

Workers
of the
World,
UNITE!

THE SPARK



ORGAN OF THE WORKERS' PARTY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Vol. 5 No. 3 (48)

March 1939

Price 1d.

THE COLOURED ON THE WRONG ROAD.

The Coloured people are traversing today the same disastrous road that the Bantu people took three years ago. It is probable that in a few years time the white workers will follow them on the same road, and unless the world situation radically changes in the near future the probability becomes a certainty.

Five years ago; when we explained what "Fusion" means for the ruling classes and what it will mean for the oppressed peoples and the exploited classes, we were called pessimists and alarmists. In the course of these five years events have sadly proved how correct we were in both our analysis and our prognosis. The Bantu would not believe at first that what we explained as the aim of the ruling classes could be true. Unable to break with their old leaders, they followed them along the disastrous road only to find out a little too late that they had been cheated. Yet even today they are far from realising the full extent of this defeat, because it may take some years before they feel on their own flesh and tissues its painful consequences.

Still less were the Coloured people prepared five years ago to accept our prognosis of the events in store for them. They laughed when we said that as soon as the ruling classes disposed of the Bantu question, they would turn to the Coloured and deal with them in exactly the same way as with the Bantu. They laughed just as the Indian people laughed at that time, just as the white workers laughed and still laugh today at the menace of Fascism. They laughed, because they believed in the promises of Hertzog and Smuts. They heard the sweet songs of Hertzog repenting the sins of his forefathers and promising these step-children a happy return into the family fold. They would not pay any attention to our warnings that these were deliberate political manoeuvres of the unscrupulous ruling classes to lull them to sleep and separate them from their oppressed brothers, the Bantu, against whom their main attack was then directed. They would not believe our repeated warnings that, once they were successfully separated from the other oppressed sections, their turn would come next, that as soon as the ruling classes had crushed the Bantu, they would forget their promises to the Coloured, as they had forgotten them to the Bantu, and proceed to crush them too. Instead of listening to us the Coloured people held fast to the promises of Hertzog and the Indians to the promises of Hofmeyr.

The first rude shock came with the Port Elizabeth Congress of the United Party. The period of sweet songs was over and the ruling classes made it abundantly clear that they intended to deal with the Coloured people in the way we predicted they would. If through their Government and Parliament they had been unable up to this time to carry out their aims concerning the Coloured and Indian Peoples, this was not due to any successful resistance on the part of the oppressed, nor to fear on the part of the rulers that their victims would resist; neither was it due to hesitation or indecision. They had their hands full with legislation for the Segregation of the Bantu, which took more time than they had expected. The General Elections brought delay too, with the unavoidable slowing down of the legislative machinery for oppression and the revival of all

kinds of promises. So the Coloured question is still on the order paper. But there is no more time for illusions. Even the "optimists", whose professional duty it was to bluff the people with tales of a growing liberal spirit in the younger generation of the white rulers who will eventually replace the old generation with its deeply rooted colour-prejudice, even they can not come out any more with this kind of talk. There is no more need for it. Since the ruling classes intend to dispose of the Coloured question during the lifetime of this Parliament, the role of the "optimists" is to make segregation and the loss of the few remaining rights more acceptable to the Coloured people; to tell them, for instance, that they will be much happier in their separate locations where they will administer to their own needs! Or that they will be better represented on a separate voters' roll!

For full three years the Damocles sword of segregation has been hanging over their heads. (They could see how the noose is closing round their neck). There was the Draft Ordinance, the debates in the Provincial Council and in the Municipalities and now the Nationalists' petition. One might have expected that, with these threats before them and the highly instructive lesson from the experience of the Bantu, their brothers in distress, fresh in their minds, they would have made some use of these three years. In fact nothing has happened to justify the least optimism. It is true, after every new threat, after every shock, there is some agitation; but it is limited only to small circles. It is sporadic and dies down after a few weeks without enveloping the masses and without elevating the struggle to a higher plane. They are treading the old road that must inevitably lead to defeat.

x x x x x x x

The Coloured people are neither better nor worse off for leadership than the Bantu or the Indian. Imperialism in South Africa succeeded in wresting and maintaining the leadership of the oppressed and exploited in its own hands. The A.P.O. (African Peoples' Organisation) which had the leadership of the Coloured up to now, was in no way better or worse than the African National Congress or the South African Indian National Congress. Here the Abdurahmans, the Gows, the Desmores, are doing the same job for the Coloured people as the Sames, the Jabavus, the Dubes and the Godlos are doing for the Bantu people, as the Ismails, the Kajejes, the Nanas are doing for the Indians, and as the R. Stuarts, Moores, Madleys and Van den Bergs are doing for the white workers. Naturally some of them may be "better" at their job than others, more efficient, better equipped with eloquence, cunning, and unscrupulousness. But essentially their job for imperialism is the same -- to keep the masses back from the revolutionary road, unaware of their strength, not knowing who their friends or enemies are and submissive to their rulers.

Admitted, one cannot bluff all the people all the time. More and more workers the world over come to realise that their leaders are misleaders who have deliberately betrayed them and handed them over to the enemy. They can be seen living luxurious lives, running round in expensive motor cars, acquiring more property, travelling overseas, receiving coronation medals and honorary degrees; and some cannot fail to suspect that all this luxury comes to their leaders, not because they are serving the interests of their people -- for this the few honest leaders languish in jail -- but because they have sold out their people to the oppressors. Imperialism the world over has brought to perfection the system of bribing and corrupting leaders of the oppressed and exploited; and it finds ways that are more dignified than the passing of money, more legitimate and more secure from the wrath of the masses. Besides it takes a long time for the masses to discover that their leaders are corrupted and to get rid of them, or, if that is impossible, to form new organisations.

This is the case now with the A. P. O. It has been brought into disrepute because the masses realise the "worth" of its leaders -- Dr. Abdurahman is only one example out of many. Now the Coloured people are turning towards a new organisation, the National Liberation League. If we refrained up till now from criticising this organisation, it was because we expected the force of events and the fresh lessons from the Bantus' experience to bring them on to the correct road. As we shall show, these expectations were not justified. The latest events convince us that, unless the present leadership is speedily driven out, the National Liberation League will lead the Coloured people into the same groove as the Bantu people were led into by Jabavu and Company.

The National Liberation League (The Nat Lib for short) was originally formed as an organisation for all Non-Europeans in order to assist in the struggle for national emancipation, against colour-bars and political and social inequalities. But beyond these vague generalisations it would not go. There was no programme to indicate how they intended to fight for their rights. This was left open, the leaders declared, in order not to antagonise other, more conservative, sections! Thus from its very inception the Nat

Lib spoke with two voices, one to the right, imitating the A. P. O., the other to the left, imitating the Stalinist Party, to which most of the Nat Lib leaders formerly belonged. Till recently it led a precarious existence, for outside Cape Town and the suburbs it had no influence whatever. But the General Election and later the Municipal Election in Ward 7 gave the Nat Lib a new lease of life. From the National-reformist policy it turned to the ultra-opportunist policy of the People's Front. It threw itself into the General Elections and supported the "People's Front candidate", the Stalinist protege, Advocate Snitcher, who was contesting the Castle Constituency. At the same time it called for support of the South African Labour Party candidates in other Cape Town constituencies -- the very same chauvinistic Labour Party that stands for complete Segregation of the Non-Europeans! The reason for this open betrayal of Non-European interests lay in the fact that by this time the Stalinists had captured the leadership of the Nat Lib. The failure of the People's Front (Stalinist and Labour Party) to win a single seat does not alter this act of treachery. In the Municipal Elections in Ward 7 the Nat Lib played an even more despicable role, concluding an alliance with Dr. Abdurahman, who backed with all his vigour the President of the Nat Lib, his daughter, Mrs. Z. Gool. The success of this election injected some new life into the Nat Lib. But now it is completely dominated by Mrs. Gool and the Stalinist clique.

