in Rome by Jesuits under an editor appointed by the Pope himself, printed a series of articles on the Jewish question. In one of them we find the following:

Two facts which appear contradictory are to be found together among the Jews scattered in the modern world: their control of moneys and their preponderance in Socialism and Communism. (*Civiltà Cattolica*, October 3, 1936.)

The conclusion which the Jesuit scribes drew from this observation is exactly identical with the anti-Semitic ravings of a Hitler or a Goebbels. It is that the Jews—not all of them, but many of

them—“constitute a serious and permanent danger to society.”

In its frenzied fear of revolution, the Vatican has lately felt constrained to attack certain mild reform measures instituted by the ruling class. Trying to find palliatives for social unrest, and at the same time rescue the bankrupt capitalist economy, the bourgeoisie in Europe has had to resort to a partial nationalization of industry (England, France, Belgium, Austria, etc.). The Vatican sees danger in these moves, for they tend to destroy the notion of the sacredness of private property. In July of this year the Pope publicly attacked nationalization and came out in favor of the type of economic organization worked out by Mussolini—the “corporations.” There is no doubt, he declared, that “under present circumstances a corporative form of social life and especially of economic life in practice favors Christian doctrine concerning the individual community, labor and private property.”

As the reader will have noticed, references to private property run like a consistent thread through all the recent political pronouncements of the Vatican. Papal concern for private property amounts, one might almost say, to a fixation. We could adduce much more evidence on this score. As it is, we have used but a small fraction of the available material. But even this establishes beyond doubt our thesis that the Roman Catholic Church has become the ideological fountain-head and one of the main organizational centers of world reaction. The black flag of counter-revolution flies over the Vatican, which has become the symbol and center of all the dark forces striving to prevent the new socialist society from coming to birth. When Trotsky described the Vatican as the “world headquarters of obscurantism and reaction,” he wrote a simple truth which has become more than ever manifest in this new stage of the battle for human progress.

The Jewish Question

The Bases for a Scientific Study of Jewish History

By A. LEON

The following article on the Jewish question is the first chapter of a still unpublished manuscript, *The Materialist Conception of the Jewish Question*, completed in December 1942. The author, A. Leon, was the national secretary of the Belgian Trotskyist party and one of the leading spirits of the Fourth International in Europe. He was arrested by the Gestapo in June 1944 and died a martyr's death in the Nazi concentration camp at Auschwitz.—Ed.

* * *

The scientific study of Jewish history is yet to transcend the stage of idealist improvisation. Serious historians have boldly attacked the field of history as a whole in the spirit of Marx, and have in a large measure conquered it for the materialist outlook. Jewish history, however, still remains the chosen land of “god-seekers” of every variety. It is one of the few historical domains in which idealist prejudices have succeeded in entrenching and maintaining themselves to so great an extent.

How many oceans of ink have been spilled to celebrate the famous “miracle of the Jew!” “What a strange spectacle are these men who have, in order to preserve the sacred trust of their faith, braved persecutions and martyrdom,” exclaims Bédarride, author of *The Jews In France, Italy and Spain*.

The preservation of the Jews is explained by all historians as a product of their devotion through the centuries to their religion or their nationality. Differences among these historians begin to appear only when it comes to defining the “goal” for which the Jews preserved themselves, the reason for their resistance to assimilation. Some, taking the religious point of view, speak of the “sacred trust of their faith”; others, like Doubnov, defend the theory of “attachment to the national idea.” “We must seek the causes for the historical phenomenon of the preservation of the Jewish people in their national spiritual strength, in their ethical basis and in the monotheistic principle,” says the *Allgemeine Enzyklopedie* which contrives in this way to reconcile the various viewpoints among the idealist historians. [*Allgemeine Enzyklopedie* (Yiddish), article of Ben Adir on anti-Semitism.]

But while it is possible to reconcile these idealist theories with one another, it is hopeless to try to find some ground for reconciling these same theories with the elementary rules of historical science. The latter must categorically reject the fundamental error of all idealist schools which consists of putting under the hallmark of free will the cardinal question of Jewish

history, namely: the preservation of Judaism. Only a study of the economic role played by the Jews can contribute to elucidating the causes for the "miracle of the Jew."

To study the evolution of this question is not exclusively of academic interest. Without a thorough study of Jewish history, it is difficult to understand the Jewish question in modern times. The plight of the Jews in the Twentieth Century is intimately bound up with their historical past. Every social formation represents a stage in the social process. Being is only a moment in the process of becoming. In order to undertake an analysis of the Jewish question in its present phase of development, it is indispensable to know its historical roots.

In the sphere of Jewish history, as in the sphere of general history, Karl Marx's brilliant thought points the road to follow. "Let us not seek for the secret of the Jew in his religion, but let us rather seek for the secret of his religion in the real Jew." Marx thus puts the Jewish question back on its feet. We must not start with religion in order to explain Jewish history; on the contrary, the preservation of the Jewish religion or nationality can be explained only by the "real Jew," that is to say, by the Jew in his economic and social role. The preservation of the Jews contains nothing of the miraculous. "Judaism was preserved not despite history, but because of history." (Karl Marx, *The Jewish Question*, French edition.)

It is precisely by studying the historical function of Judaism that one is able to discover the "secret" of its preservation in history. The struggles between Judaism and Christian society, under their respective religious guises, were in reality social struggles. "The contradictions between the State and a particular religion, Judaism for instance, are invested with a human expression by their becoming converted into a contradiction between the State and certain specific lay elements." (*Idem.*)

The general pattern of Jewish history is presented (with various slight nuances) somewhat as follows according to the dominant idealist school: Up to the destruction of Jerusalem, as late as the rebellion of Bar Kokba, the Jewish nation was in no wise different from other normally constituted nations, such as the Roman or Greek. The wars between the Romans and the Jews resulted in dispersing the Jewish nation to the four corners of the world. In the dispersion, the Jews fiercely resisted national and religious assimilation. Christianity found no more rabid adversaries in its path and despite all its efforts did not succeed in converting them. The fall of the Roman Empire increased the isolation of Judaism which constituted the sole heterodox element after the complete triumph of Christianity in the West.

The Jews of the *Diaspora*, in the epoch of the barbarian invasions, did not at all constitute a homogeneous social group. On the contrary, agriculture, industry, commerce were widely prevalent among them. It was the continuous religious persecutions which forced them to intrench themselves increasingly in commerce and usury. The Crusades, by reason of the religious fanaticism they engendered, violently accelerated this evolution which transformed the Jews into usurers and ended in their confinement in Ghettos. Of course the hatred against the Jews was also fanned by the latter's economic role. But the historians attribute only a secondary importance to this factor. This condition of Judaism continued up to the Great French Revolution, which destroyed the barriers that religious oppression had raised against the Jews.

Several important facts challenge the truth of this pattern:

1. The dispersal of the Jews does not at all date from the fall of Jerusalem. Several centuries before this event, the great majority of Jews were already spread over the four corners of

the world. "It is certain that well before the fall of Jerusalem, more than three-fourths of the Jews no longer lived in Palestine" (Ruppin).

For the great Jewish masses dispersed in the Greek Empire, later in the Roman Empire, the Jewish kingdom of Palestine was of completely secondary importance. The tie with the "mother country" was manifested solely in religious pilgrimages to Jerusalem, which played a role similar to that of Mecca for the Moslems. Shortly before the fall of Jerusalem, King Agrippa said: "There is not a single people in the world which does not contain a portion of ours." The *Diaspora* was consequently not at all an accidental thing, a product of acts of violence. "In the first place we know of no hostile power which might have forced our people to spread out through all of Asia Minor, Macedonia and Greece," correctly wrote Rabbi Herzfeld in his *Commercial History of the Jews in Antiquity*.

The fundamental reason for Jewish emigration must be sought in the geographic conditions of Palestine. "The Jews in Palestine were the possessors of a mountainous country which at a certain time no longer sufficed for assuring its inhabitants as tolerable an existence as that among their neighbors. Such a people is driven to choose between brigandage and emigration. The Scots, for example, alternately engaged in each of these pursuits. The Jews, after numerous struggles with their neighbors, also took the second road. . . . Peoples living under such conditions do not go to foreign countries as agriculturalists. They go there rather in the role of mercenaries, like the Arcadians of antiquity, the Swiss in the Middle Ages, the Albanians in our day, or in the role of *merchants*, like the Jews, the Scots and the Armenians. We see here that a similar environment tends to produce similar characteristics among peoples of different races." (Karl Kautsky in *Neue Zeit*.)

2. The overwhelming majority of Jews of the *Diaspora* unquestionably engaged in trade. Palestine itself since very remote times constituted a passageway for merchandise, a bridge between the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile. "Syria was the predestined grand route of the conquerors. . . . It was also the road followed by merchandise and the one over which ideas circulated. It is known that at a very early date there settled in these regions a large population, inhabiting great cities dedicated by their very position to commerce. . . ." (Lods, *Israel, From Its Origins to the Middle of the Eighth Century*.)

The geographic conditions of Palestine therefore at the same time explain the Jewish emigration as well as its commercial character. On the other hand, among all nations, at the beginning of their development, the traders are foreigners. "The characteristic of a natural economy is that each sphere produces everything consumed by it and consumes everything it produces. There is consequently no pressure to buy goods or services from others. . . . Because what is produced is consumed in this economy, we find among all these peoples that the first traders are foreigners." (Brentan, *Die Anfaenge des Kapitalismus*.)

Philon enumerates many cities where the Jews were established as traders. He states that they "inhabited Lybia on the mainland and in the islands, along the coasts and in the interior." The Jews who inhabited the Hellenic islands as well as the mainland and further in the West, had installed themselves there with commercial objectives" (Herzfeld, *loc. cit.*). "At the same time as the Syrians, the Jews are to be met, scattered or rather grouped in all the cities. They are mariners, courtiers, bankers, whose influence was as vital in the economic life of the time as the Oriental influence which made itself felt in the same epoch in art and in religious ideas." (Pirenne, *Mahomet et Charlemagne*.)

It is to their social position that the Jews are beholden for the wide autonomy granted them by the Roman emperors. "They (the Jews), and they only, were permitted to form a community within the community as it were and while other non-burgesses were ruled by the authorities of the burgess body, they were permitted to a certain extent to govern themselves. . . . Caesar also advanced the interests of the Jews in Alexandria and in Rome by special favors and privileges, and protected in particular their peculiar worship against the Roman as well as against the Greek local priests." (Mommson, *History of Rome*.)

Sombart, in his work of such uneven value (*The Jews in Economic Life*), wherein the worst of absurdities are mixed with highly interesting researches states: "I find in the Jewish religion the same idea-forces as those that characterize capitalism." This affirmation is correct provided we understand by "capitalism,"—"precapitalist" trade and usury. (As we shall presently see, it is false to attribute a preponderant role to the Jews in the building of modern capitalism.) In support of his thesis, Sombart cites many extracts from the Talmud and other Jewish religious books which reflect this close connection between the Jewish religion and the commercial spirit. Here are, for example, several of these quotations: "He that loveth pleasure shall be a poor man, he that loveth wine and oil shall not be rich" (*Proverbs*). And, "thou shalt lend unto many nations, but thou shalt not borrow (*Deuteronomy*). "Riches will adorn the house of the good and poverty the house of the wicked." Rabbi Eleazar said: "The righteous loves his money better than his body." And Rabbi Izchak also made this observation: "Let a man always keep his money at work."

It is naturally difficult to get a complete picture from a confused welter of texts, written and supplied with commentaries at different epochs and in different countries. The imprint of the commercial spirit is nevertheless clearly discernible in most of these writings. The work of Sombart is in this sense only an illustration of the Marxist thesis that religion is an ideological reflection of a social class. But by maintaining that it is religion which must have been the primary factor, Sombart, like other bourgeois scholars, strives to invert the causal relation.

3. Hatred for the Jews does not date solely from the birth of Christianity. Seneca treated the Jews as a criminal race. Juvenal believed that the Jews existed only to cause evil for other peoples. Quintilian said that the Jews were a curse for other peoples.

The cause of anti-Semitism in antiquity is the same as of medieval anti-Semitism: the antagonism between the merchants and every society based principally on the production of use values. "Medieval hostility toward merchants is not solely of Christian or pseudo-Christian inspiration. It also has a pagan source. The latter has strong roots in a class ideology, in the disdain which the leading classes of Roman society—the senatorial gentes as well as the provincial curia felt, out of a deep peasant tradition, toward all form of economic activity other than those deriving from agriculture." (Henri Laurent, *Religion and Business*.)

Aristotle says in his *Politics*: "The most hated sort [of wealth-getting] and with the greatest reason is usury which makes a gain out of money itself, and not from the natural object of it. For money was intended to be used in exchange, but not to increase at interest. And this term, interest, which means the birth of money from money, is applied to the breeding of money because the offspring resembles the parent. Wherefore of all modes of getting wealth this is the most unnatural." Further, "the citizens must not lead the life of mechanics or tradesmen, for such a life is ignoble and inimical to virtue."

However, while anti-Semitism was already strongly developed in Roman society, the condition of the Jews, as we have seen, was quite enviable there. The hostility of classes that live from the land toward trade does not eliminate their dependence upon the latter. The landowner hates and despises the merchant, without being able to get along without him.

