

The New _____
INTERNATIONAL

DECEMBER • 1944

NOTES OF THE MONTH

THE STRUGGLE FOR EUROPE

Toward A New Union Program

By David Coolidge

Power Politics of the Big Three

By Ernest Lund

OPEN LETTER TO THE SWP CONVENTION

By

The International Communists of Germany

SINGLE COPY 20c

ONE YEAR \$1.50

CORRECTIONS

In the last installment of the series of articles by George Barrett, an unfortunate error occurred in footnote 20 in connection with John Dewey, giving an impression opposite to the one originally intended. It should read as follows: "(Incidentally the vicious attacks upon Hegel by the Nazi theoreticians do not seem to substantiate Dewey's theory very well.) The rich potentialities of Hegelianism as attested to by the various schools: the critical atheists," etc., etc.

* * *

A number of errors were left uncorrected in the final text of the document, "Capitalist Barbarism or Socialism?" printed as a supplement to the October, 1944, issue of *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*. In order that the reader may read this valuable document with the utmost accuracy, we are calling attention to the important errors here.

On page 331, sixth line from bottom of col. 1 should read: "*declines* is made one's firm foundation, or one simply does without."

On page 335, thirteenth line from top of col. 1 should read: "to disturb the economic "sleep of the world" has met its limit."

Same page, thirty-fifth line from top of col. 1 should read: "petrification" instead of "putrefaction."

Same page, twentieth line from bottom of col. 1 should read: "with its peculiar conditions, they seek to stabilize the putrefaction and bring about the petrification by."

On page 336, seventh line of footnote, the date of Millerand's accession to the Ministry of Commerce should read: "1899."

On page 345, twentieth line from top of col. 1 should read: "can be "no mass psychology" (with or without Freud)—there is."

On page 351, twenty-ninth line from top of col. 1 is completely misplaced and should read: "Revolution, the Paris Commune, or Dreyfus scandal, at all his—."

A Real Bargain!

'The New Course'

By Leon Trotsky

'The Struggle for the New Course'

By Max Shachtman

Regular Price \$1.50

A One-Year Subscription to

The New International

Regular Price \$1.50

\$2.50 Together!

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

114 West 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.

I enclose \$2.50 (cash, check, money order), for which please send me *The New Course*, *The Struggle for the New Course* and a year's subscription to *The New International*.

Name

Address

City Zone State

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Vol. X

No. 12, Whole No. 93

Published monthly by the New International Publishing Co., 114 West 14th Street, New York, 11, N. Y. Telephone: CHelsea 2-9681. Subscription rates: \$1.50 per year; bundles, 14c for five copies and up. Canada and foreign: \$1.75 per year; bundles, 16c for five and up. Entered as second-class matter July 10, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes of the Month:

THE STRUGGLE FOR EUROPE 387

Articles:

WHICH WAY FOR PAC

By J. R. Johnson..... 390

POWER POLITICS OF THE BIG THREE

By Ernest Lund 393

TOWARDS A NEW UNION PROGRAM—IV

By David Coolidge 399

CONTRIBUTION TO "MASS PSYCHOLOGY"

By Edward Warner 402

THE ANTI-MARXIAN OFFENSIVE—IV

By James Barrett 406

Correspondence:

OPEN LETTER TO THE SWP CONVENTION

By the Committee Abroad of the International
Communists of Germany 411

CORRECTIONS 386

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME X

DECEMBER, 1944

NUMBER 12

NOTES OF THE MONTH

The Struggle for Europe

Europe is bleeding to death in the most futile war of modern history. Not even the shadow of an excuse for supporting Allied imperialism in the war as a "lesser evil" has been left under the light which the Allies now cast so clearly on their real character and aims. In the First World War, the hollowness, cynicism and deceit of the shibboleths of imperialism were perceived by the people only after the war ended and one of Wilson's fourteen points after the other went into the discard. The disillusionment of the people with the Atlantic Charter of Messrs. Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin grows every day without waiting for the war to end. Hitler never succeeded in duping the masses with the murder-régime which he called his "New Order." The revolutionary Marxists were too weak to enlighten more than a small section of the people as to the true nature of the war. The Allied leaders, however, who have, much to Hitler's relief, effectively replaced Goebbels in the Nazi Ministry of Propaganda, are now doing more to reveal the truth about the war to the masses, and doing it sooner, than the revolutionary Marxists expected or themselves hoped to do.

Who has the right to doubt it any longer: the war in Europe is being fought to decide who will enslave the continent. The stakes, in the long run, are of course even more important. The master of Europe today is the master of the world tomorrow. Right now, at any rate, the struggle for world mastery is being fought in Europe as a struggle for Europe.

A Reactionary Division

The division of Europe into more than a score of countries was reactionary, a barrier to further progress, as early as 1914. When the Second World War broke out, it was a downright anachronism. The socialist proletariat had been disoriented, demoralized and prevented by its leadership from performing the task of uniting Europe on a progressive basis. This did not make the task any less urgent. It is often the case that an historical problem which demands solution and is not solved in a progressive manner, is solved in a reactionary manner. The "solution," that is, really leaves the problem fundamentally unresolved, forces the problem to the top at a later stage and in a new form, and meanwhile aggravates all other problems and adds new ones to boot. The proletarian movement having failed to unite Europe progressively, the continent was united nevertheless—by Nazi reaction, the most concentrated expression of German imperialism. The hopeless weakness of artificially divided Europe was underscored by

the almost instantaneous collapse of the national boundaries under the blows of the biggest continental power.

Germany broke down the frontier lines which prevented the further development of Europe. She organized all the countries into a single economic and political machine. But the machine worked only to produce the means of destruction. And the ruling régime was of such a despotic nature that, far from succeeding in establishing stability, it generated a tremendous popular movement of resistance in all the occupied countries which was as much a manifestation of this instability as a guarantee of its perpetuation. The reactionary character of the "solution" of Europe's problem was revealed, among other things, in the fact that it gave birth to a *revolutionary* movement whose first aim was to expel the invader from the occupied lands, that is, to *restore* the national frontiers! As was foreseen and forecast, the union of Europe under the ægis of reaction was foredoomed to failure.

What warrants calling the movement of resistance "revolutionary"? Dogmatists who mistakenly call themselves Marxists found this characterization erroneous, even—it is hard to believe this in the light of events!—opportunistic. In their eyes, evidently, a movement deserves this name only if it was planned on their blueprints, organized under their acknowledged leadership, and set in motion from the very beginning with their "finished" and "unalterable" program consciously, openly and unambiguously inscribed on its banner. Such movements have been set to paper, but have never left it. By and large, the movements of national resistance that grew up spontaneously in struggle against the Nazi forces of occupation were revolutionary because

They were a voluntary association composed for the most part of the most militant and conscious *proletarians*, supported by the widest sections of the agricultural population and the urban middle classes;

They were directed deliberately against the ruling class, its compradore collaborators, and against the ruling state;

They employed the methods of revolutionary, armed struggle against the state power.

They aimed—unlike the imperialist armies opposing Germany—not at the restoration of the *status quo*, including the rule of the old capitalist class, but at following the expulsion of the invader with the establishment of "their own" government, even of a "socialist" government, one operating in their own interests.

The change in the European working class following the first period of the Nazi victories was radical and profoundly important. Up to 1939, it had followed the policies of social-democratic or Stalinist reformism, Popular Frontism. The "Popular Front" was a bureaucratic combination at the top; it was a purely parliamentary, reformist mechanism; it was aimed at preventing revolutionary mass action and thwarting the desire of the masses to come to decisive grips with fascism and, above all, with the bourgeois state. The will of the masses to struggle was drained off into innocuous ballot boxes and

impotent parades. In contrast, the national revolutionary movements that sprang up throughout Europe were really revolutionary.

To be sure, a past so heavily laden with massively sown confusion and illusions is not thrown off overnight. It is just as sure that while social-democracy is historically outlived and outworn, its reformist and conservative ideology lives on nonetheless, permeates millions of workers and, either in its traditional form or in the peculiar form given it by Stalinism, blocks the development of a clear-cut socialist consciousness. This fact was also to be observed in the revolutionary resistance movement. It accounted in large measure not so much for its "alliance" with the imperialist bloc of Washington-London-Moscow, but, what was and is far more dangerous, its "reliance" upon this bloc.

Allies Destroying Illusions About Themselves

The most recent events in Europe are serving at least one good purpose in this respect. With the same inexorableness that imperialism pursues and reveals its real aims in the war, it is helping destroy the illusions which caused the masses to place any degree of reliance in its beneficent pretensions. After France, Belgium; after Belgium, Greece and Poland. It will not be long before even the most deluded understand that not only are the Allies fighting as a bloc against German imperialism for the domination of the continent as the base from which to dominate the entire world, but there is a muted, but increasingly open, struggle among themselves for this domination. Among the masses of Europe, the understanding is growing that, far from being their allies in the struggle against enslavement, the Allied powers are rival slave-herders, rivals of German imperialism and rivals of each other. With the growth of this understanding will inevitably come the understanding that Europe, as a cultural community, must defend itself from degradation and destruction and that the surest safeguard of national freedom lies in the voluntary and fraternal union of all the European nations and peoples.

From their inception, the national resistance movements were overwhelmingly working class in composition and revolutionary in temper and method. They therefore constituted no less—although not as immediate—a threat to Allied imperialism than to Axis imperialism. The Allied leaders were as much aware as anyone that these movements, directed against the Nazis and their Quislings, nevertheless did not aim at restoring the power of those who ruled the countries of Europe in 1939. The failure of the multitude of national frontiers to bar the onrush of German imperialism was at the same time the failure of a class. To one degree or another, this has been understood by the masses of the "underground movements" since they came into existence. Only the absence of a revolutionary party has prevented this understanding from acquiring its clearest and profoundest expression in a socialist class consciousness.

The Allied victory in France and Belgium therefore did not eliminate the problem of the mass movement but only lifted it to a new stage. Only the presence of the German invader seemed to give the movement its "purely national" form. Once the invader was driven out, the movement, significantly enough, did not quietly dissolve into individual fragments or permit itself to be indistinguishably incorporated into the regular imperialist military formations. It did not simply hail with enthusiastic relief those who had ruled before the World War broke out and who now returned from

exile to take up their traditional powers. On the contrary, the expulsion of the Germans only posed in acute form the burning question: Who will rule France (or Belgium, or Greece, or any of the other occupied countries) now? How will it be ruled? In whose interests? Do we return to the former system, the former rulers, the former road, or do we go forward to new ones? If the old rulers could take some comfort from the knowledge that the masses do not fully realize what the new system and the new road should be, they can draw little comfort from the incontestable fact that the masses know well enough what they do not want.

The Disarming of the People

An armed people is a permanent threat to the rule of an exploiting minority. The first and principal problem of the returning "liberators" has therefore been the disarming of the national revolutionary movements or, what is tantamount to the same thing, their partial or complete incorporation into the controlled and "safe" regular armies. After decades of reformist training, millions of people in Europe learned, in the most concentrated and painful form, the power and effectiveness of arms which they freely control and are able to use as they themselves see fit. The whole "Quisling system" helped teach the masses that in self-defense they must use these arms not only against the enemy from the outside but also from enemies native to their own land. Their very "allies," imperialist to the core that they are, dinned into their ears and minds the lesson that arms are an imperative necessity for life itself.

No wonder then that any proposal, no matter who makes it, for them to surrender their arms or disband their fighting companies is met with suspicion at the worst and outright hostility at the best.

What is the native, "liberated" bourgeoisie, those who returned from abroad as well as those who remained at home working for the Nazis and who are now so busy refurbishing themselves, to do in such a situation? Power of its own, it has none. The lower middle classes upon whom it counted traditionally for its mass support—to say nothing of the working classes—are still sympathetic with the revolutionary movement which bore the brunt of their common battle against the expelled conqueror. An army of its own, it has none, or next to none. For armed "native" support, it can count as a rule on little more than the old police force, most or all of whom, as in Greece, served the Nazi master with true police zeal. And masses of armed men who are attached to their arms (unlike the average soldier in the imperialist armies, whose most ardent desire is to be demobilized), especially men who are at once militant, self-confident and suspicious, cannot be disarmed by oratory or decree.

Yet disarmed they must be. Today is bad enough for the bourgeoisie. Tomorrow can easily get worse. To "restore economic life," the class brethren must unite—de Gaullist as well as collaborator. This is easier said than done in face of an armed people which demands justice against the Quislings and even enforces this justice itself. Food must be distributed. The armed people are a threat to iniquities in this field which are inevitable under capitalist rule. Factories must be restored to their "proper owners" in order that the sanctity of private property is observed. But among other things, the "proper owners" were, sad to relate, collaborators for the most part, and the people demand that they be punished and their property nationalized; and are ready to emphasize their demand with pistol and machine gun. In a word, again, they

must be disarmed.

Who is to disarm them? The ruling class? But, as noted, it has no serious armed force at its disposal. It is not at all an accident but in the nature of the situation that has developed in one decaying capitalist country after another in Europe that the bourgeoisie must call for armed force from the biggest imperialist powers. This call meets with a perfect response, which is likewise in the nature of the situation. The response is in harmony with the inherent tendency of the bigger capitalist powers to establish their rule, in one form or another, over the smaller "powers." This tendency is not simply elemental; it is implemented by conscious plan. Control of Europe today is control of the world tomorrow. Exploitation of Europe today is exploitation of the world tomorrow.

The notion, carefully cultivated by the American imperialist press, that the armed assaults of the Allies upon the popular resistance movements are peculiar only to British imperialism, and perhaps to Russian imperialism, but under no circumstances to benevolent and altruistic Uncle Sam, is of course the most refined kind of hypocritical fraud. The disarming of the Belgian resistance movement was undertaken upon orders from General Eisenhower. More important is the fact that American imperialism has been a direct participant, and therefore accomplice, in the decisions made from time to time among the "Big Three" for the division of the spoils of Europe, as the very much beset Mr. Churchill has recently reminded everyone with considerable exasperation. The special aims of American imperialism deserve special treatment, however. They will become clearer from an analysis of the latest occurrences with regard to Greece and Poland.

The Conflict in Greece

The aims of the Greek people are anything but mysterious. They want what they fought for, which is, first of all, their complete national independence. National independence means to them not only the ousting of the Germans, but also of the British, who have squeezed enough gold and blood out of the people in their time, and of the Greek agents of the British. The aims of British imperialism are likewise no mystery. Control of Greece is vital to it not only for the economic exploitation of the country but because it is one of the many posts along the lifeline of the British Empire.

Churchill's fury at the developments in Greece undoubtedly stems from an honest sense of outrage, directed not so much at the people of Greece—from them he could easily have expected what happened; for them he already had the policy which he has practised all his life—as it is directed at Roosevelt and the "warrior marshal," Stalin. Both of them were present, at Teheran, along with Churchill. Both of them agreed to allow Britain her domination of Greece, in return for spoils for themselves elsewhere and in other forms. Churchill rightly feels that he has been traduced by Washington, in one way, and by Stalin, in another.

This is not to say that the uprising in Greece against Britain's puppet, Papandreou, was engineered purely and simply by the Stalinists who act as Moscow's faithful agents. There is no ground for such a view; on the contrary, the genuinely spontaneous and popular character of the movement is pretty well established. *Exactly* what were the rôle and aims of the Stalinists is not quite clear. Was the movement of the masses so strong that it dragged the Stalinists along? Or did the Stalinists, for their own reasons, merely stimulate a movement that was already afoot? In either case, Churchill is infuriated at the spectacle of Stalin's agents carrying on open warfare

against Britain to deprive it of territory which the same Stalin, not so long ago, so graciously acknowledged as a British slave-pen. And equally furious (and equally impotent!) against Washington, which so hypocritically pretends to be horrified at actions of the British which Washington was aware of in advance and which, in a sense, it made possible, but for which it carefully declines to take direct responsibility in the eyes of the people, both here and abroad. The Grand Alliance of Democratic Thieves hasn't much solidarity or loyalty, except when its common interests are threatened by an interloper.

The aims of Russian imperialism are also clear. For downright cold-bloodedness and cynicism it has no equal. It can oppose or support or even initiate popular uprisings with equal equanimity, always in accordance with its reactionary interests. The "disturbances" in Greece are not without interest to Moscow, which maintained a silence on them that only added to the exasperation of Churchill, who felt he had a right to Russia's aid in suppressing the people. Moscow is obviously determined to dominate the Balkans. In Romania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, the GPU is already a dominant power, if not *the* dominant power. Moscow wants a direct outlet to the Mediterranean, which it can have either by subjugating Turkey or by acquiring Salonika, under the guise of establishing an "autonomous united Macedonia" as part of the "free confederation of Balkan peoples" which Marshal Tito (read: Marshal Stalin) is advocating already.

But the Balkans are only part of the Russian plan and not even the most important part. Not less than half of Europe under the heel of the GPU—that would be a more accurate picture of the aims of the Russian bureaucracy which has gained so greatly in strength, in appetite and in self-confidence since the war began. That requires, first of all, complete domination of hapless Poland. We may be a long time in knowing, from "legal documents," the extent to which the Stalinists supported the uprising in Greece against Britain in order to prod Churchill into making his public disavowal of the Polish government in exile in London and acknowledgment of Stalin's "rights" to Poland. But only a legal cretin need wait that long. Enough material is already available, especially the material provided by Churchill himself. Stalin's own Gestapo, masquerading thinly as the "Lublin Committee," may already have proclaimed itself the "provisional government" of Poland by the time this issue is printed. Of Poland alone? No, also of most of Eastern Germany, to a line within a mere few miles of Berlin. Fortunately, before this heinous crime can be perpetrated, even the mighty Russian bureaucracy will have to deal with the revolutionary popular movement in Poland itself, a movement which never made peace with the Nazis and which the latter could not wipe out; a movement which Stalinism has thus far at least failed to corrupt or destroy. De Gaulle, in the hope of bettering the hopeless position of the French bourgeoisie in the ruthless imperialist division of the spoils, may lightly sell Poland to Stalin in exchange for assurances of support against England and the United States. The Polish workers and peasants, if they must sell themselves to Stalin, about whose system and aims they have learned so much, will sell themselves very dearly!

Aims of American Imperialism

The United States pursues a policy all its own. The conflict between its interests and those of Britain increase in number and are familiar. They are listed and analyzed in the article by Ernest Lund which appears in this issue. But it would be erroneous to conclude from this conflict that the United

States and Russia are operating more or less in common against England. American imperialism plays, can play and must play a rôle of its own in Europe, a rôle peculiar to itself. What can Russia offer the countries it seeks to dominate? Prosperity? It cannot even feed its own slaves. To dominate, it must rule at least as brutally as it does at home. What can England offer the European countries it seeks to dominate? Food—which it gets from the United States? “Reconstruction” loans—out of a treasury which is kept going by the United States? The protection of their Asiatic and Pacific colonies—by MacArthur’s armies and Nimitz’s fleets? The miserable state of British imperialism is only emphasized by its panic-stricken, desperate, brutally bloody assault upon the Greek people, which differs in no respect from the assaults of the Nazis.

America, however, has food and is ready to offer some crumbs. America has loans, and is ready to offer them under proper “guarantees,” including perfectly legal interests, plus some super-interests, plus the mortgaging of factories and plants and banks, plus the kind of governments which can be depended upon to “maintain order.” The United States has a much more ambitious aim than either Britain or Russia, each of which wants but half a Europe apiece—Washington wants all of Europe, subservient economically and politically to American finance capital.

But to realize this not very modest plan, America needs a Europe which is independent—independent of the domination of either Russia or England, but not at all independent of Washington and Wall Street! American imperialism has no desire to deal with the stricken nations of Europe through

the intermediary of Moscow or London. It has had enough disconcerting experience with that sort of thing whenever it thought of dealing, say, with the Ukraine or, say, with India. America’s *apparent* conciliatoriness toward Russia is due only to the fact that it cannot by itself tell the Russians off. This is especially difficult if Russia can utilize the conflict between America and England to make deals with the latter against the former. If Washington policy in recent times has seemed to be harsher toward crippled British imperialism (for example, the Stettinius statement on Italy in connection with Churchill’s veto of Count Sforza’s ministerial candidacy), this is due to the American plan *first* to humble and harness the British in order *then* to be able to “put Russia in her place,” that is, to keep her as well as England out of Europe so that the continent may be reduced to a preserve of American imperialism. The unfolding of events in the next period will, we are convinced, only emphasize the accuracy of this analysis of the aims and policies of the Allied “partners.”

But Europe is not so easily disposed of! Europe is not the backwater of the world. Millions of modern, cultured people inhabit it, and the continent has been the scene of revolutions which have always imperilled the plans of imperialism and often thwarted them. The peoples of Europe will not easily allow themselves to be dismembered and enslaved. This lesson even Hitler has been taught. In Belgium, France, Italy, Greece and Poland, the peoples are beginning to teach the same lesson to the Allied bandits, singly and severally. Europe will be a cauldron long before it is a grave. The task of the revolutionary Marxian movement is to see to it that it becomes the grave of imperialism itself.

Which Way for PAC

An Opportunity For Labor

For the first time in American history, against all the traditions of the Founding Fathers, a President of the United States has been reëlected “again and again and again.” When so strong a tradition is so ruthlessly broken, we may be sure that something more than tradition is at stake. The type of personal cult which so many well-meaning people, and others not so well-meaning, have built up around Roosevelt has deep social roots. Roosevelt, they say, is the man of national unity. And they are perfectly right. But it is the very imminence of national disunity which gives such power to the idea of Roosevelt as indispensable. Above all, he acts as political broker between capitalism and the working class.