The Coloured people have turned away from one corrupt clique only to find another, and under present conditions it is perhaps more dangerous than the former one. For the new clique knows how to use Left phrases to cover their treacherous opportunist policy. If Dr. Abdurahman is no longer suitable for the new conditions and the new mood of the masses, his daughter is the perfect specimen for this; a worthy daughter of the old Jesuit, with the same abilities for political trickery, cunning, eloquence and unscrupulousness, Mrs. Z. Gool has the advantage of passing through both schools, her father's and the Stalinists'. A host of smaller rogues, adventurers, job-seekers surrounds her on the executive committee. In it a minority battles for a correct policy, but is being terrorised.

The most damning evidence against the Nat Lib's opportunist and even chauvinistic policy is that the Bantu members had to quit for this or that reason and not one remains now in the organisation!

x x x x x x x

At present the agitation concerns the petition of the Nationalist Party. The Malanites are circulating a Union-wide petition to Parliament for the "final" segregation of all Non-Europeans, political, economic, social and territorial. In response to the agitation of the people the Nat Lib has called a conference of all organisations "interested in the rights and welfare of the Coloured people, including church and sport organisations" to decide what action to take. The result was the usual nauseating People's Front conference of all and sundry. The conference of "delegates", under the chairmanship of Mrs. Z. Gool, who monopolised the meeting for herself and the People's Front clique, and would not allow any Left-winger (even delegate) to speak, "decided" to answer the Malanites' petition with a counter-petition, or rather two petitions, one from the Non-Europeans and the other from their White sympathisers. Unwittingly perhaps a colour-bar was introduced by those who pretend to be fighting against colour-bars! This by the way. Much more important is the pernicious idea of the opportunists to counteract a petition of the slave owners with a petition from the slaves. They are two things that stand in no relation to each other.

The first is a political manoeuvre of a section of the ruling class, assured beforehand of results and intended only to force the pace of the Government. Smuts has not forgotten the old game of Imperialism to pretend to be progressive and push the blame for the repressive slavery legislation on to the Nationalists. This trick was taken over by the Fusion Party. They stand for segregation of the Coloured and Indian just as much as the Malanites, but they prefer to be pushed a little to save face. The Nationalists, instead of pushing them in Parliament, have decided to appeal to the country and find out if it is not possible, besides undermining the position of the Fusionists and gaining votes for themselves, perhaps also to make a breach in Fusion itself, which has already shown signs of such a process. This petition is a real effective weapon of the struggle between factions of the ruling class.

The counter-petition of the Coloured is an altogether different thing; it is sowing illusions, it is to mislead and harm the cause of the oppressed. Such petitions are only impotent weapons graciously granted by the slave-owners to their slaves in order to sidetrack their struggle into harmless, fruitless, hopeless channels. It is a favourite trick of Imperialism, what is called "fighting by constitutional means", and it amounts to this, the oppressors prescribe for the oppressed the rules and weapons of struggle

and they intend to be the judges in it! Could anything be more idiotic than such an unequal combat in which the oppressed must always lose? But to pretend to fight for the rights of the Coloured by means of petitions is not only silly, it is criminal. While they are seduced by demagogic phrases into believing that a struggle is being made they are in fact tied up by their misleaders and handed over to the enemy.

Keeping in line with the tradition of the Nat Lib and all the present reformist organisations, the Conference paid the usual lip-service to unity, and passed a resolution to strive (!) for a united National Front (?). It is not difficult to understand the motive behind it. In order not to scare even the most timid, every trace of a Non-European United Front had to be removed. The word National gives it the desired respectability and removes any doubt about its non-revolutionary character and strict constitutionalism. All progressive Europeans, like those from "church and sport organisations", or like the Labour Party, whose representative, the Rev. Mr. Cadman, was so courted by the Stalinist clique at the Conference, are especially welcome. Even if they are for segregation! Thus ended a "glorious" Conference.

Yet the "friends" of the Non-Europeans, the "progressive Europeans", the liberals, were annoyed and perturbed. The Institute of Race Relations, for instance, lost its head and rushed with a letter to the Press. The Stalinist "Guardian" deplored this letter, while we can only welcome it. For nothing can better serve to open the eyes of the Non-European than such letters by their "friends". Signed by the executive of the Institute, (Cape Times, 13.2.39) it does not at all hide the real issues, as the "Guardian" thinks. Can anything be more open and plain than the following?

"In the place of the spirit of goodwill and co-operation, without which our race relations will degenerate into sheer antagonism, and without which the white community cannot hope to maintain indefinitely its leadership and control, we shall have a united front of all non-Europeans against all Europeans as their common enemies". (our emphasis).

Without the goodwill and co-operation -- as it exists today with the help of the Institute! -- the white community cannot hope to maintain indefinitely its leadership and control! Perfectly clear. The Institute is worried lest this white supremacy for ever and ever should be endangered by the too hasty actions of the Malanites. It has devoted its time and energy to preserving this ideal in South Africa and now pleads for the adoption of their method of putting through segregation; by differentiations and bribes, and setting one section of the oppressed against the other, as has been their way in the past. Here is another illuminating passage:

"to seek instead a solution by the method of consultation and exploration of all possibilities of adjustment, with the co-operation of the churches and other non-political bodies, and not least, with the co-operation of the responsible leaders of the various non-European communities".

Co-operation of the responsible leaders! The Abdurahmans and the Abe Desmores -- also mortally afraid of a United Front -- and perhaps others from the Nat Lib can be persuaded to co-operate. Let us not forget the words "responsible leaders" of the non-Europeans has a special meaning for Imperialists in South Africa. (In passing, the Bantu people may take note that the letter expressing deep concern for the indefinite maintenance of white supremacy was signed by Senator J. D. Reinallt Jones, who is supposed to be serving the Bantu interests.)

The "Friends" of the Non-Europeans had hitherto been silent about the Nationalist petition, but now they rushed with their letters to the Press, deploring both petitions. The reason for this can also be found in their letter:

"The Coloured community at the Cape is already organising meetings of protest and circulating a counter petition".

A year ago the "friends", the liberals, the progressives (and the Stalinists) were happy about the publication of the Coloured Commission Report. "Public conscience has been awakened at last and something positive must emerge from it". "A new era for the Coloured people". "Something to fight for". These are some of the phrases they greeted it with. Exactly a year has passed since the damning Report was put on their shelves. For a year they have been silent. They have forgotten what they said at the conference in 1938, the shameless hypocrites! Now they wake up and are worried at the meetings being held without them. Through all their writings to the Imperialist Press runs a red line of fear, fear of "a united non-European front to fight the exaggerated industrial, social and political segregation called for the 'purified' group, which seems to aim at

reducing all non-Europeans to something approaching serfdom". (Cape Argus, 10.2.39)

Unfortunately this fear is at present entirely unjustified. We know that "in the long run" it will lead to it. We know that a Non-European united front, as a forerunner of the Revolutionary united front, must come. But at present the ruling classes can sleep peacefully. So long as leadership is still in the hands of the Jabavus and the Godlos, the Kajejs and the Nanas, the Mrs. Z. Gools, and the Abdurahmans, there will not be a united front to fight for freedom and equality for all the oppressed. Why? Because such a fight cannot be conducted by constitutional means only; (certainly use constitutional means as far as possible) but by every means at their disposal. Every revolutionary struggle is "unconstitutional" in the eyes of the oppressors. But such a fight cannot be led by leaders who are serbants and tools of Imperialism. They can only toy with the idea of a united Non-European front, for they do not want it.

