

July, 1941

# **THE NEW INTERNATIONAL**

*A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism*

---

---

## *Hitler's Attack on Russia*

**A New Turn in the War**

*By DAVID COOLIDGE:*

## **Roosevelt and Labor**

*By ALBERT GATES:*

## **Burnham and His Managers**

---

**DISCUSSION ARTICLES**

**BOOK REVIEWS**

**CLIPPINGS**

---

## **Franz Mehring on Historical Materialism**

---

---

**Twenty Cents Single Copy . . . Subscription Per Year \$1.50**

## THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

*A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism*

Volume VII July 1941 No. 6, Whole No. 54

Published monthly by NEW INTERNATIONAL Publishing Company, 114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. Telephone CHelsea 2,9681. Subscription rates: \$1.50 per year; bundles, 10c for 5 copies and up. Canada and foreign: \$1.75 per year; bundles, 12c for 5 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

Editorial Board:

ALBERT GATES, J. R. JOHNSON, MAX SHACHTMAN

Business Manager: JOHN BILLINGS

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

HITLER'S ATTACK ON RUSSIA A New Turn in the War .....	131
ROOSEVELT AND LABOR By David Coolidge .....	138
BURNHAM AND HIS MANAGERS By Albert Gates .....	143
DISCUSSION ARTICLE: THE RUSSIAN STATE By W. Kent .....	143
ARCHIVES OF THE REVOLUTION: CONCERNING HISTORICAL MATERIALISM By Franz Mehring .....	151
WAR POLICY IN ENGLAND By Henry Judd .....	154
BOOKS: WORKERS IN RUSSIA By Frank Demby .....	156
IN SEARCH OF LIGHT By Eugene Victor .....	157
CLIPPINGS .....	159



*Special  
Introductory Offer*

# LABOR ACTION

*Weekly Newspaper of the Workers Party  
3 Month Subscription—Only 25c.*

Regular articles and news on the war, problems affecting Negro and white workers, unemployment, trade union news, etc.

LABOR ACTION  
114 West 14th Street  
New York, N. Y.

Please send me LABOR ACTION each week for three months. I enclose 25c.

Name .....

Address .....

City..... State.....

*Published by the*

**WORKERS PARTY**

114 WEST 14th STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

June, 1941

## A 32-Page New International

*The Finest Marxist Theoretical Organ*

**SUBSCRIBE NOW!**

**\$1.50 PER YEAR**

Name .....

Address .....

City..... State.....

I also wish to contribute .....

### SUBSCRIBE TO

*America's Fighting Youth Paper:*

## THE CHALLENGE OF YOUTH

*Six Months for 10 Cents*

**YOUNG PEOPLES SOCIALIST LEAGUE**

**Youth Section, Workers Party**

114 West 14th Street

New York, N. Y.

## Hitler's Attack on Russia

### A New Turn in the War

THE LIFE OF THE political prophet, in recent years, is a most exciting one. If he cannot be consistently correct in his forecasts, he can, in any case, observe the rapidity of changing events, for, indeed, there is no lack of gigantic overnight transformations having decisive political and military consequences in the very midst of World War II. War is one of the sharpest forms of the social crisis. Occurrences are rapid and successive; many appear to be illogical and without reasonable foundation. Sad, indeed, then, is life for those who have no sound political moorings. Events beat mercilessly upon their heads whilst they bend and break under the blows, seeking catchholds in every direction, but never once landing upright and able to understand clearly the reason of it all. Marxists search for the root causes of events and if they do not always answer every problem, they can and do reasonably approximate the true answer.

In August of 1939, the hangman of the Russian Revolution "Cain" Stalin, signed a solemn pact of non-aggression with that sterling dove of peace, Hitler. Thus the arch-enemies became bosom friends. The pact of peace was to cover a period of ten years! Its justification was, said Molotov, Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, that it "guaranteed peace in the world." The immediate effect of the pact was the collapse of the campaign, planned and initiated by Stalin's international agent, the Comintern, for collective security, the Peoples Front and the war of the democratic nations against the fascist. Although the Stalinist parties throughout the world were literally speechless for several days while awaiting cabled instructions from Moscow, the drive for collective security ceased abruptly.

#### The Aftermath of the Pact

Thereafter came the dawn. The capitalist world personified in Anglo-French-American imperialism denounced Stalin and the Soviet Union as "cheats, double-dealers, dishonest and godless people" without "integrity or shame," and concluded that, after all, the democratic imperialists should have been prepared for this double-cross (one must not forget that the Hitler-Stalin pact was long in the making and at the time of its announcement an Anglo-French military and political mission was in Moscow attempting to bring about an alliance of its own with Stalin) since Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union were merely different sides of the same coin.

Hitler and Von Ribbentrop hailed the pact as a great historical achievement on the ground that Germany and the Soviet Union were in reality "natural" allies; that the democratic imperialists were responsible for hitherto keeping apart these "natural" friends; that there never was the slightest reason for a conflict between the two countries and that the pact which guaranteed their peace for ten years would be renewed for many decades!

The brown shirted murderers were not alone in their praise. Stalin graced the diplomatic conferences with an ebullient smile, as if to inform his world cohorts that this was really "the goods"; it wasn't just a Trotskyist slander. The pact was justified as a measure of peace, the single guarantee of peace on the European Continent. Fascism was a matter of personal taste, according to Molotov. There was no real point of conflict between the two countries.

#### The Common Interests of Stalin and Hitler

In a speech to the Supreme Soviet Council on August 1, 1940, Molotov declared:

"The good-neighborly, friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Germany are not based on fortuitous considerations of a transient nature, but on fundamental state interests of both the USSR and Germany."

What transpired in a few weeks after the seal was set to the treaty is now history. Assured of her eastern borders, the German military machine began to march, and Poland, its first victim, fell. Stalin marched, too. He took part of Poland in agreement with Hitler. Stalin also took Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia. In the midst of the outbreak of the Second World War, which came as a mockery of Molotov's declarations about the insurance of peace, Stalin's Red Army crossed the borders of Finland. Throughout the world, the Soviet Union became indistinguishable from Nazi Germany. The explanation given for these movements of the Red Army was the need for protection of the borders of the Soviet Union from aggression by Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia and Finland. The latter country was denounced as a tool of Great Britain and America! Great Britain was declared to be the main enemy of the Soviet Union! Russia thence became a source of material support to Germany in the war; it was also the base where were formulated the policies of what remained of the Comintern in the bourgeois world, and the subsequent chaos and confusion created by the Stalinist parties in all countries was without bounds. Stalin sought, by his adventures, to increase "the power, prestige and revenue" of his enormous bureaucracy.

In the United States, in Great Britain, in France, the war was denounced as imperialist. Germany, according to the Stalinist penmen, was fighting a defensive war to protect itself against Great Britain. Thus, on May 19, 1940, the *Sunday Workers*, quoting a Red Army commentator, wrote:

"The official memorandum of the German government states that German troops are going into Belgium and Holland in order to prevent its enemies from using these countries for the struggle against Germany. It is quite probable that this is the main objective."

The Communist Parties, wherever possible, developed campaigns against the Anglo-American sector of the war front. In

England, the People's Convention was called for the purpose of fighting for a People's Government which would proclaim as its immediate purpose the establishment of peace. In the United States a desperate struggle was organized against aid to England, the Lease-Lend Bill and American preparations for entry into war. The Stalinist propaganda was neither anti-militarist nor anti-imperialist. It was opposed only to one camp in the war, the Anglo-America. One way or another, by innuendo or directly, it justified Germany's participation in the war as being forced upon her; omitted references to the Axis in its pretended anti-war tirades, or pleasantly chastised fascism when the expediency demanded it. But there was no mistaking its genuine policy: the Soviet Union was an ally of Germany, a junior member of the Axis, but, nevertheless, a member in good standing. As a subordinate member of one of the warring camps, it was integrally a part of the imperialist war. Its propaganda and agitation conformed to its place in the war. The Communist Parties became, automatically and not always subtly, propaganda agents for the Axis. That was the necessary and logical result of the Hitler-Stalin pact.

## What Impelled Hitler's Attack Now?

The German attack upon the Soviet Union came as swiftly, and as surprisingly, as the Pact of 1939. The pact, ostensibly designed to keep the peace and secure the neutrality of the Soviet Union for at least ten years burst asunder one year and ten months after it was "sealed by the blood of both countries" (Molotov). The explanation for this event can not be found in the philosophies which govern the two countries. Those who complacently asserted that the coming together of the two countries was "a natural," are now stunned. It cannot be found in the supposedly "socialist character" of Stalin's Russia. The explanation of the attack on Russia is to be found solely upon military grounds. In war, countries which pursue a purely national policy (all the participants in this war do), govern themselves primarily upon, and act in accordance with, their vital national interests. Thus, to understand Hitler's policy one must understand the development of the war.

### The War at the Present Stage

We do not propose to make a thorough military analysis of the war. But certain important facts emerge from the whole panorama of the conflict. They are:

1. Hitler hoped, with the signing of the Russian pact, to conclude the war in a short time. His military staff apparently knew the state of Allied arms and had promised a quick victory. The theory of the blitzkrieg was predicated upon the idea of a rapid, all-out attack upon the enemies, employing immense air armadas, wave upon wave of tanks, great formations of artillery batteries and masses of men, all coordinated in one mighty offensive. Being well aware that a prolonged war might end disastrously for the Reich, Hitler promised the nation immediate victory and peace, with enormous gains in Europe, a colonial empire and economic prosperity, yea, even (sic) socialism.

2. Securing its eastern border, Germany turned to the west. There it was faced with the combined armed might of the Anglo-French alliance, an opposing force which soon dis-

integrated before the new military methods of the modernized and mechanized Reich army. France capitulated, adding her name to the long list of conquered nations. The number of victims was imposing and yet Hitler, even though he had so far achieved many small victories, failed to bring the war to a conclusion.

Germany now occupies and controls the entire western coast of Europe. It controls the Baltic Sea. It defeated England in the Balkans and won the Island of Crete. The Battle of the Atlantic is still being fought, but Hitler is truly master of all Europe west of the Soviet Union. However, he is still a long way from achieving his cardinal objective.

### The British Continue to Fight On

3. The British Empire, to the utter surprise and amazement of many and the chagrin of Hitler, while battered and groggy, continues to stand up. Moreover, it is fighting back with great courage and determination, since British imperialism is struggling for its very life. The great industrial machinery of the United States moves ahead with giant strides and, as production increases, enormous quantities of war materials are shipped to England, enhancing the strength of John Bull, whose military power is rising rather than diminishing with the passage of time. In addition, the Empire has enormous resources which are only first beginning to make themselves felt. English losses, except on the sea, are not actually debilitating. Her army remains intact, her navy is still dominant over the Axis, her air force, surprisingly efficient, is growing quantitatively and her arms are constantly increased.

4. The United States is a more belligerent opponent of the Axis. Roosevelt long ago placed America in the camp of the "democracies" presumably engaged in a great struggle against the ideology of fascism. America daily moves closer to actual military participation in the war. The occupation of Iceland by American sailors and marines, and Roosevelt's warning that he will not tolerate Axis attacks on the North Atlantic sea lanes, is an open invitation to Hitler to make the first move ere the American Navy goes into action. Intervention of the United States has brought home to Germany the conviction that this war will not end quickly, that it must now prepare for a long, long struggle.

5. The war is now approaching the close of its second year and has long since passed "the blitzkrieg stage." The concrete state of the war and its apparent endlessness belie its blitzkrieg character. In recognition of this salient fact the German military machine now charts its course.