During the course of the preëlection campaign, and even more significantly, in the choice of the vice-presidential candidate, it became more than ever clear that America, today, is politically not one America but many Americas, the America of the organized working class, of the Wall Street bankers, the Southern oligarchy, and various other groups, organized and unorganized. Nowhere was this so much reflected as in the Rooseveltian party itself. PAC is the organized recognition by labor that it has to fight for its place in the Roosevelt camp.

Within the limits of the political machinery of the United States, Roosevelt’s is as much a coalition government as Churchill’s. But as Churchill is learning in the House of Com-

mons today, votes of confidence do not conceal the deep social conflicts which exist between opposing classes. Thus, every step which Roosevelt makes today, whether it be the appointment of a new Secretary of State or an expression of opinion on the FEPC, is subjected to the most careful scrutiny by every element in society. Any one of these may be the occasion for the vigorous conflict between the classes which have placed a vote of confidence in him.

Each section of the social classes which support Roosevelt is of course hostile to his avowed opponents who center around Dewey and the Republican Party. But now that the election is won, each section knows that what matters are the contradictions and antagonisms within the Roosevelt camp itself. Thus while all followers of “the indispensable” united for his reëlection, each section unites to defend itself and urge its claims against its enemies within the coalition. The greater the ferocity of the conflicts within the coalition, the more necessary becomes the allegiance to “the leader.”

But both these processes are merely aspects of the economic and social contradictions which are tearing capitalist America apart. War or no war, all these divisions can be summarized and have their root in one basic fact—the class struggle between American capital and American labor. Like the other elements in the coalition, American labor has supported Roosevelt. But like the others, it has felt the necessity of organizing itself both from its experience of the past and the

tremendous conflicts it foresees in the future. Despite all its defects, this is the essential political significance of the PAC. Before the election its main purpose was the election of the "indispensable." But now the other aspect comes to the fore. Labor has been used through the PAC. There is now the *possibility* of labor using the PAC.

The Dual Role of the PAC

It is perfectly true that the PAC consists of a series of committees, dominated by Hillman & Co. and used by them for the purposes of capitalist politics; more precisely, the politics of the Democratic Party. Their conception of its function is in the full tradition of American bourgeois politics. They conceived of it as a means of getting out the vote for Roosevelt. They conceived of it as a means of defeating reactionaries, such as Martin Dies, and by reactionaries they mean those capitalist politicians who have no reason to disguise their hostility to the labor movement. But the organizers of the PAC conceived of it also as a means of bringing pressure to bear on the administration to make good its promises to labor and as an organized counter-balance against the reactionaries within the administration itself. And finally they conceived of it as a means of repressing any tendencies toward a break with Roosevelt and the promotion of an independent Labor Party. Such being their ideas, their organization of the committees naturally corresponded. The members were appointed from above. Mass activities were limited to routine election chores by those workers who rallied around it. The leaders were careful to disclaim any intention of forming a "third party." For these reasons the Workers Party, before the election, opposed these activities of the PAC, which were essentially capitalist politics.

But whatever the subjective intentions of the PAC leaders, these lieutenants of capital within the labor movement, they functioned within the environment of American capital in crisis and the response of the working class to that crisis. That is the perpetual disrupter of their plans to keep labor disciplined. The PAC was based upon the CIO, drew its strength from the CIO and in the minds not only of the workers but of the masses of the American people as a whole, it is indelibly linked with that militant organization of the mass production workers of the United States.

Whatever the misuse that was made of the PAC in the last election, it is an expression of the present stage of development of the American workers. In the existing situation it was used by capitalist politicians for capitalist purposes to help win an election. That is agreed. They propose to use it for the same purpose in the future. That is agreed, too. But politics does not consist only of elections, and elections do not take place in a vacuum. The capital fact about the PAC is that it is based upon the CIO. Its future therefore depends not only upon the intention and maneuvers of the leaders of the Democratic Party but upon the development of the CIO itself. The development of the CIO in turn depends upon the developing class struggle and the increasing politicalization of the workers which must result from it. The future of the PAC therefore will be the result of a conflict between the bourgeois politics of Roosevelt and Hillman on the one hand and the political needs and aspirations of the workers on the other. *We refuse to abandon this outpost to them in advance. They propose to keep it narrow and limited in scope and purpose, but drawing its strength from the masses of the organized workers. We propose that the masses of the organized workers realize where the true strength of the PAC lies and*

that they take it over and transform it into an independent Labor Party, of the workers, by the workers and for the workers and the American people. In other words, the PAC is a battleground for the class struggle, and the terrain of the struggle is not no-man's land but a labor organization. We say again: We shall not give it up; we shall fight for it.

PAC Is a Stage in a Process

In estimating the possibilities of the PAC the class-conscious workers must see it as a manifestation of a developing pattern, a pattern which began with the formation of the CIO as the mass response of the American working class to the crisis of 1929. The bourgeoisie, in its characteristic manner, jumped in front with its New Deal and its NRA to channelize in its own direction the inevitable mass organization of the working class. The American workers, however, should bear in mind today that it was only by their own independent efforts and a series of prolonged and bloody struggles that the CIO was formed. Here on the industrial plane we had the bourgeoisie trying to use the developing strength of the workers for its own glorification and for its own ends; in the result the working class used the bourgeois overtures and the bourgeois legislation only as a means to the formation of its own independent mass industrial organizations.

In estimating the possibilities of the PAC, we have also to remember the mechanism by which the CIO was organized. The masses of semi-skilled and unskilled workers made use of the only organization that existed at the time, the AFL. It is true that the AFL was a workers' organization. But its leaders were bitterly hostile to the particular type of organization which the masses needed and wanted. Such was the power of the mass movement that it split off from the AFL that section which was most sympathetic and most responsive to its requirements and used it as the basis for the organization of the CIO. On the surface it would appear and no doubt is actually true that John L. Lewis split with Green and subsidized the new organization, rallied organizers and did all the things which we know he did. But fundamentally we have to see that all the actions of John L. Lewis would have been meaningless and in fact would not have been undertaken at all were it not for the needs and aspirations of millions of American workers for that type of organization and their readiness to fight for it.

As inevitably as they moved toward mass industrial organization, today the American workers are moving toward political organization independent of the bourgeoisie. Therefore, to look at the PAC independently of its relation to the developing working class movement and the social crisis in the country would be to make an error similar to analyzing the actions of John L. Lewis and the organization of the CIO without taking into account the terrific drive of the masses which initiated and sustained the whole process. It is quite possible that the PAC may *not* be the nucleus around which the independent Labor Party will be formed. That is a historical question. The point is that *the PAC is what we have now*. Secondly, despite its close association with bourgeois politics, it has the extraordinary advantage of being rooted in the great mass organization of the working class. Without the workers, PAC is nothing. That therefore is its potential strength. The decisive factor is not the present bureaucratic composition of the PAC and the corruption to capitalist purposes of the strength and prestige of the CIO. *The decisive factor will be the political force of the working class in its response to the social crisis, just as the decisive factor in the*

formation of the CIO was the upsurge and power of the masses.

If even the PAC does not turn out to be in the coming period the road to the independent Labor Party, yet the struggle around it must leave results in political organization, education and experience which will be a valuable contribution to that actual independent Labor Party which will ultimately be formed. Historical perspective and the needs of the hour point to the necessity for a vigorous and systematic struggle for the conversion of the PAC into an independent Labor Party.

Not Only the CIO

Political action by the working class is a higher and more comprehensive stage of development than its industrial organization. Politics, we say, is concentrated economics. It involves the question of state power, of who will rule. All possible allies are needed. For this reason the PAC, in its own distorted form and for its own limited purposes, recognized that the force of labor alone was not sufficient and organized the Citizens Political Action Committee in order to draw sections of the middle classes and the Negroes to the support of labor. As usual, however, when labor leaders play bourgeois politics, they weaken the incomparable strength of labor by the very bourgeois methods which they adopt. Labor, politically organized, must lead the country. That is to say, it must present itself to all sections of the oppressed and exploited as that force which alone is able to solve their problems. But whereas bourgeois political parties find it necessary to disguise their capitalistic interests by presenting themselves as above classes and representing the interests of all the people, labor politics demands exactly the opposite. To gain strength and recognition, labor must present itself to the nation as representing the strength and the interests of labor, that is to say, of the great masses of the working people.

The struggle for the transformation of the PAC into the Labor Party therefore demands the political unification of labor with the PAC as its instrument. The Railroad Brotherhoods and the AFL undoubtedly have labor elements which feel that their interests are organically connected with the interests of the capitalist class. Such have existed and do exist in most capitalist countries but they are in a minority. Among the PAC's first aims should be the broadening of its basis to include all the organized workers in the country. Agitation and propaganda must be directed toward making the great masses of the workers feel that although the PAC rests at the moment on the CIO, it must and can become the political representative of all groups of organized labor in the country. Great masses of workers usually act on what is immediately before them. At the present moment, the struggle of the workers revolves around such questions as the abolition of the no-strike pledge, the breaking of the Little Steel Formula, the withdrawal of the labor representatives from the capitalistic War Labor Board. Every industrial struggle of national scope is a political struggle, particularly in these days when the interests of capital are not only indirectly but directly maintained and protected by the government in Washington.

Here, then, at the present stage, are immediate issues around which can be fought the battle for the transformation of PAC into the political instrument, not only of the CIO, but of all the working class. The struggle will be directly against the Roosevelt government and against those labor leaders inside and outside the PAC whose control of labor is perpetually directed to subordinating the interests of labor

to the needs of capitalist politics. To unloose the full power of labor in its struggle for its industrial demands means breaking with capitalist politics in all its forms. *The same Hillman who supports the no-strike pledge is the same Hillman who keeps the PAC tied to the Democratic Party.* To make the PAC independent of the Roosevelt party, that is the only way to make it into a weapon of labor against the capitalist class and the capitalist government.

PAC and the Nation as a Whole

But PAC must be far greater than merely the political arm of labor in its immediate struggles. The dissatisfaction with the Roosevelt government all over the country is very great. But, apart from the war, one of the reasons why this cannot take significant and organized expression is that the only concrete alternative is the miserable Republican Party. PAC as the political expression of organized labor has caught the imagination of the general public. That is a basis for political expansion. By rallying together the immense forces of organized labor in this country and denouncing the bankruptcy of the Republican and Democratic Parties, organized labor can begin now to present itself to the American people as a contender for governmental power. The millions of oppressed and degraded Negroes, disappointed with both Republican and Democratic Parties; small business, squeezed and cheated by big capital and the banks, who occupy crucial positions in the Roosevelt government; the professional middle classes, who, without trade unions, have no defense against the rising cost of living; the poor farmers, who for years have been able to exist only on a dole, dignified by the title of agricultural adjustment—all of these can be attracted to the leadership of labor if labor were to say: "It is admitted on all sides that it was the PAC which won the election for President Roosevelt; we have demonstrated that in the Roosevelt coalition labor is the strongest force; we propose to exercise to the full our strength, which has been crippled by our subservience to the Democratic Party; PAC is only an index of what labor is able to do. We demand your support and together we shall be irresistible."

That is the potential value of PAC. The idea of labor leading the nation politically can be presented not abstractly but as a concrete possibility. Under the leadership of labor, all sections of the great working community can be mobilized around PAC to work out the great problems now facing the country. Here around the PAC is the possibility of a great assemblage of the democratic forces of the nation to hammer out a program which will do for the nation in peace what the productive forces of the country have shown themselves able to do for the capitalists in war.

The Workers Party is a revolutionary socialist party. We believe that the great problem of unemployment, the Negro problem, the problems of the poor farmers, all the great problems of the country are now being intensified because of a rotting capitalist society which has outlived its usefulness. As revolutionary socialists we believe that these and other problems can be solved only by a workers' government which, backed by the great masses of the people, will begin the radical transformation of American capitalism into a socialist society. Such a task is not the work of a day or of a year, and we believe that the first necessity of such a transformation is the organization of the working class into an independent political party of its own, with a working class program.

What that program will be is a matter for democratic discussion and solution by all sections of organized labor and

those millions of the population closest to it. But we have our own program, which we intend to advocate with all the strength at our disposal. We are convinced that it is only by such a program that the United States can begin to emerge out of the perpetual crisis, waste of human life, misuse of resources, which the New Deal has so conspicuously failed to cure. We believe that this program must be of a kind which will mobilize the masses of the workers and their allies to struggle against capitalism until the socialist society is achieved. Such are our convictions and these are the ideas that we propose for the consideration of all who see the necessity of using the existing PAC as a basis for the organization of an independent Labor Party.

We propose, for example, to reorganize the whole productive system of the country. We propose as a beginning to confiscate the property of the "Sixty Families" and to confiscate all war profits coined out of the blood and suffering of the scores of millions of workers, as a means of gaining the necessary resources for the great task of producing for peace to the same and in time to a greater degree than the capitalists produced for war.

We propose the complete technical reorganization of the agriculture of this country in order to bring the productive methods and living standards of the agricultural workers and the small farmers to the level of the best-paid workers in the urban areas.

We claim that it is only with the solution of the unemployment question that it will be possible for labor to continue successfully the efforts which it is making to wipe away the oppression of the Negro people which has poisoned and disgraced American society for so many generations.

We say that it is only by such comprehensive proposals that labor will convince the majority of the nation that it is a serious substitute for the ferocious profit-seeking of the capitalist class and its venal instruments, the capitalist politicians.

That is the type of general program which we propose to struggle for in the PAC in order that it should be transformed into that independent Labor Party required by the needs of labor and by the needs of the American nation in this period of social crisis. Other sections of labor will have other programs. We propose to hammer out our differences and adopt those actions and proposals democratically agreed upon. We are confident that the developing social crisis and the needs of the workers will bring them ultimately to the point of view *which we represent*. But the time to gather together on a democratic basis is now. And the PAC offers the best existing possibility for the drawing together of the working class as a political force to express its own interests, its own responses to the developing situation, and the working class solution to the overwhelming problems of the nation.

J. R. JOHNSON.

Power Politics of the Big Three

Tightening Tensions in the Allies

To grasp the depth of the change in world politics during the course of the present war we need but contrast Munich with the Teheran conference. From a seven-power world it had become a three-power world. From Hitler, with the aid of Mussolini, bullying Chamberlain and Daladier into agreement at Munich, we have Stalin, with the aid of Roosevelt, bullying Churchill into agreement at Teheran. From Russia excluded from a conference dealing with the fate of its ally Czechoslovakia at Munich, we have Stalin boldly insisting upon a *Russian* reorganization of Central Europe and the Balkans at Teheran. From the United States distantly exerting an influence upon Munich through Great Britain, we have the United States all but displacing Great Britain as the non-European arbiter of Europe's destinies at Teheran. From the economic mobilization of the British Empire to hold its own with American world imperialism, we have the entire world, including the British Empire and its satellite empires (French, Dutch, Portuguese) placed upon American rations. From British efforts to keep its foot jammed in the door of Latin America (Argentina) to block Washington's "closed door" policy, we have Britain thrown on the defensive by aggressive American imperialism both in the colonial world and its own Dominions.

France's two-decade long masquerade as a first-rate power came to an end in 1940. The blast furnaces of the Ruhr and the chemical plants of Leuna and Oppau had outweighed, in the scales of war, the jerry-built structure of the French *système continentale* fashioned at Versailles. Krupp guns and I. G. Farben powder proved far more potent than French reliance

upon the rotten régimes in Warsaw, Belgrade, and Bucharest. Political power, as always in the long run, reflected economic reality and Germany, the strongest economic power on the continent, became the strongest political power. In a few years, Germany established itself from the Pyrennees to the Caucasus, and from the oases of the Sahara to frozen Spitzbergen, harnessing a continent to a single military-economic program. But the Hitler empire now lies crumbled beneath the combined blows of the new colossus—Russia—seeking to establish itself as master of Europe and the super-colossus—the United States—seeking to establish itself as master of the world.

What kind of post-war world do the "victors" have in mind? What will be the nature of the post-war power alignments? The answer can now be seen by a study of the relations between the "big three" during the course of the war. For the conduct of the war will, as always, determine the post-war relationships.

The first meeting of the "triangle" took place in Washington a few weeks after Pearl Harbor. Churchill came over on his first war mission and Litvinov sat in for the Russians. The points of conflict at this first meeting are of the highest significance, for they immediately indicated the interests of the three powers and in what manner they clashed.

Two Basic Conflicts

The first meeting produced two basic conflicts: (1) the "de Gaulle question" and (2) the "second front."

The real implications of the de Gaulle question were only to become apparent as time went by and the ramifications of

the problem were to become entwined with the rest of the Anglo-American controversies. The immediate phase of the problem came under four heads:

- (a) General attitude toward the "Free French"
- (b) U. S. policy on Vichy
- (c) "Free French" signature on the United Nation's charter
- (d) De Gaulle's seizure of St. Pierre and Miquelon.

These questions threw emery into the Anglo-American gears right at the outset because they involved a clash between the historical aims of American imperialism and the interests of the British Empire. American imperialism had emerged out of the first world war as the lusty young giant wrestling with British imperialism for world economic domination. The British had managed to hold their own for twenty trying years of "peace-time" competition. But less sensational and more responsible spokesmen for American imperialism than Henry Luce had already determined that the second world war should usher in the "American Century." American imperialism has no interest in saving the British Empire from Germany and Japan in order to set it up in business again as a competitor on an equal footing. France permitted Britain to rescue her in the last war at the price of British domination for two decades after. American imperialists have no inclination to be more generous with the British after this war.

Ever since the last war, the British Empire had appended to it as sub-empires the other Western European colonial possessions (French, Dutch, and Portuguese empires). In the last analysis their final protection was the British fleet. Hong Kong was as much a bastion for French Indo-China as was Saigon, and Singapore was as much a bastion for the Dutch East Indies as was Batavia.

France and the Netherlands now lay prostrate, their richest colonial plums plucked by the Japanese or at the mercy of the Germans. The Dutch were guests in London, completely dependent upon the British. The "Free French" were seeking to rally what colonial resources were left in the stray corners of the French empire. Were American resources to be poured out in reconquering and reconstructing the French and Dutch empires only to hand them back to their erstwhile owners who had proved too weak to defend them? It is not necessary for the American empire-builders to be in the business as long as the British nor to develop an equal sense of "realism" to tell the difference between playing cricket and playing power politics. The latter is played with only one rule in the book: you do what you can get away with within the limits of military power and popular opinion at home.

However, it was the aim of the "Free (i.e. colonial) French" to keep as much of the French empire intact as possible as part of the British orbit and reconstitute it after the war upon the old basis. Far from having any quarrel with this, the British were, of course, in hearty agreement and took de Gaulle's committee under their wing from the outset. *The defence of the French possessions was part of the defence of the British Empire. De Gaulle was their man.*

Roosevelt and the "Free French"

Roosevelt aimed to treat de Gaulle exactly as that, i.e., a military adjunct of the British forces. This would mean denying the French a political voice until, as the Americans never wearied of repeating with "democratic" demogogy, the French people were free again and in a position freely to elect their own government. Until then Roosevelt sought to recognize Vichy as the legitimate government as long as possible and in the meantime seek for some French clique willing to play ball

along American lines.

As a result of this conflict of interests, President Roosevelt and Churchill sparred around over the above listed "French" problems. The "Free French" had managed to get into Roosevelt's hair on the very eve of the conference by sending an expedition to seize the French islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, off the coast of Newfoundland. Secretary of State Hull issued a statement which, considering his even temper, sounded as if someone had pilfered one of the counties in his native Tennessee. To send an expedition into the North American waters without permission from Washington was bad enough, but to do it when Washington was conducting a policy of opposition to de Gaullist influence was rubbing salt into the wound. The fact that the French islands are off the Canadian coast and that General de Gaulle must have had British permission for his move—as without a doubt he did since the expedition set out from England—mattered little. For the Western Hemisphere had been declared under "our" jurisdiction by Roosevelt, including Canada (whose defense he had guaranteed without being asked), and even Iceland, which, Roosevelt said with a smile, was thought to belong to the Western Hemisphere by some geographers.

Roosevelt would very much have liked to "rescue" these islands from Vichy rule at the appropriate time and utilize them as part of the Atlantic chain of island defenses. In this case there would be slight chance that France could again establish complete sovereignty over the islands after the war. The best the French could hope for in this case was nominal political control with American right to maintain military installations. With de Gaulle in possession of the islands it would be quite impossible for the American "liberators" to simply move in on them against their wishes without rousing a terrific fuss, above all among liberal opinion in America and Britain.

(For the same considerations outlined above, the British-de Gaullist attack upon Dakar in 1940 was treated most unsympathetically by the American press.)

The other "French" differences Roosevelt and Churchill tried to compose involved the "Free French" signature to the United Nations charter. This involved the question of the status of the de Gaulle committee. No one accepted it as a government-in-exile or as a provisional government. But the British sought to grant it a semi-governmental status as an armed ally in the war. In this capacity the British maintained that the "Free French" had a right to place their signature to a declaration of general intentions such as the United Nations Charter, since the latter was no binding treaty and would play little rôle in diplomatic relations. The Americans conceded the point but continued their recognition of Vichy as the legitimate government of France.

(At the moment of writing, de Gaulle seems triumphantly installed in Paris and to have won despite all obstacles placed in his path by the Americans. However, the last chapter is still to be written. De Gaulle has Paris, but French possessions remain to be allocated in the struggle between America and Britain. The latter has already all but pushed France out of control of Lebanon and Syria, vital to British oil interests.)