As we have said many times before, singly and divided the oppressed are bound to be defeated. So were the Bantu, so will the Coloured be, so will the Indian, so will the white workers in their turn, unless they unite against the common enemy. There is no more time for toying with the idea of unity; it is time to fight for the reality of it!

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

A FRESH LESSON

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE COMING WAR

(Continued from February 1939 Spark)

ONCE AGAIN ON DEMOCRACY AND FASCISM

All of this does not, of course, imply that there is no difference at all between democracy and Fascism, or that this difference is of no concern to the working class, as the Stalinists insisted not so very long ago. The Marxists have nothing in common with such cheap political nihilism. Only, it is necessary in each given instance clearly to comprehend the actual content of this difference, and its true limits.

For the backward colonial and semi-colonial countries, the struggle for democracy, including the struggle for national independence, represents a necessary and progressive stage of historical development. It is just for this reason that we deem it not only the right but also the duty of workers in these countries actively to participate in the "defence of the fatherland" against imperialism, on condition, to be sure, that they preserve the complete independence of their class organisation and conduct a ruthless struggle against the poison of chauvinism. Thus, in the conflict between Mexico and the oil kings and their executive committee, which is the democratic government of Great Britain, the class-conscious proletariat of the world sides wholly with Mexico (this does not of course apply to the imperialist lackeys at the head of the British Labour party).

As regards advanced capitalism, the latter has long since out-grown not only the old property forms but also the national state, and in consequence bourgeois democracy as well. The fundamental crisis of contemporary civilisation lies precisely here. Imperialist democracy is putrefying and disintegrating. A programme of "defence of democracy" for the advanced countries is a programme of reaction. The only progressive task here is the preparation of the international socialist revolution. Its aim is to smash the framework of the old national state and build up economy in accordance with geographic and technological conditions, without mediaeval taxes and duties.

Again, this does not imply an attitude of indifference toward the current political methods of imperialism. In all cases where the counter-revolutionary forces tend to pull back away from the decomposing "democratic" states and towards provincial particularism, towards monarchy, military dictatorship, Fascism -- the revolutionary proletariat without assuming the slightest responsibility for the "defence of democracy" (it is indefensible!) will meet these counter-revolutionary forces with armed resistance, in order, if successful, to direct its offensive against imperialist "democracy".

This policy, however, is applicable only with regard to internal conflicts, that is, in those cases where the struggle really involves the issue of a political regime, as was for instance the case in Spain. The participation of Spanish workers in the struggle against Franco was their elementary duty. But precisely and only because the workers did not succeed in time in replacing the rule of bourgeois democracy with their

own rule, "democracy" was able to clear the path for Fascism.

It is, however, sheer fraud and charlatanism to transfer mechanically the laws and rules of the struggle between different classes of one and the same nation over to an imperialist war, that is, the struggle waged by one and the same class of different nations. At present, after the fresh experience of Czechoslovakia, there is no necessity, it seems, to demonstrate that the imperialists are fighting one another not for political principles but for domination over the world under the cover of any principles that will serve their purpose.

Mussolini and his closest associates, so far as one can gather, are atheists, that is they believe neither in God nor the Devil. The King of Britain and his ministers are mired in mediaeval superstitions and believe not only in the Devil but in the Devil's grandmother. Yet this does not mean that a war between Italy and England would be a war of science against religion. Mussolini, the atheist, will do all in his power to fan the religious passions of the Mohammedans. The devout Protestant Chamberlain will, for his part, seek assistance from the Pope, and so on. In the calendar of human progress, a republic rates above a monarchy. But does this signify that a war waged by republican France, say, against monarchist Holland for colonies would be a war of a republic against a monarchy? We shall not even dwell on the fact that in the event of a national war waged by the Bey of Tunis against France, progress would be on the side of the barbarian monarch and not that of the imperialist republic. Hygiene occupies an important place in human culture. But when a murder is involved, the question of whether the murderer washed his hands beforehand is not of decisive importance. To substitute political or moral abstractions for the actual aims of the warring imperialist camps is not to fight for democracy, but to help the brigands disguise their robbery, pillage and violence. This is now precisely the main function of the Second and Third Internationals.

THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY OF THE BONAPARTIST KREMLIN CLIQUE

The immediate blow fell this time on Czechoslovakia. France and England have suffered serious injury. But the most formidable blow was suffered by the Kremlin. Its system of lies, charlatanism and frauds has suffered international collapse.

Having crushed the Soviet masses and broken with the policy of international revolution, the Kremlin clique has become a toy of imperialism. In everything essential, Stalin's diplomacy in the last five years was only a reflection of and a supplement to Hitler's diplomacy. In 1933 Stalin strove might and main to become Hitler's ally. But the extended hand was spurned, inasmuch as Hitler, in search of England's friendship, presented himself as the saviour of Germany and Europe from Bolshevism. Thereupon Stalin set himself the task of proving to capitalist Europe that it had no need of Hitler, that Bolshevism contained no dangers within itself, that the government of the Kremlin was a domestic animal, trained to stand up on its haunches and beg. Thus, in moving away from Hitler, or more exactly, in being repulsed by him, Stalin gradually became a lackey and hired assassin in the service of the countries of sated imperialism.

Hence, this sudden frenzy of genuflection before gangrenous bourgeois democracy on the part of the totalitarian Kremlin gang; hence, the idiotically false idealisation of the League of Nations; hence, the "People's Fronts" which strangled the Spanish revolution; hence, the substitution for the actual class struggle of declamations "against Fascism". The present international function of the Soviet bureaucracy and the Comintern was revealed with especial impudence at the pacifist congress in Mexico (September 1938), where the hired agents of Moscow tried to convince the peoples of Latin America that they had to fight not against the all too real imperialism that threatened them but solely against Fascism.

As was to be expected, Stalin gained neither friendship nor trust through these cheap manoeuvres. The imperialists have become accustomed to appraise society not by the declarations of its "leaders", and not even by the character of its political superstructure, but by its social foundation. So long as state ownership of the means of production, protected by monopoly of foreign trade is maintained in the Soviet Union, the imperialists, including the "democratic" imperialists, will continue to regard Stalin with no more confidence and incomparably less respect than feudal-monarchist Europe viewed the first Bonaparte. Surrounded by the aureole of victories and his suite of brilliant marshals, Napoleon could not escape Waterloo. Stalin has crowned the series of his capitulations, failures and betrayals with the wholesale destruction of the marshals of the revolution. Can there be the slightest doubt about the fate awaiting him?

The only obstacle in the path of war is the fear of the property-owning classes of revolution. So long as the Communist International remained true to the principles of

proletarian revolution, it represented, together with the Red Army, with which it was closely bound, the most important factor for peace. Having prostituted the Comintern, and turned it into an agency of "democratic" imperialism; having beheaded and paralyzed the military power of the Soviets, Stalin has completely untied Hitler's hands, as well as the hands of Hitler's adversaries, and pushed Europe close to war.

The Moscow falsifiers are nowadays heaping cheap curses upon their former democratic friend Benes because he "capitulated" prematurely and prevented the Red Army from crushing Hitler, regardless of France's course. This theatrical thunder only illuminates all the more glaringly the impotence and duplicity of the Kremlin. Who then compelled you to believe in Benes? Who forced you to concoct the myth of the "alliance of democracies"? And, lastly, who prevented you in the critical hours when all of Czechoslovakia was seething like a cauldron, from calling upon the proletariat of Prague to seize power, and sending the Red Army to their aid? Apparently it is much more difficult to fight against fascism than to shoot and poison old Bolsheviks..... From the example of Czechoslovakia, all small states and especially all colonial peoples must learn what sort of help they may expect from Stalin.