### Why the Attack Is Made Now

With this brief summary, it becomes clearer why Germany turned east against its erstwhile partner. If the war is to be a long one, if Germany must face the material might of the United States and its probable entrance into the war, she must have the means whereby a prolonged war may be fought. Russia offers a material source for waging a prolonged war. With her western borders presently inviolate, the north impregnable, the Mediterranean shores well guarded, Germany could attack Russia without paralyzing interferences from other fronts. Thus Stalin reaped a harvest from seed planted long ago.

There is not the slightest doubt that the break between Hitler and Stalin came over the demands made of the Kremlin dictator. The precise character of these demands is not definitely known. But it is bruited about that Hitler de-

manded the whole production of Russia oil, all the grain produce of the Ukraine and, above all, demobilization of the Red Army, which did appear as a Dacomlean sword and which, through its mobilization, was using up enormous quantities of materials needed by the Reich. In addition, it is reported that Hitler demanded control of Russian economy, to subordinate it to Germany's war requirements. It was all or nothing. Rumors of a conflict between Stalin and his military staff do not appear to be fiction. Stalin was ready to yield, at least in part, to Hitler. But the demands were so paralyzing that capitulation could not be carried through without sharp internal reverberations.

It is reasonable to suppose, on the basis of the latest turn of events, that the Hess trip to England was taken for the express purpose of working out some *modus vivendi* with the British, in preparation for the German attack on the Soviet Union. It is reasonable to suppose, too, that England may have forewarned Stalin and that this fact was responsible for his sudden assumption to the post of Premier—to be able to command, no matter what course would be chosen. The Red Army, at the very least, was in partial readiness for the attack which came without the preliminary declaration of war.

No matter, once German troops were on the march Stalin had no choice. Capitulation now was precluded by the military situation. It was necessary to fight to the grim end. But the attack itself was a measure of desperation on Hitler's part also. His huge army can not remain immobile. He must constantly produce victorious results for fear of repercussions at home. The war thus drives him to desperate acts.

## Why Was the German Attack a Surprise?

The idea that Germany might attack the Soviet Union, at one stage or another of the war, was forecast in many circles. For many it was merely a guess. Others who took a long-term view on the war regarded it as inevitable, but nobody expected it so soon, and least of all the Soviet Union, the Communist Parties and their peripheries.

On June 19th, the June 24th issue of *The New Masses* appeared for public sale. Rumors had been rife for several weeks about strained Russo-German relations. But an editorial of *The New Masses* sought to calm the fears of the more agitated by saying:

"Useful as the (war) rumor was designed to be, it also indicated the course of the British government's wishful thinking. Remember that a Soviet-German war is only conceivable if Germany first reached an understanding with Great Britain." (Emphasis mine—A. G.)

How come then? Why was the Stalinist movement taken by such unalloyed surprise by the German attack? Because, as our *Labor Action* correspondent pointed out, Stalin was prepared to capitulate to Hitler's demands! In the end, either German demands were too great, or German patience was exhausted, or both. Once the Russo-German war broke out, the international game of changing horses mid-stream began.

In correspondence with the "new line" brought about by the new world situation, an editorial in the *Daily Worker* offered the following post-mortem explanation of past relations between Stalin and Hitler. It said:

"One of your (the bourgeois press) favorite inventions which you have used *ad nauseum* was the 'alliance' which you said existed between the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. Hitler's war aggression has demon-

strated that this was merely a fiction, created in your offices. It was non-existent, as the *Daily Worker* has said times innumerable."

## How They Continue to Lie

Obviously, the *Daily Worker* lies! If surprise and confusion are now rampant, it is due in the main to the manner in which the Soviet Union initiated its pact with Hitler, the course it pursued in the furtherance of the same, and the lengths to which it was prepared to go to maintain its hitherto "warm and genial" relations with the Third Reich.

At no time did the leaders of the Soviet Union declare that the Hitler-Stalin pact was the result of dire necessity in the interest of gaining time and preparing for the future. If it is countered that the régime could not very well say such a thing, we reply, first of all, that such was not Lenin's way in these matters, for he was concerned, in the last analysis, with the effect his actions would have upon the world proletariat and international socialism. Secondly, if diplomatic considerations prevented telling the whole truth about the pact, then neither was it incumbent upon the Soviet Union to misrepresent its true nature to the world.

That the *New Leader* was shocked by the turn of events is not to be wondered at, since these sterling observers of current events through reactionary and counter-revolutionary glasses believed that the Stalin-Hitler pact was a product of Stalin's world revolutionary aims. They believed that "Stalin himself helped Hitler to power in the hope that with the hands of the Berlin dictator he would make the Communist 'world revolution.'" But the very fact that they believe that Stalin, the hangman of the international revolutionary movement, aimed or is now aiming for a Communist world revolution, disqualifies them from serious consideration as analysts of world political problems. Their hatred of Stalin stems not from their abhorrence of his counter-revolutionary course, but from the false belief that he truly represents the movement for international socialism. Finally, their analysis concludes that Hitler is an untruthful and unreliable monster, never to be trusted. His attack on Russia is proof positive that he desires to rule the world. Anyway, Stalin got what was coming to him.

We have already referred to bourgeois opinion. Their analysis was always superficial, based upon secondary factors. But since the greater part of that group herald the war as a boon to the Anglo-American war camp, they are satisfied to let well enough alone. It is in the ranks of the labor and political movement of the workers, however, that enormous reverberations occur.

## In Partial Summary

Let us recapitulate the rôle of the Soviet Union in this war up to the moment when its partner turned. The pact gave the signal to Germany to open hostilities. The Red Army marched with Hitler on the basis of a prior agreement to divide Poland. While the war raged in the west Stalin seized the Baltic states and opened war on Finland. In each of these concrete instances, Russia's rôle in the war was indistinguishable from that of Germany. By her material aid to Germany she made possible, if only in part, the latter's prosecution of the war. Propagandistically, all her attacks were upon England and America as warmongers. Germany was absolved of blame. In general, Russia's rôle in the war was anti-proletarian, anti-socialist and pro-Axis. The bulk of the conscious proletariat throughout the world became alienated from the Soviet Union and were made easy victims of the demagogic propaganda of the democratic imperialists. Everyone understand that in

England and the United States, for example, the campaign against war and for peace was a policy operating in the interests of the fascist Axis. These facts are ineradicable proof of the fact that the Russo-German pact converted the Soviet Union into a junior partner of Adolph Hitler. The dénouement is here, but at what a cost! The Soviet Union, forcibly ejected from one of the warring camps, now slides ungracefully into another camp, the camp of its former opponent, if not enemy.

## Has the Character of the War Changed?

The attack upon the Soviet Union has, naturally, again raised the question of Russia's rôle in the war. Has the German assault really changed the character of the war? Is the war any less imperialist now than prior to the attack? Does the new cooperation between Russia and the Anglo-American camp change the latter's position in the war? Is Stalin's defense aimed at safeguarding the "socialist" achievements of the October Revolution? These are some of the questions which require answers. Our answers are in part already indicated. They are based upon fundamental considerations relating to the character of the Russian state and the concrete position that the Soviet Union bears to the other powers.

The Communist Party and the unions and organizations which it controls, its press, the Cannon group, the Oehler group, *The Nation* and *The New Republic* and a variety of other individuals have hastened into print, all with the general acclaim: the character of the war has changed! With Hitler's attack upon Russia, it is necessary to rise to the defense of Stalin's state. The Stalinists proclaim that the Red Army is engaged in a crusade to defend "socialist" Russia against fascism. The liberals have rediscovered the impelling necessity to defend "democratic" Russia from totalitarian attack and in this manner realize the best defense of England and world civilization. The Cannon group and the Oehler group hasten to characterize Russia's position in war as that of a degenerated workers' state with nationalized property fighting reaction, and call for support to the "revolutionary war of defense" of the Red Army.

All follow the specious argumentation developed by William Z. Foster in his speech before the National Committee of the Communist Party, where he said:

"Hitler's attack upon the Soviet Union changes the character of the World War, and thereby makes necessary changes in our party's attitude toward that war. Previously the war had been a struggle between the rival imperialist power groupings. . . . With Hitler's war against the Soviet Union the whole situation is basically altered."

This new line of Stalinism, which has great practical political significance, as we shall soon establish, is repeated in the manifesto of the American Communist Party which began: "The people of our country face a new world situation."

The only new situation in the present war is that Hitler turned upon an erstwhile ally. But this important political and military fact does not and can not alter the basic character of the war, despite the involvement of the Soviet Union. To say with the Stalinists that the attack of Hitler is an attack upon socialism, or a workers' state, however degenerated, or upon nationalized property *per se*, is merely repeating in reverse the clamor of Hitler and his wild cohorts that his war is a crusade against Bolshevism. Neither is the case.

A defense of Stalin can be justified only upon the following grounds: that the base of world socialism is threatened; that it is socialism in the Soviet Union which is being attacked and that a workers' state, however degenerated, is imperiled. None of these conditions obtain in the present situation.

Stalin's defense is purely nationalistic, having not the slightest relationship to socialism. The "genial" leader has already placed his country in the camp of the "democratic" nations fighting aggression! He has been warmly and enthusiastically received by Churchill and Eden. The transformation of the policies of the Communist Parties is in response to the nationalist requirements of the Stalinist régime. In the final analysis, Stalin is fighting solely for the preservation of his bureaucratic régime which ruthlessly exploits the Russian proletariat.

In what way, for example, has the attack upon the Soviet Union altered overnight "the struggle between the rival imperialist power groupings"? Is England's defense of her imperialist empire made more palatable now that Stalin is attacked and forms an alliance with her? Are American imperialist aims similarly altered? This is hardly so. The war remains fundamentally unchanged. The attack upon the Soviet Union is merely a tangent of the main current of the war: the struggle between German imperialism and Anglo-American imperialism. The war against Russia is subordinated to that main aim, for victory on that front may enable Hitler to continue his war in the west! Hitler is still fighting for world domination, for permanent control over Europe, for a colonial empire. At best, a victory over Russia can only serve as a means of achieving his desired goal. Contrariwise, England and America are fighting to preserve their present holdings and to destroy once and for all a most desperate and dangerous rival. Has the war, then, changed on this sector?

The Russian state, moreover, is a bureaucratic state. The bureaucracy represents a new class in the Soviet Union, resting upon the state ownership of the means of production (nationalized property) and the brutal exploitation of the Russian masses. There is not a scintilla of socialism in Stalin's domain, and a defense of the Soviet Union as such has nothing in common with a defense of the basic interest of the Russian or the international proletariat. Stalin's defense is in the tradition of nationalist defense, in this case waged in behalf of a dominant economic group, the bureaucracy.

### What Is Bureaucracy Fighting For?

The attempt to describe the outbreak of Russo-German hostilities as a struggle between bourgeois imperialist economy and nationalized property is a pure invention having no basis in fact. It was not the character of Russian economy which drove Hitler to attack (if this was his aim, he could have done it more effectively at the time the Munich pact was signed); had he been able to obtain full concessions to his demands there would have been no war, the character of Russian economy notwithstanding. Precisely the character of the international situation and the nature of the World War excludes the idea that Russia's particular struggle is against imperialist economy. Those who stand upon a position of defensism on this ground are merely inventing a situation to sustain a viewpoint based, not on the realities of the war, but upon sentiment and outlived considerations.

It is contended that an alliance between Russia and the democratic powers would not automatically lend a reactionary semi-imperialist stamp to Russia's struggle. This would be automatically true if the Soviet Union were a workers' state

or represented in this war the prerequisites for the advance of the international socialist interests of the world proletariat. In the absence of these conditions, what is Stalin fighting for?

There is general agreement in our party that the Soviet Union is not a workers' state and that the Stalin bureaucracy is a new social class emerging from the peculiarly mixed character of Soviet economy. The answer to the question, what is Stalin fighting for, is to be sought in the nature of the bureaucracy as a new class. Stalin is fighting for the retention of the economic, political and social power of that class. Given these conditions, given the relationship of the Soviet Union to the imperialist powers in this war, Stalin's struggle is not one waged in behalf of nationalized property as an economic form, but for the preservation of the bureaucratic régime which exists on the basis of nationalized property.

