

THE NEW

February 1940

INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Invasion of Finland

An Editorial

LEON TROTSKY

Again and Once More Again on the Nature of the U.S.S.R.

JAMES P. CANNON

Speech on the Russian Question

LEON TROTSKY

Dialectical Materialism and Science

Twenty Cents Single Copy - - - Subscription Per Year \$2.00

At Home

Selling the N. I.

AT a time when receipts from American branches of the party have dropped considerably, it is heartening to see the whole-hearted cooperation of the sections of the Fourth International which are in the line of fire, in the war-torn countries of the world.

From all parts of the British Empire—South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, England itself—come orders for increases in bundle orders, with thankful reports of the copies which arrived safely. More than one of these sections has helped the NEW INTERNATIONAL out of a bad spot—and we cannot overstate our gratitude to our serious Bolshevik brothers overseas. Comrades, you put your American brothers to shame! We hope they will follow the example of whole-hearted cooperation you have set; for our part we promise to redouble our efforts to help you in every way in our power.

* * *

There are hundreds and hundreds of dollars due the magazine from home branches, on many bundles which were sent out in the past and remain substantially unpaid for. If that money were paid we would have no difficulty in returning to a 32-page magazine immediately. Boston recently sent us a substantial payment on its back bill out of the profits of a dance. If dancing will do the trick then we say let every branch get up and dance! Can they dance any more energetically for the NEW INTERNATIONAL in Boston than they can in *your home town*?

* * *

In the future we're going to turn this column over to you. We want to know how you go about *selling the NEW INTERNATIONAL*, how your branch *organizes* N.I. sales, what your contacting experiences have been, where your principal financial difficulties come in, where you chalk up your most significant successes.

To each branch which sends us a publishable report of experiences from which the party can benefit, we will send in appreciation a first-class picture of Leon Trotsky, suitable for display in your branch headquarters.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

OFFICIAL THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY
(Section of the Fourth International)

Volume VI February 1940 No. 1 (Whole No. 40)

Published monthly by THE NEW INTERNATIONAL Publishing Company, 116 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up. Entered as second-class matter December 9, 1937, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Board:

JAMES BURNHAM MAX SHACHTMAN

General Manager:

GEORGE CLARKE

Assistant Manager:

SHERMAN STANLEY

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

PARTY OPINION	3
<i>An Editorial on Finland</i>	
SPEECH ON THE RUSSIAN QUESTION	8
<i>by James P. Cannon</i>	
AGAIN AND ONCE MORE AGAIN ON THE NATURE OF THE U.S.S.R.	13
<i>by Leon Trotsky</i>	
RESOLUTION ON RUSSIA	17
<i>A Statement of Policy by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party</i>	
DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM AND SCIENCE, A <i>Speech on D. I. Mendelejev</i>	24
<i>by Leon Trotsky</i>	

Inside front cover: At Home

(There's a devoted comrade in Flint, Michigan, who will gladly donate his services and his skill to the turning out of these pictures). And if a branch earns several pictures over a period of time it can always offer them as premiums in its *own* drives.

* * *

Has any branch ever tried Sunday morning house-to-house selling of the N.I.? How has it worked out? Let's hear from you on this.

* * *

There is a large supply of the December (the special Negro number) issue of the NEW INTERNATIONAL, of which an extra thousand was printed. Branches doing Negro work may have these copies at a special price of five cents each. The investment should be profitable, permitting free distribution at Negro forums, churches, C.P. meetings attracting Negro listeners, union halls frequented by Negroes and similar points of concentration. Have any of the branches used this issue of the magazine for special drives among the more

politically developed Negro workers?

* * *

Gleaned from letters received during the past month are these statements, which we feel set the keynote for the response from the branches to keep our publications going:

CHICAGO: "Within a short period of time Chicago is looking forward to another increase in the bundle order and also to making a concerted drive for renewals and new subs to the NEW INTERNATIONAL and the *Socialist Appeal*."

MINNEAPOLIS: "Enclosed you will find a check for \$52.00 for the *Socialist Appeal* and the NEW INTERNATIONAL. The enclosed remittance should square up our accounts with both the *Socialist Appeal* and the NEW INTERNATIONAL, as of January 1, 1940. Please let us know if that is not so." It assuredly was so!—and we hope other branches will speedily follow suit in clearing up their back bills.

ST. PAUL: "We are enclosing a check for \$25.00 to be applied to the *Socialist Appeal* and NEW INTERNATIONAL accounts. . . .

We have not taken up in the branch the question of a bundle order increase but will do this shortly."

SAN FRANCISCO: "I am sending you herewith \$14.21 in stamps which you will please turn over to our account on the NEW INTERNATIONAL." We still can't get rid of all those two-cent stamps but the substantial payment sure was welcome!

LONG ISLAND, from E.S.: "The N.I. is too important to be cut, and I hope we shall see a 32-page issue next time. I enclose my contribution toward it." This letter contained a check for five dollars which, we assure you, was gratefully received.

NEWARK, from I.T.: "Please extend my subscription for another six months and apply the \$1 enclosed. I wish it could be more! Long life to the N.I.!"

* * *

Our bills are many, and our receipts as this issue goes to press have dropped to practically nil. We are putting up a valiant fight to make ends meet—but we cannot succeed without the fullest cooperation from the branches. Pay up your bills, always keep your current bundle paid for, and set as your branch goal the doubling of your bundle order. The NEW INTERNATIONAL can be put back on its feet—and rapidly—if the party will unite in an effort to put it across.

—THE MANAGEMENT

Manager's Note

We were compelled to skip the January number of the NEW INTERNATIONAL because of a fire in the building where our offices are located which caused us serious editorial difficulties. We have tried to make up for this omission, however, by enlarging the current number to full size, thirty-two pages.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME 6

FEBRUARY 1940

NO. 1

Party Opinion

Finland, the "Belgium" of the Second World War — Why the Invasion? — Military Aspects of the Invasion — On the Economic Front — The Probability of Intervention — Bourgeois Propaganda — Defense of the Soviet Union

THE ROLE which Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland failed to play—the "criminally assaulted Belgium" of the second World War—may well prove to be the role of Finland. The occupation by the Red Army of some 5,000 square miles of Finnish territory, an area about the size of Connecticut, has already aroused a wave of emotional fury, patriotism, war fervor, condemnation of *Bolshevism* as *imperialism*, such as has not been witnessed for years in the capitalist press. From the Communist Party on the other hand, which only yesterday licked the blood-spattered boots of capitalist democracy, shrieks of outraged protest symmetrically supplement this rabid campaign.

It is necessary for the class-conscious militant to draw back a bit from the tendentious headlines of the Stalinist and capitalist press alike in order cool-headedly to analyze exactly what has been happening in Finland, exactly what is involved in reality behind the barrage of propaganda, and exactly what is required in this situation from a proletarian revolutionist.

Why the Invasion?

So far as Stalin is concerned, the determining factor in his foreign policy, one of the consequences of his abandoning the policy of extending the October revolution upon a world scale, is fear of war, and fear of working class revolution as a consequence of war. All his efforts are bent towards averting war, keeping it away from his doorstep, skating around it, ducking through it. This fear took him into the League of Nations, that "thieves' kitchen at Geneva" as Lenin called it, into a pact with France, and finally into a pact with Hitler, bloody executioner of the German labor movement.

For the first time in the history of his foreign policy, the pact with Hitler, precisely because world capitalism totters at the brink of a cataclysmic war, enabled Stalin at the expense of world revolution and consequently at the cost of the basic defense of the Soviet Union to make a few conjunctural gains of a diplomatic-military nature. Until Hitler sees fit to resume his march eastward, Stalin feels relatively safe. At the same time his pact with Hitler has brought measurably closer the hour of mortal danger to the Soviet Union and consequently to the Stalinist re-

gime resting upon it. This danger is so real that not even Stalin can keep his hands over his eyes any longer. He must protect himself. As always, Stalin took the bureaucratic road. Under the breathing spell given him by the pact with Hitler, he forced Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to concede military bases; he moved against Finland with the same purpose, since Finland, especially in relation to the Aaland islands between the Gulf of Bothnia and the Gulf of Finland holds the strategic key to the defense of Leningrad from invasion of the foe to the west. The bloody slaughter of the second World War, the murderous whine of enormous air fleets, the ground-shaking tread of monster tanks, all the horror, destruction, and desolation of war remind Stalin . . . that he had better close the gate to his front yard.

Stalin at the outset was not bent on invading Finland. He wanted to make a deal with the Finnish bourgeoisie. This is absolutely clear from the deal he made with the bourgeoisie in the three Baltic states, from his first proposals to the Finnish bourgeoisie, from his entire course of action in relation to Finland which cries out for everyone to see—Allies, Finnish bourgeoisie, and even Hitler, "I don't want to spread nationalization of property: if it goes too far it will destroy me. I only want to protect myself from Hitler." Stalin is not the politician of wars and revolution; he is a horse-trader; he is concerned only with preserving himself, his privileges and his rule. A "good" agreement with Finland appeared to him far more substantial and far less dangerous than the uncertain hazards of even a little war.

But, as the reactionary Washington, D.C. *Army and Navy Journal*, semi-official organ of the professional American military forces, puts it (Dec. 9, 1939), "the sturdy bourgeoisie of that country refused to bow to threat." That this "sturdiness" was due to British and American encouragement as Moscow insists is indubitable. The Allies as well as Hitler are highly interested in involving the Soviet Union deeper in the war, in discrediting the Soviet Union, and laying the basis for intervention. Nevertheless Stalin demonstrated that his need was great and pressing. He massed troops at the border. Still the Finnish bourgeoisie refused to concede. With the realization that enmeshed in this situation he might have to go through to the end—

even provoking civil war!—if the spine of the Finnish bourgeoisie proved too responsive to the Allied pressure, he set up a "Peoples' Government" at Terijoki and moved troops along the eastern border of Finland. In the opinion of the *Army and Navy Journal* which has special sources of information in Washington, "No one doubts that he would discard it (the Kuusinen government) promptly, and treat with the Helsinki government in preference to a lengthy war. It is this conviction that was responsible for the decision of the President not to withdraw our Ambassador from Moscow."

That Hitler was highly gratified by Stalin's becoming involved in war with Finland was clearly shown at the time of the invasion by the Berlin press which congratulated Stalin! Stalin's involvement in the war strengthens Hitler's western front, gives him greater bargaining power with the Allies, more thoroughly entangles Stalin in the pact, opens wider the channels to the resources of the U.S. S.R. (new and important trade agreements have just been signed between Moscow and Berlin). Nor would an early "peace" at the expense of the Soviet Union go counter to anything written down in *Mein Kampf*.

In addition to this, the Nazi war machine requires complete control of the British and Canadian owned nickel deposits in Finland. Nickel like manganese is one of the "strategic" war materials, a material that is absolutely necessary in the manufacture of arms. The fact that most of the world's nickel comes from Canada sheds an interesting sidelight on the Finnish invasion. Hitler could only gain enormously both politically and economically by giving Stalin, his ally, a push in the direction of Finland.

"Since 1933," says the *Annalist*, the highly conservative economic weekly published by the *New York Times*, (Dec. 7, 1939), "expenditures on this property (of the International Nickel Company) have totaled almost \$3,000,000 and capital expenditures during 1939 are estimated at \$4,300,000. Inasmuch as 90 per cent of the world's nickel production is produced in Canada, the strategic importance of this Finnish deposit to Russia and its friend Germany is self-evident. In view of Russia's puppet, socialist state projected for Finland, what will happen to these Canadian and British-owned nickel properties is equally self-evident."

But the nickel mines of Finland and Hitler's strategic interests in setting Stalin against Finland, or Great Britain's desire to make Finland a testing ground if it must be lost anyway, are not what budged Stalin out of the Kremlin and into the forests of Finland. It was fear of war. It was to protect himself from Hitler and the Allies, in his own bureaucratic hangman's way, that Stalin invaded Finland.

Military Aspects of the Invasion

The propaganda machine of the Finnish bourgeoisie, ably supported and supplemented by the world-wide propaganda machine owned and operated by the Bourse, the City, and Wall Street, have "annihilated" almost a Russian division a day, "wiped out" Red Army bases, inflicted "crushing defeats," and on the side "deliberately bombed" hospitals and civilians for feature stories to tug democratic heart and purse strings. Out of the maze of contradictions it is difficult to piece together the story of what is really hap-

pening on the military front in Finland. The first job is to cut through the propaganda. Declares the *Army and Navy Journal*, which is interested in the struggle from the viewpoint of military tactics (Dec. 30, 1939): "There appears to be no ground for the large number of reports reaching this country that the Russians are inadequately equipped and fed and that many are freezing to death because of inadequate clothing and shelter. As a matter of fact it is quite likely that the losses have been considerably less than contended in dispatches. As a matter of fact, the entire Russian invading forces numbers only some 200,000 men."

What has really been happening in Finland? The military situation can be outlined approximately as follows:

The Finnish war machine consists of a regular army of only 25,000 but this is supported by a Civic Guard of about 100,000 which was organized in 1918 to fight the Bolsheviks. These men together with reserves give Finland an army of about 400,000 men.

This bourgeois army enjoys the advantages of good internal communications and fighting on familiar soil, but it is far from being motorized. In the view of military experts, Russia could have reduced the Finns in a "few days" had Stalin decided to do so. But Stalin, apparently hopeful of arriving at an "understanding," even up to the last moment and thus avoiding the hazards of civil war in Finland, or because the campaign was badly organized—or both!—sent not more than 200,000 men in his first ignominiously unsuccessful drive. Even this army would have been sufficient under normal weather conditions and under fair generalship, but *the heavy artillery necessary to back the drive was completely inadequate.*

This army faced unfamiliar and bad terrain, swamps that were not frozen solidly and in which equipment bogged down, extremely foggy weather which reduced the effectiveness of the air force, one driving storm after another, long lines of communications to the rear. Finland is a country of 200,000 lakes, innumerable forests with only defiles between them easy to defend; roads are extremely rare and readily blocked; there are almost no towns, few villages, only scattered habitations, making it most difficult for large forces to move, bivouac and get up supplies. Even the snow, instead of the normal dry snow, was wet and heavy. On top of all this a cold wave swept down from the polar regions bringing sub-zero temperatures unprecedented in fifty years.

The press reports are not credible that Stalin hoped to carry out a "Blitzkrieg" tactic like that of Hitler's in Poland where swift motor units were driven like long needles into the enemy territory to be just as swiftly followed by heavier mopping up units. For the Polish campaign was conducted on flat territory similar to our own plains, in fair weather over dry ground and with full visibility for the air force which wiped out the Polish air fleet and smashed internal communications. It is obvious that Stalin never planned a "Blitzkrieg." He was trying to force a deal with the Finnish bourgeoisie, and at the same time carrying out in routine fashion the steps to show that it was not just pure bluff.

The Finnish bourgeoisie, outpost of world imperialism, decided to give the much-boasted and untested Red Army

of Stalin a test. Such a test would settle a lot of long-hanging questions in the mind of world imperialism. What effect did the purges have on the Red Army? What is its *actual fighting strength*?

It is absolutely undeniable that the Finnish bourgeois generals succeeded in revealing shocking weaknesses in the Red Army command. The crushing of Finland, which should have taken a "few days" under normal weather conditions and not a great deal longer under the bad conditions that were encountered, is yet to be accomplished.

The first plan of operation apparently envisaged three lines of attack against Finland. One in the south against the so-called Mannerheim line, one in the center from Salla towards Tornea to cut Finland in half, one in the North to reduce that section and help the center in cutting connections with Sweden. The main drive was in the center and in the north, operations in the south against and flanking the Mannerheim line being conducted mainly to divert Finnish troops from the other sectors—reports that the Russian troops are digging trenches and constructing shelters here would confirm this view. The drive across the center was intended to cut Finland in half, breaking her internal lines of communication, preventing supplies from the Allies from reaching her, making it possible to starve out the southern section. Finland in the "waist line" is only 120 miles wide. Moscow reports that the Red Army has penetrated 75 miles, the Finnish generals concede 65 miles.

This sector incidentally was very sympathetic to communism in 1918—and again in 1930 at the height of the fascist movement in Finland. The press reports that the 163rd and 44th divisions in this sector were "annihilated" are pure fabrications although a defeat was undoubtedly inflicted upon them. In the opinion of American Army strategists the Red troops made a well-ordered retreat from Salmijaervi where the Finns had blown up valuable nickel mines, and are now consolidating their forces and waiting for artillery to come up for a renewed thrust.

The greatest successes of the Red Army appear to have been in the north where they set out from Murmansk, but the press has been almost silent on happenings on this front.

In the air, activity has not been great. Almost constant fog has prevailed and daylight at this time of year lasts only a few hours. The stories of *deliberate civilian* bombings can be discounted. Certainly such bombings would not help out Stalin's appeals to the Finnish masses and would only enrage them against the Red Army. Stalin intends to handle the masses later. Stalin's first objective, as revealed in the reports of air raids, is Finnish airports and the Finnish air force (recently reinforced with 30 Bristol Blenheims from England and 80 Savoia-Marchettes from Italy); his second objective, communication lines, especially with Sweden (Tornea and Abo for example); and only in third place harrying of the ranks of the Finnish bourgeois army. This strategy conforms with that employed by the Allies and by Hitler.

Whatever the reason—whether Stalin still hoped that the Finnish bourgeoisie would meet his terms when they became convinced that he was serious and would actually carry out his threats or whether it was the fault of the Moscow staff, or a combination of the two, Stalin failed

to provide his army with adequate artillery support necessary to blast a way for the infantry. From a purely military standpoint, and not taking into account sheer generalship or the abnormal weather conditions, this weakness of the artillery accounted for the ignominious Red Army setbacks.

Press dispatches at this writing report that the Red Army is now utilizing *heavy artillery*, which would indicate that Stalin is starting a second, better-prepared campaign.

As for the fate of Finland, all the military experts unite in predicting that unless she receives major aid from the Allies, or Stalin withdraws, leaving this front "stalemated," which is unlikely, she will inevitably be defeated and crushed, in which case we can expect civil war in conjunction with the advance of the Red Army and the nationalization of the property of the Finnish bourgeoisie.

On the Economic Front

One of the aspects of Stalin's invasion of Finland which has *not* been greeted with streamers of screaming ink but which nonetheless explains a good deal of the furiousness of world imperialism, is the prospective expropriation of the Finnish bourgeoisie, as in Poland, with the advance of the Red Army. Of all Stalin's crimes to date, not a single one in the eyes of the bourgeoisie has rated such condemnation as this one. When Stalin, most reluctantly, is forced to extend the economic base upon which he rests, he twists the sword in the wound dealt by October, and the pain reminds world capitalism not only of days that are past but of days that are to come.