Only the overthrow of the Bonapartist Kremlin clique can make possible the regeneration of the military strength of the U.S.S.R. Only the liquidation of the ex-Comintern will clear the way for revolutionary internationalism. The struggle against war, imperialism, and fascism demands a ruthless struggle against Stalinism spotted with crimes. Whoever defends Stalinism directly or indirectly, whoever keeps silent about its betrayals or exaggerates its military strength is the worst enemy of the revolution, of socialism, and of the oppressed peoples. The sooner the Kremlin gang is overthrown by the armed offensive of the workers, the greater will be the chances for a socialist regeneration of the U.S.S.R., the closer and broader will be the perspectives of the international revolution.

THE SOCIAL BASIS OF OPPORTUNISM

In order to understand the present role of the social democracy and of the ex-Comintern, it is necessary once again to recall the economic foundation upon which opportunism in the world labour movement rests.

The flowering of capitalism which lasted, with inevitable oscillations, up to 1913, enabled the bourgeoisie on the one hand to raise slightly the living standard of certain proletarian layers, and on the other to throw rather juicy sops to the bureaucracy and aristocracy of labour, thus raising them above the masses. The trade-union and parliamentary bureaucracy, whose "social problem" appeared close to a solution, was in a position to point out to the masses the beginnings of a change for the better in their own lives. This is the social basis of reformism (opportunism) as a system of illusions for the masses and a system of deceit on the part of the labour bureaucracy. The reformist optimism of the Second International reached its most luxuriant flowering in the years of last economic boom prior to the war (1909-1913). For this reason, the leaders hailed the war and depicted it to the masses as an external calamity that threatened the bases of growing national welfare. Hence, the policy of "defence of the Fatherland" which was in actuality on the part of the masses an unconscious, and on the bureaucracy's part a conscious or semi-conscious defence of the imperialist interests of their respective bourgeoisies.

The war proved in reality to be not an "external" calamity which had temporarily disrupted national progress but rather the explosion of internal contradictions of the imperialist system at a moment when further progress on the basis of this system had become practically impossible. And since the war could neither enlarge our planet nor restore youth to capitalism, it ended by accelerating and aggravating in the extreme all the processes of capitalist decay. With the decline of democracy set in the decline of the labour bureaucracy. Fascism brought the workers "only" redoubled enslavement; to the reformist bureaucracy it brought utter ruin.

The political form of democracy, even if in an extremely mutilated condition ("emergency powers", immigration laws, abandonment of the right of asylum, etc.), has been preserved among the great powers only by Great Britain, France, and the United States, the richest, traditionally the most predatory and privileged capitalist countries which have long since concentrated in their hands a lion's share of the colonial possessions and the chief natural resources of our planet. It is not hard to find the explanation for this "natural selection". Democracy can be maintained only so long as class contradictions do not reach an explosive state. In order to mitigate social frictions the bourgeoisie has been compelled to provide feed for a broad layer of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, and the bureaucracy and aristocracy of labour. The bigger the feeding-trough the more ardent is social-patriotism. The reformist feeding-trough has nowadays

been preserved only in those countries which were able in the past to accumulate vast wealth, thanks to the exploitation of the world market, and their pillage of the colonies. In other words, in the condition of capitalist decay a democratic regime is accessible (up to a certain time) only to the most aristocratic bourgeoisie. The basis of social-patriotism remains colonial slavery.

In countries like Italy and Germany, which have not inherited from the past vast accumulations of riches and which are deprived of the opportunity of obtaining super-profits from their colonies, the bourgeoisie has destroyed the parliament, dispersed the reformist bureaucracy and placed the workers in an iron vice. To be sure, the Fascist bureaucracy devours not less but more than the reformist bureaucracy; but, in return, it is not compelled to make concessions to the masses nor to issue drafts which decaying capitalism can no longer pay. Deprived of its feeding-trough, the retired social-democratic bureaucracy of Italy, Germany and Austria holds high the banner of defeatism -- in emigration.

The chief source of the strength of the social-patriotic, or more exactly, the social-imperialist parties is the protection of the bourgeoisie which through the parliament, the press, the army and the police, protects and defends the social democracy against all kinds of revolutionary movements and even against revolutionary criticism. In the future war, owing to the sharpening of national and international contradictions, this organic bond between the bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie will be revealed still more openly and cynically, or to put it more exactly, it is already being revealed, especially in the treacherous policy of the People's Fronts which were absolutely inconceivable on the eve of the last war. However, the initiative for the People's Fronts originates not from the Second but the Third International.

COMMUNO-CHAUVINISM

The monstrous and rapid development of Soviet opportunism finds its explanation in causes analagous to those which, in the previous generation, led to the flowering of opportunism in capitalist countries, namely, the parasitism of the labour bureaucracy which had successfully solved its "social question" on the basis of a rise of the productive forces in the U.S.S.R. But since the Soviet bureaucracy is incomparably more powerful than the labour bureaucracy in capitalist countries, and since the feeding-trough at its disposal is distinguished by its almost unlimited capacity, there is nothing astonishing in the fact that the Soviet variety of opportunism immediately assumed an especially perfidious and vile character.

As regards the ex-Comintern, its social basis, properly speaking, is of a twofold nature: on the one hand, it lives on the subsidies of the Kremlin, submits to the latter's commands, and, in this respect, every ex-communist bureaucrat is the younger brother and subordinate of the Soviet bureaucrat. On the other hand, the various machines of the ex-Comintern feed from the same sources as the social democracy, that is, the super-profits of imperialism. The growth of the communist parties in recent years, their infiltration into the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie, their installation in the state machinery, the trade unions, parliaments, municipalities, etc., have strengthened in the extreme their dependence on national imperialism at the expense of their traditional dependence on the Kremlin.

Ten years ago it was predicted that the theory of socialism in one country must inevitably lead to the growth of nationalist tendencies in the sections of the Comintern. This prediction has become an obvious fact. But until recently, the chauvinism of the French, British, Belgian, Czechoslovak, American and other communist parties seemed to be, and, to a certain extent, was a refracted image of the interests of Soviet diplomacy ("the defence of the U.S.S.R."). Today, we can predict with assurance the inception of a new stage. The growth of imperialist antagonisms, the obvious proximity of the war danger and the equally obvious isolation of the U.S.S.R. must unavoidably strengthen the centrifugal nationalist tendencies within the Comintern. Each one of its sections will begin to evolve a patriotic policy on its own account. Stalin has reconciled the communist parties of imperialist democracies with their national bourgeoisies. This stage has now been passed. The Bonapartist procurer has played his role. Henceforth the communo-chauvinists will have to worry about their own hides, whose interests by no means always coincide with the "defence of the U.S.S.R."

When the American Browder deemed it possible to declare before the Senatorial committee that in case of a war between the United States and the Soviet Union his party would be found on the side of its passionately beloved Fatherland, he himself might have possibly considered this statement as a simple stratagem. But in reality, Browder's answer is an unmistakable symptom of a change from a "Moscow" to a "national" orientation. The "stratagem" arose out of the necessity of adaption to imperialist "patriotism". The cynical grossness of this stratagem (the turn from the "Fatherland of the toilers" to the

Republic of the Dollar) reveals the profound extent of degeneration that has occurred and the full extent of the dependence of the sections of the Comintern on the public opinion of the bourgeoisie.

