
June 1945

Fourth International

THE NEW STALINIST TURN

- *An Editorial* -

Hayek Pleads for Capitalism

By Joseph Hansen

INTERVIEW WITH A SOVIET CITIZEN

"Big Three" Differences in Germany

By Felix Morrow

The Arsenal of Marxism

Perspectives of World Development—I

By LEON TROTSKY

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

Because of the great increase in the cost of printing and mailing **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**, we are compelled to raise the price of single copies to 25c, also to raise the price in bundle orders to branches to 20c a copy. This price increase will become effective with the July issue. Subscription rates will remain the same—\$1 for six months, \$2 for one year.

* * *

Bound volumes of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** for 1944 are now ready for delivery to our readers. This volume, bound in red cloth and lettered in gold, includes an index listing material by subject as well as author. The price is \$4.50 a volume.

A limited number of bound volumes for previous years are still available—1938 through 1943—and we will be glad to furnish prices upon request.

* * *

Our agent in Milwaukee sent the following carefully thought-out suggestions which he feels will improve **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**:

"The F.I. has no parallel. But, of course, we aim to perfection. To achieve a good balance (especially when the aim is to broaden the circulation), to have 'popular' material and to maintain the theoretical quality is not too easy. The article by Lily Roy was good and was in the direction of attracting less theoretical readers to the F.I. Another suggestion I would like to make is that we have a few popularizations (the popularizations that do exist, chiefly Kerr, are either out of print or are inadequate) of Marxist economics, historical materialism, etc. These also would help in educating and in increasing the circulation.

"Please do not think me presumptuous for throwing out all these suggestions. They have been gestating for sometime."

We not only welcome these suggestions from our Milwaukee agent, but urge that all agents and readers of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** send in any suggestions which they feel will improve the magazine.

* * *

Subscribers sorely miss those issues of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** they don't receive for one reason or another.

M. V. of St. Louis writes: "I haven't been receiving my copies of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**. Will you please look into this matter and I would like to have all the numbers I didn't receive . . . I just

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 6 June 1945 No. 6 (Whole No. 55)

Published monthly by the
Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: Algonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 15c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles, 16c for 5 copies and up.

Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Managing Editor: E. R. FRANK

CONTENTS

Review of the Month American Stalinists Execute New Shift	163
Imperialist Program for the Orient By Li Fu-jen	166
Political Resolution of the European Executive Committee, Fourth International	170
"Big Three" Differences in Germany By Felix Morrow	174
Interview With a Soviet Citizen	177
Hayek Pleads for Capitalism	181
From the Arsenal of Marxism Perspectives of World Development—I By Leon Trotsky	187

Printed by Criterion Linotyping & Printing Co., Inc.

checked now and my last number was the January issue. Please excuse me too for not informing you of this sooner, as I have been working in defense work 10½ hours a day (52.5-hour week). I hardly had any time to read, but I will have more time from now on. The plant is going on

a 44-hour week and I won't be so tired."

M. P. of Chicago: "To punish myself for not paying for my subscription when it was due, I am paying you \$3 by check. The extra \$1 you may apply to an extension of this subscription or as you may see fit."

Ready for Delivery Now

Bound Volume of

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

for

1944

Price \$4.50

Order From

BUSINESS MANAGER

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

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

The following successful method for building sales is reported by Sidney Crabbe, our Boston agent:

"Our F.I. sales have been very bad for the past period and I was considering recommending to the branch a cut in our bundle order. I decided first to recommend hawking the F.I. along with our pamphlets at suitable community meetings and forums. In our first attempt our star salesman, H. Powers, sold 11 copies of the magazine. If these sales continue we shall be able to maintain our present bundle order."

Boston has not cut its bundle order. We assume, therefore, that this method of selling **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** continues to be successful.

* * *

We quote at length from a letter sent us from Coventry, England:

"We are not going to disguise the fact that we could do with some of your material at the present time, especially the **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**. If it is possible to supply us with any bound or collated issues of the F.I. we should be pleased to get hold of them. In our opinion there is no other journal that can compare with the F.I. from an educational point of view. Its profound analysis of the various problems of Marxism and the tactics and strategy of the American and world working class movements gives the world Trotskyist movement a weapon of which there is no equal. In addition to the above request, if you would supply us with Trotsky's 'In Defense of Marxism' and Cannon's 'Struggle for a Proletarian Party' we should be really grateful.

"We cannot let this opportunity go by without mentioning that the struggle your party has put up on behalf of the imprisoned 18 comrades is magnificent. We recognize in this struggle a well-thought out tactic to reach through these means to the broader masses of the American proletariat. On the basis of such tactical struggles, successfully carried through, are mass parties built. We have no doubt from reading your material that Trotskyism will achieve a mass base in the not too distant future.

"We regularly get **THE MILITANT** and **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** and they have always been valuable to us in our own personal theoretical training and also to impress workers, especially Stalinist workers who are approaching our movement, with the development of our American party and the international scope of our tendency."

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 6

JUNE 1945

NUMBER 6

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

American Stalinists Execute a New Shift in Line—

International Implications of the Turn—

Main World Antagonism Today:

USSR vs. USA

American Stalinists to Execute A New Shift in Line

ANOTHER TURN IN THE MAKING

The Stalinist parties throughout the world are executing still another change in their political line. The stalking horse for this change is the Stalinist movement in the United States. The signal for it came from abroad when Jacques Duclos, one of the leaders of the French Communist Party, wrote an article in April, criticizing "Browder and his followers" for having introduced "a notorious revision of Marxism" into the policies of the American organization. After a delay of several weeks, Duclos' article was published in *The Daily Worker* on May 24. The signal for the new turn thus coincided with the first anniversary of the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States and the formation of the "American Communist Political Association" on May 20, 1944.

The charge that the American Stalinists have been guilty of revising Marxism, that is, of betraying the American and world working class is of course irrefutable. The novelty consists solely in the fact that it comes from one of the prominent figures in the international Stalinist apparatus. But on the lips of Duclos it is deliberate deception, designed to cover up the full scope of Stalinist perfidy—both in Europe and America—and to serve as a smokescreen for a shift in policy which prepares other and no less monstrous betrayals.

In his "criticism" Duclos confines himself primarily to two points. One is the "dissolution" of the American party; and the other—Browder's "postwar perspective" expressed "in the concept of a long term class peace in the US, of the possibility of the suppression of the class struggle in the postwar period and of the establishment of harmony between labor and capital."

DUCLOS' 'MARXISM'

It is noteworthy that in his entire lengthy document Duclos doesn't condemn by a single word the *wartime* policy of the American Stalinists which was based on the "concept" of class peace for the duration, on the policy of suppressing the class struggle in wartime and of preaching and practising "harmony between labor and capital." If Browder and his followers are guilty—as they are—of "notorious revision of Marxism" by preaching such doctrines for the *postwar period*, it follows that they were no less guilty in following an identical policy in *wartime*. In 1914, shortly after the outbreak of the First World War Lenin wrote: "Propaganda of class strug-

gle even in the midst of war is the duty of a Socialist." This is a cardinal principle of Leninism. Lenin taught that those who mouth Marxist phrases in peacetime only to suspend the class struggle in wartime, when all the social contradictions become most intensified, are traitors to the working class. Why then does Duclos refrain from condemning Browder's war policy? Why does he instead actually approve it?

Because—as it is not at all difficult to show—the Stalinists in the United States have followed basically the same wartime policy as the Stalinists in France, Great Britain and elsewhere. Moreover, up to now their "postwar perspectives" have been essentially the same. Thus Thorez, Duclos' colleague and the chief of the French Stalinists, enunciated in January of this year at *Ivry* a postwar policy for France identical in all its main essentials with Browder's line in this country. Thorez, like Browder, called for the preservation of "national unity." If Browder extended the hand of solidarity to J. P. Morgan, then Thorez called for collaboration with reactionary Petainist officers, "worthy officers, including those who let themselves be misused for a certain time by Petain and who only ask to rehabilitate themselves and to do their whole duty to France."

As a matter of fact, the French Stalinists still continue not only to support the de Gaulle government but to function as Ministers in its cabinet. In Italy, the Stalinist Togliatti as vice-Premier, still props up the puppet government of Bonomi, under the regency of Prince Humbert. In Belgium, the Stalinists serve on the dictatorial Van Acker government which has just outlawed all strikes. In England, as late as February of this year, the Stalinists kept painting up the Tories as a loyal detachment of the "progressive" and "anti-fascist" forces, and demanded the continuation of the coalition government, under the postwar formula of a "Labor and Progressive Government."

WHAT STALIN DISSOLVED

The brazen pretense that Browder's policy differed "in principle" from the line of the Stalinists elsewhere can be exposed even in those instances which Duclos singles out for "criticism." Duclos takes Browder to task for "dissolving" the American Communist Party. This presumably is a "revision of Marxism." But Duclos forgets to mention a far more sensational move made by the Stalinists, namely the disbanding of the Third International by order of the Kremlin. This was done in May 1943 and it was unanimously accepted by all the Stalinist sections. Browder's action flowed logically from the action of Stalin. It supplemented and is inseparable from the latter. To accept the one while rejecting the other is

to strain at a gnat while swallowing a camel. Duclos suppresses any reference to the dissolution of the Comintern, because, as the whole world knows, Stalin bears the responsibility for it.

So far as Browder's "postwar perspective" is concerned the situation is much the same. The real author of this perspective, too, is the Marshal in the Kremlin. He enunciated it, in collaboration with Roosevelt and Churchill at Teheran; and re-affirmed it at the Crimea Conference. It was at Teheran and Yalta that Stalin promised a postwar world of peace, harmony and prosperity, and pledged to "assist the peoples . . . to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems . . . rebuilding of national economic life . . . relief of distressed peoples." And so forth and so on. Browder simply dotted all the "i"s and crossed all the "t"s in applying Stalin's formula to the United States, just as did Thorez-Duclos in France, and their confreres in England.

'SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY'

As a matter of fact Stalin did not suddenly conceive at Teheran or Yalta this perspective of peaceful and harmonious collaboration with capitalism. Stalinism has based itself from the very beginning on the possibility of the peaceful coexistence of the Soviet Union and the capitalist world. This was the gist of the theory of "socialism in one country" promulgated by Stalin in the autumn of 1924. At that stage it was eminently proper to speak, as Leon Trotsky did, of a *revision of the Marxist-Leninist theory*. At that time Trotsky warned that from the new doctrine,

there can and must follow (notwithstanding all pompous declarations in the draft program) a collaborationist policy towards the foreign bourgeoisie with the object of averting intervention, as this will guarantee the construction of socialism, that is to say, will solve the main historical question. The task of the parties in the Comintern assumes, therefore, an auxiliary character; their mission is to protect the USSR from intervention and not to fight for the conquest of power. It is, of course, not a question of subjective intentions but of the objective logic of political thought. (Leon Trotsky, *Third International After Lenin*, p. 61.)

In the years that elapsed, Stalinism, which began with revision in the sphere of Marxist theory, has passed inexorably to conscious betrayals of the world working class. Today "revision" is hardly a fitting designation for the Stalinist record of perfidies, crimes, rapacity, oppression and bloody vengefulness.

Before dealing with the true reasons for the latest Stalinist turn, let us briefly review the manner in which the American Stalinists have executed its initial phase. The official document, promulgating the change in line, is entitled "The Present Situation and Next Tasks" and was made public in the *Daily Worker*, June 4. It hews closely to the Duclos "criticism," reproducing point by point the deliberate deception practised by the latter.

STALINIST DOUBLE-TALK

The American Stalinist leaders now publicly confess to a "revision of Marxist-Leninist theory." But like Duclos, they cynically pretend that this revision is purely an American product, and, furthermore, limited strictly to "erroneous" postwar perspectives. The glorious economic vistas for American capitalism which the *Daily Worker* has been consistently boosting to its gullible readers are henceforth branded as "utopian." But in the same breath, the resolution of the National Board, CPA, smuggles these perspectives in again by proclaiming that

It is imperative that the American people resolutely support every

effort of the Truman Administration to carry forward Roosevelt's program for victory, peace, democracy and 60 million jobs.

The Stalinist leaders now reassure their followers that they have rediscovered the true "class nature of finance capital" and even "the class nature of bourgeois democracy." But while they have as yet drawn no conclusions about bourgeois democracy, these same "leaders" swear that they will not underwrite the "postwar aims of the trusts and cartels which seek imperialist aggrandizement and huge profits at the expense of the people." But these shameless swindlers, who did underwrite the war aims of these same imperialist brigands and profiteers, still shout, like the French and British Stalinists, for the preservation of national unity, which they now label as "the democratic unity of the nation." They still refuse to call for the revocation of the no-strike pledge. On the contrary, for the benefit of all the trusts and cartels, they demand that the workers:

Continue uninterrupted war production and uphold labor's no-strike pledge for the duration.

They still refuse to call for the immediate launching of the Independent Labor Party, although they now assert that:

. . . it is essential that the working class—especially the progressive labor movement and the Communists—strengthen its independent role and activities and display far greater political and organizing initiative.

SUDDEN NEED OF SCAPEGOATS

In short, from the standpoint of revolutionary policy no fundamental change whatever has occurred in the Stalinist line. It remains what it has always been—counter-revolutionary to the core. What is taking place is a change in the tactics of the Stalinists. The importance that the Kremlin attaches to this shift can be gauged by the fact that for the first time since 1929 when the Brandler-Lovestone right wing was expelled from the Communist International, the Stalinists have found it necessary to acknowledge revisionist tendencies in their own ranks and to seek for scapegoats. In his article, Duclos placed the responsibility for revisionism on "Browder and his followers." While neither Browder nor any of his "followers" is mentioned by name in the resolution of the National Board, CPA, an unprecedented step was taken in making public the vote by which this document was adopted. This vote shows that almost all of Browder's "followers," including Robert Minor, were permitted to cast their ballot for this resolution. The only one recorded against is—Earl Browder. There was also one abstention (Roy Hudson); and one absentee (William Schneiderman). Apparently, Browder is the scapegoat.

Furthermore, the text of the adopted resolution contains the following tell-tale clause:

We must establish genuine inner-democracy and self-criticism throughout our organization. We must refresh and strengthen the personnel of all responsible leading committees in the Association.

The meaning is plain enough. The world is now told that under Browder's regime there was "no genuine inner-democracy and self-criticism." Otherwise, why would it be necessary first to "establish" it? As anyone who is in the least acquainted with the Stalinist movement knows, this "democratic" formula is the classic formula for a purge—or in the language of the resolution, a "refreshing" of "all responsible leading committees."

The fundamental reasons for the change of the Stalinist line as well as its future evolution must be sought not on the national but the international plane. In other words, the key lies in the objective situation, the existing relationship of forces on the world arena, the role and position of the Kremlin in relation to the imperialist encirclement.

UNILATERAL MANEUVERS

The policies of the Stalinist parties everywhere are invariably determined by the Kremlin's foreign policy. The latter policy, in turn, serves one aim and one aim only: the preservation of the rule of the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union. From its inception Stalin's foreign policy has consisted in maneuvering between the rival imperialist camps, and using the various Stalinist parties as pawns on the diplomatic chess-board.

There has been a whole series of such maneuvers. And in each previous maneuver, the turns have been unilateral in character. That is to say, the Kremlin played the role of satellite of either the imperialist "democracies" or of Berlin and Rome, the Fascist "axis."

Thus the rise of Nazism to power led to a five year period of "alliance with the democracies," "People's Fronts," "Collective Security." The aim of Stalin's policy at that time was the establishment of an "anti-fascist coalition" and the organization of a preventive war against the "fascist aggressors."

This meant in practice a capitulation to the imperialist "democracies" (Stalin-Laval Pact, "non-aggression pacts" with Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, etc., entry into the League of Nations). In that period Stalinism exerted tremendous influence on the popular masses of Europe, disorienting and demoralizing them. By this policy the Kremlin betrayed the revolutionary offensive of the French masses in 1936; prepared the defeat of the "Loyalist" government in the Spanish Civil War and the crushing of the Spanish revolution, thus paving the way for the outbreak of World War II. Far from achieving "collective security," as Stalin so fondly hoped, his policy led to the imperialist Four Power Pact of Munich (1938).

When the war, which Stalin had in this way facilitated, drew nigh, the "Father of the Peoples"—to escape entanglement in the war—immediately jumped over into the camp of the "fascist aggressors." With the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact, the Kremlin became the satellite of Berlin and Rome. As Leon Trotsky pointed out: "Nobody else rendered such support to Hitler as did Stalin."

THE NEW ERA OF TEHERAN

However, the capitulation to the fascist imperialists proved as ineffectual as the previous capitulation to the "democracies." Even before the Soviet Union was invaded, Stalin was already preparing a shift into the orbit of Anglo-American imperialism. When Hitler attacked in June 1941, the Kremlin immediately executed this about-face. To cement the alliance with Washington and London, Stalin threw overboard the last pretenses of class struggle politics. The Comintern was formally buried, the new era of Teheran was proclaimed and the Stalinist parties in the so-called United Nations cast all restraint aside, with Browder and his followers laying down the policy and setting the pace in the United States.

Today with the crushing of Germany and as a consequence of the unprecedented military successes of the USSR, the century-old balance of power maintained by British imperialism lies completely shattered. A relationship of forces, foreseen by none, least of all by the Kremlin, now exists in the world.

With the inescapable defeat of Japan, the world system as it emerges from the second imperialist slaughter represents on the surface three huge spheres of influence: the British empire, the Soviet Union, the USA. But the overwhelming preponderance of the United States on the one side and the rise of the Soviet Union, on the other, as the dominant power on the European continent, extending its influence to the Far East, have acted

in reality to polarize the world relationship of forces. The Soviet Union now stands opposed to the USA which is headed for world domination, with the British empire assigned in advance the role of Wall Street's junior partner.

This new relationship of forces obviously narrows down greatly the Kremlin's area for maneuvers. In the entire previous period, the inter-imperialist rivalries played the decisive role in the march of world events. Today, the situation is reversed. The problem of the continued existence of the USSR, as a degenerated workers' state, now comes sharply to the forefront. The main world antagonism of the entire next period is the antagonism between the USSR and the USA.

GREATER NEEDS NEW OBSTACLES

In the face of the existing relationship of forces, the Kremlin now requires much greater territorial guarantees and strategic strongholds than was the case in the past. In accordance with these new needs of the Soviet bureaucracy, Stalin's task is to "organize" new defensive positions in Europe and Asia. The task of the US imperialists is to "organize" the world, that is, place Europe on rations: portion out segments of the world market among vassal capitalist states, re-establish the world market under its hegemony, and so on. These two tasks are mutually exclusive.

The retention of capitalist property forms in territories under the Stalinist sphere of influence will not and cannot satisfy the Anglo-American imperialists. These areas must be drawn directly into the world capitalist market as a whole. But this runs counter to Stalin's plans of integrating to one degree or another the capitalist economies on the periphery of the USSR with the country's nationalized industry. The plan is utopian. Either the nationalized property forms will extend into these areas; or capitalist property forms will be restored in the USSR. Yet the Kremlin has no other solution at present than to attempt to combine the two. The "democratic" imperialists find the existing situation in Europe insufferable. And that is not all. The Kremlin, by its position, is obliged to look for spheres of influence in Asia, too. As Japan collapses, every attempt of Stalin to move forward to meet the onward rush of US imperialism will sharpen and intensify the conflict in the extreme.

It is already manifest that among the biggest lies of the war is the lie of harmonious collaboration between the Kremlin and its allies in Washington and London. The area of conflicts instead of diminishing is constantly expanding. Episodic agreements are possible only if the Kremlin keeps constantly retreating under the pressure of American imperialism. Thus on the international arena the Kremlin faces nothing but a series of crises, each more acute than the one preceding.

It is no secret that we are in the midst of the first of these "postwar" crises. Browder himself undertakes to lecture publicly on "The Crisis in the Coalition."