"The Soviet imperialism," says the bourgeois *Annalist* (Dec. 7, 1939, "also provides a clue to the sluggishness of the stock market. The failures of stocks to maintain their customary relationship with business is one of the leading economic mysteries of the day, not only in the United States but in Canada as well. The stock market is definitely behind industrial production whether or not one holds to the view that a business recession will set in during 1940. The advance of communism into Poland and now Finland and the abolition of private property in those areas, *actual or eventual*, (our emphasis) is certainly not a development likely to encourage enhancement of stock values. An eventual collapse of Germany may likewise see communism spring up in Europe's leading industrial country. In that event, the active cooperation between Germany and the Soviet, which is now conspicuous by its absence, may have implications that are not at all pleasant to visualize. The seriousness of Russia's invasion of Finland appears to have been minimized by most commentators, but it has certainly been recognized by the stock market."

Marxists do not discount the positive gain of the expropriation of private property in Poland and its expropriation in Finland behind the bayonets of the Red Army despite the blows which Stalin's choice of methods in realizing this end deal to the world revolution and the real defense of the U.S.S.R. Stalin's methods repel and alienate the sympathy of workers throughout the world. The bourgeoisie views the situation only from the standpoint of their basic interests. Stalin's methods are indeed their own and they have no quarrel with his methods—not the

bourgeoisie who with bombs and machine guns oppress hundreds of millions of colonial people! The key question to them is private ownership of the means of production, and if Stalin is compelled to destroy the capitalist forms of property, that makes him a Bolshevik with a bomb in each hand in the eyes of any member of the Sixty families.

But more deliberate and more pernicious than this conscious reaction of the bourgeoisie is the attempt to make out the U.S.S.R. as an "imperialist" state in the eyes of the working class and to blur the distinction between the soviet forms and the capitalist forms of the ownership of property. This is the blindfold which the bourgeoisie wish to place over the eyes of the working class before arming them to fight for Wall Street in the second World War.

Increasing indications of a new and precipitous industrial slump for the coming period, occurring at the same time as the Finnish invasion, tended to add venom to the pens of the bourgeois hacks in their editorials against the U.S.S.R. Stock prices have declined sharply and a number of issues have fallen to the lowest level in the past several months, steel stocks among them. According to the *Annalist*, (Dec. 21, 1939) a "cyclical recession of unknown proportions" faces American industry. And "certain adverse factors have now developed tendencies almost as pronounced as those which preceded the 1937-38 depression by six to nine months." (Jan. 4, 1940). So shortly upon the heels of the war boom! Indeed the stalemate on the western front, the possibility that agreement might yet be reached with the German bourgeoisie, have placed a heavy strain on the feverish upswing that followed the outbreak of war and the flurry of getting ready for war profits. *Only the continuation and extension of the war can revive the American industrial machine*—that, or a major attack against the Soviet Union and its reduction to a colonial status. This sensitive reflex in industrial production is most striking proof of how intimately the capitalist system in its death agony is bound to war, its profits to slaughter, its hopes to destruction, its way out through violent suppression of the working class including the basic conquests of the proletariat in the Soviet Union.

The Probability of Intervention

The stupidity of Moscow, the blockheadedness of the generals who replaced those slaughtered by Stalin, the weakness of the decapitated Red Army—all this glaringly revealed in the Finnish campaign, has injected a feverish vigor into the sclerotic arteries of decaying capitalism. Rumania, vulnerable from all sides to attack, dared to hurl diplomatic defiance at Stalin; Mussolini drew a sharp line on what constitutes his share of the Balkans.

London, Paris, Washington, and all their lesser satellites have hurled anathema after anathema upon the Soviet Union; Herbert Hoover who drove the starving veterans out of Washington at the point of the bayonet has piously arranged "relief" for the poor Finnish bourgeoisie.

The League of Nations has placed its technical staffs at the disposal of the Helsinki government. (Something it did *not* do, for example, for Ethiopia . . . or China . . . or Czechoslovakia). Great Britain and France have begun sending help and support, and Roosevelt has even suggested a direct loan to the Finnish bourgeoisie from pub-

lic funds—the unemployed of course can afford it.

There is not a class-conscious worker who has not asked himself the question—what does all this mean?

It is worthwhile to see what the class enemy has to say about the possibility of intervention. The *Annalist* affirms (Dec. 7, 1939): "The current imitation of Hitler by Stalin cannot go unheeded, and may eventually lead to war between Russia and Britain. . . . Man power will be greatly needed if Britain is forced to lock horns with Red Russia. . . ."

"We will know in a short time," comments the *Army and Navy Journal*, (Jan. 6, 1940) "whether the Allies and Russia are to continue their uneasy relation or whether they will engage in war."

And in analyzing the meaning of the battle of three British cruisers with the German pocket battleship Graf Spee, the *Army and Navy Journal* as long ago as December 16, 1939, suggested a possible line of attack against the Soviet Union: "To the gratification of Germany, Russia was involved in war with Finland, and Great Britain and France, threatening to support the invaded Republic, were facing war with the Soviet government. . . . This situation demanded a demonstration of British seapower, and the battle with the Graf Spee furnished it. . . . To exposed countries like Italy and Japan, the threat to their security has been revived, *to Russia there is the prospect that in case of war against her, a fleet can penetrate through the Dardanelles, held by their ally Turkey, and destroy the Soviet Black Sea Fleet.*" (Our emphasis).

That in these calculations Germany is taken into consideration is shown by the analysis of this same authoritative journal (Jan. 13, 1940) upon the reasons for the stalemate upon the western front: "Despite statements to the contrary, there is little doubt but that both sides hope peace will be attained without a major military offensive. To embark on large scale air operations, they feel would arouse the military spirit of the enemy and burn the bridges to an early peace."

And even more openly, the Research Institute of America, Inc., one of Wall Street's confidential analytical services, in its Business and Legislation Report dated January 20, 1940, in commenting upon the prognosis that American participation on the European battlefields will most likely take an economic form rather than military (as the aid for Finland) and that the United States will participate in the war in a military sense most likely in Asia, particularly against Japan in order to free French and British military forces for the western front if the present alignment of powers continues, makes this significant comment:

"*Will there be peace?* The only real possibility at the present time of avoiding this economic participation is a peace arranged *before* the threatened spring offensives become real. That peace could take two shapes: First, a real peace with all European nations ending the conflict. (And if this can be said to be in the cards, almost all Washington observers have been glancing at the wrong deck). Second, a complete re-alignment of the present belligerents—a juggling with England, France, Italy, Germany and their satellites in a holy war against Russia. And this would be

a potential possibility upon the suicide, death, or resignation of Hitler."

Thus it is clear that the danger to the Soviet Union is the greatest it has been since the early years. A new catastrophic depression if war is not deepened and extended or socialist revolution if it is extended and deepened—twisting and turning on the needle-sharp horns of this dilemma, world imperialism casts its eyes on the Soviet Union.

Bourgeois Propaganda

It is in the light of the above analysis that we must approach the dark stream of propaganda spewing from the capitalist press. It flows in two directions. On the one hand, Allied propaganda, of which the Finnish is a part, is using Finland as an object lesson to make the wavering smaller states of Europe, Rumania, Turkey, Scandinavia, etc. increasingly apprehensive of Russia and more ready for a tight-knit alliance with the Allies. This propaganda is powerfully reinforced by condemnation of the Soviet Union from Washington and by the measures of assistance. This propaganda likewise is calculated to frighten Stalin with the possibilities of an intervention in *agreement with Hitler*, and hence to loosen up the Hitler-Stalin pact if it turns out that the main fight for the *time being* must be directed at Hitler. All this indicates that the second World War is still in its preliminary stages where alliances have not yet become rigidly interlocked and military encounters may be considered incidents in comparison with the titanic conflicts ahead. On the other hand, this propaganda provides the basis for intervention in the U.S.S.R. either now or *eventually*. (When Hitler has been taken care of either through annihilation or through a temporary deal). The best variant of course for both Hitler and the Allies is to stave off major conflict and the certain consequent socialist revolutions by an agreement at the expense of the Soviet Union.

That this variant has come measurably closer as a result of the weakness displayed in the Finnish invasion is demonstrated in itself by the strength of the propaganda against the Soviet Union, the campaign to identify *Stalinism* with *communism*, the dubbing of the Soviet Union as *imperialist*, the attempts to line up the working class through such agents of the capitalist class as Lewis, Green, the *New Leader*, and their ilk. "Thus there is clearly developing a situation which may largely affect the European war," says the *Army and Navy Journal*. (Jan. 6. 1940).

This propaganda has served at the same time to bring the United States considerably closer to active participation in the war. "If ever the nation, individually *and officially*, has taken sides in a European war it is now. . . ." says the *Annalist*, (Dec. 21, 1939). ". . . It is certainly a violation of the interest of our neutrality legislation, whatever the technicality that Finland is not a belligerent." The *New York Times* comments (Jan. 21, 1940): "In the United States . . . strategic considerations have carried comparatively little weight (?), but feeling for Finland has run high, compounded of hostility to communism and sympathy for the little fellow in a fight."

And Herbert Hoover declares: (*New York Times*, Jan. 21, 1940): "Up to the present the emotions of the people

of this country have not been aroused. (!?) If the war is not ended soon, the horrors that are bound to ensue will so shock us that unless we feel that we are helping in some way we shall be carried into the maelstrom. We are an emotional people. By helping a small country which has been attacked by a nation whose entire system is hateful to us, we are supplying an outlet for feelings which might well otherwise lead us into war." This is the hoary formulation of all patriotic demagogues. Under the guise of keeping us out of war, they take the very steps that will plunge us into war.

Defense of the Soviet Union

Stalin's attempt to gain military and strategic advantages through his invasion of Finland has so far succeeded only in demonstrating the incredible stupidity of Moscow and deep weaknesses in the beheaded Red Army. The socialization of property following the Red Army's occupation of Finnish areas, indubitably progressive despite the manner of achieving it, is far outweighed in real value by the blow Stalin's invasion deals to the world socialist revolution. By his procedure in Finland Stalin has still further alienated the sympathy of the workers and oppressed peoples for the Soviet Union and thus further undermined its real defense. He supplies ammunition to the imperialists and all their lackeys for a new campaign to overthrow the Soviet Union and restore private property. But the fresh crimes of Stalin do not alter the basic nature of the first workers' state created by a proletarian revolution; they only accentuate what the Fourth International has always contended: the perfidious and criminal Stalinist bureaucracy must be overthrown. But this task cannot be farmed out to world imperialism. On the contrary, the renewed and greatly intensified danger of intervention by the imperialists, of which the army of Mannerheim is an integral part, places the defense of the Soviet Union on the order of the day for the class conscious workers of the entire world. The political and material intervention of American imperialism in the present conflict only underscores this obvious duty for American militants. For the defense of the Soviet Union—against Stalin! For the world socialist revolution! These are the slogans of the revolutionary vanguard—in the Soviet Union and everywhere else.

Theory—Its Importance

"Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism is combined with absorption in the narrowest forms of practical activity. The importance of theory for Russian Social-Democrats is still greater for three reasons, which are often forgotten:

"The first is that our party is only in the process of formation. . .

"The second reason is that the Social-Democratic movement is essentially an international movement. . .

"The third reason is that the national tasks of Russian Social-Democracy are such as have never confronted any other Socialist party in the world. . . . At the moment I wish merely to state that the role of vanguard can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by an advanced theory."—Lenin in "What is to be Done?"

Speech on the Russian Question

(New York Membership Meeting, October 15, 1939)

THE Russian question is with us once again, as it has been at every critical turning point of the international labor movement since November 7, 1917. And there is nothing strange in that. The Russian question is no literary exercise to be taken up or cast aside according to the mood of the moment. The Russian question has been and remains the question of the revolution. The Russian Bolsheviks on November 7, 1917, once and for all, took the question of the workers' revolution out of the realm of abstraction and gave it flesh and blood reality.

It was said once of a book—I think it was Whitman's "Leaves of Grass"—"Who touches this book, touches a man." In the same sense it can also be said, "Who touches the Russian question, touches a revolution." Therefore, be serious about it. Don't play with it.

The October Revolution put socialism on the order of the day throughout the world. It revived and shaped and developed the revolutionary labor movement of the world out of the bloody chaos of the war. The Russian revolution showed in practice, by example, how the workers' revolution is to be made. It revealed in life the role of the party. It showed in life what kind of a party the workers must have. By its victory, and its reorganization of the social system, the Russian revolution has proved for all time the superiority of nationalized property and planned economy over capitalist private property, and planless competition and anarchy in production.

A Sharp Dividing Line

The question of the Russian revolution—and the Soviet state which is its creation—has drawn a sharp dividing line through the labor movement of all countries for 22 years. The attitude taken toward the Soviet Union throughout all these years has been the decisive criterion separating the genuine revolutionary tendency from all shades and degrees of waverers, backsliders and capitulators to the pressure of the bourgeois world—the Mensheviks, Social Democrats, Anarchists and Syndicalists, Centrists, Stalinists.

The main source of division in our own ranks for the past ten years, since the Fourth Internationalist tendency took organized form on the international field, has been the Russian question. Our tendency, being a genuine, that is, orthodox, Marxist tendency from A to Z, has always proceeded on the Russian question from theoretical premises to political conclusions for action. Of course, it is only when political conclusions are drawn out to the end that differences on the Russian question reach an unbearable acuteness and permit no ambiguity or compromise. Conclusions on the Russian question lead directly to positions on such issues as war and revolution, defense and defeatism. Such issues, by their very nature, admit no unclarity, no compromise, because it is a matter of taking sides! One must be on one side or another in war and revolution.

The Importance of Theory

But if the lines are drawn only when political conclusions diverge, that does not at all signify that we are indifferent to theoretical premises. He is a very poor Marxist—better say, no Marxist at all—who takes a careless or tolerant attitude toward theoretical premises. The political conclusions of Marxists proceed from theoretical analyses and are constantly checked and regulated by them. That is the only way to assure a firm and consistent policy.

To be sure, we do not decline cooperation with people who agree with our political conclusions from different premises. For example, the Bolsheviks were not deterred by the fact that the left S.R.s were inconsistent. As Trotsky remarked in this connection, "If we wait till everything is right in everybody's head there will never be any successful revolutions in this world," (or words to that effect.) Just the same, for our part we want everything right in our own heads. We have no reason whatever to slur over theoretical formulae, which are expressed in "terminology." As Trotsky says, in theoretical matters "we must keep our house clean."

Our position on the Russian question is programmatic. In brief: The theoretical analysis—a degenerated Workers' State. The political conclusion—unconditional defense against external attack of imperialists or internal attempts at capitalist restoration.

Defensism and Defeatism

Defensism and Defeatism are two principled, that is, irreconcilable, positions. They are not determined by arbitrary choice but by class interests.

No party in the world ever succeeded in harboring these two antipathetic tendencies for any great length of time. The contradiction is too great. Division all over the world ultimately took place along this line. Defensists at home were defeatists on Russia. Defensists on Russia were defeatists at home.

The degeneration of the Soviet state under Stalin has been analyzed at every step by the Bolshevik-Leninists and only by them. A precise attitude has been taken at every stage. The guiding lines of the revolutionary Marxist approach to the question have been:

See the reality and see it whole at every stage; never surrender any position before it is lost; the worst of all capitulators is the one who capitulates before the decisive battle.

The International Left Opposition which originated in 1923 as an opposition in the Russian party (the original nucleus of the Fourth International) has always taken a precise attitude on the Russian question. In the first stages of the degeneration of which the Stalinist bureaucracy was the banner bearer the opposition considered it possible to rectify matters by methods of reform through the change of regime in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Later, when it became clearer that the Communist Party of

Lenin had been irremediably destroyed, and after it became manifest that the reactionary bureaucracy could be removed only by civil war, the Fourth International, standing as before on its analysis of the Soviet Union as a workers' state, came out for a political revolution.

All the time throughout this entire period of 16 years the Bolshevik-Leninists have stoutly maintained, in the face of all slander and persecution, that they were the firmest defenders of the workers' state and that in the hour of danger they would be in the front ranks of its defense. We always said the moment of danger will find the Fourth Internationalists at their posts defending the conquests of the great revolution without ceasing for a moment our struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy. Now that the hour of danger is at hand—now that the long-awaited war is actually knocking at the door—it would be very strange if the Fourth International should renege on its oft-repeated pledge.

"Conservatism" on the Russian Question

Throughout all this long period of Soviet degeneration since the death of Lenin, the Fourth Internationalists, analyzing the new phenomenon of a degenerating workers' state at every turn, striving to comprehend its complications and contradictions, to recognize and defend all the progressive features of the contradictory processes and to reject the reactionary—during all this long time we have been beset at every new turn of events by the impatient demands of "radicals" to simplify the question. Thrown off balance by the crimes and betrayals of Stalin, they lost sight of the new system of economy which Stalin had not destroyed and could not destroy.

We always firmly rejected these premature announcements that everything was lost and that we must begin all over again. At each stage of development, at each new revelation of Stalinist infamy and treachery, some group or other broke away from the Fourth International because of its "conservatism" on the Russian question. It would be interesting, if we had the time, to call the roll of these groupings which one after another left our ranks to pursue an ostensibly more "revolutionary" policy on the Russian question. Did they develop an activity more militant, more revolutionary, than ours? Did they succeed in creating a new movement and in attracting newly awakened workers and those breaking from Stalinism? In no case.

If we were to call the roll of these ultra-radical groups it would present a devastating picture indeed. Those who did not fall into complete political passivity became reconciled in one form or another to bourgeois democracy. The experiences of the past should teach us all a salutary caution, and even, if you please, "conservatism," in approaching any proposal to revise the program of the Fourth International on the Russian question. While all the innovators fell by the wayside, the Fourth International alone retained its programmatic firmness. It grew and developed and remained the only genuine revolutionary current in the labor movement of the world. Without a firm position on the Russian question our movement also would inevitably have shared the fate of the others.

The mighty power of the October revolution is shown by the vitality of its conquests. The nationalized property and

the planned economy stood up under all the difficulties and pressures of the capitalist encirclement and all the blows of a reactionary bureaucracy at home. In the Soviet Union, despite the monstrous mismanagement of the bureaucracy, we saw a tremendous development of the productive forces—and in a backward country at that—while capitalist economy declined. Conclusion: Nationalized and planned economy, made possible by a revolution that overthrew the capitalists and landlords, is infinitely superior, more progressive. It shows the way forward. Don't give it up before it is lost! Cling to it and defend it!

