

The Danger of War and the Defense of the Soviet Union

New Version of Social Patriotism as Deadly as Old

By MAURICE SPECTOR

Theodore Dan of the Russian Social-Democratic Party bitterly resented the Soviet seizure of power. Otto Bauer of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party drugged the masses with poison of "constitutional" Marxism and confidently took Dollfus's word for it that the latter was not plotting a counter-revolutionary coup d'etat. Jean Zyranski of the French Socialist Party lavishly scatters revolutionary phrases while supporting the expulsion of the Bolshevik-Leninists. Having thus brilliantly acquitted themselves in the class struggles of their several countries, these worthies in a thesis on "Socialism and the War Danger" jointly rally to the defense of the Soviet Union.

The International, they declare, meaning the Second International, must free itself from "traditional opinions." It is common knowledge that the "traditional opinions" meant rattling the sword of "revolution against war" in the security of peace-time and docilely capitulating to the military budgets on the declaration of war. In 1914, says Bauer, "the International could not decide in favor of either of the two coalitions which were both composed of capitalist and Imperialist powers, and the Socialist parties accepted a policy of National Union with their respective governments." But the present danger of a war between two coalitions, one headed by Hitler Germany, the other including the Soviet Union, creates an entirely different situation. The amendments to the "traditional opinions" the thesis presents for the changed situation only prove that the more Bauerism changes, the more it remains the same, with this difference that in its pre-war manifestoes at least, the Second International never did come out in support of "National Union." In words at least, the pre-war pledges of the International threatened the Imperialist war-mongers with a revolutionary crisis.

Defending the Soviet Union With Social Patriotism!

On their own candid admission, the motives impelling Bauer-Danz Zyranski to flaunt their social-patriotic policy are the noblest, the most impeccable. "The interests of international socialism demand that German fascism shall be defeated. The interests of international socialism demand that the Soviet Union shall be victorious." How is all that to be effected? By a revolutionary struggle against capitalism, and not against the war danger merely as some isolated phenomenon? By organizing the forces of the working class in the direction of the dictatorship of the proletariat? By registering the bankruptcy of the Second and Third

Internationals whose policies and leadership were impotent to stem the tide of fascism? Do Bauer and Company urge the British Labor Party to fight for a government to establish socialism and not administer capitalism or the Socialist-Stalinist leadership of the People's Front to quit collaborating with Herriot-Laval and organizing the workers' militia against the armed menace of La Roque?

Not at all. To appeal to the independent action of the masses was never the weakness of Bauer-Danz Zyranski. As their signal achievements indicate, they are realists. To overthrow Fascism, they realize, they must have the powerful aid of the peaceful and democratic Imperialist powers associated in the League. The Comite des Forges, Schneider-Creusot, and Winston Churchill, these will make the world safe for the Soviet Union! But if you think we are going too far, let us quote: "In fighting against war, international socialism must support the governments of those countries which, saturated by the results of the last war, want to preserve peace"—as the British Royal Air Force is preserving peace before the north-west frontier of India. "International socialism," they add, "must support the institution of the League of Nations." In all countries allied with the Soviet Union, Socialists cannot and must not hinder the conduct of the war. They must appeal to the workers to do their duty as soldiers as well as in the war industry." Compelled by the obvious reality, to admit that the League is an instrument of imperialism, that the good Democracies are based on subjection of the proletariat and the colonial peoples, that the regional pacts are modern military alliances, they nevertheless cling to their main thesis that imperialism in military alliance with the U.S.S.R. is still hallowed.

Essentially the Bauer thesis urging the alliance of the working class with the capitalist state allied with the U.S.S.R., is the now familiar and reasonable position of the Stalin-Laval communists. Both declarations of policy serve as the basis for "organic unity" of the Second and Third Internationals. Unless the masses can be organized to resist the social-patriotic sophistry of Stalin-Bauer, they will be involved in a ghastly repetition of August 1914. The most tragic illusion of all is that the defense of the Soviet Union requires the betrayal of the working class independence in countries allied with the U.S.S.R. The Stalin-Bauer policy invites the defeat of both the Soviet Union and the international working class.