INTOLERABLE CONTRADICTIONS

It is this critical situation, flowing from the new world relationship of forces, that has dictated the latest turn, whose first stages we are now witnessing. Caught in intolerable contradictions, Stalinism is seeking to use the masses in all capitalist countries as pawns in its game of power politics. Implicit in the Stalinist turn is the threat to "resume" the class struggle unless the imperialist pressure is lifted and "collaboration" restored.

The Kremlin has resorted to this form of diplomatic blackmail before. In the period of "People's Fronts," Stalin played the self-same game in his famous letter to Ivanovich on the "necessity" of the world revolution. The bluff that the Kremlin

would resort "to the most terrible measures" is being repeated under entirely different historical conditions.

It is a bluff because no one fears the masses and the unleashing of the revolutionary mass offensive more than the traitors in the Kremlin. In addition to all the factors that operate to divide the "Big Three," there is one common aim that binds them together: it is their joint conspiracy to avert and if necessary crush the socialist revolution in Europe. The counter-revolutionary record of the Kremlin in the course of the war itself leaves no room for doubts on this score.

By injecting the poison of national-chauvinism, and by its entire policy with regard to Germany, the Kremlin did more than anybody else to prop up Hitler's regime to the very end. When the Italian masses rose against Mussolini, it was the Kremlin that rushed to the aid of Marshal Badoglio and the House of Savoy. The Red Army was used to suppress the workers and peasants revolution in Bulgaria where the Stalinists acted from the beginning to retain capitalism, just as they did in Rumania, in Yugoslavia and all other occupied territories outside of the borders of the USSR. In Greece, Belgium, France and other countries, occupied by the Anglo-American troops, the insurgent masses were disarmed with the direct assistance of the Stalinists. The latest dispatches from Northern Italy are proof that this policy of disarming the workers remains in full force.

RED DANGER FROM BELOW

On the other hand, the enormous sharpening of the class struggle and the inextricable position in which the Kremlin finds itself are compelling these gentlemen to play with dynamite. If they play their counter-revolutionary game too openly, they incur the risk of becoming more and more isolated from the revolutionary rank and file. There is already ferment in the ranks of the Stalinist parties in Italy, France, and elsewhere.

It ought not to be forgotten, however, that even bluffs have a logic of their own. The Stalinists are now venturing on a road on which they may find themselves compelled to travel much further than they ever intended. Or more correctly, the

mass movements, which they seek to harness for their own rigidly limited and nefarious purposes, can under certain conditions readily sweep over their own heads.

In and of itself the fact that the Soviet Union has borne the full brunt of the struggle against Nazism—and played the decisive role in crushing it—has profound repercussions which will be fully felt only in the days to come. It is profoundly revolutionary in its impact on the consciousness of the masses in Europe and throughout the world.

At the same time the great prestige of the Soviet Union is being usurped by Stalinism and utilized for counter-revolutionary purposes. In this there is a mortal danger to the revolutionary masses in Europe as well as the Soviet Union itself. Stalinism will not lose its prestige automatically. This will be accomplished only by the most audacious, irreconcilable and fierce political struggle. It can be successfully accomplished only in the struggle for the ideas of Trotskyism and under the banner of Trotskyism. This we must demonstrate in action in the next period.

DYNAMICS OF THE REVOLUTION

The gratifying thing is that for the first time in more than two decades of the struggle of Trotskyism, the objective conditions, the entire course of historical development, are acting directly in our favor and not against us as in the past. For in the period of the downward curve of the revolution, the proletarian vanguard inescapably suffered the heaviest blows at each turn of events. Each of these sharp turns was determined by defeats of the workers and therefore served to strengthen the forces of reaction, including Stalinism. We have now entered an entirely different historical season. It is our enemies who will suffer the most at each sharp turn in the titanic developments ahead. Our movement, on the contrary, can leap ahead with giant strides, never accomplished before by the revolutionary movement. The primary condition for this is that we act each time to reinforce the blows of the events themselves, intervening to the maximum degree in the revolutionary process and thereby speeding it up enormously.

Imperialist Program for the Orient

By LI FU-JEN

The shift of the war to the Pacific is bringing more sharply into focus the real—as distinct from the pretended—purposes and aims for which the imperialists plunged mankind into the second world slaughter. The war against Germany, first challenger of the *status quo*, appears as the necessary prelude to a struggle among the remaining imperialist powers for a re-division of the world.

As far back as 1934, in the theses entitled *War and the Fourth International*, the Trotskyists estimated the then coming war as essentially a struggle over colonies. In 1940, in the first stage of the slaughter, the *Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution* reiterated this estimate in the following words: "The entire present war is a war over colonies. They are hunted by some; held by others who refuse to give them up. Neither side has the least intention of liberating them voluntarily." In the deeds of the imperialists themselves we are now receiving striking confirmation of this Marxist evaluation of the character of the war.

Asia contains the richest of the colonial prizes. It is here, accordingly, that the greatest stakes of the war lie—continental and insular lands embracing more than half the world's population and endless stores of natural wealth. It was here, for two centuries and more, that the Western Powers built their most profitable empire domains. By war against the native inhabitants, and sometimes among themselves, the imperialist plunderers established the pattern of Oriental empire which existed at the time of Pearl Harbor. The colonial loot extracted from the Orient would be sufficient to industrialize China and India several times over and provide the inhabitants of all Asia with a high standard of living.

Britain conquered India, extended her sway into Burma, established an outpost in Malaya (Singapore), pushed on to Hongkong, carved out "spheres of interest" in China. The Dutch imperialists warred on the Indonesians, seized the rich archipelago of the East Indies, and clamped its people in the vise of colonial servitude. France grasped an empire in Annam and Tonkin (Indo-China). Czarist Russia reached into Manchuria,

Japan, a late-comer in the game of colonial banditry, grabbed Korea and Formosa, then made war on Russia to pave the way for seizure of Manchuria and, later, China. Yankee imperialism, another late-comer, though potentially far more powerful, snatched the Philippines from Spain.

When Germany, in 1914, hurled her first challenge at her Western rivals, Japan—still not a full-fledged imperialist power—joined with the Allies in the hope of sharing in the colonial spoils of war. All Japan got was the crumbs that fell from the conference table at Versailles—the Marshalls, the Carolines and Mariannas, Pacific Islands which Germany was forced to disgorge and which had little more than strategic value for a future war against the United States. Japan's ambitions, and needs, went much further, as shown even then by her seizure of the Chinese province of Shantung. But the Yankee imperialists, assuming their role as the dominant world power after the last war, compelled Japan to relinquish that little tidbit. Dai Nippon perforce had to bide her time, await a fresh opportunity to push her program of empire expansion.

Deeming the time opportune in 1931, when her Western rivals, above all America, were beset by devastating economic crisis, Japan marched unhindered into Manchuria. In 1937 came the Japanese invasion of China. By these campaigns the Japanese imperialists were, in the words of Trotsky, endeavoring to assure themselves a "broad drill ground" on the Asiatic continent for a subsequent challenge to the Anglo-American imperialists for the control and domination of all eastern Asia. With the fall of France in 1940 and Hitler's seemingly successful invasion of the Soviet Union the following year, Japan's hour of destiny struck.

But imperialist Japan, like imperialist Germany, arrived on the scene too late. Germany, with an industrial economy second only to that of the United States, could not find resources or striking power commensurate with the task of "organizing" Europe and establishing world hegemony. Hitler's dream of *Pax Germanica* ended in catastrophe. Japan, with none of Germany's economic advantages, and weighted down by the archaic relics of a dead past, is still less equipped to realize the imperial dreams of her reactionary ruling class. Her program for an "East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere" must likewise end in fearful catastrophe.

Japan's international position was accurately delineated in the theses adopted in 1938 by the founding conference of the Fourth International on *The War in the Far East and the Revolutionary Perspectives*.

Insular Japan, in the era of the twilight of capitalism, proceeding from a weak economic base, is debarred historically from achieving the imperial destiny of which her ruling classes dream. Underlying the imposing facade of Japanese imperialism are fatal organic weaknesses which have already been aggravated by the military conquest of Manchuria. The resources of Japanese capitalism have been proved inadequate for the task of empire building. The economic fabric of the country is being strained to breaking point by the new military campaigns. Japanese capitalism survives by means of the intensest exploitation of the Japanese proletariat, while the peasants, forming the major part of Japan's population, are victims of growing impoverishment and distress. The burdens of both workers and peasants are being increased unbearably by the war. More than 30,000,000 Chinese in Manchuria await the opportunity to liberate themselves from the Japanese yoke. Another 21,000,000 Koreans and 5,000,000 Formosans strive for their independence from Japan. All these factors constitute the Achilles heel of Japanese imperialism and foredoom it to destruction. Such military victories as the Japanese army is able to win in China have only an episodic importance. . . . The military machine of the Japanese imperialists has never yet been flung against a first-

class power. Weakened by what will turn out to be Pyrrhic victories in China, Japanese imperialism will go down to defeat in the coming world war if its career is not brought to a speedier end by the proletarian revolution.

The glittering victories which Japan scored in the first months of the Pacific war—the conquest in quick succession of the Philippines, Hongkong, Malaya, Burma and the Netherlands East Indies—deceived certain fancied Marxists in the ranks of Shachtman's Workers Party into the belief that they had underestimated Japan's real strength. Actually, these victories represented the high point of Japan's military offensive, the last brilliance of a burned-out candle nearing final extinction. Japanese imperialism is now suffering defeat after defeat. American troops have almost completed the reoccupation of the Philippines. Burma has been retaken by British forces and the latter are now poised for assaults which without doubt will drive the Japanese from Thailand, Malaya and Hongkong. French, Dutch, British and Australian troops are being made ready to take Indo-China and the Netherlands East Indies. Australian troops are even now hammering at the approaches to the great island of Borneo. Japan, despite the fiercest and most costly defensive struggles, is proving unable to stem the gathering counter-attack. And meanwhile, the American imperialists are pressing relentlessly their campaign of obliteration from the air against the Japanese homeland. Tokyo has already been laid in ruins. Large parts of Nagoya, Osaka and Kobe, Japan's principal industrial cities, have been wrecked by aerial attack. Japanese imperialism is headed for total catastrophe, irretrievable ruin. The Japanese people are paying a terrifying price for the defeated ambitions of their rulers.

"Liberated" Areas

The stepped-up tempo of the "Battle for Asia"—an expression which in itself correctly defines the war as one of colonial plunder—brings to the fore the question of the future of the islands and continental areas "liberated" from the clutches of the Japanese imperialists. There is nothing in the deeds of the Anglo-American "Liberators," or even in their words, to indicate that the inhabitants are to be given freedom and independence. If the "democratic" slavedrivers have their way, these peoples will again exchange one set of colonial bandits for another.

Let us consider the case of "liberated" Burma. The same old gang of British despots is back on the job. But let us go back a little. In October, 1943, after his expulsion from Burma by the invading Japanese, the British governor, Sir Reginald Dorman-Smith, lamented the fact that the oppressed and downtrodden Burmese had not rallied to defend the British despots against their Japanese challengers. Said he:

Neither our word nor our intentions are trusted in that part of the globe. . . . We have fed such countries as Burma on political formulae until they are sick at the very sight and sound of a formula, which has come, as far as my experience shows, to be looked upon as a very British means of avoiding a definite course of action.

Sir Reginald is now back in Rangoon. His last act before flying into Burma from Simla, as reported by *Time* magazine (May 28) was to offer the Burmese—another of those hypocritical "formulae." It takes the form of the familiar British Government "white paper" and outlines three stages by which Burma is to gain "full self-government within the British Commonwealth." With a pause to note that this definitely is *not* the same thing as independence, which would include the unconditional right to *secede* from the British Empire, here are the three stages: First, since the colony's "progress" has been "in-

errupted" by the Japanese invasion and occupation, direct rule by the governor of Burma will continue until December, 1948. So even this spurious "self-government" is postponed to a rather hazy future. But by December 1948, and here we come to point two, it is "hoped" elections will have been held and the prewar "partial self-government" of Burma restored. Point two, as we see, provides for elections only if the British masters of Burma decide to hold them. And now, as if points one and two were not enough to make the Burmese throw their hats in the air and shout for joy at their impending "freedom," we have point three, which is even more alluring. This final point declares that after the elections, which may or may not be held, depending on the pleasure of the governor and his London instructors, the Burmese people, having agreed among themselves, will draft a constitution to be approved by the *British Parliament*. But suppose the Burmese should draft a constitution which Parliament will not approve? Well, the Burmese will be right back where they started! All of which adds up to the fact that Burma will not get independence now or in the future if the British imperialists can possibly prevent it.

"Liberation" a la Americaine

Perhaps the American imperialists are more liberal, more genuine in their desire to see colonial peoples freed, than the hard-crusted British tyrants? After all, didn't Congress 12 years ago pass a law (the Tydings-McDuffie Act) "voluntarily" giving independence to the Philippines—in 1946? That is next year. Lest there be any doubts about it, Washington loudly proclaims its intention to apply the law on time, perhaps even earlier. Yet side by side with this, Navy Secretary James V. Forrestal announces that the United States will "continue to bear responsibility for the security of the Philippines, and will have to have bases, and strategic areas supporting those bases, to carry out that responsibility." In talking about a state which is about to be given independence, one surely does not say: "I want bases in your territory and I'm going to have them." Yet that is how Forrestal talks about the future "independent" Philippines.

But Japan's defeat and disarmament—isn't that supposed to guarantee perpetual peace in the Pacific? Against whom, then, must the "security" of the Philippines be guarded? Forrestal, understandably, did not go into that. The "independent" Philippines under the puppet regime of President Sergio Osmena (who has already obligingly agreed to cede military bases to the United States) will remain under American domination and open, as they were before Japan walked in, to exploitation by Wall Street. If the Filipinos should have the temerity to assert the independence they will supposedly enjoy, American armed forces will stand ready to shoot them down. How does all this square with the Atlantic Charter, which pledged freedom to all peoples "everywhere in the world," including, above all, their right to governments of their own choosing? The Atlantic Charter was simply a screen to hide the predatory war aims of the "democratic" imperialists. Shortly before his death, Roosevelt, the principal author, even denied that such a thing as the Atlantic Charter ever existed.

But perhaps we shall find the French imperialists more benevolent toward the colonial peoples? From Algiers, after France's defeat, they spouted veritable geysers of high-sounding phrases about "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" and worked out grandiose paper plans for raising the level of their colonial slaves and granting them "a measure" of "self-government." Under de Gaulle, they are hopeful of getting back into Indo-China again, with British aid. Troops are already being deployed

from France with that aim in view. But the type of "liberation" they will bring has already been exemplified in the Levantine states (Syria and Lebanon) and in North Africa, where French troops and legionnaires have lately been shooting down the inhabitants. Under the stress of defeat in 1940, the French bandits proclaimed the independence of Syria and Lebanon from their new seat of government in North Africa. They did this because they were not at that time in a position to combat the independence movement in those countries. North Africa was different. With Anglo-American aid they had re-established themselves there and disposed of sufficient armed forces to keep the natives in continued subjection.

With the defeat of Germany, the picture has changed. While hypocritically proclaiming that France "still respects" the independence of Syria and Lebanon, de Gaulle sends in his troops to restore French colonial rule. The native governments denounced this violation. Attempts to prevent the French troops from taking over led to bloody encounters. Such is the real face of French imperialism. The pattern in the Levant and North Africa will be repeated in Indo-China, if de Gaulle has his way.

While all the imperialist bandits thus make clear their "freedom-loving" intentions as regards the colonies, the war against Japan is meanwhile bringing to the fore in sharpest fashion the rivalry between the two big imperialist powers—the United States and Great Britain. The smaller imperialist states, debilitated and weakened by military defeat, tag along at the coattails of the Big Powers, hoping to retain something in the mad scramble of the giants for colonial domination. It is in the Pacific, as we pointed out before, that the greatest colonial prizes are at stake. Leaving aside possible Stalinist territorial ambitions in the Far East, the most obvious fact here is the anxiety of the British imperialists over the commanding position of their American rivals.

Inter-Imperialist Rivalry

In the fight against Japan, the British imperialists have been forced to accept a division of labor which corresponds to the great dominant purposes of their American rivals. The British are to "liberate" their own former colonies—Malaya, Hong-kong, British Borneo. They will supervise and assist the French and Dutch imperialists in the "liberation" of Indo-China and the Netherland East Indies, probably drive the Japanese from Thailand. Perhaps, too, they will have the task of helping expel the Japanese from Britain's former sphere of interest in south China.

The American imperialists have reserved to themselves the lion's share of the "liberating" crusade—most of China proper, Manchuria and Korea (unless Stalin gets there first), Formosa—plus, of course, the crushing of the imperialists of Dai Nippon in the Japanese home islands. In this vast sphere of military operations, the British are being permitted only a "token" share of activity, and that only upon their own strong insistence.

British concern over this division of military operations was voiced very pointedly in a *New York Times* dispatch from London on May 25, which quoted "qualified British quarters" as saying that "Britain desired to play a considerably larger role in the Far Eastern war than the United States was disposed to allocate to her." Let us ask: If the sole concern is to defeat Japan and really free the peoples who have been enslaved by the Japanese imperialists, what does it matter whose forces are employed for the job, where, or in what proportion? In demanding a "larger role" the British bandits expose their interested motives. In seizing the lion's share, the American bandits

disclose *their* real aims. The British bandits, however, are quite open and unabashed about their predatory designs, for the "qualified British quarters" quoted in the *Times* dispatch make no bones about the fact that the "importance of these questions" is assessed "in terms of post-war prestige and economic advantage." Could anything be plainer?

Faced by the prospect of renewed and more devastating economic crisis once the fighting is over, the Wall Street monopoly capitalists are bent on dominating not only the Pacific area, but the entire world. American capitalism, with its enormous productive plant and vast capital accumulations, can function more or less smoothly only by means of unrestricted access to the world market. From commanding positions on the Asiatic mainland, in Japan and the Philippines, who can doubt that the Wall Street appetite will extend to the British sphere of interest in south China (if it is re-established), to Hongkong and Malaya, to French Indo-China, thence to the rich Netherlands East Indies, and in short order to Burma and India, the "brightest jewel in the British imperial crown?" How will Britain be able to resist the pressure of the American colossus?

That Britain's fears for its Far Eastern domain are by no means ill-founded can be seen from an article in the *Reader's Digest* for the current month, written by Eric Johnston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and spokesman *par excellence* for American imperialism. This article, significantly entitled "America's World Chance," projects a grand program of commercial penetration of China—and India. The writer speaks glowingly of American commercial expansion south of the Rio Grande, where "every Latin American country has a 'Commission of Inter-American Development' preparing projects *devised to be attractive to capital from the United States.*" (Our emphasis).

Johnston goes on to say that a "joint Mexican-American Commission for Economic Cooperation has approved projects which in Mexico alone would require a capital expenditure of some \$400,000,000."

What can be done in Latin America can also be done in China and India. In fact, Johnston writes as if those two great countries were already practically in the Wall Street bag. It is not just trade, but capital investment—the greatest problem of American imperialism because of its accumulated fat—which interests this Big Business spokesman. He relates how William D. Pawley of the Intercontinent Corporation, an American company, built India's first airplane plant. Pawley got together 400 "educated Indians" who "took to aeronautical engineering like ducks to water. The American members of the staff numbered only 38. The Indian employes (engineers and workmen) were ultimately 14,000. They established India's first real assembly line, and came to rival American records of production per man hour."

Johnston's mouth literally waters as he contemplates the prospect of being able to exploit India's vast manpower and to get from it profits even higher than those squeezed from skilled American labor. "There is no doubt," he writes, "that almost all backward peoples are mentally and physically capable of doing higher work [the British, alas, keep them at coolie labor!] and more remunerative work than they are doing now. What they need is *capital.*" (Johnston's is the emphasis on the last word.)