14 Points of Controversy

The controversy over de Gaulle between Roosevelt and Churchill at their first Washington meeting became the first public manifestation of the British-American conflicts that were to bedevil relations at each stage of the war and remain, in the main, unsolved. Other points of controversy that come to the fore as American imperialism begins to squeeze its

older rival are:

1. U. S. interests in Dutch empire (East India oil and Dutch Guiana bauxite).
2. U. S. interests in Saudi Arabian oil, developed as a wartime project but actually the first real entry of American capital into the British Near East oil preserve.
3. U. S. interests in the Red Sea, arising out of the need to safeguard new oil routes by maintaining present U. S. control of Eritrea.
4. U. S. Asiatic interests (a "free" India, Burma and Malay States to permit American economic penetration on an equal footing with Britain).
5. U. S. interests in the "internationalization" of Hong Kong, Singapore, Saigon, and other imperialist bases in the Pacific area.
6. U. S. desire to "close the door" in Latin America by driving Britain out of Argentina.
7. U. S. interests in French empire (Indo-China, Dakar, Martinique, St. Pierre, Miquelon and New Caledonia).
8. U. S. influence in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.
9. U. S. interests in maintaining present bases in British Atlantic islands (Bermuda, etc.).
10. U. S. needs of a 5-ocean navy to secure its new world position (in contrast with old 5-5-3 ration).
11. U. S. displacement of Great Britain as the leading merchant marine power.
12. U. S. (Hull) policy of "free trade" versus British Empire restrictions.
13. U. S. "gold standard" policy as expressed at Breton Woods versus British "credit system" proposals (Keynes plan).
14. U. S. policy of "freedom of air" versus British policy of "spheres of influence" in post-war aviation.

(No matter what Churchill may say, he is presiding over the dissolution of the Empire.)

However, the politics involving the above questions became, of necessity, involved with politics concerning the third partner, Russia. These politics also had their starting point in this first Washington meeting. At the conclusion of the Roosevelt-Churchill talks, Litvinov joined the pair at the White House (New Year's Day, 1942). He had only one axe to grind, the opening of a "second front" in Western Europe in the shortest possible time. Thus opened the second major question of "three power" relations. From then until the Teheran conference, the second front issue was to place the most severe strains upon United Nations relations. *If the question of de Gaulle symbolized the nature of the long list of British-American differences, then the "second front" concentrated within itself all the many facets of British-Russian differences.**

Where to Invade Europe?

The question as to where to invade Europe involved almost automatically the question of the domination of Europe after the war. The defeat of Germany through an invasion of West-

*In an article in the July, 1943, *New Internationalist* on "The Coming Invasion of Europe," the author emphasized the primarily political nature of the "second front" question. It was pointed out that the locale of the invasion would determine in large measure the control of post-war Europe. The entire struggle over the "second front" has since proved the complete validity of this approach. The prediction of an invasion through the Balkans proved in error because of a miscalculation of the relationship of forces. The analysis failed to take into account the American rôle in the problem as pro-Russian, rather than pro-British. What was attributed to Anglo-American policy on the "second front" turned out to be solely British policy.

ern Europe meant certain Russian domination of Poland, the Balkans, Finland, and a strong voice throughout the Continent. The latter was made all the more certain by the rôle of the Communists in the underground movements of Europe. Such a termination of the war would leave Moscow the "boss" of Europe with the exception of the Atlantic fringe of British satellites. The British have made it a cornerstone of their diplomacy since the Middle Ages to prevent a "one-power" domination of the Continent. England, with its economic resources and control of the seas, depended for security upon a balance of power on the continent which would always permit an alliance with one of the continental powers. Every last Englishman felt the effects of a "one-power" Europe when Germany established continental hegemony from June 1940 to June 1941. With the "Blitz" raging over London and the island living in daily dread of invasion, the English realized their peril in the face of a Europe mobilized against them by an enemy power.

As a result, Churchill used every device and stratagem known to the age-old ruling class of Britain to prevent the war from ending with Russian hegemony replacing German. He sought to block every "second front" move in Western Europe and push to the fore his pet alternative of the "soft under-belly" of Europe, specifically an invasion through the Balkans. All the wisdom of British statecraft proved unavailing in the end. The relationship of forces resolved it against British interests. But the two-year struggle of Churchill to save the British position in Europe makes an instructive chapter in the history of world power-politics.

It is not yet clear just what Litvinov was told at the White House. Reports have it that he received a blanket promise of a "second front" invasion of Europe in 1942 from Roosevelt, with Churchill making modifications and conditions. Thus began what the Russians have since referred to as the "January promise," for Litvinov reported to Moscow that the stage was set for the 1942 invasion of Western Europe.

As the "second front" controversy developed, the rôles between the three powers remained the same. Russia pressing hard, Britain resisting obstinately, and the United States supporting Russian views. *A "Russian solution" at the expense of Britain's rôle in Europe would weaken the British Empire all the more and confirm its rôle of vassal to American imperialism.* With Russian hegemony threatening most of the Continent, Britain would have no choice but to cling to American protection, as France, in the face of the Hitler threat, had no choice but to cling to British protection.

This division of views on the "second front" became apparent during the spring of 1942. As the German armies began to push forward again in their great spring offensive in South Russia and the Russian position became critical, they pressed all the harder for the "second front." Yet it was becoming obvious that no such move was in prospect on the part of the Anglo-Americans. The British general staff was resolute in its opposition.

Angry over what they considered the breach of the "January promise," the Russians sent Molotov to Washington in May on a quick visit. Just what was discussed between Roosevelt and Stalin's errand boy is not yet known. However, a public announcement at the conclusion of the conference stated:

"In the course of these conversations full understanding was reached with regard to the urgent task of creating a second front in Europe in 1942."

This seemed to put teeth into the "January promise" and Molotov went hurrying home. However, the announcement

was made only in the name of the Americans and Russians. It is quite likely that the peculiar language of the announcement, "with regard to the urgent task," was meant to convey that Roosevelt's agreement with the need of a "second front" was still contingent upon British approval before it could be realized.

The announcement must have given Churchill one of his explosive moments. For, hardly two weeks after Molotov left with the glad tidings, Churchill flew into Washington to find out "what was up." His answer to the "second front" this time was an abrupt "no." According to Lyle C. Wilson, chief of the United Press Washington bureau, "Churchill argued that the point of attack should be from the south, against what he termed 'the under-belly of Europe' and he enlarged his ideas to propose that the major assault on Hitler's fortress should include an Allied movement into the Balkans." (U. P. dispatch, June 6, 1944.)

The North African Invasion

Stalin's rejoinder from Moscow when he heard that the "second front" was off must have been written on asbestos paper. For it so thoroughly frightened Roosevelt that he sent Gen. Marshall, Admiral King, Harry Hopkins, and Stephen Early, his secretary, on an emergency trip to London in July. According to the above-quoted Wilson dispatch:

"Marshall, King, and the others had orders to attempt to win Churchill over to a 1942 European invasion. John Bull stood pat. Marshall and King had an alternative proposition. It was for the invasion of North Africa at Oran and Casablanca, and at London in July 1942, that plan was agreed upon."

Stalin recognized the North African operation as poor "Ersatz" as far as the military need of drawing German divisions out of Russia was concerned. As for the political implications of the North African invasion, Stalin viewed this move in the Mediterranean basin with hostility. It seemed to indicate Roosevelt's yielding to Churchill's Balkan perspective. Stalin's answer was to whip the "second front" campaign in the Russian and foreign Communist press to a frenzy. Above all did the British C.P. go into action. Demonstrations, petitions and resolutions descended upon 10 Downing Street and the Parliament like a storm. Meanwhile columns were rolling toward the Caucasus. An alleged offer by the British to move troops up from Iran to defend the Caucasian oil fields was reported rejected by Stalin with the advice that they be used in France. British-Russian relations seemed to have reached the breaking point.

The Russian tone began to worry Churchill seriously. He resolved that a face-to-face talk with Stalin would help matters. On August 12, the King's first minister appeared at the Kremlin: anything to keep Russia fighting. Churchill is reported to have spent four unpleasant days in somewhat heated discussions with Stalin. Upon his return he was to refer to Stalin in a House of Commons speech as "a man direct and even blunt in speech." The discussions evidently ended in an impasse. Stalin did not retreat from his insistence upon the "second front" and Churchill did not yield to his pressure.

Upon Churchill's departure, Stalin pleasantly surprised Henry C. Cassidy, Associated Press correspondent, by replying to his routine written inquiry with a personal letter. It was Stalin's method of revealing to the world that the Churchill visit had changed nothing. The central point of the letter was a demand that the Anglo-Americans make good their commitments "fully and on time."

The Russian and German armies were locked in decisive battle at Stalingrad. The "second front" campaign was lashed to new heights. The British C.P. filled Trafalgar Square with demonstrators howling for the "second front" and 35,000 massed at Madison Square Park in New York City. Ominous was the appearance of banners attacking "British imperialism" and calling for the "immediate freedom of India." Among other new demands was one calling for the immediate trial of Britain's No. 1 prisoner, Rudolph Hess. The Russians raised the question in such a manner as to cast suspicion upon both the purpose of the Hess flight to England and the reason for Britain's keeping him in such a shroud of mystery.

Churchill's Demonstration at Dieppe

At this time, late in August, 1942, Churchill decided to make a demonstration of his own. Some 10,000 troops, mainly Canadians, suddenly launched a night attack upon the French coast at Dieppe. After a night of indecisive fighting, the Allied forces withdrew, having suffered some 6,000 casualties. The announcement of the Dieppe casualties sent a chill through all "second fronters" but the most hardened Stalinists.

The true story of Dieppe is yet to be told. The official designation was that it was a "reconnaissance in force." The explanation that the Dieppe attack was a valuable rehearsal for invasion in force seems most unlikely. What did it demonstrate beyond that known fact that 10,000 men cannot storm a fortified beach without previous artillery or aerial saturation and expect to live to tell the tale? It did, however, serve as a gag in the mouth of many a glib-tongued "second frontier."

The Russians, however, losing as many men every hour at Stalingrad as the total loss at Dieppe, were totally unimpressed. If anything, the Allied inaction during the nerve-straining test at Stalingrad made the "Vozhd of all the Russians" all the more vicious. A story is told about Stalin's conduct at one of the state banquets for Willkie. Both the Russian attitude and Stalin's character lend credence to it. The story has it that after the usual endless round of toasts, someone proposed a toast to "our gallant Allied airmen." As the gathering arose to the toast, Stalin remained seated. In embarrassed surprise the others resumed their seats. Stalin then rose to propose a toast to "our gallant Soviet flyers going to their death in cast-off planes" sent by the Allies. He then continued to say that Churchill had "stolen" 150 new American fighters from a Russia-bound convoy while in a British port. The British later claimed that the planes had been removed on orders of Gen. Eisenhower in preparation for the North African landings. Churchill shortly after referred to "the very strong and stark assertions" made by the Russians. He could quite easily have had the banquet story in mind.

In December, 1942, the Americans hit the beaches of French North Africa. The American and British press hailed the operation as the "second front." This was to be the long-expected relief to the hard-pressed Russians. Stalin gave no more than a public grunt of approval, and stated merely that it "fulfilled the prerequisites for undertaking a second front." A month later, as Roosevelt and Churchill met at Casablanca, Stalin was significantly absent. His reply to their invitation was a biting statement which said in effect, "You people have plenty of time for such things but I am too busy fighting a war to attend." Nor did he bother to reply to their friendly message or give a hint as to where the Russians stood on the "unconditional surrender" formula of Casablanca. Stalin's reply came a month later when, on the anniversary of the Red Army he said in an order of the day:

"In view of the absence of a second front in Europe, the Red Army alone is bearing the whole weight of the war."

The North African invasion raised anew a whole series of complicated questions of British-American relations arising out of the question of the French Empire. Roosevelt revealed the outlines of his anti-de Gaullist strategy (really anti-British in essence) by springing his own jack-out-of-the-box in the person of the reactionary militarist, General Giraud. Whether Darlan came into the picture by accident or previous plan cannot be said for certain. In any case, he immediately fitted into the American strategy of operating in the French possessions through pro-American Vichy contacts. The Darlan-Giraud-Peyrouton stench brought forth a feeling of revulsion throughout the democratic and liberal world. In Britain, and to a lesser extent in America, the North African situation was assailed with fury by an outraged public opinion that had been taken in by the Four Freedoms talk and the allegedly anti-fascist character of the war. Roosevelt felt obliged to duck out with a statement attributing it to General Eisenhower on grounds of "military expediency." The American liberals, who can forgive almost anything but criticism of Roosevelt, discovered the guilty culprit in a State Department official "by the name of Murphy" (since designated as American gauleiter for Germany). However, Churchill arose in the House of Commons and stated with a broad smile and open-handed generosity that the entire "credit" for the North African venture goes to his "esteemed friend, President Roosevelt."

Though Churchill was alleged to have said that of all the crosses he had to bear, the Cross of Lorraine was the heaviest, it proved the one cross which was so important to Britain that Churchill was willing to show exceptional patience under its load.

The Fear of a Separate Peace

Following Stalingrad, the Russian armies undertook their great winter offensive, which rolled the Germans back for hundreds of miles. This change in the military situation altered Russia's rôle in relation to her Allies. It now became apparent that the Germans' hopes of knocking Russia out of the war were over. The Germans had a choice of either putting up with the dreaded two-front war or making peace with one of their enemies. *Whereas before Stalingrad the Russian question posed itself to Britain as a matter of staving off a Russian surrender, after Stalingrad it became a matter of convincing Russia not to make a separate peace.* The latter situation left Russia in a vastly more powerful position in dealing with her allies. Stalin began to use it to the full.

All through the Spring of 1943 the Americans and British were given repeated cases of the jitters as the Russians unloosed a flood of "separate peace" rumors. The situation caused Churchill to undertake another trip to Washington in May. Following Churchill's visit, Joseph E. Davies was dispatched on his so-called "Second Mission to Moscow." According to Lyle C. Wilson, the mysterious letter to Stalin is said to have contained the following:

"Dear Mr. Premier:

"Winston and I want to see you at your earliest convenience. You say where and when.

[Signed] "F. D. R."

(Aside from Davies' value as a symbol of Russo-American

*The question of full coalition warfare has become, for the Soviet Union, a question of shortening the war. For Britain and the United States it is still a question of winning the war.—Earl Browder, *Teheran—Our Path in War and Peace*, page 19.

friendship, Roosevelt also based his choice, no doubt, on the need to preserve manpower and not use anyone of real mental stature to perform errand-boy missions.)

The next Roosevelt-Churchill meeting was delayed to the last minute awaiting word from the Kremlin. Finally they met without Stalin at Quebec in August, 1943. The Russian military situation continued to improve. So did Stalin's war of nerves against his allies.** The Quebec meeting took place in the midst of the most dire rumors about Russia's intended course of action. In the very midst of the conference, Stalin suddenly recalled Litvinov from Washington. *Churchill recognized that he was pressed against the wall. The question of Russia's rôle in Europe could no longer be headed off by treating her as a poor cousin.* The architect of the first *cordon sanitaire* against Russia realized that the cards were held by his opponents and a second *cordon* to keep the Russian bear in his native wilds was not realizable.

It was decided to send Hull and Eden to Moscow to confer with the Russians and let them know that the British were ready to talk terms. The Moscow conference of Foreign Ministers was the first taste of diplomatic victory for the Russians. It prepared the groundwork for the real showdown to come soon afterward when the three "big bosses" would get together. The Russians indicated that they were satisfied by the turn of events by setting their signature for the first time to a document that called for "unconditional surrender" of Germany.

It is significant that Eden stopped in at Ankara on his way back for a discussion with the Turks. The rôle of Turkey during a Balkan invasion would, of course, be a very important one. Were the Turks already setting things in motion for such an invasion, according to prior agreement with Great Britain? If so, Eden may have had the purpose of setting them straight on the latest turn of events. Did the British still hope for a compromise with Russia by which Russian troops would join the Allies for an invasion of the Balkans? In this case it would require Turkish agreement to permit Russian troops to use Turkish bases aside from the more general question of Turkey's attitude to Russian influence in the Balkans.

The Results of the Teheran Conference

On December 1, 1943, the momentous gathering took place in Teheran that was to cast the new relationship of forces on a world scale. The exact story of what took place during the discussion is not yet officially released.

All accounts of the Teheran conference agree upon a violent conflict between Stalin and Churchill, with Roosevelt playing the rôle of "peacemaker." A more accurate description of the rôle of Roosevelt would be to say he greased the skids under Churchill while Stalin was doing the pushing.

Professor Oscar Lange, who visited Stalin "on behalf of Polish-Americans," reported to Drew Pearson that "When these plans for Poland had come up at Teheran, Stalin disclosed, President Roosevelt had been in complete agreement, but Prime Minister Churchill had hesitated.

**Stalin's war of nerves during 1943 included many sudden and seemingly contradictory moves. Almost every one of them was open to two seemingly opposite explanations. They included: 1. The dissolution of the Comintern, explained as a peace gesture to the anti-Komintern Axis and as a step to placate the Allies. 2. Restoration of the freedom of the Greek Orthodox Church, explained as a sop to American opinion and as a weapon for the penetration of the Balkan Slavic community. 3. Organization of the National Committee of Free Germany and the Union of German Officers in Moscow, explained as a means of liaison for a separate peace and as a vehicle of revolution within Germany. 4. Recognition of Badoglio at a time the Allies were hesitant, explained as a gesture to the conservative elements of Italy and Europe and as a support to the popular movement in Italy to undermine the Allied Military Government.

"'He asked me: Who is to guarantee the security of this new Polish state? I answered simply: The armed might of the Soviet Union.'"

Forrest Davis states the same relationship between the three principals in his articles in the *Saturday Evening Post* of May 13 and 27, 1944. Davis is usually regarded as directly inspired by the White House. Together with Ernest Lindley, Roosevelt biographer and New Deal historian, he was commissioned to write the official *White Book* on how we got into the war. Davis also makes the point that Churchill and Stalin were at sword's point during most of the conference and that Roosevelt exerted his influence to "appease" Stalin because of the President's "tough-minded determination to enroll the Soviet Union as a sincere and willing collaborator in post-war settlements."

The outlines of the Russian victory at Teheran are now becoming quite clear. They include:

1. The "second front" invasion of Western Europe, as the indispensable military key to Russian aims.
2. A free hand for Russia in Poland. The Lublin government of Stalin is already acting as the provisional régime. The London exile government is confronted with the threat of civil war if it seeks to interfere in Poland.
3. Russian hegemony over the Balkans. Whether this includes Greece, traditional British sphere, is not yet certain.
4. Russian occupation of eastern Germany.
5. Russian domination of Finland.
6. Russian annexation of the Baltic states.

The full magnitude of this Russian triumph will only fully impress itself upon us as we witness its unfolding. It far surpasses the most ambitious dreams of Pan-Russian statesmen under Czarism. *It means, in actuality, nothing less than a Russian Europe.* It means domination of the continent, except for the nations on its western fringe. Even these will feel its full effects through Russian pressure from without and Communist activity from within.

Roosevelt and the Russians

Roosevelt's aims in aiding this Russian triumph are to be seen from the previous description of the Anglo-American differences. The American domination of the British Empire (i.e., in essence, the colonial world) requires a Britain placed in a position of complete dependence upon the United States. Russian domination of Europe leaves Britain so little with which to maneuver between her two opponents that her chances of escaping vassalage to America are exceedingly small. Even the rumored plans of a "West European bloc," to include Great Britain, the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, France, Spain, Italy and Belgium cannot help Britain avoid dependence upon America, even if contradictions within the bloc were ironed out. The boasts of some British editors that such a bloc would represent two-fifths of the land area of the world is meaningless. The "land area" referred to is composed in the main of the colonial world. Given Russian pressure upon Europe and American ("liberation") pressure upon the colonial world, this land area will reveal itself more as a volcano of seething discontent than a bastion of empire defense.

There is, of course, to offset this tendency, the matter of Russo-American differences. These include possible conflicts in China, in the Near East, and in Europe itself. However, in contrast to the immediacy of the conflicts with British inter-

ests, American conflicts with Russian interests are of a more historical character. In the immediate period they are more than offset by the many factors that make for mutually profitable collaboration between Russia and the United States. Russia is not a competitor in the world market, Russia is not a naval power, Russia's main interests are not colonial (i.e., in the traditional colonial spheres), and Russia will need American capital to rebuild after the war and thus prove a considerable market for American goods. *The extension of collectivized economy into eastern Europe and sections of the Balkans would be opposed by America, as by the entire capitalist community of interests. But this too is a conflict of historical scope and more than offset in the immediate period by Russia's rôle as the most effective counter-revolutionary force in Europe.* The defeat of the German revolution by Russian agents and Russian arms would certainly be worth the extension of Russian collectivism into Poland and Romania. *American imperialism hopes to deal with the latter in its next chapter. However, the Central European proletariat must be dealt with in this one.*

If the outline of new Russian and American spheres of domination was drawn at Teheran, we can say that the machinery for this maintenance is being constructed at Dumbarton. The League of Nations was the vehicle of Anglo-French domination of the continent and partnership with America in domination of the world. Dumbarton is to be the vehicle of an American-dominated Russo-British balance of power in Europe and an undisputed American domination of the entire world.