Fifteen years of uninterrupted purges, degradation and corruption have brought the bureaucracy of the ex-Comintern to such a degree of demoralisation that it has become able and anxious to openly take into its hands the banner of social-patriotism. The Stalinists (we shall soon have to say, the ex-Stalinists) have not, of course, set the Thames on fire. They have simply picked up the well-worn banalities of petty-bourgeois opportunism. But in propagating them, they have injected into them the frenzy of "revolutionary" parvenus, who have turned totalitarian slander, blackmail and murder into normal methods of "defending democracy". As for the old classic reformists, washing their hands in innocence after every embarrassing situation, they have known how to use the support of the new recruits to chauvinism.

In that imperialist country which happens to be in the same camp with the U.S.S.R. during the war (if any such is found), the section of the ex-Comintern will, naturally, "defend" Moscow. This defence, however, will be of no great value, for in such a country all parties will "defend" the U.S.S.R. (In order not to compromise itself with its imperialist ally, Moscow would probably order the communist party not to shout too loudly, and might possibly try to dissolve it altogether.) On the contrary, in countries of the hostile camp, i.e., precisely where Moscow will be in greatest need of defenders, the ex-communist parties will be found completely on the side of their imperialist Fatherland: this course will be infinitely less dangerous and far more profitable. The ruling Moscow clique will reap the just fruits of fifteen years' prostitution of the Comintern.

THE SECOND AND THIRD INTERNATIONALS IN COLONIAL COUNTRIES

The true character of the social democracy as a party whose policy rested and still rests on imperialist exploitation of backward peoples appears most clearly in the fact that in colonial and semi-colonial countries the Second International has never had any influence. The labour bureaucracy of imperialist countries feared either consciously or semi-consciously to set in motion a movement in the colonies that might have undermined the basis of its own prosperity in the metropolitan centres.

It was otherwise with the Comintern. As a genuinely internationalist organisation, it immediately threw itself upon the virgin soil of the colonies and thanks to the revolutionary programme of Leninism gained important influence there. The subsequent bourgeois degeneration of the Comintern transformed its sections in colonial and semi-colonial countries, especially in Latin America, into a left agency of European and American imperialism. Parallel with this, a change occurred also in the social basis of the colonial "communist" parties. Mercilessly plundering its Asiatic and African slaves and its Latin American semi-slaves, foreign capitalism is at present compelled in the colonies to feed a thin layer of aristocracy -- pitiful, pathetic but still an aristocracy amid the universal poverty. Stalinism has in recent years become the party of this labour "aristocracy" as well as of the "left" section of the petty bourgeoisie, the office-holders in particular. Bourgeois lawyers, journalists, teachers, etc., adapting themselves to the national revolution and exploiting the labour organisations to make careers for themselves, find in Stalinism the best possible ideology.

The revolutionary struggle against imperialism demands courage, resolution and the spirit of self-sacrifice. Where are the petty-bourgeois heroes of the phrase to find these qualities? On the other hand, adaptation to "democratic" imperialism permits them to carve out placid and pleasant careers on the backs of the toilers. The best possible way of hiding this adaptation from the workers is provided by the slogan of "Defence of the U.S.S.R.", i.e., friendship with the Kremlin oligarchy. This opens up an opportunity of publishing newspapers without readers, arranging pompous congresses and all sorts of international publicity. This corperation of professional "Friends of the Soviet Union", fake "socialists" and "communists" who by their noisy declamation against Fascism cover up their social parasitism and their subservience to the imperialists and the Kremlin oligarchy has become a veritable plague of the labour movement in colonial and semi-colonial countries. Stalinism -- under all its masks -- is the chief obstacle in the path of the liberating struggle of backward and oppressed peoples. The problem of colonial revolutions has henceforth become indissolubly linked with the historic mission of the Fourth International.

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SQUEEZED LEMONS (NO. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$)

The London Bureau of incurable centrists (Fenner Brockway, Walcher and Co.) jointly with Brandler, Sneevliet, Marceau Pivert, and with the participation of "sections that

have split from the so-called Fourth International", have united in view of the war danger to create - please do not smile! - the War Emergency Fund. These gentlemen did not bother their heads about a "fund" of ideas. Thank Heaven, they are materialists and not idealists. It is open to doubt whether this new "unification" represents a danger to imperialism. But it does perform a great service to the Fourth International, for it brings together the shallowness, the hybridity and inconsistency of all varieties and shades of centrism, i. e., that tendency which is in sharpest contradiction with the spirit of our epoch. Like all similar mechanical "unifications", it will become a source of new internal conflicts and splits and will fall to pieces at the very moment that the hour for action arrives.

Could it be otherwise? The organizations occupied with the heroic creation of the "Fund" did not arise on the basis of a common programme, but have arrived from all the corners of the political map of centrism as the homeless splinters of old opportunist parties and factions, continuing even to-day to play with all the colours of the opportunist rainbow, and to evolve in different directions. All of them have steadily declined and grown weaker in recent years, with the exception of the newly-split party of Marceau Pivert, for which the same unenviable fate may be predicted. In no country in the world did the London Bureau succeed in creating a new organization, from young fresh elements on the basis of its own programme. No revolutionary group will rally to this banner which has neither a past nor a future. In the colonial countries the London Bureau does not possess even a shadow of influence. It may be regarded as a law that the "revolutionary" organization which in our imperialist epoch is incapable of sinking its roots into the colonies is doomed to vegetate miserably.

Each of these outlived groups holds together by force of inertia and not by the strength of ideas. The one organization with a more serious revolutionary past in this quarter, the P.O.U.M., has to date proved incapable of courageously revising its centrist policy, which was one of the main reasons for the collapse of the Spanish revolution. The remaining members of the group are even less capable of criticism and self-criticism. The spirit of senile dilettantism hovers over this whole enterprise.

Assuredly not a few "remnants" had gathered in the beginning around the banner of the Fourth International. But the enormous work of selection, cleansing and re-education was accomplished here on the basis of a scientific theory and a clear programme. This work, the meaning and importance of which philistines have never understood, has gone on and is still going on in an atmosphere of free, open and patient discussion. Whoever has failed to pass this test has proved in action his organic inability to contribute anything to the building of a revolutionary International. It is these winnowed, worn and rejected "remnants" that have been incorporated to-day into the "fund" of international centrism. This fact alone places on the entire enterprise a stamp of hopeless disability.

In a lucid moment Marceau Pivert declared a few years ago that any tendency in the working class conducting a struggle against "Trotskyism" thereby characterizes itself as a reactionary tendency. This did not, we notice, prevent Pivert, as a congenital centrist whose words are always contrary to his deeds, from joining the London Bureau which seeks to create a physiognomy of its own by convulsively shying away from "Trotskyism".

It is not hard, however, to forecast that the bourgeoisie, the reformists, and the Stalinists will continue to label these creators of the "Fund" as -- "Trotskyists" or "semi-Trotskyists". This will be done in part out of ignorance but chiefly in order to compel them to excuse, justify, and demarcate themselves. And they will actually vow, with might and main, that they are not at all Trotskyists, and that if they should happen to try to roar like lions, then like their forerunner, Bottom the weaver, they succeed in "roaring" like sucking doves. We know them: they are no fledglings. The Fenner Brockways, the Walchers, the Brandlers, the Sneevliets, the Piverts, as well as the rejected elements of the Fourth International have managed in the course of many long years -- for some, decades -- to evince their hopeless eclecticism in theory and their sterility in practice. They are less cynical than the Stalinists and a trifle to the left of the left social democrats -- that is all that can be said for them. That is why in the list of the Internationals they must therefore be entered as No. $3\frac{1}{8}$ or $3\frac{1}{4}$. With a "fund" or without one, they will enter into history as an association of squeezed lemons. When the great masses, under the blows of the war, will be set in revolutionary motion, they will not bother to inquire about the address of the London Bureau.