The one reliable ally of the Soviet Union is the international working

class. But it is that ally that Stalin and Bauer with their social-patriotism are attempting to demoralize, systematically driving them into the camp of the rival imperialisms struggling for the redistribution of the world market. On this point there can be no doubt. The whole policy of the People's Front in France is directed to civil peace, class collaboration in preparation for the coming war. The support of the sanctions policy of the League of Nations involves the proletariat in support of the imperialist

politics of the imperialist powers in the League. The Bauer thesis piously expresses the hope that the lessons of the last war "will inspire the working class of the world with the determined will to use a new war . . . to overthrow the capitalist system." The Bauer position will do anything but that. The fruits of the Stalin-Laval pact are already tragically apparent. The former communist and revolutionary ideology in the ranks of the Comintern is being supplanted by the ideology of liberalism,

patriotism, and pacifism. The collaboration with the "remnants of bourgeois democracy" proclaimed by the Seventh Comintern Congress must inevitably sabotage any developing struggle for power, lest it undermine the military capacity of the bourgeois ally and appear to redound to Hitler's advantage. Once educated in the spirit of the "sacred union," it is not easy to make a right about face at anybody's command. Declaration of war will be followed by the suppression of all critical working class organization

Fourth Int'l Only Guardian of Workers Fatherland

and press. The General Staff will rule. Bauer's policy will never lead to the revolution; it can only lead to another Versailles or the complete collapse of civilization.

Our's Is the Policy of Lenin

To the social-patriotism of Bauer-Dan we oppose the only policy that can save the Soviet Union as a socialist state, the position of revolutionary defeatism in every capitalist country whether allied with the Soviet Union or not. Lenin advocated the overthrow of Czarist Russia and the overthrow of the Kerensky Government regardless of the protestations and objections of patriotic socialists that defeat, revolution and a separate peace would betray the cause into the hands of Prussian Militarism. Lenin and Trotsky were vociferously denounced as German agents. Their former slogan of "make the world safe for democracy"—the democracy represented by the imperialist Allies,—the socialist-patriots have now supplemented with the plea of the Defense of the Soviet Union. But this kind of "Defense" must lead exactly to the same results as their 1914 defense of Entente democracy or "socialism" on the part of the German government-socialists. Social-patriotism had done its work so thoroughly that despite the terrible slaughter of the war and the subsequent chaos, in the victorious and vanquished countries alike, the proletariat was unable to overthrow the guilty ruling classes. "The working class," Bauer-Dan write coolly, "were not able to overthrow capitalism when it was weakened by the World War; they are now threatened with the danger of having to go through the hell of a second World War." If that is the case, it is thanks principally to the social-patriotic and treacherous doctrine and leadership of Bauer and Company in the last war.

Logic of Stalinism Predicted

The whole course of events which culminated in the Stalin-Laval pact and now finds expression in the Bauer thesis accurately verifies the consistent contention of the Russian Opposition that for the U.S.S.R. the most serious of all questions in connection with the war danger was the inner regime. The ebb in the tide of the post-war revolutionary movement nurtured the soil of the nationally disposed bureaucracy. Stalinism rationalized its position in the familiar theory of socialism-in-a-single-country, which by implication dispensed with the necessity of a revolutionary Communist International, since socialist construction was independent of the "state aid of the Western proletariat." Accommodation with the "neutralized bourgeoisie" and maneuvering through the League of Nations realistically followed. To destroy

the Leninist Opposition it was necessary to crush the party. The anti-Marxist policies of the Stalinized Comintern contributed decisively to the accession of Hitler. The sequel of it all was the defensive measure of the Stalin-Laval commune which directs a mortal blow at the remnants of revolutionary policy of the Comintern. Every defeat of the Western working class has in turn resulted in the strengthening of the bureaucratic reaction, to the point where its most perfect expression is the personal dictatorship of Stalin. A new world war in which the workers would fall to achieve their independence of both the Soviet and the Comintern bureaucracy, in which they would continue to take part as an ally of the imperialist governments would spell doom to the Soviet Union as a workers' state.