Nationalized property in the Soviet Union, therefore, can not, merely by its existence, have a fundamentally decisive effect upon the character of the war. Nationalized property, for example, did not make progressive Stalin's attack upon Finland. The essential task of the proletariat in Russia is the same as the task of the proletariat elsewhere in the bourgeois world. This is not, however, tantamount to saying that Russian economy and capitalist economy are identical. They are different. But, as one sector of the imperialist world finds it necessary to attack Russia in consonance with its particular war needs, another sector, for exactly identical reasons, makes an alliance with it. Nationalized property, therefore, is not the determinant for characterizing this war. To proceed from that point of departure is to go astray of the true situation. In the instant case, Hitler wants from Russia what he wants from other nations, no matter what the character of their economies.

Given these fundamental considerations, it is not necessary for Stalin to surrender the Soviet Union over to Anglo-American imperialism to transform his rôle in the war into a reactionary one. Why should Stalin turn the Soviet Union over to Great Britain or the United States? What becomes of our analysis of the Stalin bureaucracy as a class? Precisely because this bureaucracy is a new class, with complete economic and political power, it fights to defend that power against anyone who would dethrone it. There is no basic reason why Stalin should turn internal power over to any other country; on the contrary, there is every good reason why he does not and why he fights so determinedly to maintain his rule, not only against other imperialist nations, but, above all, against the Russian proletariat. In saying this, we do not imply that Stalin will fail to travel the high road of collaboration with England and the United States in order to maintain his reign. The presently announced pact between Great Britain and the Soviet Union, barring either party from making a separate peace, only draws closer and subordinates the Soviet Union to its more powerful ally.

It is true, if a workers' state existed in the Soviet Union, if it represented the world base for socialism, an alliance with England and America would not, in and of itself, make Russia's rôle reactionary in this war. But this does not obtain in the Soviet Union. It is, we repeat, precisely the class position of Stalin's bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, and the relation of that bureaucracy to world imperialism in this war which makes it reactionary.

## Stalin's Speech and the 'New' Party Line

No better proof of the foregoing is offered than the speeches of Churchill, Eden, Roosevelt and Stalin. Their unanimity is indeed touching. Outstanding in their common attitude to the new turn in the war is the manner in which they brush aside secondary and superficial considerations for the real questions involved.

Churchill and Eden, in the name of the British Empire, and Roosevelt, in behalf of American imperialism, declared their continued hatred for communism and, consequently, the Russian Revolution. But they are unanimously determined not to permit these "secondary" questions to obliterate their main aim in the war: destruction of Hitler and German imperialism. There is nothing in the character of Stalin's prosecution of the war or in the conduct of Stalin's agents in their countries to cause them anxiety. They are certain that Stalin's nationalism makes him a safe gamble and they are even more certain that they shall not be confronted with the discomfiture of "defeatist" socialist propaganda by the Comintern behind the lines. The Stalinist holiday is over.

Stalin's speech is the barometer for judging Russia's part in the war and the manner in which it intends to prosecute it. It is a commonplace to say of a speech by Stalin that it contains the commonest of platitudes, that it is dry and stale or that it lacks relationship to the socialist ideal or practice. In this case it stands out more boldly because, unfortunately, it is not a Soviet Congress with which we are concerned. Those who had hoped that now, under the conditions of an invasion of the Soviet Union, Stalin would be compelled to revert to his Bolshevik past, are disappointed. Aside from its brazen justification for the pact with Hitler, the speech is in the tradition of past Russian rulers.

### The Aim of the War

Firstly, Stalin identifies the Soviet Union as a "democratic power" fighting together with England and the United States. Fascism, which was only yesterday a matter of "personal taste," has now become abhorrent and "savage." The Russo-German pact, which was "sealed by the blood of both countries," is dishonestly described in *post factum* manner as follows:

"I think that not a single peace-loving state could decline a peace treaty with a neighboring state even though the latter was headed by such fiends and cannibals as Hitler and Ribbentrop. . . . The peoples of the Soviet Union now see that there is no taming (it could not see it before -A.G.) of German fascism in its savage fury and hatred of our country, which has insured all working people labor in freedom and prosperity."

In the tradition of the bourgeois statesman, with the same specious reasoning, Stalin defines the war as a war of the "entire Soviet people against the German fascist forces." He is even less the internationalist than Churchill or Roosevelt when he declares:

"The aim of this national war in defense of our country against the fascist oppressors is not only elimination of the danger hanging over our country, but also aid to all European peoples groaning under the yoke of German fascism."

### Stalin's Bourgeois War

Yes, for Stalin this is a national war in defense of his country. In this war he has "loyal allies in the peoples of Europe and America." His war will merge with the struggles of these



people "for democratic liberties." While the cruel despot of the Kremlin thus speaks of the "peoples" and "democratic liberties," he fails to say anything about socialism and omits even the slightest word about the oppressed proletariat of the world, of the hundreds of millions of enslaved colonial peoples under the heel of world imperialism (England, America, France, etc.). There is nothing of the ringing cry of Bolshevism calling for the exploited of the world to overthrow their exploiters and establish true freedom and true democracy in the new order of socialism. National despot that he is, he can not wage a revolutionary war against Hitler; he can not even carry on a defeatist propaganda against the bloody fascist régime in Germany. Like the war of Britain and America against Hitler, it is being fought by purely military means. For just as Churchill and Roosevelt, molded and influenced by their class positions, dare not employ revolutionary methods in the midst of the war, methods which might realize the overthrow of Hitler, so Stalin (personification of the bureaucracy), circumscribed by his class position, can not and dare not resort to revolutionary means of prosecuting the war.

Stalin, to be sure, finds place in his speech to praise "the historic utterance of British Prime Minister Churchill," for his declaration of support to Russia in the war against Germany. He calls upon the Russian masses to support and "rally around the party of Lenin-Stalin" (1), for the totalitarian despot, no matter under what circumstances, must constantly carry along his totalitarian ideological baggage and force its imprint upon the minds of the people. Every word expressed by Stalin is opposed to the genuine internationalist and socialist spirit. He fears revolution no less than his new found democratic bourgeois allies. In the present period, one spark can serve to ignite a flame that might travel around the earth, to swamp all the bloody tyrants who rule over oppressed humanity. Stalin's régime would be among the first to fall.

The democratic bourgeois world accepted Stalin's speech with great enthusiasm. If there are revolutionaries and socialists who do not yet understand that the speech was the expression of a program and a policy, the *New York Times* does not make this mistake. In an editorial of July 4 entitled "Back to the Russian Earth," the *Times* writes:

"Stalin's broadcast yesterday was not the appeal of the Communist leader to the embattled proletariat. . . . It is no class war now to which the Supreme Commissar summons all of the forces of the state. It is a 'national war in defense of our country.' Over and over again he appeals to the oldest fighting instincts. He repeats the slogans of patriotism, calling up on the people to save Russia, to defend the freedom of the homeland, their national independence, even their 'democratic liberties.'"

Is it any wonder that the White Guardist Russians have sprung to life, that the Orthodox Church wasted not a moment in announcing its support to Stalin, that Kerensky has come out in print calling for support to Stalin's war? All of these gentry recognize the stuff of which they are made: simple and undiluted nationalism. This is the spirit to which Stalin appealed.

### Nothing in Common with Socialism

But there is an additional and even more important reason why Stalin can not employ revolutionary socialist methods in his war against Hitler. There is no socialism in Russia. The proletariat and peasantry live under a gruesome dictatorship which exploits them in the most cynical fashion. Every revolutionary worker and peasant in the Soviet Union, despite official pronouncements, knows this. There is an intense hatred for the bureaucracy stored up in the hearts of the

great mass of people. The employment of revolutionary socialist methods in this war would light a flame in Russia that would burn away the rotten, exploiting régime.

We have said that Stalin is a nationalist. In the present epoch of international economics and international politics, Stalin does, it is true, play the game of international politics, governed not by socialist, but by purely nationalist considerations. The Comintern is one of his world agents. It is not necessary to repeat in detail what we have said so many times about the conduct of the Communist Parties throughout the world. Agents of the Kremlin, they carry out Stalin's policies in the bourgeois world.

They have responded instantly in the present situation, again with policies developed for them in Moscow. Coinciding with the non-socialist defense of the Soviet Union organized by the bureaucracy, it has again hauled out of its arsenal of betrayal the policy of the People's Front. It has taken a war of frightening proportions to bring about a return to the disgrace of popular frontism and class collaboration. But no other result was possible on the basis of Stalinism. Observe the manner in which William Z. Foster, Kremlin potentate of the American Stalinist Party, announces the return to the old policy. In his report to the National Committee of the Communist Party, he said:

"One thing our party must be especially conscious of is the need to translate its political line into life as speedily and thoroughly as possible. If we are to help build up a great People's Front, to mobilize the American nation for militant struggle against Hitler, we must bring our party into action more quickly and thoroughly. . . . Now we must proceed boldly to develop the broadest united front and People's Front activities."

It is in this manner that the defense of the Soviet Union is organized by those who have destroyed the October Revolution. Back to the musicians, artists, ministers, professional defenders of Soviet Russia; back to the mire of bourgeois democracy after wallowing in the mire of the fascist Axis!

## How Shall the Soviet Union Be Defended?

This is the crucial question. But it is precisely on this question that so many fail. The conduct of the Cannon group gives ample evidence of how adherence to an outlived, non-applicable policy can result in a complete disorientation of a movement. For more than a year now the Socialist Workers Party, embarrassed and with tongue in cheek, have attempted to explain away Stalin's relation to the Axis. Their position of defense of the Soviet Union, confused as it was, arose unavoidably because that organization clung to the theory that Stalin's régime was a "degenerated workers' state" and that the existence of nationalized property, progressive in relation to capitalist property relations, requires defense under any and all conceivable circumstances, whether or not it is the nationalized property which is involved in any war, and no matter what the nature of the war is.

In contrast to their veritable silence on the question of defense during the Stalin-Hitler honeymoon, the Cannon group is now shouting loudly. Lacking a solid Marxist theory in their approach to the current problem, they have completely lost their bearing. In their zealotry to apply their particular concept of the defense of the Soviet Union, they have developed a campaign which is reminiscent of a period passed ten years ago when the international left opposition regarded itself as a faction of the Communist International.



Thus, after the complete degeneration of Stalinism, after the conclusive counter-revolutionary victory of the bureaucracy and the physical annihilation of the Old Bolsheviks in the Soviet Union, the Cannon group discovers a fundamental cleavage between the "revolutionary war" of the Red Army and the activities of the Communist Party in the United States. It pleads with the American Stalinists to avoid the pitfalls of popular frontism.

### Pleading a Case

In its appeal to the Communist Party, published in the July 5 issue of *The Militant*, the Socialist Workers Party says:

"The Soviet Union is now compelled to enter into temporary alliances with capitalist powers . . ." (1)

This statement overlooks the inherent character of Stalinism as anti-socialist. What is meant by the phrase, "is now compelled to enter into temporary alliances with capitalist powers"? What kind of an alliance did Stalin enter into with Hitler? And prior to Hitler? That there are strong compelling forces driving Stalin in one direction or another is obvious, but the paths which Stalin and his bureaucracy chose are as much determined by their general anti-Bolshevik political theory and practice. When the SWP writes in the above manner, it is, consciously or unconsciously—it makes no difference which—seeking to justify the present course of Stalinism.