But the final word in the realization of these designs of the great powers will rest, not upon the strength of their arms or the ability of their statesmen, but rather upon the working classes and the exploited colonial peoples. The globe which the gentlemen at Dumbarton are wrangling over may well prove to be not a globe at all but a bomb with lighted fuses in Europe, in India, in the Arab world, in Africa, and, in the last analysis, the home countries of the principals themselves. As with the League of Nations during the post-war revolutionary wave, Dumbarton may prove of greatest service to its architects and builders as an instrument against the social revolution. For the architects of the new world of socialism, on the other hand, it is of great importance to note these tremendous changes of power relations resulting from the war in order the more realistically to cast our own perspectives in the struggle to tear the destinies of humanity from the hands of the capitalists and their statesmen and place them in the hands of the working people.

Sept. 18, 1944.

ERNEST LUND.

THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA:

'INDIA IN REVOLT'

By HENRY JUDD

Order from the
WORKERS PARTY
114 W. 14th St., N. Y. C.

PRICE: 25 CENTS
In Bundles of
Five or More—20 Cents

Towards A New Union Program (IV)

Organization of Labor Politics

In this, the fourth article in this series dealing with the need of a new programmatic orientation for the labor movement in the United States, the discussion will revolve mainly around the organizational and tactical questions of working class political action.

The first article, in the May number of *THE NEW INTERNATIONAL*, dealt with the war and the no-strike pledge. The second, in the June number, discussed class collaboration and the relationship of the trade union bureaucracy to the bourgeoisie. The third, in the September issue, took up proletarian politics in relation to the bourgeoisie and the capitalist state. This article ended with the statement that "... the Republican and Democratic Parties are the political instruments of a class. They serve the interests of the capitalist class. They cannot serve the interests of the proletariat, which is an alien class to the bourgeoisie. . . . For the proletariat, the little propertyless people, to stand before the capitalist state, before the men of property and power, and demand a place in the sun, is to demand a transformation of that state by the class which can profit only from the *status quo*. This sets a real challenge before the proletariat: the challenge to organize politically, independently, with class-conscious clarity and militancy."

The Imperative Task of the Trade Unions

This is the practical and imperative task before the trade union movement. The reflection of Franklin D. Roosevelt to some degree aids in transferring the question to a different area of attack. Before the elections, the problem was clouded by the fact that millions of workers believed that the contest between Roosevelt and Dewey was a genuine contest between two parties with fundamentally different social viewpoints. Previous articles in this series have attempted to explain why this is not so. But because they believed this, thousands of workers felt that Roosevelt was, in an important sense, a lesser evil and to be preferred to Dewey. Since there was no mass party of labor, these workers believed that not to vote for Roosevelt meant either to "throw away their votes" or to turn the country over to reaction.

It must be said that despite the soundness of the theoretical arguments that can be made against this conclusion drawn by labor, *their* instincts, which drew them to Roosevelt and away from Dewey, had definite progressive features. The matter was confused for the working class furthermore by the existence of the PAC. Here was a political committee, formed out of the CIO, which purported to be leading labor to independent political action. The fact that the independence of the PAC resided only in its organizational and physical "separation" from the Democratic National Committee and of course from the Republican National Committee, was not of political significance to the CIO masses for reasons which have already been gone into in detail. Also the demonstration of strength by the PAC, even before the election, was a further source of disorientation to workers whose political thinking is still very immature and naïve.

The proletariat is now in politics as never before. This has been demonstrated. But what was done was a manifestation once again in history of *trade union politics*, that is politics at the trade union level, the bread and butter "take home"

level. This may be described as the politics of a militant proletariat groping toward class consciousness. It is political action without the illumination of political theory.

Despite this, the proletariat has made real political progress in the United States during the past year. This is irrefutable. Through the activities of the PAC there has unquestionably arisen a new sense of political power and a slim understanding of the inadequacy of simple trade union activity. The question arises of what to do next. What, for instance, should be done with the PAC? Turn it into a Labor Party? Organize a Labor Party? Continue the PAC as it is?

Before we go further into this it is necessary to take up a phenomenon that rears its head perennially in American politics. That is the third party movement and third party propaganda. This agitation has already begun and appeared in the liberal press immediately following the election. This is a great danger for the proletariat.

The Liberal Party of New York State received over 300,000 votes in New York City alone. That is, this number of people voted for Roosevelt through the Liberal Party. The leaders of this party are very enthusiastic about their showing and are already talking about a national Liberal Party. Such a party could only get its membership from the petty-bourgeoisie and labor. Labor, however, would play only a subordinate rôle and would find itself under the ideological influence of a petty bourgeois leadership. Not only would this be true of the ranks of labor but also of that part of the labor bureaucracy which allied itself with such a party. This course could only lead to the shrouding of the proletariat in another myth: the myth that the middle class, including the liberals, is a coherent social class and that the petty-bourgeoisie and the farmers can play an independent class rôle in capitalist society. The penetration of the labor movement with such erroneous concepts and theories would not only disorient the working class politically but would also interfere seriously with the sustaining of trade union militancy on the economic level. This was demonstrated very clearly by the attitude of the petty bourgeois liberals toward such anti labor measures as the no-strike pledge and wage stabilization.

The Question of a "Third Party"

The present talk from the liberals about forming a third party, so soon after the election, is a sort of shamefaced admission that even these stupid people realize that the campaign talk and promises were only a blanket to cover over the real aims of the Roosevelt Administration, namely, the extension of United States imperialism to world dominion. For labor or the working farmers to place themselves at the disposal of such puerile sycophants would be to commit political and class suicide.

There is reason to believe that this third party movement suffered a real blow by the death of Wendell Willkie. It is clear to me that Willkie was playing with the idea of a new Liberal Party, perhaps to take the field in 1948. This would have been a most insidious evil for the proletariat to be faced with. It seems that Willkie became convinced that the Republican Party was so thoroughly discredited that it would not likely be able to recover. He was probably of the belief that

the Democratic Party, facing insuperable difficulties in the next four years, would also lose the confidence of labor and the masses of the people.

Willkie was a man moving in a definitely liberal direction, developing great influence and enthusiasm. At the same time he was a big business man and the representative of big business. During his active business career he was allied with the most reactionary section of big business. Outwardly at least he disassociated himself from business and became a "people's champion." Willkie had little or nothing to say about business during his days of political activity. He concerned himself with foreign policy, forays into the realm of civil liberties and the rights of minority groups.

We may never know what Willkie had in mind, but from what he was, it can be said that any move of his toward third party organization would have interested large masses of people and the big bourgeoisie also. Under certain conditions, he might have been supported by them temporarily just as they did Roosevelt during his first administration. From their side Willkie could become their representative in one final effort to resolve the deep contradictions of bourgeois society. After Roosevelt, the Democrats will have no one sufficiently astute and proficient in the arts of bourgeois politics. The Republican Party will recline in the grasp of the Old Guard and its crouching medieval-minded but powerful patrons. Willkie and a new Liberal Party might have given the bourgeoisie temporary surcease from the ominous rumblings in the ranks of a long-suffering proletariat.

Basic Problems That Call for Solution

This brings us back to the point where we left off discussing the reflection of Roosevelt. The fanfare and pyrotechnics of party warfare are behind us. Great social problems are before us and cry out for solution. Mankind stands confronted with questions of such portent as we have never had to deal with before in all the decades of the twentieth century. First there is the general matter of the salvation of humankind itself and the rescue of civilization from a headlong plunge into despair or barbarism. This is the lesson of the Second Imperialist World War, the lesson taught us by the piles of dead and maimed, the wreckage of the cities, the European shambles, starvation and misery, imperialist thievery and capitalist oppression.

The United States is not separate from Europe, Asia and Africa, and cannot be separate. The rapacity of the imperialist plunderers causes the bourgeoisie of the United States and England to reach out into every nook and corner of the earth. Markets, raw materials, natural resources, labor power, capital—these are the building blocks of world imperialism, of international war, of the exploitation and oppression of the people. This is the god of the Anglo-American bourgeoisie and Roosevelt and Churchill are his major prophets.

The Anglo-American bourgeoisie seeks to dominate the world. But before them stands the threat of disunity in their own ranks, the danger to them of mass uprisings on the continent of Europe and the inchoate but ever present demand of the proletariat that it be fed, housed and clothed. The bourgeoisie in the United States will attempt to pacify the proletariat here with blood money drawn from the exploitation and sufferings of the European workers and the colonial masses. England will play the same game as of old. But it will not work this time. The working class will not be so tolerant and the colonial masses will not remain quiet.

The embattled bourgeoisie cannot possibly recover except

temporarily. This means that the working class and the masses of the people face a great danger: the progressive degeneration of bourgeois democracy. This is but a cautious way of saying that while the military defeat of Germany and Japan seems assured, the fascistization of the United States can proceed apace in the years following such a military triumph. American workers cannot defeat fascism by killing German workers, just as German workers cannot rid themselves of their Hitlers by killing American workers.

The bourgeoisie will fight like fury to retain its social power, the right to exploit and plunder. To retain and protect their class opportunities they will resort to every subterfuge, every canard; every form of bribery, political and economic. Should these fail, they will be prepared to strike relentlessly at the proletariat and its organizations. The question today is: who shall be master in the house? This is the way all important social questions pose themselves. Which class shall rule? The bourgeoisie, the class of the minority; or the proletariat, the class of the majority? How shall the proletariat pierce the thin veil of sham bourgeois democracy and come to actual grips with the social dictatorship of the bourgeois minority? How can this be accomplished and at the same time the proletariat gird itself for protection against the bourgeoisie when this class, recognizing that it can no longer rule through bourgeois-democratic slogans, decides on repressive measures?

Labor Must Think and Act on Class Lines

This is the framework into which the proletariat must fit all of its political and economic thinking and planning today. This is the class pattern along which the working class must think. Their constant frame of reference should be relentless prosecution of the class struggle. Outside of this framework and this reference, the proletariat cannot approach the problems of the war, of reconversion and unemployment, of continued taxation to pay for the war, of democratic rights and civil liberties with any degree of benefit to itself.

War and fascism are the twin evils of our time. All the immediate and concrete disabilities of the proletariat are subsumed under these twin evils. Such evils as the anti-labor acts of Congress, wage freezing, profiteering prices, job stabilization etc., are but the reflection of the underlying political course which the bourgeoisie is traveling. The heart of the problem is the degeneration of bourgeois society, the decrepitude of capitalist productive relations and the attempts of the ruling class to escape from its importunity through imperialist war and totalitarianism. So far as the future is concerned, there is very little left in the capitalist horn of plenty save economic crisis, war and fascism. The bourgeoisie cannot save the world from mass unemployment, it cannot escape the Third Imperialist World War and it is not the class upon which reliance can be placed to deliver the world from fascism.

These are the foremost tasks confronting the organized labor movement, the organized proletariat. The trade unions cannot accept the tremendous responsibility which is laid at their door if they remain as they are. I do not mean that they should cease to be trade unions in the historical and functional sense, but they must acquire a new outlook on history, they must take on a new function in addition to the economic functions they perform today. The new outlook on history is to acquire a knowledge of the course of capitalist society, the class nature of bourgeois society, consciousness of the place and rôle of the proletariat, conscious acceptance of class struggle.

gle and progressive realization that the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat can only result in dismemberment of workers' organizations unless the working class is organized for the exercise of social, political and economic power and control.

This means above all the political organization of the proletariat as a class, the formation of a mass political party of the toilers. This is the task before the trade unions: to realize the reasons why this is imperative, to envisage the goal of political organization, to understand its practical aims and to take the necessary concrete steps for providing out of the ranks of the union movement the human and financial equipment needed for the formation of the party of the proletariat. This is the new function, the new program the organized labor movement must assume. This course is indicated not only in connection with the evils of imperialist war and fascism, which many workers may believe to be remote, but also in connection with the practical survival of the trade union movement with any appreciable degree of militancy. The survival and independence of the trade unions can be guaranteed through class political activity of the working class. In the future it will not be possible to protect the unions even as economic organizations save by the political party of the proletariat. To talk of protecting the unions, the rights of the workers to organize, to bargain collectively and to enforce its demands even partially by the grace of a bourgeois government in the future, is to confuse protection with surveillance.

The Position of the Workers Party

The Workers Party, a political organization of Marxian revolutionists, has for several years advanced the idea that the trade unions should accept the responsibility for initiating and carrying through the formation of a mass labor party in the United States. The Workers Party put forward this slogan for an independent labor party as the concretization of the concept of independent political action by the toilers. It was and remains a call from the Marxian revolutionists for the working class to break with the bourgeoisie politically, to reject bourgeois politics and the present or future capitalist parties. In practice this means, at present, to renounce the Republican and Democratic Parties and in their place erect the mass party of labor. All of the articles in this series have been concerned with elucidating the reasons why this step should be consummated by the trade unions and the working class.

Aside from the important propaganda carried on by the PAC, urging workers to "get into politics," and the stimulation to political thinking which this propaganda accomplished, virtually nothing has been done in a practical way toward independent proletarian political organization. This is due mainly to the political immaturity of the working class in the United States and the trade-union bureaucracy's class-collaborationist servility.

The labor party we are talking about and which the Workers Party advocates should be based on the unions. In the first place here is where the most advanced workers are. Here are the masses of the organized proletariat. Here are the financial resources necessary for perfecting a political organization. Also it is in the unions that workers are made conscious of the need for political organization if for no other reason than the fact that it is here that their daily experience aids in the germination of political thinking. The maturing of this experience, however, and its conceptualization can only take place in the political organization where this experience is generalized, clarified and interpreted. It is in the workers' political

party that proletarian political theory is developed and the political program organized. It is here also that the strategy and tactics of working-class political organization are learned. The party of labor should not be based on the unions primarily for the reason that the composition of a political party is determined by its composition, for the nature of a political party must be judged by its program as well as by its composition. But a party based on the trade unions is more likely to have a proletarian program. This point is of significance in connection with any future excursions by the labor bureaucracy into the field of labor party organization. From their platform of class collaboration and their petty-bourgeois outlook they are likely to ignore the important question of program and base themselves on "people." Not the people in the labor movement but the liberals outside the trade unions. They might invite some Senator Norris to form a party that labor would support. But the labor bureaucracy does not think in terms of themselves as the leaders of an independent party of the working class. What we wish to emphasize is not so much that non-trade-union liberals should be rejected because they themselves are petty bourgeois but rather because their ideas and program are petty bourgeois. This means that their politics is really bourgeois politics. This is what the proletariat must reject and renounce.

This all, for the working class, is a part of an evolutionary process, a dynamic process of trial and error, of struggle against the bourgeoisie, of failure today and success tomorrow, of learning in the course of the class struggle and assimilating the teachings of the great masters' proletarian politics.

Labor Party and Revolutionary Party

Many workers who know of the Workers Party and who are readers of *Labor Action* will ask why the Workers Party, a revolutionary party, advocates formation of a labor party. The answer to this question is a simple one. The Workers Party is primarily concerned with the building of the Marxian revolutionary party in the United States, for the reason that only a revolutionary party can lead the masses of the working class to the accomplishment of its historic tasks and the achievement of its class aims. This is no less than the complete reorganization of society for social ownership, production and distribution. The Marxian revolutionists aim for the reorganization of human society for real freedom and genuine democracy; not the sham that is capitalist democracy. In a word the goal of the revolutionists is socialism and the socialist society.

All workers who understand the full needs of the working class and are prepared to accept the program of the revolutionary party will come directly into the Workers Party. Unfortunately, however, experience teaches that the great mass of the toilers have not advanced to this stage. This does not eliminate in the least, however, the basic need for the proletariat to effect a break with capitalist parties and capitalist politics. The Marxists will not hold aloof in snobbish isolation, however. We emphasize, that the proletariat must take that step which it is capable of taking in the United States today and under the present circumstances. The trade unions can found a mass independent labor party. Trade-union militants can lead and inspire those workers under their influence to break from and renounce the Republican and Democratic Parties. The leading militants in the labor movement can begin now to organize the labor party. The mass of the workers are ready for this modest step. It is a modest step but if consummated it would be the most tremendous leap forward that the proletariat has taken in its entire career in this country. It

would be the most progressive movement ever to materialize inside the working class. It would mean that the proletariat had awakened from its long political slumber, that it had seen through the shabby covering of bourgeois society, that it was in full flight away from the miseries of capitalist exploitation and oppression.

Why do we make such claims for such a modest beginning in proletarian political independence? Because even such meagre beginnings would be a demonstration that the working class has been aroused, that its class consciousness has been heightened, that it is learning—learning political organization, political tactics and the elementary forms of political theory. The proletarian masses would not be left to themselves to grope their way forward. The more advanced trade-union militants and the Marxian revolutionists would be at their side and in their midst: working with them, fighting with them; teaching, leading, inspiring them.

The Program of a Labor Party

The Workers Party has published in *Labor Action* a "Transitional Program," a program for an independent labor party. This is the program that the Workers Party proposes for the labor party. It may turn out that when the labor party is formed that it will not accept all of this program. We cannot predict about this. This is the program that we will advocate. The Workers Party believes that this program is a necessary bridge for the proletariat into the full Marxist revolutionary position. Should it not carry, the Workers Party will remain at its post in the ranks of the proletariat and in the labor party, as the rallying center for the most advanced workers and the inspirer and teacher of the masses.

The workers' struggle is therefore carried on, on two fronts: the narrower front for the direct building of the revolutionary party, the Workers Party, and the wider front where the struggle is to lead the mass of the proletarians to break with the Republican and Democratic Parties. There is no contradiction between the two; they complement each other. It is in the course of this struggle that the mass revolutionary workers' party will be built. The call for independent political action for breaking with the two capitalist parties poses the main questions of the living class struggle before the working class as a whole. It cuts across the line dividing the AFL from

the CIO. The forces of the labor party will come from the AFL and the CIO. Labor party activity is a unifying activity that may prove fruitful in bringing the two trade-union federations together. It is realized though that the industrial unions are the most fruitful field for political action. The power of the industrial unions even at the trade-union level will be enhanced as their membership absorbs the new proletarian political learning in the labor party. It is then and not until then will the functional aspect of industrial unionism be exalted above the worship of structure which prevails today.

The Fear of Capitalist Reprisals

The question of reprisals by the bourgeoisie against the working class and its organizations, if there is a break from the bourgeois parties, is feared by many workers. This is the argument continually dinned into the ears of labor by the labor bureaucrats. This is a question that must be faced. Of course, slave-owners will never consent to the emancipation of their slaves. They, assisted by their labor lieutenants, will fight like a wolf pack against the labor party. They know what it means. No matter how long the road may be, the bourgeoisie know that once begun the march of the proletariat into a labor party is a gathering of the proletarian masses for victory, freedom and social power.

The struggle for independent class political action will engender a reaction from the bourgeoisie. This must be true unless we accept the no-class-struggle of the liberals, the most backward workers, and the trade union bureaucracy. The answer to any aggression from the bourgeoisie is mass organization, mass militancy; not softening of the class struggle, not class peace but determined intensification of the class struggle whenever the bourgeois counter-offensive sets in.

This completes our argument for the formation of the labor party. The great necessity is to begin. This is a challenge to the militants in the trades unions. They cannot escape this responsibility. It is far better to take on this responsibility now than to repent later in an American version of the concentration camp.

Next month these articles will be continued with a discussion of the Negro Worker and the Trade Unions.

DAVID COOLIDGE.

Contribution to "Mass Psychology"

German Exiles Find New Alibi

Psychoanalysis and its extension to "mass psychology" are the sensational style-trends, or better yet, style-maladies of our day. Everyone who feels miserable, weak, helpless, uneasy, disoriented, disappointed, discouraged, desperate and (not last of all) conscious of guilt, reaches for the psychological opium and plunges into the arms of a doctrine which promises to satisfy the need for an explanation of certain phenomena that have hitherto remained "unexplained." Obviously in times of crisis, the number of "truth-seekers" grows in the same ratio as the fundament of society wobbles. The search for the unveiling of a putative "ultimate" mystery, for an all-explaining explanation, is increasingly fostered the more the view arises and grows, after the experiences

of recent decades, that *all* other explanations have "obviously" failed or else were not "complete." It is said and written and argued emphatically: reformism, democracy, fascism and Marxism are all equally great disappointments. Somewhere or other there *must* still be a mystery whose disclosure has been lacking up to now (namely, in order to ease our bedraggled conscience and to justify our trust in Anglo-American-Russian imperialism). All those who staked their hopes upon the "reform" of society and want to place them there again in the future, are especially in need of a reiterated justification of their behavior.

Thus, for example, the failure of the whole "left-wing" policy is not explained by this policy itself, but by all sorts of

possible, that is, impossible circumstances. The Social-Democracy propagated these circumstances under the collective name of the "power of circumstances" as far back as before the first World War. Therewith it only proclaimed its determination, come what may, to allow the circumstances to remain stronger than it was itself. It was therefore impossible, in the years 1918-1923, to get it to grasp the fact that the terrible power lay in the first instance in its own imagination and that it was nothing but its own narrowminded, cowardly, malevolent, deceitful and treacherous policy.

As a consequence of this policy, which certainly did smell of the power of certain conditions, reformism of all shadings really found itself—brilliantly confirmed. The conditions which it loaded on to its own back actually became stronger every day. Under these conditions, to suggest that it *break* the power of circumstances, would have signified to cut away its hind end. It resolutely preferred to have itself *kicked* in the hind end and to be dispatched with elegant sweep into the concentration camp or the emigration. And therewith commences the objective function of "mass psychology" in all its scope.