The Two Roads

If the Stalin-Bauer policy leads to the calamitous repetition of August 1914, it criminally opens the door to the perils of Imperialist intervention, not only from the direction of Hitler, but also from the "democratic" allies of the U.S.S.R. In the event of a protracted struggle and under the dictatorship of the most reactionary elements whom the imperialist war inevitably brings to the top, the "democratic" allies may turn openly fascist, concluding their own peace with their fellow-fascists at the expense of the Soviet Union. Even now, Laval's collaboration with the Soviet Union is sufficiently precarious and feeble for a rapprochement with Hitler have been extended more than once. But if the proletarian revolution does not destroy Western imperialism, the Soviet Union will be subjected to the terrific pressure of world reaction. This and the exhausting demands of modern military operations would confront the Soviet Union with the peril of an internal bourgeois-Bonapartist attack on its social basis. In these circumstances it is in the vital interests of the defense and preservation of the U.S.S.R. as a Workers' State (1) to build up a new revolutionary Fourth International independent of the diplomacy of the Soviet bureaucracy, and directing its energies to the transformation of the impending world Imperialist war into a civil war for international socialism; (2) despite the perils difficulties involved, to make every effort to renew the Bolshevik party of Lenin by the organization of the Soviet section of the Fourth International, pledged to the unconditional defense of the U.S.S.R. but in the interests of its very defense to the unsparing criticism of everything in the war and diplomatic policy of the Stalin regime that is incompatible with revolutionary Marxism.

WHO FINANCES ITALY'S WAR?

How Big Business Provides Loans to Mussolini

(Reprinted from the British "New Leader," Organ of the I.L.P.)

Speculation has been very active in European capitals recently about the possible source of funds to keep the Italian war machine going. Will France furnish Italy the money to fight a war in Abyssinia? It is extremely improbable that the Laval government, pledged to economic and the security of the franc, will permit any loans. But there is another power in the French Republic from which Italy can obtain funds.

Observers have been wondering why certain French newspapers have shown such an exaggerated friendliness towards Italy. This friendliness cannot be entirely attributed to outright subsidizing of French journalists by the Italian government (it is common gossip that there have been large quantities of Italian money going around the Paris publishing world). A better explanation can be found in the enormous influence certain portions of French industry have on the press.

Loans to Industry

If the French banks, so the story goes, cannot lend directly to the Italian government, there is nothing to prevent them from offering loans to French industry. And the latter are in no way forbidden to assist Italian industry. It is a roundabout way, but, for that matter, no less effective. This is how this reported scheme will work. French industries will invest their funds in Italian industry. The Italian government, which has a very thorough control over Italian industry, will convert those francs into lira and utilize them for the purchase of the raw materials, which Italy so sadly lacks, from foreign countries. It is very simple, and works just as well as a direct loan.

There have been some indications which support this story. At the time of the Stresa Conference, a delegation of French bankers and industrialists, led by Ernest Mercier (one of the subsidizers of Colonel de la Roque's Fascist Croix de Feu), were escorted on a tour through Italian industrial plants

under the guidance of Count Volpi, the great Italian capitalist who has profited heavily from misconnections with the Fascist government. As a climax, this delegation was received in Stresa by the Duce himself.

Another straw in the wind.

Money from War Late in July, the "Echo de Paris," a newspaper with Fascist sympathies, which has shown a marked friendliness to Italy, published an article signed by the editor on the state of Italian finances. The article painted a very rosy picture of Italian finances and industry. But there was one very significant sentence in it: "It is probable that Italy must sooner or later make a bid, under one form or another, for foreign credit." The "under one form or another" was obviously the Duce's bid, through his principal spokesman in the French press, of the sort of circuitous financing described above.