The triumph of Christianity did not bring any notable changes in this regard. Christianity, at first the religion of the slaves and the downtrodden, was rapidly transformed into an ideology of the ruling class of landed proprietors. It was Constantine the Great who laid the foundation for medieval serfdom. The triumphal march of Christianity across Europe was accompanied by an extension of feudal economy. The religious orders played an extremely important role in the progress of civilization, which consisted in that epoch of developing agriculture on the basis of serfdom. There is little astonishing in the fact that "born in Judaism, formed at first exclusively of Jews, Christianity nevertheless nowhere during the first four centuries finds more difficulty than among them in acquiring partisans for its doctrine." (Juster, *The Jews in the Roman Empire*.) As a matter of fact, Christian mentality during the first ten centuries of our era viewed everything connected with economic life from the basic standpoint "that a merchant can with difficulty do work pleasing to God" and that "all trade implies a greater or lesser amount of cheating." (Henri Laurent, *Religion and Business*.) The life of the Jews appeared completely incomprehensible to Saint Ambrose who lived in the Fourth Century. He despised the wealth of the Jews profoundly and firmly believed that they would be punished for it by eternal damnation.

The fierce hostility of the Jews toward Catholicism and their determination to preserve a religion which admirably expressed their social interests are therefore completely natural. It is not the loyalty of the Jews to their faith which explains their preservation as a distinct social group; on the contrary, it is their preservation as a distinct social group which explains their attachment to their faith.

Nevertheless, like the hostility in antiquity toward the Jews, Christian anti-Semitism, in the first ten centuries of the Christian era, never went to the extreme of demanding the annihilation of Judaism. Whereas official Christianity mercilessly persecuted paganism and heresies, it tolerated the Jewish religion. The condition of the Jews continued to improve during the decline of the Roman Empire, after the complete triumph of Christianity and up till the Twelfth Century. The more economic decay deepened, all the more did the commercial role of the Jews grow in importance. In the Tenth Century, they constituted the sole economic link between Europe and Asia.

4. It is only from the Twelfth Century on, parallel with the economic development of Western Europe, with the growth of cities and the formation of a native commercial and industrial class, that the condition of the Jews begins to worsen seriously, leading to their almost complete elimination from most of the Western countries. Persecutions of the Jews take on increasingly violent forms. As against this, in the backward countries of Eastern Europe, their condition continues to remain flourishing up to a fairly recent period.

From these few preliminary considerations, we can see how false is the general conception prevailing in the sphere of Jewish history. *Above all the Jews constitute historically a social group with a specific economic function. They are a class, or still better, a people-class.*

Here is a fairly accurate picture of their economic function:

"The peasant and the lord during the Middle Ages are not producers of merchandise. It is true that they exchange their surpluses on occasion, but exchange is for them something fundamentally alien, an exception. Thus, neither the lord nor the peasant generally possess large sums of money. The greatest part of their wealth consists of use values, of wheat, cattle, etc. Circulation of merchandise, circulation of money-capital, and money economy in general are fundamentally alien to this form of society. Capital lives, according to the clear expression of Marx, in the pores of this society. It is into these pores that the Jew penetrated." (Otto Bauer, *The National Question*.)

The concept of class does not at all contradict the concept of people. It is because the Jews have preserved themselves as a social class that they have likewise retained certain of their religious, ethnic and linguistic traits.

This identification of a class with a people (or race) is far from being exceptional in precapitalist societies. Social classes in antiquity are frequently distinguished by a more or less national or racial character. "The upper and lower classes . . . are in many countries, simply the conquering peoples and the enslaved peoples of a previous epoch. The race of invaders crystallizes into a slothful and turbulent nobility. . . . The invaded race lives not by arms but by work" (Augustin Thierry, *History of the Conquest of England by the Normans*). Kautsky speaks in the same vein: "Different classes can acquire a specific racial character. On the other hand, the confluence of different races, each of whom has specialized in a specific occupation, can have as result that each of these races will occupy a different social position within the same community. It may happen that *the race becomes a class*." (Karl Kautsky, *Are the Jews a Race?*)

In passing, let us remark that inasmuch as the divisions between the various classes in precapitalist times are airtight, it often happens that national differences persist for a very long time. They manifest themselves particularly in language differences. The language of a conquered people used to be demoted to the role of a despised popular tongue, while the language of the conquerors became the language of "high society." In England, the Norman aristocracy continued for many centuries to use French while the people spoke Saxon. It is from the fusion of these two languages that modern English was formed. In the long run, the language differences faded away. The Burgundians, the Franks and other barbarians quickly started speaking the language of their subjects. On the other hand, the Arab conquerors imposed their own language on conquered peoples. These language differences between classes disappeared completely only with the advent of the bourgeoisie to power.

There is evidently a continuous interdependence between racial or national and class characteristics. The social position of the Jews has had a profound, determining influence on their national character.

There is no contradiction in this idea of a people-class; and it is even easier to show the correspondence between class and religion. Whenever a class attains a certain degree of maturity and consciousness, its opposition to the ruling class takes on religious forms. The heresies of the Albigenses, the Lollards, the Manichaeans, the Cathari and other innumerable sects that swarmed in medieval cities, were the initial religious manifestations of the growing opposition to the feudal order by the bourgeoisie and the people as a whole. These heresies nowhere reached the level of a dominant religion because of the relative weakness of the medieval bourgeoisie. They were savagely drowned in blood. It was only in the Seventeenth Century that

the bourgeoisie, increasing in power, was able to bring about the triumph of Lutheranism and above all of Calvinism and its English equivalents. We may add that this scientific view has been perforce accepted for a long time by all serious historians.

Whereas Catholicism expresses the interests of the landed nobility and of the feudal order, while Calvinism (or Puritanism) those of the bourgeoisie or capitalism, Judaism mirrors the interests of a precapitalist mercantile class.

The correspondence between class and religion is, naturally, not absolute. All of the gentry were not Catholics, nor were all adherents of Calvinism, bourgeois. But the classes do leave their imprint on religion.

What primarily distinguishes Jewish "capitalism" from capitalism proper so-called is that, by contrast with the latter, it is not the bearer of a new mode of production. "The merchants' capital is pure, separated from the extremes, the spheres of production, between which it intervenes." "The trading nations of the ancients existed like the gods of Epicurus in the intermediate worlds of the universe or rather like the Jews in the pores of Polish society." "Both usury and commerce exploit the various modes of production. They do not create it, but attack it from the outside." (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Volume III.)

The accumulation of money in the hands of the Jews did not arise from a special mode of production, from capitalist production. Surplus value (or surplus product) came from feudal exploitation and the lords were obliged to yield part of this surplus value to the Jews. Hence the antagonism between the Jews and feudalism, but hence likewise came the indestructible bond between them.

As for the lord, so too for the Jew, feudalism was mother earth. If the lord needed the Jew, the Jew also had need of the lord. It is by reason of this social position that the Jews were nowhere able to rise to the role of a ruling class. In feudal economy, the role of a merchant class could only be a clearly subordinate one. Judaism could only remain a more or less tolerated cult. (The sole known exception was a Mongol tribe (the Khazars) on the shores of the Caspian Sea, who adopted Judaism in the Eighth Century. Was there perchance a relation between the commercial function of this tribe and its conversion to Judaism?)

We have already seen that the Jews in antiquity had jurisdiction over their own community. The same was true in the Middle Ages. "In the plastic society of the Middle Ages each class not only lived according to its own customs, but also had its own special jurisdiction separate and apart from the juridical organization of the State, the Church had its officialities, the nobility had its feudal courts, the peasants their demesne courts. The bourgeoisie, in its turn, acquired its sheriffships." (Henri Pirenne, *Les Anciennes Democraties des Pays Bas*.)

The specific organization of the Jews was the *kehilah*. Each cluster of Jews was organized into a community (*kehilah*) which lived its own social life and had its own juridical organization. It was in Poland that this organization attained its highest degree of perfection. According to an ordinance issued by King Sigismund II in 1551, the Jews had the right to choose judges and rabbis whose duty it was to administer all their affairs. Only in actions between Jews and non-Jews did the *Voivodies Courts* intervene. Each Jewish cluster was free to choose a community council. The activities of this council, called *kahal*, were very extensive. It collected taxes for the State, apportioned the general and special taxes, directed the elementary schools and high schools (*Yeshivah*). It had jurisdiction over all questions concerning trade, craft-skills, charity.

It took care of settling conflicts between members of the community. The power of each *kahal* extended to the Jewish inhabitants of surrounding villages.

Jewish Autonomy

With time the various councils of Jewish communities made a practice of assembling regionally at regular intervals to discuss administrative, juridical and religious questions. These assemblies thus assumed the aspect of miniature parliaments.

On the occasion of the great fair of Lublin, a sort of general parliament assembled in which the representatives of Great Poland, Little Poland, Podolia and Volynia participated. This parliament was called *Vaad Arba Aratzoth*, or the Council of the Four Countries.

Traditional Jewish historians have not failed to discern a form of national autonomy in this organization. "In ancient Poland," says Doubnov, "the Jews constituted a nation having autonomy, with its own internal administration, courts and a certain juridical independence."

Clearly, it is a gross anachronism to speak of national autonomy in the Sixteenth Century. This epoch knew nothing of the national question. In feudal society, only the classes had their special jurisdictions. Jewish autonomy is to be explained by the specific social and economic position of the Jews and not at all by their "nationality."

Its linguistic evolution also reflects the specific social position of Judaism.

Hebrew disappeared very early as a living language. The Jews everywhere adopted the languages of the peoples among whom they lived. As early as the Fifth Century before Christ, the Jews of the *Diaspora* spoke Aramaic. Later, they mainly used Greek. "The epitaphs of the Jewish cemeteries of Rome are mainly Greek, worded in a jargon that is barely understandable. Some are Latin; none is Hebrew." (Friedlaender, *Sittengeschichte Roms*.) But this linguistic adaptation generally occurred in the form of a new dialect in which we again find some Hebraic expressions. There existed at various times in history Judo-Arabic, Judo-Persian, Judo-Provençal, Judo-Portuguese, Judo-Spanish and other dialects, including, of course, Judo-German which has become present day Yiddish. The dialect thus expresses the two contradictory tendencies which have characterized Jewish life: the tendency to integration in the surrounding society and the tendency to isolation, deriving from the socio-economic situation of Judaism.

It is only where the Jews cease constituting a special social group that they become completely assimilated in the surrounding society. "Assimilation is not a new phenomenon in Jewish history," states the Zionist sociologist Ruppin in his book, *Les Juifs Dans le Monde Moderne*.

In reality, while Jewish history is the history of the preservation of Judaism, it is at the same time the history of the assimilation of large sections of Judaism. "In North Africa, before the rule of Islam, many Jews worked at *agriculture* but the majority of them were absorbed by the local population." (*Idem.*) This assimilation is explained by the fact that the Jews by turning agriculturalists ceased to constitute a separate class. "Had the Jews devoted themselves to agriculture, they would have been dispersed throughout the country; and this would, in a few generations, have led to their complete assimilation to the rest of the population despite the religious differences. But addicted to commerce and concentrated in cities, they formed

separate communities, associating and marrying only among themselves." (*Idem.*)

Let us also recall the numerous conversions of Jewish landed proprietors in Germany in the Fourth Century; the complete disappearance of the Jewish warrior tribes of Arabia; the assimilation of the Jews in South America, in Surinam, etc. In the epoch of the development of capitalism, from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century, assimilation in Western Europe, generally meant penetration into the Christian capitalist class. The penetration of the Jews into the capitalist class may be compared to the "capitalization" of feudal properties. In the latter case, too, the struggle of the bourgeoisie against feudalism terminated in some cases, by the total expropriation of the feudal class (as in France) and in other cases by the penetration of feudal elements into the capitalist class (as in England and Belgium). Capitalist development has had a similar effect upon the Jews. In some cases they were assimilated; in others, they were eliminated.

The law of assimilation might be formulated as follows: Wherever the Jews cease to constitute a class, they lose more or less rapidly, their ethnical, religious and linguistic characteristics; they become assimilated.

It ought to be added parenthetically that as a general rule, the persecutions of the Jews were social in character. But the lag of ideology behind the social superstructure can account for certain *purely religious persecutions*. In some regions, the Jews were able to preserve their special religion for a fairly long time despite their transformation into agriculturalists. In such cases, the persecutions were designed to *hasten* their conversion. What distinguishes *religious persecutions* from *social persecutions* (under a religious guise) is their less violent character and the feeble resistance of the Jews. Thus, it appears that in Visigoth Spain the Jews were in part agriculturalists. Consequently, the Visigoth kings never thought of expelling them, as Ferdinand and Isabella did later. On the whole, purely religious persecutions must be considered as exceptional.

It is very hard to trace Jewish history in Europe at several important periods, because the economic, social and political conditions were so different in various countries. Whereas Poland and the Ukraine were completely feudal at the end of the Eighteenth Century, we witness in Western Europe an accelerated development of capitalism during this same period. It is easy to understand that the situation of the Jews in Poland bore far more resemblance to the situation of the French Jews in the Carolingian era than to that of their co-religionists in Bordeaux or Paris. "The Portuguese Jew of Bordeaux and the German Jew of Metz are two absolutely different beings," wrote a French Jew to Voltaire. The rich bourgeois Jews of France or Holland had virtually nothing in common with the Polish Jews who constituted a class in feudal society.

Despite the marked differences in conditions and in the tempo of economic development of the various European countries inhabited by the Jews, a careful study permits the delineation of the following main stages of their history.

I. Precapitalist Period

This was also the period of the greatest prosperity of the Jews. Commercial and usurious "capital" found great possibilities for expansion in feudal society. The Jews were protected by the kings and princes and their relations with other classes were in general good.

This situation lasted up to the Eleventh Century in Western

Europe. The Carolingian epoch, the culminating point of feudal development, was also the apex of Jewish prosperity.

Feudal economy continued to dominate Eastern Europe till the end of the Eighteenth Century. And the center of Jewish life shifted more and more to that area.

II. Period of Medieval Capitalism

From the Eleventh Century on, Western Europe entered a period of intensive economic development. The first stage of this evolution was characterized by the creation of a corporative industry and a native merchant bourgeoisie. The penetration of mercantile economy into the agricultural domain determined the second stage.