PERSPECTIVES

All the forces and mainsprings of the last war are again being set in motion but in an incomparably more violent and open form. The movement follows well-worn grooves and consequently proceeds at a swifter pace. Nobody believes at present, as they did on the eve of 1914, in the inviolability of frontiers or the stability of regimes.

This is an enormous advantage to the revolutionary party. If on the eve of the last war, the sections of the Second International themselves did not know as yet what their conduct would be on the morrow, and adopted super-revolutionary resolutions; if the left elements only gradually freed themselves from the pacifist swamp and groped for their road, then to-day all the starting positions have been occupied with precision prior to the war. Nobody expects an internationalist policy from the social-democratic parties which themselves do not promise anything but the "defence of the Fatherland". The departure of the Czech social-patriots from the Second International is the beginning of the latter's official disintegration along national lines. The policy of the Third International is fixed in advance almost as distinctly; the prognosis in this case is only slightly complicated by an element of adventurism. If the German and Italian social democrats and ex-communists will be platonic defeatists, it is only because Hitler and Mussolini forbid them to be patriots. But wherever the bourgeoisie still continues to feed the labour bureaucracy, the social democrats and ex-communists will be found completely on the side of their General Staffs, and, what is more, the first fiddle of chauvinism will be in the hands of the musicians of the Stalin school. Not only the fiddle, but also the revolver aimed at the revolutionary workers.

At the beginning of the last war, Jean Jaures was assassinated, and at the end of the war, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. In France the assassination of the leader of the French socialist party did not deter other leaders from entering the government of imperialist war. In Germany the murder of two great revolutionists was accomplished with the direct participation of the social-democratic government. The actual murderer in France was an obscure petty-bourgeois chauvinist, while in Germany counter-revolutionary officers did the killing. The situation to-day even in this respect is incomparably clearer. The work of exterminating the internationalists has already commenced on a world scale prior to the outbreak of the war. Imperialism no longer has to depend on a "happy accident". In the Stalinist Mafia it has a ready-made international agency for the systematic extermination of revolutionists. Jaures, Liebknecht, Luxemburg enjoyed world fame as socialist leaders. Rudolf Klement was a young and as yet little known revolutionist. Nevertheless the assassination of Klement because he was the secretary of the Fourth International is of profound symbolic significance. Through its Stalinist gangsters imperialism indicates beforehand from what side mortal danger will threaten it in time of war.

The imperialists are not mistaken. If they succeeded, after the last war, in maintaining themselves everywhere except in Russia, it was only because of the absence of revolutionary parties. Freeing themselves with difficulty from the web of the old ideology, with its fetishism of "unity", most of the oppositional elements in the social democracy did not go further than pacifism. In critical moments such groupings proved more capable of checking the revolutionary mass movement than of heading it. In this sense, it is no exaggeration to say that the "unity" of the parties of the Second International saved the European bourgeoisie.

At present, sections of the Fourth International exist in thirty countries. True, they are only the vanguard of the vanguard. But if to-day, prior to the war, we had mass revolutionary organizations, then revolution and not war would be on the order of the day. We lack this, of course, and we hold no illusions on this score. But the position of the revolutionary vanguard is far more favourable to-day than it was 25 years ago. The main conquest is that before the war there already exist in all the most important countries of the world tested cadres, numbering hundreds and thousands of revolutionists in growing numbers, welded together by the unity of a doctrine, and tested in the school of cruelest persecutions by the imperialist bourgeoisie, the social democracy, and, in particular, the Stalinist Mafia. The Second, the Third, and the Amsterdam Internationals cannot at present convene their congresses, because they are paralyzed by their dependence on imperialism and because they are torn asunder by "national" contradictions. On the contrary, the sections of the Fourth International, despite their extremely meagre resources, the difficulties of obtaining visas, the murder of their secretary and the hail of repressions, were able in the most critical moment to convene their international congress and adopt unanimous decisions in which the tasks of the present titanic struggle are formulated precisely and concretely, on the basis of all historic experience.

These precious cadres will not be swerved from their road by any wave of chauvinism, nor intimidated by Stalinist Mausers and knives. The Fourth International will enter the next war as a tightly-welded unit, whose sections will be able to follow one and the same policy, irrespective of the boundaries and trenches dividing them. It is quite possible that at the beginning of the war, when the blind instinct of self-preservation combined with chauvinist propaganda will push the popular masses towards their governments, the sections of the Fourth International will find themselves isolated. They will know how to withstand nationalist hypnosis and the epidemic of patriotism. In the principles of internationalism they will find a bulwark against the herd panic below, and the

terror from above. They will view with contempt the oscillations and vacillations of philistine "democracy". On the other hand, they will listen closely to the most oppressed sections of the population and to the army pouring out its blood. Each new day of war will work in our favour. Mankind has become poorer than it was 25 years ago, while the means of destruction have become infinitely more powerful. In the very first months of the war, therefore, a stormy reaction against the fumes of chauvinism will set in among the working masses. The first victims of this reaction, along with Fascism, will be the parties of the Second and Third Internationals. Their collapse will be the indispensable condition for an avowed revolutionary movement, which will find for its crystallization no axis other than the Fourth International. Its tempered cadres will lead the toilers to the great offensive.

LEON TROTSKY.

Coyoacan, D.F., Oct.10, 1938.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

A CRITIC OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

A highly significant feature of the present time is the large number of new organisations, political and semi-political, that are being formed, all groping more or less blindly for a solution of one or more of the problems that have been created by the decay of world capitalism. This mushroom growth, of which we have our share even in backward South Africa, is of course no accident.

People do not seek refuge in such organisations when life flows smoothly, when they can look forward to the future with some degree of confidence. To-day life does not flow smoothly, and the future is black with the threat of tragedy. The ever increasing difficulties of capitalist economy are forcing every government into feverish preparation for war, filling the hearts of the workers with apprehension. But this alone is not enough to account for the crop of new organisations. It is because the masses are sunk in political ignorance that they react to the present situation by joining all manner of stupid societies. It is because they see certain results that have a direct bearing on their own lives, but are unable to see that all those results flow from a single cause -- the decay of capitalism. If they were aware of this, the masses would not waste their time and energy on associations that aim at the treatment of symptoms, but would rally round the revolutionary party, which seeks to uproot the disease itself, that is, to overthrow the capitalist system.

The new organisations range all the way from religious sects (for example, we have recently been told that there are now no fewer than 500 different Bantu churches in South Africa), which look for non-political, and therefore utterly futile means of escape, to working class political parties that are sufficiently close to Marxism to constitute a serious danger to the revolutionary cause. Among the latter is a party recently formed in Belgium, called the "Centre for the Unification of the Revolutionary Forces", which publishes a monthly paper called "Contre le Courant" (Against the Stream). The character of this party may be clearly seen from an article in the third issue of "Contre le Courant" (2/12/38), in which the foundation of the IVth International is described as an "abortion".

"The official proclamation of the IVth International", the article begins, "is the fruit neither of the impatience nor of the capricious nature of any one of its founders. It results from an analysis of the general situation of capitalism. It is in that analysis that Comrade L. Trotsky finds the justification for his foundation, as if the mere fact of its proclamation would automatically attract to it, if not the "broad masses", at least the workers who have reached a high degree of political consciousness.