Who will supply the capital? Why, the benevolent Wall Street capitalists, of course! Says Johnston:

In the United States we have *surplus* capital [again Johnston's emphasis]. One of the basic criticisms of our economic situation during

the last two decades has been that we have surplus capital that remains idle. The backward countries are calling for it.

Here, then, is the real program of American imperialism for the countries of the Orient. These countries are to be bound in servitude to Wall Street. The overweening ambitions of these ruthless dollar-bandits spell a continuance of colonial slavery, besides sowing the seeds of more devastating wars. No wonder the San Francisco conference, with Wall Street's delegation in the lead, voted down a proposal that a promise of independence for the colonial peoples be included in the charter of the proposed world "peace" organization. In the light of their manifestly predatory aims, it would be embarrassing to the imperialists even to *promise* freedom to their colonial slaves.

The peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, in Asia and elsewhere, will never get their independence as a gift of their oppressors. Freedom can be won only by determined, unremitting struggle to throw off the shackles of imperialist bondage. The liberating struggle of the colonial peoples naturally fuses with the world struggle of the working class to end the capitalist system, of which colonial slavery and imperialist war are the inevitable products. The further progress of the war in the Pacific will open up new opportunities to the oppressed peoples. On the very morrow of Germany's defeat, the flames of colonial revolt rose in North Africa and the Near East—to threaten the imperialists who had deceitfully inscribed "Liberty" on their bloodstained banners. With the defeat of Japan, or even before, the teeming millions of the Orient will join the great battle for freedom. As the *Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution* prophetically declared:

By its very creation of enormous difficulties and dangers for the imperialist metropolitan centers, the war opens up wide possibilities for the oppressed peoples. The rumbling of cannon in Europe heralds the approaching hour of their liberation.

A Correction

Through a regrettable error the article, *Defense of the Soviet Union and Revolutionary Tactics*, which appeared in the March 1945 issue of our magazine, was accredited to G. Munis and the date of its writing was omitted. This document is, as a matter of fact, an official document of the Spanish Group in Mexico, and should, furthermore, have been accompanied by the date of its adoption, namely: March 1944.—Ed.

The Maturing Revolutionary Situation in Europe and the Immediate Tasks of the IV International

Political Resolution Adopted by the European Executive Committee, Fourth International, January 1945.

The events which have transpired since the European Conference in February 1944 have on the whole confirmed the perspectives of the Conference.

In June 1944 American and British imperialism abandoned their expectant attitude and hurled en masse their armed forces on Europe with the aim of annihilating German imperialism and at the same time of damming up the revolutionary tide, smashing it, counteracting the influence of the USSR and thus definitely consolidating the multiple gains which the war has procured for them in Europe.

The reactionary, and clearly counter-revolutionary character of their intervention has everywhere been amply demonstrated.

Counter-Revolutionary Imperialist Intervention

In *Italy*—against the democratic and revolutionary aspirations of the Italian masses—they supported Badoglio, one of the principal pillars of Mussolini's fascist regime and of the bankrupt monarchy. After Badoglio was compelled to resign in face of the growing discontent of the people, British and American imperialism thrust Bonomi to the forefront and continued to exercise their reactionary tutelage on him and on the whole of political life in Italy.

In *Belgium* they supported Pierlot, representative of big Belgian finance capital, and they did not hesitate to protect his artificial and despised regime with the firepower of their tanks and their cannons.

wards the revolutionary movements of the European masses. Despite the real and profound antagonisms between them and although they occasionally have different interests in various European countries, they are both in agreement on the necessity of maintaining reactionary capitalist order everywhere in Europe and of smashing the beginnings of the revolutionary upsurge of the masses.

The Policy of Stalinism

The Stalinist bureaucracy of the USSR has definitely shown itself to be no less hostile to any revolutionary development in Europe. This was foreseen and has manifested itself in a more complex way because of the diversity of its interests in different European countries and because of the lesser or greater pressure of the masses on the apparatus of the Communist parties. In countries occupied by the Red Army—Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Finland—the capitalist regime is maintained; the military apparatus reigns as master and the reactionary generals and fascists (Mannerheim, Miklos, Radescu) who participated in the war against Russia, remain at the helm, supported by "People's Front" combinations of bourgeois politicians and CP representatives. In all these countries, the Stalinist bureaucracy is concerned above all with appearing before world imperialism as a factor of "law and order."

In *France*, with the objective of concluding a military alliance with this country for the purpose of jointly plundering Germany and in order to wrest France from the American orbit, the Communist Party is taking the lead in the policy of national unity and it is consciously sacrificing the vital interests of the working class.

In *Italy*, the Communist Party systematically aspires by its policy to win the confidence of the bourgeoisie and to gain agreement with the Vatican, in order there also to become a great "national" party, capable of orienting the foreign policy of the country in a pro-Russian direction. The Italian Communist Party prefers to break its alliance with the Socialist Party rather than break with Bonomi, and it is the only workers' party in Italy which supports the regency of Prince Humbert.

In *Spain*, the Communist Party appears as the inspirer of the "National Union" movement which repeats under particularly odious conditions the policy of "the outstretched hand" with respect to Catholics, Monarchists, and other reactionary or confused elements who supported Franco during and after the civil war.

In *Belgium* and in *Greece* the Communist parties found themselves compelled to temporarily turn against the governments of Pierlot and Papandreou on the one hand because of the strong pressure of the masses who threatened to break out of

bounds and on the other hand in order to counteract the American and British plans to dominate these countries. But while the insurrection of the popular masses, particularly in Greece, developed by its own internal logic and transformed itself into a revolutionary struggle against the entire national bourgeoisie and foreign imperialism, and clearly posed the question of power, the leadership of the Communist parties in Belgium and in Greece betrayed the unfolding revolution by orienting themselves towards a compromise on the basis of a new governmental combination with the bourgeois parties, supported by foreign imperialism. However, the Greek experience has demonstrated that despite their general line of betrayal, the Communist parties still possess deep roots in the masses, and that the capital of confidence they have acquired for themselves by exploiting the prestige of the October Revolution and the USSR and thanks also to the courageous conduct of their members and of their lower cadres, is still far from exhausted.

The Greek experience at the same time demonstrates that the attitude of the Communist parties, in a revolutionary situation characterized by the general uprising of the masses and their will to struggle, is not simply a function of the foreign policy of the USSR. The pressure of the masses makes itself felt in the attitude of both the members and lower cadres of the Communist parties, bringing with it the threat of breaking the bureaucratic vise of the leadership, as well as impressing itself on the latter and obliging it to disguise its general line of betrayal in order to be able finally to dam up the centrifugal forces of the masses and of its own rank and file.

The Civil War

However, neither the energetic counter-revolutionary intervention of British and American imperialism nor the treacherous conduct of the Stalinist and reformist bureaucracies has succeeded in checking the maturing of the revolutionary situation in Europe.

As the theses of the European Conference in February 1944 have underscored, "the imperialist war is being transformed with inexorable necessity into civil war."

One after another the European countries are being drawn into the revolutionary vortex. While the imperialist war continues to drag on, in the countries "liberated" either by the Red Army or by the Allied troops, civil war flares and spreads.

In a number of countries with an agricultural structure and with strong feudal survivals, such as Poland and Hungary, occupied by the Red Army, it is the acuteness of the agrarian question, aggravated by the consequences of the war and the harshness of Nazi occupation, which in the main pushes the masses into revolutionary action. In other countries, among them Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Belgium, it is above all economic ruin manifested in inflation, mass unemployment, shortage of foodstuffs, which is at the bottom of the revolutionary ferment. Throughout Europe, five years of imperialist war have completely disorganized economic life, exhausted material resources, ruined the system of circulation, brought on famine and misery.

An indescribable chaos reigns in all the "liberated" countries, without any prospect of amelioration in sight.

On the contrary, while British imperialism, itself considerably impoverished in this war, proves incapable of extending any material aid whatever to the countries it claims in its own sphere of influence (Belgium, Italy, Greece) and while American imperialism abstains from risking its capital and its commodities in a Europe caught up in wild inflation and jolted by

the first assaults of the revolution, the revolutionary action of the masses undermines the last possibilities of the bourgeoisie to re-establish its economy shattered and ruined by the war.

The revolutionary character of the situation is determined today by the fact that the slightest demand of the masses against the high cost of living, against famine, against unemployment puts a question mark over the very foundations of capitalism and leads inescapably to a struggle against the regime in its entirety.

The months ahead will aggravate this already extremely tense situation.

Last year has seen the inter-imperialist antagonisms, as well as the antagonism between imperialism and the USSR, attain an extreme acuteness.

To the degree that the secondary imperialisms collapse, to the extent that the Russian, American and British armies penetrate more deeply into Europe, and the defeat of Germany appears inevitable and close, posing the question of the future disposition of Europe and of the world—to that extent the "victors" will find themselves obliged to reveal their real "war aims," to specify their demands and directly consolidate their interests by diplomacy and force.

American imperialism, in order further to weaken British power and to assure its commodities and its capital free access everywhere, systematically opposes the British policy which seeks to create blocs tied exclusively to British imperial economy (Civil Aviation Conference in Chicago, declarations of Stettinius concerning British policy in Italy and Greece.)

On the other hand, differences with Russia over the settlement of German, Polish and Balkan questions, become more extensive to the degree that the Red Army penetrates into central and southern Europe.

England seconded in this sphere by the United States, attempts to limit the scope of Russian successes by maintaining the London Polish government as an instrument of struggle against the complete seizure of Poland by Russia, by the maneuvers of King Peter against Tito in Yugoslavia, by the brutal subjugation of Greece to its yoke and above all by the opposition which it will openly manifest to Russian plans concerning the fate of Germany after the latter's defeat.

As a result of the exacerbation of inter-imperialist antagonisms and the strengthened German resistance in the face of the perspective of partition and despoliation which the Allied imperialist bourgeoisie and the reactionary Stalinist bureaucracy offer the German people, the war drags on piling up material and financial ruin.

But even in the event of an early defeat of Germany, no immediate social amelioration can be envisaged in Europe. The defeat of Germany will liberate twelve million foreign workers who will augment the ranks of unemployed in Europe.

But above all it will automatically intensify the revolutionary struggle on the entire continent, by drawing into the struggle masses who still are, thanks to the treacherous action of the Communist and Socialist parties, subordinating the struggle for their own demands to the prosecution of the war.

Every measure of the bourgeoisie to check the rise of the cost of living, to lower prices, to dam up inflation, is doomed to certain defeat. No administrative measures can restore real value to money without the expansion of production and the re-establishment of international exchange. No administrative measures can wipe out the black market so long as industry is unable to supply the peasants with cheap and plentiful products. Finally, no administrative measures can revive in the workers their strength and will to work in order to expand

production without at the same time furnishing them with generous nourishment, satisfactory wages, and a tolerable standard of living.

The Character of the Revolutionary Movement

The revolutionary upsurge is taking place in Europe within the general framework of the continuing imperialist war and of the occupation of different countries by Allied or German armies. It is this fact which still curbs the revolutionary energies of the masses, which acts to distort the true class character of the struggle, which disperses it and which conditions the relative defeats of the first waves of the revolution.

In Belgium, in Italy, in Greece, the masses have fought and are fighting in an atmosphere which is still generally unfavorable, under the domination of the imperialist war, in the presence of occupying armies and under the hostile pressure against every independent class movement, resulting from the policy of national unity practiced by the treacherous workers' parties.

Alongside the working class and sometimes ahead of it, the revolutionary movement embraces large sections of the poor peasantry and of the urban petty bourgeoisie, ruined either by inflation or by deflationary measures. The revolutionary fermentation of the petty bourgeoisie is one of the principal factors of the political instability which now reigns in all European countries, aggravating the crisis of the bourgeoisie, accelerating and amplifying the self-movement of the working class.

However, if the proletariat proves incapable of finding a victorious and relatively rapid solution to the struggle against the bourgeoisie, then the mass of impatient petty-bourgeois elements will inevitably turn, as in the past, to reactionary and fascist solutions.

Experience has already demonstrated both in the countries "liberated" by the Red Army as well as in those "liberated" by the Allied armies, that the ruined bourgeoisie which is incapable of granting the slightest concessions to the masses and which is directly threatened by their growing agitation, has first of all recourse to "strong" solutions, resorting to police and military dictatorships based on occupation troops and on national fascist elements previously utilized during the Nazi occupation in order to smash the movement of the masses.

An interim "democratic" era of a relatively prolonged duration up to the decisive triumph either of the socialist revolution or once again that of fascism, is proving to be impossible. "Democratic" maneuvers are not, however, excluded in those cases where the bourgeoisie is able, thanks to the active aid of foreign imperialism, to strengthen itself first of all by brutally repelling the first revolutionary assaults of the masses and is able to rebuild its own apparatus of coercion (army, police), of disarming and dissolving the autonomous organizations of the masses such as militias, partisan detachments, etc., that had been created during the Nazi occupation—and in this way regaining its self-assurance. In such situations if the bourgeoisie is once again faced with the threat of a new and violent revolutionary offensive of the masses, it is possible that the bourgeoisie may open up a certain arena for "democratic" maneuvers which it will employ.

But in no case will these possibilities transcend the framework of a factitious solution extremely limited in point of time.

Our perspective, and therefore the definition of our tasks in the immediate future, must be based not on exceptional circumstances which may permit certain countries to experience a "democratic" period under the threatening pressure of the

masses and for a limited time, but on the general line of the bourgeoisie as it has been derived from recent experiences in all the European countries and particularly in the countries characterized by an objectively revolutionary situation. Basing ourselves on the experience in Belgium and especially in Greece, we must emphasize the danger of seeing certain countries, following the example of Hungary (Horthy regime) and Poland (Pilsudski) after the last war, enter directly, after the first defeat of the revolution, into a dictatorial regime from which they will emerge only thanks to the direct support of the European and world proletariat.

On the other hand, the aggressive and brutal interference of foreign imperialism, first and foremost of British and American imperialism in a number of European countries (Belgium, Holland, Italy, Greece) where they have not hesitated to employ the harshest method of violence and massacre applied in colonial countries, shows how conscious imperialism is of the danger which weighs on the capitalist regimes of the European countries and how determined it is to struggle with utmost energy to dam up the revolutionary tide before it breaks loose over the entire European continent and other parts of the world.

The European bourgeoisie—in face of the direct threat of the masses and despite the dangers to their economic and political independence implicit in the active intervention of foreign imperialisms—do not hesitate to appeal to the forces of English and American imperialism and to support themselves principally upon these forces in order in the meantime to rebuild their own police and military apparatus of coercion.

In a number of countries, the revolutionary crisis has as its apparent point of departure the conflict between the armed popular forces—which had been amalgamated in organizations of resistance against the Nazi occupation—and the bourgeois state determined to restore its authority over them. In reality, the conflict is between the popular masses who refuse to submit again to the old capitalist order, who aspire to a revolutionary solution, and the governmental gangs of the reactionary bourgeoisie supported by foreign imperialism.

Despite the prejudices, illusions, confusion and darkness which still obscure and trouble the consciousness of the masses, despite the fact that the Communist parties corrupted by the politics of class collaboration, devoid of any boldness, devoid of any program and any revolutionary perspective, have nevertheless been lifted by the masses to head their struggles—despite all this, recent events in Belgium and Greece constitute the first phase of the revolution which has actually begun in these countries. Through these struggles and the inevitable struggles of tomorrow the masses will throw off everything that is outlived and will acquire the necessary experience to carry their struggles to the necessary culmination: the seizure of power.

Our Tasks in the Present Stage

While Europe as a whole has entered a revolutionary period, the amplitude and rhythm of the revolutionary crisis varies from country to country. In a number of countries, including primarily France, Spain, Italy, history still grants us a limited time for our sections to step up their ideological and organizational preparations in anticipation of the great struggles ahead. In other countries, such as Belgium and Greece, our sections have already had occasion to confront the first wave of the unfolding revolution. But it is not a question of a unilateral evolution toward decisive revolutionary or reactionary solutions. Pauses of greater or lesser duration are inevitable because of the general situation in Europe.

With scarcely an exception, all the necessary historic conditions for the triumph of the socialist revolution in Europe are not only objectively mature but even in the process of rotting. Lacking only are genuine revolutionary parties in the principal countries of Europe.

Although we have a solid core of devoted revolutionists in every European country, it is an undeniable fact that no European section of the Fourth International has as yet succeeded in becoming an organization whose internal functioning and methods of work are worthy of a real Bolshevik party.

Although time is pressing and we must not neglect the tasks which impending events are going to impose on us, the most important task for every section is to pitilessly uproot every trace of petty-bourgeois organizational methods, every vestige of the discussion group epoch and to replace them with a truly Bolshevik organization and method of work.

Our sections must utilize the interval between the successive phases of the revolution in order to assimilate the experience acquired, to improve their positions, to prepare themselves better for the next phase. In general, all our European sections should consider the immediate period as an extremely compressed period for political and organizational preparation in anticipation of the infinitely more widespread and acute struggles in all Europe.

In every country, the Party of the Fourth International should do its utmost to arm its members politically, to strengthen its technical and material resources, to multiply its avenues of expression, primarily the legal papers, and to acquire some strong footholds in all the trade union and political organizations.

It is at the same time necessary, taking the real conditions in each country as the point of departure, to elaborate a detailed plan of action in which the fundamental slogans of the transitional program find a living and concrete expression.

The primary political questions which are posed in the present period in the different European countries and to which our program of action must correspond, are the following:

- a) The economic ruin resulting from the war and the consequent unemployment, high cost of living, famine.
- b) The political crisis of the bourgeoisie translated into the instability of the bourgeois governments.
- c) The fate of the popular political and military formations which emerged from the resistance to the Nazi occupation, and the neo-fascist threats.
- d) The aggressive interference of foreign imperialism.
- e) The continuation of the imperialist war and the imperialist plans for "peace."

The program of action of each of our European sections should revolve around these problems, anchoring them around conditions peculiar to each country and providing concrete solutions for them, with the following general considerations as a guide:

The restoration and expansion of economic life can only be the work of the working class which will through its organizations (factory committees, trade unions) elaborate a plan based on the needs of the civilian population and which will apply the plan under the control of its organizations.

The idea of the plan implies control of economy by the working class, as well as an adequate organization of the latter and of the popular masses.

In every "liberated" country, the bourgeoisie has shown itself incapable of revitalizing economic life and improving the lot of the masses of the people.

In some countries the political crisis of the bourgeoisie is manifested by governmental instability.

In view of this general situation which at bottom reflects the social crisis of the capitalist regime, our European sections will advance the slogan of the Workers' Government or Workers' and Peasants' Government, (corresponding to the character of the country). But this slogan, perfectly correct at the present time, will find no echo whatever among the masses, if it is not adjusted to the conditions peculiar to each country. The Workers' Government does not immediately signify the dictatorship of the proletariat, which can be realized in each country only by the Bolshevik party basing itself on workers' and peasants' Soviets, but a government of parties which claim to be workers' parties, which for the moment have the confidence of the masses and which declare themselves prepared to realize a minimum program of anti-capitalist measures. Such are the Communist and Socialist parties today. Therefore the significance of the slogan of the Workers' Government issued by our sections is nothing else but the following: We say to the workers' parties, "Break the reactionary coalition with the bourgeois parties, take power and put your program into effect."

On every occasion the leadership of our national sections should seize upon every aggravation of the political crisis to put forward this slogan concretely.

Such a government should base itself on the organizations of the working class and the toiling masses in general, on the militias, the factory committees, the housewives' committees, the trade unions. But here, too, our sections must be capable of discerning in already existing organizations—such as the patriotic militias, the French FFI, the Greek partisans, etc.—despite their names and their reactionary orientation, their progressive social content, supporting them, orienting them and extending them.