Proceeding from a false fundamental position, the Cannon group necessarily subordinates the struggle against Stalinism to their version of what constitutes the defense of the Soviet Union. In the closing paragraph of the aforementioned appeal, they state:

"Comrades of the Communist Party—only by deepening the revolutionary struggle, fighting ceaselessly against the imperialist war, capitalist terror, can you march side by side with the Red Army in its defense against Hitler. Not a People's Front with the bosses, but a workers' front of struggle! This is the only real defense of the Soviet Union. And in this defense we stand ready to join you in any action that will advance our common cause."

Everything is telescoped and misrepresented in this appeal. It is false to attribute the slightest revolutionary possibilities to Stalinism. Yet the appeal desires to exact precisely the impossible from Stalinism. The Communist Party can not and will not carry on a revolutionary struggle in defense of the Soviet Union because it is alien to revolutionary ideas and practice, because such a struggle is against the basic interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy! Stalinism can not, therefore, organize a workers' united front of struggle to defend the Soviet Union. What it will do now, with the turn in the war, is to fight against any movements of the workers to improve their class positions, whether it be strikes for wages, hours or conditions, or political struggles against the bourgeois state, on the ground that these struggles will impede the defense of Stalin. If the Cannon group stands ready to join with the Stalinists in a revolutionary defense of the Soviet Union, they are on safe ground, for this circumstance will not and can not come to pass.

### The Struggle Against Stalin Is Eliminated

But the real criminal character of the position of the SWP, and all who believe as they do, is that they have completely obliterated now the program of the revolutionary overthrow of Stalin in the Soviet Union. It is no accident that the slogan for the independence of Soviet Ukraine has been omitted from

the columns of the Cannonite press. It is no accident that Cannon in his telegram to Stalin, sent through Ambassador Oumansky at Washington, demands only "the revival of Soviet democracy as the first step in strengthening the struggle against German Nazi imperialism and the capitalist world." With the flourish of a pen, Cannon distorts the position of the Fourth International, which called for a political revolution against Stalinism, precisely because it is impossible to realize democratic demands and rights under that régime.

In this manner the SWP has thrown overboard the genuinely revolutionary content of the Fourth Internationalist struggle against Stalinism. That is why their defensism is shame-faced and politically dishonest.

The way to defend the Soviet Union, that is, to defend what remains of the historically progressive achievements of the October Revolution, is by ceaselessly waging the revolutionary struggle in the Soviet Union, especially under the conditions of war. Stalinism is incapable of defending these achievements in this war for the reason that it has alienated the overwhelming mass of workers and peasants in the Soviet Republics, and especially the international proletariat. What is needed in this war is the spirit of October. Such a spirit can awaken the great spirit of the Russian masses and the workers of the world. But to awaken that spirit it is necessary to ring out the revolutionary cry of freedom and that is impossible without continuing and deepening the struggle against Stalin and Stalinism now!

### The Revolutionary Way Out

So long as Stalin and his bureaucracy remain, the struggle is doomed. The defense of the Soviet Union is genuine only if it carries with it the aim of destroying the bureaucracy, seeks to reestablish soviets, the trade unions and the economic and political democracy of the workers and peasants. Any other defense is a defense of the "power, prestige and revenues" of the régime. Those who seek to couple a revolutionary defense of the Soviet Union jointly with Stalin against Hitler, or what they deem to call a struggle against capitalism, are in an insoluble contradiction and will never be able to extricate themselves from it.

The great lesson of the past two decades is that the economic and political freedom of the world's oppressed, the realization of the socialist revolution, is only possible by the independent revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and its allies everywhere, in the democratic capitalist world, in the fascist capitalist world and in the Soviet Union.

In our opinion the defense of the Soviet Union means the overthrow of Stalinism and the establishment of the genuine power of the workers state. Given such a condition, there is everything to defend.

A.G.

### Another War Yet to Come?

"A trade war will follow the present war." (Shephard Morgan, Chase National Bank of New York, *Glasgow Citizen*, January 3, 1941).

\* \* \*

"Whatever, Lord, we lend to Thee  
A thousandfold repaid shall be.  
Then gladly will we lend to Thee."  
(Hymn.)

# Roosevelt and Labor

THE SECOND WORLD IMPERIALIST WAR poses in a most practical and concrete manner the question of the future character of world society. What kind of society will exist after the war is over. Will we have world fascism, bourgeois democracy or *proletarian* socialism? Should the United States triumph it is reasonable to assume that some sort of "New Deal" on a world scale would be attempted. If this is a probability then it is our business to try to envisage and predict what the world would be like under the domination of the "New Deal" imperialist bourgeoisie. This is not all; a further question intrudes: assuming the victory of the New Deal bourgeoisie, has the world proletariat any compelling reasons now for believing that its condition would be enhanced, improved, or even equal to what it was before the war? That is, what is the probability of the *status quo ante bellum*; of the perpetuation of bourgeois democracy as we have known it? If not bourgeois democracy as we have known it, then what?

There are numerous persons, high in public life and by no means of radical proclivities, who admit and urge that there must be a change, that the world can not go on in the old way. A Mr. Batt, a business man and deputy director of the Office of Production Management (OPM) returned from England with the startling announcement that a "revolution" was taking place there and that the old capitalism is dead. Mr. Luce of "Time" and "Fortune" has spoken of the "American Century" after the war. Miss Dorothy Thompson wants a "Ring of Democracies." Mr. Streit demand "Union Now."

Norman Thomas, the social democrats and the beleaguered liberals are very modest in their desires. They want only that "democracy" be maintained and extended. Mr. Thomas, in his ardent and burning desire to keep us out of the war, almost forgot his fervid call for "socialism in our time."

## The Bourgeois Groups

There are two groups, both within the ruling class, whose desires and plans for the future are not completely clear. On the one hand there is a section, the Old Guard bourgeoisie whose mouthpiece today is Lindbergh. They are against the war, they say, but for what reason we can not at this time be certain. They work in the dark and behind the façade of anonymity. When they appear in the open it is to make a flank attack. Their positive pronouncements are always in defense of good old-fashioned American democracy, the "American Way of Life" and "Our System of Free Enterprise." They have never been outshouted in their appeal to the Founding Fathers, to religion and the Declaration of Independence; not even by the Stalinists in the days of Collective Security. But their real program for the future is not known and their aims are obscure.

Next there is the "New Deal" bourgeoisie, led by Roosevelt. These crusaders sallied forth in 1933 with a fanfare of trumpets and a program. Wilson had his "New Freedom" and Roosevelt promulgated his "New Deal." As the years went on the New Deal began to sag and crack. It was transformed into the War Deal and that is where we find ourselves today. Beyond the bare fact that Roosevelt and the New Dealers move into war with a singleness of vision and purpose, we are as much in the dark as in the case of their blood brothers, the

"economic royalists." For as far as we know their program for the future is amorphous, their ideas vague and their plans and intentions imperfectly illuminated.

The purpose of this article is specifically to examine the New Dealers, to examine this section of the bourgeoisie in relation to the proletariat and the class struggle. This is important mainly for the reason that Roosevelt represents primarily that part of the ruling class which has to a considerable extent succeeded in convincing the working class that capitalist society, while far from perfect, is steadily being improved under the ministration of the New Deal. Furthermore, the Roosevelt bourgeoisie believes that it will not be difficult to hold the proletariat under its banner because of the devastating régime of Hitler and the irreconcilable anti-labor attitude of the capitalist Old Guard. We shall primarily concern ourselves, therefore, with the Roosevelt New Dealers and their backers in the ranks of the bourgeoisie.

## The Labor Upsurge

As United States imperialism prepares for a showdown with German imperialism, the dominant local phenomenon is the revolt of the working class against the set tendency of the bourgeoisie to conspire against the trade unions and to freeze wages. This is attempted by the ruling class in the face of gigantic profits, a rapid increase in profits over last year. This fact has thoroughly penetrated the consciousness of the proletariat. It overshadows their somewhat muffled patriotism. The intensity and persistence of the strike wave is a source of constant annoyance to the bourgeoisie and creates uncertainty in their ranks.

The spearhead of the upsurge of the trade union proletariat is the CIO. In order clearly to comprehend this movement of the working class it is necessary to understand the historic roots and development of the CIO. What is happening today is an integral part of the origin of the CIO. The movement for the CIO arose inside the American Federation of Labor some years after the objective conditions for industrial unionism had already matured. The transformation of industry from the craft, hand production base, to complete machine production on a mass scale was already full-grown years before organized agitation for industrial unions got under way in the AFL. Not only had modern technology triumphed but it was increasingly accelerated in the decades following the First World Imperialist War.

## Trade Unions and Industrial Changes

Not only this, but capitalist centralization and concentration created huge monopoly industries. These corporations built vast industrial units and gathered in millions of workers to man their ever-expanding plants. These millions of proletarians were gathered from all over the earth and assembled and disciplined in the organized processes of capitalist production. Furthermore the leaders of industry and finance rendered a service to the working class when they adopted the practice of giving preference in hiring to younger men. The older men, schooled in the earlier methods of production, were unfitted both psychologically and physically for the more rapid pace of modern machine technology. Also in the beginning—before they learned the dangers involved—industrial

leaders preferred younger men and women because they did not have family responsibilities in the same proportion as the older people. Therefore lower wages could be paid to the young unmarried men than to the older ones with families to support. But aside from desires of the employers it is a fact that modern mass production industry must give the preference to the younger men and women who have the required physical stamina and endurance.

We say then that the whole of mass production industry in the United States was ready for the vertical union long before it became a reality. The old craft form was outmoded and the working class was ready for the new unionism. That the CIO seemed to appear suddenly, to burst from the AFL overnight and take its place in the mass production factories is only strange when one fails to take into account the long years of preparation and the foundations laid by the process of capitalist production.

What is happening today is in a direct line of descent from the beginnings of the industrial union movement as represented by the CIO. The movement arose out of certain objective conditions. It functions today in similar objective conditions, only in a more intense and faster moving situation. The events and the situation which called forth industrial unionism are with us yet. The only difference that can be discerned is in magnitude, intensity and the wider understanding of the proletariat of the meaning of the struggle in which it is engaged.

### **The Triumph of Industrial Unionism**

The industrial union movement expresses itself today as the CIO. But it is wider and deeper than any label or any given name. At a later stage the movement may go by another name. It is not to be excluded that its economic and political activity may move to a higher plane. Theoretically it is correct to say that genuine industrial unionism should be consciously based on principles of class struggle and not class collaboration as is the case with the CIO today. What must be emphasized now, however, is the continuous dynamic character of the industrial union movement. This flows from its origin and coincides with the objective conditions faced by the working class. The movement expresses—very primitively it is true—the beginnings of a new body of concepts, concepts that impel a whole class forward, that is, political concepts. To be unclear on these points is to place oneself in a position of confusion and the danger of falling prey to the clever and deliberate nonsense promulgated by the bourgeoisie to that effect that “communists” are responsible for the strikes in the “defense” industries.

The dynamics of the industrial union movement has been completely misunderstood in some quarters. It has never been understood and appreciated by the leadership of the AFL. From the position that the mass production workers did not want to be organized, this leadership moved over to open hostility to industrial unionism and the most adamant and ingrown craft unionism. Even the leadership of the CIO itself does not fully comprehend the nature of the movement which it is attempting to lead. There were some who predicted, after the first flush of organization, that the CIO had reached its peak; the AFL was getting stronger, its unions were more solid and better organized than those of the CIO. Some of the

### **The New Unionists**

blind, however, began to see when the AFL started to flirt a little with a sort of semi-industrial unionism. The Marxists, who were clear on the issues, took the position that the success of the CIO was to be welcomed.