"Since this analysis opens up perspective of great importance, which can give rise, among certain sections of the working class, to a hope that is liable to be destroyed by immediate reality, it is the right and the duty of the revolutionary workers to express their doubts on what they consider to be a political error on the part of Comrade L. Trotsky.

"That is why we consider it useful to open a discussion that will expose the political explanation of the hasty proclamation of the IVth International, for in our opinion Comrade Trotsky expresses a false political conclusion when he says that the situation of capitalism is pre-revolutionary."(Their emphasis.)

The writer goes on to justify his attitude by a somewhat futile excursion into dialectical theory, from which he emerges with the momentous, but scarcely novel conclus-

ion that before the social revolution can take place there must be a progressive "series of transformations of quantity into a superior quality"....."not only in the material basis of society but also in the consciousness of wider and wider strata of the masses who form the revolutionary class". This conditions, he points out, was present in Russia during the period immediately preceding the revolution, but it does not exist today, he thinks, for "although the IVth International has been proclaimed, these revolutionary 'parties' exist only in the form of tiny minorities, while obstacles of various kinds obstruct their development among the masses". That is to say, the masses have not yet reached that level of political consciousness that will enable them to recognise the parties of the IVth International as their true leaders.

From this it follows, apparently, that the IVth International was born prematurely. What then is the correct time for its birth? "We will rather", says the article, "apply ourselves seriously to the task of examining the relation of forces between the classes as they are at present, with the object of intervening as a revolutionary vanguard when the forces of the proletariat are sufficient to ensure the triumph of the revolution". Meanwhile, continues the article, "should we not recognise that on the eve of an imperialist war, when the capitalist State and the ideologists of the bourgeoisie, of Stalinism and of reformism are making every effort to reinforce the current of nationalism, not the least of the enemies of the social revolution, should we not recognise, we say, that since the masses are still following their leaders, there can be no question of an immediately pre-revolutionary situation? This question takes us right to the root of Comrade Trotsky's error".

"From all we have said, we believe it is possible to deduce that if every revolutionary situation, pregnant with a social revolution, can be recognised by certain social indices, it necessarily follows that those signs should be visible in process of formation in the preceding period, the pre-revolutionary period".
(Their emphasis.)

The writer then summarises Lenin's teaching on the characteristics of a revolutionary situation, and asks whether all these characteristics can be seen developing at the present time. He agrees that the objective conditions of a revolution are already in existence, or at least are rapidly approaching maturity, but he can find no evidence of increasing political consciousness and activity on the part of the proletariat, and therefore considers it an error to claim that the present situation is pre-revolutionary.

The most obvious criticism of this argument is that it is at variance with the existence of an organisation that aims at the unification of the revolutionary forces. A working class party cannot hope to gain the confidence of the masses if, while professing to aim at proletarian unity, it objects to an act whereby revolutionary parties in more than thirty countries were united in a single organisation. However, let us be fair to the writer. His contention is not that the act of union is bad in itself, but that if it takes place before the forces that are thus united are strong enough to ensure the victory of the revolution, then it will raise false hopes in the workers, thereby leading to a further weakening of the revolutionary forces. The proper time to unite, he thinks, is when the political experience of the workers has convinced them that it is necessary to fight the bourgeoisie.

This argument arises out of a profound confusion of thought. It is true that if a united front of working class parties in a single country is arranged by the leadership of the several parties before the political experience of the rank and file has led them to demand common action, the consequences may be serious. For in the absence of a common aim, old differences are liable to lead to new quarrels and thus to quench any hopes that may have been raised by the union. But the IVth International is not a united front from above, expressing nothing but the desire of Comrade Trotsky. It is not a united front at all in the ordinary sense of the term. That is to say, it is not the union of a number of parties with different platforms for the pursuit of a goal that is common to all of them, but the union, on an international scale, of parties that have identical aims. So how can such an organisation give rise to false hopes "among certain sections of the working class"? It will give rise to legitimate hopes in that section of the working class which is already sufficiently class-conscious to have joined the parties of the IVth International, but other sections, which have not yet reached that high degree of political understanding, will be unaffected by it, for the time being at least. And when events force political consciousness on them, they will discover that an organisation designed to fight for their newly discovered political demands is already in existence.

But a much more serious error is the assumption that since the masses are still blindly following their reformist and counter-revolutionary leaders, it is not legiti-

mate to describe the present situation as pre-revolutionary. Here we have a purely formalistic argument that is the very antithesis of Marxism. It implies that as society progresses towards a revolutionary situation all the characteristics of such a situation must appear simultaneously and develop along parallel lines. One might as well argue that when an infant is born one has no right to expect its ultimate development into a complete human being because as yet it cannot speak, or sign its name, or recognise the differences between the IInd, IIIrd and IVth Internationals. Of course the infant may be cut off before it reaches manhood, but nobody would deny, for that reason, its potential manhood. And yet that is precisely the sort of argument that is used by the pretended Marxists of the "Centre for the Unification of the Revolutionary Forces". We have no right, they say in effect, to prepare for international working class action against the bourgeoisie, because the working class is not yet awake to the necessity for such action. They admit that the objective conditions of a revolutionary situation are rapidly developing, but since these conditions may just as easily lead to fascism as to communism, it is illegitimate to describe the present situation as pre-revolutionary, and illegitimate therefore to build an organ of international revolutionary struggle. (Since the baby may die, we have no right to hope that it will one day be a man, and therefore it need not be nursed.)

That there is a distinct danger of the present situation developing towards fascism in the countries that the Stalinists still insist on calling "democratic" we are very acutely aware, and we have never ceased to warn the workers in those countries of the fate that is in store for them if they continue to neglect the weapons of revolutionary struggle. But it is precisely because of that danger, and because the workers are still largely unaware of it, that the IVth International had to be founded when it was. If the workers continue to be duped by their criminal "leaders" into accepting a state of moral as well as material disarmament, it is our duty, and the duty of every genuine Marxist, to provide at least some of the weapons that will be needed in the coming struggle. And one of the most important of these weapons is an international association of revolutionary parties. To delay the formation of that association at a time when a new imperialist war is looming on the horizon would be tantamount to acquiescing in the criminal policy of working class disarmament. For when the war begins there will be fascism in every belligerent country, no matter what the present form of the state may be, and then it will be too late to assemble the forces of the international revolution. Thus the foundation of the IVth International is not an act of stupid optimism based on an unduly rosy estimate of the present situation, but is rather an absolutely necessary precaution against an almost inevitable deterioration -- a deterioration for which the "Centre for the Unification of the Revolutionary Forces" and similar organisations will not be entirely blameless.