The Class Forces

On the Russian question there are only two really independent forces in the world. Two forces who think about the question independently because they base themselves, their thoughts, their analysis and their conclusions, on fundamental class considerations. Those two independent forces are:

- (1) The conscious vanguard of the world bourgeoisie, the statesmen of both democratic and fascist imperialism.
- (2) The conscious vanguard of the world proletariat.

Between them it is not simply a case of two opinions on the Russian question, but rather of two camps. All those who in the past rejected the conclusions of the Fourth International and broke with our movement on that account, have almost invariably fallen into the service of the imperialists, through Stalinism, social and liberal democracy, or passivity, a form of service.

The standpoint of the world bourgeoisie is a class standpoint. They proceed, as we do, from fundamental class considerations. They want to maintain world capitalism. This determines their fundamental antagonism to the U.S.S.R. They appreciate the reactionary work of Stalin, but consider it incomplete, insofar as he has not restored capitalist private property.

Their fundamental attitude determines an inevitable attempt at the start of the war, or during it, to attack Russia, overthrow the nationalized economy, restore a capitalist regime, smash the foreign trade monopoly, open up the Soviet Union as a market and field of investments, transform Russia into a great colony, and thereby alleviate the crisis of world capitalism.

The standpoint of the Fourth International is based on the same fundamental class considerations. Only we draw opposite conclusions, from an opposite class standpoint.

Purely sentimental motivations, speculation without fundamental class premises, so-called "fresh ideas" with no programmatic base—all this is out of place in a party of Marxists. We want to advance the world revolution of the proletariat. This determines our attitude and approach to the Russian question. True, we want to see reality, but we are not disinterested observers and commentators. We do not examine the Russian revolution and what remains of its great conquests as though it were a bug under a glass. *We have an interest! We take part in the fight!* At each stage in the development of the Soviet Union, its advances and its degeneration, we seek the basis for revolutionary action. We want to advance the world revolution, overthrow capitalism, establish Socialism. The Soviet Union is an important and decisive question on this line.

Our standpoint on the Russian question is written into our program. It is not a new question for us. It is 22 years old. We have followed its evolution, both progressive and retrogressive, at every stage. We have discussed it and taken our position anew at every stage of its progressive development and its degeneration. And, what is most important, we have always *acted* on our conclusions.

The Decisive Criterion

The Soviet Union emerged from the October revolution as a workers state. As a result of the backwardness and poverty of the country and the delay of the world revolution, a conservative bureaucracy emerged and triumphed, destroyed the party and bureaucratized the economy. However, this same bureaucracy still operates on the basis of the nationalized property established by the revolution. That is the decisive question for our evaluation of the question.

If we see the Soviet Union for what it really is, a gigantic labor organization which has conquered one-sixth of the earth's surface, we will not be so ready to abandon it because of our hatred of the crimes and abominations of the bureaucracy. Do we turn our backs on a trade union because it falls into the control of bureaucrats and traitors? Ultra-leftists have frequently made this error, but always with bad results, sometimes with reactionary consequences.

We recall the case of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union here in New York. The bureaucrats of this union were about as vile a gang of labor lieutenants of the capitalist class as could be found. In the struggle against the left-wing in the middle twenties they conspired with the bosses and the A.F. of L. fakers. They expelled the left-wing locals and used hired thugs to fight them and to break their strikes. The difference between them and Stalin was only a matter of opportunity and power. Driven to revolt against the crimes of these bureaucrats the left-wing, under the influence of the Communist Party in the days of its third period frenzy, labelled the union—not merely its treacherous bureaucracy—as a “company union.”

But this same “company union,” under the pressure of the workers in its ranks and the increasing intensity of the class struggle, was forced to call a strike to defend itself against the “imperialist” attack of the bosses. Workers who had kept their heads, supported (“defended”) the strike against the bosses. But the Stalinists, trapped by their own hastily-improvised theory, having already denounced the union as a company union, renounced support (“defense”) of the strike. They denounced it as a “fake” strike. Thus their ill-considered radicalism led them to a reactionary position. They were denounced, and rightly, throughout the needle trades market as strike breakers. To this day they suffer the discredit of this reactionary action.

To defend the Soviet Union as a gigantic labor organization against the attacks of its class enemies does not mean to defend each and every action of its bureaucracy or each and every action of the Red Army which is an instrument of the bureaucracy. To impute such a “totalitarian” concept of defense to the Fourth International is absurd. Nobody here will deny defense of a bonafide trade union, no matter how reactionary its bureaucracy. But that does not prevent us from discriminating between actions of the bureaucracy which involve a defense of the union against

the bosses and other actions which are aimed against the workers.

The United Mine Workers of America is a great labor organization which we all support. But it is headed by a thorough-going scoundrel and agent of the master class who also differs from Stalin only in the degrees of power and opportunity. In my own personal experience some years ago, I took part in a strike of the Kansas miners which was directed against the enforcement of a reactionary labor law, known as the Kansas Industrial Court Law, a law forbidding strikes. This was a thoroughly progressive action on the part of the Kansas miners and their president, Alex Howat. Howat and the other local officials were thrown into jail. While they were in jail, John L. Lewis, as president of the national organization, sent his agents into the Kansas fields to sign an agreement with the bosses over the head of the officers of the Kansas district. He supplied strike breakers and thugs and money to break the strike while the legitimate officers of the union lay in jail for a good cause. Every militant worker in the country denounced this treacherous strike-breaking action of Lewis. But did we therefore renounce support of the national union of mine workers? Yes, some impatient revolutionaries did, and thereby completely disoriented themselves in the labor movement. The United Mine Workers retained its character as a labor organization and only last Spring came into conflict with the coal operators on a national scale. I think you all recall that in this contest our press gave “unconditional defense” to the miners’ union despite the fact that strike-breaker Lewis remained its president.

The Longshoremen's union of the Pacific Coast is a bonafide organization of workers, headed by a Stalinist of an especially unattractive type, a pocket edition of Stalin named Bridges. This same Bridges led a squad of misguided longshoremen, through a picket line of the Sailor's Union in a direct attempt to break up this organization. I think all of you recall that our press scathingly denounced this contemptible action of Bridges. But if the Longshoremen's union, headed by Bridges, which is at this moment conducting negotiations with the bosses, is compelled to resort to strike action, what stand shall we take? Any ordinary class conscious worker, let alone an educated Marxist, will be on the picket line with the Longshoremen's union or “defending” it by some other means.

Why is it so difficult for some of our friends, including some of those who are very well educated in the formal sense, to understand the Russian question? I am very much afraid it is because they do not think of it in terms of struggle. It is strikingly evident that the workers, especially the more experienced workers who have taken part in trade unions, strikes, etc., understand the Russian question much better than the more educated scholastics. From their experiences in the struggle they know what is meant when the Soviet Union is compared to a trade union that has fallen into bad hands. And everyone who has been through a couple of strikes which underwent crises and came to the brink of disaster, finally to emerge victorious, understands what is meant when one says: *No position must be surrendered until it is irrevocably lost.*

I, personally, have seen the fate of more than one strike determined by the will or lack of will of the leadership to

struggle at a critical moment. All our trade union successes in Minneapolis stem back directly to a fateful week in 1934 when the leaders refused to call off the strike, which to all appearances was hopelessly defeated, and persuaded the strike committee to hold out a while longer. In that intervening time a break occurred in the ranks of the bosses; this in turn paved the way for a compromise settlement and eventually victorious advance of the whole union.

How strange it is that some people analyze the weakness and defects in a workers' organization so closely that they do not always take into account the weakness in the camp of the enemy, which may easily more than counter-balance.

In my own agitation among strikers at dark moments of a strike I have frequently resorted to the analogy of two men engaged in a physical fight. When one gets tired and apparently at the end of his resources he should never forget that the other fellow is maybe just as tired or even more so. In that case the one who holds out will prevail. Looked at in this way a worn-out strike can sometimes be carried through to a compromise or a victory by the resolute will of its leadership. We have seen this happen more than once. Why should we deny the Soviet Union, which is not yet exhausted, the same rights?

The Danger of a False Position

We have had many discussions on the Russian question in the past. It has been the central and decisive question for us, as for every political tendency in the labor movement. That, I repeat, is because it is nothing less than the question of the revolution at various stages of its progressive development or degeneration. We are, in fact, the party of the Russian revolution. We have been the people, and the only people, who have had the Russian revolution in their program and in their blood. That is also the main reason why the Fourth International is the only revolutionary tendency in the whole world. A false position on the Russian question would have destroyed our movement as it destroyed all others.

Two years ago we once again conducted an extensive discussion on the Russian question. The almost unanimous conclusion of the party was written into the program of our first Convention:

(1) The Soviet Union, on the basis of its nationalized property and planned economy, the fruit of the revolution, remains a workers' state, though in a degenerated form.

(2) As such, we stand, as before, for the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack.

(3) The best defense—the only thing that can save the Soviet Union in the end by solving its contradictions—is the international revolution of the proletariat.

(4) In order to regenerate the workers' state we stand for the overthrow of the bureaucracy by a political revolution.

But, it may be said, "Defense of the Soviet Union, and Russia is a Workers' State—those two phrases don't answer everything." They are not simply phrases. One is a theoretical analysis; the other is a political conclusion for action.

The Meaning of Unconditional Defense

Our motion calls for unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack. What does that mean? It

simply means that we defend the Soviet Union and its nationalized property against external attacks of imperialist armies or against internal attempts at capitalist restoration, without putting as a prior condition the overthrow of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Any other kind of defense negates the whole position under present circumstances. Some people speak nowadays of giving "conditional" defense to the Soviet Union. If you stop to think about it we are for conditional defense of the United States. It is so stated in the program of the Fourth International. In the event of war we will absolutely defend the country on only one small "condition": that we first overthrow the government of the capitalists and replace it with a government of the workers.

Does unconditional defense of the Soviet Union mean supporting every act of the Red Army? No, that is absurd. Did we support the Moscow trials and the actions of Stalin's G.P.U. in these trials? Did we support the purges, the wholesale murders of the old Bolsheviks? Did we support the actions of the Stalinist military forces in Spain which were directed against the workers? If I recall correctly, we unconditionally defended those workers who fought on the other side of the barricades in Barcelona. That did not prevent us from supporting the military struggle against Franco and maintaining our position in defense of the Soviet Union against imperialist attack.

It is now demanded that we take a big step forward and support the idea of an armed struggle against Stalin in the newly occupied territories of old Poland. Is this really something new? For three years the Fourth International has advocated in its program the armed overthrow of Stalin inside the Soviet Union itself. The Fourth International has generally acknowledged the necessity for an armed struggle to set up an independent Soviet Ukraine. How can there be any question of having a different policy in the newly occupied territories? If the revolution against Stalin is really ready there, the Fourth International will certainly support it and endeavor to lead it. There are no two opinions possible in our ranks on this question. But what shall we do if Hitler (or Chamberlain) attacks the Sovietized Ukraine before Stalin has been overthrown? This is the question that needs an unambiguous answer. Shall we defend the Soviet Union, and with it now and for the same reasons, the nationalized property of the newly annexed territories? We say, yes!

That position was incorporated into the program of the foundation congress of the Fourth International, held in the summer of 1938. Remember, that was after the Moscow trials and the crushing of the Spanish revolution. It was after the murderous purge of the whole generation of Bolsheviks, after the people's front, the entry into the League of Nations, the Stalin-Laval pact (and betrayal of the French workers). We took our position on the basis of the economic structure of the country, the fruit of the revolution. The great gains are not to be surrendered before they are really lost. That is the fighting program of the Fourth International.

The Stalin-Hitler Pact

The Stalin-Hitler pact does not change anything fundamentally. If Stalin were allied with the United States, and

comrades should deny defense of the Soviet Union out of fear of becoming involved in the defense of Stalin's American ally, such comrades would be wrong, but their position would be understandable as a subjective reaction prompted by revolutionary sentiments. The "defeatism" which broke out in our French section following the Stalin-Laval pact was undoubtedly so motivated and, consequently, had to be refuted with the utmost tolerance and patience. But an epidemic of "defeatism" in the democratic camp would be simply shameful. There is no pressure on us in America to defend the Soviet Union. All the pressure is for a democratic holy war against the Soviet Union. Let us keep this in mind. The main enemy is still in our own country.

What has happened since our last discussion? Has there been some fundamental change in Soviet economy? No, nothing of that kind is maintained. Nothing happened except that Stalin signed the pact with Hitler! For us that gave no reason whatever to change our analysis of Soviet economy and our attitude toward it. The aim of all our previous theoretical work, concentrated in our program, was precisely to prepare us for war and revolution. Now we have the war; and revolution is next in order. If we have to stop now to find a new program it is a very bad sign.

Just consider: There are people who could witness all the crimes and betrayals of Stalin, which we understood better than anybody else, and denounced before anybody else and more effectively—they could witness all this and still stand for the defense of the Soviet Union. But they could not tolerate the alliance with fascist Germany instead of imperialist England or France!

The Invasion of Poland

Of course, there has been a great hullabaloo about the Soviet invasion of Polish Ukraine. But that is simply one of the consequences of the war and the alliance with Hitler's Germany. The contention that we should change our analysis of the social character of the Soviet state and our attitude toward its defense because the Red Army violated the Polish border is even more absurd than to base such changes on the Hitler pact. The Polish invasion is only an incident in a war, and in wars borders are always violated. (If all the armies stayed at home there could be no war). The inviolability of borders—all of which were established by war—is interesting to democratic pacifists and to nobody else.

Hearing all the democratic clamor we had to ask ourselves many times: Don't they know that Western Ukraine and White Russia never rightfully belonged to Poland? Don't they know that this territory was forcibly taken from the Soviet Union by Pilsudski with French aid in 1920?

To be sure, this did not justify Stalin's invasion of the territory in collaboration with Hitler. We never supported that and we never supported the fraudulent claim that Stalin was bringing "liberation" to the peoples of the Polish Ukraine. At the same time we did not propose to yield an inch to the "democratic" incitement against the Soviet Union on the basis of the Polish events. The democratic war mongers were shrieking at the top of their voices all over town. We must not be unduly impressed by this democratic

clamor. Your National Committee was not in the least impressed.

In order to penetrate a little deeper into this question and trace it to its roots, let us take another hypothetical example. Not a fantastic one, but a very logical one. Suppose Stalin had made a pact with the imperialist democracies against Hitler while Rumania had allied itself with Hitler. Suppose, as would most probably have happened in that case, the Red Army had struck at Rumania, Hitler's ally, instead of Poland, the ally of the democracies, and had seized Bessarabia, which also once belonged to Russia. Would the democratic war mongers in that case have howled about "Red Imperialism?" Not on your life!

I am very glad that our National Committee maintained its independence from bourgeois democratic pressure on the Polish invasion. The question was put to us very excitedly, point-blank, like a pistol at the temple: "Are you for or against the invasion of Poland?" But revolutionary Marxists don't answer in a "yes" or "no" manner which can lump them together with other people who pursue opposite aims. Being for or against something is not enough in the class struggle. It is necessary to explain *from what standpoint* one is for or against. Are you for or against racketeering gangsters in the trade unions?—the philistines sometimes ask. We don't jump to attention, like a private soldier who has met an officer on the street, and answer, "against!" We first inquire: who asks this question and from what standpoint? And what weight does this question have in relation to other questions? We have our own standpoint and we are careful not to get our answers mixed up with those of class enemies and pacifist muddleheads.

Some people—especially affected bosses—are against racketeering gangsters in the trade unions because they extort graft from the bosses. That side of the question doesn't interest us very much. Some people—especially pacifist preachers—are against the gangsters because they commit violence. But we are not against violence at all times and under all circumstances. We, for our part, taking our time and formulating our viewpoint precisely, say: We are against union gangsterism because it injures the union in its fight against the bosses. That is our reason. It proceeds from our special class standpoint on the union question.

So with Poland: We don't support the course of Stalin in general. His crime is not one incident here or there but his *whole* policy. He demoralizes the workers' movement and discredits the Soviet Union. That is what we are against. He betrays the revolution by his whole course. Every incident for us fits into that framework; it is considered from that point of view and taken in its true proportions.

The Invasion of Finland

Those who take the Polish invasion—an incident in a great chain of events—as the basis for a fundamental change in our program show a lack of proportion. That is the kindest thing that can be said for them. They are destined to remain in a permanent lather throughout the war. They are already four laps behind schedule: There is also Latvia, and Estonia, and Lithuania, and now Finland.

We can expect another clamor of demands that we say, point-blank, and in one word, whether we are "for" or

"against" the pressure on poor little bourgeois-democratic Finland? Our answer—wait a minute. Keep your shirt on. There is no lack of protests in behalf of the bourgeois swine who rule Finland. The *New Leader* has protested. Charles Yale Harrison (Charlie-the-Rat) has written a tearful column about it. The renegade Lore has wept about it in the *New York Post*. The President of the United States has protested. Finland is pretty well covered with moral support. So bourgeois Finland can wait a minute till we explain our attitude without bothering about the "for" or "against" ultimatum.

I personally feel very deeply about Finland, and this is by no means confined to the present dispute between Stalin and the Finnish Prime Minister. When I think of Finland, I think of the thousands of martyred dead, the proletarian heroes who perished under the white terror of Mannerheim. I would, if I could, call them back from their graves. Failing that, I would organize a proletarian army of Finnish workers to avenge them, and drive their murderers into the Baltic Sea. I would send the Red Army of the regenerated Soviet Union to help them at the decisive moment.

We don't support Stalin's invasion only because he doesn't come for revolutionary purposes. He doesn't come at the call of Finnish workers whose confidence he has forfeited. That is the only reason we are against it. The "borders" have nothing to do with it. "Defense" in war also means attack. Do you think we will respect frontiers when we make our revolution? If an enemy army lands troops at Quebec, for example, do you think we will wait placidly at the Canadian border for their attack? No, if we are genuine revolutionists and not pacifist muddle-heads we will cross the border and meet them at the point of landing. And if our defense requires the seizure of Quebec, we will seize it as the Red Army of Lenin seized Georgia and tried to take Warsaw.

Foreseen in Program of Fourth International

Some may think the war and the alliance with Hitler change everything we have previously considered; that it, at least, requires a reconsideration of the whole question of the Soviet Union, if not a complete change in our program. To this we can answer:

Again and Once More Again on the Nature of the U.S.S.R.