The Mass Basis of Mass Psychology

Arrived abroad, the German leadership had but one means of covering up its betrayal: it had to supplement the old deception with a new one. The new deception consisted in introducing the "power of circumstances" also in the form of the "masses." In the most variegated forms and gradations, the fault for the failure of the German leadership's policy, which was after all as right as rain in the "long run," was attributed to the masses. Reference was therefore made to the "immaturity," the "vacillation," and "un-militant" will and character of the German masses in general, and of the workers and petty bourgeoisie in particular. In themselves, these were already "explanations" which also benefited those who had always stood on the sidelines. They too felt themselves "brilliantly" confirmed, for they had been downright "principled" in never placing any trust in the capacity of the masses to take shape politically. Wherewith came the flight of all of them under the protecting skirts of the non-German imperialisms. There was now one more reason for plunging into the psychology of the masses. The petty bourgeois believed that the explanations and recipes of psychoanalysis which he prescribes for himself are also applicable to the mass.

In this connection, it is no accident that the most muddle-headed of all German writers, Herr Thomas Mann, following the final loss of his anxiously guarded "relationships" to Hitler-Germany, made one of his usual "confessions." The reactionary side of Freudism always stood out in bolder relief and thereby made itself acceptable to Thomas Mann. So this man, who will never touch an iron until he is absolutely convinced of its conservative coldness finally acknowledged Master Freud. The jubilation of the assembled psychoanalysts knew no bounds—Thomas Mann had become a "socialist." And indeed: Thomas outdid everything that a whole century had produced of philistine socialist tub-thumping. He traveled to America and instructed us on the "coming victory of democracy." What else could you expect: next to ornamented hollow phrases (many of them affliated with a shamefaced "socialism") stood the insight, "painfully" gained, no doubt, that it was true the "democracies" bethought themselves of their own violence against the impudent Fascist "aggressor." In other words: for the "most representative" German scribe, too, the road to the "emancipation" of the Germans lay over Anglo-American arms.

On the other side, social-democrats, Stalinists, democrats and pacifists were able to maintain their illusions and the policy based upon them, up to the victory of Hitler, only because they were supported by economically superior America or the favor of the great mass butcher, Stalin. They took excellent care of the affairs of American imperialism and of Stalin and at the end they had no need of changing a single one of their shabby customs. But this is not the point, it is rather the general result.

The Unity on the Backs of the Masses

A common *negative* platform was found in the form of the "problem of the masses." The German emigration, united and true-blue petty bourgeois in all its breeds (with the strict exception of the unpsychological Trotskyists) recognized the "masses" as the latter-day decisive problem that had to be solved. God's petty-bourgeois zoo being rich in gradations, transitions and varieties of interest, the words were exceedingly different, but the heart of the matter was "fortunately" always the same. As ever, the word meant nothing, the practice everything. In other words, it is a matter of complete indifference for the subject whether the masses are saddled with an "active" guilt, or merely have a certain "social character" imputed to them which makes them "innocent" in the active sense. In both cases, the "psychological" view is an "attempt at explanation" which lies *outside* the subject. It cannot, therefore, make the slightest contribution to the solution of the problem; at most, it can bring about confusion through vast speculative nonsense. The speculation may be recognized immediately by examining the claim of "mass psychology." For example, this is what one of the representatives of the "new science," Erich Fromm has to say: "The concept of social character is a key concept for the understanding of the social process." The "results" of this "key" concept have "a bearing on our course of action. For, the understanding of the reasons for the totalitarian flight from freedom is a premise for any [!] action which aims at the victory over the totalitarian forces."

We see: the evil of society is not to be cured in the good old way with means which have developed out of the real social movement. "Any action" rather has as its premise the "psychological" understanding as—Fromm understands it. Whereas the real economic-social movement admits of no other way out than the socialization of the means of production, Fromm remains entirely within the framework of "democracy." Consequently, he does not want to eliminate the evil radically, he wishes only to "improve" it. If he plans to carry the improvement "very" far, and even ventures so far as to call his "new order" democratic socialism" (he declares right afterward: "But the name does not matter"), this does not change a thing. We already know enough when we learn: "The question of whether an economic and political system furthers the cause of human freedom cannot be answered in political and economic terms alone." Or: "But purely economic concepts like socialization of the means of production are not sufficient either."

The Old Song

How all sorts of rubbish about "human freedom" can be scribbled together nevertheless, without "socialization of the means of production" (and that *purely and simply*), is precisely what the "mass psychologist" shows us. For a long, long time it has been a special trade of the petty-bourgeois intellectuals to combat the evil with "radical" phrases, without wishing to destroy *its foundations*. Old Dietzgen called such

people "diplomaed lackeys of clericalism." And Lenin said in connection with this term of Dietzgen:

Our Russian intellectuals—like their colleagues in all other countries, for that matter—who like to consider themselves progressive people, look very much askance when the question is shifted to the plane of the judgment contained in Dietzgen's words. They look at it askance because the truth is a thorn in their side. It suffices to reflect only a little bit upon the political dependence, then upon the general economic dependence, then upon the dependence of their mode of life and in every other respect, of the present-day men of education upon the ruling bourgeoisie, to recognize the absolute correctness of Dietzgen's sharp characterization. It suffices to recall the overwhelming majority of the stylish philosophical tendencies that rise up so often in the European countries, beginning perhaps with those that were linked with the discovery of radium down to those that seek today to cling to Einstein—to get an idea of the connection that exists between the class interests, the class standpoint of the bourgeoisie, the support it bestows upon every form of religion, and the ideological content of the stylish philosophical trends.

It suffices indeed to look at the political dependence, *etc.*, of the whole circle with which Fromm is linked (for example, also the "Institute for Social Research" under Max Horkheimer), to be well-informed on the ideological content of the latest style trend tendency of "mass psychology."

For those who are unable to go deeply into the full range of the social relations in class society, it is always hard to conceive of the practical significance of such style trends. Above all, they do not discern the significance of the division of labor on the ideological field, and cannot grasp how a direct connection runs from the most flagrant deceit and the filthiest demagoguery right up to the finest "scientific" revelations, and how the bourgeois class line is strictly preserved regardless of all the fine distinctions. Let us try to present the case by means of a few simple examples.

Number One

Roosevelt receives from Mr. Stimson certain information about the German youth. This German youth is infested with terrible ideas and will set the world on fire again at the first opportunity, unless. . . .

Thus we find ourselves in the field of "psychology" and Stimson-Roosevelt, for easily understandable reasons, need psychological arguments too. Conclusion: Germany must be placed under strict guard for perhaps fifty years, if only because of the ideological infection of the "dangerous" German youth. That the youth is only an additional pretext, and serves only to veil Anglo-American interests, naturally remains unstated. We therewith get back three facts: 1. Roosevelt-Stimson are conducting the war from the standpoint of "democracy." 2. They make use of "psychological" propaganda tricks. 3. They come forward, as is known, in the name of "culture" and "human freedom."

Number Two

The second case is made up by literary slobs like Emil Ludwig, Rex Stout, Lord Vansittart, Ilya Ehrenburg, *etc.* These people have made the study of the German character their labor of love. Their scientific diligence has led them easily to the conviction that in Germany there are no human beings at all, but only uncommonly wicked beasts of prey, dangerous to the common weal and dangerously common. If Ilya Ehrenburg especially makes "discoveries," you can immediately recognize the "genial, terse and pregnant style of Satlin," also in the field of—zoölogy. Like master, like scribe. So Ilya builds up a new humanism on the enrichment of zoölogy. The formula of the new humanism is genial, pregnant, terse. Two sentences: To

exterminate beasts of prey and vermin is a service to humanity. *Ergo*, the extermination of the Germans is "humanism."

Since Ilya and company are absolutely worthless for anything else, they can bring to our attention again only three facts: they are enthusiastic democrats, shrewd psychologists (symbolically, our Ilya wrote a "Heroes and Sharpers" novel in his early days), and humanists. Naturally, they are substantial imperialist warriors.

Number Three

The third case is already tragic. It does not seem to belong to our series, because it deals with a tendency which obviously suffers under Ilya's psychological experiments. Let us give this interesting phenomenon the space it deserves. We quote from an editorial in *Solidarität* (official organ of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Society of the United States), Sept. 1944:

But what is to become of Germany? An idle question, which is being ardently discussed in American newspapers, magazines and books. The answer is confusing. That applies also to those professional prophets who present their views at the microphone to the radio listeners in the interests of beer, cigarettes, clothing, ice cream, furniture, soap, pills and other cultural merchandise. Much is said and written about a "soft" and a "hard" peace. Many chatter in favor of cutting Germany to pieces and partitioning it, and of placing the German people under guardianship for at least fifty years. Others go even further in their enthusiasm and out of the goodness of their hearts: They want to exterminate the German people as the best thing for the world. These people have learned all sorts of things from the Nazis, and so they now want to apply their methods to the Germans. But in the name of democracy and humanity, please note, and that, my lad, is something quite different.

And then we have those fine fellow-citizens whose plans for Germany are unclouded by the slightest knowledge of history, but who explain to us with mild irritation that the Germans are bad and bellicose by nature. Simply all of them, and that for many generations back. In case, however, a small part has lost this inherited German good-naturedness, that is nothing but an accident, and besides this minority is so tiny that it cannot be counted in the council of good peoples. To this minority belong also those Germans in America who tell us that there is no distinction between the Nazi barbarism and the German people as a whole. Whoever draws a distinction is simply a Nazi in disguise. It is consoling to know that these noble champions are paid very well for their speeches and writings, that they want nothing more to do with Germans and that they will take another turn with the next change of wind.

"Logically," we Americans of German descent also partake of this German nature, whose unfortunate virtues have been inherited by us as well. This nature is analyzed over and over again, in articles, books and speeches. And it is called simply *the* German man . . . always the undifferentiated German man burdened with the megalomania and the sadistic lust for power of the Nazis. Can we still look in a mirror without being gripped by horror at ourselves? We can do it without the slightest shudder. It is a proof of our wickedness.

Thousands of German-Americans, however, are fighting in Uncle Sam's armed forces against the Nazis and Japanese on all fronts. The names of many of them are to be found in the casualty lists. On this score, the "analysts," with or without psychology, keep quiet. They are well aware that the German-Americans as a whole are not behind any other nationality when it comes to helping the United Nations to victory. All this is obvious; it would seem to be for our patrons, too. And since twenty-seven per cent of the American people has German blood in it, many demagogues, in the last analysis, are also more or less heavily burdened with our "heritage"—something we naturally do not wish, for we would rather deal with honest people.

Too bad that the writer of the article remains anonymous: he has talent and he does not do a bad job of depicting the psychological tub-thumping. But if he were to look a little closer at his *Solidarität* he could find a number of articles

which are also not so bad when it comes to the question of the "psychology" of the German people. We would be faced first of all with a certain whimpering lady who recently poured her heart out there, and piled up lamentations on the terrifying guilt of "the" German women amidst many Woes! and Ohs! and Ifs and Buts, guilt for which said women must make corresponding "atonement." But what is more important: *Solidarität* is only the American representative of the reformist tendency which, if it did not hold to some sort of "break-down" of the masses, would be forced to make the simple admission that it bears itself the guilt for "breaking-down." This tendency is simply incapable of renouncing psychological considerations. On the contrary, it was compelled to justify itself with psychological arguments even as long ago as the days before Mr. Churchill had discovered the "wicked" German people.

Many believe that a man like our author constitutes an exception to the rule because he apparently takes an "opposition" stand. But this is a big mistake. It is simply something that lies in the nature of the ideological division of labor when some people spoil their stomachs with the food they have themselves prepared. This is especially the fate of reformism. Read through the above quotation attentively again and you will find that the author is in fundamental agreement and "merely" holds that things have gone too far. He and his similars are far from the idea of shifting the question to where it belongs fundamentally. They will take good care not to say that the "question of guilt" can never be shifted to the people and not even to the Nazis" but only to *imperialism*. They will therefore take good care not to say that the present-day presentation of the "question of guilt" is particularly the *foundation* of the whole psychological swindle, and that it is precisely this decisive swindle that they are supporting with all their heart. The second imperialist war—it must be said unmistakably to these people—is just like the first one, and including all the atrocities of the Nazis, *your* work. On the basis of your betrayals (count in the Great Stalin and his hired crew), it was inevitable, with the Nazis or without them, and it would have broken out between other groups of powers (for example, between England and America as the main adversaries) if not between those now at war. In the best of cases, what you are contesting is the percentage of the "guilt" of the German people, and your exertions are aimed to show that you yourselves belong to the "better" Germany which understands how to sacrifice its sons on the battlefield of American imperialist interests. You conceal the fact that the Nazis are hated by the Allies not as "Nazis," but only as imperialist competitors. You therefore also conceal the fact that the settlement of accounts with the Fascist criminals can only be the work of the very peoples they subjugate, and that everything else (see Italy) is imperialist deceit. It is on this deceit that the calculations of reformism are based; and yet it sometimes wonders how it happened that it got the short end of the stick.

Further down, we will have a few supplementary remarks to add to this theme. Here we need only take note that our author, in the further course of his arguments, also speaks of the "working class." Here we find the psychological mass basis of mass psychology in its pristine original. Next to flourishing illusions about the "working class of the victorious powers," whom it will not be possible "this time, in its organized [!] and representative [!] section [that is, with the plainly indicated elimination of the elementary, revolutionary movement!], to exclude from the peace negotiations," he says: "The

working class of the world will always come together again. It will learn from its past mistakes and weaknesses. This applies especially to the German workers, who held a leading position in the international movement for many years."

Enough—the failure of the masses in one form or another is called, this time, the mistakes and weaknesses of "the" working class, and "the" German workers as such. This is no accident either, for in reality *the* German workers could easily have been brought to the point of a life-and-death struggle against Fascism if they had had a different leadership. Our author psychologizes, and simply translates the wretchedness, capitulations, cowardice and treachery of the German leadership into mistakes and weaknesses of *the* working class. Reason for him not to be "behind any other nationality when it comes to helping the United Nations to victory." Reason enough for dragging the illusory working class of the "victorious powers" along to the peace negotiations and to have it "co-determine" the percentage of the guilt.

So, even this man with his bellyache is a solid imperialist warrior in the name of democracy. He too operates with psychological instead of real arguments, and naturally he is unable to take his eyes off a "part" of the guilt of the German people. He too is a "humanist"—only, one of the whimpering kind who has "hopes" for a better future in the "classless society."

Number Four

The fourth case is that of the mass psychologist himself. He is Erich Fromm, the specialist, the "scientist," whose task it is to objectify the business of self-justifications, to make them into a system, and to give them the specific sense of a "key concept." This is what the miraculous key looks like:

The onslaught of Nazism did not meet with political opponents, the majority of whom were ready to fight for their ideas. Many of the adherents of the leftist parties, although they believed in their party programs as long as the parties had authority, were ready to resign when the hour of crisis arrived. A close analysis of the character [!] structure of German workers can show one reason—certainly not the only one—for this phenomenon. A great number of them were of a personality type that has many of the traits of what we have described as the authoritarian character. They had a deep-seated respect and longing for established authority. The emphasis of socialism on individual independence versus authority, on solidarity versus individualistic seclusion, was not what many of these workers really [!] wanted on the basis of their personality structure. One mistake of the radical [!] leaders was to estimate the strength of their parties only on the basis of the range which these ideas had, and to overlook their lack of weight.

We do not yet deal here with the almost unbelievable confusion, the problems, the untrammelled fantasy, *etc.*, which our learned psychologist presents us with in this paragraph alone. We will have occasion to deal separately with these sides of the matter and a few others, and we content ourselves here with recording once more: the specialist in psychology, like all the others, is conducting the imperialist war on the side of "democracy," and is a humanist with a special "human problem." For all his genteel and "objective" construction, he cannot dispense with the basest of all arguments, the most revolting calumny of the German workers. He calls his own unmilitant will what any other social-democratic betrayer calls his: the unmilitant will of the *masses*. "The *majority*" of the "political opponents" were *not* "ready to fight for their ideas"; *many* "were ready to resign"; a *great number* of German workers had *many* of the traits of the "authoritarian character." For this reason, Fromm's own submission to American imperialism, that is, to the established authority, is called: "*They*" had a deep-seated respect and longing for "established authority."

Therewith Fromm merely establishes the united front of imperialist deceit: the link between the flagrant methods of deceit and the "refined," between crude demagoguery and the "canonizations" of alleged science.

Supplementary Remarks

Up to now we have laid special emphasis on the share of the German emigration in the "mass psychology" because this emigration has actually done pioneer work in this regard. In addition its "new" ideology is taking shape in intimate connection with the completely similar ideology of Anglo-American-Russian imperialism. The emigration argues: How correct was "our" policy of "progressive" evolution by means of democracy and reform, has been "most brilliantly" confirmed in the Western democracies. If the Western democracies now have special difficulties and their development is threatened by further danger, it is due precisely to the German events. What is to be done, once the German people has as much as "failed," and proved itself immature, longing for authority and even "wicked"? The answer is familiar; it corresponded with the requirements of the imperialists: all that remained was to liberate the German people from Hitler's barbarism with the aid of the Western democracies, and thereby to give it once more the opportunity for a human-democratic evolution.

With this line of activity, the emigration *believed*, in the best of cases, that it had ideas of "its own," and would be able to enlighten the future "allies." In reality it merely confirmed the old axiom that it is social being around which slides the petty-bourgeois consciousness. The being, in turn, which served its consciousness as sliding surface, was Anglo-American or Russian imperialism. If ever there was a hope of regaining the lost positions, then only with their aid. The "spirit" set down the postulate of quasi-absolute democracy. It proclaimed its absolute truth and its still more absolute power of salvation, in so far as it would finally be understood what "true" democracy actually is. Yet this did not prevent true democracy from remaining as weak in the flesh as the spirit has been willing

from time immemorial. Current business practice followed on the heels of the most humane phrases—the higher the willing spirit had soared, the more it had to wish for the most profane means.

In practice, nothing more was involved than the submission to imperialism of the "free choice," or than the most revolting begging for its favor. It is pure begging—these numerous laments and "criticisms" which accompany sycophancy. The lamentations over the shortsightedness of the Allies at the Munich accord were great: the Allies had not gone "far" enough and had made rotten compromises, according to the standards of their counsellors, instead of entering immediately into the holy war. Now there are "sharp" criticisms of the fatal tendency of the Allies not to halt at the mere "liberation" of Germany, at the "armed" maintenance of "peace," and similar ideals, but to dismember Germany, to destroy it industrially, *etc.* This time the Allies are going too "far" and again show little inclination to concern themselves with their counsellors. But all this changes nothing in their readiness in principle to go along through thick and thin. The end is like the beginning:

Everywhere there are special interests and corresponding illusions. Of those the whole content of whose life is the most vulgar submission and the embellishment of this submission, only this may be said in conclusion: when the master chastises them for growling, they will accept this "means" as well. The "power of circumstances" is great; the cynicism of Professor Tillich of the "Free German Committee" is still greater; a kick received as a good ending is universally regarded as a "sure thing." And do not forget that civilized people could never have been deceived and misused if the bourgeoisie did not have an army of servants to tell the people in every possible key: *You don't even want to fight! We, however, know how to be "rebellious" down to the most terrible revolutionary phrases! Let us recognize the power of circumstances and conduct Realpolitik!*

EDWARD WARNER.

The Anti-Marxian Offensive

IV-Supplementation

Fourth, Marxism, it is charged, has contributed to the chaos of our time by overemphasizing the "material" factors of historical causation and neglecting others, especially the one of psychological motivation.

(1) The "materialist" accusations against Marxism which fill the academic textbooks of the country are always supplemented by the authors' usual "factors" theory purporting to be alternative explanations of historical causation. Whereas Marxism allegedly "oversimplifies," "mechanizes," "rigidifies," *etc.*, the critics, on the other hand, show the "complexity" of societal problems.⁽²¹⁾ The usual result is a pot-pourri of "multiple factors" without any attempt to differentiate among those which are basic, derivative, correlative, or contingent. Such approach (under the guise of "objectivity") absolves the critics, of course, from the responsibility of doing any explaining at all, let alone thinking.

(2) The so-called "psychological" approach employed by

the revisionists in connection with Marxism expresses itself in two ways: an analysis of leadership-motivation (generally psychoanalytic, since this does not seem to impose too rigorous a discipline upon the unscientific litterateurs), and an indictment of those same leaders for not having acquainted themselves with the principles of mass psychology.

An example of the first method would be the various "case studies" which attempt to explain revolutionaries in terms of "frustration-aggression" patterns, *e.g.*, Lenin's revenge for his brother's assassination, Marx's attack upon capitalism because of his illness and disappointments, or almost any radical activity as a revolt against the "father-image." To Edmund Wilson, for example, *Capital* is merely a projection of Marx's "trauma," and "commodities" the poetic image of Marx's art, whose theme is not political economy but the "regenerateness of human nature," an ideal derived from his "moral" forebears.⁽²²⁾ The alleged moral fervor of Karl Marx and of the socialist ideal in general has no objective validity for Wilson

because it cannot be "ultimately proved" and therefore must be invoked by "moral and emotional methods." (Barzun in similar vein even proves the superiority of the marginal utility theory over the labor theory of value by quoting Hamlet's "there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so.") This is not only the dead-end of solipsistic psychology but of suprahistorical ethics. We are challenged to "prove" Kantian "ultimates" and asked to subscribe to an ethic which cannot even recognize objective scientific analyses, let alone deduce moral principles from them. Eastman, by the way, in connection with this Marxian "moralism" goes further than Wilson. Marx, he maintains, was not even concerned with "ideals" and therefore neglected (unlike Eastman himself, apparently) "standards of justice and rationality." We must undo this harm today by returning to "common-sense," the *only* guide in "social and political matters" (italics mine).⁽²³⁾ Hook, on the other hand, places a plus where Wilson and Eastman underscore a minus. Consistent, at least, with his latest revisionism, he contrasts the "moral passion and idealism" of the Second International with the immorality of the Bolsheviks, who (among all the derelictions generally imputed to them) never comprehended, it would seem, such pragmatic mysteries as the interdependence of "means and ends."