The fierce attacks of the bourgeoisie and of foreign imperialism upon the popular militias and armed formations of partisans which emerged from the resistance to Nazi occupation, demonstrate that the criteria of our class enemy were more correct than the political intuition of the ultra-leftists outside and inside our ranks as far as these formations are concerned.

Instead of ignoring them or condemning them en bloc, the followers of the Fourth International must attempt to develop their progressive social content and orient them toward an independent political existence in the service of the toiling masses and against the bourgeoisie.

The active interference of foreign imperialism and in the first place of British imperialism in Belgium, Italy and Greece, on the one hand sharply poses the need of intense propaganda for fraternization with the soldiers of the occupying armies and on the other hand, the intensification of the struggle against British imperialism by our British sections.

The European Executive Committee calls upon all interested European sections to issue as soon as possible material in the English language addressed to the soldiers and to use every means of strengthening the tendency of fraternization with the toiling masses of the occupied countries, the German masses and soldiers.

Finally, it is necessary to take into consideration the fact that the war is continuing and that heavier sacrifices than ever before will be imposed on the masses.

The sections of the Fourth International must struggle with all their might against the currents of national unity,

and seize every opportunity to demonstrate to the masses that the imperialists are incapable of bringing the war to a rapid conclusion and of consolidating a democratic and lasting peace.

The war can end and the peace can be real in character only through the coordinated action of the toilers of all countries in overthrowing capitalism and establishing in its place the Socialist United States of Europe and of the world. The sections of the Fourth International must mercilessly denounce the monstrous plans of plunder and rape envisaged for the vanquished countries, especially Germany, and elaborated by the diplomats of the "Allied" imperialist bourgeoisies and the Stalinist bureaucracy.

The EEC emphasizes the urgent necessity for all sections to abandon propaganda which is pure theoretically but which

remains abstract and incomprehensible to the masses, and to immediately elaborate a plan of action, keeping in mind the real situation in every country and securing themselves every single lever, capable of setting the masses in motion and accelerating their revolutionary maturity.

An unprecedented revolutionary situation is unfolding throughout Europe.

On our political and organizational abilities depends the task of becoming, in the grandiose events of this period, a real political force which can definitely lead the masses toward the conquest of power.

January 1945.

THE EUROPEAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL.

"Big Three" Differences in Germany

By FELIX MORROW

The pattern of "Big Three" differences over Germany will in all likelihood be similar to that of their other differences. One month after unconditional surrender the Allied Control Commission for Germany has yet to meet. But it may well meet in the next few days and issue a communique announcing complete agreement. Then, within a few weeks, new signs of disagreement will emerge. Another meeting will perhaps again announce a new agreement, and so on. Amid the millions of words reporting both agreements and disagreements, we shall be told little officially of what is actually at stake. The fog will never lift because none of the powers can tell the truth. The gap between their public avowals and their real aims is too great.

They can tell the world what unites them in Germany: their common desire to prevent the revival of an *independent* German economic and military power. This common aim kept them together in the war and may for a time continue to hold them together.

What they cannot tell the world, however, is that this common aim does not exhaust their separate plans in Germany. Had the common aim been the sole one, there would have been a single mixed army of occupation, a single administration. Instead the Anglo-American and Red Army occupation areas are not only separate, but sealed off from each other. Not a single American or British reporter has yet been admitted to the Red Army zone. But the rest of the world knows little more of what is going on in the Anglo-American zones, for amid the reams of press reports there is almost nothing which answers the crucial questions.

The key to understanding the real situation in Germany is that, in addition to their common aim, each of the Big Three cannot fail to operate in its own occupation zone on the perspective of eventual utilization of its German base against one or both of the others in World War III. However short or long the time before the next war, this perspective must guide them. None of them can say so, but this is what is happening.

Publicly they join in assuring the peoples that they are at one in the aim of destroying the roots of Nazism and militarism in Germany, and in creating a free, democratic Germany. In this lying propaganda the powerful Stalinist movement throughout the world takes the lead. It can reach the working class as the capitalist governments cannot hope to do in their common aim of deceiving the world working class.

Stalin's Public Line on Germany

There has just appeared, dated May 1945, a 107-page pamphlet, "The Treatment of Defeated Germany," by V. J. Jerome, editor of *Political Affairs*, theoretical monthly organ of the American Stalinists. It provides us with the most rounded exposition so far of Stalin's public line on Germany.

The key sentences are the following:

Differentiation should, of course, be made between the Nazis and the German people. Yet it is not a question of clay and potter. The collaboration of the people in its decisive mass with criminal Nazi rule and Hitler's war of aggression is incontrovertible by the facts. Whether that support has on the part of some been through abject submission or of others through conscious adherence, the German people cannot be exonerated . . .

. . . Given this reality, the postwar extirpation of Nazism and the democratic reconstruction of Germany must be brought about primarily from without—under the direction of the victorious Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition.

To bulwark the thesis that the German working class is incapable of extirpating Nazism after the military defeat, Jerome provides a falsified history of the German labor movement and of the German past. A few examples will indicate his method. "Germany is a country that has not to its credit a single consummated revolution." True, but it was equally true of Russia, up to 1917, and scarcely justifies Stalin's use of German workers for slave labor. Jerome quotes and accepts as true a cynical Social Democrat's characterization of the November 1918 revolution: "There was never a more civilized revolution in history." But he leaves out the fact, which the same Jerome wrote many times in the past, that the German proletariat wanted it to be and strove to make it a proletarian revolution like the Russian October. He says not a word about the revolutionary situation of 1923, when the proletarian majority followed the Communist party which, however, failed to seize the opportunity. He says not a word about the fact that the Communist party on the eve of Hitler's coming to power had 600,000 members (the Russian party had 160,000 members at the time of the October Revolution) and six million voting for it, but under Stalin's orders did not lift a finger to prevent Hitler's entry into the government, whereas even the Austrian Social Democracy belatedly took to arms against Dolfuss.

We leave to another time, however, an adequate answer to

the Stalinist and "democratic" libels on the German proletariat. Here we wish to deal with their assertion that what the German proletariat allegedly cannot do for itself the "Big Three" will do for it: extirpate Nazism and militarism and bring a free Germany into being.

Many times before 1935 the Communist International explained that Nazism and militarism were rooted in capitalism and could be permanently destroyed only by doing away with capitalism. Today the Stalinists begin correctly enough by stating, as Jerome does in his pamphlet:

The Nazi dictatorship left basically intact the joint and interlocking class domination of monopoly capitalists and feudalist Junkers—the former as owners of all the heavy industries and the latter as lords of the vast estates and as the militarist caste from which nearly all the Reichswehr generals derive.

The Nazi dictatorship came into being, not to subjugate monopoly capital and Junkerdom, but to serve as the desperate instrument of these joint class forces for maintaining their rule at home and for waging imperialist war.

It would logically follow from this that one must destroy not only the Nazi instrument but also its masters, monopoly capital and Junkerdom. But at this point the Stalinists drop the Marxist terminology, and declare that the solution is to carry out the Yalta agreement on Germany. That agreement, of course, contains nothing about abolishing monopoly capital and the Junker estates. Even if the Yalta agreement were carried out to the letter, the capitalist and Junker roots of Nazism and militarism would remain.

The Yalta Agreement on Germany

In reality, however, the Yalta agreement will not be carried out, is already being violated. The Stalinist press is full of proof of this fact but, far from drawing the conclusion that London and Washington cannot and will not carry out the freeing of Germany from the roots of Nazism, it treats each violation as a deviation which can be corrected. Thus the Stalinist press seeks to delude the working class with the false idea that the "democracies" are carriers of progress. As long as the Kremlin finds it possible to maintain the "Big Three" alliance, this propaganda will be continued. That the working class is disoriented as a result is of no moment to the Kremlin which long ago reduced the working class to the role of dupe and pawn in the game of power politics.

The Yalta agreement is quite specific and unambiguous. It declares for occupation and control that would "disarm and disband all German armed forces; break up for all times the German General Staff that has repeatedly contrived the resurgence of German militarism; remove or destroy all German military equipment; eliminate or control all German industry that could be used for military production; bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment and exact reparation in kind for the destruction wrought by the Germans; wipe out the Nazi party, Nazi laws, organizations and institutions, remove all Nazi and militarist influences from public office and from the cultural and economic life of the German people; and take in harmony such other measures in Germany as may be necessary to the future peace and safety of the world."

Certainly this is a simple-enough directive to the occupying forces—were the "Big Three" able to carry out a united policy.

Are the "democracies" carrying out the Yalta decision to "break up for all times the German General Staff?" That is not indicated by the amazing incident of the 16-day Doenitz administration in Flensburg.

On May 7, at Reims, the German general staff uncondition-

ally surrendered . . . and set up shop as the German government at Flensburg in the British occupation area. A joint statement repudiating Doenitz' pretensions could have been forthcoming in an hour—had Churchill wanted it. Instead, for weeks the Moscow radio railed against what was happening in Flensburg, while Washington remained silent and the British government blandly referred all questions to Marshal Montgomery in charge of the British occupation area. He, far from answering reporters' questions, established a blackout of all news from Flensburg.

The Meaning of Flensburg

There followed two weeks negotiations among the "Big Three." Washington at first backed the British, then advised the British to yield to the Moscow demand for liquidation of the Flensburg regime. It should not be forgotten, however, that as late as May 16, questioned in the House of Commons, Churchill simply said he preferred to speak of the Doenitz regime as "an administration rather than government." He still hoped, it would seem, to leave the Doenitz group intact. Whether he seriously hoped to do so despite the Kremlin's objections, we shall perhaps not know for certain until the British revolution opens the Downing Street archives. In any event, Churchill had given the German upper classes a signal that as soon as he could do so he would be amenable to a deal with them.

That such was the effect of the Flensburg incident is indicated by the former U. S. Undersecretary of State, Sumner Welles, who (but only after it was all over) wrote:

It is a strange anomaly that the German general staff, the creator of German militarism, without which Nazism could never have plunged the world in war, should have been permitted to continue in existence for even one hour after Germany's unconditional surrender . . .

The British government, with at least the tacit acquiescence of our own government, permitted Admiral Doenitz to maintain what the German people considered a national regime. After the surrender the radio at Flensburg continued to broadcast to the German people in the name of his "government."

For an even longer period Field Marshal Montgomery confirmed the command of Field Marshal Busch over two and a half million German troops.

Is it surprising that the German people still think the German general staff continues as before? (*New York Herald Tribune*, May 30.)

The liquidation of Flensburg was hailed by the Moscow radio as "new evidence of Allied unity." But, a few days later, it began to complain that Field Marshall Busch was still in command. This complaint continues, as we go to press, the May 31 *Daily Worker* reporting the May 30 *Red Star* in Moscow as stating:

At the very outset we pointed out the danger to the common allied cause in retaining the German high command. We again are compelled to declare that since Von Busch still enjoys the opportunity to execute the tasks of the General Staff—"demobilization of German troops"—he selects and reserves cadres for a variety of adventures.

Why Churchill continues this "danger to the common allied cause"—this neither *Red Star* nor the Stalinist press here explains. For to admit that the "democracies" are determined to preserve the German ruling class and are looking ahead to German bases in World War III—this would be to admit the falsity of the whole Stalinist line.

Are the "democracies" carrying out the Yalta agreement to "bring all war criminals to just and swift punishment?" The known facts prove the contrary. In the fall of 1942, Lord Chancellor Simon and President Roosevelt simultaneously announced that a United Nations War Crimes Commission would be

formed, but it did not come into being until October 1943 when it first met in London. Nearly another year later, on August 30, 1944, its British chairman, Sir Cecil Hurst, told a press conference that as a result of the many obstacles (which he had created) the list of war criminals still "would be meager" at the end of the war. Even Sir Cecil Hurst, however, apparently wanted to do more than the British government would let him, and so he resigned in protest on January 5, 1945. The same month Congress failed to appropriate funds for the American delegate, H. C. Pell who, in an interview on January 26 told the press he had been prevented from continuing his work because "some officials in the State Department" opposed his view that the Nazis should be punished for their crimes against German Jews.

Now, at the end of May, Lord Wright, chairman of the Commission, announces that the time when trials can begin "seems to be within measurable distance." He states the commission has prepared a list of some 2,500 Germans, 110 Italians, seventeen Bulgarians, two Albanians, two Hungarians and two Rumanians. This reads like a bad joke, when one thinks of the tens of thousands of German higher officers, SS and Nazi officials and big industrialists who by the narrowest judicial definition could be termed war criminals. Lord Wright hastens to add that ultimate lists will include "the thousands" who participated in mass murder and slave labor. But if it took three years to produce the present lists, one may wonder how many years it will taken even to double the number. More important, the commission is merely a fact-gathering agency, and there is no "United Nations" decision as yet as to the method of trial.

To any Marxist it is obvious from these facts—indeed, we were able to predict this in advance—that the capitalist governments have no intention of executing thousands of Junkers and capitalists. To do so would mean the decimation of the ruling class of Germany. On the contrary, it is just this class on which the "democracies" depend for ruling Germany and for eventual support against the Soviet Union. True, under prodding from the Kremlin and public opinion, there will undoubtedly be many more war criminals punished than the six brought to trial after World War II. But it is already clear that the "democracies" have succeeded in establishing a procedure which is certain to save tens of thousands of Junkers and capitalists. Class solidarity and class aims motivate this.

The Stalinists complain about the non-performance of the United Nations War Crimes Commission but the Stalinist line makes it impossible for them to explain the class reason for the situation. So that V. J. Jerome must limit himself to chiding "our own over-zealous worriers over the rights of our enemies." And when a reformist socialist like H. N. Brailsford remembers enough of his Marxist past to indicate the class reasons for the Anglo-American policy, Jerome has to defend the "democracies" against Brailsford: "He has no intrinsic faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter and is utterly cynical toward the purposes of peace, democracy and national freedom for which the United Nations and its leading Tri-Power Coalition are joined in common struggle." On the basis of such a line, Jerome and every other Stalinist can explain nothing and must deceive the working class about what is happening.

Stalin's Policy in the Red Army Zone

What course is Stalin himself pursuing in the Red Army zone? Is it much different from that of the "democracies?" The censorship conceals the facts from us. But we do know that in Rumania and Hungary the Kremlin is not liquidating capital-

ist property. The League of German Officers sponsored by Moscow during the war may well be continuing in the Red Army zone. Like the "democracies," Stalin may be planning to use the Junker officer cadres for his own purposes. But that means that the roots of German imperialism remain.

That, however, would be only one aspect of the reactionary policy pursued by Stalin. Whatever he may do to the German upper classes, his policy toward the German masses remains reactionary. Millions of German workers and peasants, in uniform or out, are being herded eastward for forced labor. The Stalinists attempt to justify this by the thesis of the workers' responsibility for Nazism, including twisted quotations from Marx to prove that there can be such a thing as a reactionary people; even so, however, they can scarcely add that Marx prescribed that such a people should be put to slave labor.

The Stalinists therefore end by resorting to the bourgeois code: "Exaction of compensation from aggressors for their damages is an established right under international law." Two things are false here: the whole idea of the war guilt of an "aggressor" when all the capitalist nations are equally guilty; and, in any event, the idea that the masses shall pay for the crimes of their rulers. Needless to say, Stalin did not begin with the idea of war guilt and thereupon decide to put the German masses to forced labor, but made his decision and turned over to the Jeromes the unpalatable task of justifying it. They could find no other arguments than those used by the imperialist bourgeoisie. There are no other arguments.

The Main Issues in Dispute

Perhaps the principal conflict today between Stalin and the Anglo-American bloc over Germany is not the latter's failure to destroy the roots of Nazism and militarism—Stalin knows well enough they will not do so—but their refusal to turn over to him the millions of workers and peasants who fled in terror from the Red Army zone. For various reasons the American, British and French governments are unlikely to use Germans for forced labor on a large scale: there is much unemployed labor in western Europe; the labor movement apart from the Stalinists is opposed to it. This provides the "democracies" with a welcome opportunity to parade their liberalism in contrast to Stalin's use of forced labor. In any event they do not want to provide Stalin with millions of additional manpower. They may still do so, however, in preference to yielding to other demands of Stalin. Meanwhile, however, they have already begun to release considerable numbers of German war prisoners, whereas in the Red Army zone millions of prisoners and civilians are being moved eastward for slave labor.

Stalin, who controls roughly about one-third of Germany's industrial resources, is also demanding that the Anglo-Americans turn over to him movable industrial plants and machinery from their area. His purpose is twofold: to strengthen industry in the Soviet Union and the countries it controls, and to weaken the industrial power of the Anglo-American areas in Germany. Moreover he fears that living standards in the Anglo-American zones will be higher than in the Red Army zone. Hence the Stalinists argue against including in "reparations in kind"—the formula of the Yalta agreement—much consumers' goods, because such manufactures will operate against the program for disarming Germany economically. "The dominant category of the reparations will have to be raw materials, capital assets, and retribution by manpower." To strip Germany thus cannot fail to have catastrophic effects on the living standards of the German masses. Jerome justifies that too:

The interests of long-lasting peace and the dictates of justice de-

mand that the German aggressor State be reduced to an economy in which the living standards shall not exceed those of Norway, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, or any other nation its armies sought to subjugate.

One can safely hazard a guess that, while demanding the removal of factories from the parts of Germany which he does not control, Stalin will not do likewise in the area he controls. The great industrial plant of Silesia will remain basically intact, ostensibly on the ground that it is now to be part of Poland. The real reason will be that German technology and skilled manpower remains superior to that of the Soviet Union and can produce more if kept as it is. Likewise, in all probability, with the industrial district around Berlin. For the last thing in Stalin's mind is the eventual re-unification of a united Germany. What he holds he aims to keep, regardless of the feelings of the German people.

It should be obvious that Stalin's demands for more capital assets from Germany will not easily be granted by the Anglo-Americans. That Stalin should keep intact one-third of Ger-

many's industrial strength while demanding that the others break up the rest is scarcely conducive to agreement. But we can be sure that Stalin will muster considerable pressure. He will back Polish, Yugoslav, Czechoslovakian, French, Belgian, Dutch demands for German capital assets. His aim will be, even if he does not get the assets for the areas he controls, to get them out of the areas controlled by the Anglo-Americans.

To sum up this brief sketch of the differences: Stalinist complaints at the failure of the Allies to liquidate the German ruling classes are a necessary part of the present Stalinist line of portraying the tripartite division of Germany as the method of democratizing the German nation; it is also a form of pressure to get further concessions from the Allies in the negotiations now going on. But the Kremlin itself has no illusion that it can succeed in getting the Allies to liquidate the German ruling class. That is so much pap for the masses. All that the Kremlin hopes for is to succeed in getting from the Allies more German slave labor and more factories and machinery. That is the real aim of the Stalinist libels on the German proletariat.

The Soviet Union Through the Eyes of a Soviet Citizen

The rarest type of information concerning the USSR consists of interviews with Soviet citizens. Such an interview, however, was made possible in France when a 33 year old Soviet physician was freed last year among a group of Russian prisoners, with the aid of comrades of the Fourth International. This interview was published in June-July-August issue of *Quatrieme Internationale*, organ of the European Executive Committee of the Fourth International.

In publishing this interview, the editors of *Quatrieme Internationale* made the following comment: "Although some of the answers are obscure or quite unsatisfactory, it is nonetheless interesting to learn just how the USSR and the Stalinist regime are judged by the young generation of Soviet citizens who are capable of arriving at a judgment, despite the oppressive atmosphere of the bureaucratic regime and the absence of political life—and consequently the absence of adequate political education."

* * *

Question: a) What bodies of the Russian Communist Party did you belong to? b) What role did you play in them? c) Why and how did you leave the Party?