(Reprinted from the Bulletin of the Russian Opposition)

Psychoanalysis and Marxism

CERTAIN COMRADES, or former comrades, such as Bruno R., having forgotten the past discussions and decisions of the Fourth International, attempt to explain my personal estimate of the Soviet State psychoanalytically. "Since Trotsky participated in the Russian revolution, it is difficult for him to lay aside the idea of the workers' state inasmuch as he would have to renounce his whole life's cause," etc. I think that the old Freud, who was very perspicacious, would have cuffed the ears of

War was contemplated by our program. The fundamental theses on "War and the Fourth International," adopted in 1934, say:

"Every big war, irrespective of its initial moves, must pose squarely the question of military intervention against the U.S.S.R. in order to transfuse fresh blood into the sclerotic veins of capitalism. . . .

"*Defense of the Soviet Union* from the blows of the capitalist enemies, irrespective of the circumstances and immediate causes of the conflict, is the elementary and imperative duty of every honest labor organization."

Alliances were contemplated. The theses say:

"In the existing situation an alliance of the U.S.S.R. with an imperialist state or with one imperialist combination against another, in case of war, cannot at all be considered as excluded. Under the pressure of circumstances a temporary alliance of this kind may become an iron necessity, without ceasing, however, because of it, to be of the greatest danger both to the U.S.S.R. and to the world revolution.

"The international proletariat will not decline to defend the U.S.S.R. even if the latter should find itself forced into a military alliance with some imperialists against others. But in this case, even more than in any other, the international proletariat must safeguard its complete political independence from Soviet diplomacy and thereby also from the bureaucracy of the Third International."

A stand on defense was taken in the light of this perspective.

The slogan of defense acquires a concrete meaning precisely in the event of war. A strange time to drop it! That would mean a rejection of all our theoretical preparation for the war. That would mean starting all over again. From what fundamental basis? Nobody knows.

There has been much talk of "independence" on the Russian question. That is good! A revolutionist who is not independent is not worth his salt. But it is necessary to specify: Independent of whom? What is needed by our party at every turn is class independence, independence of the Stalinists, and, above all, independence of the bourgeoisie. Our program assures such independence under all circumstances. It shall not be changed!

James P. CANNON

psychoanalysts of this ilk a little. Naturally I would never risk taking such action myself. Nevertheless I dare assure my critics that subjectivity and sentimentality are not on my side but on theirs.

Moscow's conduct, which has passed all bounds of abjectness and cynicism, calls forth an easy revolt within every proletarian revolutionary. Revolt engenders need for rejection. When the forces for immediate action are absent, impatient revolutionaries are inclined to resort to artificial methods. Thus arises, for example, the tactic of individual terror. More frequently resort is taken to strong expres-

sions, to insults, and to imprecation. In the case which concerns us certain comrades are manifestly inclined to seek compensation through "terminological" terror. However, even from this point of view the mere fact of qualifying the bureaucracy as a class is worthless. If the Bonapartist riffraff is a class this means that it is not an abortion but a viable child of history. If its marauding parasitism is "exploitation" in the scientific sense of the term, this means that the bureaucracy possesses a historical future as the ruling class indispensable to the given system of economy. Here we have the end to which impatient revolt leads when it cuts itself loose from Marxist discipline!

When an emotional mechanic considers an automobile in which, let us say, gangsters have escaped from police pursuit over a bad road, and finds the frame bent, the wheels out of line, and the motor partially damaged, he might quite justifiably say: "It is not an automobile—devil knows what it is!" Such an estimate would lack any technical and scientific value, but it would express the legitimate reaction of the mechanic at the work of the gangsters. Let us suppose, however, that this same mechanic must recondition the object which he named "devil-knows-what-it-is." In this case he will start with the recognition that it is a damaged automobile before him. He will determine what parts are still good and what are beyond repair in order to decide how to begin work. The class-conscious worker will have a similar attitude toward the U.S.S.R. He has full right to say that the gangsters of the bureaucracy have transformed the workers' state into "devil-knows-what-it-is." But when he passes from this explosive reaction to the solution of the political problem, he is forced to recognize that it is a damaged workers' state before him, in which the motor of economy is damaged, but which still continues to run and which can be completely reconditioned with the replacement of some parts. Of course this is only an analogy. Nevertheless it is worth reflecting over.

"A Counter-Revolutionary Workers' State"

Some voices cry out: "If we continue to recognize the U.S.S.R. as a workers' state, we will have to establish a new category: the counter-revolutionary workers' state." This argument attempts to shock our imagination by opposing a good programmatic norm to a miserable, mean, even repugnant reality. But haven't we observed from day to day since 1923 how the Soviet State has played a more and more counter-revolutionary role on the international arena? Have we forgotten the experience of the Chinese revolution, of the 1926 general strike in England, and finally the very fresh experience of the Spanish revolution? There are two completely counter-revolutionary workers' Internationals. These critics have apparently forgotten this "category." The trade unions of France, Great Britain, the United States, and other countries support completely the counter-revolutionary politics of their bourgeoisie. This does not prevent us from labeling them trade unions, from supporting their progressive steps, and from defending them against the bourgeoisie. Why is it impossible to employ the same method with the counter-revolutionary workers' state? In the last analysis a workers' state is a trade union which has conquered power. The difference in attitude in these two cases is explainable by the simple fact

that the trade unions have a long history and we have become accustomed to consider them as realities and not simply as "categories" in our program. But, as regards the workers' state there is being evinced an inability to learn to approach it as a real historical fact which has not subordinated itself to our program.

"Imperialism?"

Can the present expansion of the Kremlin be termed imperialism? First of all we must establish what social content is included in this term. History has known the "imperialism" of the Roman state based on slave labor, the imperialism of feudal land-ownership, the imperialism of commercial and industrial capital, the imperialism of the Czarist monarchy, etc. The driving force behind the Moscow bureaucracy is indubitably the tendency to expand its power, its prestige, its revenues. This is the element of "imperialism" in the widest sense of the word which was a property in the past of all monarchies, oligarchies, ruling castes, medieval estates and classes. However, in contemporary literature, at least Marxist literature, imperialism is understood to mean the *expansionist policy of finance capital* which has a very sharply defined economic content. To employ the term "imperialism" for the foreign policy of the Kremlin—without elucidating exactly what this signifies, means simply to identify the policy of the Bonapartist bureaucracy with the policy of monopolistic capitalism on the basis that both one and the other utilize military force for expansion. Such an identification, capable of sowing only confusion, is much more proper to petty-bourgeois democrats than to Marxists.

Continuation of the Policy of Czarist Imperialism

The Kremlin participates in a new division of Poland, the Kremlin lays hands upon the Baltic states, the Kremlin orients towards the Balkans, Persia, and Afghanistan; in other words, the Kremlin continues the policy of Czarist imperialism. Do we not have the right in this case to label the policy of the Kremlin itself imperialist? This historical-geographical argument is no more convincing than any of the others. The proletarian revolution, which occurred on the territory of the Czarist empire, attempted from the very beginning to conquer and for a time conquered the Baltic countries; attempted to penetrate Rumania and Persia and at one time led its armies up to Warsaw (1920). The lines of revolutionary expansion were the same as those of Czarism, since revolution does not change geographical conditions. That is precisely why the Mensheviks at that time already spoke of Bolshevik imperialism as borrowed from the traditions of Czarist diplomacy. The petty-bourgeois democracy willingly resorts to this argument even now. We have no reason, I repeat, for imitating them in this.

Agency of Imperialism?

However, aside from the manner in which to appraise the expansionist policy of the U.S.S.R. itself, there remains the question of the help which Moscow provides the imperialist policy of Berlin. Here first of all, it is necessary to establish that under certain conditions—up to a certain degree and in a certain form—the support of this or that im-

perialism would be inevitable even for a completely healthy workers' state—in virtue of the impossibility of breaking away from the chains of world imperialist relations. The Brest-Litovsk peace without the least doubt temporarily reinforced German imperialism against France and England. An isolated workers' state cannot fail to maneuver between the hostile imperialist camps. Maneuvering means temporarily supporting one of them against the other. To know exactly which one of the two camps it is more advantageous or less dangerous to support at a certain moment is not a question of principle but of practical calculation and foresight. The inevitable disadvantage which is engendered as a consequence of this constrained support for one bourgeois state against another is more than covered by the fact that the isolated workers' state is thus given the possibility of continuing its existence.

But there is maneuvering and maneuvering. At Brest-Litovsk the Soviet government sacrificed the national independence of the Ukraine in order to salvage the workers' state. Nobody could speak of treason toward the Ukraine, since all the class-conscious workers understood the forced character of this sacrifice. It is completely different with Poland. The Kremlin has never and at no place represented the question as if it had been *constrained* to sacrifice Poland. On the contrary, it boasts cynically of its combination, which affronts, rightfully, the most elementary democratic feelings of the oppressed classes and peoples throughout the world and thus weakens extremely the international situation of the Soviet Union. The economic transformations in the occupied provinces do not compensate for this by even a tenth part!

The entire foreign policy of the Kremlin in general is based upon a scoundrelly embellishment of the "friendly" imperialism and thus leads to the sacrifice of the fundamental interests of the world workers' movement for secondary and unstable advantages. After five years of duping the workers with slogans for the "defense of the democracies" Moscow is now occupied with covering up Hitler's policy of pillage. This in itself still does not change the U.S.S.R. into an imperialist state. But Stalin and his Comintern are now indubitably the most valuable agency of imperialism.

If we want to define the foreign policy of the Kremlin exactly, we must say that it is the policy of the *Bonapartist bureaucracy of a degenerated workers' state in imperialist encirclement*. This definition is not as short or as sonorous as "imperialist policy," but in return it is more precise.

"The Lesser Evil"

The occupation of Eastern Poland by the Red Army is to be sure a "lesser evil" in comparison to the occupation of the same territory by Nazi troops. But this lesser evil was obtained because Hitler was assured of achieving a greater evil. If somebody sets, or helps to set a house on fire and afterward saves five out of ten of the occupants of the house in order to convert them into his own semi-slaves, that is to be sure a lesser evil than to have burned the entire ten. But it is dubious that this firebug merits a medal for the rescue. If nevertheless a medal were given to him he should be shot immediately after as in the case of the hero in one of Victor Hugo's novels.

"Armed Missionaries"

Robespierre once said that people do not like missionaries with bayonets. By this he wished to say that it is impossible to impose revolutionary ideas and institutions on other people through military violence. This correct thought does not signify of course the inadmissibility of military intervention in other countries in order to cooperate in a revolution. But such an intervention, as part of a revolutionary international policy, must be understood by the international proletariat, must correspond to the desires of the toiling masses of the country on whose territory the revolutionary troops enter. The theory of socialism in one country is not capable, naturally, of creating this active international solidarity which alone can prepare and justify armed intervention. The Kremlin poses and resolves the question of military intervention, like all other questions of its policy, absolutely independently of the ideas and feelings of the international working class. Because of this, the latest diplomatic "successes" of the Kremlin monstrously compromise the U.S.S.R. and introduce extreme confusion into the ranks of the world proletariat.

Insurrection on Two Fronts

But if the question thus shapes itself—some comrades say—is it proper to speak of the defense of the U.S.S.R. and the occupied provinces? Is it not more correct to call upon the workers and peasants in both parts of former Poland to arise against Hitler as well as against Stalin? Naturally, this is very attractive. If revolution surges up simultaneously in Germany and in the U.S.S.R., including the newly occupied provinces, this would resolve many questions at one blow. But our policy cannot be based upon only the most favorable, the most happy combination of circumstances. The question is posed thus: What to do if Hitler, before he is crushed by revolution, attacks the Ukraine before revolution has smashed Stalin? Will the partisans of the Fourth International in this case fight against the troops of Hitler as they fought in Spain in the ranks of the Republican troops against Franco? We are completely and whole-heartedly for an independent (of Hitler as well as of Stalin) Soviet Ukraine. But what to do if, before having obtained this independence, Hitler attempts to seize the Ukraine which is under the domination of the Stalinist bureaucracy? The Fourth International answers: Against Hitler we will defend this Ukraine enslaved by Stalin.

"Unconditional Defense of the U.S.S.R."

What does "unconditional" defense of the U.S.S.R. mean? It means that we do not lay any conditions upon the bureaucracy. It means that independently of the motive and causes of the war we defend the social basis of the U.S.S.R., if it is menaced by danger on the part of imperialism.

Some comrades say: "And if the Red Army tomorrow invades India and begins to put down a revolutionary movement there shall we in this case support it?" Such a way of posing a question is not at all consistent. It is not clear above all why India is implicated. Is it not simpler to ask: If the Red Army menaces workers' strikes or peasant protests against the bureaucracy in the U.S.S.R. shall we support it or not? Foreign policy is the continuation of the internal.

We have never promised to support *all* the actions of the Red Army which is an instrument in the hands of the Bonapartist bureaucracy. We have promised to defend only the U.S.S.R. as a workers' state and solely those things within it which belong to a workers' state.

An adroit casuist can say: If the Red Army independently of the character of the "work" fulfilled by it, is beaten by the insurgent masses in India, this will weaken the U.S.S.R. To this we will answer: the crushing of a revolutionary movement in India, with the cooperation of the Red Army, would signify an incomparably greater danger to the social basis of the U.S.S.R. than an episodic defeat of counter-revolutionary detachments of the Red Army in India. In every case the Fourth International will know how to distinguish where and when the Red Army is acting solely as an instrument of the Bonapartist reaction and where it defends the social basis of the U.S.S.R.

A trade union led by reactionary fakers organizes a strike against the admission of Negro workers into a certain branch of industry. Shall we support such a shameful strike? Of course not. But let us imagine that the bosses, utilizing the given strike, make an attempt to crush the trade union and to make impossible in general the organized self-defense of the workers. In this case we will defend the trade union as a matter of course in spite of its reactionary leadership. Why is not this same policy applicable to the U.S.S.R.?

The Fundamental Rule

The Fourth International has established firmly that in all imperialist countries, independent of the fact as to whether they are in alliance with the U.S.S.R. or in a camp hostile to it, the proletarian parties during the war must develop the class struggle with the purpose of seizing power. At the same time the proletariat of the imperialist countries must not lose sight of the interests of the U.S.S.R.'s defense (or of that of colonial revolutions) and in case of real necessity must resort to the most decisive action, for instance, strikes, acts of sabotage, etc. The groupings of the powers since the time the Fourth International formulated this rule have changed radically. But the rule itself retains all its validity. If England and France tomorrow menace Leningrad or Moscow, the British and French workers should take the most decisive measures in order to hinder the sending of soldiers and military supplies. If Hitler finds himself constrained by the logic of the situation to send Stalin military supplies, the German workers, on the contrary, would have no reason for resorting in this concrete case to strikes or sabotage. Nobody, I hope, will propose any other solution.

"Revision of Marxism"?

Some comrades evidently were surprised that I spoke in my article ("The U.S.S.R. in the War") of the system of "bureaucratic collectivism" as a theoretical possibility. They discovered in this even a complete revision of Marxism. This is an apparent misunderstanding. The Marxist comprehension of historical necessity has nothing in common with fatalism. Socialism is not realizable "by itself," but as a result of the struggle of living forces, classes and their parties. The proletariat's decisive advantage in this struggle

resides in the fact that it represents historical progress, while the bourgeoisie incarnates reaction and decline. Precisely in this is the source of our conviction in victory. But we have full right to ask ourselves: What character will society take if the forces of reaction conquer?

Marxists have formulated an incalculable number of times the alternative: Either socialism or return to barbarism. After the Italian "experience" we repeated thousands of times: either communism or fascism. The real passage to socialism cannot fail to appear incomparably more complicated, more heterogeneous, more contradictory than was foreseen in the general historical scheme. Marx spoke about the dictatorship of the proletariat and its future withering away but said nothing about bureaucratic degeneration of the dictatorship. We have observed and analyzed for the first time in experience such a degeneration. Is this revision of Marxism?

The march of events has succeeded in demonstrating that the delay of the socialist revolution engenders the indubitable phenomena of barbarism—chronic unemployment, pauperization of the petty bourgeoisie, fascism, finally wars of extermination which do not open up any new road. What social and political forms can the new "barbarism" take, if we admit theoretically that mankind should not be able to elevate itself to socialism? We have the possibility of expressing ourselves on this subject more concretely than Marx. Fascism on one hand, degeneration of the Soviet State on the other outline the social and political forms of a neo-barbarism. An alternative of this kind—socialism or totalitarian servitude—has not only theoretical interest, but also enormous importance in agitation, because in its light the necessity of socialist revolution appears most graphically.

If we are to speak of a revision of Marx, it is in reality the revision of those comrades who project a new type of state, "non-bourgeois" and "non-worker." Because the alternative developed by me leads them to draw their own thoughts up to their logical conclusion, some of these critics, frightened by the conclusions of their own theory, accuse me . . . of revising Marxism. I prefer to think that it is simply a friendly jest.

The Right of Revolutionary Optimism

I endeavored to demonstrate in my article "The U.S.S.R. in the War" that the perspective of a non-worker and non-bourgeois society of exploitation or "bureaucratic collectivism," is the perspective of complete defeat and decline of the international proletariat, the perspective of the most profound historical pessimism. Are there any genuine reasons for such a perspective? It is not superfluous to inquire about this among our class enemies.

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

"But," Coulondre objects, "Stalin displayed great double-

dealing. The real victor (in case of war) will be Trotsky. Have you thought this over?"

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

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

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

Both of them, Coulongre and Hitler, represent the bar-

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

October 18, 1939

L. TROTSKY

Resolution On Russia

(A Statement of Policy by the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party)

1. *The Second World War, now in its opening stages, is an imperialist war for the re-division of the earth.* This estimate of the character of the war has been elaborated in the greatest detail by our international movement over a period of ten years, and has been verified by all the events since the actual outbreak of the war. Among the territories the imperialist powers covet is the territory of the U.S.S.R., the one-sixth of the world from which capitalist enterprise has been excluded since November, 1917. They would like to smash the Soviet state's monopoly of foreign trade, which for twenty-two years has prevented imperialist finance, industry and trade from competing against Soviet enterprise within the Soviet Union; to make available to the capitalist world this field for capital investment and its rich granaries and raw materials on terms dictated by the capitalists; in short, to reduce the Soviet Union to a colonial or semi-colonial status.

"Every big war, irrespective of its initial motives, must pose squarely the question of military intervention against the U.S.S.R. in order to transfuse fresh blood into the sclerotic veins of capitalism." In these words, our international theses, "War and the Fourth International" (1934), sounded a warning to the revolutionary workers to foresee this inescapable result of the contradiction between the U.S.S.R. and the imperialist states and to be on guard. These words are more than ever true today.