The growth of cities and of a native merchant class brought with it the complete elimination of the Jews from commerce. They became usurers whose principal clientele consisted of the nobility and the kings. But the mercantile transformation of agricultural economy resulted in undermining these positions as well.

The relative abundance of money enabled the nobility to throw off the yoke of the usurer. The Jews were driven from one country after another. Others became assimilated, being absorbed mainly by the native bourgeoisie.

In certain cities, principally in Germany and in Italy, the Jews became primarily loan-makers to the popular masses, the peasants and the artisans. On becoming petty usurers exploiting the people, they were often victims of bloody uprisings.

In general, the period of medieval capitalism was that of the most violent Jewish persecutions. Jewish "capital" came into conflict with all classes of society.

But the unevenness of economic development of Western European countries operated to alter the forms of anti-Semitic struggles.

In one country, it was the nobility which directed the struggle against the Jews; in others, it was the bourgeoisie, and in Germany, it was the people who unleashed the movement.

Medieval capitalism was practically unknown in Eastern Europe. There was no separation between merchants' capital and usurious capital. In contrast to Western Europe where the Jew became synonymous with the usurer, the Jews in Eastern Europe remained mainly traders and middlemen. Whereas the Jews were progressively eliminated from the countries of the West, they constantly strengthened their position in Eastern Europe. It was only in the Nineteenth Century that the development of capitalism (it is no longer corporative capitalism this time, but modern capitalism, which appears on the scene) began to shake the prosperous condition of the Russian and Polish Jews. "The poverty of the Jews in Russia dates only from the abolition of serfdom and of the feudal regime in rural property. So long as the former and the latter existed, the Jews found wide possibilities for subsisting as merchants and middlemen." (Sombart, *L'Apogée du Capitalisme*.)

III. Period of Manufacture and Industrial Capitalism

The capitalist period, properly speaking, began in the epoch of the Renaissance and manifested itself at first by a tremendous expansion of commerce and the development of manufactures.

In the measures that the Jews survived in Western Europe, and only a few were left there, they took part in the development of capitalism. But the theory of Sombart, who attributes a decisive activity to them in the development of capitalism,

belongs to the sphere of fantasy. Precisely because the Jews represented a primitive capitalism (mercantile and usurious), the development of modern capitalism could prove only fatal to their social position.

This fact does not at all exclude—far from it—the individual participation of Jews in the creation of modern capitalism. But wherever the Jews were integrated into the capitalist class, there *they were likewise assimilated*. The Jew, as a great entrepreneur or shareholder of the Dutch or English India Company, was already on the threshold of baptism, a threshold, moreover, which he crossed with the greatest of ease. The progress of capitalism went hand in hand with the assimilation of the Jews in Western Europe.

If Judaism did not completely disappear in the West, it was owing to the massive influx of Jews from Eastern Europe. The Jewish question, which is now posed on a world scale, therefore results primarily from the situation of Eastern Judaism. This situation is, in turn, a product of the lag in economic development of this part of the world. The special causes of Jewish emigration are thus linked with the general causes behind the emigration movement of the Nineteenth Century.

The general emigration of the Nineteenth Century was caused in large measure by the failure of capitalist development to keep pace with the crumbling of feudal economy or manufacture economy. The ranks of the English peasants, evicted by the capitalization of rural economy, were swelled by the artisan or manufacturing workers displaced by machines. These peasant and artisan masses, eliminated by the new economic system, were driven to seek a livelihood across the ocean. But this situation was not indefinitely prolonged. Because of the rapid development of the productive forces in Western Europe, the section of the population deprived of its means of subsistence was presently able to find sufficient work in industry. That is the reason why, in Germany, for instance, emigration to America, which was very strong in the middle of the Nineteenth Century, dwindled almost completely towards the end of the century. The same applies to England and other countries of Western Europe.

But while the disequilibrium between the crumbling of feudalism and the development of capitalism was disappearing in Western Europe, it was growing worse in the backward East-European countries. The destruction of feudal economy and primitive forms of capitalism proceeded there much more rapidly than the development of modern capitalism. Increasingly greater masses of peasants and artisans had to seek their road of salvation in emigration. At the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, it was principally the English, the Irish, the Germans and the Scandinavians who formed the bulk of immigrants to America. The Slavic and Jewish element became dominant toward the end of the Nineteenth Century among the masses heading for America.

At the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, the Jewish masses sought new roads of immigration. But at first, it was toward the interior of Russia and Germany that they headed. The Jews succeeded in penetrating the great industrial and commercial centers where they played an important role as traders and industrialists. Here we come upon a new and important fact: For the first time in centuries a Jewish proletariat was born. The people-class began to differentiate socially.

The Jewish proletariat, however, remained concentrated mainly in the sector of consumers' goods industry. It was primarily of the artisan type. In the same measure as large-scale industry expanded its field of exploitation, the artisan branches of economy declined. The workshop was superseded

by the factory. And it thus turned out that the integration of Jews into capitalist economy still remained extremely precarious. It was not alone the "precapitalist" merchant who was forced to migrate, but also the Jewish artisan worker. Jewish masses streamed in ever larger numbers from Eastern Europe to the West and to America. The solution of the Jewish question, that is to say, the complete absorption of the Jews into economic life, thus became a world problem.

IV. The Decline of Capitalism

By socially differentiating Judaism, by integrating the latter into economic life and by emigration, capitalism has laid the bases for the solution of the Jewish problem. But capitalism has failed to solve it. On the contrary, the fearsome crisis of the

capitalist regime in the Twentieth Century has aggravated the plight of the Jews to an unparalleled degree. The Jews, driven from their economic positions under feudalism, could not be integrated into a capitalist economy in utter decay. In its convulsions, capitalism casts out even those Jewish elements which it has not yet completely assimilated.

Everywhere is rife the savage anti-Semitism of the middle classes, who are being choked to death under the weight of capitalist contradictions. Big capital exploits this elemental anti-Semitism of the petty bourgeoisie in order to mobilize the masses around the banner of racism.

The Jews are being strangled between the jaws of two systems: feudalism and capitalism, each feeding the rottenness of the other.

Translated by Ed Wilde.

Behind the Scenes of World War II

By RALPH GRAHAM

NOTE: Additional light is shed on the backstage politics of World War II in the book *As He Saw It*, by Elliott Roosevelt, of which a pre-publication condensation is being published serially by *Look* magazine. Elliott Roosevelt, son of the late President, was with his father at wartime conferences of the Big Three, the Big Four and the Big Five, and has intimate knowledge of the secret deals made there and the disagreements between the Allied Powers. In the second installment of the *Look* series (September 17), the junior Roosevelt tells what transpired at the Casablanca conference in January 1943.

Among other things, he confirms what Ingersoll says about British preoccupation with a Balkan route into Europe. He relates that "the American Joint Chiefs of Staff brought Father up to date on plans thus far discussed with

their British opposites. It developed that they were opposites in more ways than one, that the British chiefs had worked out with Churchill an agenda differing considerably from the American agenda. Instead of talks about massive thrusts against the flanks of Europe, the British were intent on smaller actions in the Mediterranean. Sicily, and other way-stations to victory, were mentioned; the Dodecanese Islands, for example, leading to Greece, and a push into the mountainous Balkans. . . . Always he (Churchill) was of the opinion that we should enter Europe in such a way as to meet the Red Army in central Europe, so that Britain's sphere of influence would be maintained as far east as possible."

The late President was ever conscious of America's imperialist destiny and lost no oppor-

tunity of advancing Wall Street's interests at the expense of the British ally. A banquet in Casablanca, young Roosevelt relates, was attended by the Sultan of Morocco. "Father and the Sultan were chatting about the wealth of natural resources in Morocco. Churchill changed the subject, but the Sultan returned to it again. Father remarked on how the British and French financiers had dredged riches out of colonies and raised the question of possible oil deposits in Morocco. He mentioned that the Sultan might engage firms—American firms—to carry out a development program. . . . The Sultan's face glowed. . . . It was a delightful dinner. Everybody—with one exception—enjoyed himself completely. Glowering, biting at his cigar, Britain's Prime Minister followed the Sultan from the dining room."—R. G.

* * *

Official war histories as a rule tell virtually nothing of the politics of war. Treating war as an independent phenomenon, they disclose strategic plans, describe the order of battle, and record campaign results—all in terms of the military art itself. Reading the map-strewn reports of Generals Marshall and Eisenhower, one gets just that and nothing more. It is as if one were watching a game played for no particular reason but the gratification of the players and the edification of the spectators. Yet if we accept the well-established dictum that war is a continuation of politics, then it is obvious that the politics of war are its most important aspect. The sanguinary clashes of men massed in armies, the corpse-strewn battlefields, the devastated cities, are the end result of political developments and political decisions.

The politics of the First World War were understood and proclaimed by Marxists long before the first shots were fired. The true aims of the warring states accorded not at all with the altruistic purposes which they were obliged to avow in order to get men to fight and kill each other. Conclusive empiric proof of this fact came when the Bolsheviks published the secret war treaties, and the victors drafted the Versailles "peace." The predatory character of World War I then became apparent to all mankind. So also in the case of World War II. The revolu-

tionary Marxists—the Trotskyists—were its sole consistent opponents. They alone proclaimed its true character as a predatory war on all sides as far as the imperialists were concerned.

The empiric truth of this estimation is now being made manifest in, among other things, the robber treaties which the victors are imposing on the vanquished. While the bloody holocaust was in progress, the hired enlighteners of public opinion did their level best to prop up the myth of a "war for democracy" against fascism and Japanese militarism, by studiously avoiding any reference to the *real* political aims of the "democratic" participants. The top war-planners conferred in the strictest secrecy. Censorship prevented writers from revealing unpalatable facts which, despite all the secrecy, they were able to obtain.

Now the full truth is beginning to be uncovered. Books of the "Now It Can Be Told" variety are making their appearance. First among them are Ralph Ingersoll's *Top Secret* (New York, 1946, Harcourt, Brace and Company, \$3.00) and Fred Eldridge's *Wrath in Burma* (New York, 1946, Doubleday & Company, Inc., \$3.00). Ingersoll's book is a newspaperman's story of the Allied invasion of Europe. The author is the editor of the New York newspaper *PM* and was on the planning staff of SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces)

during the war. Eldridge is a young reporter who went through the Burma campaigns with Stilwell as the latter's public relations officer. Neither of these books tells the full story of the politics behind the European and Burma campaigns, for they are essentially campaign reports. Yet each lifts a sizable corner of the curtain which hid the material interests at work behind the scenes. For this they are valuable.

Political considerations, the advancement of the interests of the imperialist belligerents, being the motivating factor which produces war, also necessarily enter as a dominating element into strategical and even tactical planning. This is well illustrated by Ingersoll in his description of the conflicting policies of the United States and Great Britain in the war against the Axis. While these two great Powers were united for a common *general* military objective, they nevertheless remained imperialist rivals with clashing world interests and found it difficult for that reason to agree on common plans of action. Says Ingersoll:

Both the British Empire and the United States of America sought the complete destruction of the armed forces of the German, Japanese and Italian Empires.

The United States of America sought this practically without qualification—that is, sought to destroy the armed forces of the enemy in the shortest possible time, by the most direct route, with only reasonable regard for risk to life and limb and no regard whatever for the expenditure of material resources. In seeking to win the war, the United States of America had no regard, either, for political considerations—it was as willing to trade with a Darlan to secure an advantage in Africa as it was to allow Stalin an advantage in the Balkans, both acts having only to pass the single test that they speeded final victory over the armed forces of the Axis. You might sum up the American objective as: "To destroy the armed forces of the Axis PERIOD."

The British Empire also sought to destroy the armed forces of the Axis—but only by the employment of such strategy as would best further the highly complex economic and political interests of the British Empire. In the chemical sense of the word, there is simply no such thing as a "pure" British military objective—or at least there is no such thing in any military action larger than a skirmish. The British *always* mix political with military motives.

Ingersoll displays here, as he does throughout his book, a fairly objective attitude toward British imperialism and its aims. But as an apologist for American imperialism, he displays an equally obvious penchant for idealizing his own imperialist masters.

Britain, it must be remembered, entered the war as a declining world power, desperately trying to hold on to a position which no longer corresponded with economic reality. Its Empire, and for a while even its position as an island kingdom, was menaced by the Axis. But it was menaced, too, by its American "ally" on the other side of the Atlantic. And it was ever fearful of the prospect of Stalin's expansionism. To meet the more immediate menace of the Axis, it was obliged to enter into a war coalition with the powerful transatlantic rival and with the Soviet Union. In defeat by the Axis it would suffer extinction. In victory it would have to contend with its powerful allies of yesterday. The victory could turn out to be of the Pyrrhic variety. It was therefore essential for the British imperialists, that in the very midst of the war, they should try to strengthen old positions, recover positions lost, gain new ones if possible, and generally prepare to meet the challengers of tomorrow.

Unlike Britain, the post-war dominance of American imperialism was assured as the corollary of its economic and financial hegemony, which in turn assured military ascendancy. After the victory the U.S. could proceed, more or less at its leisure, to garner the fruits. American imperialist ambitions, because of

their global scope and magnitude, assumed a geographic formlessness in which particular objectives were obscured and submerged. This made it easy for the propagandists of U.S. imperialism to portray American participation in the war as a grand, disinterested crusade to bring "democracy" to all the world.

Nevertheless, Ingersoll to the contrary notwithstanding, the American imperialists were not at all tardy in picking up what they could, along the path that led them to victory. They grabbed up military bases around the world and assiduously penetrated the world's markets as first installments on their program of *Pax Americana*.

Soon after Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt and Churchill agreed that first attention should be given to defeating the forces of the Axis in Europe, while conducting a "holding war" against Japan. With the focus thus narrowed to the European sphere, says Ingersoll, "the conflict between British and American objectives was seen to be primarily a conflict over whether the principal road into Europe should be via the Mediterranean or across the English Channel." A trans-Channel invasion was indeed agreed upon, but in some "mysterious" manner it transpired that armies, shipping and equipment assembled for that operation got diverted—first to the campaign in North Africa, then to Sicily, then to Italy.