Answer: a) I followed the normal course of all Soviet youth, joining the Octobrists, then the Pioneers and next the *Komsomol* (Russian Young Communist League). I was a member of the Russian Communist Party for only a short time. I managed to leave it in the beginning of 1934 without being expelled, by attending meetings less and less frequently. My motivation for dropping out was the change in Party policy which no longer corresponded to personal views.

b) In the Party I was assigned to the Young Communist League where I functioned as secretary of a factory unit.

c) I was opposed to the policy of exportation (in the period of "dumping"). In my opinion it was necessary first to satisfy the needs of the Russian people. The Party acted to thwart the most elementary material aspirations of the Russian proletariat. I was likewise opposed to the regime of violence in furthering the development of the collective farms. Finally, the increased taxation was likewise contrary to my convictions. In conclusion, the bureaucracy, unable to realize a harmonious

development of Soviet economic life, ignored the needs of the Russian working class and employed mechanical measures in order to maintain the system within the framework of formalistic collectivism.

Q.—What were the principal problems of Soviet domestic policy in the solution of which you took part?

A.—Let me say first of all that in the USSR there is no discussion of political problems. One has to be content with accepting decisions handed down from the top.

In 1935 I took part in the Party purge of the Trotskyist elements.

The only problems that could be discussed were those of an economic character—construction and organization of the country, technical improvements to be introduced in industry.

Q.—Did you participate in information meetings on the international political situation? What were, in your opinion, the relations at the time between the socialist construction in the USSR and the world proletarian revolution?

A.—I took part in the regular information meetings on the politics of the bourgeois world, what they meant, the possibility of triumphing over them in the course of the war, and of achieving ultimately, through the war, the world-wide extension of the revolution. In my opinion, the problem of socialist construction in the USSR is bound up with the world proletarian revolution.

Q.—How do you explain the initial defeats (Bialystok and Minsk)? If there were betrayals (Pavlov), how do you explain them?

A.—The explanation for the initial defeats of the Red Army is to be found in the demoralization among the troops owing to the material hardships of life in the Soviet Union before the war. Taking advantage of that demoralization, German

propaganda was able to make inroads into the Russian army; German propagandists conducted their agitation in its ranks.

Pavlov and others betrayed because they took the first opportunity to show that they never had any ideological bonds with the regime.

The coordination and discipline between various elements in the army were very poor; there was lack of understanding of the new German tactics and the attack came as a surprise. There was the betrayal of many army generals who for 25 years did nothing except supervise parades and who were not inclined to risk their lives. There was ignorance in handling new weapons recently produced. The army did not know how to fight. There was no systematic organization of the guerrillas and the armed forces assigned to the defense of cities remained on purely defensive positions.

The prevalent mood might be formulated as follows: the Russian soldier lacked the enthusiasm to defend the Stalinist structure.

Q.—How was the military reorganization of the USSR accomplished? What are the reasons for it? What part did civilian resistance and the guerrillas play in this reorganization? What role did the workers' battalions play in the war (Leningrad, Rostov)?

A.—The defense army was in the meantime put in action. The command was changed and discipline restored. Liaison between the different armies was assured. At the same time the work of the guerrillas became more effective. Nazi atrocities perpetrated against Russian prisoners became known through the soldiers who escaped, and this stimulated the energies, hence the hatred of fascism.

The guerrilla detachments were primarily composed of old Bolsheviks. At Leningrad the workers' battalions played a great role in the defense of the city. Frequently heard was the cry: "We'll prevent the fascists from taking Lenin's city!"

Q.—In your opinion, how should the war end? What kind of peace can be concluded between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries? How can new wars against the USSR be prevented—by the international revolution or by agreements with the imperialists?

A.—So long as capitalism survives, new wars are bound to recur periodically. To prevent new wars against the USSR it is necessary to overthrow capitalism; it must be the last victim of the war.

The imperialist war has to be terminated in the revolution. Otherwise the USSR will have to conclude peace with the capitalist countries. To safeguard itself, the USSR must rely on the world proletariat.

Q.—What do you think of the Red Army from the standpoint of its social composition, the relation between the soldiers and the officers, the technical quality of the command? What do you think of the strategy of the Red Army commanders and their strategic and material preparations? What is the Red soldier fighting for? (Compare with Jules Romains' descriptions of Verdun.) Is the Red Army a formation of the international proletariat, the army of the Third International as Lenin called it, or is it the army of the Russian people?

A.—The Red Army is an international Army because of the diverse national elements of which it is composed. In training and field maneuvers excellent results were obtained. But the first Finnish campaign demonstrated that the army had not yet

reached the level of technological development and discipline one could have expected. An estimate of strategy can be made only in time of action. The Red Army showed itself strategically inept at the beginning of the war with Germany. The German war gave it the experience it lacked and which it possesses today. The Russian soldier is fighting today to vindicate and preserve his right to live. Nazism has very clearly showed him its oppressive goals. Since then the only goal of the Russian soldier has been to destroy fascism.

Comradely relations exist between officers and soldiers, for they both come from the proletarian milieu. The officers eat separately; their food is better than that of the soldiers. The troops consider this normal. However, in 1933, inadequate rations on warships at Leningrad gave rise to protest movements among the soldiers. Similar actions likewise occurred during the war.

Officers are given assignments after a period of training in a military school. However, after the betrayal of the generals in September 1941, the People's Commissariat of Defense decreed that an officer who did not place himself in the forefront during battle would be broken and the soldiers would select a substitute from their ranks in whom they had the greatest confidence.

Bourgeois type of discipline was instituted several years before the war. But in reality these regulations were not observed and soldiers saluted officers only when they wanted to. Not until 1940, under Timoshenko, did the officers enforce the salute. Classes were organized to teach the troops to salute. In general it can be said that the Red Army has reverted to bourgeois norms in matters of discipline and in relations between officers and soldiers. In my opinion this purely formal discipline is useless and undermines the soldier's morale.

Q.—Some Russian soldiers say that this war between the USSR and Germany is not political in character and that when attacked you have to defend yourself. What do you think of this interpretation? What are the reasons for wars in general and in particular why will there always be wars against the USSR so long as the capitalist environment remains? From this point of view, how can the war threat to the USSR be averted?

A.—All wars are political and economic in character. War is the continuation of politics. In order to defend the USSR, capitalism must be abolished.

Q.—What do you know about fascist atrocities in the USSR and elsewhere? Do you know that the German fascists began by employing their barbaric methods against the German people? Do you think it is possible to fight against fascism without fighting together with the international proletariat against capitalism? Don't you think that fascism exists because the revolution has failed to keep pace with the maturity of the objective situation?

A.—The cruelty of the Germans manifested itself in different ways in different areas: corpses were hung on telephone poles, prisoners were used as targets during maneuvers. My own memories are too grim to recall.

I am not acquainted with the attitude of the German fascists toward the proletariat, but it is natural for the bourgeoisie to deal even more savagely with the revolutionary proletariat of its own country than with prisoners of war. I think that fascism exists because of the delay of the revolution. Since Russia is menaced by world capitalism, it is necessary to fight against capitalism together with the international proletariat.

Q.—What, in your opinion, is the difference between Soviet economy and capitalist economy? Is Soviet economy already fully socialist or communist? Are the workers masters of production? Does planning take place according to the two great essential needs of the workers' state: a) the world revolution; b) broad mass consumption? What do you think of the big American and English capitalists lending money to the Soviet Union, supplying it with war materiel and poking their fingers into the affairs of the workers' state? What will be the consequences of this situation in the postwar period? Will the USSR be able to resist the pressure of international capitalism without a revolution abroad?

A.—Under the capitalist regime the economy is in the hands of individuals or groups of individuals, whereas Soviet economy is at the disposal of the country. Soviet economy is tending toward a general collectivization of the economic budget, one part of which is allotted to the needs of the government, and another to the construction of public enterprises and the payment of functionaries.

The economy in the USSR is socialist and not communist. It will become communist when the entire production is organized for the purpose of satisfying the needs of the proletariat. At present we are still in the period of construction. A part of the wealth is therefore diverted for the purpose of this construction. Another part is devoured by the bureaucracy, thus diminishing the share of the proletariat.

The scarcity of necessities gives rise to a struggle for self-preservation; everyone fights to increase his personal share. The bureaucracy exploits this situation for its own aggrandisement. It exercises control over the work of the proletariat and generally over the production of the country.

At present, under the socialist regime, wages are based on individual output. Under the communist regime, wages must depend on the needs of the individual. At that stage, the masses will have reached such a high degree of consciousness that work will become a necessity like food.

It is impossible to build socialism in one country. The workers should be the masters of production. Actually they are masters only of their own labor. In order to reach a higher form, an alliance is necessary with the struggle of the world proletariat, included in this struggle is the fight against the bureaucracy.

I lack the technical knowledge to speak concretely of planning.

As for the relations with the Anglo-Americans, their alliance with the Russians is based only on their momentary common interest: the defeat of Germany.

The interests of the USSR lie on the side of the world revolution which will free it from the possible domination by the Anglo-Saxons.

Q.—What do you know about the NEP and collectivization? What do you know about the growth of the bureaucracy, denounced by Lenin as far back as 1922? What is the importance of the bureaucracy in Soviet economic and political life? What are the relations between the bureaucracy and the Russian proletariat? Between the bureaucracy and international capitalism? Do you know how Stalin came to power? Do you know that Stalin would not have come to power without the aid of Zinoviev and Kamenev; and that he could not have maintained himself in power without the aid of Radek and Bukharin? Do you know that Stalin came to power, ousted Trotsky and expelled the entire Bolshevik Old Guard from the leadership and later from the Party—and all this at the time of the NEP when the

bourgeoisie (*kulaks*) were growing internally, and under the pressure of world imperialism?

A.—The NEP was introduced in the period of famine and shortage of technical equipment. Indispensable productive foundations had to be created before the socialist construction of the country could be undertaken. Private trade existed especially in the cities. The NEP became unnecessary when the government had adequate financial and economic resources at its disposal. The *kolkhozes* (collective farms) were imposed almost exclusively by force, according to plans laid down by members of the Party. These methods were employed because of lack of time. It would obviously have been better to establish model *kolkhozes* in order to peaceably demonstrate to the peasantry the superiority of this collective organization over private exploitation.

The dissolution of the *sovkhoses* (State farms) and the swing back to the system of *kolkhozes*, observable in the years before the war, show the inability of the bureaucracy to attain a superior form of collectivization in the countryside. Demoralized by the policy of the bureaucracy, the agricultural worker took no pains with the quality of his work.

The bureaucracy was formed by those who held posts in the organization of the country. The bureaucracy detached itself from the proletariat toward the end of the war in 1923. At present it holds all the leading positions. In my opinion the bureaucracy is an unavoidable form for the control of the financial and productive forces of the country. The bureaucracy rests on the proletariat, and the Party rests on the bureaucracy.

The proletariat considers the bureaucracy a sad necessity. There is no essential difference between Soviet and bourgeois bureaucracy. As for the relation between the bureaucracy and the proletariat, one can say that each goes its own way and each defends its own interests.

With regard to the methods whereby power was concentrated in Stalin's hands, I have no special information.

It was said of Trotsky that he was an opportunist, that he was against the policy of Stalin and Lenin, that he entered into relations with fascism and that he had been expelled from the Party for these reasons.

Stalin's rise to the leadership of the Communist party shifted the political role of the Party in favor of the bureaucracy, which would not have happened had the revolution triumphed.

Q.—What do you know of the history of the Russian Revolution; the role of Lenin and Trotsky; the internationalist perspectives which were undisputed and followed at the time even by Stalin? What do you know about the Moscow trials? How do you explain that the entire Bolshevik Old Guard—with the exception of Stalin and Molotov—allegedly betrayed the Revolution to which they had devoted their lives? Are the books Zinoviev wrote in collaboration with Lenin, and the books of Bukharin, Pyatakov, Rykov, Preobrazhensky, etc., still known in the Soviet Union? What do they say about Trotsky and what did you think of him before coming here? Do you know how he died? Do you know that he was one of the principal political leaders during the Revolution, the organizer and leader of the November 7 insurrection and the founder of the Red Army? Are you acquainted with his political and military works?

A.—It seemed strange to me that all the leaders should have betrayed the Revolution, but I was too busy to formulate this clearly in my mind. I felt uneasy and had moments of doubt. Many shared my position but couldn't express it and all they could do was keep it to themselves.

Trotsky's old sympathizers and all those up to the age of 63 who in the past had any contact at all with him were sent to concentration camps.

Most of the decisive elements of internal policy escaped my attention, as was the case with almost all the citizens of the USSR. In my opinion, faced with a proletariat groping confusedly for the reasons behind their unsatisfactory material conditions, the Party, unable to satisfy their needs, switched the discontent from itself to the "Trotsky opportunists."

Concerning Lenin and Trotsky I know they were the architects and leaders of the proletarian revolution. I have no precise recollection of the points on which they may have disagreed, not being sufficiently politically conscious at the time (1932-1933). In my estimation, Stalin came third. At that time the world revolution was the policy of the Party.

Concerning the Moscow Trials, everybody was surprised to learn that all the old leading spirits of the Bolshevik Party were traitors. It was impossible for those who had any doubts to arrive at any clear opinion. The presence of the Old Bolsheviks stood in the way of the Party bureaucracy's shift to a new policy—the Constitution of 1935, Stakhanovism, the introduction of new bourgeois forms into the army, and so on. Hence the political necessity of the Moscow Trials.

I explain the death of Kirov and Tukhachevsky, the death of Orlov and Gorki as follows: these leaders were very popular and the Stalinist leaders couldn't possibly accuse them of Trotskyism. Stalin had them killed in order to shield his policy.

The writings you mention in your question are not read today in the USSR. When the authors were condemned, their books were withdrawn from circulation. Even the texts of Lenin seem to have been mutilated or falsified. Nonetheless they are surely to be found in university libraries and in the libraries of the scientific institutes.

On the whole, Trotsky is hardly a subject of interest in the USSR since he left it. He is no longer considered to have been the principal organizer of the Red Army. Trotsky is given no credit for any achievement of his own in Russia. Of course no one knows the books he has published since his departure from Russia. The "New Course" is unknown to me.

Q.—What are the differences and relations between scientific progress in the USSR and in capitalist countries? Are you familiar with Soviet literature (Mayakovsky, Yessenin)? Have you read the books of Pilniak or Sholokhov? Have you read "And Quiet Flows the Don," and "Waste Lands," and what do you think of these descriptions of the civil war and collectivization? Are there any Russian writers who made a deep impression on you? What do you know of foreign literature (Romain Rolland, Gide, Malraux, Heinrich Mann, and so on)?

A.—Under the capitalist regime it must be impossible for the proletarian strata to get an education. These difficulties did not exist in the USSR. Not only are schools free, but students are also entitled to scholarships in order to assure their livelihood. But in the beginning of 1941, a new law introduced tuitions into the schools (200 rubles a month starting with the eighth grade) except for very good students. Many students had to leave the universities en masse. There were big protests. This law was annulled for the duration of the war.

I am familiar with some of the works of the Soviet authors whom you mention. I have read "And Quiet Flows the Don," and I have seen it in the movies. I was very fond of writers who wrote about the civil war. I love Dostoevsky. I know "Jean Christophe" by Romain Rolland. Gide and Heinrich Mann are

only names to me. I never heard of Malraux, but I have read some of Moliere's plays. I also know Balzac and Dumas.

Q.—With respect to the big wage differentials in the USSR, do you know that this is proof that socialism isn't achieved, inasmuch as the distribution of wealth still proceeds in accordance with bourgeois norms? What is the strength of the bureaucracy? The woman question; what do you think of the law against abortions?

A.—Socialism does not prevent work from being paid in accordance with the respective skills. Communism implies that men are recompensed not according to their abilities but according to their needs. Therefore the regime in the USSR is socialist and not communist.

To illustrate here are some average wages in different professions:

Printers	200 to 300 rubles a month
Chauffeurs	300 to 600 " " "
Mechanics	350 " " "
Waiters	180 plus tips
Household Servants	120 to 150 rubles a month
Graduate Physicians	350 on the average
Bureaucrats	300 and more
Teachers	200 to 300
Professors of Medicine	3,000 and more

A kilogram of bread costs 1 ruble 10 kopeks.

Only service and plant managers earn more than 1,000 rubles. Sometimes an individual holds more than one office (in the liberal professions).

Agricultural workers are on piecework pay.

The number of bureaucrats can be estimated at one-third of the male working population. [Trotsky estimated the number of bureaucrats at 10-12 millions, which is in effect approximately one-third of the Soviet male working population.]

The laws on working regulations met with very poor reception. These laws stipulate, for instance, that a worker who is late twenty minutes must be brought to court and sentenced, even a woman with children is liable.

With regard to the woman question, the political rights are the same; the same wages are paid to women for the same work.

The prohibition of abortions resulted in aggravating the material hardships and increasing the number of children. In addition, the growth of secret abortions led to higher mortality rates. A physician who performs an abortion loses his right to practice.

There has been a constant increase in the population since the Revolution. Each year Russia gives birth to a Finland. Heads of families receive no supplementary wages. Families of more than 7 children get 2,000 rubles a year. For each birth there is a bonus of 90 rubles.

Q.—Isn't it your impression that there is no real political or profound intellectual life in the Soviet Union? Do you know that the Fourth International demands freedom for all Soviet parties (those who accept Soviet democracy as their basis)? What is your opinion of this measure? Don't you think that this is the only way to undermine the power of the bureaucracy? For us, the proletarians of capitalist countries, socialism signifies above all freedom. What do you think of the 1935 Constitution? Did you take part in the functioning of Soviet bodies (factory councils and so on)? What did you think and what was your reaction to the news that Soviets had been suppressed in favor of universal suffrage of the bourgeois type?

A.—There is no political life in the general sense of the word, nor any intellectual life in the USSR. Scientific life has more favorable conditions for expansion, provided it does not trespass on the political domain. If everyone spoke out what is in his mind, there wouldn't be room enough in all the prisons. The day-to-day hardships tend to switch life to purely material preoccupations.

The restoration of Soviet parties in Russia is one of the fundamental planks for the country's return to political liberty. It is one of the foundations for the struggle against the bureaucracy.

The 1935 Constitution serves as a screen for the political aims of Stalin. It is primarily the bureaucracy that profits from the constitutional legality. The urban proletariat accepted the law formulated by the government, without having any possibility of criticism except in the details of each article. The only candidates were those officially designated.

Q.—What do you know about Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht? Do you know that they were the forerunners of the Communist International in Germany? Do you know how they died? What do you know about the German revolution of 1919 and the role of Kautsky? What do you know concerning the defeat of the German proletariat in 1923? How could Hitler have come to power in a country which according to Lenin was the closest to communism in 1919, if not thanks to the false policy of the revolutionary leaders? To whom do you attribute this false policy? In your opinion, why do the Germans continue to fight? Don't you think that the failure of the Germans to put an end to the war by ridding themselves of Hitler is due to the fact that they have no perspective of salvation? And don't you think that Stalin's policy, which consists in ignoring the German proletariat and its revolutionary aspirations, is the chief explanation for the continued existence of the Nazi regime? What should be done with the Germans? Shouldn't they be immediately summoned to join us in a common fight for socialism and to put an end to the war? Do you know that in Moscow there is a "Free Germany Committee", sponsored by Stalin and composed almost exclusively of bourgeois reactionaries, including a number of generals (von Seidlitz) and SS commanders, together with the notorious von Paulus, the "defender" of Stalingrad? What is your opinion of such a committee? Do you think it can be of service to the revolution, or is the contrary true?

A.—Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht are for me two fighters of the world proletariat. They were killed by the Social Democrats.

I have heard of Kautsky, but no longer recall anything except his name.

In my opinion the revolution in Germany was killed by the lackeys of the bourgeoisie. I know nothing about the defeat of the German proletariat in 1923. In Russia the entire proletariat was ready to conquer or die.