Will either the Laval government will allow such a deal to be made remains to be seen. But deal or no deal, there is little doubt that French industry stands to make money from war and preparation for war in Italy. For important French firms are closely connected already by investment in Italy.

M. Albert Gallier, for instance. M. Gallier is one of the directors of the great Italian trust Montecatini, whose chemical works profit from the sale of explosives. He is also director of Hautx Fournesaux, Forges et Acieries de Denain et d'Anzin, affiliated with the Comite des Forges, and having as vice-president M. Leopold Pralan, vice-president of the Comite des Forges. This firm of Denain and Anzin makes special steels for war vessels and other steel products for military purposes.

There is another director of Montecatini, M. Paul Ernest Picard, also director of the Comptoir National d'Escompte de Paris, one of the great credit establishments in Paris. M. Picard is also a director of Forges et Chantiers de la Mediterranee, which makes armaments.

Explosives Pay

The lines run the other way, also—Italy into France. Montecatini

is interested in the subsidiaries of the great French chemical trust of Kuhlmann and in another French chemical firm, La Societe des Phosphates Tunisiens et des Engrais et Produits Chimiques.

The French financial paper, "Information," August 1, gives a brilliant picture of the place Montecatini holds in Italy, especially in war time:

"The explosives branch is prospering. Besides receiving the ordinary orders, it is a secret to no one that the present outlook of the exterior politics of Italy is provoking additional orders which are not confined only to explosives. It is certain that, under the present circumstances, Montecatini will find their importance increasing, especially since Montecatini tends, more and more, to satisfy all Italian industrial needs."

While the French business men are profiting from these war preparations, it is interesting to find the Germans are not absent either from the fertile field of Montecatini.

Germany's Part

The I. G. Farbenindustrie, the enormous German chemical trust, long ago leased patents to and acquired shares in the Italian trust. And now we find that, according to "Information," a banking group, at the head of which is the Dresdener Bank, obtained, a short time ago, a block of Montecatini shares amounting to about 500 million lira, par value. Knowledge of this fact should throw light on the German attitude, which is undisguisedly hopeful for an Abyssinian war. Thus while German arms, German steel and the Abyssinians, have been sold to the Abyssinians, German industry has been investing in the Italian munitions business.

And Britain? It is well known that Britain's export trade with Italy is larger than that of other countries. Even without this trade, there are British investments in Italy, prominent among which is the branch of the armaments firm of Vickers, called Vickers Terini.

Participation of British industry in the profits of war in Italy may provide one explanation why the "big business" press in London has been so friendly towards Italy.

and maneuvering through the League of Nations realistically followed. To destroy

Comrade Candide and Comrade Browder ... A Tragi-Comedy

Being the Story of an Honest Worker Who Fell into a Coma in the Twilight of the "Third Period"

By JOHN MARSHALL

Chapter I

THE story is told of an honest worker, who was a fraternal delegate to the 8th Convention of the Communist Party in April, 1934. For want of a better name, we shall call the comrade Candide. The high point of that convention, all must recall, was a programmatic speech by Earl Browder, which lasted six hours; its conclusion was, according to the Daily Worker, rapturously greeted by a prolonged ovation from the assembled delegates.

At the very moment Browder finished his report, Candide suddenly lapsed into utter unconsciousness. After several weeks at the hospital, the doctors diagnosed his case as sleeping sickness, and there he lay in a coma for over a year, kept alive by artificial feeding.

During that time tremendous changes came over the policies of the Comintern. The Soviet Union entered the League of Nations; Stalin-Laval concluded the Franco-Soviet pact, warning French communists not to actively oppose French imperialist military preparations. The "social-fascist" leaders of the Second International became brothers-in-arms. The C. P. discarded the "united front from below" and formed united fronts from above, forsaking in advance any criticism of their allies. The Social-Democratic policy of "the lesser evil" was taken up by the C. P. through the medium of the Popular Front. The dual Red trade unions, which had been declared parts of the capitalist state apparatus and even semi-fascist and company union in character, were dismantled

twice as fast as they had been created. The Seventh Congress of the Comintern gave official blessing to support of bourgeois democracy, both in peace and war.