The Italian Campaign

The North African campaign was essential for opening the western Mediterranean to Allied shipping. The Sicilian campaign which followed was, according to Ingersoll, a "concession invasion"—a concession to British demands by the U.S.—and was never regarded as a major strategic operation to be followed up by a plunge into Italy. Yet that is exactly what happened. It seems that the British, in command of the biggest staging area of the European phase of the war—England itself—were able to commit forces to action where they chose and then compel American acquiescence and aid. And so, although on the highest planning levels the trans-Channel invasion had top priority, "all the resources England and American could produce and transport" were drained by the Sicilian and later the Italian campaigns, with the result that the trans-Channel invasion was postponed, not once but several times.

Roosevelt and Churchill had agreed early in 1942 that a trans-Channel invasion should be undertaken in the fall of that year. The North African campaign then intervened. Preparations meanwhile went forward and another date was set. Then came the landings in Sicily and Italy. There was still another delay and still another date set. D-day didn't arrive until June 6, 1944.

The campaigns in Sicily and Italy were essential from the point of view of British aims. But in light of the over-all strategy of defeating the Axis as quickly and as cheaply as possible, they were stupid and meaningless, besides being very costly. Of the campaign in Italy, Ingersoll proves that it "never made military sense." The defeat of Germany would have meant the automatic collapse of Italy and of Germany's Balkan satellites. No military action against them would have been necessary. As it was, mountains of corpses were piled up in the Italian peninsula and the country was devastated from end to end. The war as a whole was needlessly prolonged. But snuffed-out lives and ruined cities count but little in imperialist calculations.

From the first, as Ingersoll explains, Britain had a "passionate preoccupation over the Balkan route into Germany" and hence over an invasion of Italy, since Italy is the main gateway to the Balkans. It was a preoccupation which envisioned a

campaign through the Balkans as an alternative to a trans-Channel thrust into Germany.

This preoccupation was in the beginning, and remained until the end, a constant force, always in conflict with American military strategy in the European Theater. It carried the British State to such lengths that the Prime Minister himself even coined a deceptive phrase to popularize it—putting into circulation the notion that the most ornery and easily defended mountain barriers on the Continent constituted “the soft underbelly of Europe.”

After Rommel had been defeated in North Africa and British garrisons were comfortably ensconced in the Italian colonies, the western Mediterranean became safe for Allied shipping. Britain was concerned next to open the eastern Mediterranean and therewith her lifeline to India and the Far East, where she viewed with grave misgivings the American monopoly of the war against Japan. The Italian campaign was a logical next step to the British, for in addition to opening Britain's lifeline it could furnish a springboard for a drive into the Balkans.

The reason for British preoccupation with the Balkans is obvious. As Ingersoll remarks:

It was reasonable of them . . . to have preferred the Balkans to the Channel route; it served their long-term interests, as they understood them, to get to the Balkans before the Russians. This was the secret-that-was-no-secret of their preoccupation with the Balkan route to victory.

The Red Army had already turned the tide of the German invasion. Churchill wanted to drive an Allied wedge north and south through eastern Europe to circumvent Soviet conquest of the Balkans. A Soviet-dominated Europe was the nightmare of British imperialism. But aside from the Sicilian and Italian campaigns, the American strategical concept prevailed: invasion of the German stronghold from the West. The Yankee imperialists felt they could deal with Stalin later.

Stalin was of course well aware of Churchill's Balkan preoccupation and was pressing insistently for a “second front” in the West. Roosevelt was not prepared to risk a break in the alliance with the Soviet Union in order to satisfy Britain's eastern European aims. Churchill, on the other hand, wanted the Russians to be kept fighting as hard as possible without the aid of a second front in the West. As Ingersoll says, “the longer the Russians fought, the weaker the Russians would be at the end of the war and the better chance the British had, vis-a-vis the Russians, in the post-war struggle for the domination of Europe.”

Although Churchill was unable to engineer a Balkan campaign, the British Field Marshal Alexander was able to scrape together from the Allied war pool a motley army of Poles, Frenchmen, Brazilians and Canadians, plus some Americans and British, to continue his campaign all the way up the Italian boot to the Apennine Mountains. In April 1945 he was able to cross the Po and get within striking distance of Trieste—just before the European war ended. Trieste, the gateway to the Balkans, was thus saved from Tito—and Stalin.

After France had been overrun by the Allied armies, a new Anglo-American conflict developed on the question of how Germany should be invaded. The British wanted to drive through the lowlands of Holland and across the Hamburg plains, in order to strike directly at Berlin. The Americans preferred what was known as the “Frankfurt gap”—a drive clear across the waistline of Germany. Their strategists believed German defense would be at its strongest on the northern plains, which are cut by big rivers and thousands of tiny waterways and which, while flat, are so low that the ground was not solid enough to support

heavily armored vehicles off the roads. The Frankfurt gap, on the other hand, was a rocky road which required the cracking of Metz, the crossing of the Moselle and the Saar, and a penetration of the West Wall at a place where it was densest. But offsetting these obstacles, the Frankfurt gap route offered, says Ingersoll:

1. The crossing of the Rhine where it was only half the width it attained near its mouth.
2. Broad unfortified valleys for avenues (the Hamburg plains were packed with military installations, organized into training grounds for the German army).
3. Firm footing for vehicles, which could leave the roads anywhere.
4. The strong possibility of surprise, since it was known that the Germans were vastly more apprehensive about the northern route which led so directly to their capital.
5. At the far end of the Frankfurt corridor into Germany there were magnificent possibilities for strategic maneuver. An army breaking through there had the free choice of three directions in which to exploit—north to Berlin; east, to join with the Russians; or south, into Bavaria and Austria.

The deeper one drove into the Hamburg plains, on the other hand, the more obvious one's intentions became and the more easily could the enemy concentrate against them.

Despite these weighty considerations, the British stubbornly favored the Hamburg route for the very simple reason that they “wanted Berlin and the north coast of Germany as insurance that in the event of a German collapse these should not fall into the hands of the Russians.” As it transpired, both strategies were employed. Montgomery's armies took the Hamburg plains route, while the American General Bradley drove through the waist of Germany to link up with the Red Army on the Elbe. But Stalin got to Berlin first.

It was at the Elbe that the last Anglo-American clash occurred over policy in the European war. The episode, never revealed in the press, is another instructive example of the imperialist politics always kept hidden in the background. Here it is as related by Ingersoll:

It was some time after the end of the war that British, American and Russian spheres of action in Germany were announced in the press. Actually they had been determined and formally agreed upon at Yalta. They were posted on our Army Group maps. We had a special map just for their study, two months before the end of the war. The only uncertain lines were the borders of the French area, which was still under negotiation, France not having been represented at Yalta.

Bradley's plan, after striking through to the Elbe—which was deep in the territory which had been ceded to the Russians at the Yalta conference—was to retreat as soon as possible to within the American boundaries. Very practical considerations moved him. We had no sooner entered Germany than we began uncovering not thousands, but tens and finally hundreds of thousands of displaced persons and liberated prisoners of war, slave laborers and sufferers in concentration camps. An enormous percentage of them came from Russia and eastern Europe. These multitudes constituted a very grave problem to us. UNRRA's efforts were like a taxicab company's trying to move all of the commuters out of New York between five and seven. So Bradley ordered that all Russians, Poles and eastern Europeans migrate forward in the wake of the armies, planning to concentrate them in those Russian areas which he overran; then, drawing back, he would be able to give them back to the Russians without the expenditure of a gallon of gasoline or an hour's argument.

By the time Bradley reached the Elbe, Roosevelt was dead. One evening soon after Roosevelt's death, Churchill called Bradley personally, and going over Eisenhower's head asked him not to retreat from the Elbe—because he, Churchill, wished this area with which to bargain further with the Russians. Bradley said he thought this might make trouble; it was sure to be misinterpreted, he felt, since

the boundaries had already been formally agreed upon . . . so he simply passed the problem back to the Supreme Allied Commander.

As we see, the British imperialists were far more fearful than their American allies needed to be, about Soviet domination of eastern Europe and the Balkans. As the war progressed, this concern took precedence over a speedy military defeat of the Axis. Allied victory was in sight anyway. What matter if the agony were prolonged?

* * *

On the much smaller scale of the war in Burma, we observe a similar situation: sordid material motives lurking behind the military campaigns. Japan's armies battered down the weak British colonial defenses, swarmed into Burma and threatened neighboring India, Britain's greatest colonial possession. In the campaigns to retake Burma, it was not at all a question of liberating the Burmese, but of restoring British colonial rule. To the Yankee imperialists, Burma was a sort of side-show of the war, but an important one at that. They wanted to keep China in the war and the only way to do that was to open a supply route to China through Burma. The American, British and Chinese allies were perpetually at loggerheads. The conflicts had nothing whatever to do with questions of "pure" strategy. In every case, as Eldridge reveals in his book, it was the broad political and material interests of the participants which produced the disagreements.

Imperialist Intrigues

At the outset, the British refused to permit Chinese troops to enter Burma in sufficient numbers to hold the Japanese back from China's frontier. They preferred to see all Burma overrun by the troops of Japan rather than permit the Chinese to do what they themselves were incapable of doing. A Chinese victory in Burma would have enhanced China's prestige, and, correspondingly, reduced the prestige of British imperialism which already was at a low ebb. And it might have been difficult to get the Chinese out after the war. American reinforcements could not be brought in, because the port of Rangoon was in Japanese hands and the Japanese navy and air force was in control of all East Asiatic waters. With unrest seething in India, the British would not risk Indian detachments in combat with the Japanese. So the Allied forces that were in Burma—British, American and Chinese—got thrown out in a swift debacle which Stilwell described as "a hell of a licking."

When the time came to execute plans for the retaking of Burma, plans calling for the participation of British-Indian and Chinese-American forces, the conflicts and the bickerings grew.

The "Allies" worked continuously at cross purposes. The British kept practically all the troops they had raised in India for holding the 385,000,000 people of that sub-continent in continued subjection to their rule. They would not spare any sizable forces for the task of "freeing" Burma. The U. S. was keeping its main forces for the assault on the Philippines and Japan, which were the key to the domination of the Pacific. Stilwell's job was to train and command Chinese troops both to protect American air bases in China and to co-operate with the British in Burma. But military lend-lease intended for use in China and Burma was under the control of Chiang Kai-shek. The Chinese dictator kept these supplies for use against the Stalinist-dominated armies in China. Nor would he furnish adequate replacements for Stilwell's Chinese divisions in Burma. He was holding his troops intact for later use in civil war against Yen-an. All through the war he kept his best divisions at the job of blockading the "Red" areas in China's northwest. This conservation of Chiang's forces was carried to such lengths that Chiang even permitted the Japanese to overrun American air bases in southwest China rather than commit the necessary number of troops to their defense. When Stilwell, frustrated and angry, demanded that Kuomintang troops blockading Yen-an be deployed against the Japanese, Chiang responded by demanding Stilwell's recall.

Chiang, of course, wanted the Japanese driven from China. But he figured that once Japan had been conquered in her homeland, the Japanese occupation of China would automatically collapse—which it did. Therefore it was of more immediate importance to Chiang to conserve his forces for the fight with the Stalinist-dominated forces which he knew must follow the war. Meanwhile he strove to squeeze as much lend-lease as he could from the American ally.

The British similarly wanted to recover Burma. But they knew it would fall into their lap like a ripe plum, together with Malaya and Hongkong, as soon as Japan was defeated. All they wanted in Burma was a sort of token campaign which would keep the Japanese forces there busy and prevent them from making incursions into India. Meanwhile they husbanded their manpower and resources for a quick walk-back into their East Asiatic possessions when the shooting was over. This, too, happened.

War for democracy? The liberation of Asia from Japanese imperialism? These were just deceptive slogans for mass consumption. The Second World War like the First was fought by the imperialists in their own interests. Not "democracy" and "liberation" were the stakes, but world domination, colonies, markets, spheres of influence, profits.

Indian Correspondence

By K. TILAK

The Congress leaders from the time of their release from prison last year have made clear that they are ready to compromise with British imperialism. Their present attitude in the recently concluded Cabinet Mission negotiations shows clearly that the Indian bourgeoisie are no longer thinking in terms of "struggle" but only of settlement with British imperialism.

The proposals of the Cabinet Mission are both of a long-term and short-term character. The long-term proposals claim to provide machinery by which India can frame its own con-

stitution and advance peacefully to independence. The reality, however, is quite otherwise. In the first place the so-called Constituent Assembly (in reality a constitution-drafting body) is not to be chosen by direct, universal franchise. It is to be a body chosen by *indirect* and *very limited* franchise. In fact, it is to be chosen by the members of the present provincial legislatures, who were elected at the February-March 1946 elections on quite other issues and not at all on the question of election for a constituent assembly. Secondly, the Indian Native States

(which receive a substantial representation) are to be represented by the nominees of the autocratic Princes and not by representatives elected by the States' subjects. Thirdly, the concessions that have been made to satisfy the Moslem League (a weak centre, two sub-federations comprising the Moslem majority provinces, and the proviso that nothing can be passed in the "Constituent Assembly" on any subject of major communal importance without the assent of a majority of the two major communities—Hindus and Moslems) simply invite a breakdown at any stage of the proceedings of this unique "Constituent Assembly." And when one considers that the Moslem League is a party of feudalists who have always in practice been the servitors of the imperialists, it is not difficult to foretell that the scheme is bound to flounder.