An example of the second method is to be found, for instance, in Eastman's indictment of Marxian leadership beginning with Marx himself. Eastman contends first, that the domination-submission pattern of human behavior has not been sufficiently understood by that leadership, especially the phase of submission which explains the rise of totalitarianism; second, that since competition and possessiveness are part of human nature, the concept of private property would seem to have psycho-biological validity; and third, that his psychological analysis must be correct, being substantiated by no less an authority than Gordon Allport.

(a) Had Eastman offered some esoteric theory whose subtlety or profundity were known only to the specialists or some well-known theory which Marxists had no justification for neglecting, there would have been some grounds for his accusations. But to indict men like Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky and others for not having recognized what any intelligent observer of human behavior has known for thousands of years is typical Eastman presumptuousness.

(b) His is an outmoded instinctivism or an animistic Freudianism which explains nothing since it merely succeeds in attributing universal traits to an undefined "human nature."⁽²⁴⁾ Even a cursory encyclopaedism such as Eastman's should at least be acquainted with those phases of modern biology, social psychology and anthropology, as well as of the neo-Freudianism (Horne, Fromm, Dollard, etc.) with their emphasis upon human plasticity, adaptability, etc., and the general conditioning factors of environmentalism. It is only because Eastman has always chosen the easier task of writing loosely about "human nature" and not subjecting himself to the disciplines of historical materialism (which, incidentally, does not neglect psychological factors) that he has given us descriptions of totalitarian developments within Russia, for example, in terms so dear to the modern Machiavellians, viz., the mechanical ousting of one man or group by another. Thus, his "psychology" can only reduce itself to such profundities as "history repeats itself" or "human nature never changes."

(c) Two additional questions might be raised in connection with his "property instinct" and the "domination-submission" pattern. Do the property-less millions of the world exercise mass neurotic suppression or admirable self-discipline, and

would not this pattern be a perfect justification for all exploitive societies, especially the totalitarian ones, since domination and submission would fulfill perfectly the psychological requirements of its inhabitants?⁽²⁵⁾

(d) Eastman's appeal to Allport for authority is unfortunate; one has only to quote this gentleman to see how suspect his judgments can be. Society, he maintains, can solve its problems if men will only try reconciling their "desires" ("security," "decency") instead of fighting about "demands." It is really as simple as all that!

Fifth, Marx's analysis of capitalism, the critics insist, even in terms of "pure" economic theory must be re-evaluated since it too (like his socio-political theories) has not stood the test of time.

It should be noted at the outset that of all the critics dealt with here only Corey and Schumpeter (perhaps Heimann), to my knowledge, are trained economists, and that they, as well as Turner and Bingham, have at least had the elementary decency to read original source material. In neither case, however, is such training necessarily an adequate preparation for understanding Marx. The others give the impression of having merely consulted either the customary textbook "annihilators" or the exegetic "interpreters" of Marxian economy. A complete counter-critique of these economic "refutations" could, of course, easily fill a volume.⁽²⁶⁾ We shall limit ourselves, therefore, to an examination of some of the more flagrant examples of distortion and misunderstanding, and shall in the case of Parkes, Schumpeter and Bingham, for instance, indicate the sterile programmatic conclusions flowing from their type of economic analysis.

(1) The major attack upon Marxian economy concerns itself, of course, with the "outmoded" labor theory of value. It might be remarked parenthetically that we are witnessing an ironical situation where a number of "socialist" theoreticians are admitting the untenability of the labor theory, whereas their anti-socialist opponents have had the good sense to recognize that such theory is quintessential to Marxism. Some typical anti-Marxian errors are as follows: a failure to differentiate or grasp the relationship between labor and labor power, production and consumption, labor power and price, production costs viewed from the standpoint of capitalist society as a whole and from that of individual capitalists, exchange-values and use-values, the law of value and the factor of supply-demand, capitalist categories treated by a conceptual analysis as stable economic data and those same categories correlated with the dynamics of socio-political tendencies. The failure, for example, to locate exploitation at the point of production permits a Turner to identify exploitation with such factors as disproportionality of wealth, intra-class conflict, and spoliation of consumers. It permits a Bingham to maintain that since value is created only in commodity exchange, the theory of surplus value or exploitation is fallacious. Profits, as all good bourgeois economists contend, are "merely" wages of management whose savings and investment furnish the motivating power behind production. Parkes, in confusing value, price, supply and demand, etc., tells us at one point that value is the expression of supply and demand, but he also informs us at another point that labor is most socially useful which has produced the most profit, the "labor in which there is the largest margin of profit between the value which is added to society and that consumed by its laborers." Or, that the fall in the production of goods during the depression depended upon their prices. Aside from his inability to go beyond "prices" to more fundamental causal factors, he is, like many

other critics, knocking down straw men, since Marx never contended that all goods during stagnation behaved similarly.

To take another example: Parkes, Drucker, Chase, Bingham and Barzun (understanding nothing of exchange and use-values, cost or price) maintain that our machine civilization has, in the words of Drucker, repudiated the "entire Marxist creed" which may still have some appeal to pre-industrial countries where labor is the primary source of wealth. And Hook and Turner agree with Barzun that the theory of surplus value is only an instrument of "social agitation" which, he adds, also denies "consciousness" and "will" to the worker who may actually "prefer" to work under capitalist "contracts." The economic status of the worker, in other words, depends purely upon a "freedom" which permits him to choose or reject, to work or travel, etc., and not upon an alienation which actually divorces him from the means of livelihood.

Marx, according to Turner and Schumpeter, did not consider the factor of differentiated labor, and Schumpeter adds that labor cannot be treated as a commodity, since such an approach implies that working men like machines, are produced on the basis of a "rational cost-calculation." Once again a confusion of labor, labor-power, and use-value. In the first place, it is the critics and not Marx who mechanistically conceive of different kinds of labor producing different quantities of goods and values. They do not divide labor into its abstract and concrete forms. The various concrete forms (skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled) are merged into the total undifferentiated abstract human labor of total society which at a given level of production determines the total social value of all commodities. Moreover, their static interpretation has prevented them from grasping the fluid character (constantly stressed by Marxian economy) of the productive processes revealed most dramatically under the imperatives of war conditions: accelerated centralization, the rapid shiftings of production units, the intensified training of skilled labor, etc. In the second place, as to "rational cost-calculation," a distinction should be drawn between that which is produced and that which is utilized. The obvious fact that machines are produced differently from human beings tells us nothing. What is important is that the productive process, including the variables of the market, determines the calculations of machines and of labor power, the latter incidentally being in a constant state of "reproduction" via the industrial labor reserve.

It can be readily seen even from these few examples that the critics have been able to make out a case for themselves by either disregarding or miscomprehending Marxian nomenclature, by abstracting economic categories out of their inter-related context, by divorcing the economic from the social and political factors inherent in capitalist society, and by treating that society as though some transcendental laws had guaranteed its eternal stability. The reason why any fuller discussion of these as well as other distortions found throughout anti-Marxist literature, would necessitate a separate study is that we are dealing here with illustrations typical of certain schools of bourgeois economic theory. These "refutations" are, in spite of a professed originality, mere repetitions, for instance, of Marshall, Boehm-Bawerk, Cassel, Mitchell, von Mises and others, no one of whom has ever transcended the limitations of the capitalist orbit. Speaking of capitalist economists, Marx observed in *The Misery of Philosophy* that they are like theologians for whom there are only two kinds of religion, that of others which was man's invention, and that of their own, which was inspired only by God.

(2) Joseph Schumpeter, however, has had the imagination to visualize the possibility of "socialism" (a variation, though, of his own). Moreover, he has even offered a theory to explain the probable demise of capitalism. Before attaining prominence in this country he was a widely-recognized authority for many years on the Continent. Even in his early association with the Austrian school of subjectivism he showed himself to be, if not an original, at least an unorthodox economist. Realizing that a science of economics could not be based upon pure psychological motives, he tried in his first book⁽²⁷⁾ to formulate in terms of mathematics and social "physics" an objective science similar to the attempts of the Mechanistic School in sociology. His specific datum was market-behavior. Beginning with his next work,⁽²⁸⁾ he abandoned the mathematical approach since, as he discovered, it was too formalistic a conception to deal with the dynamic nature of society. The substituted technique was to be "accurate description," (the Karl Pearson ideal of all bourgeois science). In his following study while continuing to preoccupy himself with the market mechanism, he also attempted to modify his idea developed in *The Theory of Economic Evolution*, explaining the driving force behind capitalist production. Capitalist rationale in the earlier analysis was to be sought in the psychological orientation of the bourgeoisie, its audacity, initiative, its sporting propensity for taking chances and accepting innovations. In the later book, as well as in the present, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, he adds the "profit" motive to the capitalist's "daring." We are emphasizing those factors in his earlier works which have specific relevance to the book under discussion.

It is interesting to note in passing that in spite of voluminous details concerned with savings, investment, profits, etc., *Business Cycles* succeeds, like similar "equilibrium" economics, in explaining nothing; what it does do is describe in almost reflex fashion the cyclical fluctuations of capitalist development. In his analysis, stagnation (merely a temporary interruption) results from some maladjustment never clearly explained; at times he seems to indicate an inherent capitalist exhaustion, while at other times he stresses equally mysterious factors "extraneous to the capitalist mechanism itself." Capitalist "innovations" (technical-productive and imperialist) are responses to periods of non-profitability. Not only is capitalist crisis, however, never explained, but we also never learn the reasons for the capitalist's "daring." Apparently like capitalism itself, it is to be accepted as an irrefutable datum. We are informed further that if the capitalists are to succeed in bringing us continued abundance, they must not be terrorized by a meddling Roosevelt administration which is more concerned with creating a Service State catering to unemployed than helping its audacious entrepreneurs (von Mises' recent pæan to *laissez-faire, Omnipotent Government*, follows a similar logic). However, if the capitalists themselves do not accept their responsibility to their own class, they shall probably be dispossessed by some managerial class who will administer the "socialist" state. After referring to Marx as a "prophet" and "genius" and describing the "economic interpretation of history" as "one of the greatest individual achievements of sociology to this day," Schumpeter proceeds (like many other critics who begin by praising Marx) to such ridiculous and self-contradictory evaluations as to make one dubious about Marx's "greatness" and his own international reputation.

(a) For example, the "neo-Marxian" (Marx himself, we are informed by all the critics, never dealt with monopoly or imperialism) description of cartelization is infantile in its ca-

tering to popular misconceptions about "big business influencing foreign policy." Imperialism is refuted merely by a categorical denial of the class struggle and a refusal to cope with the validity of Marxian doctrine regarding accumulation, centralization, concentration, the falling rate of profit, the struggle for markets, etc., and yet he adds, "production is incidental to the making of profits"! Moreover, Marx's theory of social classes is unacceptable because it defines "individual and group-wise power in purely economic terms." What has happened then to that "greatest achievement of sociology"?

(b) It is somehow difficult to reconcile Schumpeter's "audacious" capitalists with the picture of frightened business men running to Washington ever since 1933 for periodic government intervention and protection. The inconsistency is Schumpeter's, of course, and does not apply to the Marxian analysis which assumes a basic class agreement between business and government since the latter is the coercive instrumentality of the former. Neither does the concept of business enterprise free from government regulation and protection have historical validity because such absolute separation never existed either in early American or in English and Continental history, e.g., English government intervention in behalf of industrial against mercantile capital, protectionism in Germany, etc. Whereas in the early days governmental measures were necessary for the development of progressive capitalism, such actions today have as their aim the buttressing of a moribund imperialist structure.⁽³⁰⁾

(c) His interpretation of capitalist crisis merely in terms of temporary technical readjustments is similar to the sociological approach, for example, of Ogburn's "culture lag" or Chapin's "synchronous culture cycles." These are attempts to correlate "material" and "non-material" aspects of culture. Since Schumpeter's psychological factors of "daring," "inventiveness," would seem to indicate "non-material" factors as causative, he would have to validate his theory by studying specific periods of history; establishing exact causal relationships between the two aspects of culture; indicating the rapidity, intensity and pervasiveness of changes in both, etc.—all of which he does not even begin to cope with. Such superficiality accounts for his statement that a society may be "fully and truly socialist and yet be absolutist or democratic, aristocratic or proletarian, theocratic or atheistic, belligerent or pacific, nationalist or internationalist."

(3) A word should also be mentioned in connection with the kind of economic criticism levelled at Marx by a "socialist" adversary, Eduard Heimann (an evaluation of other "socialists" such as Langer, A. Lerner and Lederer must be reserved for a separate article.

(a) Heimann tells us that the labor theory of value is "logically untenable and inapplicable to the practical problems arising within capitalism." When he proceeds to prove his point, however, he commits such typical fallacies as the following: he repeats the charge that technological production has invalidated the labor theory, since, according to Marx, profits are to be mechanically correlated only with the number of workers employed. Like Schumpeter he refers loosely to labor-saving techniques, the growth of aggregate capital, a fall in the general rate of profit, imperialism, etc., without seeing any connection at all between such factors and the theory of surplus value. Imperialism, for instance, to him is only a Marxian "political theory resorted to as a substitute for an economic theory of recovery." Heimann at times approaches the problem of profits as though society were com-

pletely mechanized and at other times as though the labor theory had to be validated merely on the basis of productive developments within and among specific industrial units.

(b) He imputes to Marx a Ricardian theory of prices in which "prices are linked to labor values in a strict deduction." Whereas Ricardo could not meet the challenge of price variation, Marx, in his analysis of prices of production, demonstrated that the average rate of profit was not in contradiction to the price mechanism, but that, as a matter of fact, the latter found its regulator in the former.

(c) Heimann, too, levels false accusation against Marx by maintaining that his theory concerns itself only with an analysis of cost and not of demand. In his discussion of demand (and of other allied subjects) Heimann shows us that not only has he missed the central point of Marx's critique, viz., its analysis of capitalist tendencies but that his preoccupation with derivative matters is characteristic of those interested only in preserving the present system. This is made especially clear in his harmonistic contention that "both factors, capital and labor, contribute to their mutual product and each draws from the final value a short equivalent (?) to that contribution." Aside from ignoring at this point the factors of capitalist reproduction, the creation of new values, etc., he apparently sees no relationship between the statement just quoted and his other remark added by way of mere after-thought: "the reason why the laborer does not receive the profit is that he does not own capital." Exploitation and profits, for instance, from Heimann's viewpoint, are purely moral problems and are in no way explained by the Marxian "economic theory of value and price."

(d) The profundity of his discussion can be judged, perhaps by his remarks in connection with the Marxian polarization of classes. Although this, as he admits, has taken place, there is an "indispensable qualification" to be noted. In transportation, for example, the individually operated automobile is making headway at the expense of the centralized railroad system!

(e) Heimann's most surprising non sequitur is to be found in his criticism of the equilibrium economists, for it is here that he attempts to counterpose Marx's work as the most "comprehensive and impressive model of what we have to do." Ironically enough, in his own accurate summation of the Marxian position he is obviously unaware that Marx was directing his attack upon the precursors of Heimann's revisionist thinking.

(4) It is to be expected, of course, that the various economic theories which are either fully formulated as alternatives to Marxism or merely stated by implication in the many criticisms levelled at it, should lead to definite political conclusions. Granted the premises of an economics which denies the class struggle, one must expect harmonistic and collaborationist political programs. Thus Schumpeter, for instance, calls for a post-war "ethical imperialism" of Anglo-American domination over the "social democratic" governments of small countries. In spite of certain "fascist features" which may attend the coming world, the general political pattern suggested is the only chance for "liberal socialism." As for the electoral mass, which is incapable of action other than a "stampede," it can best serve its purpose by not obstructing but accepting parties, machine-politicians and "bosses," since these are the normal instrumentalities which "regulate" political competition in any democracy.

To use another example, Parkes in his *The World After the War* advocates a revived League of Nations in which the

victorious powers are to maintain a "preponderance of military power" in order to perpetuate the "status quo." While it is likely that the "business classes" will get the major share of the "distributions of rewards," labor and agriculture will also be "better off." (*Italics mine.*)

And Bingham chides the Marxists for addressing themselves to a non-existent working class instead of directing their attention to transforming all our "producers" into "consumers." Don't try to "equalize" wealth and the general income. All this is unnecessary as long as you can elect a government which by means of the usual Keynesian techniques will merely "control" the economy. The political model he suggests is the corporate state with its "industrial guilds." In fact it can be so democratic and harmonious a society as to win the approval even of the Catholic Church whose encyclicals on the subject Bingham quotes with great enthusiasm. However, in his most recent book, *The Practice of Idealism*, he has made a startling discovery. Like Max Lerner, Dorothy Thompson, Harry Barnes, Julian Huxley, Harold Laski and others, who are also capitalizing on the ideological commodity of the day, viz., "revolution" (a counterpart to the millennial products of the post-war world, plastics, pre-fabrications, synthetics and international police forces), Bingham now detects not one but five revolutions. Along with the "revolutions" in technology, government, nationalism and religion, he senses that perhaps the "strongest force in the world today is the revolt of the common man." It is a "revolution" though whose fundamental problems can be solved neither by the Right nor Left but by the "middle way" of governmental control of investment and planning, and on a world scale we are to make good our commitments to the Atlantic Charter granting to all peoples "free access to raw materials," controlling cartels for purposes of expanding production, etc., etc. *The Practice of Idealism*, indeed, is a book which not only presents the nebulous program of typical bewildered liberalism but a book whose title aptly describes the Platonic character of non-Marxian thought which we have been considering throughout this essay.

V—CONCLUSION

(1) From the standpoint of academic criticism, the anti-Marxian offensive represents the traditional attempt to defend the status quo against a system whose theory and practice are directed toward the destruction of capitalism.

(2) From the viewpoint of revisionism, its criticism, in spite of various theoretical façades merely constitutes escapist techniques in order to avoid the painful necessity of confronting its own ethical and psychological derelictions.

(3) In both cases, whether in the apologetics of the former or in the rationalizations of the latter, we are justified in saying that the virulence of their attacks naturally coincides with or is in proportion to the intensity of the crisis affecting contemporary society.

(4) As far as explaining individual anti-Marxian behavior, however, this crisis must be considered only as a general framework of reference, a starting point for analysis, and not as an over-all formula describing the activity of every type of trader. We have attempted to suggest some individual and group motivational patterns within the general conditioning factor of the capitalist framework.

(5) To accept the general for the specific in this case is not only to fall into illogicality or into a superficial psychology. It also prevents one from combatting anti-Marxism programatically. Dwight Macdonald, for example, in commenting on the

Dewey-Hook attack upon non-logical thinking, remarks that they are dealing only with a symptom, the cause being our "period of social frustration." In the first place, Macdonald's statement is really no significant explanation, since it is too inclusive a generalization. In the second place, it does not make clear whether "social frustration" refers to society exclusive of the obscurantist writers themselves or whether it describes the lives of everyone living in that society. In the third place, it fails to do justice to the varieties of religious and mystical personalities who have existed throughout different periods of history. Finally, it has no value as a programmatic weapon.

To Marxism there is little difference whether it is being attacked by the Catholicism of a Maritain or the "socialism" of a Hook (the technique for combatting each tendency differs, of course). Even many *New Leader* articles, Daniel Bell's, for instance, come close enough in their analyses to be described as "Marxist." What is important, therefore, is not so much whether these writers deal with symptoms or causes, or what honorific banners they chose to travel under, but what political conclusions they draw and what practicable programs they support. For all their "Marxian" protestations, *The New Leader*, for example, always winds up behind the Democratic Administration. The road to power remains the key question.

(6) In spite of (or what is actually part of the same picture) the general "democratic" and "idealistic" nature of their ideology, the critics are nevertheless faced with the intractable realities of an irrational society. They are forced, therefore, to deny in practice what they always profess in theory, viz., the "free," "automatic" market, the "fluid" relationships of classes, the "delicately-balanced" mechanism of the State, etc. While their ideological "refutation" of Marxian prediction and analysis continues unabated, their "programmatic" recommendations only confirm further the validity of the socialist alternative. No amount of economic, social, or political revisionism, whether in text books or in daily life, has ever succeeded in circumventing the law of value. Hence the futility of their "planned" economics, of their harmonistic sociology and of their "democratic" politics. The self-contradictory nature of the anti-Marxian offensive therefore, is merely an accurate reflection of the irreconcilable forces in our class society which will be solved only by the proletarian revolution.

(21) Thackeray once recorded various rhetorical mistakes committed by grammarians in the very act of instructing others on correct usage. A study of anti-Marxian literature reveals similar inconsistencies. The typical clichés of absolutism, inevitability, dogmatism, etc., directed against Marxism can just as well be levelled against the critics themselves. Besides the psychological reasons for their behavior suggested at the beginning of this essay, one must also include as possible explanation the absolutistic character of traditional idealism.