The proletariat must be conscious of its struggle. It seems to me that in Germany it was the political unpreparedness of the proletariat that made fascism possible. The proletariat was not sufficiently organized. The German soldier fights on because he still believes it is possible to resume the offensive. Lack of propaganda in the German army impels the soldier to continue fighting against his own wishes. Hitler believed in victory because his espionage organizations depicted the Russian proletariat as demoralized.

Stalin's aims are not the aims of the German proletariat. To fight the German army, it is necessary to follow two lines of procedure: fight to the death at the time of defense, conduct political propaganda at the time of offense. The "Free Germany Committee" created by Stalin fights against fascism and not for the revolutionary proletariat.

Q.—What do you know about China, the Canton insurrection, the Shanghai events and the alliance with Chiang Kai-shek? Are you acquainted with the fact that it was the communist leadership that prevented the agrarian revolution, and forced the small peasants to return the land to the big feudal landlords? Do you think that the communist revolution must be made in China or is it merely an unimportant diplomatic question for you? (Is it a matter that concerns only the bureaucracy or something vital to all communists and all the exploited?)

A.—I have heard of the Chinese Red Army which had contact with the Soviet government, from whom it received assistance; and that a school for officers and leaders existed in Russia. This army has entered the army of Chiang Kai-shek in order to fight against Japan. The communist revolution in China must be the concern of all the communists. It is true that the Stalinist attitude has been only one of self-preservation.

Translated by G. G.

Hayek Pleads for Capitalism

By JOSEPH HANSEN

THE ROAD TO SERFDOM, By Friedrich A. Hayek. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. 250 pp. \$2.75

* * *

Hayek dedicates his *Road to Serfdom*: "To the socialists of all parties." Despite this dedication, which one might believe should have limited its reading public to the left wing political movement, the book has achieved popularity among circles long notorious for their hostility to socialism. The *New York Times*, for instance, praises its "rigor of reasoning," its "remorseless logic," its "impressive authority," and judges it to be nothing less than "one of the most important books of our time." Apparently agreeing with the verdict of the *Times*, local Chambers

of Commerce are reported to be ordering the *Road to Serfdom* in wholesale lots.

Hayek's message "to the socialists of all parties" in fact boils down to nothing but a variation of the ancient theme of Big Business that capitalism is superior to socialism. Hayek's sudden vogue among reactionary circles undoubtedly is due to the apparent effectiveness with which he makes out a case for the familiar Chamber of Commerce arguments against socialism.

It must be admitted that Hayek's presentation is somewhat unusual compared to that of most professional red-baiters and defenders of capitalism. Hayek selects his audience and limits

his objectives. To understand the purpose of Hayek's arguments, which in themselves are exceedingly weak and easily answered, it is first necessary to visualize the type of individual he addresses. It is not the class-conscious worker, still less the Marxist. He directs his propaganda to that section of the petty bourgeoisie which inclines toward socialism as the only means of ending the continual wars and depressions of capitalism. He attempts to block their further progress toward active participation in the socialist movement and to provide them with a bridge leading toward reaction. The book can thus be classified as a kind of transition propaganda that hopes to take the radical petty bourgeois step by step from a mood of doubt to rejection of socialism and outright support of capitalism.

Beginning of the Transition

The author early establishes his authority as an economist and successful professor; but he does not lean heavily on this authority until later when he comes to the crucial issues upon which his entire argumentation rests. In his opening he prefers to flatter the intelligence of his reader, speaking in the style of a logician and seeking common grounds of interest. In the preface he implies that he too was a socialist "as a young man." He is still an idealist with "certain ultimate values." He is self-sacrificing, having painfully carried out his "duty" to speak out despite "every possible reason for *not* writing or publishing this book."^{*}

In the introduction Hayek seeks additional emotional ties with his reader. To believe in socialism, it seems, is not an uncommon error. It is only too human. Moreover it arises from the best of intentions. "If we take the people whose views influence developments, they are now in the democracies in some measure all socialists. If it is no longer fashionable to emphasize that 'we are all socialists now,' this is so merely because the fact is too obvious."

The learned professor's assertions bristle with falsehoods. Socialism, for instance, is not a common belief of our generation, at least not in America, the mightiest stronghold of capitalism. It is still promulgated only by the vanguard of the proletariat. The people "whose views influence developments" are not "all socialists." This does not concern Hayek however. He is making an emotional appeal to the petty bourgeois sickened over the growth of Stalinism, confused by its superficial resemblance to Nazism, despairing over the apparent weakness of genuine Marxism and swept from his feet by the tidal waves of bourgeois war propaganda. The professor's primary aim, as we shall see again and again, is the establishment of emotional rapport with his reader in order to convert him into an enemy of socialism. "Is it not possible," he continues, "that if the people whose convictions now give it an irresistible momentum began to see what only a few yet apprehend, they would recoil in horror and abandon the quest which for half a century has engaged so many people of good will?" Observe the neat rationalization the professor provides for abandoning the "quest": "Is there a greater tragedy imaginable than that, in our endeavor consciously to shape our future in accordance with high ideals,

^{*}Apparently the declaration that the author will lose popularity, will be understood only by a few "elite," is speaking unpalatable truths, etc., heightens the appeal of a book of this type to petty bourgeois readers. Lawrence Dennis, leading theoretician of self-acknowledged American fascism, utilizes similar expressions in his writings. James Burnham, whose thought closely parallels that of Dennis, likewise has a few phrases on the theme of unpopularity in his pot-boiler, *The Machiavellians*.

we should in fact unwittingly produce the very opposite of what we have been striving for?"

Most petty bourgeois who have begun to regret their socialist youth, we presume will hasten to agree with the professor that no greater tragedy is imaginable. Nevertheless, a soul sick petty bourgeois, who has not yet completely freed himself from the last traces of Marxism, might ask for convincing evidence that this tragedy, so difficult to imagine, is applicable to socialism. Hayek aims to provide such "evidence."

"Sincere idealists," explains Hayek, have sought socialism in order to bring greater freedom. But instead of bringing greater freedom, "socialism means slavery." As proof, Hayek quotes capitalist political thinkers of last century's "liberal" school to which he claims adherence and cites as confirmation of their warnings against the danger of socialism the instances of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, not forgetting of course to point his finger likewise at the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union.

"But fascism and socialism are polar opposites!" might exclaim the reader in surprise. "It does not at all follow that what is true of fascism or degenerate Stalinism likewise holds for socialism."

The logical professor of bourgeois economy replies imper turbably:

It is probably preferable to describe the methods which can be used for a great variety of ends as collectivism and to regard socialism as a species of that genus. Yet, although to most socialists only one species of collectivism will represent true socialism, it must always be remembered that socialism is a species of collectivism and that therefore everything which is true of collectivism as such must apply also to socialism.

This is what the *New York Times* admires as "rigor of reasoning" and "remorseless logic." We can agree that it is logic of a kind—the logic characteristic of bourgeois thought in its period of utter decay. How well this logic reflects reality can be seen by any one able to read the press. Fascists and Nazis hunt down socialists in order to murder them. In the "democracies" the men who "influence developments" are now preparing to drown the rising European socialist revolution in blood. In Hayek's logic, however, movements in absolute contradiction to each other are amalgamated and pronounced one and the same.

For a petty bourgeois in retreat Hayek's method of thought is "probably preferable." Once accepted, all else follows "remorselessly," including the overthrow of Marxism.

Hayek, of course, is not original in his logic. He simply states more baldly the assumption at the bottom of the whole school which maintains Nazism and Marxism are twins; that Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia are species of one genus; that Stalinists and Nazis are both representatives of a new class hitherto unknown and unforeseen in history. Hayek's method is characteristic of the petty bourgeois approach to this subject. Its appeal to petty bourgeois renegades from socialism has been demonstrated again and again, one of the most prominent recent instances being that of James Burnham, whom Hayek mentions favorably in a foot note.

Where his purposes require it, our bourgeois pundit not only amalgamates the unamalgamable, he divides the indivisible. This gives his logic a symmetry that should please the petty bourgeois eye. The petty bourgeois renegades from socialism have long pondered the question of means and ends in order to construct a suitable rationalization to cover their base retreat. Hayek does not overlook this powerful instrument of bourgeois propaganda. "All the consequences with which we

shall be concerned in this book," he declares, "follow from the methods of collectivism irrespective of the ends for which they are used." Thus does Hayek drive an axe between means and ends. In dialectic logic on the contrary, means and ends reciprocate, are in mutual dependence. A revolutionary takes as his end the building of a political party of the working class so that it can become the means to reach a new end, the dictatorship of the proletariat, which in turn becomes the means to inaugurate the socialist society of peace and plenty. Hayek's logic, however, makes an arbitrary abstraction of "means," amputates it from "ends" and opens it up like an empty sack in which he can place whatever content he requires to "prove" his thesis.

Only a soul-sick petty bourgeois, unable to think clearly, could be taken in by logic as "remorseless" as this. But it is precisely such individuals Hayek addresses, and the efficacy of arbitrarily separating ends from means in driving the petty bourgeoisie from Marxism has been demonstrated many times over. I do not know of an exception among the renegades from Marxism who has not passed through the stage of sweating over "means and ends." It is now a standardized argument in bourgeois propaganda.

Hayek deals quite concretely with the dangers, terrors and horrors of socialist means. Among his major exhibits is *planning*. This spokesman of the capitalist order holds that planning leads to the very opposite of what it sets out to accomplish. Instead of a means of achieving greater freedom, planning in the eyes of the professor becomes the means leading to slavery and chaos. Under the fascists freedom was lost, but the fascists are only one species of collectivism of which the socialists are another, therefore freedom would be lost under the socialists just as much as under the fascists. Or to drop more deeply with Hayek into the logical abyss: Since ends (by this Hayek implies good or bad intentions) have nothing to do with what happens from the use of certain means, and since planning is inherently a bad means, no matter who uses it evil results will follow; but planning is characteristic of socialism, therefore. . . .

The facts are so well known one is astonished that even the most delirious petty bourgeois could bring himself to accept such "reasoning." The fascists in both Germany and Italy used "planning" to crush the working class, drive down the standard of living, intensify exploitation and unite the capitalist class in a bid for world power through imperialist war. This "end" had nothing to do with good or bad intentions. The capitalist class utilized fascist "planning" in order to preserve its rule.

Socialist planning, on the other hand, begins with the expropriation of capitalist property, the expansion of the productive machinery, the raising of the standard of living and the balancing of the economy through correlation of its various sections by means of a general plan. Planning in this case too has nothing to do with good or bad intentions. It is the means the working class must utilize to preserve itself from utter disintegration. At the same time it becomes the means to end the class struggle. Under fascism the class struggle continues; under socialism the classes eventually disappear.

It is not necessary to be a Marxist to see the fallacy in Hayek's analysis of planning. Anyone who understands the class struggle, as do the capitalists, can see that the result of planning is not implicit in planning in and of itself as a means, but is implicit in what class does the "planning" and for what end. The class struggle in the *Road to Serfdom*, however, receives scant notice. "Remorseless logic" and "rigor of reasoning" replace the brutal facts of life in capitalist society. This rejection of class analysis is characteristic of petty bourgeois thought.

The petty bourgeois wants to exorcise the class struggle; he is sick of it. Hence Hayek's argumentation, if it is to achieve its purpose, must inevitably follow the traditional pattern of petty bourgeois thought.

Hayek still has left the task of providing his reader with an arsenal of rationalizations "proving" the inherent evils of planning. This he accomplishes with a horror show. Human nature, it seems, is so constituted common agreement cannot possibly be reached on all the vast complexity of small details in the general plan; some regions would feel slighted and pained because they did not receive development of their resources equal to that of regions more favorably situated; authority would have to be delegated to a central body; this central body would rule arbitrarily; hence individual freedom would vanish. Thus any petty bourgeois, terrified at the prospect of losing his individual "freedom," can see that there is no "greater tragedy imaginable" than planning.

The Horror of Horrors

Hayek does not consider any of the teachings of the Marxists on the subject of planned society. He does not even consider the views of Leon Trotsky, author of the plans in the Soviet Union which enabled that backward country to accomplish in less than a quarter of a century the economic development of hundreds of years of capitalism. Thus he presents a highly distorted picture of what planning is like in both theory and practice. First he divides up the planned economy among countries which would be at each other's throats instead of positing a united world economy in which national boundaries no longer existed. Secondly, he envisages the continued existence of class divisions which would lead to internecine conflicts over planning within each isolated country. Thirdly, he insists on an economy of scarcity which would give rise to group struggles over the division of the national income. Hayek counts upon his readers to accept these omissions and distortions. Apparently the learned professor believes his audience to be completely unfamiliar with the literature dealing with planned economy.

Another means of achieving socialism, the building of a proletarian party, is likewise considered objectionable by our idealistic moralist. The subject naturally holds considerable interest for the bourgeois propagandist since the proletarian party constitutes the means whereby the working class will eventually dispose of capitalist anarchy. Moreover it is precisely in relation to the proletarian party that the sick petty bourgeois experiences most acutely his emotions of revulsion and his urge to flee. The building of the proletarian party is the crucial political problem of the day not only for the working class, but also, from the opposite side, the capitalist class. That is why the capitalists utilize every means to attack, hamper, prevent the building of such a party and to crush it with force and violence if necessary when it does appear. Hayek too places the question of the revolutionary party high on his agenda.

Pursuing his "remorseless logic" he again amalgamates polar opposites:

In Germany and Italy the Nazis and Fascists did, indeed, not have much to invent. The usages of the new political movements which pervaded all aspects of life had in both countries already been introduced by the socialists. The idea of a political party which embraces all activities of the individual from the cradle to the grave, which claims to guide his views on everything, and which delights in making all problems questions of party Weltanschauung, was first put into practice by the socialists.

Now it is true that socialism approaches all the problems of society from the viewpoint of the historic interests of the

working class. From their opposing side the bourgeois statesmen do the same for the capitalist class. But what Hayek infers, namely, that fascist "usages" were introduced "by the socialists," is not true. The "usages" of fascism are much older than the socialist movement. If one wishes to know, the real parallel can be found among the practices of any outlived oppressing class or caste in the periods when its rule was threatened by the oppressed. In the tradition of the Inquisition, fascism continues "usages" that are extremely ancient. To identify Nazism and socialism is not at all different from identifying the victims of the Inquisition with their persecutors. Nevertheless Hayek coolly declares: "The relative ease with which a young communist could be converted into a Nazi or vice versa was generally known in Germany. . . ." The only distinction Hayek makes between the Nazis and the anti-Nazis of Germany is to call the latter the "old" socialists and the Nazis their spawn, the "new" socialists. Their struggle is represented simply as a factional squabble in which the more dynamic won out.

Hayek assures his petty bourgeois audience that a socialist party "is not likely to be formed by the best but rather by the worst elements of any society." As solemnly as a witch doctor probing for "reasons" in the entrails of a chicken, the learned economist lists three "causes" for the attraction of the worst elements to socialism.

First, "if we wish to find a high degree of uniformity and similarity of outlook, we have to descend to the regions of lower moral and intellectual standards where the more primitive and 'common' instincts and tastes prevail. . . . If a numerous group is needed . . . it will be those who form the 'mass' in the derogatory sense of the term, the least original and independent, who will be able to put the weight of their numbers behind their particular ideals." This will be recognized as the theme song of many a renegade from Marxism who ends up as a slavish supporter of the present order. Nevertheless, like the famed song of the Lorelei it seems to exercise a fatal attraction on these petty bourgeois mariners.

Secondly, such "elements," in the lofty Hayek's aristocratic opinion, require a "potential dictator." This dictator "will be able to obtain the support of all the docile and gullible, who have no strong convictions of their own but are prepared to accept a ready-made system of values if it is only drummed into their ears sufficiently loudly and frequently. It will be those whose vague and imperfectly formed ideas are easily swayed and whose passions and emotions are readily aroused who will thus swell the ranks of the totalitarian party." All this of course places a somewhat somber shadow on Hayek's earlier pronouncements about the high idealism of socialists, his own erstwhile socialism and the good intentions of those of socialist views who "influence the development of events." Nevertheless such propaganda undoubtedly has an emotional effect upon the petty bourgeois in process of rejecting socialism, uneasy over the "discrimination between members and non-members of closed groups." Hayek's purpose is to formulate and give expression to the mood of such an individual turning away from the proletarian party with its discipline, its singleness of purpose, its strenuous activity, its great demands on courage and indomitability in the face of world reaction's powerful opposition.

Hayek's third "cause" does not rise above the level of the rest of his remorseless logic. "It seems to be almost a law of human nature that it is easier for people to agree on a negative program—on the hatred of an enemy, on the envy of those better off—than on any positive task." Socialism thus being negative appeals to negative natures in strict accordance with

the law of human nature emphasized by Hayek to the exclusion of its correlative, that people under the pressure of events will unite on positive programs that sometimes completely reshape society. Hayek makes out the program of socialism to be simply destructive; it does no more than single out "Jews" and those better off, such as "Kulaks" and capitalists for attack. Hayek utters these poisonous slanders with the most "impressive authority" possible to a bourgeois professor. That he expects his readers to accept such garbage is an interesting indication of the low opinion bourgeois propagandists hold for the petty bourgeoisie and their knowledge of the program of socialism.

Personal Integrity and the Party

Hayek apparently has carefully studied the typical pattern of retreat from socialism followed by such renegades as Eastman, Lyons, Burnham, etc., for he caps his tale of horrors about the proletarian party with a lurid description of what happens to the moral character of its members.

The principle that the end justifies the means is in individualist ethics regarded as the denial of all morals. In collectivist ethics it becomes necessarily the supreme rule; there is literally nothing which the consistent collectivist must not be prepared to do . . . no act which his conscience must prevent him from committing. . . .

Hayek seems to have forgotten the party attracted only the "worst elements" who presumably would lack the "conscience" that has now suddenly come into prominence. However, this is a mere bagatelle. When you open all the stops some of the chords are bound to sound discordant. The volume makes up for the lack of harmony.

The sensitive soul of the petty bourgeois in retreat must undoubtedly shrink at the thought of how close he came to sinking in the morass of the socialist movement when he reads Hayek's description of the "typical German." Yes, by strange coincidence, as the Allied armies neared their goal in Germany, Hayek's description of the typical socialist became, in fact, that of the "typical German."

Hayek's amalgamation of Nazis and socialists does not permit his reader to distinguish just whom he refers to in any particular asseveration. His intention, however, is clearly to utilize all means available in his remorseless logic, no matter how despicable, in order to draw an evil picture of the socialist movement. Thus he declares:

Since it is the supreme leader who alone determines the ends, his instruments must have no moral convictions of their own. They must, above all, be unreservedly committed to the person of the leader; but next to this the most important thing is that they should be completely unprincipled and literally capable of everything. They must have no ideals of their own which they want to realize; no ideas about right or wrong which might interfere with the intentions of the leader.

Hayek emphasizes this point so strongly it would seem that bourgeois propagandists who have made a study of this field of their work believe it to be an unusually effective argument:

The general intellectual climate which this produces, the spirit of complete cynicism as regards truth which it engenders, the loss of the sense of even the meaning of truth, the disappearance of the spirit of independent inquiry and of the belief in the power of rational conviction, the way in which differences of opinion in every branch of knowledge become political issues to be decided by authority, are all things which one must personally experience—no short description can convey their extent. Perhaps the most alarming fact is that contempt for intellectual liberty is not a thing which arises only once the totalitarian system is established but one which can be found everywhere among intellectuals who have embraced a collectivist faith and who are acclaimed as intellectual leaders even in countries still under a liberal regime.