In the event that a miracle takes place and the scheme goes through somehow, the British imperialists are prepared for this eventuality too. The decisions of the "Constituent Assembly" will have no sanction, the constitution it works out will have no force, *until* the Constituent Assembly enters into a Treaty with the British Government. As to what the terms of this treaty will be, no one seems to have even inquired. But it is safe to assume that they will be such as to nullify those clauses of the constitution prepared by the Constituent Assembly as would confer any real power on the Indian people. It is noteworthy that this treaty will be concluded while British troops are in occupation of India and will bear all the hall-marks of a "forced treaty."

The Congress has accepted these long-term proposals. It has, in its usual demagogic fashion, not failed to criticize the undesirable features of the proposals, but this has not prevented its acceptance. The Congress is thus doing its best to lull the people into the false belief that independence is around the corner, and that a peaceful transfer of power is in the offing (which means, of course, that any struggle or preparations for it become unnecessary!).

The short-term or interim proposals are meant to cover the period between now and when the treaty is concluded. These proposals are for the formation of an Interim Government composed of the representatives of the main parties (Congress and the Moslem League). This Interim Government, however, would have no real power, since the Viceroy's power of veto (which includes not only the power to disallow but also to initiate) continues. Thus, participation by Congress in this fake government would serve little purpose other than providing the Viceroy's government with a popular facade with which to cover its real imperialist character.

The Congress has rejected these interim government proposals. Not, however, for any of the reasons mentioned above, but because it was unable to secure the inclusion of a Nationalist Moslem nominee of Congress due to the objections of Mr. Jinnah, the President of the Moslem League, who claims his organization has the sole right to represent Moslems. If not for this difficulty, Congress was prepared to accept the interim proposals and join an Interim Government, thus completing its identification with the system of imperialist administration of India. [Since this report was written, the Moslem League has withdrawn, and an interim government has been formed, headed by the Congress leaders.—ed.] For, it should be remembered that Congress is in office today in seven provinces, loyally carrying out the administration for the British masters. These ministries have already proven themselves staunch protectors of "law and order." Strikes, for which the prescribed notice is not given, are illegal. The strikers are arrested and sentenced. Even demonstrations are quite often banned and demonstrators prosecuted.

The Madras Congress Government recently arrested twenty people for participating in protest demonstrations against the arrest of Jawaharlal Nehru by the Kashmir State authorities!

It should be noted that Congress is compromising with British imperialism precisely at a time when the mass mood is high. The masses have shown that they are prepared to take the path of struggle without the encouragement of, and even in spite of, their leaders. This was clear in the Calcutta demonstrations for the release of the Indian National Army prisoners. These demonstrations were composed mainly of the petty bourgeoisie and revealed the extent of discontent in their ranks. The petty bourgeoisie, however, are incapable (as the August 1942 struggle amply proved) of carrying on any sustained struggle against the imperialists without the leadership, either of the bourgeoisie or of the working class. Therefore, from our point of view, much more important than the Calcutta demonstrations, was the strike in Bombay in aid of the Royal Indian Navy mutineers. The Bombay workers, perhaps the most advanced in India, went on what was practically a general strike, with demonstrations and clashes with police and military, in support of the mutinous Indian sailors. The small Trotskyist group in Bombay was the first to call for the general strike. They plastered a section of the working class area with posters calling for strike in support of the naval ratings, and led a demonstration in the night, which was successful in calling out the night-shift workers in several mills. The Stalinists came out in support in the morning. The most significant fact about the Bombay events is that they took place in open defiance of the Congress leadership.

The situation was pregnant with possibilities. This was a time when the RAF strikes were just over, Indian naval ratings were striking all over India in sympathy, and there was wide support for the Indian sailors in the Indian army. But further development of the struggle was effectively stopped by the intervention of Patel, one of the Congress leaders, on whose advice the ratings surrendered. His guarantees of "no victimization," of course, proved to be worthless.

The Bombay incident is important for two reasons. First, it shows the growing consciousness of the masses. The Bombay workers struck on a major political question. In August 1942 they had supported the Congress. Now they supported the sailors. Secondly, the action has built a bond between the Indian workers and sailors (and indirectly with the soldiers too) which will be of immense value in the future when the masses will need the active support of the armed forces in their struggle against imperialism.

It is not, of course, entirely accidental that the masses are showing such militancy at a time when the bourgeoisie is dropping its opposition of the war days and embarking on a course of collaboration with British imperialism. The Indian bourgeoisie does not want any kind of mass struggle against imperialism *at any time* which it does not control and which it cannot stop. The recent manifestations of mass militancy, and particularly the working class action in Bombay, only reinforce the determination of Congress to come to a settlement with the imperialists. The alternative, a struggle—before which the struggle of August 1942 will pale into insignificance—is like a nightmare to them. They are doing their best to pacify the masses by deceiving them with the propaganda that independence is not far off, etc. And Congress influence is so great at the moment that it has succeeded in holding the masses back from action.

But it has not succeeded in holding back the workers from action on *economic* demands. This year has seen a series of widespread working class struggles for higher wages, against dismissals, etc., in every part of India. Congress efforts to throttle

these struggles have generally failed. (The only exception is the calling off of the All-India Railway General Strike, which was scheduled for June 27.) The Indian trade union movement, though it was never strong, is now definitely on the up-grade. Large sections of hitherto unorganized workers are now joining the unions.

The Communist Party of India, taking advantage of the illegalization of other parties and its own new-found legality, and the patronage of the imperialist government during the war years, built up an efficient organization throughout India as well as a powerful position in the trade union movement. Today, however, it is paying the price for the means it employed to secure these gains. Throughout India there is a wave of hostility against the Stalinists for their support of the imperialist war, and their opposition to the August 1942 struggle. This intense hostility is most widespread among the petty bourgeoisie. It is also true that the Congress leaders attempt to use it against Communism and the "internationalists," including the Trotskyists. But it cannot be gainsaid that the deep anti-Communist Party feeling springs from hatred of British imperialism and those who acted as its agents in 1942. (Sellers of our literature at meetings attended by predominantly petty bourgeois crowds in Calcutta, for instance, are often questioned as to whether the literature is "Communist." It is only by saying that it is "not Stalinist" or saying that it is "Trotskyist" that they are able to dispose of them!) If the situation of the Stalinists among the petty bourgeoisie is hopeless, their situation among the work-

ers is only a little better. The more politically minded layers of the working class have left them. But backward workers, who were unionized by the Stalinists during the war, still support them. The Stalinists have ceased having any widespread *political* influence anywhere. They have degenerated into a set of trade union bureaucrats with a more or less trade union following.

Even here, they are coming into competition with the Congress, which has, for its own nefarious purposes, entered the trade union field through an organization known as the *Hindustan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh* (Indian Workers Service League). The unions of the HMSS are based on class-collaboration, openly preach non-violence, and are in reality an instrument for the twin object of betraying the workers to the capitalists in their day-to-day struggle and for bringing the workers under the political influence of the bourgeois Congress. The Trotskyists are certain to find themselves in the position of defending unions, even though they are bureaucratically controlled by the Stalinists, against the menace of the HMSS.

The Trotskyist organization has, in the last few months, for the first time in its brief history, found opportunities for open work. In particular, it has found opportunities to enter the trade union field. We have already registered substantial gains. . . . The conclusion is perhaps justified that the few advances are likely to be only the first gains in the period we have just entered—a period in which the Bolshevik Leninist Party of India for the first time has a real chance to grow.

June 29, 1946.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

A Documentary History of the Fourth International

By LEON TROTSKY

The year 1929, which saw the crystallization of the Trotskyist movement on a world scale and on firm programmatic foundations, was likewise signalized by the outbreak of an internal struggle over the class character of the Soviet Union.

The event which precipitated this controversy in the Trotskyist ranks was the conflict between Moscow and Chiang Kai-shek over the disposition of the Chinese Eastern Railway. The imperialist bourgeoisie and its liberal choir-boys, of course, backed Chiang. Their hue and cry about Soviet "imperialism" found reverberations among many workers and among the still scattered ranks of the Trotskyists.

Under the pressure of bourgeois public opinion

elements professing adherence to Trotskyist ideas became hesitant about defending the USSR. Since some political justification had to be provided for this act of class desertion, attempts immediately ensued to revise the Marxist appraisal of the USSR.

The bellwether of this initial attempt at neo-revisionism was Hugo Urbahns, leader of the German oppositional group "Leninbund," who advanced in 1929 the idea that the USSR really represented a new type of state—"neither capitalist nor proletarian."

Trotsky unhesitatingly declared war against Urbahns and his co-thinkers. In September 1929 he wrote the first in a whole series of basic documents on the crucial question of the class

nature of the USSR, because attempts to revise it were repeatedly made in Trotsky's lifetime. Each time, beginning with Urbahns, Trotsky resolutely repulsed all those who simply played every possible variation on the theme originally scored by Urbahns in 1929.

Louzon, referred to in the text, was a French syndicalist, at the time one of the editors of *La Revolution Proletarienne*, organ of the Syndicalist League of France.

An English translation of this celebrated document, the first installment of which appears below, was originally published in *The Militant*. It has been checked against the Russian original and revised by John G. Wright.—Ed.

* * *

We have established that three tendencies exist in the international Communist movement, namely: the Right, the Centrist and the Left (Marxist) tendencies. But this classification does not exhaust the question, because it omits the ultra-Lefts. Meanwhile the latter continue to exist, engage in activities, commit blunders and threaten to discredit the cause of the Opposition.

To be sure, today there no longer are extant any, or hardly

any, ultra-Leftists of the naive-revolutionary "aggressive" variety to whom Lenin devoted his famous book [*The Infantile Sickness of Left-Communism*]. Similarly, few ultra-Leftists of the 1924-25 formation (Maslow and others) have remained in the Opposition. The experience of defeats has not failed to leave its imprint. But the lessons of these years have been far from assimilated by all the ultra-Lefts. Some freed themselves of prejudices,

while preserving the revolutionary spirit. But others dissipated the revolutionary spirit, while retaining the prejudices. At all events, there remain not a few *ultra-Lefts infected with skepticism*. They eagerly display a formal radicalism in all instances where they are not placed under an obligation to act. But in practical questions they most frequently incline toward opportunism.

Whereas reformism represents an irreconcilable enemy, ultra-Leftism represents an internal disease which acts as a deterrent in the struggle against the enemy. We must rid ourselves of this disease at all costs.

For several months I tried, through correspondence, to get from the Leninbund leadership a clear statement on the most fundamental questions of Communist politics. My attempts were in vain. The differences of opinion proved too great. Nothing remains except to bring them out into the open and submit them to a serious discussion. This is all the more necessary in view of the fact that the editorial board of the Leninbund publications has already initiated the discussion, after it became apparent that not only serious but positively *decisive* differences had arisen within the Left Communist Opposition over the Sino-Soviet conflict. Groupings have already been formed over this issue. Naturally, individual shifts will still take place. A number of comrades who have taken a wrong position will correct themselves. Others will, on the contrary, deepen their error and reach the logical conclusion, that is, they will break away completely from the Marxist position. This invariably happens in all deep-going disputes when hitherto undefined differences of opinion are submitted to the test of major events.

It's an ill wind that blows no one any good. There are all too many manifestations of ideological stagnation and routinism among the disjointed Oppositional circle-groups. A thorough discussion of major political differences of opinion will enable the viable elements and groups within the Opposition to find their proper place more easily and will thereby speed the process of ideological crystallization around real and not fictitious poles. On the question of the Sino-Soviet conflict there are two basic viewpoints, linked up with the most fundamental problems of the world revolution and of the Marxist method.

The most finished expression *sui generis* of the formalistic-Leftist viewpoint has been supplied by Louzon. It is easier for him because of his entire mental make-up. Comrade Louzon is not a Marxist but a formalist. He operates far better with geography, technology, and statistics than with the materialist dialectic of class society. One can often glean considerable information from his articles, but it is impossible to learn anything politically from them. Louzon is far more attracted by abstract national "justice" than by the actual struggle of the oppressed peoples for liberation. Louzon produces elaborate proofs that the Chinese Eastern Railway was built by Czarism for the purpose of seizures and plunder. He has a map showing that this railway crosses the heart of Manchuria. He proves by statistical data that Manchuria has been settled in recent decades by Chinese peasants. We thus get a *Russian* railway on *Chinese* soil *side by side* with the railways of other imperialist states. Wherein is the difference? asks Louzon. And he concludes that there is no difference, or virtually none. The treaty of 1924 was an imperialist treaty. Lenin would have returned the railway to China, that's for sure. Louzon is positive about it.

In order to determine whether a policy bears an imperialist character in a given territory, it is enough according to Louzon to determine what nationality inhabits the given territory: "If Northern Manchuria were populated by Russians, the policy of the Czar and of the Soviet Union would be legitimate; but if it

is populated by Chinese, then it is nothing else but the policy of robbery and oppression" (*Revolution Proletarienne*, August 1, 1929). It is hard to believe one's eyes in reading these lines. The policy of the Czar and the policy of the workers' state are analyzed exclusively from the nationalist standpoint and are therewith completely identified. Louzon proclaims the policy of the Czar in Russian provinces to be legitimate. Yet for us the Czar's policy in Siberia was no less criminal, predatory and oppressive than in Manchuria. The policy of the Bolsheviks applies, for better or for worse, one and the same set of principles in Manchuria, in Siberia, or in Moscow, Comrade Louzon! In addition to nations there exist classes. The national problem separate and apart from class correlations is a fiction, a lie, a strangler's noose for the proletariat.