(22) Besides resorting to a racial theory in order to explain the Jewish quality of Marx's compassion for the oppressed, Wilson's point in tressing also the forces of Rousseauism and nineteenth century utopianism as sources of Marx's ideas is an example typical of anti-Marxian analysis. Once show that Marx was not "original" (the bourgeois atomic preoccupation with uniqueness, individuality, etc.) and you apparently destroy, if not the validity, at least the force of his ideas. Thus this "psychologizing" has an ironical logic of its own: it begins in vacuo by probing the psyche and in the process finds itself with no such entity, but merely with a lifeless composite. Moreover, granted the behavior patterns assumed by these psychologists (who are equally susceptible to a similar kind of analysis), there are still the *ideas of Capital or State and Revolution* to be confronted even though their genesis may reside in glands, conditioned reflexes, or frustrations.

(23) Only "common sense" triumphant can offer us a political ideal which warns us against "common ownership and state control." Since this phrase refers to Russia he is not only guilty of the usual anti-Marxian duplicity by making Stalinism and Marxism synonymous, but he is also contradicting all his other indictments of Russian slavocracy wherein no "common ownership" was found to exist at all. *Common ownership* describes socialism, and "state control" within such framework could only mean governmental administra-

tion or military defense against alien elements internally or externally. "Common ownership," naturally, is not what Eastman wants; his "common sense" demands that we "extend the democracy" which we now possess, a perfect program for political myopia.

(24) Other anti-Marxists guilty of a similar approach are B. Russell and R. Niebuhr. The former posits a "power" principle and the latter an "egoistic" impulse which socialists have allegedly underestimated.

(25) Eastman's most ambitious attempt in applying his knowledge of technical psychology is to be found in his *The Literary Mind*.

(26) For similar reasons this essay cannot concern itself with answering the innumerable examples of bald assertion, half-truth, historical distortion and falsification found throughout the literature of the critics we are discussing.

(27) *The Nature and Content of Economic Theories* (1908).

(28) *The Theory of Economic Evolution* (1912, 1926).

(29) *Business Cycles*, 2 vols. (1939).

(30) This tendency to define capitalism purely in terms of its laissez-faire period naturally leads to political and economic misconceptions which see in monopoly capitalism not a logical development of its former period but an entirely new society. In our discussion of the State and of the Marxian theory of classes we pointed out that the critics had politically and socially misinterpreted the results of intraclass struggles and group expropriation among the bourgeoisie, for an emergence of a new or "managerial" class. Economically, those critics who refer only to laissez-faire characteristics as examples of "pure" capitalism fall into similar errors. To them the system of pre-war Germany or Italy was not capitalism but "industrial feudalism," "industrial serfdom," an "integrated economy," etc. (Neo-political and economic definitions, by equating capitalism with democracy, and serfdom with totalitarianism, have provided a "scholarly" rationale for support of the war). The presence of the "free" market and "free" labor are to the critics indispensable criteria of capitalism. (a) There is no qualitative difference between a "free" and a "controlled" market. The presence, absence, extent, or intensity of government intervention whether under laissez-faire or under monopoly is to be evaluated in terms of methods of class rule. "Integrated" economies

which "regulate" the market, curb labor and intensify exploitation are attempting to compete against those who can still afford the ideological luxury of "unhampered" capitalism. The critics' economic "open arena," in which price-mechanisms of competing capitalists regularize market conditions, has become a museum piece. The emphasis has shifted from the domestic to the world market; markets are divided according to agreements, combines, and patent pools; prices are "determined" by trusts, administrative decree or government edict. But no matter how monopoly, centralization, concentration and cartelization may eliminate, distort and telescope certain functions of the earlier market, it still continues to reflect its class relations of owners and property-less. Under the law of value, labor power is still THE commodity being bought and sold and is subject to the same monopolized control as other products and materials. As for the "freedom" of labor (which to Marxists has always meant "freedom" from the means of production, rendering the laborer a "wage SLAVE") what can such a concept mean now under conditions of mass unemployment, colonial servitude, intensified world exploitation and war regimentation, this last giving rise to another point of the critics' "refutation." (b) Viewed from the historical standpoint of the various stages of capitalism and from that of the international market, the mechanistic counterposing of the critics' "politics determines economics" becomes abstract and meaningless. Incapable of differentiating between ultimate economic and immediate socio-political causes and of comprehending the dialectical nature of a world system, they mistake the part for the whole. Totalitarianism, they argue, proves that the State "determines" the economy and in so doing also disproves Marx. Aside from their usual weakness of not defining the State, they are not even consistent in their logic. According to them a capitalist state under conditions of intensified war or military siege ceases to be capitalistic because the military are in control and the market is no longer regulated by the "equilibrium" of supply and demand. If they answer that these conditions are only "temporary" or "emergencies," then they have failed to see that the socio-political techniques of "regulation" employed by the ruling classes in the totalitarian countries (as in ours) are also "emergency" measures to cope with the development of economic forces.

The SWP and European Revolution

Letter of the German Comrades

INTRODUCTION

The following letter to the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party was, as may be perceived from its contents, not a private document. We sent it to the SWP with the request that it be published in a bulletin and be presented as material to its recent convention. We learn it was neither published nor presented in any form, and nobody found out that it even existed. Consequently, there is nothing left for us to do but to look after its dissemination ourselves and to treat it in accordance with its character as an "open letter."

We gladly acknowledge that we see in its publication in *The New International* a great political advantage for all concerned. So far as we are concerned, we have always combatted the method of "internal" and similar bulletins and we stand for the method which we have set forth in our letter. A Bolshevik organization must learn to bring its political disputes before the eyes of the broad public. There is no other way of training people in an understanding of political struggles over opinions, of gaining unreserved confidence in the sincerity of the party, of having an "intellectual life," and thus of becoming a genuinely *Bolshevik* organization. Thus for example, we greet it joyfully when the SWP itself breaks for once with its custom and reprints in the *Fourth International* an article directed against us which first appeared in an "Internal Bulletin" of the English section. We shall have occasion to speak about this article, but whatever was behind its publication in the

Fourth International—we see in the destruction of the "internal" secrecy-mongering the only means of obtaining a general improvement. And if, in seeming contradiction to our own principles, we ourselves proposed to the SWP to put our letter in a "Bulletin," the reasons for it will be found from a reading of the letter itself. We say in it that in all political disputes we always gave our opponent the opportunity to inform himself in good time, to arrange himself according and—therewith to take over the initiative. If the opponent is capable of utilizing the opportunity, then the dispute really gets under way and must lead us (we are, to be sure, very "self-assured") in a roundabout way to the result desired by us. If, on the contrary, he misses the opportunity, then the initiative simply falls back into our hands and the desired result (the public discussion) is there at the beginning. In both cases, the seeming contradiction is dissolved in practice. This practice has the task, now more than ever, of destroying that widely disseminated legend which is called: All evil stems from "Bolshevik principles." It was the main purpose of our letter to rehabilitate these principles and to introduce an extensive discussion. The same purpose is pursued by the present publication, which at the same time demonstrates in favor of one of the supreme rights of a Bolshevik organization. We refer to the right to be a *political* faction and to present our views freely. It is only necessary to avoid confusing the right of faction with organizational maneuvers and machinations, from which we keep our good distance and with which we have nothing in common.

To the National Committee of the
Socialist Workers Party

Dear Comrades:

The AK of the IKD (Committee Abroad of the International Communists of Germany) has taken cognizance of and discussed your "Draft Resolution of the National Committee on 'The European Revolution and Tasks of the Revolutionary Party'" (*Internal Bulletin*, Vol. VI, No. 3, Sept. 1944). The question of the European revolution must be of the most particular interest to us if only be-

cause this revolution is in the last analysis the main task of the European comrades themselves. Inasmuch as an International Secretariat does not exist, we should like to try in this way to participate in the discussion and to contribute to the clarification of a problem upon the correct solution of which everything depends for us. In doing this, we do not wish to present a general criticism of the "Draft Resolution," but to draw your attention to certain points which, if taken seriously into account, could improve the draft substantially.

The Main Defect of the Resolution

1. The principal defect of the draft consists at the present moment in the fact that it is in general still a draft which deals with the question of the European revolution "separately." It is correct that the problems of the revolution in Europe are different in many respects from those in North and South America, in the colonies, etc. But at this moment, when the *international* perspectives are coming to the fore, it is a grievous mistake to leave out the interrelation of the European revolution with the world revolution. It is positively startling, in a document of the Fourth, not to find a single word on the colonial problem. And yet, the question, for example, of the French colonies is a question that cannot only kill the "isolated" French revolution but also the world revolution. It is altogether impossible for the French, Belgian, Dutch and English revolution to triumph without the slogan: "Immediate and unconditional independence of all the colonies." And precisely because this slogan is already a vital necessity for the "narrower" European revolution, it applies all the more strongly to the international revolution. As things stand concretely, it is directed in the first instance against American imperialism and brings whole continents into rebellion against it. If your resolution is serious about the slogan: "Hands Off the Italian Revolution! Hands Off the European Revolution!" it must deal with this point painstakingly and do everything to extend its repercussions upon the American revolution. And therewith, a fundamental treatment of the American perspectives and immediate tasks would follow automatically. The "Draft Resolution" says nothing about America save the few meager phrases that make up Paragraph 38. It limits itself with great obstinacy to the European revolution, and over and over again to the European revolution, without even making the attempt to examine the independent revolutionary rôle of America. But ruined and hungry Europe is lost if America succeeds in putting it on short rations. The European masses, for their part, can draw no hope out of an internationalism, the American link of which is completely eliminated. The resolution, as it now stands, can only dishearten them. The American party must finally work out methods which harass its *own* bourgeoisie and above all bring the main prop of the latter into rebellion against it.

Europe and the "National Question"

2. A further defect of the resolution, which involves all the others, is the absence of an adequate general orientation. A correct estimation of the *world capitalist* evolution is lacking, from which the international perspectives first follow. It is no accident that the resolution bases itself upon the example of Italy, though Italy, as always in history, is not "typical." The French example which can now be utilized fully as a "model," does not play the slightest rôle in the draft. To be able to draw the lessons of the French events, it is, to be sure, necessary to have a clear position on the "national" question which is so important for Europe (and not there alone). The French example, the Polish movement, the events in the Balkan countries, in Norway, etc., have shown irrefutably that the whole movement was compelled to group itself around the national question. Nobody can doubt that the best and most progressive social elements of Poland were to be found among the 250,000 Poles who, according to the statement of Osubka-Morawski, fell in the Warsaw uprising alone. Stalin and Hitler and the Allies were very well aware of this and they behaved accordingly. Which is precisely why there were 250,000 victims in Warsaw alone. Well now: this genuine people's movement, these magnificent, passionate fighters, greatly disturbed the London government-in-exile as much as they "exasperated" Stalin by the declaration that they would refuse to recognize any compromise that would sacrifice the independence of the Polish people, and that any agreement made in Moscow would have to be ratified in Poland itself. One must be completely blind not to recognize: all of Europe is obliged to defend its national freedom, first against Hitler but then against the Allies and Stalin. Any resolution that does not see this central point and which, like the draft (under the pressure of the indisputable facts), passes over it with a couple of casual "acknowledgments," is necessarily false. The draft says, for example: "The German Revolution is the key to the European revolution." We for our part believe that it does not make much sense today to speak of Germany as the "key." In addition, the motivation which the draft gives for the key position are dubious in the highest degree, especially from the economic standpoint. But be that as it may, the German masses are fighting desperately for their national independence—the key position will

be characterized wholly and completely by the national question. Only an energetic, clear, unambiguous treatment of the national question by the international movement can give the German masses the perspective they need in the struggle for their national independence and against their own bourgeoisie. The United Socialist States of Europe cannot be organized without there first existing the autonomous and independent states of Europe. The events of the last three years have proved irrefutably: the strategic transitional point for the victory over Hitler, the Allies and Stalin is the national question. The fact that the draft places the general propaganda slogan of the United Socialist States of Europe at the top, turns the practical relationships upside down. It displaces the center of gravity of the whole real movement and thereby makes it useless in practice. Moreover, it is high time, in our opinion, to raise the slogan of the United States of the World for the *general* propaganda of the vanguard. America, Japan, the colonies must be drawn into consideration. The objective conditions for world socialism are ripe—Europe and Asia can no longer live without America.

The Movement Is "National"—But Not Nationalistic

3. Back in August, 1941, we wrote ("Report on the French Situation") that while the French movement would necessarily be national, it would in no way be "nationalistic." The effect upon the American comrades of this and many other declarations (see our "Three Theses") was as if they had suddenly been doused with cold water. Today, at any rate, there can no longer be the slightest doubt that the broad masses of Europe are "national" in the sense of their demand for independence, but that they reject the capitalist system either instinctively or consciously. France, which is much further developed, shows this to be the case more clearly than does backward Italy and it gives the Allies correspondingly greater worries. When we contended so unswervingly that while the European movement must flare up on the national question, it will, from the very outset, have to go beyond these limits and reveal itself as an integral part of the *social* question—where did we get this certainty from?

With this we return to lack of a correct estimation of the *world-capitalist* evolution characterized under point 2. For such an estimation, we can only refer you here to our study: "Capitalist Barbarism or Socialism," which we submitted to you as far back as last year and which has now been published in *The New International*. Whatever may be the position taken on the views presented there—it remains a fact that it was precisely these views that enabled us to predetermine the course of developments correctly. It does not suffice, either for the members of the party or for the masses, to tell them day-in and day-out about the "wicked" imperialists. On the contrary, it must be elucidated to them that it does not lie in the "wicked" will of these imperialists that, for example, the aims of Hitler and of American imperialism are entirely the same. Only by means of a firm position on the whole character of the development in decaying capitalism, can we reach conclusions that make possible an adequate practice. We have been too long in the ranks of the Fourth, and we would not deserve the name we bear, if we were to be silent at this moment about the fact that: the practice of the draft is confined to paper. The resolution exhausts itself in hollow phrases about the United States of Europe, about the necessity of a revolutionary party, in optimistic observations on all the things that are to "come," etc. Here is just where we can see how monstrous the confusion and the failures of the SWP in the last three years have been. If the SWP is really to be made an instrument of the proletarian struggle, one thing above all is necessary in the resolution: an open, honest, clear squaring of accounts with its theoretical conscience for these last three years. Lenin steadfastly emphasized that the most important criterion for the seriousness of a revolutionary party is its attitude toward its own mistakes. There cannot be a practice, nor can one's own party (let alone the masses) be educated politically, if political and theoretical questions are dealt with as if they were contraband. Still less, however, can an *international* organization be built up if a section (in this case, *us*) is abused for holding views which the others themselves were forced to accept—secretly, confusedly, shamefacedly, unscrupulously, smuggled-in—under the pressure of the facts. The political, theoretical and moral prestige of the SWP, its consciousness of responsibility toward the International, cannot be great if it lightmindedly destroys the prestige of other sections. In what follows, we present a few important examples of the line that the correction of the resolution should take.

The Change in Political Positions

4. Taking into account the opposition of the SWP leadership to our conception of the "national question," we underscored with special sharpness in the "Report on the French Situation" and in the "Three Theses" that the oppressed countries would depend upon the struggle for their liberation from the foreign yoke, and that the movement bears the character of a people's movement, with all strata participating. We cannot set forth here what the comrades in the IS (which at that time still held, at least as a sort of "wastebasket," regular "Secretariat sessions"), comrade M., comrade Daniel Logan, Stewart and others, made out of our conception, how we were "interpreted," etc. The unwillingness of the SWP leadership to conduct an open, loyal, unprejudiced discussion and to make possible a correct orientation for the international movement, is the reason why all these "interpretations" have remained unclarified and why we are now compelled, with clarifying polemic eliminated, to present our views "purely theoretically" in *The New International*. We wish, however, to note here that one of our main opponents was comrade Daniel Logan. At the beginning of the discussion, he went so far as to set down *in print* that the national movement in Europe is an *obstacle* for us. A few months later, in the IS, he notified us literally: "The more I read your documents, the more I am against them. We will discuss and then we will see if we have to part company." What's important now is this: Comrade Logan, comrade M. and all the others were forced, as things went on, to change their position. Comrade Logan especially made himself a sort of "champion" of the national question. Unfortunately, neither he nor others possessed the courage to revise their position *openly*; unfortunately neither were they able to contribute anything to the clarification of the question. Again, comrade Logan especially practiced a "championship" which surrounded the whole question with 90% moral prescriptions and pedantic "conditions" (on "what to do," "if" de Gaulle, "if" this or that "tactic," etc.), and which consisted of 10% verbal "support." Everybody was concerned with one thing above all others, to make the "revolutionary" leadership of the whole movement the *precondition* of participation in it. And the result? The real movement simply swept this whole mess of abstract observations, prescriptions, fantasies about the "leadership of the Fourth International," about de Gaulle and the intentions of the Allies, aside for what it is: a heap of trashpaper. Today, the draft declares simply:

"The Yugoslav Partisan movement originated as an indubitable [!] movement of the masses, whose workers-peasant sections [!] aspired not only [!] to drive the Nazi conquerors out of their country, but to abolish the rule of the rapacious and reactionary landlord and capitalist cliques represented by King Peter and his government-in-exile. The determination of the masses [!] to drive out the imperialist invaders and to win national freedom [!] was fused [!] with the social struggle against the native exploiters."

This is the only attempt made in the draft to analyze in closer detail the situation which is otherwise handled first and foremost on the basis of the slogan of the "United Socialist States of Europe." In this connection, it is of the highest interest to give the floor to comrade Daniel Logan on France, about which the draft is so curiously silent. In the *Fourth International* of September, 1944, comrade Logan says in an article entitled "Whither France?":

"Undoubtedly, the Parisian workers carried along with them large strata of the petty bourgeoisie, not only its lower ranks, but also civil servants, students, sons and daughters of bourgeois families. The insurrection, the immediate objective of which was the overthrowing of the German yoke, thus took a 'popular' and 'unanimous' aspect. With its democratic and patriotic illusions the atmosphere was somewhat reminiscent of that of the 19th century revolutions."

What the draft and comrade Logan (who has long been acquainted with our study on "Capitalist Barbarism or Socialism") "record" here after the fact, is what we wrote three years ago and what we maintained in oral discussions until we were sick to the stomach. The miracle has occurred: the development took the course that was forecast, without caring in the slightest about the views, prescriptions, claims to leadership and conditions of the American comrades and of comrade Logan. As is always the case when neither the real situation nor one's own strength is taken into account, the "leadership" of the Fourth was neither at hand, nor did anybody accept any moral or other "prescriptions," nor did anybody whose concern himself about the Fourth. And what is worse: neither the resolution nor Comrade Logan has given any

sort of sign of rehabilitating the position of the "Three Theses" which they brought into such ill-repute. On the contrary, we will see a continuation of the business of making shift from day to day with half-measures, and at the same time of constant talk about "responsibility" toward the International organization. But the practical damage and the failures of such an attitude are immeasurable. If it were not for the confusion, the lack of sincerity, the inconsistency of the American leadership in all these questions, it would be impossible for even a single party branch to declare itself *in favor* of the draft resolution. The confusion is complete; nobody has the slightest idea any longer of what is involved. And this is only part of the damage. Had our thesis been acknowledged that the democratic demands and especially the demand for national liberation should be supported "unconditionally," and that (given the absence of organizations in the various countries) we should place ourselves at the head of the movement at least propagandistically and agitationaly, entirely different results could have been achieved.

First, the international organization, in so far as it exists at all, could have been equipped theoretically, politically, propagandistically and agitationaly in a unified way.

Second, it could thereby have won, in the course of these three years, a substantial influence upon the consciousness of the masses and especially of the masses-in-arms. Three years of united, energetic, audacious work have carried the ideas of the Fourth anywhere and made it appear as a "vanguard." Our papers, which go all over the world in various ways, could have furnished the proof in this important question alone (which profoundly affects the entire world, Europe and Africa, Asia and South America, Japan and Canada, the Poles and the Negroes in the U. S. A.) that we are not only able to talk about the "United Socialist States of Europe" week in—week out, but that we also know "the need of the hour."

Third, the Fourth would have won therewith the capacity for action that it now needs more than ever before. English, French, "German," American, Canadian and Negro friends have spread throughout the world and have also reached France, Italy, etc. In France and Italy especially, there are "native" comrades. Do all these comrades possess the necessary equipment, and do they find a support in the orientation of the International? To put the question differently: Do they know what to do now? The "national question" is in no wise resolved with the driving out of the Germans; with the coming of the Allied armies of occupation, it only enters its second stage. The soldiers of the United Nations were told that they are fighting for the Atlantic Charter, we must on the contrary beat Allied imperialism by demanding that the charter be *carried out unconditionally*. We will show below by means of the Italian example that the Fourth is incapacitated. First, we record the result that was obtained in reality. Namely: theoretical and political confusion, international disunity and discreditment of one of the most important sections of the Fourth, elimination of America and of the colonies from the horizon of the draft resolution.