The bourgeoisie and its theoreticians had a clearer understanding of the industrial union movement. They preferred the success of the AFL whenever they were forced to choose between the two organizations. The AFL to them represented “responsible” unionism, that is, docile unionism. They saw, correctly, that if any type of trade unionism had revolutionary implications it was the industrial union. They perceived that here was something new of great potential power and strength. Down the road somewhere and under the proper objective conditions they were not sure what might happen. The bourgeoisie was correct, as they are at times in relation to their own class interests. The industrial union movement is not hard set. It is fluid, vibrant and virile. It is militant and understands something of what is necessary to be done and how to do it. It is made up of comparatively young workers who flock into the movement. They are serious and eager to learn. They believe in industrial unionism and in its possibilities. They are crusaders, often impatient at delays and usually ready for a picket-line struggle with the employer.

These young proletarians have not absorbed what the capitalist press calls “responsible unionism.” At times they resort to “wildcat” strikes. They do not always submit to the commands of their leadership. They are not thoroughly regimented. No one should be alarmed at this. Even the so-called wildcat strike is a manifestation of initiative, of power and courage. It is proof that the industrial union movement throbs with life. This drive and skepticism in the ranks are a necessary corrective to the class collaborationist attitude of the leadership. Even the bourgeoisie today in the period of its decline finds it necessary to tolerate a little wildcatting, inside its own ranks, in order to hold back its demise.

This is the kind of labor movement that the bourgeoisie was face to face with at the outbreak of the war. It is a movement with this background, this history and this composition that manned the “defense” industries. It was not the AFL craft unions. They had only nibbled occasionally at organizing the great army of proletarians in the mass production industries.

It was clearly discernible at the CIO convention in November, 1940, which was held after the Selective Service Act had become law, that these workers were not primarily concerned with such an abstraction as “national defense.” Their primary interests were building the CIO, that is, industrial unions; union recognition with signed contracts and wage increases. Thousands of these workers understand thoroughly that the basic task is the building of industrial unions. That is not just a theory, for they know almost nothing of the theory involved. They know the concrete situation and the practical questions involved. Some of the strikes, for instance, have not involved wages at all, but union recognition. The capitalist press along with the social-democrat *New Leader* have noted this as a black mark against the CIO. The bourgeois press wanted to give the impression that trade union activity should center on wages only. A demand for the recognition of the union and the closed shop, they consider outside the realm of legitimate unionism. It is a bid for power which, of course, the ruling class considers a threat to its safety.

## The Growth of Class Consciousness

With the upturn in war preparations and the publication of profit figures, showing tremendous increases over 1939 the mass production workers became extremely wage conscious. They wanted more of the profits returned to them. Not only because the cost of living was rising but also for the reason that within these workers was born the germ of a new and seminal idea: profits were created by the working people and they should share more equitably in their distribution. And too this was the way they understood the New Deal. It was a plan for a larger life for all the people. To be real this plan must give the workers an ever increasing share of the national income.

The bourgeoisie had been thinking also. They had ideas and plans. They had a war to fight. One can not fight wars with bond salesmen, college professors and social workers. The main body of the working class in the factories and on the farms is necessary for the military adventure. This working class must be regimented and tamed. This must be accomplished not only to prosecute the war in a military way but in order to clear the tracks for unhampered boosting of profits. The proletariat, however, evinced no real inclination to close ranks and suspend the struggle for social and economic gains. This led to a conspiracy on the part of the bourgeoisie to scuttle the labor legislation, peg wages, increase hours and break the unions, particularly the CIO. In practice this was what was attempted in all the big strikes: Bethlehem, Ford, All-Chalmers, International Harvester, North American and others. The tactic was so plain and open that even the most stupid should understand.

The bourgeoisie, as is its wont, called in the most docile and gullible of the union leadership. They appealed to their patriotism.

Not only were some of the labor leaders captured by the bourgeoisie, docile and patriotic, but also corrupt and stupid. The sharpest and cleverest trap was set for Philip Murray, for obvious reasons. For not only is Murray the head of the CIO but he is an honest labor leader with ability and a genuine interest in the advancement of the working class. Roosevelt forced Murray onto the "Mediation" Board. Then things began to happen. The bourgeois captains knew what they were about but the labor captains understood neither the aims of the ruling class, the temper of the proletariat, nor the stage of the class struggle through which the workers were groping their way.

## The Communist Bugaboo

This whole panorama of events, ideas and situations is the real background of the recent strike wave. It is the concrete analysis of these events, ideas and practical situations that one must seek an understanding of that segment of the world drama being enacted in the United States today.

When the proletariat refused to submit and resisted "pacification" by the bourgeoisie and the government, a dilemma was posed before Roosevelt and the ruling class. An explanation and a cure had to be found. Industry and finance blamed the situation on Roosevelt and the New Deal. The President and his cohorts had steadfastly refused to consider "cooling off" legislation, revamping of the Wagner Act and the grant of judicial powers to the Mediation Board. The workers had been coddled by the New Deal and given visions of power that if attained or even approached, would disrupt capitalist economy. Not only this but the press and others made still an-

other accusation against the New Deal and the CIO. Both the government and the CIO had been nurturing the "viper of communism." This accusation and the accompanying attack reached their peak when the workers at the North American Aircraft Corporation refused to wait for the "Mediation" Board to render its advisory decision. The capitalist press screamed its imprecations against "communist" activity. The government and the heads of the CIO joined the chorus. There was no doubt in the minds of any of these gentlemen that the road to peace, harmony and full speed ahead for the "defense" program lay through purging the unions of "communists."

When such talk comes from Murray and the CIO leadership we can only say that it is the most puerile infantilism. When it comes from the Old Guard of the bourgeoisie, they lie and they know it. When uttered by Roosevelt and the New Deal in connection with the use of the army in a strike, we are face to face with a new and dangerous phase of the New Deal which we will say more about later on.

To say that the recent strikes are due to the activity of "communists" or "the communists" is to ignore both the background of the strikes and the nature of industrial unionism. Also the oft repeated charge about "communist" responsibility is only to say that one rejects the doctrine of spontaneity as an explanation for the strikes. To say with the bourgeoisie that the Stalinists "foment" strikes, meaning that there would be none, or only inconsequential ones in the "defense" industries, is identical with accepting the bourgeois notion that "radicals" and "outsiders" foment the class struggle. The strikes are an integral part of the class struggle which reached the heights it did because of well-defined objective conditions.

## Roosevelt Strikes Too

It should also be said that no questions of tactics are at issue here. What we are discussing is the reason for the strikes *per se* and not questions of timing, organization of procedure. Philistines, quacks and chauvinists of all stripes talk about tactics, tempo and the rest of it when they really mean class collaboration as a principled position. In a very elementary and halting manner the proletariat is in process of rejecting this concept of class peace in favor of class struggle.

This may have been a revelation to Roosevelt and the New Dealers. This may account for his sudden decision to strike with the army. He perhaps discovered that he did not have the total allegiance of the working class. It did not trust him completely. The material conditions of life were a stronger factor in their decisions than the "defense" program or the fading promises of the New Deal. The fact is that the New Deal had failed even before the outbreak of the war. Although the working class supported Roosevelt for the third time, they were only choosing what they considered the lesser of two evils. Even at that the large popular vote given Willkie demonstrated that the ranks of labor were not solid behind Roosevelt.

It is not easy to fathom the mind of the New Dealers and their plans for the future, but it is imperative that we make the effort. What are they thinking about and what are their plans not only for carrying through the war but what type of society do they envisage after the war? A capitalist society to be sure, but what kind of capitalist society? The traditional bourgeois democracy? Hardly. The pleas and protestations of the liberals are not availing.

There are cogent reasons for believing that Roosevelt has a "plan." The New Deal was a part of that plan. At least one

thing seems clear and that is the New Deal intent to stifle the Old Guard bourgeoisie and at the same time win the allegiance and support of the proletariat. This consummation would put the New Deal firmly in the saddle and whip the "enlightened" bourgeois into line. So long as the Old Guard kept to its "evil" ways, Roosevelt could chastise them with his proletarian support. But the war broke out and with it came American preparation for entry. The "economic royalists" got their chance for the reason that it is they who control the decisive sectors of industry. Furthermore, the proletariat in the war industry factories failed to act out the rôle that had been assigned them; that of more or less docile supporters of the war preparations. It is one thing to revolt against Ford, whom the New Deal wanted to teach a lesson. It is something quite different, however, at another stage in the war preparations, to stop production at North American, whose president is cooperating fully with the Administration.

Roosevelt's use of the army in breaking the North American strike was extremely revealing. Not mainly for the reason that here was a capitalist army moving against workers—that has been done before; but because this specific action seems to be part and parcel of wider aims and intentions. Even the big capitalist press was mildly stunned and uncertain whether or not to applaud. This was strange indeed when one remembers the fact that forcible suppression of strikes is a chief constituent of their arsenal of anti-labor activity. But they had their reasons which were expressed in a somewhat cautious manner by the big bourgeois press. The *New York Herald Tribune* displayed its perturbation in an editorial entitled "The Pity of It." Big business was disturbed not only by the audacity and courage of the young proletarians at North American but, in this instance, more by the action of the Roosevelt government in "seizing" the plant.

### Plant Seizure Alarms Capitalist Press

Despite the fact that the government did not really seize the plant but only placed it temporarily under the supervision of army officers, the bourgeoisie was alarmed. The capitalist press was convinced that military occupation had become necessary only because Roosevelt had refused to support "cooling off" legislation and had assumed that the "Mediation" Board could rely on "labor's voluntary cooperation." This assumption was rudely shattered, said the *Herald Tribune*, making necessary "the military occupation of the North American Aviation plant, in the order to selective service boards that they reclassify defense strikers and in the imminent threat of anti-strike legislation far more coercive than a 'cooling off' mandate . . . all this is a great pity. It is a pity that strikes must be broken with bayonets for want of a proper initial labor policy . . . it is a pity that into the call for selective service there should have to be introduced a punitive feature." The *Herald Tribune* is also against "compulsory arbitration" and is doubtful that "the situation demands any such drastic shift of policy." The *New York Times*, while not as tearful as the *Herald Tribune*, took a similar position on the matter of "compulsory arbitration" and in its criticism of the President for not accepting proposals made on revision of the Wagner Act and providing "cooling off" procedure.

The *Times* and other big capitalist papers were against plant seizures, even in the North American instance, where there was no real seizure. They were against even the slightest gesture at the taking of private property by the government. This was the real "pity of it." The *Times* pointed out that it was not necessary for the army to take over the plant

in order to break the strike. Also the big capitalist press made the "discovery," after the North American affair, that Roosevelt's basic interest was the "defense" program. Right here the big bourgeoisie stumbled on what was, for them, confirmation of fears they had had all along; namely that Roosevelt and the New Dealers have ideas of making some sort of change in capitalist society. Furthermore, the Old Guard of the bourgeoisie ran into a contradiction. All along they too have been ardent defenders of the "defense" preparations. This basic interests also were alleged to revolve around the "defense" program. Their press emphasized daily, whenever and wherever there was a strike or a threat of a strike, that the workers were holding up "defense," the workers on strike were holding up so many millions in "defense" orders. Some of them finally got around to the place where even the anticipated subway strike in New York City would vitally retard the whole "defense" program.

Notwithstanding this seeming unanimity of purpose, the Old Guard of the bourgeoisie claimed to discover that the New Dealers' motivations were not the same as theirs. In their opinion, Roosevelt had made no distinction between the seizure of the plant by the army and the breaking of the strike with the army. New Deal strikebreaking is a buttress to capitalism, but New Deal plant seizing is an assault on capitalism. Despite the "national emergency," nothing must be done that tends to destroy the "system of free enterprise"; there must be an abiding respect for private property.

The Old Guard of the bourgeoisie is skeptical of the New Dealers and the support given them by the "enlightened" bourgeois. The Old Guard is scared. Scared both of the proletariat and of those recalcitrants within the ruling class who support the New dealers. The whole ruling class must make war against German imperialism but they fear what may happen during the war or after. They do not trust the New Dealers, while at the same time they dread the boldness of the proletariat, particularly through the industrial unions.