2. *The imperialists' response to the Finnish events strikingly confirms the prediction and warning of our thesis.* The Second World War included among its fronts from the first a rabid ideological campaign against the Soviet Union. Under the pretext provided by the Finnish events, this ideological war against the U.S.S.R. immediately reached a scope and intensity surpassing anything since the actual imperialist intervention in the first years of the revolution. In actual fact the war against the Soviet Union at that point already passed the ideological stage (Roosevelt's credits to Finland, Hoover's fund-raising committee, revival of the League of Nations as center of the anti-Soviet drive, American, British and Italian arms and planes to Mannerheim, etc.). Powerful sections of the ruling class in all imperialist countries endeavor to compromise the differences between Britain and Germany in order to unite

them against the Soviet Union. Even without this, however, as indicated by their reaction to the Finnish events, the "democratic" imperialists may shortly go over to a direct and full-fledged war against the Soviet Union.

3. *That the Second World War took the form it did in its initial stages—the imperialists turning upon each other before going on to seek the destruction of the Soviet Union—was envisaged by our theses, "War and the Fourth International."* As a result of Stalin's reactionary foreign policy and the defeats imposed upon the workers by the Comintern, imperialist fears of revolution temporarily abated; under Stalin the Soviet Union appeared in the world arena as an auxiliary to one imperialist camp or the other. Nevertheless the fundamental antagonism between the imperialist world and the Soviet Union remained, basically far deeper than the antagonisms among the imperialist powers. Stalin's attempt to take advantage of the war to strengthen his military-strategical position in the Ukraine and the Baltic galvanized the imperialists into a new high stage of war-preparations and belligerent acts against the Soviet Union. Stalin's continued "neutrality" was desired by the democratic imperialists only on condition that he make no attempts to strengthen himself against the eventual imperialist assault on the Soviet Union.

4. *A direct falsehood, and a direct service to the democratic imperialists, is the attempt to characterize the Soviet Union and Fascist Germany as identical kinds of states ("red and brown fascism," "red and brown imperialism," etc.).* These amalgams are employed by the imperialists and their lackeys in attempting to render more plausible their chauvinist justification of the war as a "war of democracy against fascism." To characterize the Soviet Union in such terms represents a yielding to the pressure of the democratic imperialists. This is demonstrated by the fact that the centrists in the labor movement (Socialist Party of Norman Thomas, Lovestoneites, etc.) found it but a step from the employment of these characterizations to outright democratic patriotism in support of the Finnish bourgeoisie and its imperialist backers.

5. *The war of the imperialists against the Soviet Union is enormously facilitated by the Soviet bureaucracy and its outer apparatus, the Comintern.* In direct contrast to the

revolutionary public diplomacy of Lenin and Trotsky, the Kremlin clique wages its secret diplomacy without explanation to either the Soviet or the world proletariat; thus each new move of the Kremlin in the world arena arouses the darkest suspicions and weakens the loyalty to the Soviet Union of even the most advanced workers. The repulsive character of Stalinist propaganda for the defense of the Soviet Union—identifying the defense of the U.S.S.R. with acceptance of Stalinist policy in all spheres—engenders in many workers the rejection of both. Stalinist propaganda on behalf of the Nazi-Soviet alliance undoubtedly drives sections of the proletarian vanguard, outraged by Stalin's cynical betrayal, into a subjective attitude of antagonism to the Soviet Union in order to safeguard their defeatist attitude toward Nazi Germany. This subjective attitude is today one of the most powerful levers in the hands of the social-patriots. In these various ways the Kremlin adds its weight to that of the democratic imperialists in creating enormous pressure upon the revolutionary vanguard to abandon the concept of the defense of the Soviet Union against the capitalist world.

6. *It is under the foregoing conditions that the Socialist Workers Party is confronted with the task of re-stating its attitude toward the Soviet Union today. The conditions under which we undertake our task may be summed up succinctly: OVERWHELMING PRESSURE TO ABANDON THE SOVIET UNION.* All tendencies to regard the Soviet Union as a lost cause, to cross it off and say there is nothing left of the conquests of the great revolution worthy of defense, signify a capitulation to this pressure. The revolutionary quality of our party, and its capacity to stand up in the war crisis, is tested at this point, above all, by its ability to withstand this pressure of the capitalist world and remain faithful to the defense of the Soviet Union.

An analysis of the Soviet Union constitutes inevitably more than an academic task; a Marxist analysis is at the same time a *programmatic declaration on the basic questions of the proletarian revolution.* The interpretation of the history of the classical bourgeois revolution, the French Revolution, has been for 150 years the battleground of contending bourgeois and petty-bourgeois (and later also the proletarian) camps. It is likewise with the unfolding of the first successful proletarian revolution.

Who made the Russian Revolution? Why was it successful? Why did the working class surrender its power to a privileged bureaucracy, and under what conditions will it retrieve its power? Should the Soviet Union be defended? What is the relation between Bolshevism and Stalinism? Is the U.S.S.R. a workers' state even though degenerated? Is it an asset or a liability to the international working class? The answer to these and related questions is also the answerer's program for the working class in his own country. It is especially important to point out this fact today in the democratic countries, where under pressure of the imperialist war-mongers, erstwhile "friends" of the Soviet Union have revised their views in conformity with those held by bourgeois democracy, yet attempt to palm off their views as "revolutionary" (Lovestoneites, Socialist Party, Independent Labor Party of England, etc.). Abandonment of the revolutionary Marxist estimate of the Soviet Union

and its course is merely a preliminary to—where it is not simultaneous with—abandonment of a revolutionary attitude against the bourgeoisie of one's "own" country.

The Nature of the Soviet State

7. The Soviet state was founded in November, 1917 upon the theory of Marxism and by means of the strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution flowing from that theory. Marxist theory was conclusively vindicated by the October Revolution. The revolution transformed private property into state property, the necessary form of economy for the transition from capitalism to socialism. Control of this property was exercised by the working class through the Soviets (workers' councils elected on the basis of occupational representation), the factory committees, the army committees, the trade unions and the revolutionary party. This Soviet democracy constituted the dictatorship of the proletariat sketched by Marx, exercised uncompromisingly against the bourgeoisie, both national and international, and against all irreconcilable enemies of the workers' state. It was the broadest and most genuine democracy which has ever existed.

Nevertheless, it was denounced from the first by currents in the labor movement (Second International, International Federation of Trade Unions, anarchists, "pure and simple" trade unionists, etc.) who were partisans of other methods—at bottom, bourgeois-democratic methods—of solving humanity's problems. In their material and ideological war against the Soviet Union, they pointed to contradictions between the model of the workers' state as sketched by Marx and Lenin, and the reality. No one, however, was more critical than Lenin, and more observant than he, in pointing out the gaps between ideal and reality. Since Lenin's death, those who carried on the Leninist tradition, the Bolshevik-Leninists—now the Fourth International—continued to subject the Soviet Union to the most thoroughgoing critical analysis. All valid criticism of the Soviet Union—the scientific explanation of the developing gap between the Leninist ideal and the harsh reality—is the achievement of the Bolshevik-Leninists.

Among the *immediate* factors which intervened between ideal and reality were the vast destruction and expending of the resources of the country brought by the imperialist war from 1914-1917, the destruction accompanying the civil war and the imperialist intervention of the whole capitalist world in the ensuing years, and the necessary emergency measures to combat these conditions which the Soviet state had to take. These were not, however, the decisive factors which intervened between ideal and reality and which transformed the Soviet democracy of 1917 into Stalin's totalitarian regime of 1939.

8. The ideal of the Soviet state sketched by Marx and elaborated by Lenin was an ideal for an *international workers' regime.* Only on a world scale, on the basis of the material and technological resources of at least the advanced countries could the Soviet state be built and endure along the lines of the model outlined by Marx and Lenin.

The Soviet Union will perish unless the revolution is successfully extended to one or more advanced countries, said Lenin. True enough, he expected the wrecking of the Soviet state, rather than its degeneration; to put it more

correctly, he did not sharply differentiate between these two possibilities. The two are not, however, contradictory. Degeneration must inescapably end at a certain stage in downfall.

The Degeneration of the Soviet State

9. *The degeneration of the Soviet state is part of the price paid by the Soviet and world proletariat for the failure to spread the revolution into Western Europe.* The responsibility for this process of degeneration rests first of all upon the social-democracy which collaborated with the capitalist world in crushing the post-war revolutions in Western Europe. The claim elaborated by the social democracy and its bourgeois allies, that the degenerate bureaucracy of the Soviet Union is the logical outgrowth of the Bolshevik doctrines of Lenin and Trotsky, is a contemptible attempt to justify the counter-revolutionary role of social democracy. The Bolshevik-Leninists, the Left Opposition, fought the degeneration at every step. If Stalinism triumphed over the proletarian core of the party it was only because Stalinism *adapted itself* to, and literally became the tool of, the imperialist world.

10. *The pressure of capitalist encirclement upon an isolated workers' state was particularly malignant in backward Russia.* The backward economy which the Soviet Union inherited from the Czarist Empire has been deprived of free access to the advanced technology of the Western world by the hostility of the capitalist world. That, in spite of this, Soviet economy was able to multiply its output by ratios of acceleration unprecedented in history, testifies to the superiority of state property over the anarchy of private property. But it could not, out of nothing as it were, outstrip the rate of productivity of advanced technology elsewhere. It remains behind the capitalist world by the decisive criterion of *productivity per man hour*. And in this fact lie the roots of the Soviet bureaucracy.

11. *Where goods are scarce and their control and consumption constitutes a privilege, it is inevitable that a distinction will arise between privileged and unprivileged.* In the Soviet Union this took place when the scarcity of consumers' goods and the universal struggle to obtain them generated within the state a policeman (the bureaucracy) who arrogated to himself the function of distribution. Hostile pressure from without imposed on the policeman the role of "defender" of the country, endowing him with national authority under cover of which he was doubly able to plunder the country. This policeman, the Stalinist bureaucracy, differs from other labor bureaucracies—such as the Second International, which are generated by a similar process of economic scarcity, but one artificially imposed by capitalist property relations upon the advanced countries—in the greater power it wields; for while the labor bureaucracies in capitalist countries rule the workers with brutal disdain, they are themselves servitors of the ruling class and its state, whereas the Stalinist bureaucracy itself possesses the state apparatus in the Soviet Union. The Stalinist bureaucracy, in short, differs from the ordinary labor bureaucracy in that it is the bureaucracy which rules over a labor movement which destroyed its capitalist class in 1917. But the destruction of the Russian capitalist class did not free the Soviet Union from the pressure of world im-

perialism. As the conservative urge to maintain privileges gained under an economy of scarcity in a capitalist country motivates a labor bureaucracy to serve its "own" ruling class, so the anxiety to conserve privileges under the economy of scarcity imposed upon the Soviet Union by capitalist encirclement has led the Stalinist bureaucracy into the service of the dominant ruling class internationally—world imperialism. Where the labor bureaucracy in a capitalist country serves its "own" rulers as long as the latter allow it to retain its status quo (and the "enemy" imperialist rulers when its "own" ruling class dispenses with its services in favor of the Fascist bureaucracy—as the German social democracy, for instance, now serves Germany's enemies), the Kremlin serves now one, now another group of imperialist powers, depending upon which bloc can better assure it of retaining its status quo in the Soviet Union.

12. *Despite the depredations of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the Soviet Union remains a workers' state. More accurately, it is a degenerated workers' state, having been stripped of many of the characteristics it possessed under Lenin's government: above all stripped of Soviet and party democracy and of Leninist internationalist policy.* The Soviet Union retains, however, its *class character*—like the trade unions plundered by the labor bureaucrats, reduced to servitors of the bosses but still remaining in fundamental antagonism to capitalism. Despite all the inroads of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the chief conquest of the overturn achieved by the October Revolution in the realm of economy remains: state property. So long as the nationalized property is not overturned or seized by the imperialist powers, the Soviet Union remains a workers' state, degenerated though it is.

13. *The Stalinist bureaucracy represents merely a temporary malignant growth.* The conditions for its triumph—the backwardness of the country and the imperialist environment—bear a temporary and transitional character, and will disappear with the victory of the world revolution.

Only postponement of the world revolution nourishes the bureaucracy. It feeds on the defeats of the world working class. It maintains its arbitrary rule only because the Soviet masses have not been awakened by revolution without. It plays no independent role in production. It serves no need of production. On the contrary, bureaucratism has become the worst brake on the technical and cultural development of the Soviet Union. This was veiled for a certain time by the fact that Soviet economy was occupied for two decades with transplanting and assimilating the technology and organization of production in advanced capitalist countries. But the higher the economy rose, the more complex its requirements became, all the more unbearable became the obstacle of the bureaucracy. The constantly sharpening contradiction between them leads to uninterrupted political convulsions. The explanation for this is to be found precisely in the fact that the bureaucracy is not the bearer of a new system of economy peculiar to itself and impossible without itself, but is a parasitic growth on a workers' state. The monstrous purges in the U.S.S.R. testify to the fact that Soviet society tends organically toward ejection of the bureaucracy. The Stalin regime is a regime of permanent crisis. By the sweep and monstrous fraudulence of his purge, Stalin testifies to nothing else but the incapacity of

the bureaucracy to transform itself into a stable ruling class.

14. *The primary danger of the end of the Soviet Union as a workers' state and its transformation into a capitalist state comes from imperialist intervention.* The imperialist invaders will find allies within—there is growing within the bureaucracy a wing which realizes that the bureaucratic caste can insure its positions of privilege only through rejection of nationalization, collectivization and the monopoly of foreign trade, replacing them with "Western civilization", i.e.—capitalism. This section of the bureaucracy seeks, as its way out of the conflict which rages between the needs of the nationalized economy and the bureaucracy's organic incapacity to manage it, a place as a com-pradore bourgeoisie in the service of the imperialist powers.

The Foreign Policy of the Stalinist Bureaucracy in the War

15. *Like the foreign policy of all regimes, the foreign policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy is a continuation of its internal policy.* The bureaucracy has lost all faith in the creative capacity of the masses whom it plunders. It has established a system of ruling without any control from below. Thus it has crystallized beyond reform a political regime which would be fatally disrupted by an awakening of the masses. These internal characteristics of the bureaucracy enter into its foreign policy. The interests of the U.S.S.R. demand, above all, successful proletarian revolutions, especially in the advanced countries, and a common plan of economy with such workers' states. The bureaucracy, however, began its reign without any faith in the possibility of successful revolutions elsewhere, formulating this lack of faith in its theory of "socialism in one country"—that is, from the outset the bureaucracy adopted a perspective which ruled out revolutions elsewhere. Its further development (degeneration) soon brought the bureaucracy to the realization that revolutions in the advanced countries would destroy the basis of its political regime, which rests on the passivity of the masses. Hence, the foreign policy of the bureaucracy is directed, first of all, toward the bourgeois governments and not toward the international working class. The good-will of bourgeois governments is the primary objective of the Soviet bureaucracy.

16. *The Communist International serves the Kremlin in its foreign policy solely as a means of winning the goodwill of the "friendly" bourgeois governments and of hindering the foreign policy of the "enemy" governments.* Thus that section of the proletariat influenced by the Comintern is transformed into an auxiliary force of one imperialist camp or another. The Kremlin, through its foreign agency and also in its own name, proceeds to embellish and idealize the "friendly" imperialism, calling upon the proletariat to subordinate itself to the "friend." After five years of duping the workers with slogans for the "defense of the democracies," Moscow is now engaged in whitewashing Hitler's marauding policy as one of "peace." The Kremlin has become the most valuable agency of imperialism, for the power and prestige of the Kremlin enable it to serve a "friendly" imperialism to a far greater degree than the Second International was ever

able to serve. These services of the Comintern have become an extremely attractive bargaining point in the Kremlin's overtures to the imperialist powers.

17. *The leaders of the Comintern justify this policy by the general proposition that an isolated workers' state must utilize the contradictions in the camp of imperialism. The general proposition is indisputable.* An isolated workers' state cannot fail to maneuver between the hostile imperialist camps; and maneuvering means temporarily supporting one of them against the other. However, this constrained support for one bourgeois state against another is justified only when it is demonstrated in the full view of the world proletariat that the isolated workers' state is thus saved from destruction and that the support is not purchased by suspension of the working class' struggle to overthrow that bourgeois state. By these criteria, the alliance with Hitler must be condemned.

18. *The Brest-Litovsk peace reinforced German imperialism against France and England and sacrificed the national independence of the Ukraine.* The class-conscious workers, however, could understand without difficulty that signing of the treaty was necessary for salvaging the workers' state. Having saved itself by that peace, the Soviet Union could later destroy the peace. Here is the classical example, under the internationalist regime of Lenin and Trotsky, of maneuvering between the imperialist camps.

In the alliance with Hitler, however, the Kremlin does not claim that it is *constrained* to accept the alliance in order to continue to exist; nor does it represent the sacrifice of Poland as a bitter necessity imposed upon the Soviet Union by the imperialist powers. On the contrary, the Kremlin boasts of its alliance and does not trouble to explain how it can possibly justify having aided Hitler in enslaving some twenty-three million Poles. The economic transformations in the provinces occupied by the Red Army, covering eleven million people, can scarcely be said to compensate for delivering more than twice that number to Hitler. Under these conditions, the oppressed classes and peoples throughout the world have been affronted by the alliance with Hitler, thus weakening extremely the international position of the Soviet Union.

19. *As in the occupation of the Polish Ukraine, so in the invasion of Finland, the Kremlin poses and resolves the question, like all other questions of its policy, absolutely independently of the ideas and sentiments of the international working class.* That its "successes" monstrously compromise the Soviet Union and wreak havoc in the international working class, does not concern it at all.

20. *The Stalinist bureaucracy cannot provide the international working class with a satisfactory explanation of its invasion of the Polish Ukraine and Finland, because a full explanation would constitute a damning indictment of Stalinism.* Stalinism is directly responsible for the fact that Finland has remained up to now an outpost of imperialism on the Soviet border. By its internal and external policies—the plight of the Finnish population of Soviet Karelia and the fate of the German proletariat under Stalinist leadership were the two facets of Stalinist policy which struck home most directly to the Finnish masses—the Stalinist bureaucracy drove into passivity a proletariat and peasantry which had always been foremost in the van-

guard of revolutionary fighters in the Czarist Empire, which had conducted a heroic civil war (1918) and which had illegally maintained a powerful Communist party up until the rise of Hitler. The Soviet Union could not aid the Finnish revolution of 1918; it could certainly have aided a revolution any time in the last decade. That no revolution eventuated is the responsibility of Stalinism. Instead of Leningrad being protected by a successful Finnish proletarian revolution, it is "safeguarded" by an invasion of Finland. Essentially the same story can be told of the Polish Ukraine. Stalin cannot explain this without exposing himself.