For the very fact that such organisations exist is a proof that their diagnosis, and therefore their policy, is wrong. It is just because the masses are uneasy in face of the growing aggressiveness of the bourgeoisie that it is possible for a body like the "Centre for the Unification of the Revolutionary Forces" to come into being. It is because the workers are responding, even if only with increasing political apathy, to the decay of capitalism, that some of them can be roped into new pseudo-Marxist parties. Their growing dissatisfaction with the older reformist parties and trade unions provides an opportunity to the new parties; but it also proves that objective conditions are beginning to have an effect on them. In other words, the ground is being prepared for the development of the subjective conditions of revolution. But the new parties, like the old, are doing nothing to stimulate that development. Instead, they are telling the workers to wait for the growth of revolutionary consciousness in the masses, and promising to assume the leadership when that happy event occurs. Which means that they are doing their best to check the growth. For if the workers are simply told to wait and see, the only result will be still greater apathy. Thus the immediate effect of their diagnosis is that the fruit of a potential revolutionary situation is blasted before it can be reaped. The only conclusion we can come to is that such people do not want the revolution. There is all the more justification for the foundation of the IVth International.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

"THE SPARK"

Subscription Rates

Single Copies, 1d. One Year (12 issues), 1/-. Bundle of eighteen copies, 1/-.
Address your subscriptions to: The Manager, "The Spark", P.O.Box 1940, Cape Town.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

A N O T H E R S T A L I N I S T A P O L O G Y

The tradition of lying and calumny in the reformist and class-collaborationist movements, open or disguised, is hardly less imposing than the record of capitalist defamation, lies and malicious invention. To equal the outright red-baiting and reactionary writings of the most rabid capitalist newspapers is not possible. But in its own way, the various reformist groups within the working class movement have, over the course of history achieved results which in objective importance have served the interests of capitalism even better than its avowed supporters. History can match lie for lie. The aim of communism is to nationalise women, raved the 19th Century opponents of socialism -- the aim of Communism stated the anarchists and Fabians is to make slaves of the working class, slaves to the machine of the State. Lenin and Trotsky, said Sisson, are German spies in the pay of the Kaiser -- this is true, said the Socialists, including Mr. Olgin, at present a high functionary in the pay of Stalinism. Bolsheviki are madmen who believe in terrorism and individual assassination, howls the yellow press in every country in the world; -- there is more than a shadow of truth in this statement, says MacDonald and other luminaries of the British Labour Party. Marxism means the end of personal liberty, write the weightier more theoretical capitalist newspapers; -- and this is echoed even today by men like Hook and Eastman who are only repeating the stale vapourings of all reformist and anarchist groups since the middle of the 19th Century.

But there is a distinction between the lies of capitalism and those of the "friends" of the working class movement. The difference is in that the one attempts to kill the organised movement altogether, and aims to do so consciously and deliberately. The other wishes by its lies to take control of the working class movement for its own purposes of personal power, leadership and influence in order to keep it on the innocuous paths of legalism and class-collaboration. But in both cases the lies result in the stultification and breaking up of the workers movement. In some cases the lies are due to ignorance. But in the overwhelming majority of cases they are vicious, deliberate and knowingly published. For even ignorance itself is criminal where the propounder of the statement assumes the right to speak with authority. In politics as in every branch of human knowledge no one has the right to make a statement which cannot be proven by the existing facts.

In the propagation of lies within the labour movement the Stalinist bureaucracy has surpassed all other groups. It has even excelled the most rabid and reactionary sections of Fascism and Capitalism. And its apologists are no less skilful, its hired journalists just as unscrupulous as Hearst or Beaverbrook. It has falsified history; suppressed documents; rewritten text books; slandered and slaughtered old Bolsheviki; belittled those figures whose stature and true historical roles are embarrassing it; aggrandised nonentities whose roles were and are mischievous and irresponsible; twisted statistics to its own ends; committed murder; built up false evidence; staged trials and frame-ups. There are few crimes in the calendar in which the Stalinist bureaucracy directly or indirectly has not taken part.

And always it has had its faithful servants, the Stracheys, Dutts, Olgins, Pollits, Browders and the host of near-Stalinists among the liberal bourgeoisie who with a great outpouring of ink have consistently whitewashed and explained away the black perfidy of Stalinist reaction. They also have their experts. And a certain J.R.Campbell has now fully qualified for the position of expert on Trotskyism.

Campbell has written a previous brochure on Trotskyism. He has now qualified in the fullest sense of the word by being chosen by the Left Book Club to write the latest book of the month entitled somewhat ineptly "Soviet Policy and Its Critics". That the critics consist of damned "Trotskyists" whether they are Centrists, like the I.L.P. or reformists like the Mensheviks, or Trade Union bureaucrats like Citrine is of no great matter. It is Trotskyism which is attacked. That is Campbells task -- to confound once and for all the menace of Trotskyism, i.e., every grouping which does not accept the divine infallibility of Stalin. It is significant to note that it was considered necessary that the Left Book Club, that sanctimonious smug-faced body of persons should publish the magnum opus. From the efforts of our enemy we can judge the success of our movement. In more than 50,000 homes "Soviet Policy and its Critics" is compulsory reading; and every little suburban petit bourgeois will regale his little conscience with small snippets from the writings of Trotsky and voluminous, garrulous comment by Campbell.

To correct Campbell by following up misstatement after misstatement, dealing with quotation after quotation wrenched from its context, pointing out historical lie after lie would demand many more pages than the 374 in his book. An ignoramus can, in one sentence, make so many errors that it would take a page in which to correct them. That is true of Campbell with this exception; not only is he an ignoramus but in addition he is dishonest. His dishonesty is revealed by concealing facts which he well knows by the

well-worn method of dealing with quotations completely out of context, by bald misstatement and adroit fabrication. Particularly revealing is his chapter dealing with Trotsky's role during the February and October days. Here we see the now popular Stalinist invention in which Stalin is elevated to the position of close and equal friend of Lenin and Trotsky already an undisciplined opportunist whose role in the revolution was in reality a minor one only.

The latter portion of Campbell's effusion deals with the Moscow trials and its critics. Here we have a curious position. In spite of the evidence of the Dewey Commission, in spite of the powerful body of evidence which have convinced some of the greatest bourgeois jurists in the world as well as lawyers whose record in the Labour Movement is above suspicion, there is in Campbell's pages not one doubt, not a single hesitation that everything is for the best in the best of all possible Stalinist worlds. Discrepancies in evidence as Piatakov's fictitious flight to Norway which according to official records did not take place are lightly glossed over by the explanation that German Fascism is easily capable of arranging this flight without the knowledge of the Norwegian authorities; after all, argues Campbell, did not Germany send aeroplanes to Spain to aid Franco "in spite of the control exercised by the Non-Intervention Committee". Apparently Campbell believes that the Non-Intervention Committee was a remarkably efficient watchdog and any power that could circumvent its hawk-like watchfulness could do almost anything. Mr. Campbell apparently does not know that the function of Non-Intervention was to assist Franco by depriving the Loyalists of any external aid. The speciousness of arguments of this nature are obvious to everyone who is not completely debased by the poison of Stalinism and its associates.

Chapter headings of this book deal with an historical criticism and revaluation of Trotsky, a ringing "confirmation" of the existence of "Socialism" in the Soviet Union, a final "proof" that Trotskyism and Fascism are twins, and a limping "indication" of the People's Front. In the course of these outpourings it is clear that to Campbell every defeat of the workers is a triumph, every loss a gain, every betrayal a victory. To read the book which is dull with the abysmal tedium which only a brazen and shameless liar can impart to his writings, is in itself a lesson proving that there are no limits to the depths of human lying and the outpourings of professional apologists.

We can expect further "masterly analyses" by the hirelings of Stalinism on the menace of Trotskyism. For Trotskyism really is a menace, a menace to the very existence of the ruling clique now in power in the Kremlin. But not only is it a menace to Stalinism, it is the only hope for the workers of the world, for humanity itself. For only with its help in marxist theory and practice is there hope for the world. Without this weapon we are lost and with us civilisation itself.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

AFRIKAANS TRANSLATION OF

"THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO" By MARX and ENGELS

"DIE KOMMUNISTE-MANIFESTO"

With an Introduction by Leon Trotsky

Price 3d.

Price includes postage to any part of Africa. Send your orders to P.O.Box 1940, Capetown.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(Issued by the Workers Party of South Africa, P.O.Box 1940, Cape Town. C.R. Goodlatte 33, York Street, Salt River, is responsible for all political matter in this issue.)