The most irreconcilable of the Old Guard bourgeoisie are the cast-off elements from which Lindbergh probably draws support and finances for the America First Committee. This group may include Ford and some of the Standard Oil families. Out of the mouth of Lindbergh, a fascist, white-supremacy zany, they have called for "a new leadership in Washington" before the time arrives for the next presidential election. This group claims to be against the war, but this is incredible unless they are appeasers of Hitler or are testing out the possibilities of fascism in the United States.

The public and active leaders of the Old Guard of the bourgeoisie, who are "enemies" of the New Dealers, are possibly correct when they hint that Roosevelt may have "totalitarian" aims and aspirations. Not primarily as a war measure in the struggle against German imperialism but as one of the emerging facets of the New Deal itself.

### Danger from New Dealism

This question must be examined not primarily from the class viewpoint of the bourgeoisie but in relation to the proletariat as a class and in light of its class aims and historical interests. It is imperative, in the opinion of this writer, that the working class in the United States turn its attention now to the perspectives, plans and ideas of the New Dealers and their bourgeois supporters. It is not necessary to tell the proletariat to watch the "economic royalists"; they will do that



without undue agitation. But a warning must be sounded in connection with the New Dealers.

The New Deal is still faced with capitalist collapse and the degeneration of bourgeois society as we have known it. The New Deal did not pull the country out of the depression; the war economy is only a gruesome substitute for adequate peace-time production and there still remain 9,000,000 unemployed. There are pressing consumer problems now and these will be increased a thousand-fold after the war. Sloan, of General Motors, has spoken repeatedly on this question. Officials of General Electric have manifested interest in their fate as producers not only of capital goods, but of consumer goods on a mass scale. The same is true of Litchfield, of Goodyear Rubber, who voiced doubts as to the future in his New Year's message printed in Akron papers.

After the present uncontrolled expansion of capital goods plant and equipment, this market will decline and go flat. This is happening not only in the United States but in every capitalist country. The staggering sums being poured out today for powder plants and aircraft factories that will not be needed after the war is only a sample of what is taking place in every field of industry. The plant that was abandoned after the last war, such as Hog Island, the explosives plant at Nitro, West Virginia, and various government arsenals, assume Lilliputian proportions in relation to what we will observe after the present war. Combined with the post-war fate of the capital goods market, the prostration of the consumer goods industries through vast and unprecedented unemployment, is the national debt. This will expand to astronomical size.

The problems we pose cannot be examined either in isolation or as a cross-section of the general movement of capitalist society. All of the social, economic and political problems of today are subsumed under the root problem of the entire epoch. That problem is the attempt of declining, embattled and frustrated world capitalism to perpetuate itself. It is the attempt of bourgeois society to gain a new birth of freedom. The whole 20th century has been an era devoted to planning for capitalist resuscitation. The fact that contradictions arise which force the various nations into periodic armed conflict means only that there are differences of opinion in the ranks of the world bourgeoisie as to the manner of achieving the stabilization of capitalism. That was the meaning of the First World War. It is more clearly the real meaning of the present World War.

### World War II Seeks Another Solution

The rise of what is known as fascism is not some incidental and detached political development. It is not a mutation but the result of continuous variations in the rapid decline of world capitalism in the twentieth century. Fascism is an increasingly prominent part of the political and economic configuration of world bourgeois society in a period of capitalist convulsion. Those liberals and others who see in fascism something even resembling a new social order are only playing with words and do not perceive that the present stage of capitalist decline, which produced fascism, is in some real sense inevitable, unless liquidated by a basic social transformation. These liberals (and proletarians, too) are not only playing with words but with the concentration camp, in every capitalist country, the United States included.

Despite the fact that the present war is an imperialist war, as was the First World War, the present conflict is not a mere repetition of the first. It is something more than an imperial-

ist war. The inner development of the present struggle will propel the imperialist nations and world bourgeois society outside the present bourgeois democratic orbit. The old "balance of power" politics has passed away never to return. To speak of the war as a struggle for the "redivision of the world" is inadequate and dangerous. It is nearer correct and significant to say that it is a war for the domination of the whole world, either by Germany or the United States.

The post-war problems to be faced by each group of warring nations will be identical. That will be the problem of making world capitalism function. To say that there must be no new Versailles provides no solution to this problem. Any attempt at reallocation of colonies and raw materials also will not answer the question. Those who think that the many problems posed by the decline of world capitalism and the war will necessarily find their solution in an Anglo-American victory, fail to grasp the meaning of the ordeal and the travail which bourgeois democracy is now going through, and the worse ordeal that it will face later, even though Hitler is defeated.

### New Dealism Has a New Program

The main forces involved today are German and American imperialism. Hitler has accepted it as a fact that capitalism has entered a new stage and that this new period is one in which capitalism can not survive if dependence is placed on bourgeois democratic guarantees. The American bourgeoisie does not accept this dictum in its public pronouncements, but pretends that it is engaged in a struggle, not for a "New Order," as is Hitler's contention, but for a sort of reincarnation of bourgeois democracy on a higher plane. The leadership in this evolution has fallen to the New Deal, whose major prophet is Roosevelt. The attention of the proletariat in the United States should be centered on Roosevelt. There is reason to hold that Roosevelt also believes bourgeois democracy must be transformed, or converted. He and the New Deal bourgeoisie will unquestionably come forward in due time with a "plan." He will not be able to hold to the old shibboleths. The proletariat will not respond as in the past to the traditional capitalist slogans. The New Dealers will, and in fact have already discovered that this is a fact. That the proletariat has not yet directly rejected these slogans either intellectually or in action is not today real solace to any section of the bourgeoisie. Roosevelt and the New Deal are particularly concerned because it was they who virtually assumed leadership of the working class in the United States with the promulgation of the NIRA. The ascendancy of the New Deal was based on the allegiance of the proletariat. This allegiance was used to chastize the Old Guard of the bourgeoisie and bring in the "New Order" with the New Deal at its head.

The working class submitted, at times very noisily, to this régime even after the failure of the NRA and after it was clear that the New Deal was no cure for the evils of a decaying capitalism. The war came and brought with it the drive to put through the "defense" program. The bourgeois Old Guard with their ownership and control of the "defense" industries, insisted on "business as usual": maintenance of the old monopolistic practices, boosting of profits, continuation of international connections, including respect for patent rights and agreements with Germany, and was, above all, firm on restrictions on the proletariat and the rise in wages.

## Its Relations to the Proletariat

We have already analyzed the response of the working class to this situation in relation to the employer. But the New Deal concluded that the proletariat in the industrial unions were not only breaking through the net of the "economic royalists" but were also bursting the bonds forged around them by the New Deal. With only the most primitive and vague understanding of the problems that we have been discussing in this article, the workers, led by the industrial unions, marched into class struggle with heightened consciousness, irrespective of the demands of the "national emergency." We want to emphasize again that this should have been expected, especially by Marxists, given the situation and the existence of the new industrial unions.

In many respects this development reached its peak in the North American strike. Here one had an opportunity to look into the New Deal mind and envisage what the future may hold in the way of a "plan." Roosevelt used the army for the same reasons that Hitler would use his army. Not for the simple reason that the "defense" program was being hindered but because to the New Deal the strike portrayed an advance stage of the class struggle. The workers were becoming increasingly disillusioned, not only with the "economic royalists" but with the New Deal bourgeoisie also. The proletariat was losing its respect for the processes of bourgeois "democracy."

Not only did the New Deal Roosevelt act for the same reasons that would have motivated a Hitler but he used the same violent methods, and without respect for bourgeois democratic legality. Under-Secretary of War Patterson stated that the action was "of dubious legality." After the act Congress passed a law "legalizing" such procedure.

As we have stated, even the Old Guard of the bourgeoisie was a little stunned. Here was the New Deal which had steadfastly refused to permit any changes in the Wagner Act, which was against "cooling off" periods or "legal" compulsory arbitration, virtually "taking the law into its own hands."

## Roosevelt Seeks a Way Out

This writer is convinced that Roosevelt and the New Deal thoroughly understand that bourgeois democracy has run its course and that such a political system can not longer stand against an awakening proletariat. Roosevelt faces what every bourgeois ruler and leader faces: the problem of the class struggle in these days of bourgeois democratic impotence and unfolding proletarian intervention. The outposts of the class struggle in the United States are an uncharted territory. This is the result of the activity of the workers in the mass production industries. The New Deal is caught between these workers and the Old Guard of the bourgeoisie. The New Deal seeks to pay the rôle of arbiter and mediator. For the reasons that we have given, both from the angle of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as a whole, this mediation can not be essentially different from the mediation of Hitler and the National Socialists. All the talk in the United States about the necessity of "total defense" against "totalitarianism," when stripped of mysticism, cant and chauvinist idealism, means the adoption of a native brand of "totalitarianism." This development is inevitable, given capitalism today, unless checked by decisive action of the proletarians. Liberals and workers who think otherwise are due for a rude jolt and a taste of a new type of Americanism.

Roosevelt and the New Deal bourgeoisie will attempt to

pull world capitalism out of the doldrums under their leadership. The milder processes of bourgeois democracy have lost their potency and charm. In this particular imperialist epoch an individual rises to power supported by a party which is the bearer of an idea. That idea flowers into a political system whose only aim is the preservation and stabilization of world capitalism. Roosevelt and Hitler stand face to face, engaged in a struggle to determine which shall become the world's No. 1 imperialist chieftain.

## The Proletariat Is the Only Hope

If the foregoing analysis is even moderately reasonable, then the outcome of the present war, without the revolutionary intervention of the world proletariat, will be dark indeed for the working class and the peoples of all countries. The collapse of bourgeois democracy, the attempt to save international capitalism through a devastating world war, the demonstrated incompetence of bourgeois democratic leadership, its confusion and its fright, all these together combined with the determination to hold fast to capitalism, present the specter of world fascism.

On the other side stands the international proletariat. The freest and largest section is in the United States. It is also the most active and militant section and in this sense the most advanced. In this same sense it is the vanguard of the world working class. We have already portrayed its organization, its roots and its temper. The situation in the United States is extremely consequential. This country may and can become the pivot around which the world movement of the working class turns. Roosevelt sees this and will undoubtedly attempt to crush the movement ruthlessly and decisively. The American proletariat threatens to harass him and the New Deal on the road to world power.

This is not all. The European working class, including the Russian, is not dead. One possible outcome of the entanglements and shifts of the present war can be and may be revolutionary actions in one or more European countries. The world stage is set for a thrust by the international proletariat. This is demonstrated not only by the objective scene in connection with the collapse of capitalism, but primarily by the resistance of the proletariat to imperialist pacification. This refusal of the working class, especially in the United States, to be passive reveals a primordial inclination to go forward. This more than instinctive attitude of the working class is stultified and shunted into patriotic channels because no adequate political leadership has emerged. Trotsky wrote three years ago that the crisis of the proletariat is the crisis of leadership. This is far more evident today than when Trotsky wrote. The proletariat in the United States has met a test and needs a revolutionary leadership to organize it and lead the march to victory.

DAVID COOLIDGE.

---

"Calculations of profit and loss are our life." (Winston Churchill, May 7, 1940.)

\* \* \*

"The chairman declared a dividend of only 15 per cent. A general uproar ensued. In view of the general disagreement and many interruptions, there appeared no chance of proceeding to dispose of the business." (Indian Iron & Steel Co. report, *London Times*, October 23, 1939.)