21. *Our condemnation of the military intervention of the Stalinist bureaucracy is motivated by our defense of the Soviet Union.* The military-strategic advantages gained in the Polish Ukraine and Finland are far outweighed by the negative results—that the Kremlin purchases its alliance with Hitler by putting the Comintern to work whitewashing him; that the Ukrainian provinces were purchased at the price of aiding Hitler to enslave 23 million Poles; that the invasions are carried out without consideration of the will of the workers of the Soviet Union, or the occupied territories, or the international proletariat and, indeed, in direct violation of the ideas and feelings of the masses, and consequently compromise the Soviet Union and disorient the world working class.

22. *Our condemnation of the military intervention of the Stalinist bureaucracy has nothing in common with the attacks upon the Soviet Union by the social-democrats, petty-bourgeois democrats, anarchists, etc.* These non-Bolshevik critics of the Kremlin hypocritically denounce the Soviet Union as imperialist for using military force and for violating existing borders. For us, however, the borders of the capitalist world are not at all inviolate, and military force may very well serve revolution, as in the aid given by the Red Army to the revolution in Georgia in 1920. *We argue as defenders of the Soviet Union, the non-Bolshevik critics as its enemies.* It is impossible, therefore, for revolutionists to find any common ground with non-revolutionists in condemning the foreign policy of the Soviet bureaucracy.

23. *The Kremlin's crimes in foreign policy are simply a continuation of its crimes against the national economy of the Soviet Union. Its foreign policy flows from its internal policy: they constitute the mode of existence of the Bonapartist bureaucracy of a degenerated workers' state in capitalist encirclement—nothing more or less than that.* The disease necessitates surgical treatment; but that can be done only on the basis of the scientific diagnosis elaborated above. Those who, overcome by the spectacle of Stalinist degeneration, seek to exorcise it by all sorts of epithets ("imperialism," "red fascism," "the bureaucracy is a new class," "no longer a workers' state but a bureaucratic state," etc.) do not help the cure of the disease. *On the contrary, by abandoning the precise, Marxian definitions painstakingly elaborated and developed with the years by our international movement, and replacing our Marxian definitions by epithets from the arsenal of the democratic-imperialists, they only sow confusion and play into the hands of the enemies of the Soviet Union.*

Regeneration of the Soviet State

24. *The armed overthrow of the Soviet bureaucracy by the working class is the necessary condition for the regeneration of the Soviet state.* This political revolution is the chief task of the revolutionists in the U.S.S.R. Each day added to the domination of the bureaucracy helps rot the foundations of the socialist economy and increases the chances for capitalist restoration. The bureaucracy has, by its destruction of Soviet democracy, left open to the Soviet workers only the road of armed overthrow of the bureaucracy as the means for reviving Soviet democracy.

Within the Soviet Union today only preparatory propagandistic work is possible. The impetus to the Soviet workers' revolutionary upsurge will probably be given by revolutionary events outside the country. The Soviet workers' fear of the hostile surrounding capitalist world is Stalin's guarantee for his continued domination. Were the horizons of the U.S.S.R. ringed with red instead of brown, the Soviet masses could be depended upon to settle all scores immediately against the bureaucracy. The chief strength of the bureaucracy lies not in itself but in the disillusionment and passivity of the masses, in their lack of new perspective. A wave of revolutionary struggle of the masses in the imperialist countries, certain to come in the course of the war, will open a new perspective of struggle for the Soviet masses. The struggle against social inequality and political oppression, for the freedom of the trade unions and the factory committees, for the right of assembly and freedom of the press, legalization of soviet parties, revival of the Soviets as representative bodies democratically elected on the basis of occupational representation, revision of planned economy from top to bottom in the interests of producers and consumers, the fight against the international policy of the bureaucracy and its secret diplomacy—these will be the slogans that will mobilize the masses, and the aims of their uprising against the bureaucracy.

The mobilization of the masses of the Soviet Union for these aims is the task of the Fourth International. The social hatred stored up by the workers against the bureaucracy—this is precisely what, from the viewpoint of the Kremlin clique, constitutes Trotskyism. The Kremlin fears with a thoroughly well-grounded fear the bond between the deep but inarticulate indignation of the workers and the organization of the Fourth International. For there is but one party capable of leading the Soviet masses to insurrection—the party of the Fourth International.

25. The growth of the productive forces in the Soviet Union as a result of the nationalization of the means of production in 1917 and in spite of the depredations of the bureaucracy signifies that the regeneration of the Soviet state will take place on a far higher economic and cultural basis than in 1918. Nevertheless, the solution of the economic contradictions of the U.S.S.R. will remain, as in 1917, solvable only in the international arena, by the world revolution. Only by linking Soviet economy to the advanced economy of the great states, once these come under the rule of the proletariat, will the danger of another degeneration be averted. But in that way it *will* be averted. The international revolution will put an end to all burea-

cracies by putting an end to all special privilege. Control and consumption of goods will no longer constitute a privilege. Science and technology on a world scale have provided the foundations for an economy of plenty, and only the old, obsolete property forms stand in the way.

26. *For an independent Soviet Ukraine*, is one of the fundamental slogans of the coming revolution in the U.S.S.R. The right of self-determination, brutally violated by Stalin, must be reinstated. The indubitably widespread movement for Ukrainian independence will become the property of the capitalist restorationist movement unless it is channelized in the revolutionary movement; a channel it will find in any event. A degenerated Soviet state would easily find the way to mutually satisfactory collaboration with an independent Soviet Ukraine in a genuine Union of Soviet Republics. The same considerations hold for a national-freedom movement which may develop among the Byelo-Russian and other nationalities in the Soviet Union.

Defense of the Soviet Union

27. *We have always stood for the unconditional defense of the Soviet Union against the capitalist world or internal attempts at capitalist restoration.* Never was it more necessary to reiterate this principle than today, when the unfolding of the Second World War demonstrates that inherent in it is an attempt by the imperialists to restore capitalism in the U.S.S.R. Defense of the Soviet Union is a *class duty*, as it is a class duty to defend any section of the labor movement against the capitalist world. We defend the Soviet Union against capitalist blows, irrespective of the circumstances and immediate causes of the conflict.

28. *Defense of the U.S.S.R. is the logical corollary of our analysis of the first workers' state. All kinds of democratic, idealistic, ultra-left, anarchistic theories, ignoring the character of Soviet property relations or the class contradiction between the Soviet state and the bourgeois states, lead logically, especially in case of war, to counter-revolutionary conclusions.*

29. *Our conception of the defense of the U.S.S.R. remains in its basic fundamentals the conception which the revolutionary movement held at the very birth of the Soviet State.* The defense of the Soviet Union was always conceived of as an integral part of the international revolution. The defense of the Soviet Union was conceived of as subordinated to the world revolution, in the specific sense that a *part* is subordinated to the *whole*. The Bolsheviks in 1918 were prepared to risk the existence of proletarian power in the Soviet Union for the sake of the German revolution, by virtue of the criterion that the success of the German revolution—one of the major advanced countries—was more important than the Russian revolution. Likewise today, if the U.S.S.R. were allied with Germany in the war, the German revolution would unquestionably menace the immediate interests of the defense of the U.S.S.R.; nevertheless we, like the Bolsheviks in 1918, would be for the most decisive measures to assure the success of the German revolution. This in no wise signifies the negation of the defense of the Soviet Union or a conflict between it and world revolution; for the world revolution, or any part of it more significant than the Soviet

Union, such as the German revolution, would constitute in the end the most decisive defense of the Soviet Union.

30. *Since the triumph of the Soviet bureaucracy (1923), the defense of the Soviet Union has involved a clear distinction between the needs of the Soviet Union and the needs of the bureaucracy.* Since 1923 defense of the Soviet Union, for revolutionists, has in no way signified *political support* of the rulers of the Soviet state. In 1920 we supported the Red Army march into Poland as motivated by the interests of the revolution, likewise the aid given by the Red Army to the revolutionists in Georgia in wresting it from a puppet-government of the imperialists. Those were acts dictated by revolutionary considerations to the revolutionary-internationalist government of the Soviet Union. The Stalinist bureaucracy, however, represents interests and ideas almost the opposite of the interests and ideas of the October Revolution and we can therefore give no support to its politics, including its military politics (invasion of Poland, Finland, etc.).

31. *Since 1927 our movement has proclaimed that the needs of the defense of the Soviet Union as a workers' state is fundamentally separated from the bureaucracy's defense of the U.S.S.R.* It was then stated that, in the interests of the genuine defense of the Soviet Union, the proletarian vanguard can be obliged to eliminate the Stalin government and replace it with a revolutionary-internationalist government which would coordinate the defense of the U.S.S.R. with the furthering of the world revolution. The change of government was then conceived to be possible by the reform of the Communist party. In 1933 the bankruptcy of the Communist International became evident when the great German party was ordered to go down before Hitler without striking a blow. We abandoned the perspective of reform of the Communist parties, including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The necessary change of government could, consequently, take place only by building a new revolutionary party capable of taking over the government (the new party was of course illegal by fiat of the Stalin government). By 1936 the complete extirpation of the former power of the Soviets made clear that the political revolution could take place only in the form of *armed overthrow* of the Soviet bureaucracy. The development of our program for the regeneration of the Soviet state, as thus outlined, was always, however, and remains so today, predicated on the conception that the task of regeneration was the best and most decisive way of defending the first workers' state.

32. *The abandonment (1933) of the perspective of regenerating the Communist International and its parties did not fundamentally affect the perspective of regenerating the Soviet state.* A *party* and a *state* are not objects of the same order. A party is a selection of people on the basis of certain ideas and methods. This selection, in the Third International, became so fundamentally opposed to Marxism that we were obliged to abandon all hope of regenerating it. But the Soviet state differs from a party in that it is a complex of social institutions which continues to persist in spite of the fact that the ideas of the bureaucracy are now almost the opposite of the ideas of the October Revolution. Above all, *the nationalized property in the means of production* persists and determines the *class char-*

acter of the Soviet Union. That is why we do not renounce the possibility of regenerating the Soviet state. That dictates to us its defense against the capitalist world.

33. Defense of the Soviet Union against imperialism includes, of course, the newly occupied territories which, with the nationalization of their means of production, have become identical in class character with other parts of the U.S.S.R.

34. Our slogan for an independent Soviet Ukraine is the application to the field of the national question of our general slogan for the revolutionary overthrow of the bureaucracy. In the same sense that the revolutionary overthrow of the bureaucracy does not conflict with the defense of the Soviet Union, but on the contrary, best serves that defense, so the independence of the Soviet Ukraine will facilitate the defense of the Soviet Union. The same considerations motivate our slogan for an independent Soviet Finland.

35. Our defense of the Soviet Union is an *unconditional* duty. It is unconditional in two senses:

(a) We do not demand that the Soviet bureaucracy, prior to our participation in the defense of the U.S.S.R., make any agreement or concessions. Indeed, "defense" can have meaning only in this sense. For if we demanded that the bureaucracy first comply with certain conditions, or that the circumstances under which we would defend a workers' state against imperialism be of a certain character, that would not be defense at all but, rather, defeatism. For is it not a fact that we are ready to defend the United States, for example, under certain conditions—e.g., control of the country by the working class? "Conditional defense" is a misuse of terms. One is either a defensist or a defeatist.

To require nothing of the bureaucracy as a condition for our defense of the Soviet Union—that signifies also that our defense has nothing in common with that of the bureaucracy.

(b) We do not shelve our aim of a political revolution in the U.S.S.R. during the war. Recognizing that the overthrow of the bureaucracy would immensely strengthen the U.S.S.R. in conducting the war, our objective of a political revolution remains in the period of the war and, indeed, becomes absolutely imperative. A number of considerations should make this obvious. If the course of the war should push Stalin into a complete military alliance with Hitler, pressure for capitalist restoration would in all likelihood come most immediately from "ally" Hitler and the "compradore" wing of the bureaucracy. Hitler would demand entry into the country for German technology to facilitate war production—but in the form of capitalist concessions, and he would be supported in his demands by the "compradore" wing of the bureaucracy. Enmeshed in the alliance, the bureaucracy would resist ineffectively, if at all. Under such conditions the resistance to capitalist restoration would require mobilization of the Soviet masses in revolutionary struggle against capitalist restoration and its agents within the Soviet Union. Such a mobilization could have as its object only a political revolution for the regeneration of the Soviet state.

The difference between this political revolution and a social revolution in an imperialist country, apart from the obvious fact that the former would not have as its task

the overturn of private property, is that, whereas in the imperialist country we continue the class struggle without considering the effect on the military front, in the Soviet Union the political revolution would have to be carried on with one of its objects being to safeguard the borders at all times against imperialist invasion. In this sense, and only in this sense, our aim of political revolution is subordinated to the task of defending the state property against imperialist attack.

36. *The attempt of the democratic-patriots (Norman Thomas, Lovestone, etc.) to characterize our policy as a capitulation to Stalinism is a conscious and deliberate falsification.* They had to go over bodily to the camp of the "democratic" imperialists (American Labor Party resolutions) before they had the effrontery to so characterize the same policy which in former years (when they were tail-ending the Stalinists) they slandered as "anti-Soviet." No less contemptible is the attempt to draw from our position the implication that we will join Stalin in crushing proletarian movements in the Soviet Union or elsewhere. Our struggle against Stalin's armed forces in Loyalist Spain should be sufficient refutation of the charge. We defend the nationalized property of the Soviet Union against the imperialists. Successful proletarian revolutions, in the Soviet Union or elsewhere, would constitute the best possible defense of the Soviet Union. Hence we would defend those revolutions, arms in hand, if necessary against Stalin's armed forces. That is the obvious meaning of our specific slogans for an independent Soviet Ukraine, an independent Soviet Finland, and a political revolution for the regeneration of the Soviet state.

37. *The fundamental difference between our conception of defense of the U.S.S.R. and that of the Stalinists is today especially sharply posed.* On the question of the German revolution Stalin is whitewashing Hitler, presenting his "peace" policy as good coin, calling the masses to struggle only against those opposed to Hitler's policy. The Comintern press indignantly repeats Goebbels' charges against the British as responsible for the attempted bombing of Hitler, and utilizes the occasion to warn the workers that Hitler's replacement would most likely take the form of a monarchist restoration aimed against the U.S.S.R.—ergo, Hitler should remain. We, on the contrary, insist that the hostility of the German working class against the Nazi regime must in the course of the war find the way to destroying the Nazi regime. Not merely because the Nazi regime is an unstable, treacherous ally of the U.S.S.R. but above all because a German revolution would far outweigh in importance the Russian Revolution.

The specific weight of the German revolution and its successful prosecution are in no way impeded, however, if the vanguard of the German working class gives due consideration to the needs of the U.S.S.R.—its real needs and not those asserted by the bureaucracy. If, for example, Hitler finds himself constrained by the logic of the situation to send military supplies to the Soviet Union, the German workers would have no reason, in that concrete instance, to resort to strike or sabotage. The development of the German revolution would find sufficient scope while facilitating whatever material aid the Soviet Union would be receiving from its imperialist ally.

38. *In the imperialist countries fighting against the U.S.S.R. in a war, also, the proletariat must not lose sight of the interests of the U.S.S.R.; in cases of real necessity, the workers must resort to the most decisive action: strikes, acts of sabotage, etc. in order to hinder the sending of soldiers and supplies against the U.S.S.R.*

The practical differences dictated to the workers on each side in connection with the defense of the U.S.S.R. in no way modify the fundamental principle that, in all imperialist countries, independent of the fact as to whether or not they are in alliance with the U.S.S.R., the proletariat must develop the class struggle with the purpose of seizing power as soon as possible.

39. *For the revolutionary vanguard in the democratic imperialist countries, where their voices are being drowned out by the anti-Soviet thunder, the real danger now is not the danger of confusion between our concept of what is worthy of defense in the U.S.S.R. and that of the Stalinists, but the danger that we may give direct or indirect help to the dominant political current which tries to identify the U.S.S.R. with the Fascist states. In order to inspire the workers to defend the Soviet Union, it is vitally important to make clear to them what we defend (nationalized property), against whom (the imperialists and the bureaucracy), and how (by revolutionary means). This work of developing clear and inspiring slogans will not produce miraculous results, for we are working amid the thunderous din of democratic-imperialist propaganda. Our voices*

may very well be drowned out for a time by the first waves of patriotism. We are going today *against the stream*. He who argues against our program from the standpoint that it is difficult to make it persuasive to the workers, is thereby yielding to the democratic pressure; if logical, he will end up in the patriotic camp.

40. *We are not a government party; we are the party of irreconcilable opposition, not only in capitalist countries but also in the U.S.S.R.* Our tasks, among them the "defense" of the U.S.S.R., we realize not through the medium of bourgeois governments and not even through the government of the U.S.S.R., but exclusively through the education of the masses, through agitation, through explaining to the workers what they should defend and what they should overthrow. Such a defense cannot give immediate miraculous results. Our work must be directed so that the workers on whom we have influence should correctly appraise events, not permit themselves to be caught unawares, and prepare the general sentiment of their own class for the revolutionary solution of the tasks confronting us.

This kind of defense of the U.S.S.R. naturally differs, as night from day, from the official defense which the Stalinists conduct. The difference is summed up in these slogans. The Stalinists say: "For the Fatherland! For Stalin!" The defense waged by the Fourth International is carried on under the slogan: "For Socialism! For the world revolution! Against Stalin!"