Once again it is to be noted that Hayek does not specify that these evils are peculiar to Nazism and to Stalinism, but on the contrary he incorporates socialism in his amalgam. Apparently he trusts the profound ignorance—or wishful thinking—of his petty bourgeois audience to act as fertile soil for such denigrations. As is well known, in the history of independent thought, of rebellion against the most colossal forces of oppression, the titans stand in the socialist movement. What figures in Hayek's pale sickly world can reach the shoe tops of men like Marx, Engels, Luxemburg, Liebknecht, Debs, Lenin, Trotsky? or for that matter the shoe tops of any rank and filer of the socialist movement who stands against the stream?

Possibility of Plenty

Thus far the "rigor of reasoning" of our economic witch doctor has "proved" that planning leads to slavery, that a proletarian party attracts the worst elements, and that socialist morals lead "of necessity" to those "features of totalitarian regimes which horrify us." This would seem enough to arm sufficiently the most wavering of the circle to which Hayek appeals. The professor, however, is aware that he must cross another hurdle.

In the final analysis the whole possibility for socialism in our epoch rests on the feasibility of enormously increasing the productivity of world society. Marxism has determined how this can be done through the efficient utilization of present resources, transport and factories, the elimination of unemployment, the cessation of war, the ending of economic chaos through rational planning and the early expansion of the productive system through the intensive application of science. Many surveys have been made of the possibilities of plenty; the most conservative revealing grandiose perspectives if no more were done than to run the existing machines at full capacity. The experience of war production has opened the eyes of every worker to the potentialities of the modern factory. He needs only imagine peace time goods in place of the present destructive products that are being poured out to get an inkling of what could be done under a truly rational system.

Our representative of capitalist economy, however, attempts to persuade his petty bourgeois reader to the contrary on this crucial point:

In their wishful belief that there is really no longer an economic problem people have been confirmed by irresponsible talk about "potential plenty"—which, if it were a fact, would indeed mean that there is no economic problem which makes the choice inevitable. But although this snare has served socialist propaganda under various names as long as socialism has existed, it is still as palpably untrue as it was when it was first used over a hundred years ago. In all this time not one of the many people who have used it has produced a workable plan of how production could be increased so as to abolish even in western Europe what we regard as poverty—not to speak of the world as a whole. The reader may take it that whoever talks about potential plenty is either dishonest or does not know what he is talking about.

Elsewhere, Hayek speaks about the "familiar clichés and baseless generalizations about 'potential plenty' . . . and the 'carefully fostered belief in the irrationality of our economic system . . . the false assertions about 'potential plenty.'" We will skip the untruth about no "workable plan" having been produced for Western Europe or the world to increase production, and confine ourselves to consideration of Hayek's principal point about the "myth" of potential plenty. In view of the surveys that have been made, the practical experience of the Soviet Union, and the evidence of war production, an intelligent worker would expect at least an attempt by the bourgeois economist to prove his brazen assertions. But Hayek is not

writing for the "worst elements" such as intelligent workers. Proof that humanity can never achieve economic plenty? Hayek offers none. Doubtless he calculates that the petty bourgeois to whom he is appealing will be satisfied by the publisher's declaration on the jacket that Hayek is a "world-famous economist," former "Director of the Austrian Institute for Economic Research and Lecturer in Economics at the University of Vienna," at present "a member of the faculty of the London School of Economics." In the words of the *New York Times* this is "impressive authority." Only in the "regions of lower moral and intellectual standards where the most primitive and 'common' instincts and tastes prevail" do you find elements capable of demanding proof from such a distinguished bourgeois professor. Hayek simply evades discussing the basic assumption upon which his entire argumentation rests. It would be hard to find a more contemptuous way of dismissing the intelligence of Hayek's petty bourgeois audience.

Having established in his remorseless manner that potential plenty is only a "myth," Hayek proceeds to the next link of his logic. It concerns the "inevitability" of socialism, another breathing point in the flight of petty bourgeois radicals from socialism. If economic plenty is unrealizable it follows that socialism is not inevitable. Full planning is an inevitable stage of economic development only in the event that such abundance is produced no basis is left for the formation of selfish groups such as castes, classes. So long as scarcity prevails, ruthless struggle for the major share endures. When this drive wheel comes to a halt, however, then rational planning of world society not only becomes feasible, but inevitable.

For the benefit of a petty bourgeois brooding remorsefully over "inevitability," Hayek propounds a different view. Man "knows of no laws which history must obey," he states flatly in his introduction. "No development is inevitable." This view constitutes the utter breakdown of science, the denial of the possibility of determining the course of development of any phenomena.

The truth is, Hayek announces triumphantly that "planning" is not inevitable. "The conviction that this trend is inevitable is characteristically based on familiar economic fallacies—the presumed necessity of the general growth of monopolies in consequence of technological developments, the alleged 'potential plenty,' and all the other popular catchwords. . . ."

Are you sure the "growth of monopolies in consequence of technological developments" isn't a manifestation of the organic tendencies of capitalist economy? might ask the petty bourgeois reader, hoping to have his last doubts removed. Absolutely, assures the comforting professor. "Competition" is being eliminated not by organic changes inherent in the capitalist economic system, but as the "result of deliberate policy."

The growth of statism, however, which seems to be what Hayek means by "deliberate policy," is not an indication of lawlessness and lack of inevitability in economic and political developments. On the contrary it is irrefutable proof that the means of production have become so vast, complex and highly socialized that the irresistible tendency is to bring in the general controls of society, i.e. government. This can occur under the domination of an exploiting class, which simply exacerbates the class struggle, temporarily resolving it in bloody conflict as in Germany, or under the domination of the majority who establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and begin the elimination of class divisions and the development of planning in the interests of the new society as a whole.

In Hayek's opinion all that is required to prevent planning from becoming inevitable is to change government policy.

Hayek's petty bourgeois audience should feel comforted over this moth-eaten assumption that the government is not the executive instrument of the ruling class but an independent force above the classes which can be persuaded to restore "competition" by changing policies without halting "technological changes."

Besides attacking socialism head on, Hayek counterposes a Utopia in order to leave his petty bourgeois client with a positive program. The Utopia he advocates is nothing less than "competitive" society.

Competitive Utopia is quite hazy. The classes are never clearly outlined. We don't know whether they even exist in this snug realm. It seems to consist of small merchants, artisans and farmers all competing with fairly equal resources on the market, all competing according to the Rule of Law, i.e., fixed rules of the game set down in advance so that only "luck" and "enterprise" shall determine who will be the most successful. Hayek labels such a system one of "freedom" and claims it would be the most moral of possible worlds, one where his "certain ultimate values" would find greatest expression. Foggy as is this Utopia, at least the content of its "freedom" is clear, this "freedom" Hayek has been pounding into the ears of his petty bourgeois reader from the beginning of the *Road to Serfdom*. It is the freedom to buy, the freedom to sell, the freedom to exploit, the freedom to make a profit, and the freedom to wage an occasional war. It is the kind of freedom Hayek wants instead of the "slavery" of planned economy. He believes correct government policy can achieve it.

Competitive Utopia resembles more than anything the free world the corner grocer day dreams about when the chain store across the street takes away his customers with a special sale. In brief it is a petty bourgeois Utopia. Professor Hayek hopes it will appeal to the petty bourgeois radical who reads the *Road to Serfdom* and thus furnish him with an ideal to fight for in place of the united world order of socialism.

Unfortunately it is a reactionary Utopia, as can easily be proved from Hayek's own proclamations. "What our generation has forgotten is that the system of private property is the most important guaranty of freedom, not only for those who own property, but scarcely less for those who do not." Competitive Utopia is thus based on private property, i.e., single individuals owning, controlling and exploiting the national resources and economic system. Private property is the cornerstone of capitalism.

This system, as is only too well known, does not stand still but develops glaring inequalities. Hayek justifies inequalities: "In a system of free enterprise chances are not equal, since such a system is necessarily based on private property and (though perhaps not with the same necessity) on inheritance, with the differences in opportunity which these create." Thus the snug little realm of Competitive Utopia has already grown into a very real murderous capitalist society in which 60 families can and do constitute, with Hayek's permission, a ruling oligarchy. Listen to this panegyric, worthy of the pen of Henry Ford: "Money is one of the greatest instruments of freedom ever invented by man. It is money which in existing society opens an astounding range of choice to the poor man. . . ." Still further, "who will deny that a world in which the wealthy are powerful is still a better world than one in which only the already powerful can acquire wealth?"

Competitive Utopia even has its unemployed. Hayek feels considerable sympathy for these unfortunates and thinks something should be done for them, in fact he even proposes a solution for unemployment which should have a familiar ring to

those who have never suffered unemployment in Competitive Utopia but know its rigors under America's 60 families. Our "world famous" economist believes, for instances, that "those who can no longer be employed at the relatively high wages they have earned during the war must be allowed to remain unemployed until they are willing to accept work at a relatively lower wage." This solution would undoubtedly satisfy Hayek's "ultimate moral values," the freedom of the lucky to offer what wages they wish and the freedom of the unlucky unemployed to starve.

Competitive Utopia is not quite as rosy as its author pretends. It even has its emergencies when it appears both freedom and competition may be temporarily suspended in order of course to preserve freedom and competition. "The only exception to the rule that a free society must not be subjected to a single purpose," declares our humanitarian, "is war and other temporary disasters." By "disasters" we presume he refers to strikes, unemployed demonstrations, and proletarian uprisings.

Hayek and Imperialist War

Having brought his petty bourgeois convert to embrace the principle of private property, Hayek carries through his transition to support of the present order, no doubt hoping his convert will trustingly follow. In passing he attacks the trusts—how can you appeal to the petty bourgeoisie without a demagogic attack on the trusts?—but this does not swerve him from his main purpose, that is, to win support for the Second World War which is being waged by some very real trusts far removed from petty bourgeois Utopias. He does the job boldly, not hesitating to state his purpose in the opening sections of his book:

There is an even more pressing reason why at this time we should seriously endeavor to understand the forces which have created National Socialism: that this will enable us to understand our enemy and the issue at stake between us. It cannot be denied that there is yet little recognition of the positive ideals for which we are fighting.

Perfidious purpose is apparent in amalgamating Hitler's National Socialism with proletarian revolution. It is ideological preparation for the crushing of the European workers under guise their revolution is in reality simply a new form of Hitler's movement. Hayek even lays the basis for Allied persecution of the Jews: "We should never forget that the anti-Semitism of Hitler has driven from his country, or turned into his enemies, many people who in every respect are confirmed totalitarians of the German type." In other words, don't permit the fact that anti-Nazis have been bitterly persecuted by Hitler lull you into handling them in any other way than Hitler did. In Hayek's logic they are simply another species of collectivism, twins of Nazism! Hayek tries to reinforce this ideology by demagogic assertions about "former socialists who have become Nazis." This demagoguery is strangely coincident with inspired stories in the Allied press about Nazis going underground and disguising themselves as socialists.

As part of his support of the Allied imperialists, Hayek justifies the war time measures restricting the freedom he moralizes over. "In wartime . . . of course, even free and open criticism is necessarily restricted." This has been the position of petty bourgeois "liberalism" since the outbreak of the war. It is characteristic of the servility of the petty bourgeois mind before imperialism as soon as the master raises his whip.

Hayek, however, carries his servility to extreme ends, leaving the road open for support of a Third World War of imperialism in preference to socialism which would forever eliminate wars.

"As is true with respect to other great evils, the measures by which war might be made altogether impossible for the future may well be worse than even war itself." This perspective of unending wars is quite in accordance with Hayek's "rigor of reasoning" since the imperialist rivalries that lead to World War simply carry "competition" to its logical conclusion.

Thus we arrive at the true appreciation of Hayek's work, his economics, his logic and his science—it is war propaganda; war propaganda especially aimed at the socialist movement. All the arguments about means and ends, morals, independent thinking, the impossibility of planning, the inevitability of economic inequality, the possibility of "freedom" under capitalism are seen to be a bridge leading to support of the imperialists in their war for profits, markets and colonies. It is crassly apparent in Hayek's book. Nevertheless the *New York Times* and the Chamber of Commerce expect the petty bourgeoisie will swallow it as "one of the most important books of our times."

How far does Hayek wish to take his readers in support of the dying order of capitalism? He swears again and again and again that he is opposed to fascism. However, in rejecting socialism and in amalgamating it with fascism, Hayek opens the road to reaction. An invariable characteristic of petty bourgeois thought is its oscillation between the poles of socialism and fascism. If it rejects socialism, it seems almost a political law it must advance in the direction of fascism by whatever name it may be called. A critical eye can detect phrases in the *Road to Serfdom* which could well appear in *Social Justice*, organ of the fascist demagogue Father Coughlin. Like Coughlin, Hayek attacks both capital and labor: "When capital and labor in an industry agree on some policy of restriction and thus exploit the consumers, there is usually no difficulty about the division of the spoils." Another sentence indicates the tendency: "By destroying competition in industry after industry, this policy puts the consumer at the mercy of the joint monopolist action of capitalists and workers in the best organized industries." The direction of thought is still more explicit in the following observation: "The recent growth of monopoly is largely the result of a deliberate collaboration of organized capital and organized labor where the privileged groups of labor share in the monopoly profits at the expense of the community and particularly at the expense of the poorest, those employed in the less-well-organized industries and the unemployed." The fascist

demagogue promises to "free" the "little man" from both the trusts and the "labor czars." Hayek's "liberal principles" even envisage an "active" state that would not permit "the use of violence, for example, by strike pickets." He does not mention what this active state would do about the violence of capitalists who precipitate strikes.

In scientific politics such ideas as these are classified as part of the intellectual preparation of the petty bourgeoisie for fascism. Fascist demagogy drums into the ears of its dupes that labor and capital are equally enemies of the "little man" although the actual blows of fascism are always directed against the labor movement.

The professor himself seems to have been thinking along lines he does not completely reveal in his book. He states enigmatically: "If I had to live under a Fascist system, I have no doubt that I would rather live under one run by Englishmen or Americans than under one run by anybody else." Even in his ostensible campaign against totalitarianism as a whole the worthy professor has his national preferences which he states well in advance of all eventualities. Just in case fascism does come to power in Britain or America, Professor Hayek makes clear he has already run up the white flag and will be able to get along without making trouble.

How popular Hayek's propaganda will prove among the petty bourgeoisie of America is not year clear. His support of the war with all its filth, blood and unholy profits will not add to the attractiveness of the *Road to Serfdom* among those layers of the petty bourgeoisie beginning to feel sick at the stomach over the millions of casualties, the colossal destruction and the astronomical costs. Its arguments against socialism, however, may well influence those who have already shifted away from the socialist camp under the impact of the war propaganda. Their vague emotions and confused thoughts are here formulated in what the *New York Times* terms a "remarkably fine" English style.

Among class-conscious workers, however, the book will be listed as another of the series that began about the time of Roosevelt's "Quarantine the Aggressors" speech, when the war preparations got seriously under way, munitions orders were placed by the government with the big bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeois intellectuals began their retreat from the camp of Marxism.

EDITOR'S NOTE: America's real role in Europe and in the world is one of the central questions of our epoch. It is not a new question. It confronted the revolutionary Marxists after the first imperialist war. In the post-Versailles epoch, the theoretical analysis and programmatic position were elaborated by Leon Trotsky and constituted the official position of the Communist International. It goes without saying that it was later discarded by the Stalinists, along with the rest of the program of Bolshevism.

Among the key documents relating to the role of US imperialism are two speeches made by Trotsky, two years apart: the first delivered July 28, 1924 and later published (*Izvestia*, August 5, 1924) under the

title, "The Premises for the Proletarian Revolution"; and the second delivered February 15, 1926. Both of these speeches together with other material were issued by the Soviet State Publishers as a pamphlet, "Europe and America."

In the introduction to this pamphlet (February 25, 1926) Trotsky wrote:

"The staggering material preponderance of the United States automatically excludes the possibility of economic upswing and regeneration for capitalist Europe. If in the past it was European capitalism that revolutionized the backward sections of the world, then today it is American capitalism that revolutionizes over-mature Europe. She has

no avenue of escape from the economic blind alley other than the proletarian revolution, the destruction of tariff and state barriers, the creation of the Soviet United States of Europe and the federative unification with the USSR and the free peoples of Asia."

These basic ideas of Trotsky and the method he employed in arriving at them retain their full force today.

Trotsky's February 1926 speech was published by us in the April and May 1943 issues of *Fourth International*. With this issue we begin publication of his July 1924 speech. The translation by John G. Wright is from the Russian original.

* * *

Once Again on the Preconditions For the Proletarian Revolution

Comrades, ten years have elapsed since the outbreak of the imperialist war. In that interval the world has greatly changed; but still it hasn't changed quite so much, far from it, as we had supposed and expected ten years ago. We analyze history from the standpoint of the social revolution. This standpoint is at one and the same time both theoretical and practical, dynamically so. We analyze the conditions of development as they take shape behind our backs and independently of our will in order, after having understood them, to act upon them through our active will, i.e. the will of the organized class. These two sides of our Marxist approach to history are linked most closely and indissolubly. Were we to confine ourselves solely to taking into account what is happening, then such an approach would in the long run degenerate into fatalism and indifference, into social apathy, and at a certain stage it would assume the aspect of Menshevism, which contains a large dose of fatalism and worshipful acceptance of what takes place behind the backs of people. Were we to confine ourselves, on the other hand, solely to revolutionary action, to the revolutionary will, we would then incur the risk of falling into subjectivism, which is multiform: one of its varieties in anarchism, Left S. R.'ism is another, it is our native Russian variety of subjectivism, and finally included here are those manifestations in communism itself which Vladimir Ilyich (Lenin) called "the infantile diseases of leftism." The whole art of revolutionary politics consists in correctly combining objective analysis with subjective action. And in this is the gist of the Leninist school.

I said that we approach history from the standpoint of the revolution which is bound to transfer the power into the hands

A certain level of technical development is presupposed. Has this level been already attained, if we take the capitalist world as a whole? Unquestionably, yes. How is this proved? It is proved by the fact that large-scale and biggest capitalist enterprises and their combinations—trusts and syndicates—are conquering middle-sized and little enterprises all over the world. Consequently, a socio-economic organization resting solely on the technology of large-scale and biggest enterprises, an organization correctly constructed along the line of trusts and syndicates but on principles of solidarity; an organization that embraces the whole nation, the state and then the whole world would offer colossal material advantages. This precondition exists, and, moreover, it has existed for a long time.

The second objective precondition is that society must be so divided that there exists a class interested in the socialist overturn, and strong enough numerically and influential enough industrially to assume this overturn upon its shoulders. But this is not enough. It is necessary for this class—and here we pass over to the *subjective* preconditions—to possess a clear understanding of the situation and to consciously desire the overturn. It is necessary that there stands at its head a party able to lead the class during the overturn, and capable of assuring victory. And this, on the other hand, presupposes a corresponding condition of the ruling bourgeois class, its loss of influence over the popular masses, its own ranks in disarray, its class self-confidence gone. Such a condition of society is a revolutionary condition. Psychological, political, and dynamic organizational preconditions for the accomplishment of the insurrection and its culmination in victory can arise only on the basis of certain productive-social relations.

If we inquire into the second precondition, the class division of society, i.e. the role and significance of the proletariat in society, then here, too, we can say one thing and only one: it has long ago matured, decades ago. This is best proved by the role of the Russian proletariat which is very young. What then has been lacking up to now? What has been lacking is the final subjective precondition, the awareness of the proletariat of Europe of its position in society, and its corresponding organization, its corresponding training by the party capable of leading it. This is what has been lacking! More than once have we Marxists pointed out that contrary to all sorts of idealistic theories, the consciousness of society keeps lagging far

for all who are assembled here. And besides, all of us have had occasion from time to time to return to the ABC, to the fundamentals, in order by means of the old method to arrive at new conclusions, prompted by the existing situation.) And so, the fundamental, cardinal precondition for the social revolution is a certain level of the development of the productive forces—a level under which socialism and later communism as an economic system, as a mode of production and distribution of goods, offers material advantages. On the plow of a peasant it is impossible to build either communism or even socialism.