Oblivious to all these mighty events, our hero slumbered on, until, on May Day of this year, he was unexpectedly aroused from his coma by the stirring strains of the Internationale from a workers' parade. His revolutionary spirit reawakened, Candide's body quickly followed, and he was soon on the road to recovery.

While convalescing, Candide began to read the Communist press with great eagerness, to review the progress made by the movement during his long sleep. He could hardly believe his eyes. Slogans in the Daily Worker: "For a Labor Party—Invoke Sanctions Against Fascist Italy—Support the League—Blockade the Suez Canal—United Front—Popular Front—Hurrah for John L. Lewis, etc., etc." He asked himself: had illness affected his mind? Or was all this a monstrous deception perpetrated upon the revolutionary workers? Had the enemies of the C. P., the social-fascists or the Trotskyites, captured the Stalinist press? He piled the question after question without satisfaction. They kept assuring him that all this was the new official line. He could not believe them; they were merely trying to humor and soothe an invalid.

Browder's magnificent speech at the Eighth Convention still echoed in his ears; its compelling analysis of the world situation and its clear directives for the forthcoming period were still fresh in his memory. Candide could not rest until he had seen his beloved leader to find out from his lips the truth of the matter.

Chapter II

ONE day last week, restored to health, comrade Candide made his way to the ninth floor where Browder holds court. We have received a transcript of their conversation on our private papers, from which we extract the following:

Candide: "Comrade Browder, for four years I have been a loyal member of the party, the International Labor Defense, the Trade Union Unity League, the Friends of the Soviet Union, the League Against War and Fascism, the United Front Supporters, the A. F. of L. Rank and File Committee for Unemployment Insurance, the Anti-Nazi Federation, Friends of the Workers School, Film and Photo League, the Freiheit Mandolin Orchestra, the Pierre Degeyter Society, the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union, the Workers International Relief, and the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. For the past year and a half through no fault of my own, I've been out of touch with party affairs. I've so many things to ask you about, I hardly know where to begin. But tell me, comrade, is it true that the Central Committee addressed a letter to the leaders of the Socialist Party here, asking for a united front?"

Browder: "Yes, we sent the first letter on June 25 last year, and we've been sending them at regular intervals ever since." **Candide:** "But only two months before your letter at the Cleveland Convention I heard you say: 'Unity with these gentlemen, Norman Thomas and the S.F. leaders, means surrender to the capitalist attacks. That is not the kind of unity the

workers need. We need a united front of the workers against the capitalists, and all their agents. But that means that unity must be built up, not with these leaders but against them. That means not a united front from the top, but a united front from below.' (p. 56.) To verify my recollections, I bought a copy of your speech the other day, and, sure enough, those were your very words."

Browder: "The world situation has changed since then, comrade, and we must adapt our tactics accordingly." **Candide:** "But has the situation so radically changed in this country, or has the essential character of all these social-fascist leaders changed?"

Browder: "Dimitrov, the new leader of the Comintern, declared at the recent Congress: 'We must unite all democratic forces in the non-fascist countries in order to defend the remnants of bourgeois democracy.'"

Candide: "How can we unite with social-fascists, those cunning agents of fascism in the ranks of the working class, to fight fascism? Isn't the slogan of 'the defense of democracy' a social-fascist slogan, and a reliance on the democratic state in the struggle against fascism, the fatal policy of 'the lesser evil' that handed Germany over to Hitler? How well I remember your condemnation of these craven Socialists and the reformist trade union bureaucracy who hold back the workers from revolutionary struggle which alone can defeat and destroy fascism, and under the slogan of defense of democracy, and choosing the lesser evil, lead the workers to submit and support the intermediate steps to the introduction of fascism. That is why we call these leaders social-fascists, and their theories social-fascist." (p.