Dialectical Materialism and Science*

The Continuity of Cultural Heritage

YOUR CONGRESS convenes amid the celebrations of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the Academy of Sciences. The connection between your Congress and the Academy is made all the firmer by the fact that Russian chemistry occupies by no means the last place in the achievements that have brought fame to the Academy. Here it is perhaps proper to pose the question: What is the inner historical significance of the elaborate academic celebrations? They have a significance far beyond mere visits to museums, theatres and banquets. How can we estimate this significance? Not merely by the fact that foreign scientists, kind enough to come here as our guests, have had the opportunity of ascertaining that the revolution far from destroying scientific institutions has on the contrary developed them. This evidence acquired by the foreign scientists pos-

sesses a meaning of its own. But the significance of the academic celebrations is far greater and deeper. I would formulate it as follows: *The new state, a new society based on the laws of the October Revolution takes possession triumphantly—before the eyes of the whole world—of the cultural heritage of the past.*

Since I have inadvertently referred to heritage, I must make clear the sense in which I use this term so as to avoid any possible misunderstandings. We would be guilty of disrespect to the future, dearer to all of us than the past, and we would be disrespectful of the past, which in many of its aspects merits profound respect—if we were to talk loosely about heritage. Not everything in the past is of value for the future. Furthermore, the development of human culture is not determined by simple concretion. There have been periods of organic growth as well as periods of rigorous

**A Necessary Explanation*: In 1925 Trotsky, as chairman of the technical and scientific board of industry, was head of all scientific institutions, and in that capacity delivered the speech, published below, before the Mendeleev Congress on September 17, 1925. On April 18, 1938, Trotsky wrote the following foreword to the English translation of his speech:

"This speech was delivered in 1925, at a time when the author still firmly hoped that Soviet democracy would overcome the tendencies towards bureaucratism, and create exceptionally favorable conditions for the development of scientific thought. Because of a combination of historical causes this hope has not yet materialized. On the contrary, the Soviet state in the intervening thirteen years has fallen victim to complete bureaucratic ossification and has assumed a totalitarian character equally baneful to

the development of science and art. Through the cruel irony of history, genuine Marxism has now become the most proscribed of all doctrines in the Soviet Union. In the field of social science, shackled Soviet thought has not only failed to utter a single new word but, on the contrary, has sunk to the depths of pathetic scholasticism. The totalitarian regime likewise exercises a disastrous influence upon the development of the natural sciences. Nevertheless the views developed in this speech retain their validity, in the section too, which deals with the inter-relations between the social regime and scientific thought. However, they should be placed not against the background of the present Soviet state, a product of degeneration and disintegration, but rather taken in the light of that socialist state which will arise from the future victorious struggle of the international working class."

criticism, sifting and selection. It would be difficult to say which of these periods has proved more fruitful for the general development of culture. At all events, we are living in an epoch of sifting and selection.

Roman jurisprudence had, from the time of Justinian, established the law of inventorial inheritance. In contrast to pre-Justinian legislation which established the right of an heir to accept inheritance provided only he likewise assumed responsibility for all obligations and debts, inventorial inheritance gave the inheritor a certain degree of choice. The revolutionary state, representing a new class, is a kind of inventorial inheritor in relation to the accumulated store of culture. Let me state frankly that not all of the 15,000 volumes published by the Academy during its two centuries of existence will enter into the inventory of Socialism! There are two aspects of by no means equal merit to the scientific contributions of the past which are now ours and upon which we pride ourselves. Science as a whole has been directed toward acquiring knowledge of reality, research into the laws of evolution, and discovery of the properties and qualities of matter, in order to gain greater mastery over it. But knowledge did not develop within the four walls of a laboratory or a lecture hall. No, it remained a function of human society and reflected the structure of human society. For its needs, society requires knowledge of nature. But at the same time, society demands an affirmation of its right to be what it is; a justification of its particular institutions; first and foremost, the institutions of class domination, just as in the past it demanded the justification of serfdom, class privileges, monarchical prerogatives, national exceptionalism, etc. Socialist society accepts with utmost gratitude the heritage of the positive sciences, discarding, as is the right of inventorial choice, everything which is useless in acquiring knowledge of nature but only useful in justifying class inequality and all other kinds of historical untruth.

Every new social order appropriates the cultural heritage of the past not in its totality but only in accordance with its own structure. Thus, medieval society embodied in Christianity many elements of ancient philosophy, subordinating them, however, to the needs of the feudal regime and transforming them into scholasticism, the "handmaiden of theology." Similarly, bourgeois society inherited among other things from the Middle Ages, Christianity, but subjected it either to the Reformation, that is, revolt in the shape of Protestantism, or pacification in the shape of adaptation of Catholicism to the new regime. In any case, Christianity of the bourgeois epoch was brushed aside to the degree that the road had to be cleared for scientific research, at least, within those limits which were required for the development of the productive forces.

Socialist society in its relation to scientific and cultural inheritance in general holds to a far lesser degree an attitude of indifference, or passive acceptance. It can be said: The greater the trust of socialism in sciences devoted to direct study of nature, all the greater is its critical distrust in approaching those sciences and pseudo-sciences which are linked closely to the structure of human society, its economic institutions, its state, laws, ethics, etc. Of course these two spheres are not separated by an impenetrable wall. But at the same time, it is an indisputable fact that the heritage

embodied in those sciences which deal not with human society but with "matter"—in natural sciences in the broad sense of the term, and consequently of course in chemistry—is of incomparably greater weight.

The need to know nature is imposed upon men by their need to subordinate nature to themselves. Any digressions in this sphere from objective relationships, which are determined by the properties of matter itself, are corrected by practical experience. This alone seriously guarantees natural sciences, chemical research, in particular, from intentional, unintentional, semi-deliberate distortions, misinterpretations and falsifications. Social research primarily devoted its efforts toward justifying historically-arisen society, so as to preserve it against the attacks of "destructive theories," etc. Herein is rooted the apologetic role of the official social sciences of bourgeois society; and this is the reason why their accomplishments are of little value.

So long as science as a whole remained a "handmaiden of theology," it could produce valuable results only surreptitiously. This was the case in the Middle Ages. It was during the bourgeois regime, as already pointed out, that the natural sciences gained the possibility of wide development. But social science remained the servant of capitalism. This is also true, to a large extent, of psychology which links the social and natural sciences; and philosophy which systematizes the generalized conclusions of all sciences.

I said that *official* social science has produced little of value. This is best revealed by the inability of bourgeois science to foresee tomorrow. We have observed this in relation to the first imperialist World War and its consequences. We have seen it again in relation to the October revolution. We now see it in the complete helplessness of official social science in the evaluation of the European situation, the inter-relations with America and with the Soviet Union; in its inability to draw any conclusions regarding tomorrow. Yet the significance of science lies precisely in this: To know in order to foresee.

Natural science—and chemistry occupies a most important place in that field—indisputably constitutes the most valuable portion of our inheritance. Your Congress stands under the banner of Mendeleev who was and remains the pride of Russian science.

To Know So That We May Foresee and Act

There is a difference in the degree of foresight and precision achieved in the various sciences. But it is through foresight—passive, in some instances as in astronomy, active as in chemistry and chemical engineering—that science is able to verify itself and justify its social purpose. An individual scientist may not at all be concerned with the practical application of his research. The wider his scope, the bolder his flight, the greater his freedom from practical daily necessity in his mental operations, all the better. But science is not a function of individual scientists; it is a public function. The social evaluation of science, its historical evaluation is determined by its capacity to increase man's power and arm him with the power to foresee and master nature. Science is knowledge that endows us with power. When Leverrier on the basis of the "eccentricities" in the orbit of Uranus concluded that there must exist an

unknown celestial body "disturbing" the movement of Uranus; when Leverrier on the basis of his purely mathematical calculations requested the German astronomer Galle to locate a body wandering without a passport in the skies at such and such an address; when Galle focussed his telescope in that direction and discovered the planet called Neptune—at that moment the celestial mechanics of Newton celebrated a great victory.

This occurred in the autumn of 1846. In the year 1848 revolution swept like a whirlwind through Europe, demonstrating its "disturbing" influence on the movement of peoples and states. In the intervening period, between the discovery of Neptune and the revolution of 1848, two young scholars, Marx and Engels, wrote *The Communist Manifesto*, in which they not only predicted the inevitability of revolutionary events in the near future, but also analyzed in advance their component forces, the logic of their movement—up to the inevitable victory of the proletariat and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It would not at all be superfluous to juxtapose this prognosis with the prophecies of the official social science of the Hohenzollerns, the Romanovs, Louis Philippe and others in 1848.

In 1869, Mendeleev on the basis of his researches and reflection upon atomic weight established his Periodic Law of the Elements. To the atomic weight, as a more stable criterion, Mendeleev linked a series of other properties and traits, arranged the elements in a definite order and then through this order revealed the existence of a certain disorder, namely, the absence of certain elements. These unknown elements or chemical units, as Mendeleev once called them, should in accordance with the logic of this "Law" occupy specific vacant places in that order. Here, with the authoritative gesture of a research worker confident in himself, Mendeleev knocked at one of nature's hitherto closed doors, and from within a voice answered: "Present!" Actually, three voices responded simultaneously, for in the places indicated by Mendeleev there were discovered three new elements, later called gallium, scandium, and germanium.

A marvellous triumph for thought, analytical and synthesizing! In his "Principles of Chemistry" Mendeleev vividly characterizes scientific creative effort, comparing it with the projection of a bridge across a ravine: For this it is unnecessary to descend into the ravine and to fix supports at the bottom; it is only necessary to erect a foundation on one side and then project an accurately designed arc which will then find support on the opposite side. Similarly with scientific thought. It can base itself only on the granite foundation of experience but its generalizations like the arc of a bridge can rise above the world of facts in order later, at another point calculated in advance, to meet the latter. At that moment of scientific thought when a generalization turns into prediction—and prediction is triumphantly verified through experience—at that moment, human thought is invariably supplied with its proudest and most justified satisfaction! Thus it was in chemistry with the discovery of new elements on the basis of the Periodic Law.

Mendeleev's prediction, which later produced a profound impression upon Frederick Engels, was made in

the year 1871, the year, that is, of the great tragedy of the Paris Commune in France. The attitude of our great chemist to this event can be gathered from his general hostility towards "Latinism," its violence and revolutions. Like all official thinkers of the ruling classes not only in Russia and in Europe but throughout the world, Mendeleev did not ask himself: What is the real driving force behind the Paris Commune? He did not see that the new class growing from the womb of old society was here exercising in its movement as "disturbing" an influence upon the orbit of old society as the unknown planet did upon the orbit of Uranus. But a German exile, Karl Marx, did at that time analyze the causes and inner mechanics of the Paris Commune and the rays of his scientific torch penetrated to the events of our own *October* and shed light upon them.

We have long found it unnecessary to resort to a more mysterious substance, called phlogiston, to explain chemical reactions. As a matter of fact, phlogiston served merely as a generalization for the ignorance of alchemists. In the sphere of physiology, the time has long since passed when a need was felt for a special mystical substance, called the vital force and which was the phlogiston of living matter. *In principle* we now possess sufficient knowledge of physics and chemistry to explain physiological phenomena. In the sphere of the phenomena of consciousness we are no longer in need of a substance labelled the soul which in reactionary philosophy performs the role of the phlogiston of psychophysical phenomena. Psychology is for us in the *final analysis* reducible to physiology, and the latter—to chemistry, mechanics and physics. This is far more viable than the theory of phlogiston in the sphere of social science where this phlogiston appears in different costumes; now disguised as "historical mission," now disguised as changeless "national character," now as the disembodied idea of "progress," now as the so-called "critical thought," and so on *ad infinitum*. In all these cases, an attempt has been made to discover some super-social substance to explain social phenomena. It is hardly necessary to repeat that these ideal substances are only ingenious disguises for sociological ignorance. Marxism rejected super-historical essences, just as physiology has renounced the vital force, or chemistry—phlogiston.

The essence of Marxism consists in this, that it approaches society concretely, as a subject for objective research, and analyzes human history as one would a colossal laboratory record. Marxism appraises ideology as a subordinate integral element of the material social structure. Marxism examines the class structure of society as a historically conditioned form of the development of the productive forces; Marxism deduces from the productive forces of society the inter-relations between human society and surrounding nature, and these, in turn are determined at each historical stage by man's technology, his instruments and weapons, his capacities and methods for struggle with nature. Precisely this objective approach arms Marxism with the insuperable power of historical foresight.

Consider the history of Marxism even if only on the national scale of Russia, and follow it not from the standpoint of your own political sympathies or antipathies but from the standpoint of Mendeleev's definition of science:

To know so that we may foresee and act. The initial period of the history of Marxism on Russian soil is the history of a struggle for correct socio-historical prognosis (foresight) as against the official governmental, and official oppositional viewpoints. In the early Eighties, that is, at a time when official ideology existed as the trinity of absolutism, orthodoxy and nationalism; liberalism day-dreamed about a Zemstvo Assembly, i. e., a semi-constitutional monarchy, while the Narodniki combined feeble socialistic fantasies with economic reaction. At that time Marxist thought predicted not only the inevitable and progressive work of capitalism but also the appearance of the proletariat in an independent historical role—the proletariat taking hegemony in the struggle of the popular masses; the proletarian dictatorship leading the peasantry behind it.

There is no less a difference between the Marxist method of social analysis and the theories against which it fought than there is between Mendeleev's Periodic Law with all its latest modifications on the one side and the mumbo-jumbo of the alchemists on the other.

Natural Science and Marxism

"The cause of chemical reaction lies in the physical and mechanical properties of compounds." This formula of Mendeleev is completely materialist in character. Chemistry instead of resorting to some new super-mechanical and super-physical force to explain its phenomena, reduces chemical processes to the mechanical and physical properties of its compounds.

Biology and physiology stand in a similar relationship to chemistry. Scientific, that is, materialist physiology does not require a special super-chemical vital force (as is the claim of Vitalists and neo-Vitalists) to explain phenomena in its field. Physiological processes are reducible in the last analysis to chemical ones, just as the latter—to mechanics and physics.

Psychology is similarly related to physiology. It is not for nothing that physiology is called the applied chemistry of living organisms. Just as there exists no special physiological force, so it is equally true that scientific, i. e., materialist psychology has no need of a mystic force—soul—to explain phenomena in its field, but finds them reducible in the final analysis to physiological phenomena. This is the school of the academician Pavlov; it views the so-called soul as a complex system of conditioned reflexes, completely rooted in the elementary physiological reflexes which in their turn find, through the potent stratum of chemistry, their root in the subsoil of mechanics and physics.

The same can be said of sociology also. To explain social phenomena it is not necessary to adduce some kind of eternal source, or to search for origin in another world. Society is a product of the development of primary matter, like the earth's crust or the amoeba. In this manner, scientific thought with its methods cuts like a diamond drill through the complex phenomena of social ideology to the bed-rock of matter, its component elements, its atoms with their physical and mechanical properties.

Naturally, this does not mean to say that every phenomenon of chemistry can be reduced *directly* to mechanics; and even less so, that every social phenomenon is directly reducible to physiology and then—to laws of chemistry and

mechanics. It may be said that this is the uppermost aim of science. But the method of gradual and continuous approach toward this aim is entirely different. Chemistry has its special approach to matter; its own methods of research, its own laws. If without the knowledge that chemical reactions are reducible *in the final analysis* to mechanical properties of elementary particles of matter, there is not and cannot be a finished philosophy linking all phenomena into a single system, so, on the other hand, the mere knowledge that chemical phenomena are themselves rooted in mechanics and physics does not provide in itself the key to even one chemical reaction. Chemistry has *its own keys*. One can choose among them only from experience and generalization, through the chemical laboratory, chemical hypothesis and chemical theory.

This applies to all sciences. Chemistry is a powerful pillar of physiology with which it is directly connected through the channels of organic and physiological chemistry. But chemistry is no substitute for physiology. Each science rests on the laws of other sciences only in the so-called *final instance*. But at the same time, the separation of the sciences from one another is determined precisely by the fact that each science covers a particular field of phenomena, i. e. a field of such complex combinations of elementary phenomena and laws as require a special approach, special research technique, special hypotheses and methods.

This idea seems so indisputable in relation to the sciences of mathematics and natural history that to harp on it would be like forcing an open door. It is otherwise with social science. Outstanding trained naturalists who in the field, say, of physiology would not proceed a step without taking into account rigidly tested experiments, verification, hypothetical generalization, latest verification and so forth; approach social phenomena far more boldly, with the boldness of ignorance, as if tacitly acknowledging that in this extremely complex sphere of phenomena it is sufficient merely to have vague propensities, day-to-day observations, family traditions, and even a stock of current social prejudices.

Human society has not developed in accordance with a pre-arranged plan or system, but empirically, in the course of a long, complicated and contradictory struggle of the human species for existence, and, later, for greater and greater mastery over nature itself. The ideology of human society took shape as a reflection of and an instrument in this process—belated, desultory, piecemeal, in the form, so to speak, of conditioned social reflexes which are in the final analysis reducible to the necessities of the struggle of collective man against nature. To arrive at judgments upon laws governing the development of human society on the basis of their ideological reflection, on the basis of so-called public opinion etc. is almost equivalent to forming a judgment upon the anatomical and physiological structure of a lizard on the basis of its sensations as it lies basking in the sun or crawls out of a damp crevice. True enough, there is a very direct bond between the sensations of a lizard and the latter's organic structure. But this bond is a subject for research by means of objective methods. There is, however, a tendency to become most subjective in judging the structure and laws that govern the development of human society in terms of the so-called consciousness of

society, that is, its contradictory, disjointed, conservative, unverified ideology. Of course, one can become insulted and raise the objection that social ideology is, after all, at a higher elevation than the sensation of a lizard. It all depends on one's approach to the question. In my opinion there is nothing paradoxical in the statement that from the sensations of a lizard one could, if it were possible to bring them into proper focus, draw much more direct conclusions concerning the structure and function of its organs than concerning the structure of society and its dynamics from such ideological reflections as, for example, religious creeds which once occupied and still continue to occupy so prominent a place in the life of human society; or from the contradictory and hypocritical codexes of official morality; or, finally, the idealistic philosophic conceptions which in order to explain complex organic processes occurring in man, seek to place responsibility upon a nebulous, subtle essence called the soul and endowed with the qualities of impenetrability and eternity.

Mendeleev's reaction to problems of social reorganization was one of hostility and even scorn. He maintained that from time immemorial nothing had yet come from the attempt. Mendeleev instead expected a happier future to arise through the positive sciences and above all chemistry which would reveal all of nature's secrets.

It is of interest to juxtapose this point of view to that of our remarkable physiologist Pavlov who is of the opinion that wars and revolutions are something accidental, arising from people's ignorance; and who conjectures that only a profound knowledge of "human nature" will eliminate both wars and revolutions.

Darwin can be placed in the same category. This highly gifted biologist demonstrated how an accumulation of small *quantitative* variations produces an entirely new biologic "quality" and by that token he explained the origin of species. Without being aware of it, he thus applied the method of dialectic materialism to the sphere of organic life. Darwin although unenlightened in philosophy, brilliantly applied Hegel's law of transition from quantity into quality. At the same time we very often discover in this same Darwin, not to mention the Darwinians, utterly naive and unscientific attempts at applying the conclusions of biology to society. To interpret competition as a "variety" of the biological struggle for existence is like seeing only mechanics in the physiology of mating.