Louzon's method is not Marxism, but sheer schematism. It incurs this penalty, that almost all the Social Democratic publications without exception develop the same line of thought and arrive at the self-same conclusion. The decision of the Second International, elaborated under the leadership of Otto Bauer, completely reproduces the ideas of Louzon. How could it be otherwise? The Social Democracy is, of necessity, formalistic. It thrives on analogies between Fascism and Communism. In its eyes all those who "deny" democracy or violate it belong on the same plane. The supreme criterion is "democracy" which the reformists elevate (on paper) above the classes. Louzon acts in exactly the same way with the principle of national self-determination. This is all the more strange because Louzon as a syndicalist is sooner inclined to a formalistic denial of democracy. But it frequently happens with formalistic thinkers that while denying the *whole*, they reverently grovel before a *part*. National self-determination is one of the elements of democracy. The struggle for national self-determination, like the struggle for democracy in general, plays an enormous role in the lives of the peoples, particularly in the life of the proletariat. He is a poor revolutionist who does not know how to utilize democratic institutions and forms, including parliamentarianism, in the interests of the proletariat. But from the proletarian standpoint, neither democracy as a whole nor national self-determination as an integral part of it, stands above the classes; nor does either of them supply the highest criterion of revolutionary policy. This is the reason why we regard the Social Democratic analogies between Fascism and Bolshevism as charlatanism. For the same reason the equating of the Sino-Soviet treaty of 1924 with an imperialist treaty, on the basis of a [geometrical] law of symmetry, we regard as—the grossest blunder.

To whom would Louzon have wanted to cede the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1924? To the Peking Government? But this government lacked hands with which to take it; nor did it have legs with which to reach it. The Peking Government was a thread-bare fiction. The reality was: Marshal Chang Tso-lin, chieftain of *hung hu tzu* [Manchurian bandits], dictator-hangman of Manchuria, paid agent of Japan, mortal enemy of the national-revolutionary movement which erupted violently in 1925 and which became transformed in 1926 into an expedition of the South against the North, *i.e.*, in the last analysis, an expedition against Chang Tso-lin. *To surrender the railway to the Marshal would have meant in practice to make an alliance with him against the unfolding Chinese revolution.* This would not have been a whit superior to the delivery of artillery and munitions to White Poland in 1920 during the latter's war against the Soviet Republic. This would not have been the fulfillment of a revolutionary duty, but the most ignominious betrayal of the Chinese revolution, the real revolution, the one that is accomplished by the classes, and not an abstract shadow

that haunts the head of Louzon and other formalists like him.

Entangling himself in contradictions, Louzon talks himself into this, that he reproaches the Soviet Government for having signed on September 20, 1924 a treaty with Chang Tso-lin "the most reactionary militarist that ever ruled in China." Yes, he was the most reactionary. Obviously, instead of concluding a treaty with him, which protected the railway from this extreme reactionary, what should have been done, according to Louzon, was to simply make him a gift of it.

Naturally, the treaty of 1924 which abrogated all the imperialist privileges of Russia did not provide any absolute guarantees against Chang Tso-lin, because the latter had troops in Manchuria, while the Soviet troops were far removed from the scene. But however far away they may be, they exist nonetheless. Chang Tso-lin betimes engaged in raids, at other times he beat a retreat. He demanded, for example, that the railway transport his counter-revolutionary troops without any restrictions whatever. But the railway, basing itself on the treaty, put all sorts of obstacles in his path. He arrested the director of the railway, and then beat a retreat. For good and substantial reasons he placed no reliance upon his own forces alone. But Japan, for various reasons of her own, refrained from supporting him actively, but watched and waited. All of this was a great gain for the Chinese revolution, which unfolded from the South toward the North.

Revolutionary Aid or Imperialist Intervention?

In order to demonstrate even more graphically the complete barrenness of Louzonian formalism, let us approach the question from another side. Everybody knows that in order to entrench themselves in a backward country, the imperialists often give arms to one tribe against another, to one province against another, to one class against another. That is how, for example, the United States systematically acts in paving its way into South America. On the other hand, everybody knows that the Soviet Government gave large-scale aid to the Chinese national-revolutionary army from the very first days of its formation, and especially during its Northern Expedition. The Social Democrats throughout the world shrieked, in chorus with their respective bourgeoisies, about the Soviet military "intervention" in China, viewing it only as a revolutionary cover for the old policy of Czarist imperialism. Is Louzon in accord with this, or isn't he? This question is addressed to all the imitators of Louzon. We Bolsheviks hold just the contrary opinion: it was the elementary duty of the Soviet Government to come to the aid of the Chinese revolution—with ideas, men, money, arms. That the Stalin-Bukharin leadership has inflicted political injuries upon the Chinese revolution which outweigh by far the value of its material support, is a separate question with which we shall deal presently. But the Mensheviks accuse the Soviet Government of imperialism not because of Stalin-Bukharin's line on the Chinese question, but for intervening in Chinese affairs, for giving aid to the Chinese revolution. Did the Soviet Government commit a crime by this intervention or did it render a service, Comrade Louzon? Personally I would find it hard to speak here of any services rendered, because the intervention constituted the fulfillment of an elementary duty, stemming from the interests of the Russian and the Chinese revolutions alike. Now let me ask: Was it permissible for the Soviet Government, while helping the South with its left hand, to surrender with its right hand the Chinese Eastern Railway to the North, against which the war was directed?

Our answer is: Inasmuch as the Soviet Government could not transfer its railway from the North to the South, it was bound, in order to facilitate the revolution's offensive against the Northern militarists, to retain this railway firmly in its hands so as not to permit the imperialists and the militarists to convert it into a weapon against the Chinese revolution. That is how we understand revolutionary duty with respect to a *genuine* struggle for a *genuine* national self-determination of China.

Side by side with this there was another task. It was necessary to so conduct the policy in relation to the railway as to permit the Chinese masses, at least their advanced layers, to clearly grasp the liberationist aims and tasks of the Soviet Government with regard to China. I dealt with this in a previous article where I cited the decisions of the Commission of the Central Committee of the Russian party, formulated by me and adopted in April, 1926. The gist of these decisions was: We regard the Chinese Eastern Railway as one of the weapons of the world revolution, more specifically, of the Russian and Chinese revolutions. World imperialism can, of course, directly or indirectly, openly or covertly, wrest this railway from our hands. In order to avoid graver consequences we may find ourselves compelled to surrender it to the imperialists, just as we found ourselves compelled to sign the Brest-Litovsk peace. But until then, so long as we have the possibility and the power, we shall protect it from imperialism, in preparation for handing it over to the victorious Chinese revolution. Towards this end, we shall immediately establish schools for Chinese railwaymen with a view to educating them not only technically but politically.

But this is precisely what drives Chinese reaction to fury. A *Reuters* dispatch carries the following declaration of Wang, the present Foreign Minister of China:

The only way out for China is the unification of all nations in order to effectively resist *Red Imperialism*, otherwise China will perish in the tentacles of *Communism*.

Involved here, as we see, is not at all a struggle against imperialism in general. On the contrary, the Chinese Government appeals to imperialism for aid against "*Red Imperialism*," which it identifies with the peril of Communism. Could one wish for a clearer, more precise, and more calculated formulation?

Louzon attempted to prove that the sympathies of the imperialist states are on the side of the Soviet Government against China. As a matter of fact, however, the only thing he proved was that on partial questions the attitude of the imperialists toward the Soviet Union is contradictory. To the extent that imperialism rests on the inviolability of property rights, to that extent it is constrained to concede the same rights to the Soviet Government, too. If this were not the case, then even trade, for instance, would be impossible between the Soviet Republic and the capitalist countries. But if it came to war, then the pretext for war, *i.e.*, the question of who owned the railway, would completely fade into the background. The imperialists would approach the question solely from the standpoint of struggle against that danger which they label "*Red Imperialism*," *i.e.*, the international proletarian revolution.

It would not be amiss to recall in this connection the conduct of the White emigres in the Far East. Even the *New York Times*, August 17, 1929, wrote on this score that: "Here (in Washington government circles) the possibility is conceded that the White Russians may have provoked the incidents (border clashes) on the Chinese side, which would hardly have happened otherwise." According to Louzon what is involved is China's national self-determination. Chiang Kai-shek appears as the embodiment in life of democratic progress; the Moscow Gov-

ernment, as the embodiment of imperialist aggression. But the White emigres turn up for some unknown reason on the side of China's national self-determination—against Russian imperialism. Doesn't this single fact demonstrate how hopelessly Louzon entangled himself by replacing class policy with geography and ethnography? The White bandits who kill Red Army soldiers on the Far Eastern frontiers have in their own fashion a better grasp of politics than Louzon. They do not become entangled in secondary trifles but reduce the question to its essentials: the struggle of the world bourgeoisie against the revolution.

Substituting Pacifism for Bolshevism

Departing from the class standpoint for the sake of an abstract-nationalistic position, the ultra-Lefts necessarily slide away from a revolutionary position into a purely pacifist one. Louzon relates how the Soviet troops captured in their day the Siberian railway and how later "the Red Army, in conformity with Lenin's anti-imperialist policy, carefully came to a halt at the frontiers of China. There was no attempt to recapture the territories of the Chinese Eastern Railway" (*Revolution Proletarienne*, p. 228). The highest duty of the proletarian revolution, it appears, is to carefully dip its banners before national frontiers. Herein, according to Louzon, is the gist of Lenin's anti-imperialist policy! One blushes with shame to read this philosophy of "revolution in one country." The Red Army halted at the frontier of China because it was not strong enough to cross this frontier and meet the inescapable onslaught of Japanese imperialism. If the Red Army were strong enough to assume such an offensive, it would have been *duty-bound* to launch it. A renunciation by the Red Army of a revolutionary offensive against the forces of imperialism and in the interest of Chinese workers and peasants and of the world proletarian revolution would not have meant the fulfillment of Lenin's policy but a base betrayal of the A B C of Marxism. Wherein lies the misfortune of Louzon and others like him? In this, that he has substituted a national-pacifist policy for the internationalist-revolutionary policy. This has absolutely nothing in common with Lenin.

In its time the Red Army invaded Menshevik Georgia and helped the Georgian workers overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie. To this day, the Second International has not forgiven us for it. Georgia is inhabited by Georgians. The Red Army was composed mainly of Russians. With whom does Louzon side in this old conflict?

And what about the march on Warsaw in the summer of 1920? Louzon is perhaps aware that I opposed this campaign. But my objections were of a purely practical character. I feared that the toiling masses of Poland would not succeed in rising in time (war proceeds as a rule at a faster tempo than the revolution); and I was of the opinion that it would be dangerous for us to leave our base too far behind. This forecast was confirmed by events: the march on Warsaw was a mistake. But it was a practical error and not at all an error in principle. Had the conditions been more favorable, it would have been our direct duty to lend armed assistance to the revolution in Poland, as well as everywhere else. Yet it was precisely at that time that Lloyd George, Bonar Law and others accused us for the first time of Red Imperialism. This accusation was then picked up by the Social Democracy, and from there it has imperceptibly traveled to the ultra-Lefts.

Against revolutionary "intervention" Louzon quite inappropriately advances the old and uncontested principle: "The emancipation of the working class can be achieved only by the

workers themselves." On a national scale? Only within the framework of a single country? Is it permissible for workers in one country to aid the strikers of another? Can they send arms to insurgents? Can they send their army, if they have one? Can they send it either to help the uprising or in order to prepare an uprising, just as strikers send squads to pull out workers in factories that have remained behind?

Why Isn't Louzon Bold Enough to Go the Whole Way?

While adopting a nationalistic-democratic standpoint, Louzon nevertheless refrains from carrying it consistently through to the end. For if the Chinese Government is truly fighting for national liberation against Soviet imperialism, then the duty of every revolutionist is not to give Stalin philosophic lectures on ethics but to give active aid to Chiang Kai-shek. From Louzon's position, if it is taken seriously, it follows that one's direct duty is to help China—by force of arms if possible—gain her national independence against the heirs of Czarism. This is plain as daylight. Louzon himself cites, quite properly, the fact that the Soviet government gave aid to Kemal against the imperialists. Louzon demands that the self-same principles be applied to China. Quite so: as against imperialism it is obligatory to help even the hangmen of Chiang Kai-shek. But right here the brave Louzon pauses in indecision. He somehow senses that the conclusion flowing from his position must read something like this: "Workers of the world, come to the aid of the Chinese government which is defending its independence against the assaults of the Soviet state!" Why then does Louzon stop midway? Because this sole consistent conclusion would simply convert our ultra-Leftist formalists into agents of imperialism and into political attorneys for those Russian White Guards who are now fighting arms in hand for China's "liberation." This lack of consistency does honor to the political instinct of the "ultra-Lefts" but not to their political logic.

Are Socialist "Concessions" Permissible?

At this point, Comrade Urbahns, together with his closest co-thinkers among the leadership of the Leninbund, injects himself into the controversy. In this, as in most other questions, they strive to straddle the fence. They publish an article by H.P., a disciple of Korsch, another article by Louzon, still another by Paz, an erroneous article by the Belgian comrades, a Marxist article by Landau and one by me. Then the editors finally come forward with an eclectic philosophy, borrowing two-thirds from Louzon and Korsch and one-third from the Russian Left Opposition. Rhetorically all this is covered by the formula: "Our agreement with Trotsky is not 100 percent." Basing himself essentially on Louzon, Urbahns does not, nevertheless, remain content with geography and ethnography alone. His attempts to drag in a class standpoint, i.e., to bolster up Louzon with Marx, yield, however, truly sad results.

Let us give the floor to the programmatic article in *Die Fahne des Kommunismus* (the Leninbund's theoretical organ):

The railway represents to this very day a Chinese concession to a foreign government, *which viewed from China's side (?)*, differs only in degree (*graduell ?!*) from all the other concessions held by the imperialist powers. ("On the Russo-Chinese Conflict," Issue No. 31, p. 245.)

Here we still have pure Louzon. Urbahns is teaching the German revolutionists to appraise facts "from China's side."

Meanwhile, the need is to appraise them from the proletarian side. National boundaries do not exhaust the issue.