# Burnham and His Managers

THE publication of the book *The Managerial Revolution*, by James Burnham has caused a considerable stir in numerous circles. The book, shrouded with an aura of mystery, is receiving a clever publicity campaign designed to make it sell in large quantities. Here at last, the publishers say, has come a man who not only explains many things about our world which is not widely understood, but provides an answer as to what will be the character of the future society. Naturally, a man who can tell the bourgeois world what the future holds in store, providing it is not socialism—even though he predict the end of capitalism—is a highly welcomed individual, for the bourgeoisie, in any case, has long ago learned to distinguish between dangerous theories and those which are merely exciting, diverting and unusual. The bourgeoisie does not feel that way about the theory of the managerial revolution because this theory, when stripped of its own brand of semantics, is fundamentally a justification of fascism and all forms of totalitarianism. In the case of Burnham, and a host of others, it is issued forth as the result of objective scientific research, but is nonetheless a product of a mental rationalization which justifies the “wave of the future.”

The theory of the managerial revolution is a product of the economic, political and social chaos of decay monopoly capitalism. It forms part of world ideological confusion arising from the salient and unavoidable fact that capitalism is dying; that the socialist victory which many awaited has not yet occurred; that socialism has suffered uninterrupted defeats; that capitalism resorts, in one country after another, to methods of barbarism and acknowledged abnormalities in economy in order to maintain itself. It is a theory which springs of hopelessness and despair.

Theories similar to Burnham's managerial revolution have been published, but none with the simplicity and fullness of the erstwhile member of the Workers Party. He has presented a complete blueprint of this managerial revolution: the decay of capitalism, the emergence of the new society, the time element involved, the character of the new state, the new class struggle and the future of mankind in the next period of history! The presentation is schematic, mechanical and static. It is grounded upon little or no facts, and this is, as we shall shortly illustrate, no slight or unconscious omission, for despite Burnham's constant allusion to the need of scientific procedure (about which he has so often lectured Marxists) and the necessity for verification (empirically) by the facts of history, there is little of this in the book.

## In Passing . . .

In the course of elaborating his theory, Burnham writes:

“Nor have the managers themselves been constructing and propagating their own ideologies; this has been and is being done for the most part by intellectuals, writers, philosophers. Most of these intellectuals are not in the least aware that the net social effect of the ideologies which they elaborate contributes to the power and privilege of the managers and to the building of a new structure of class rule in society. As in the past, the intellectuals believe that they are speaking in the name of truth and for the interests of all humanity” (page 73).

Thus a considerable agitation takes place for a new society. It is characteristic of this situation that none of the propo-

nents of the new order are conscious of what it is they agitate for or theorize about. A seemingly sad situation for the new society, but it is made all the sadder by the fact that the new “ruling class,” the managers, are abysmally ignorant of existing historical currents which seek to place them into power as the new dominant class in a new social order.

It is apparently Burnham's “historical rôle,” however much he declines the honors at this time, to enlighten the “new class” to its gigantic social rôle, even though he “has no program to offer” and has no subjective feelings one way or another about the new society, so that it may understand whither it is drifting, what it is fighting for (even though it is not fighting) and, above all, to understand the power it already has.

The purpose of this review is to objectively examine the central features of the managerial theory and to reserve specific analysis for another time. An agitational denunciation of Burnham because he is a renegade from socialism solves not a single question involved in the instant case, for it is incumbent that his theory be scientifically analyzed to determine whether or not it has any merit. There is a time and place for everything. The fact that Burnham is an apostate would not automatically prove the invalidity of the managerial theory, though it will help to establish some of the inner urgings that prompted more flagrant statements contained in the book. A reading of the book will amply show that the author cannot be separated from his theory.

Burnham's theory of the managerial revolution may be summarized as follows:

1. Capitalism is doomed. Unable to solve a single one of its contradictions, it cannot maintain itself and has already retreated under the pressures exerted by the onward rush of the new social order.

2. Socialism “is not possible of achievement or even of approximation in the present period of history.”

3. The managerial revolution occurs before our very eyes. In truth, it began in or at the close of the First World War, has continued uninterruptedly ever since and will be completed within fifty years. Its victory is inevitable; it is worldwide.

## Capitalism, and the Present Epoch

The justification of the theory of the managerial revolution can be partially sustained by proving the irremediable collapse of capitalism and the impossibility of socialism, for only then is it possible to pose alternative social solutions. Thus, Burnham proceeds to prove first of all the collapse of capitalism. But it is precisely herein that the basic error of his theory is exposed. Burnham's analysis of capitalism is highly superficial and composed of half-truths. In outlining seven characteristics of capitalism, long ago described by Marx and Engels, he omits mention of the decisive structural changes which occurred at the close of the nineteenth century, namely, the development of monopoly capitalism as a world economic order in which the world market, the world division of labor and world trade have become paramount. The era of finance capital, the significance of which was recognized even by enlightened bourgeois economists, and the internal economic

changes wrought by this development, the attendant political changes which followed, and the increased intervention of the state in the economic process—all of this fails to find a place in the Burnham analysis, though reference to it is made in the latter portion of the book, where he discusses the Berle-Means theory of ownership and control, and “statification” of the economic process is his theme.

This omission is interesting because Burnham constructs his theory on the concept of “free” capitalism, *laissez-faire*, simple class relations and the relatively simple rôle of the state.

Capitalism has been in a state of permanent crisis since the outbreak of the First World War. The rise of the imperialist epoch, while it increased the production of goods, raised to a small degree the world standard of living and increased the total wealth of capitalism, at the same time intensified its inherent contradictions on a world plane. The forecasts of Marx and Engels were fully verified. Technological improvements, the organic composition of capital and the falling rate of profit, the growth of mass unemployment on a world scale, the limitations of the home market and in turn the world market, polarization of wealth, all of these characteristics create the capitalist doom.

The Marxists have demonstrated that these insoluble capitalist contradictions based on socialized production lay the basis for socialism. Socialism can solve the contradictions by removing the primary cause for their existence: private ownership of the means of production, production for profit and the market (world), bourgeois class relations to capital. Unless capitalism is abolished these corroding contradictions make life a hellish nightmare for the millions and millions of inhabitants in this world. Unemployment, poverty, misery and war are not merely conditions offering the possibility of agitational activity against the bourgeois social order; they are economic and political problems of the highest magnitude.

The nature of the capitalist crisis, its cyclical character was established by Marx many years ago, while bourgeois economists sailed in a fog and never understood this phenomenon. Many of the latter have paid obeisance to the founders of scientific socialism for their acute observations on this riddle of capitalist economy. It was therefore both surprising and amusing to read that Burnham, while he agrees with much that Marx and Engels wrote about the capitalist crisis, feels that they did not answer everything in relation to it, had left much unsaid and therefore only partially answered the question. However, one is disappointed, for, having been led into the belief that Burnham would supply that which is missing, one finds that the sponsor of the new social order immediately passes over this point as if it were not decisively important.

### “Free” Capitalism and the State

The development of capitalism has not proceeded in a straight line; it has been uneven (industrial, agricultural and colonial nations) and combined (the merging of advanced industrial and backward agricultural methods, overlapping, development by leaps, etc.). The rôle of the state as the instrument of the ruling classes, has likewise reflected this uneven and combined development of capitalism and was subjected to particular changes on the basis of peculiar national developments. But whatever the nature of the particular development of any national state, its fundamental rôle has been that of a bourgeois state representing the historical social interests of the dominant economic class, the bourgeoisie.

The state in Germany was possessed of features quite dif-

ferent from that of the United States; the French from the English; the Russian from the Scandinavian. The form of the state in all countries was dependent upon the manner in which their capitalism arose, peculiar national traditions, the way in which the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as classes came into existence, the share of the national economy in the total world capitalist economy, etc. But no matter what the form, whether it was democratic, absolutist, constitutional monarchy, in all instances the state represented the interests of the dominant economic class.

To say, as Burnham says, that the state was the true capitalist state which governed the least, and permitted free, unbridled development of competition, is only a half answer. The state “which governed the least” was itself the product of the particular nature of a national economy. It governed the least in the early history of the United States where the development was completely internal, free and unlimited. Yet even in the United States, the state in the field of foreign affairs was a forthright representative of the rising bourgeoisie. But foreign affairs, the relation of one national bourgeois state to another, are based essentially upon economic relations; the affairs of state are political counterparts of the economic needs and relations of the various national capitalist classes.

In Great Britain, however, the development of capitalism occurred in a way which involved the intimate and direct intervention of the state in the creation of the British Empire, the basis of British capitalism. It is universally known, too, that German industry began almost from the start as a cartelized industry nurtured along with the utmost consideration and intervention of the Hohenzollern régime and the Reichstag, which subsidized a large section of the national economy.

### The Root Error of Marxism

If Burnham adds little or nothing to our knowledge of capitalism, he at least supplies something new in description, designed to avoid simplicity and understanding. The class character of capitalism and the rôle of the bourgeoisie was never difficult to describe nor difficult to understand. In any case, the bourgeoisie knew that it owned the instruments of production and controlled, as a class, the total distribution of the total production. It remained for Burnham, ever the innovator, to describe this property relation in as obscure a language as possible. Burnham writes that the bourgeoisie “controls access to the instruments of production” and maintains a “preferential control of distribution”! This point is many times emphasized throughout the book in the manner of a discovery, which presumably provides a startlingly new insight on the nature of capitalism. According to him, it is this “control of access to the instruments of production” and “preferential control of distribution” which *has been replaced* by the “state ownership of the major instruments of production”; or *will be* so replaced, since the process *is now* occurring.

It is in elaboration of this point that Burnham weaves his theory of the managerial revolution. State ownership of the instruments of economy signifies control of distribution. The new state is controlled by the managers, who, as we point out in another section of this article, by their control “own” the instruments of production and thereby control the distribution of the total product of the new economy. The character of the state is necessarily altered in this process. Such a development was never foreseen by the Marxists; they were blinded by their belief that capitalism must *inevitably* be followed by socialism. Their failure to understand that this is not true, that capitalism *is inevitably* being followed by managerial so-

ciety eliminates them as a serious and decisive social force. The root of the Marxist error is to be found in their false estimate of the state and its rôle in present-day society. If this were true, we should owe the professor a debt of gratitude, but there are many good reasons for our failure to acknowledge the debt.

### The Epoch of Monopoly Capitalism

Marx and Engels sixty years ago forecast alterations in the functions of the state. They prophesied the necessity of state intervention in the economic process as an inevitable development of capitalism, of monopolized and trustified capitalism. In my article, *German Society and Capitalism* (THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, April, 1941) I outlined the fundamental characteristics of the present epoch in replying to Dwight Macdonald, who also adheres to the notion that a new social order has emerged in Germany—the same kind of social order that exists in the Soviet Union. Macdonald calls his society “bureaucratic collectivism” and mainly differs from Burnham in his rejection of the latter’s theory that it is the managers who rule in the new social order. He asserts that a new class of politicians has arisen in Germany and it is that new class that rules—the same class rules in the Soviet Union.

Oddly enough, it is Macdonald who attempts, however unsuccessfully, to prove his theory upon economic grounds, namely, that there is an absence of production of profit, production for a market, an end of wage labor, and, most important, state control of the economic process (equated by Macdonald to ownership). Burnham says the same things, without attempting any proof, yet both agree that it is a new society. Though their differences are not decisive, we believe Macdonald has more authority for his conclusions than Burnham has for managerial society.

For that reason, my reply to Macdonald applies equally well to Burnham. I wrote in my article the following:

“Monopolist capitalism has marked the end of simple capitalism, laissez-faire capitalism. Under these structural changes, the role of the state to the classes has undergone changes, although its basic rôle remains identical: the instrument of bourgeois society. Macdonald speaks of the democratic bourgeois state as bourgeois apologists describe it, but as it actually never was and certainly could not be under monopoly capitalism.

“The state fuses with monopoly capitalism and has a more direct and intimate interest in the economic well-being of the ‘nation.’ In declining capitalism, the duties of the state are magnified, since the increased conflict of ‘national capitals’ marks the struggle between states.”