It unfolded because the proletariat did not prove strong enough to avert it. For the proletariat had not succeeded in orienting itself in society, in becoming conscious of its role, of its historic mission, in organizing itself, in setting itself the task of seizing power and in solving this task. At the same time the imperialist war, which came as a penalty for that which was not the responsibility but the misfortune of the proletariat, was destined to play and did play the part of a mighty revolutionary factor.

The war laid bare the acute, profound and unpostponable

necessity of effecting a change in the social structure. I said that the transition to socialist economy offered considerable social advantages long prior to the war. This means that even before the war the productive forces would have developed far more powerfully on socialist foundations than they could on capitalist foundations. But we have seen that even with the retention of capitalist foundations, the productive forces before the war grew swiftly not only in America but in Europe. In this lay the relative "justification" of the very existence of capitalism. Following the imperialist war we already observe an entirely different picture: the productive forces are not growing but are being destroyed. As hitherto, and even to a far greater degree than ever before, they are constricted within the framework of the private ownership of the means of production and within the framework of the national states that have been created by the Versailles Peace. The events of the last decade have for the first time revealed incontrovertibly that further human progress is incompatible with capitalism. In this sense the war was a revolutionary factor. But not only in this sense. By turning with its ruthless methods the entire organization of society inside out, the war has knocked the consciousness of the toiling masses out of the grooves of conservatism and tradition. We have entered the epoch of revolution. . . .

The Previous Decade: 1914-1924

If we approach the decade that has elapsed from this standpoint, it will be seen that it falls into several clearly defined periods. The first period is the period of the imperialist war which embraces more than 4 years—for all of us, for Russia, a little less, a little over 3 years. The new period in this decade begins with February and especially October 1917. This is the period of the revolutionary payment for the war. The history of 1918-1919, and in part also of 1920—at least for certain countries, the history of these three years proceeds wholly and exclusively under the sign of the liquidation of the imperialist war and the immediate expectation of the proletarian revolution in all of Europe. The October Revolution took place in our country, the monarchies of the central European states were overthrown, there was a mighty upsurge of the proletarian movement throughout Europe, and even in America. The final high points of the postwar upswing were the uprising in Italy in September 1920, and the March 1921 days in Germany. The September 1920 uprising in Italy virtually coincided with a movement of our own—the Red Army's offensive against Warsaw—which was likewise an integral part of the mighty revolutionary tide, and ebbed back together with it. It is possible to say that this epoch of *direct* postwar revolutionary offensive culminated in the terrible flare-up in Germany in March 1921. We conquered in Czarist Russia, and the power of the proletariat has become entrenched in our country. The monarchies of Central Europe were overthrown, swept away virtually without a battle. But if we leave out the episodic events in Hungary and Bavaria, nowhere else did the proletariat conquer power; and in the foregoing episodic instances the proletariat did not succeed in holding power. After this it might appear, and to our enemies and opponents it actually did appear that an era of the restoration of capitalist equilibrium was in the offing, an era of healing the wounds resulting from the imperialist war, an era of the entrenchment of bourgeois society.

From the standpoint of our revolutionary policy this new period begins as a period of retreat. This retreat was announced by us—not without a serious internal struggle—at the Third World Congress of the Comintern in the middle of 1921. We took note of the fact that the first mighty assault after the imperialist war did not suffice to bring victory, because there was no leading

party capable of assuring victory; and the final major event of this three year period, the March movement in Germany signaled the greatest danger: had the movement proceeded further along this road, it carried with it the threat of smashing the young parties of the Communist International to pieces. The Third International called a halt, ordering a retreat from the direct line of battle, where our parties in Europe found themselves as a consequence of the postwar events. There then opened up the era of struggle for the influence over the masses, a period of systematic, stubborn, agitational work under the slogan of the proletarian united front, and later the united front of workers and peasants. This period lasted approximately two years. And in this brief interval there took shape a psychology adapted to the moderated pace of agitational and propaganda work. Revolutionary events, it seemed, had indefinitely been postponed to a rather distant future. Yet precisely toward the latter part of this brief period Europe was again convulsed by a mighty paroxysm, that of the Ruhr occupation.

At first sight the occupation of the Ruhr might seem a minor episode in bleeding and torn Europe that had just about seen everything. But in the nature of things the occupation of the Ruhr was akin to a brief repetition of the imperialist war. The Germans put up no resistance, for they had nothing to resist with, and the French invaded, arms in hand, the neighboring country, seizing an industrial region which constituted the heart of German economy. As a result, Germany and along with her the rest of Europe again to a certain extent lived through a war situation. The economy of Germany became disorganized, and as a result French economy proved disorganized, too. It was as if history had decided to repeat an experiment. After the imperialist war had shaken up the whole world, had raised the most backward masses of toilers to their feet, but did not lead them to victory, after this, after five years, it is as if history tried to make a new experiment, a sort of re-examination.

I will give you a brief repetition of the imperialist war—thus spake history. I will once again shake to its foundations the already shaken economy of Europe, and give you, the proletariat, the Communist parties, an opportunity to make up for the opportunities you lost during these last five years.

We saw how in the course of 1923 the situation in Germany suddenly and drastically altered in a revolutionary direction. Bourgeois society was shaken to its foundations. Stresemann, the bourgeois Prime Minister, openly stated that he was heading the last bourgeois government in Germany. The Fascists said: "Let the Communists take power, our turn will come later." Germany's national and governmental life was completely knocked from its grooves. You all recall the fate of the mark and the fate of German economy as a whole during that period. There was an elemental flood of the masses into the Communist Party. The Social Democracy, which is today the main force of stagnation in the service of old society, was split, weakened, with no faith in itself. The workers were quitting its ranks. Today, on viewing this period in retrospect, a period embracing all of 1923 and especially the latter part of 1923, from June on, after the termination of passive resistance—when you look back and survey the entire situation then existing in Germany, you say to yourself: History never created and will hardly ever again create more favorable preconditions for the proletarian revolution and for the seizure of power. If we gave our young Marxist scholars an assignment to think up a more favorable situation for the seizure of power by the proletariat, in my opinion they could not do so, provided of course they operate with actual and not mythical or fantastic data. But one thing was lacking. Lacking was the degree of tempering, the degree of vision, resolution

and fighting ability of the Communist Party necessary to assure timely action and victory. And this example shall again and again teach all of us—all the more so, our youth—to understand the role and significance of the correct leadership in the Communist Party, which, by historical count is the last factor of the proletarian revolution, but not the last in point of importance.

The collapse of the German revolution ushered in a new era in the development of Europe, and in part throughout the world. We characterized this new period as the period of the coming to power of the democratic-pacifist elements of bourgeois society. To take the place of fascists have come pacifists, democrats, Mensheviks, radicals and other middle-class parties. Of course, had the revolution conquered in Germany, the whole historical chapter through which we are now living would have been entirely different in content. In that case, even if there were the Herriot government in France, Herriot himself would have had an altogether different appearance, and the span of his political existence would have been far briefer, although I would not vouch even now for his political longevity. (Applause.) The same thing applies to Macdonald and all other varieties of this same basic democratic-pacifist species.

Fascism, Democratism, Kerenskyism

In order to have a rudimentary understanding of the change that has taken place, one must ask oneself: what is fascism? and what is pacifist reformism which is sometimes for brevity's sake called Kerenskyism? I have already given definitions of these current concepts. But I repeat them again, for without a correct understanding of fascism and neo-reformism one will inevitably arrive at a false political perspective. Fascism may assume different aspects in different countries; it can be diversified in point of social composition, but in its essence fascism is that combat grouping of forces which is moved to the fore by threatened bourgeois society in order to repel the proletariat in a civil war. When the democratic-parliamentarian state apparatus becomes entangled in its own internal contradictions, when bourgeois legality hampers the bourgeoisie itself, the latter sets in motion the most combative elements at its disposal, freeing them from the fetters of legality, and obliging them to employ all the methods of force and terror. This is fascism. Therefore fascism is a condition of civil war on the part of the bourgeoisie, just as we have the grouping of forces and the organization for an armed uprising in the epoch of civil war on the part of the proletariat. We thereby say that fascism cannot represent a protracted and, so to speak, "normal" condition of bourgeois society, just as a condition of an armed uprising cannot be a constant, normal condition of the proletariat. Either the insurrection, on the one hand, or fascism, on the other, leads to the defeat of the proletariat, and in that case the bourgeoisie gradually restores its "normal" state apparatus; or the proletariat conquers, and in that case no room remains for fascism, but for entirely different reasons. The victorious proletariat, as we know from our not inextensive experience, has at its disposal several means of preventing fascism from flourishing, and all the more so from growing. (Applause.)

Consequently, the replacement of the fascist chapter by the chapter of normal bourgeois "order" was determined by this, that the initial attacks of the proletariat, both the first (1918-21) and the second (1923), were repelled. Bourgeois society has held its ground, and it has regained a certain measure of self-confidence. The bourgeoisie does not find itself so directly menaced in Europe today as to arm and set the Fascists in motion. But it does not feel itself firm enough to rule in its

own name. That is why Menshevism is necessary in the interval between the two acts of the historical drama—it is necessary to fill in the historical intermission. The bourgeoisie needs Macdonaldism in England; it needs a Left-Socialist Bloc in France even more urgently.

But is it possible to regard the Labor Party government in England or the Left Bloc government in France as a regime of *Kerenskyism*? Kerenskyism is the label we conditionally gave to the rise of reformism about three years ago when we expected that the parliamentary shifts to the left in France and England would coincide with the revolutionary changes in Germany. This did not take place, as a consequence of the defeat of the German revolution in the autumn of last year. When the definition of Kerenskyism is sometimes repeated even today with reference to the Left Bloc or Macdonaldism, it testifies to a lack of understanding of the situation and constitutes an abuse of accepted terminology.

What is Kerenskyism? It is a regime which arises when the bourgeoisie has already lost hopes or no longer hopes to emerge as victor in an open civil war and makes the most extreme and risky concessions, handing over the power to extreme "left" elements among the bourgeois democracy. It is a regime which arises when the apparatus of repression has already dropped out of the hands of the bourgeoisie, or is in process of dropping. It is clear that Kerenskyism cannot be a protracted condition of society. It must terminate either in the victory of Kornilovism (in European languages—Fascists) or in the victory of Communists. Kerenskyism is a direct prelude to October, although, of course, October need not always and everywhere grow out of Kerenskyism. . . . Is it permissible to call the Macdonald regime or that of the Left Bloc in France as Kerenskyism in this sense? No, it is impermissible. That is not at all the situation in England. The forces of the English Communist Party are such that it could not possibly speak of any close perspective of seizing power. And if that is so, then there are no foundations for Kornilovism, either. In all probability, Macdonald will this time cede place to the Tories, in accordance with all the rules of parliamentary procedure. In France, neither the condition of the state apparatus nor the forces of the Communist Party are such as would presuppose a direct and swift evolution of the Left Bloc regime into the proletarian revolution. The concept of Kerenskyism obviously does not apply here. There must be a serious turn of events, before it is possible to speak of Kerenskyism. And here we are confronted with the question which is now the central one, namely: what is this interim period of reformism? what does it rest on? can this regime be stabilized? can it become a "normal" condition for a number of years, which would of course signify a corresponding postponement of the proletarian revolution? This is the central question of our time.

As has already been said, such a question cannot be solved solely on the subjective plane, that is, on the plane of our desires, of our mere readiness to effect a change in the situation. And here, as always, objective analysis, an accounting of that which is, of that which is undergoing change, of that which is becoming must be the precondition for our actions. Let us try to approach the question from precisely this aspect.

What Determines the Fate of European "Reformism"

In the most important countries of Europe the reformists are now in power. Reformism presupposes certain concessions on the part of the possessing classes to the dispossessed; it presupposes certain "sacrifices," even if modest ones, by the

bourgeoisie in favor of the proletariat. Is it possible to believe and assume that in present-day Europe, which is far poorer than it was before the war, there is an economic basis for any sort of extensive or deep-going social reforms? There is little talk of this, at any rate on the continent, even by the reformists themselves. Whenever any reference is made today to "social reforms," it is sooner from the other side: the repeal of the 8-hour day, or the introduction of such amendments as would in effect reduce it to zero, and so on. But there is a practical question quite close to "reforms," which is a life-and-death question for the workers of Europe, first of all the workers of Germany, parts of former Austria-Hungary, Poland and also France—it is the question of stabilizing the currency. The stabilization of monetary tokens—the mark, the krone, the franc—means the stabilization of wages, insuring them against terrible downward plunges. This is the central question in the life of the entire continental European proletariat. Undoubtedly, those relative and far from reliable and unstable successes which have been reached in currency stabilization provide some of the most important foundations of the current reformist-pacifist era. Should the mark in Germany break and plunge downwards, the revolutionary situation would be restored in its full scope. And should the French franc continue skipping today rung by rung down the ladder as it did a few months ago, the fate of Herriot's cabinet would become even more problematical and more dubious than is already the case.

It is therefore necessary first of all to formulate the question of neo-reformism as follows: what are the foundations on which rest the hopes of strengthening the economic equilibrium, even if a relative and temporary one, and in particular with regard to stabilizing currency and wages? What are these foundations and how deep-seated are they?

In approaching this question we run up against the central figure in the modern history of mankind: the United States of North America. Comrades, whoever wishes or tries today to discuss the destiny of Europe or of the world proletariat without taking the power and significance of the USA into account, is in a certain sense drawing up a balance sheet without consulting the master. For the master of the capitalist world—and let us firmly understand this!—is New York, with Washington as its state department. We observe this today even if only in the plan drawn up by the experts. We observe that Europe, which only yesterday was so powerful and so proud of her culture and her historical past—we observe that in order to get out from under, in order to crawl out on all fours from those fearful contradictions and misfortunes into which Europe has driven herself, she is compelled to invite from across the Atlantic a general by the name of Dawes whose wisdom is an unknown quantity. He may be wiser than Solomon, or not so wise. Nobody knows. (Laughter.) And so, they invite him from America and he confidently sits down at a table, and some say that he even puts his feet on the table. (Laughter, applause.) And he draws up a precise prescription concerning the regulations and dates of Europe's restoration. And then this timetable designating the arrival and departure of governmental trains of all the states of Europe is proffered by him to the respective governments for fulfillment. And they will all accept it! Hughes, the United States Minister of Foreign Affairs, is making an "unofficial" junket of Europe. Macdonald and Herriot have organized in the meantime a super-official conference. But we are sufficiently acquainted with this routine, so habitual, so diplomatic and so sugary to the point of nausea. Behind the back of the conference, behind the scenes, and not so very far behind them, for from beneath the curtains one can readily

perceive protruding a pair of excellent, sturdy American boots, stands Mr. Hughes who presents demands and issues orders. Why orders? Because he has the power to order. Of what does this power consist? Of capital. Of wealth. Of unprecedented economic power.*

In the past, the development of Europe and of the whole world proceeded by and large under the conductor's baton of England. England was the first country to make large-scale use of coal and iron, and thanks to this took into her hands for a long time the leadership of the world. In other words, England cashed in politically—and in international relations—on her economic preponderance. She commanded Europe, pitted one country against another, issued loans, refused loans, financed the struggle against the French Revolution, etc., etc. And England ruled the world. The United States is after all England's oldest daughter that inherited a great deal from her mother. But the preponderance which England possessed in the heyday of her prosperity over Europe and the rest of the world is nothing compared to the preponderance of the US today over the whole world, including England. And this, comrades, is the central question of European and world history. Without understanding this, one cannot understand the destinies of modern history, its next chapter. General Dawes did not appear accidentally from across the ocean, nor is it accidental that we are all obliged to know that his name is Dawes and that he has a general's rank. He is accompanied by several American bankers. They thumb through the diplomatic papers of the European governments and they say: We won't permit this; this is what we demand. Why? Because the entire reparations structure will collapse unless America provides the first installment, all told some miserly 800 million gold marks to stabilize German currency. Because it depends on America whether the franc stands or falls; and it depends a little on America whether the pound sterling stands or falls—or does not fall, but just keeps fluctuating. (Laughter.) Yes, all this depends on America. And you know that the mark, the franc and the pound sterling do play some role in the lives of the peoples.

(To Be Continued)

*On July 22, that is, just the other day, Hughes addressed a gathering of English ministers and jurists. This speech, according to Hughes, was not official. Not even a "shadow" of that. The orator referred ironically (his irony bore a close resemblance to the sole of American boots) to Europeans who make trips to America in order to lecture, instruct and captivate the sympathies of the Yankees and especially their aid. And then Mr. Hughes, for his part, proceeded to "lecture" and "instruct" Europeans how they could gain the cooperation and assistance of the United States. "The Western hemisphere (North and South America) are, I am happy to say, a model of peace." They, the Americans, mind you, have succeeded where Europe has failed. "Our relations with Canada, are a model of peace. . . . We know almost as surely as that the planets move along their orbits that we shall preserve peace (with Canada)." In other words, if you Britons ever become so rash as to war against us, you should know that your colony Canada will be with us against you. "You have the Dawes plan . . ." and you must accept it. For if you fail to satisfy the American investors, nothing will come of all your discussions. "My confidence that a way will be found out of all the existing difficulties is based on the fact that failure would lead to chaos." That is to say, if you resist, then we shall leave you to your own resources and Europe will perish without our aid. "You can count . . ." "you must . . ." "you must not. . ." That is the tone of the speech delivered before a gathering which included the heir to the British throne and His Majesty's Ministers. All of official England replied by grinding its teeth at this speech which expresses very strikingly the interrelations between America and Europe. But, as everybody knows, grinding one's teeth is the weakest of all resources in a struggle.—L. T.

Just Published—

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ELEVENTH CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN TROTSKYISTS

Contained in this pamphlet are the two main programmatic documents adopted by the Socialist Workers Party at the Convention held November 16-19, 1944, in New York City.

The United States and the Second World War

Deals with current domestic problems and tasks of the American workers, especially in light of the Big Business offensive against labor and the drive to Prussianize every aspect of American social life.

The European Revolution and Tasks of the Revolutionary Party

This international resolution is motivated by the Trotskyist position that the European masses desire a decisive change and are groping for the revolutionary Socialist way out of the blind alley of capitalism; and that the decisive instrument to this end is the revolutionary party—the party of Trotskyism—able to offer them a bold and realizable program for the socialist transformation of Europe and the establishment of the Socialist United States of Europe.

48 pages, 15 cents

DOCUMENTS OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Founding Conference of the Fourth International

Contains the program and resolutions adopted by the Founding Conference in 1938. Included is the fundamental resolution on "The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International" (the Transitional Program) and the "Thesis on the World Role of American Imperialism."

128 pages, 25 cents

Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Dissolution of the Comintern

Addressed to the workers of the world and particularly to those who have adhered to the Comintern, the manifesto analyzes the Kremlin's foreign and domestic policies which motivated Stalin to formally bury the Communist International founded by Lenin and Trotsky; and calls on the workers of all lands to rally to the banner of the Fourth International, World Party of Socialist Revolution.

The manifesto is combined in one pamphlet with a speech by James P. Cannon on THE END OF THE COMINTERN.

36 pages, 10 cents

Manifesto of the Fourth International on the Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution

An analysis of the economic rivalries leading to World War II and a summary of the aims of the imperialist powers. The manifesto elaborates the revolutionary socialist program of the Fourth International, and analyzes and answers with realistic optimism the major problem confronting the working class—the preparation of a party capable of leading the proletarian revolution. Issued by the Emergency Conference, May 1940.

24 pages, 5 cents

Manifesto of the Fourth International to the Workers and Peasants of India

Analyzing the role in India of British domination, American "mediation," and Stalinism, this manifesto presents the basis for a revolutionary program of emancipation through the agrarian revolution, democratic committees of struggle, and a Workers and Peasants Government. September 1942.

24 pages, 5 cents

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.