First of all, it is sheerest nonsense to maintain that the proletarian state is obliged on the whole not to possess enterprises ("concessions") in other countries. Here Urbahns, in the footsteps of Louzon, is simply taking a backstairs route to the theory of socialism in one country. The question of the workers' state implanting industrial enterprises in backward countries is not simply an economic question but one of revolutionary strategy. If Soviet Russia has virtually failed to take this path, it was not out of principled considerations but because of technological weakness. Advanced, i.e., highly industrialized, socialist countries like England, Germany and France would be in every way interested in building railways, erecting plants and grain "factories" in backward countries, former colonies, etc. Naturally they will not be able to do this either through coercion or through magnanimous gifts. They would have to receive certain colonial products in exchange. The character of this type of socialist enterprise, their administration, their working conditions would have to be such as to raise the economy and culture of the backward countries with the aid of the capital, technology and experience of the richer proletarian states to the mutual benefit of both sides. This is not imperialism, nor is it exploitation, nor subjugation; it is, on the contrary, the socialist transformation of the world's economic life. There is no other road at all.

For example, when the dictatorship of the proletariat is established in England, it will not at all be obliged to make a gift to the Indian bourgeoisie of the existing British concessions. This would be the stupidest possible policy, tending to enormously strengthen the power of the Indian capitalists and feudalists allied with them in relation to the Indian proletariat and peasantry; and it would retard the development of the socialist revolution in India for a long time. No! The workers'

state, while proclaiming the full freedom of the colonies, will be obliged to eliminate immediately any and all national privileges from the concessions, doing away with the law of the club on the one hand and degradation on the other. At the same time, without letting go of the concessions, the workers' state will be bound to transform them not only into vehicles of India's economic upbuilding but also of her future socialist reconstruction. Naturally, this policy, equally indispensable for consolidating Socialist England, could be carried through only shoulder to shoulder with the vanguard of the Indian proletariat and it would have to offer obvious advantages to the Indian peasants.

Let us now endeavor, together with Urbahns, to view the question "from India's side." For the Indian bourgeoisie the socialist "concessions" will prove far worse than capitalist concessions, if only because they would mercilessly slash its profits for the benefit of Indian workers and peasants. Conversely, for the latter the socialist concessions will become powerful bases of support, a kind of socialist bastion where forces could be gathered in preparation for the socialist overturn. Naturally, as soon as the Indian proletariat assumed power, the former concessions would pass into its hands. The relations between the Indian and the British proletariat will be regulated not by memories of bourgeois property but by the higher principles of the international division of labor and of socialist solidarity.

There is, therefore, *no* simply Indian side, or simply "Chinese side." There is the side of Chiang Kai-shek. There is the side of the advanced Chinese workers. There are countless shadings of the petty bourgeoisie. When Urbahns tries to look at the issue from "China's side," he in reality dons the spectacles of a Chinese petty bourgeois who is at a loss, in a difficult situation, to choose a position, and take sides.

(To Be Continued.)

The Program for Ceylon

Appendix to the Program of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India on the Tasks of Ceylon

Recognizing the unity of the revolutionary struggle in India and Ceylon, and the need to build a *single* revolutionary party on a continental scale, the *Lanka Sama Samaja Party* entered the *Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India* as a constituent unit at the inauguration of the latter in 1942. By this act, the L.S.S.P. ceased to exist as an independent party, and its members adopted as their own the program of action of the new party. But this program, drafted necessarily as a guide to the All-Indian Party as a whole, does not (especially in its transitional sections) pay attention to the specific problems of the revolutionary movement in Ceylon, where the political setting and the relation of class forces among the native population are in significant respects different from those obtaining on the continent of India. The old (1941) program of the L.S.S.P. is at the same time unsatisfactory in its theoretical aspects, chiefly because it adumbrates a "national" revolution in Ceylon, which is a false perspective. Hence arises the need for the present appendix to the program of the BLPI.

1. The Unity of the Revolution in India and Ceylon

The overthrow of British Imperialism is the indispensable condition for the liberation of Ceylon from its backwardness, and of its people from their present misery and economic slavery. At the same time, the revolutionary struggle in Ceylon cannot proceed in isolation, and with its own independent forces, to the stage of the overthrow of the imperialist regime. Even at its highest point of mobilization, the revolutionary mass movement in this island alone could not, unassisted from outside, generate the energies required to overcome the forces which the imperialists would muster in defense of their power in Ceylon, which is for them not only a field for economic exploitation, but a strategic outpost for the defense of the Empire as a whole. It does not follow from this, however, that the revolutionary emancipation of Ceylon is postponed indefinitely, or until British Imperialism as a world-wide system is destroyed by other agencies. For, the destruction of British Imperialism is posed as an immediate and practical

task in India, where history has already mobilized the forces required for its achievement. The geographic proximity of India and Ceylon, the very close economic and cultural ties which bind their peoples together, and above all, the common enslavement of India and Ceylon by British Imperialism, make it certain that the masses of Ceylon will have the opportunity, by participating fully in the Indian revolution, to throw off the British yoke and with it the whole exploitative social order maintained by imperialism. On the other hand, the complete emancipation of India itself is unthinkable while Ceylon is maintained as a solid bastion of British power in the East. From this point of view, we may say that the revolutionary struggle in Ceylon will be bound up with that on the continent *in all its stages*, and will constitute a provincial aspect in relation to the Indian revolution as a whole.

It would be entirely wrong to conclude from the unity of the revolution in India and Ceylon that the right of the Ceylonese people to self-determination has to be surrendered, or that their interests must in any way be subordinated

to those of the Indians. Ceylon's right of self-determination, on the other hand, can only be exercised *after* the destruction of the imperialist regime by the Indian revolution. Thereafter the Ceylonese people and they alone, will decide the political future of Ceylon, i.e. whether Ceylon will enter an Indian Federation, or having entered such a federation, whether she will at any time secede therefrom. To fail to recognize and emphasize this right of independence of the Ceylonese nation would in effect hinder the masses of Ceylon from uniting with those of India against British imperialism, and make it easier for the latter to utilize Ceylon as a base of support against the growing revolutionary movement in India and South Asia.

2. The British Conquest and Capitalist Development of Ceylon

The British completed in 1815 the conquest of Ceylon they began in 1795. The primary aim of this conquest was to win a strategic base for the defense and expansion of their Eastern empire, but the British sought also the rich profits of the island's trade.

Before the advent of the British, the economy of the coastal districts and parts of the interior which had passed under European rule had already lost to a great extent its old localized and self-sufficient character, and had become linked through extensive external trade with European commercial capital. Correspondingly, the old social order had in great measure broken down in the Low Country areas. The sole bulwark of the old order remained in the feudal aristocracy of the Kandyan Kingdom. After the British conquest of Kandy, in their reprisals against the 1818 rebellion, they broke decisively their short alliance with the Kandyan aristocracy, and destroyed their power. The history of this class was thereafter one of degeneration and decay. They played no part in the revolt of 1848, and settled down in the end to carry out, in their districts, the more menial tasks of the imperialist administration through the Headmen system. In this role they distinguished themselves by their corruption, and by their unbridled gangsterism at the expense of a helpless peasantry. The relics of the feudal classes occupy an utterly insignificant position in the country today, and only the most immaterial vestigial traces remain in Ceylon of its old economy.

By 1834, the British had built up a modern administrative and legal system which cleared the way for the systematic capitalist development of the country. This was begun through the opening of coffee plantations in the up-country. For this purpose, and for the building of roads, etc., in opening up the country, the British found it necessary to import very large numbers of workers from South India, where a supply of free labor had been created by the drastic expropriation of the peasantry and the destruction of handicrafts in the preceding period. The development of the plantations system by British capital investment and the exploitation of imported labor from South India continued without intermission down to the present period, when this system has become the centre and basis of the entire Ceylonese economy, account-

ing for the great bulk of the island's production. With the exportation of plantation products for the world market, Ceylon became bound up inextricably with the imperialist economy of Britain, and ended once for all her isolation as an island.

To pave the way for the development of coffee, tea, and rubber plantations in the up-country, and of rubber and coconut plantations in the Low-country, the expropriation of peasant lands was carried out in repeated stages throughout the latter Nineteenth and early Twentieth centuries. This was accomplished under cover of legal forms (e.g. the Waste Land Ordinance) as well as by more direct and open means. This process as well as continuance of the neglect of artificial irrigation by the government, and its indifference to the needs of peasant agriculture, spelt the ruin of the peasantry. The British did not, in Ceylon, introduce institutions analogous to those of Indian semi-feudal landlordism, but left the peasantry without any defense in the face of capitalist expansion. The consequence was that this class, through the ages the solid foundation of the whole national economy, perished miserably in the struggle for bourgeois existence, and rapidly lost their significance in the economic life of the island.

The peasantry appears today as a class of paupers, either the proprietors of wholly uneconomic plots of land, or share-croppers for absentee landowners. In a majority of those cases they are compelled to work part-time as hired laborers on the plantations and elsewhere. The peasantry together with semi-proletarian elements engaged in peasant agriculture, still number about two-thirds of the population in Ceylon, but they produce only one-third of the Island's food supply, and the total area under peasant cultivation is far less than that occupied by the plantations. The peasantry face only greater ruin and pauperization under imperialism. Their sole future lies not in the schemes of agrarian reform concocted by the big native bourgeoisie in order to win political support, but in their taking the revolutionary road along with the proletariat. Large sections of the peasantry have already slipped down to the ranks of the proletariat, or, as stated above, while attending to cultivation of their own, are driven to hire themselves as wage-laborers as well. The latter development renders easier their identification with the proletariat in its revolutionary future.

The most important local class that arose on the basis of the new capitalist order was the proletariat, whose nucleus was the thousands of South Indian workers brought over for work in the plantations, etc. The proletariat swelled thereafter, with ever fresh importations of workers from India, and later on, with the slipping down of native peasant elements into its ranks. The latter form today the main section of the urban proletariat. Numerically the working class population has grown to over one million out of a population of six million, a very high proportion in a backward colonial country. In composition, however, the proletariat is in overwhelming bulk unskilled and semi-skilled and is engaged in extractive industry, light industry and transport. Only a small sector of the working class is urban,

and no heavy industry exists. "Immigrant" Indian workers (miscalled immigrant, since for the most part they have been resident in Ceylon for generations) still preponderate among the working class numerically, and this fact establishes a special tie between the workers of India and Ceylon, the significance of which for united revolutionary struggle will be immense.

The main section of the bourgeoisie in Ceylon is, of course, British, who dominate completely all economic spheres. The owners of capital are mainly coupon-clippers in Britain, whose local affairs are managed by Agency Houses, etc. Indian capital, too, is coming to play an important part in economic life. Indian interests monopolize the wholesale trade in foodstuffs and other necessities, and have wide ramifications in all fields, including commerce, finance and industry.

The native Ceylonese bourgeoisie is dwarfish, not only in comparison with the white bourgeoisie in Ceylon, but also and very markedly, in comparison with the proletariat. The native bourgeoisie had its belated origin in the accumulation of capital through Government service perquisites and salaries, and through the farming of arrack and toddy rents, and grew to some extent as a class when they exported plumbago and opened up rubber and coconut estates in the present century. In the field of trade they play an unimportant part, not only in comparison with the British, but also with Indian interests. They have hardly entered the field of industry proper. The purely subsidiary role the bourgeois as a non-industrial bourgeoisie play economically to the imperialists doom them to subservience in politics as well. They have replaced the remnants of the feudal classes in the administration of the country, and in politics seek only to entrench themselves firmly within the imperialist system.

3. The Political Setting: The Bourgeois Parties

Ceylon has always been administered as a Crown colony by the British. Since the period of the Great War, they have sought to build up a facade of democratic institutions in the Island, with the establishment of elected legislatures, and the Ceylonization to a high degree of the administrative and judicial services, etc. At the same time, of course, the British continued to hold in their hands the whole substance of real power. Their policy in this respect was rendered easier by the loyal co-operation from the beginning of the native bourgeoisie, who have never shown more than the tamest constitutional aspirations. The highest point in the pseudo-democratic development referred to was reached in 1931, when universal franchise was granted. But the difficulty of accommodating the regime to the resulting mass pressure on legislation and administration, especially in a period of rising mass consciousness and action, had led the imperialists to a reconsideration of policy. In the projected new Constitution to be imposed on Ceylon they have substituted for progressive "democratic" development, a very close alliance with the native bourgeoisie against the masses, whose influence on government, through the universal franchise is to be under-

mined by establishing a Cabinet system and Second Chamber. The native bourgeoisie are daily taking upon themselves greater responsibility for the Imperialist administration of Ceylon, and can be said to have entrenched themselves politically within the imperialist system. An era of counter-reforms, however, has dawned so far as the masses are concerned and they are bound to recognize with increasing acuteness the fact that while further constitutional developments may satisfy the needs of the bourgeoisie they themselves can find no way out of their present plight except by the revolutionary road. It is unnecessary to argue to show that in the coming revolution the Ceylonese bourgeoisie will play a wholly counter-revolutionary part. They have taken up their positions in the imperialist camp already.

The rebellion of 1818 against British rule was led by the feudal aristocracy of the Kandyan districts. It was defeated, and the strength of feudalism destroyed forever. The revolt of 1848 saw the peasantry entirely without leadership from any class capable of coordinating their struggle on a wide or national scale. It was therefore a revolt of despair only. Between 1848 and the present day there has occurred no serious open challenge to British rule, since the riots of 1915 never developed the dimensions of a revolt. The long continued civil peace in Ceylon does not imply an absence of discontent among the people at all times, but only the hopelessness of this discontent. With the transformation of the country under imperialism, an entirely new setting for the political movement was created. The dissolution of the feudal classes, the smallness and political tameness of the new bourgeoisie, and above all, the relative insignificance in the country of the petty bourgeoisie (especially the peasantry) place on the *proletariat* the chief burden of the anti-imperialist struggle in Ceylon. This fact is borne out negatively by the recent political history of the island.