15.) Aren't we falling into a social-fascist trap when we limit our struggle against fascism to the defense of democracy? That's not revolutionary struggle, it seems to me, but an imitation of the lesser evil policy. Don't you remember saying that 'the social-fascists try to confuse and disarm the workers . . . by means of counterposing 'democracy against dictatorship,' by trying to hide the fact that the capitalist dictatorship is only a form of capitalist dictatorship; that this slogan is used to hide the fact that capitalist democracy is not the enemy but the mother of fascism; that it is not the destroyer, but the creator of fascism? It uses the truth that fascism destroys democracy, to propagate the falsehood that democracy will also destroy 'fascism . . . thus delivering the working class over to fascism bound and helpless.'" (p. 16.)

Browder: "The Communist Party under the leadership of our beloved Stalin is a realistic party of Bolsheviks. We have a monolithic party, but we have flexible policies. We do not let outworn policies hamper our adaptation to new conditions. Discard the policies without delay, without discussion, if necessary, but our party goes forward from one triumph to another, despite temporary setbacks. Have you read the latest statistics from the Soviet Union? Have you even heard how the Popular Front in France has stopped the advance of 'fascism there? Isn't that already vindication enough for our change in tactic?"

Candide: "I'm glad you brought up the united front in France. One of the conditions for the united front agreement there reads that both parties shall abstain from criticism of each other. But at Cleveland you said: 'In all united front

activities, the Communists must always grant the right to all other groups, and reserve the right for themselves, of mutual criticism.' (p. 72.) Why did the French Communist Party give up the right of criticism, and even agree to abandon all factional work in the trade unions?"

Browder: "It was necessary in order to attain unity and maintain it."

Candide: "But you went on to say: 'The Communists can never agree to be silent, to refrain from criticism, on any breaking of agreements for struggle, or any betrayal or desertion of the fight. Any such agreements would not be contributions to unity, but rather to disunity.'" (p. 72)

Browder: "Our Soviet comrades are fighting side by side with us" and the Radical Socialists, against the fascists. There have been no betrayals, no desertions of the fight."

Candide: "But at Brest and Toulon, the sailors, who protested against the Laval-Herriot decrees, were killed and wounded. What did the Socialist leaders, what did we do about that? Could we stand silent when workers are shot down by French gendarmes, while Herriot sits at the same time in the Laval cabinet and the Popular Front?"

Browder: "You don't understand the cunning of the fascists, comrade. Those riots were the work of police provocateurs, of fascist agents, possibly of White Guard, Menshevik, counter-revolutionary Trotskyites. Blum and Cachin, the leaders of the united front, agreed on that. No, we have the most harmonious relations within the Popular Front, and, as for the united workers' front, that has been going so well that we are even now negotiating to form a single party."

Candide: "Unite in the same party with social-fascists? On what basis? A revolutionary program of struggle, the program of Marx and Lenin?"

Browder: "The time is not ripe for that. We will unite today on a program of struggle against war and fascism. We must overcome the sectarian tendencies in the party. That's why it's necessary, for example, to build a Labor Party here."

Candide: "But, comrade, how can you win the workers in this epoch, which Lenin called 'the epoch of wars and revolutions,' by enacting reforms on the reformist program? Isn't the worst form of right opportunism to hide the face of the party in that manner? You, yourself, said at the last convention that 'we must again emphasize . . . that . . . under no circumstances . . . (can we allow) . . . the abandonment of the independent role of the Communist Party. To push the Communist Party into the background, to allow it to be forgotten, is fatal to the success of a particular campaign, as well as endangering our future development. The tendency to bring forward workers' tickets in large industrial cities is generally wrong; it is a tendency to succumb to Farmer-Laborism.' (p. 69-70.) How can we withdraw our party candidates in favor of a joint labor or people's tickets, as we are doing today?"

Browder: "Don't you read the Daily Worker, which explains all these things?"

Candide: "Every day, comrade, and sometimes three and four times a day. Now I think I understand the reasons for all these things, and then again I'm not sure. There are so many innovations in the (Continued on Page 6)