The Example of Italy

5. The example of Italy. In view of the confusion of the SWP in the question of Italy, we submitted to you last year certain "Political Proposals." Here we wish only to state that you did not even consider it necessary to give us an answer, let alone to discuss these *proposals* with us amicably (as we proposed). (Parenthetically: comrade Logan was "of course" *against*.) Even as far back as that time, it was no accident that our proposals referred mainly to the activity of the American section, which we found, as early as then, to be completely out of the picture with regard to Italy. In any case: with reference to the line to follow in Italy itself we pointed to the importance of the so-called "free elections." Today the draft resolution says in paragraph 22: "It [the Bonomi government] cannot purge the fascists and give democratic rights to the Italian people *because the Allies are returning the fascists to the seats of power and are determined to prevent the masses from exercising their democratic rights and electing a government of their own choosing.*" (Our emphasis.)—A fine and correct statement. But in paragraph 33, which is buried negligently beneath the heap of protestations and pretty useless phrases and speaks sort of in passing of the "bold program of transitional and democratic demands corresponding to the consciousness of the masses and the tempo of developments," there is no trace of the important question of the election of a government "of their own choosing." It says shamefacedly: "free election of all officials." If, however, the Allies prevent the election of a native government, you cannot talk around

this in practice but must make this question the axis of all the practice. For this is the only question, moreover, with the help of which internationalism can become directly active. An energetic, clear, stubborn propaganda in favor of free elections in Italy, in "liberated" Poland, France, etc., would be a direct blow against the Allies. To employ a sharp formulation: The whole population must be positively "infested" with the demands or the "principles" of the Atlantic Charter. These demands which the Atlantic Charter raises hypocritically, are a part of our own transition program. We cannot play hide and seek with them. But further: in France, for example, free elections cannot be propagandized without proclaiming the independence of the colonies. An additional blow against the Allies, which involves America directly in the action. We have no better means of pushing forward the class differentiation and of pushing back the other tendencies, than the consistent pursuit of the democratic tasks. And the elections are of special importance because they automatically set all the other questions in motion, which are important for the freedom of self-determination of peoples, the freedom of parties (of the revolutionary party, too, consequently), the freedom of revolution, etc. No free elections without complete freedom of the press, of speech and of assembly—no revolutionary party without free agitation and propaganda, that is, without the possibility of convincing the masses step by step of the correctness of its program and its tactics. The draft sidesteps all these questions, and instead of solving them it covers them with declamations about the party.

The Question of the Revolutionary Party

6. The question of the revolutionary party is one of the weakest and most illusory points of the entire draft. The reasons why the Fourth is in a not-at-all "brilliant" position precisely in this all-decisive field, and why it has failed in the steeling of its ranks, already follow from what is said above. It is impossible to take even one step forward without telling the whole truth, without destroying the existing illusions and embellishments of reality. Let us first take paragraph 29 of the draft:

"The Trotskyists have prepared themselves during the years of reaction for the revolutionary upsurge. The Trotskyist movement has a tested program, a firm cadre and an international organization. Upon its shoulders rests an historic responsibility. It must render every assistance to our Italian and European co-thinkers to assemble the forces for the revolutionary Marxist parties and strengthen those that already exist. Toward this end, the Trotskyists will pay the closest attention to all the new manifestations of the European labor movement, and work with the greatest energy to attract all leftward-moving groups to the Trotskyist program and banner. This work the Trotskyists will carry through with the greatest tactical flexibility and in a comradely spirit." (There follow the usual declarations on the struggle against all deviations and on programmatic intransigence.)—

If this paragraph is taken as a *promise*, as a good *resolve*, and as an abstractly admissible declaration, no objection can be made to it. But all this has value only if full account is taken of the reality. It is true that we have a "tested program." Have we reflected, however, as to what it means when Lenin writes: "We do not at all regard the theory of Marx as something terminated and inviolate: we are, on the contrary, convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science whose all-sided further development is a necessity for socialists if they want to keep abreast of life"? (Our emphasis.)

It is clear that there can be no talk of the "all-sided further development" of theory. On the economic side, nothing. Or rather: on this score the leadership of the SWP consistently sabotaged the only systematic attempt to fix a political line on the basis of the economic evolution. We refer here to our study: "Capitalist Barbarism or Socialism." Regardless of the merits of this attempt, it is characterized by the fact that it does not fold its hands before an "unalterable" reality and does not repeat abstractly-correct formulas, but seeks to "keep abreast." It was up to you to clarify us on any mistakes that may have been made in our attempt, whereas what you actually did was to lead the movement around without the compass that is so needed in the present period.

In the question of Russia, nothing. Trotsky reexamined precisely this question periodically (if necessary, every week), and on the basis of the fact that there was anything but a "finished prototype" for the Russian question, he introduced his corrections. We shall return to the Russian question under a separate heading—the

point here is that the International is stuck fast in the results of the discussion of 1939. This is an altogether untenable situation, which has led in the literary practice of the SWP to the worst empiricism. The confusion in this question (produced, again, by the pressure of wicked facts) may be checked by anyone from the pages of the *Militant* and the *Fourth International*. And inasmuch as it is a question of establishing the truth, whose acknowledgment must not be neglected even with regard to a political opponent we must say: the helplessness and tragic ridiculousness we cannot fail to mention, the percentage of malicious demagoguery which reminds us strongly of the mutual accusations of Naville-Molinier) with which the SWP confronts the attacks of Shachtman, can be a secret only for those whose eyes are filled with dust. Some comrades (for example, Morrow and Morrison a year ago) have felt the need of a reexamination of the Russian question. This question ought to be placed upon the agenda of the convention in order to bring the present confusion to an end.

In the national question, nothing; nothing besides the confusion, the indecisiveness, the incidental and shamefaced "acknowledgments." We insist, however, the national question will dominate Europe, Africa, Asia and even America—the revolution will find itself to an ever greater degree in the mere preparatory stage, the greater the lack of revolutionary parties. The SWP must create complete clarity in its mind on what the slogan of the "United Socialist States of Europe" is in the present period. It is a *propaganda slogan*, which should be supplemented by the slogan of the Socialist World Union, but it is *completely unsuitable* for solving as much as a single question of the preparatory period. There are slogans, political and theoretical generalizations, *yes, whole "programs,"* which, if practiced falsely, become all the more false in practice the more they are right according to the *letter*. The SWP, is living proof of how, with the best program, the most correct principles, the grandest demands, everything can be turned wrong-side-up in practice, and the theory can be degraded to a dead schema. The draft must finally concern itself with the real course of the historical movement, with the national question, and must seek to settle the problems of the transition period that has inevitably lasted "longer than desired." It will then finally situate the slogan of the "United Socialist States of Europe" in the place where it belongs: at the end, where the entire revolutionary movement is *summarized*.

What Our "Historical Responsibility" Means

7. Thus far we have touched only on the most important questions, on questions relating to the draft. However, these questions dominate the field. They alone suffice to necessitate a very critical attitude toward the abstract propaganda assertions of Paragraph 29. The statement: "The Trotskyists have prepared themselves during the years of reaction for the revolutionary upsurge," can be subscribed to only with the greatest reservations. We absolutely acknowledge the subjectively sincere will in the preparation, but between what people think of themselves and what they are in reality, there often exists, by virtue of iron laws of class society, a tremendous difference. These laws inevitably become operative as soon as you fail to understand how to "keep abreast" of the living development. We have seen too many crises and degeneration, in our ranks too, to be able to pass over in silence the fact that we "prepared" ourselves for "the revolutionary upsurge" in a highly defective, irresolute, inadequate and incomplete way. We should come together on the basis of the subjectively indubitable sincere will and recognize the truth that our movement, in political and theoretical respects, has neither "a firm cadre" nor an "international organization." On the other hand, it is true that upon our shoulders "rests an historic responsibility." And this consists among other things in taking into account the situation as it really is. We "must render every assistance to our Italian and European co-thinkers to assemble the forces for the revolutionary Marxist Parties and strengthen those that already exist." That is what it says in one single paragraph about the "international organization," as if it were an entirely incontestable fact, and right thereafter about "those" parties that "already exist." We should rather start out with the honest declaration: As a result of unfavorable historical conditions and the devastating effects of the war, there "exists" unfortunately very little, and above all there is not one single "party." The thoughtless contradictions in which the draft indulges, injure our standing in the eyes of the world infinitely more than the practice of our principle: *Speak out what is*. More than a year has passed since the collapse of Italian Fascism. Another year will go by (we

forecast this here) and we will hear the same "indestructible" phrases. Will we be taken seriously at all? Will we ever reach an understanding of where the real tasks lie?

Let us recognize, in order to prepare a better future: we are worse off than was necessary. We failed in the past "to render every assistance to our Italian and European co-thinkers"; we often acted otherwise than "to strengthen those that already exist"; only the least of our work was carried through "with the greatest tactical flexibility and in a comradely spirit."

As to Italy, we recall particularly the cheerless "Editorial" in the *Militant*, composed entirely of dried-out, hollow, fantastic and hard-shell phrases, which made up the "answer" to the manifesto of the Italian comrades. At the time, we transmitted through the IS our opposition to this "Editorial"—it was scandalous to throw the "Russian Question" as a monkey-wrench among the Italian comrades, and to hand them, in a not very appealing way, worries that they need not have. Once and for all, it should be noted: It is absolutely possible to be a member of the Fourth *without sharing our views in the Russian question*—indeed, we have the unconditional right to propagate views that are contrary to your own.

How the German Section Was Treated

In so far as we ourselves are concerned, our experiences are extremely dreary. When we inquired in the IS last year about what the Plenum would take up at its sessions in October, comrade Logan gave us the embarrassed reply: "Trade-union questions." To our surprise, the result of the meeting was the "Resolution on the European Revolution," with everything that went along with it. Thus, it was not only deemed necessary to keep us uninformed and to "cut us out," but we were tricked in the shabbiest way in a *political question* which (as stated) *concerns us primarily*. This is the "comradely spirit" that animated the whole attitude toward us in *all political questions*. It so happens that we are one of the few sections that "already exist." We are one of the oldest and most stable organizations of the Fourth. Under conditions and difficulties about which the American comrades do not have the slightest notion, we issued a paper in the emigration and up to the outbreak of the war, published brochures, books and documents, and helped conspicuously to decide all the political questions. We attach great importance to saying to the convention: The leading American comrades are quite especially aware of the fact that Leon Trotsky greatly esteemed our work and never corrected us in a single *political question*. But anybody who knows the methods and aims of German Fascism will know that we do not have the slightest outlook of once more finding "remnants" of the German organization inside Germany when we return there. Our organization exists only abroad and is scattered all over the world. Following Erwin Wolff and Rudolph Clement, Walter Held, one of our greatest hopes, also fell into Stalin's hand.

We often contemplated the idea of submitting a memorandum on the German section to the Americans. Some day we shall perhaps be forced to do so, but for the moment we should like to say only this: We were called upon by the SWP leadership and by the IS to write articles, theses and replies. They were rejected without grounds being given, or else made public only after fourteen months of "working" on the organization (our "Three Theses"). In view of our situation, we sought for support—this was rejected on "grounds" about which a highly instructive brochure could be written. We submitted proposals—it was not even "deigned" to give us an answer. And we do not wish to be silent about this: we addressed an "Open Letter" to Max Shachtman and placed it at the disposal of the SWP. After we had waited long enough for a decision and had once more remained without a reply, we put the "Open Letter" in the hands of him to whom it was addressed. The "indignation" of the SWP leadership over our step and the miserable bureaucratic subterfuges of comrade Logan are adequately characterized by two simple facts.

First, comrade Logan, to whom as the then secretary of the IS, we had given the letter for transmission, understood his assignment very well and transmitted it to the SWP leadership. Second, the SWP leadership conferred on the letter and decided *against its publication*, but again it did not deem it necessary to communicate this to us. *Precisely because we learned of this, we refused at any cost to make inquiries of our own in the IS on how things stood.* On the contrary, after having exercised patience for

a long time, we were resolved to give the SWP leadership a first lesson in the simplest "comradely spirit."

We were naive and thought: *We* not only have the "duty" to understand our great American brother in all his "peculiarities"—but *for once* he, on the other hand, must also learn to understand a bit the little European brother. As we said in the open letter to Max Shachtman: "The horse philosophizes over the whip one way and the driver another." When comrade Frank, for example, is defending the viewpoints of the SWP leadership, he likes to use the phrase: "That's the way we build our party—that's the way it runs." We freely admit: *Our* organization "runs" in a "different" way. We believe that this whole system of bulletins (for "Committee members *only*," etc.), of prohibition of discussions, of concealment of differences of opinion (fear of public criticism the minute it touches "us") has *not the slightest thing in common* with Bolshevism, and must sooner or later ruin any organization. Bolshevism consists, on the contrary, in the most open discussion of all political and party-organizational questions before the eyes of the broadest masses (and primarily of the masses of workers), in the freedom of expression of all shadings and standpoints *within one and the same basic tendency*. Political questions (which include precisely all party questions) must not be dealt with "secretly" or "confidentially." The working methods of the SWP leadership only leads to having, at every moment, a "betrayed secret," an inner-organizational scandal which weakens the prestige of the organization inside and outside, and strengthens the tendency toward bureaucratization which is present in every organization. (In passing: We have just looked through a lot of convention material and found in it some outstanding contributions by comrade Lydia Bennett. Comrade Bennett—similarly comrade Morrison—feels exactly where the nub of the whole question lies. Her arguments are the finest and most striking proof that as a result of the procedure of the SWP leadership, there is not a single person who still understands how differences of opinion arise, what they signify, etc. Neither the members nor the masses can be trained in this way; still less can they gain unconditional confidence in the organization. But comrade Bennett is still laboring under the mistake that it is necessary to punish the "guilty one" who transmitted a "secret document" to an opponent organization. The "guilt" lies entirely and solely in the system that prevails. It is necessary to demolish this whole system from top to bottom, and to grasp this idea: Only such prohibitions should be made as *are correct and as can be carried out*. All other "prohibitions" should be violated, and their violation is a boon for the party which *would otherwise learn nothing* to the end of its days. We, for example, fought out a whole series of factional fights with a "method" which would look like "sheer madness" to you. That is, we did not have a single "internal" bulletin, we did not write a single letter or take a single measure without informing our opponent about it *even before* our friends, presenting him with copies, etc. It so "happened" always that our opponent had material resources at his disposal, whereas all we had was our ideas. The result, on every occasion, was that our opponent disappeared radically from the political surface. It will be said: "Emigrant politics." But we ask: Why did the others disappear, and not we? We believe (to answer our question exactly): We really learned something from the "emigrant" Lenin, whereas others think they are "Bolsheviks."

To summarize: We do not complain about the insinuations against us made from Minneapolis to London: "Emigrants—very nice fellows;—unfortunately, suffered a lot of defeats;—have a certain psychology;—a little bit screwy;—nice fellows." But we ask the convention: Do you think that we write open letters and (upon request) documents about our views in order to have them buried unceremoniously—without so much as letting us know why it was that we "died"? What European "co-thinkers" is it that you propose to "strengthen," and who is it you want to make the European revolution with, if not those rare specimens who have survived the European catastrophe physically and politically? Do you believe that the best way of promoting the European revolution consists of gagging and discrediting these rare specimens?

8. In connection with the question of the party, we point further particularly to the tautological formulation of paragraph 26. This and the following paragraphs up to the end of the section on Italy are especially empty, abstract, weak, useless. Not a word in paragraph 1 corresponding to the reality. It should be replaced by the frank admission that the SWP needs an ideological and political reorientation.

Russia and the "Red Army"

9. Without entering into the Russian question itself, we should merely like to call attention to the untenable inconsistency which the draft reveals in this respect, too, due to the lack of a sound theoretical foundation. You cannot (as is done in paragraph 50 and elsewhere) underscore the unequivocally counter-revolutionary character of the Stalin-policy, exclusively reactionary in all and every respect, completely interwoven with and overtrumping the imperialist policy of the Allies—and then evade the consequences. The draft endeavors to reconcile the old theoretical position and the reality by means of a quotation from Trotsky which has been outstripped by the reality. The least that the draft must say is: "Red Army" appears and can appear *only* as Stalin's agent. *Everywhere it will only be the armed weapon of the counter-revolution.* It must be treated with the same methods as all the other imperialist armies.

10. Therewith stands the question of the destruction of Stalinist influence in general. Especially in the oral discussions with the European comrades we have steadfastly emphasized that the "Stalinist influence" is more of a phantom than a solid reality. The whole question reduces itself in the last analysis to the weakness of the opponents of the Stalinists—a phenomenon which we were able to study only too well in Germany and in France. In the "Three Theses," we sought with great deliberateness only to outline the situation, appraise the forces and to set down the task that towers above all the others. We wrote especially: "However one views it, the transition from fascism to socialism remains a utopia without an intermediate stage, which is *basically* equivalent to a democratic revolution."

On the basis of his formulation, comrade Morrow ascribed to us a "false theory of stages," which we never even dreamed of. (It is to the merit of comrades Morrow and Morrison that they at least honestly wanted to discuss.) The senior schoolmaster, comrade Logan, discovered in his dictionary that the German word "Umwaelzung" should be translated into "revolution." And a "democratic revolution," he rejects. (Comrade Logan was "mistaken" on the word "Umwaelzung" in spite of the dictionary, but we calmly made him a present of it.) Since then, much paper has been wasted on the profound question: Will the Allies install fascist or "democratic" governments in the occupied countries; will the bourgeoisie seek to save itself by a "restoration" of "democracy"; can that last for a long or a short time? We think, as we did before, that these are idle jests. Today, just as three years ago, the problem is to formulate the fundamental task and to analyze the situation. Fourteen months after the overthrow of Italian Fascism can very conveniently be accommodated in a "theory of stages"—even if nobody has noticed up to now that in discussing all the things the bourgeoisie and the Allies are going to do next, he is already practicing our alleged "theory." In any case: the bourgeoisie and the Allies have already sought to deceive in the Fascist and in the "democratic" way in Italy. Are we finally ready to come forward in favor of free elections in order to expose the Allies before the whole world and to permit the camp of their adversary to crystallize? If not, the phantom of the "Stalinist influence" will continue to exist thanks to our past and present narrowness, and we may as well be resigned to all kinds of "stages." Today, the opponent of the "democratic revolution," comrade Logan, writes: "With its democratic and patriotic illusions the atmosphere was somewhat reminiscent of that of the 19th century revolution." This is the finest "shamefaced" acknowledgment of our position and of the "democratic revolution" we have met with up to now. But comrade Logan also writes:

"A more and more loudly voiced opposition to de Gaulle will come from his left. A possible variant is an increasing Socialist and Stalinist participation in the cabinet. We may even see a Stalinist-Socialist cabinet, with de Gaulle relegated to the democratic post of president of the Republic."

Hence, following the "democratic revolution"—other "stages." We think that this time comrade Logan is calculating more correctly even if what we continue to see unfold is, exclusively that process "which is *basically* equivalent to a democratic revolution." We ask unrelentingly: Are we finally going to concern ourselves with this process and simply dissolve into thin air the Stalinist influence (which is untenable in a world in which it encounters real opponents)? And we ask: Where are the infinite recipes, prescriptions, "tactics," etc., which comrade Logan scattered so amply on all sides when things had not yet gone "so far"? The French section of the Fourth is not even mentioned in his article. As to our

own tasks, he suddenly has *nothing* to say. A fanfare of trumpets concludes his observations: "Victory will not be easy. But the French workers have made a good start: coming out of the political primitivism of German oppression, they have immediately started to storm capitalist society."

That is how, on the one side, the reality plays us nothing but dirty tricks; and on the other side, everything moves "spontaneously." The same picture in every other question. Everyone now speaks of the Balkanization and colonization of Europe—our "Three Theses" were burned because of it. Everyone now speaks of "slave labor" and of the intentions of the Russians to perpetuate slave labor—the "Three Theses" were abused for it. But today the development to the slave state is no longer a secret, and the Russians must be opposed under all circumstances with armed resistance. And the Fourth is still non-existent in most countries. Do you want to continue to acknowledge this in concealed form in certain "Editorials," and act in practice as if the "Three Theses" committed blasphemy in asserting that, at least in Europe, there is no *organized labor movement*?

11. In conclusion: the factual dissolution of international collaboration is expressed most crassly in the IS. It has ceased to exist even as a formal and absolutely impotent body—the SWP decides everything sovereignly. There has never been such a state of affairs—although a well-functioning IS was never more necessary than now. The convention must take up this question, in which is summarized all the misery of the Fourth.

"When the Heart Is Full, the Mouth Speaketh"

A German proverb has it: When the heart is full, the mouth speaketh. We beg the comrades to excuse us if this letter has grown longer than was intended. There is no time left to go over it editorially or for style. But we hope that it will be understood in the way it is meant: as an expression of the concern of old and experienced comrades, who have spent all their conscious life in the movement, and can keep silent no longer. We would not have written had we thought: the situation is 'hopeless.' On the contrary, we believe that with the silencing of Trotsky, upon whose counsel and judgment we all depended, great difficulties and a severe setback were inevitable. We are acting in the spirit of our murdered comrade if we cast up the balance sheet of the period since his death. It will be impossible for the convention to do such a job—it can only start on it and make preparations to finish it. If we may give advice, it is this: preparation and energetic carrying-out of the discussion for at least half a year. The entire discussion should be conducted as publicly as possible, so that everyone can be convinced of the seriousness of your work, form an independent judgment and acquire confidence. It hurts neither the prestige of the leadership nor that of the organization when it speaks openly about everything—on the contrary, it destroys the legend that all evil stems from "Bolshevik principles." Let the convention, at the beginning of its sessions, take the resolve: No discussion on questions of discipline, on bureaucratism and the like. Lenin showed for the 100th time in his *Infantile Malady*, that "discipline" can never be the pre-condition but always only the *result* of a *long-lastingly correct policy*. If the convention keeps rigorously to the political questions and derives from them the most urgently needed measures (with regard to the methods of work as well), the question of discipline will solve itself in practice. There is no other road to success—the abstract question of discipline can only poison everything. In this spirit, we wish the convention a fruitful labor with all our heart, and send it our comradely greetings.

Auslandskomitee der Internationalen
Kommunisten Deutschlands
(Committee Abroad of the International
Communists of Germany)

London,
October 22, 1944.

A COST-PLUS WAGE

An Answer to the Wage-Freeze

By MAX SHACHTMAN

PRICE: 5 CENTS

IN BUNDLES: 3 CENTS