After a long period of passivity, the first stirrings of national revivalism in 1912-14 proclaimed that the native bourgeoisie had emerged as a political force. The distorted and infantile character of the revival itself, which never even approached the heights it reached in India, and the incapacity of the bourgeoisie to pose for itself higher aims than that of gradual constitutional progress won by begging nicely at Whitehall, testified to the essential weakness of native capitalism. The bourgeoisie were then, as now, fundamentally loyal to British Imperialism, but dared at least to be openly critical of the administration, and to seek a measure of broad mass support for their pleas for constitutional advance. But even this role of oppositional criticism played by the bourgeoisie, dwindled progressively with the rising of the working class movement in the twenties and still more afterwards. The march of events since 1931 illustrates the growing withdrawal of the bourgeoisie from oppositional, and even mass politics itself, in favor of harmonious cooperation, over the heads of the masses, with the imperialists. Their willing association during the war, in the administration of the repressive Defense Regulations regime decisively indicated the road they

chose to follow. Today, with growing consciousness of their role, they act as the junior partners of the firm of British Imperialism and Company, taking practically full responsibility for the administration, though without any real power in their hands.

It is natural that the native bourgeoisie have not built a mass party or even sought to promote their interests by means of an active mass movement. This is entirely consonant with their character as a small, non-industrial bourgeoisie, whose economic interests do not bring them into serious conflict with the Imperialists. The National Congress (1918) came nearest to becoming the National bourgeois party, but with the turn of bourgeois politics in the thirties, this organization rapidly lost importance. Today, apart from the temporary exigencies of elections, etc., the bourgeoisie are content to secure their interests by means of behind-the-scenes bargaining with the British. The National Congress has accordingly been deserted by its most important old leaders, and is only an empty shell, despite the attempt of the Stalinists to convert it into the arena of the "National United Front" which they aim at building. The liberal and petty bourgeois elements who are temporarily in charge of the Congress exist only to show their impotence before the big bourgeois leaders, as was recently demonstrated when, after much fist-shaking, they capitulated to support the Soulbury Counter-Reforms at the behest of the Senanayake clique.

The insignificance politically of the Ceylonese petty-bourgeoisie is reflected in the absence of wide mass movements bearing their stamp, as have repeatedly occurred in India. There are no political parties which really draw their inspiration from the peasantry or the petty-bourgeoisie, and such bourgeois parties as go among these elements for support tend to do so on communal or other sectional grounds, rather than on basic social and political issues.

The *Sinhala Maha Sabha* is a communal organization which draws its chief support from the petty bourgeoisie, mainly from small traders, school teachers, government servants, etc., who place their faith and their hope of survival in the benevolence towards them of their communal bourgeois leaders. The latter, however, are adherents of the purest political opportunism, and have never dared to challenge the position or contest the policies of the Senanayake clique which attends to the affairs of the native bourgeoisie.

The Jaffna Youth Congress was the product of radical tendencies among the intelligentsia, but is a body whose influence is on the wane. It has never given a hint of struggle to achieve its aim which is stated to be national independence, nor does it show the slightest comprehension of the class issues involved in such a struggle.

The All-Ceylon Tamil Congress was formed in 1944, ostensibly to command the adherence of all the Tamils, as such, in the island, and to advance their common interests. It was really the product of the temporary collaboration of widely different elements (Indian and Ceylonese) in the attempt to cash in on the visit of the Soulbury Commission for their various sectional

interests. With the first acid test that was applied, however, in the publication of the Soulbury Report, which was unfavorable to the communal demands they had supported, the Tamil Congress tended to break up into its constituent elements. There is no evidence that the Tamil Congress will long survive the defection of so many of its leaders who accepted the new Constitution. What is certain is that no ties exist among the Tamils as a community which are capable of standing the strain of the class divisions that exist among them.

In recent years, sections of the Indian capitalists in Ceylon became aware of the possibility of utilizing to their own political advantage the civic disabilities and economic grievances of the Indian "immigrant" workers. For this purpose they set up the Ceylon Indian Congress in 1939, and with it the Ceylon Indian Congress Trade Union. The pressure of the workers on these organizations was exercised strongly from the beginning, and reflected in the repeated struggles for leadership which took place within them. In 1941-42, the big bourgeois leaders were temporarily defeated by the section having the support of the trade union officials, etc., led by Azeez, and some of these bourgeois leaders withdrew from playing an active part in the Indian Congress. Today, however, the capitalist elements, through Thondaman and others are again making a bid for full control of the Congress. It is not certain whether, in view of the conflicts that have arisen, the bourgeois elements will succeed in consolidating the Indian Congress as their political instrument. The Congress Labor Union has become to a great extent a bureaucratic and reformist trade union basing itself on the kanganies and other intermediate strata among the plantation population, and these elements continue to exercise pressure on Congress as a whole.

If the political parties above described are insignificant and formless this applies all the more to the other groupings that have a shadowy existence in the backwaters of politics. It is not an accident that in Ceylon, the only political parties which show growing mass influence and a capacity for organization are those which work among the proletariat.

4. The Working Class Movement and Its Political Parties

With the big transport strikes of the twenties the proletariat of Ceylon commenced its history of militant struggle. The first organized centres of the workers' movement were the Ceylon Trade Union Congress (1928) and the Labor Party, formed as the political wing of the T.U.C. in 1929. Under this leadership the working class played a leading part in the agitation for universal franchise, which was won in 1931, in the teeth of the opposition of bourgeois parties. The Labor Party and the T.U.C. were alike under the personal control of Mr. A. E. Goonesinghe, and when the latter from a strike leader, turned into a strike-breaker and labor agent of the big employers, these organizations followed consistently reactionary policies. The T.U.C. has since 1929-30, opposed almost every workers' strike, and has been turned into a union of the privi-

leged section among Sinhalese workers, giving open support to racial agitation against Indian workers, and maintaining very friendly relations with the employers. The Labor Party, likewise, is today a loyal supporter of the Imperialist system.

During the thirties, ideas of revolutionary socialism spread widely among the workers, chiefly due to the propaganda of the *Lanka Sama Samaja Party*. The end of this decade was marked by the militant uprising, for the first time in their history, of the plantation workers. Huge strikes in which thousands of workers were involved, took place especially on the tea plantations in 1939 and 1940. This upsurge was followed by a new wave of struggle among the urban workers culminating in the widespread strikes of 1941-42. The workers' movement subsided only with the stringent enforcement of Defense Regulations, under which strikers, and militant workers' leaders were prosecuted or detained without trial, and the entire working class regimented under a system of military fascist regulations. The end of the Imperialist war in 1945 saw a new upswing of the workers' economic struggles. This upswing has by no means reached its culmination, and the post-war years are sure to see bigger struggles than ever before in the history of the Ceylon workers.

A feature of the period after 1938 was the spread of trade unions among hitherto unorganized workers. During the war, however, only those trade union organizations whose leaders could be relied on not to impede the war effort in any way were permitted to work unpersecuted, and after 1942, such unions as the Industrial and General Workers' Union and the Estate Workers' Union which followed uncompromisingly militant policies, were deliberately smashed by the arrest and detention without trial of their leaders. A consequence of this is that the trade union movement in Ceylon emerges at the end of the war under the leadership of reformists of various shades, whose position, however, is rendered insecure by the certainty of big working class struggles in the near future.

The chief centres of the trade union movement today are: The Ceylon Indian Congress Labor Union (51,000 members); The Trade Union Congress of Mr. Goonesinghe (16,000 members); The Ceylon Trade Union Federation (15,000 members); and the Industrial and Estate Workers' Union (12,000 members).

Apart from the Labor Party of Mr. Goonesinghe, which is only an appendage of the T.U.C., and does little more in politics than contesting municipal elections for Mr. Goonesinghe's personal supporters, there are three main parties working among the proletariat. These parties represent different trends which were originally accommodated within the *Lanka Sama Samaja Party*.

The L.S.S.P. was formed in 1935 as a radical mass party with an anti-imperialist and socialist program, which was, however, vague in character. The main section of the leadership of the L.S.S.P. became increasingly aware of the need to transform it into a proletarian party with a clear revolutionary program of action. This

aim was in the end realized, though repeated crises split the party in the meantime.

Early in 1940, all the adherents of Stalinism in the L.S.S.P. were expelled, who later formed the United Socialist Party. This party in turn divided into various groupings, of which the most important is the Communist Party of Ceylon, the official exponent of Stalinism in Ceylon. The more general description given of the Communist Party of India in the main body of the program applies equally to the C.P. of Ceylon. Specific features of Stalinist reaction which must be mentioned regarding the Ceylon C.P. are: (1) Its support of, and entry into the National Congress, and its aim of making this impotent body the arena of a "national united front." (2) Its abandonment of all revolutionary propaganda against imperialism in favor of innocuous pleas for independence, and all sorts of constitutional panaceas for the social evils of the country. (3) Its adaptation to petty-bourgeois pressure and a vulgar trade union outlook in the support of governmental restrictions on Indian immigration.

The chief strength of the C.P. of Ceylon lies in its control of the Ceylon Trade Union Federation, in which are organized a substantial number of urban workers in light industries.

The reorganization of the L.S.S.P. on proper (i.e. Bolshevik) lines aimed at by a majority of its leadership was begun in 1940, and steadily carried on in the years of war. The 1941 Conference of the L.S.S.P. authorized this development. This conference also adopted a proletarian-revolutionary program, though this program displayed the limitations earlier referred to. The conference finally decided unanimously to proceed with the steps taken towards the formation of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party, in association with various Indian groupings of Fourth Internationalists. The L.S.S.P. consequently entered the Bolshevik-Leninist Party at its inauguration in 1942, with the unanimous consent of its membership.

A new party, falsely calling itself the "L.S.S.P." was formed in 1945 by a grouping of members which split from the B.L.P.I. for no principled reasons, together with other elements who were not members of the B.L.P.I. Although the differences of those who split away from the party were mainly organizational, there is no doubt that the continued existence of the new "L.S.S.P." will lead to its adoption of policies of a petty-bourgeois character, and the consequent growth of a party resembling the L.S.S.P. at its formation in 1935. The way for this is paved by the organizational Menshevism of this party. It is not possible however at this stage to make a stable characterization of this party which has not yet settled down to well defined policies, or clearly deviated in political line from the program of the B.L.P.I.

5. The Transitional Program: Special Features in Ceylon

In mobilizing the revolutionary forces in Ceylon, the following peculiarities of the national setting have to be emphasized:

(1) The political separation of Ceylon from India; the economic conflicts that exist between

the Ceylonese bourgeoisie and sections of the petty-bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and their Indian rivals on the other; and the whole national cultural heritage of Ceylon—are the basis of strong nationalist and anti-Indian sentiments which have been repeatedly transmitted to the working class as well. It is necessary for the party to fight unremittingly against chauvinism in all its forms, in order to point out the unity of the revolutionary struggle in India and Ceylon, against British Imperialism. At the same time, it is the duty of the Bolshevik-Leninists to uphold the right of self-determination of the Ceylonese people. Accordingly, a central agitational slogan of the party must at all times be: "Complete Independence Through the Overthrow of Imperialism in India and Ceylon."

(2) Even in the transitional period, the class (i.e. anti-capitalist) character of the political struggle of the working class must come more into the open in Ceylon than in India. This is due (a) to the close and harmonious cooperation of the native bourgeoisie with the imperialists, and their increasing sense of responsibility for the existing regime; (b) to the low specific gravity of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie in general in politics; and (c) to the lesser weight of the purely democratic demands among the transitional demands in Ceylon, where there is greater political freedom in normal times, and where no feudal forms of oppression persist.

It is clear that as the post-war crisis in Ceylon assumes full proportions, the chief slogans upon which the workers will mobilize in their struggles will be the demands for (a) Minimum wage fixed by law; (b) Statutory 8-hour day; (c) Work or Maintenance. The party will place these slogans in the forefront of its propaganda and agitation among the working class, particularly because these demands serve to bring the workers directly into political struggle against the government.

Among the plantation workers, the following demands will be placed by the party in the forefront of its work, in addition to those given above:

Full Trade Union Rights, including right of access to estates for union representatives; Abolition of present system of eviction of workers by means of criminal procedure; Abolition of Kangany system—Transfer of all workers to estate gangs; Weekly payments of wages; Right to hold meetings within plantations; Full ownership by workers of lines and demarcated areas around them; 26 days' work minimum for all workers willing to work; Full implementation of Labor Regulations regarding half-names, etc.

The B.L.P.I. (Ceylon Unit) puts forward the following immediate demands on behalf of the Ceylonese peasantry:

No Tariffs and Taxes on Necessities; Abolition of Irrigation Rates; Free Pasture Lands; Crown Lands to the Peasants.

Apart from these special slogans and demands, and the qualifications noted above, the transitional program of the B.L.P.I. is an adequate guide to the work of the Ceylon Unit of the party in the transitional period.

***Now Available!
Bound Volumes***

***384 Pages
Price \$4.50***

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL FOR 1945

This valuable compendium of contemporary Marxist analysis and criticism contains articles by E. R. Frank, Li Fu-jen, Felix Morrow, William Simmons, William F. Warde, John G. Wright, in addition to numerous writings of Leon Trotsky.

AMONG THE SUBJECTS ARE:

- **The Strike Wave in America**
- **Perspectives of the European Revolution**
- **The Civil War in Greece**
- **The Colonial Problem: Asia, Africa, Latin America**
- **Imperialist Diplomacy and the Preparations for a Third World War**
- **The Middle East and the Jewish Problem**

Also included are documents and resolutions of the Socialist Workers Party and the Fourth International.

The Volume is cross-indexed by author and subject.

ORDER NOW from

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.