In each of these cases we observe one and the same fundamental mistake: the methods and achievements of chemistry or physiology, in violation of all scientific boundaries, are transplanted into human society. A naturalist would hardly carry over without modification the laws governing the movement of atoms into the movement of molecules which are governed by other laws. But many naturalists have an entirely different attitude upon the question of sociology. The historically conditioned structure of society is very often disregarded by them in favor of the anatomical structure of things, the physiological structure of reflexes, the biological struggle for existence. Of course, the life of human society, interlaced with material conditions, surrounded on all sides by chemical processes, itself represents in the final analysis a combination of chemical processes. On the other hand, society is constituted of human beings

whose psychological mechanism is resolvable into a system of reflexes. But public life is neither a chemical nor a physiological process but a social process which is shaped according to its own laws, and these in turn are subject to an objective sociological analysis whose aims should be: To acquire the ability to foresee and to master the fate of society.

Mendeleev's Philosophy

In his commentaries to the *Principles of Chemistry*, Mendeleev states: "There are two basic or positive aims to the scientific study of objects: that of forecast and that of utility. . . . The triumph of scientific forecasts would be of very little significance, if they did not in the end lead to direct and general usefulness. Scientific foresight, based on knowledge, endows human mastery with concepts by means of which it is possible to direct the substance of things into a desired channel." And further Mendeleev adds cautiously: "Religious and philosophical ideas have thrived and developed for many thousands of years, but those ideas which govern the exact sciences capable of forecasting have been regenerated for only a few centuries and have thus far encompassed only a limited sphere. Scarcely two hundred years have passed since chemistry became part of these sciences. Truly, there lies ahead of us a great deal both in respect to prediction and usefulness to be derived from these sciences."

These cautions, "insinuating" words are very noteworthy on the lips of Mendeleev. Their half-concealed meaning is clearly directed against religion and speculative philosophy. Mendeleev contrasts them to science. Religious ideas—he says in effect—have ruled for thousands of years and the benefits derived from these ideas are not very many; but you can see for yourselves what science has contributed in a short period of time and from this you can judge what its future benefits will be. This is the unquestionable meaning of the foregoing passage included by Mendeleev in one of his commentaries and printed in the finest type on page 405 of his *Principles of Chemistry*. Dimitry Ivanovich was a very cautious man and did not intend to quarrel with official public opinion!

Chemistry is a school of revolutionary thought not because of the existence of a chemistry of explosives. Explosives are far from always being revolutionary. But because chemistry is, above all, the science of the transmutation of elements; it is hostile to every kind of absolute or conservative thinking cast in immobile categories.

It is very instructive that Mendeleev, obviously under the pressure of conservative public opinion, defended the principle of stability and immutability in the great processes of chemical transformation. This great scientist insisted with remarkable stubbornness on the immutability of chemical elements and their non-transmutation into one another. He felt the need for firm pillars of support. He said: "I am Dimitry Ivanovich, and you are Ivan Petrovich. Each of us possesses his own individuality even as the elements."

Mendeleev more than once scornfully denounced dialectics. By this he understood not the dialectic of Hegel or Marx but the superficial art of toying with ideas, half sophistry, half scholasticism. Scientific dialectic embraces general methods of thought which reflect the laws of devel-

opment. One of these laws is the change of quantity into quality. Chemistry is thoroughly permeated with this law. Mendeleev's whole Periodic Law is built entirely on it, deducing qualitative difference in the elements from quantitative differences in atomic weights. Engels evaluated the discovery of new elements by Mendeleev precisely from this viewpoint. In his sketch, *The General Character of Dialectics as a Science*, Engels wrote: "Mendeleev showed that in a series of related elements arranged according to their atomic weights there are several gaps which indicated the existence of other hitherto undiscovered elements. He described in advance the general chemical properties of each of these unknown elements and foretold approximately their relative and atomic weights, and their atomic place. Mendeleev, unconsciously applying Hegel's law of change of quantity into quality, accomplished a scientific feat which in its audaciousness can be placed alongside Leverrier's discovery of the yet unknown planet Neptune by computing its orbit."

The logic of the Periodic Law, although later modified, proved stronger than the conservative limits which its creator tried to place upon it. The kinship of elements and their mutual metamorphoses can be considered as proved empirically from the hour when with the help of radioactive elements it became possible to resolve the atom into its components. In Mendeleev's Periodic Law, in the chemistry of radioactive elements, the dialectic celebrates its own most outstanding victory!

Mendeleev did not have a finished philosophical system. Perhaps he lacked even a desire for one, because it would have brought him into inevitable conflict with his own conservative habits and sympathies.

A dualism upon basic questions of knowledge is to be observed in Mendeleev. Thus it would seem that he tended toward agnosticism, declaring that the "essence" of matter must forever remain beyond our cognition because it is "alien to our knowledge and spirit" (!). But almost immediately he offers us a remarkable formula for knowledge which at a single stroke brushes agnosticism aside. In the very same note, Mendeleev says: "By accumulating gradually their knowledge of matter, men gain mastery over it, and to the degree in which they do so they make ever more precise predictions, verifiable factually and *there is no way of seeing how there can be a limit to man's knowledge and mastery of matter.*" It is self-evident that if there are no limits to knowledge and mastery of matter, then there is no unknowable "essence." Knowledge which arms us with the ability to forecast all possible changes in matter, and endows us with the necessary power of producing these changes—such knowledge does in fact exhaust the essence of matter. The so-called unknowable "essence" is only a generalization of our inadequate knowledge about matter. It is a pseudonym for our ignorance. Dualistic demarcation of unknown matter from its known properties reminds me of the jocular definition of a gold ring as a hole surrounded by precious metal. It is obvious that if we gain knowledge of the precious metal of phenomena and are able to shape it, then we can remain completely indifferent to the "hole" of the substance; and we gladly make a present of it to the archaic philosophers and theologians.

Major Miscalculations

Despite his verbal concessions to agnosticism ("unknowable essence") Mendeleev is unconsciously a dialectic materialist in his methods and his higher achievements in the sphere of natural science, especially, chemistry. But his materialism appears as though encased in a conservative shell, shielding its scientific thought from too sharp conflicts with official ideology. This does not imply that Mendeleev artificially created a conservative covering for his methods; he was himself sufficiently bound to the official ideology, and therefore undoubtedly felt an inner compulsion to blunt the razor edge of dialectical materialism.

It is otherwise in the sphere of sociological relationships: The warp of Mendeleev's social philosophy was conservative, but from time to time remarkable surmises, materialist in their essence and revolutionary in their tendency, are woven into this warp. But alongside of these surmises there are miscalculations and what miscalculations!

I shall confine myself to only two. Rejecting all plans for social reorganization as Utopian and "Latinist," Mendeleev envisaged a better future only in connection with the development of scientific technology. But he had his own Utopia. According to Mendeleev, better days would come when the governments of the major powers of the world realized the need of being strong and arrived at sufficient unanimity among themselves about the need of eliminating all wars, revolutions, and the Utopian principles of all Anarchists, Communists, and other "mailed fists," incapable of understanding the progressive evolution occurring in all mankind. The dawn of this universal concord was already to be perceived in the Hague, Portsmouth, and Morocco Conferences. These instances represent major miscalculations on the part of a great man. History subjected Mendeleev's social Utopia to a rigorous test. From the Hague and Portsmouth Conferences blossomed the Russo-Japanese war, the war in the Balkans, the great imperialist slaughter of nations, and a sharp decline in European economy; while from the Moroccan Conference, in particular, there arose the revolting carnage in Morocco which is now being completed under the flag of defense of European civilization. Mendeleev did not see the inner logic of social phenomena, or, more precisely, the inner dialectic of social processes and was therefore unable to foresee the consequences of the Hague Conference. But, as we know, the significance of science lies, first and foremost, in foresight. If you turn to what the Marxists wrote about the Hague Conference in the days when it was arranged and convoked, then you will easily convince yourselves that the Marxists correctly foresaw the consequences. That is why in the most critical moment of history they proved to be armed with the "mailed fist." And there is really nothing lamentable in the fact that the historically-rising class, armed with a correct theory of social knowledge and foresight, finally proved to be likewise armed with a fist sufficiently mailed to open a new epoch of human development.

Permit me to cite another miscalculation. Not long before his death, Mendeleev wrote: "I especially fear for the quality of science and of all enlightenment, and general ethics under 'State Socialism.'" Were his fears well-founded? Even today, the more far-sighted students of Mendeleev

have begun to see clearly the vast possibilities for the development of scientific and technico-scientific thought thanks to the fact that this thought is, so to speak, nationalized, emancipated from the internecine wars of private property, no longer required to lend itself to bribery of individual proprietors but intended to serve the economic development of the nation as a whole. The network of technico-scientific institutes now being established by the State is only a tiny and so-to-speak material symptom of the limitless possibilities that have been disclosed.

I do not cite these miscalculations in order to cast a slur on the great renown of Dimitry Ivanovich. History has passed its verdict on the main controversial issues, and there is no basis for resuming the dispute. But permit me to state that the major miscalculations of this great man contain an important lesson for students. From the field of chemistry itself there are no *direct* and *immediate* outlets to social perspectives. The objective method of social science is necessary. Marxism is such a method.

Whenever any Marxist attempted to transmute the theory of Marx into a universal master-key and ignore all other spheres of learning, Vladimir Ilyich (Lenin) would rebuke him with the expressive phrase: "Komchvanstvo" ("Communist swagger"). This would mean in this particular case—Communism is not a substitute for chemistry. But the converse theorem is also true. An attempt to dismiss Marxism with the supposition that chemistry (or the natural sciences in general) is able to decide all questions is a peculiar "*Chemist* swagger" (Khimchvanstvo) which in point of theory is no less erroneous and in point of fact no less pretentious than *Communist* swagger.

Great Surmises

Mendeleyev did not apply a scientific method to the study of society and its development. A very careful investigator who repeatedly checked himself before permitting his creative imagination to make a great leap forward in the sphere of generalization, Mendeleyev remained an empiricist in socio-political problems, combining conjectures with an outlook inherited from the past. I need only say that the surmise was truly Mendeleyevian especially where it touched directly upon the scientific industrial interests of the great scientist.

The very gist of Mendeleyev's philosophy might be defined as *technico-scientific optimism*. This optimism, coinciding with the line of development of capitalism, Mendeleyev directed against the Narodniks, liberals and radicals, against the followers of Tolstoy and, in general, against every kind of economic retrogression. Mendeleyev believed in the victory of man over all of nature's forces. From this arises his hatred of Malthusianism. This is a remarkable trait in Mendeleyev. It passes through all his writings, purely scientific, socio-publicistic, as well as his writings on questions of applied chemistry. Mendeleyev greeted with pleasure the fact that the annual increase in Russia's population (1½%) was higher than the average growth in the whole world. Computing that the population of the world would in 150-200 years reach 10 billion, Mendeleyev saw no cause for any alarm. He wrote: "Not only 10 billion but a population many times that size will find nourishment in this world not only through the application of labor but

also through the persistent inventiveness which governs knowledge. It is in my opinion sheer nonsense to fear lack of nourishment, provided the peaceful and active communion of the masses of the people is guaranteed."

Our great chemist and industrial optimist would have hardly listened with sympathy to the recent advice of Professor Keynes of England who told us during the academic celebrations that we must busy ourselves with limiting the increase in population. Dimitry Ivanovich would have only repeated his old remark: "Or do the new Malthuses wish to arrest this growth? In my opinion, the more, the merrier." Mendeleyev's sententious shrewdness very often expressed itself in such deliberately over-simplified formulas.

From the same viewpoint—industrial optimism—Mendeleyev approached the great fetish of conservative idealism, the so-called *national character*. He wrote: "Wherever agriculture in its primitive forms predominates, a nation is incapable of permanent regular and continuous labor but is able to work only fitfully and in a harvest-time manner. This reflects itself clearly in the customs in the sense that there is a lack of equanimity, calmness and thriftiness; fidgetiness is to be observed in everything, a happy-go-lucky attitude prevails, along with it extravagance—there is either miserliness or squandering. . . . Wherever side by side with agriculture, factory industry has developed on a large scale, where one can see before one's eyes, in addition to sporadic agriculture, the regulated, continuous, uninterrupted labor in the factories, there obtains a correct appraisal of labor, and so on." Of especial value in these lines is the outlook on national character not as some primordial fixed element created for all time, but as a product of historical conditions and, more precisely, social forms of production. This is an indubitable, even if only a partial approach to the historical philosophy of Marxism.

In the development of industry Mendeleyev sees the instrumentalities of national re-education, the elaboration of a new, more balanced, more disciplined and self-controlled national character. If we actually contrast the character of the peasant revolutionary movements with the movement of the proletariat and especially the role of the proletariat in October and today, then the materialist prediction of Mendeleyev will be illumined with sufficient clarity.

Our industrial optimist expressed himself with remarkable lucidity on the elimination of the contradictions between city and country, and every Communist will accept his formulation on this subject. Mendeleyev wrote: "Russian people have begun to migrate to cities in large numbers. . . . My view is that it is sheer nonsense to fight against this development; this process will terminate only when the city, on the one side, will spread out to include more parks, gardens, etc., i.e. the aim in the cities will be not only to render life as healthy as possible for all but also to provide sufficient open spaces not only for childrens' playgrounds and for sport but for every form of recreation; and, on the other hand, in the villages and farms, etc., the non-urban population will so multiply as to require the building of many-storied houses; and there will arise the need for water-works, street lighting and other city comforts. In the course of time all this will lead to the whole countryside (sufficiently densely populated), becoming inhabited, with dwellings being separated by the so-to-speak kitchen gar-

dens and orchards necessary for the production of food-stuffs and with factories and plants for manufacturing and altering these products." (D. I. Mendeleev, *Towards an Understanding of Russia*, 1906).

Here Mendeleev testifies convincingly in favor of the old thesis of Socialism: the elimination of the contradiction between city and country, Mendeleev, however, does not here pose the question of changes in social forms of economy. He believes that capitalism will automatically lead to the levelling out of urban and rural conditions through the introduction of higher, more hygienic and cultural forms of human habitation. Herein lies Mendeleev's mistake. It appears most clearly in the case of England to which Mendeleev referred with such hope. Long before England could eliminate the contradictions between city and country, her economic development had already landed in a blind alley. Unemployment corrodes her economy. The leaders of English industry see the salvation of society in emigration, in forcing out the surplus population. Even the more "progressive" economist, Mr. Keynes told us only the other day that the salvaging of English economy lies in Malthusianism! . . . For England, too, the road of overcoming the contradictions between city and country leads through Socialism.

There is another surmise made by our industrial optimist. In his last book, Mendeleev wrote: "After the industrial epoch, there will probably follow in the future a most complex epoch, which, according to my view, would denote a facilitation, or an *extreme simplification of the methods of obtaining food, clothing and shelter*. Established science should aim at this extreme simplification towards which it has already been partly directed in recent decades." (idem).

These are remarkable words. Although Dimitry Ivanovich elsewhere makes reservations—against the realization, god forbid, of the Utopia of Socialists and Communists—in these words he nevertheless outlines the technico-scientific perspectives of Communism. A development of the productive forces that would lead us to attain extreme simplification of the methods of obtaining food, clothing and shelter would also clearly lead us to reduce to a minimum the element of coercion in the social structure. With the elimination of the completely useless greediness from social relations, the forms of labor and distribution will assume a Communist character. In the transition from Socialism to Communism no revolution will be necessary since the transition wholly depends upon the technical progress of society.

Utilitarian and "Pure" Science

Mendeleev's industrial optimism constantly directed his thought towards practical industrial questions and problems. In his purely theoretical works, we find his thought directed through the same channels to the problems of economy. There is a dissertation by Mendeleev devoted to the question of diluting alcohol with water, a question which is of economic significance even today. (An ironic reference to the resumption of the State-sale of *vodka*.—Ed.) Mendeleev invented a smokeless powder for the needs of state defense. He occupied himself with a careful study of petroleum, and that in two directions—one, purely theoretical, the origin of petroleum; and the other, technico-industrial uses. Here we should always bear in mind Men-

delevyev's protest against using petroleum simply as a fuel: "Heating can be done with banknotes!" exclaimed our chemist. A confirmed protectionist, Mendeleev took leading part in elaborating tariff policies and wrote his "Sensible Tariff Policy" from which not a few valuable directives can be quoted even from the standpoint of socialist protectionism.

Problems of northern sea routes stirred his interest shortly before his death. He recommended to young investigators and navigators that they solve the problem of opening up the North Pole. He held that commercial routes must necessarily follow. "Near that ice there is not a little gold and other minerals, our own America. I should be happy to die at the Pole, for there at least no one 'putrefies'." These words have a very modern ring. When the old chemist reflected upon death, he thought about it from the standpoint of putrefaction and dreamt incidentally of dying in an atmosphere of eternal cold.

Mendeleev never tired of repeating that the goal of knowledge was "usefulness." In other words, he approached science from the standpoint of utilitarianism. At the same time, as we know, he insisted on the creative role of disinterested pursuit of knowledge. Why should anyone in particular seek for commercial routes by round-about ways to reach the North Pole? Because reaching the Pole is a problem of disinterested research capable of arousing scientific research-sport passions. Is there not a contradiction between this and the affirmation that science's goal is usefulness? Not at all. Science is a function of society and not of an individual. From the socio-historic standpoint, science is utilitarian. But this does not at all mean that each scientist approaches problems of research from a utilitarian point of view. No! Most often scholars are motivated by their passion for knowledge and the more significant a man's discovery the less is he able as a general rule to foresee in advance its possible practical applications. Thus the disinterested passion of a research worker does not contradict the utilitarian meaning of each science any more than the personal self-sacrifice of a revolutionary fighter contradicts the utilitarian aim of those class needs which he serves.

Mendeleev was able to combine perfectly his passion for knowledge for its own sake with incessant preoccupation about raising the technical power of mankind. That is why the two wings of this Congress—the representatives of theoretical and of applied branches of chemistry—stand with equal right under the banner of Mendeleev. We must educate the new generation of scientists in the spirit of this harmonious coordination of pure scientific research with industrial tasks. Mendeleev's faith in the unlimited possibilities for knowledge, prediction and mastery of matter must become the scientific *credo* for the chemists of the socialist fatherland. The German physiologist, Du Bois Reymond once envisaged philosophic thought as departing from the scene of the class struggle and crying out: "*Ignorabimus!*" That is, we shall never know, we shall never understand! And scientific thought, linking its fate with the fate of the rising class, replies, "You lie! The impenetrable does not exist for conscious thought! We will reach everything! We will master everything! We will rebuild everything!"

Sign the Pact
with
Revolutionary Marxism
for a
32
page
NEW INTERNATIONAL
Every Month



I am enclosing \$. to insure a 32-page
NEW INTERNATIONAL every month.

Name

Address

City State