Any serious student of economics and history can readily understand the ramifications of the above description. In a class society, the welfare of the nation is identified with the ruling class and the state necessarily acts in the best interests of the total capital. The permanent economic crisis of world capitalism, the permanence of modern war, the paralyzing conflict between mutually exclusive classes, require the economic, political and social intervention of the state in all affairs of the nation.

Engels wrote in *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*:

“... the modern state, again, is only the organization that bourgeois society takes on in order to support the external conditions of the capitalist mode of production against the encroachments as well of the workers as of the individual capitalist. The modern state, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national capital. The more it proceeds to the taking over of productive forces, the more citizens does it exploit. The workers remain wage-workers—proletarians. The capital relation is not done away with. It is rather brought to a head.”

This development, as described by Engels, has nowhere been completed except in the Soviet Union, where, however, we have a totally different set of historical conditions which make it impermissible to discuss simultaneously with a discussion of the capitalist world. But no matter, Engels described a *prevailing tendency inherent in monopoly capitalism*. It is this tendency which is in the ascendance. Whether or not this tendency will ever be completed, i.e., whether the state becomes the single capitalist, is highly questionable. In any case, it has not occurred, nor does it appear likely to occur. However, if one understands the nature of the general tendency, he can understand what now appears to be, superficially speaking, non-capitalist developments in world bourgeois society.

For the sake of argument, let us assume that the capitalist class disappears, the state becomes the sole capitalist, operating under managers’ or politicians’ control, the proletariat becomes a slave class, the markets disappear, profits disappear, planned production prevails, all in the interest of a new state form. Should this occur, naturally we would be standing at the threshold of a new society. But none of this has occurred. Neither Burnham nor Macdonald has established that it is occurring, and the *facts* of current history prove that it has not come to pass.

### Efficiency and Proletarian Enslavement

In the course of an elaboration of the nature of fascism Trotsky once pointed out that there was a significant parallel in the existence of fascist régimes in those countries which were economically poor, or were poor in relation to their needs in the world market. The powerful and rich democracies did not require the installation of totalitarian régimes, whose first task is the solution of the class problem—the subjugation of the proletariat. The secret of Germany’s economic revival and military rearmament is to be found not in the inherent superiority of “bureaucratic collectivism” or “managerial economy,” but in the barbaric exploitation of the masses.

Failure to appreciate these fundamental factors leads Burnham, as it did Macdonald, in an exaggeration of superficial and secondary occurrences. Thus, Burnham, in endeavoring to prove the superiority of “managerial economy” (fascism) shows that in Germany finance is controlled, there is no inflation (when as a matter of fact, in the true economic sense, you do have inflation, measured by the tremendous growth of savings in the absence of purchaseable commodities, and in the complete disproportion in production between war goods, heavy capital goods and consumer goods); Germany has rapidly increased her territorial borders; that she “makes war better” than the capitalist nations; that the Hitler régime inspires “fanatical loyalty,” etc.

We prefer to leave this phase of the question for the moment and turn to the concrete development of the so-called managerial revolution.

One final remark, however, is necessary. The conditions which compel statification and state intervention in the economic process, naturally increase the specific weight of that organ, increase its personnel, give it great powers of control. The tendency toward bureaucratism is enhanced. The power of the bureaucracy grows and it enjoys a large measure of independence. But always, until now, its aim is the maintenance of the bourgeois social order, no matter whose rights it may invade to accomplish that aim.

## How the Managerial Revolution Occurs

On page 75 of his book Burnham asserts:

"The managerial revolution is not just around the corner, that corner which seems never quite to be reached. The corner of the managerial revolution was turned some while ago. The revolution itself is not something we or our children have to wait for we may, if we wish, observe its stages before our eyes."

Elsewhere, the professor writes of the managerial revolution that "This drive will be successful." We are to expect, according to him, that the revolution which began some twenty-five years ago *will be completed* in fifty years. The managerial revolution has already conquered in Russia, Germany, Italy (of Japan we are not yet certain) and was begun in the United States with the advent of the New Deal.

Having observed the "establishment" of the managerial revolution, we are then told who the managers are and in what manner this revolution occurred; the relation of the state to the revolution and the economy.

". . . the managers are simply (!) those who are, in fact, managing the instruments of production nowadays," writes Burnham on page 77. They are, he declares, production managers, operating executives, superintendents, administrative engineers, supervisory technicians (in government), administrators, commissioners, bureau heads, etc.

Where, in fact, do the aforementioned "managers" actually manage and control industry? What is their relation to the bourgeois owners of the instrument of production? The answers to these questions are evasively given. Reference is made to Germany and Russia, to the New Deal and Italy. But neither in Germany nor Russia do conditions obtain to support the theory of managerial control. Nor will one find this "conclusive evidence" in the New Deal. Something quite different is to be observed in these "examples." If Burnham seeks refuge in the fact that his revolution has not yet taken place, or is not completed, then he contradicts himself, for his theory is posed variously in the past, present and future; namely, that it has occurred, is occurring and will occur.

The managerial society exists. The leaders of the revolution are named. How does this revolution occur? In Russia it came as a result of the proletarian revolution which degenerated into, or as Burnham prefers, developed into the managerial state. It came there as the result of the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, a social revolution. In Germany it came with the victory of Hitler. In America it is coming through the impulses engendered by the New Deal.

## Belief and Reality

In each instance "The basis of the economic structure of managerial society is governmental (state) ownership and control of the major instruments of production.

"On a world scale the transition to this economic structure is well advanced" (page 118).

It is explained that while parliament "was the sovereign body of the limited state of capitalism," the bureaux, as governmental bodies, "are the sovereign bodies of the unlimited state of managerial society" (page 148).

Burnham states it in another way as follows:

"In the new form of society, sovereignty is localized in administrative bureaux. They proclaim the rules, make the laws, issue the decrees. The shift from Parliament to the bureaux occurs on a world scale. *Viewed on a world scale, the battle is already over*" (page 148).

Where do such conditions actually exist? In no country,

except the Soviet Union, and there in other forms and under an entirely different set of circumstances.

Among other things, Burnham portrays the new society as another exploitative social order, within which the proletariat remains an enslaved class, the class struggle continues unabated between the proletariat and the managerial ruling class (the capitalist class has been destroyed, some entering the ranks of the managers, others the proletariat). On a world scale, wars will continue on a more destructive level as between managerial states which will no longer be confined to the original borders of the dominant managerial powers, but will be wars between different areas of the world (Japan—Far East; Germany—Europe and Africa; the United States—the Western Hemisphere). Thus the blueprint!

If the above appears schematic and unreal, that is exactly the manner in which it is outlined by Burnham. As a rule he confines himself to generalities and assertions. They are so debatable as to make impossible conclusions, because we speak different languages.

In what country do the managers rule the state, control or even manage the instruments of production? We are not here concerned with the control, or management, of a single technical operation in a factory, as Burnham would at times seem to imply in some sections of his book. We are concerned with the totality of the social order. Except for Russia, the *de jure* and *de facto* owners, controllers and managers of the instruments of production are the capitalists.

In what country has the state become the owner of the instruments of production? Only in Russia is the state the owner of the means of production, and this was not due to a managerial revolution; it resulted from a socialist revolution (no matter what eventually occurred to that revolution) and the *expropriation* of the capitalist class.

## The Managerial States

In Germany you had a political Bonapartist assumption of power by the fascists—a political revolution, for the sake of argument—but in no fundamental sense was this occurrence a social revolution, a transfer of economic power from one class to another. As I have already pointed out in my articles on Germany, the bourgeoisie in that country remains the bourgeoisie. *Class relations to capital are bourgeois*. The state, it is true, functions differently in many ways from that of the American or the British, but its fundamental character is not at variance with the states of the democratic powers.

The conflict between Nazi Germany and Great Britain can not be explained as the struggle between opposing social orders, but only by the nature of the power of these imperialist nations and their relation to the world market. Every feature of bourgeois economy, the profit system, wage-labor, private ownership of the means of production, the financial structure, the character of the war and the manner of their prosecution of this war are unchanged in either nation.

It is not necessary to restate the figures I have previously produced to show that the foregoing is the fact. The present German state corresponds in a large measure to the character of the bourgeois state outlined by Marx and Engels. The political bureaucracy in Germany exerts an enormous power. To a considerable degree, it controls the economic, social and political life of the nation. However great the abnormalities inherent in the nazi power, they do not conflict with the fundamental nature of the bourgeois economic order. They result from contradictions emanating from a powerful productive apparatus isolated from the sources of profitable existence

by the nature of world capitalism. The status of the proletariat remains unchanged. Political changes have been many and for the Nazi Party they have meant state power, economic sinecures for many thousands of previously disfranchised and declassed elements; it has meant riches and entrance into the ranks of the bourgeoisie for the Brown shirt hierarchy.

What of the managers in Germany? They remain "managers," operating executives, superintendents, administrative engineers, etc., in the employ of the bourgeoisie, from whom they receive their orders and their salaries, even though that bourgeoisie may be compelled to subordinate itself to the demands of the state under the conditions of the war. Otherwise, what has happened to the bourgeoisie in Germany, to the powerful association of Ruhr industrialists or the Junkers? Have they been liquidated or economically expropriated? Are they now salaried individuals who obtain the lion's share of national income, merely on sufferance from a triumphant managerial state which has no need of a bourgeoisie? The question answers itself.

### The Class Position of the "Managers"

Let us return to the United States. The managers in this country play even less a special rôle, industrially, politically or socially, than in Germany. It is not an accident that the "managerial class" is unaware of what Burnham considers the overwhelming fact of present-day society: the managerial revolution. The "managerial class" happens not to be a class. It cannot be identified by common economic interests which claim their adhesive organization. Burnham's assertion that the binding quality of the "managerial class" is the all-powerful desire to produce, to continue producing, and to operate industry is a kind of subjective individualistic desire (we do not for a moment grant that this feeling exists) which has no great social, political or economic significance, certainly not the significance which enables one to conclude that this disorganized, goal-less, idea-less conglomeration is now engaged in taking or has already conquered power.

Is Stettinius a manager? Is Knudsen a manager? In the simplest meaning of the term, yes. But they are also members

of the bourgeoisie, like so many others of their rank. Their economic interests, their habits and associations, their psychology is bourgeois, for they are, economically, politically and socially, members of the ruling class.

The thousands upon thousands of other "managers" who fit the description given by Burnham make up a *part* of America's middle class. Their consciousness, their activity, their basic rôle in the national economy is to be likened to that of the total middle class. What superior aptitudes and greater social consciousness do superintendents, operating engineers, draftsmen, production men, foremen, have over other equivalent economic groupings? Because they do not represent a basic and fundamental class, with common ideas and common aims, because they have no goal, no program, either for themselves or society as a whole, because of their unstable economic position, it is futile to assign grandiose historical tasks, such as "managerial revolution," to them. The whole of this group are employees, who decide nothing, but carry out orders, each doing his specific task in a given industry, which is coordinated at the pinnacle. They in no sense determine or direct production. But Burnham does not prove what he says about them, he merely state his point and lets it rest there.

• • •

Burnham's scientific objectivity suffers in discussing the question of Managerial Society and Socialism. Like all apostates, his socialist past is embarrassing and he must needs salve his conscience by "proving" the impossibility of socialism, at least in his own lifetime. Thus he lays his pattern: the specific social weight of the proletariat diminished with technological developments, the proletariat declines in numbers; the development of war science foredooms the socialist revolution since you cannot take power with "street barricades and pike-staffs." In any case, the managerial society will precede socialism in the next period of history. We shall return to these questions in our next article.

If thus far we have failed to answer concrete data in favor of the managerial theory, it is because the author has not supplied any; his theory is composed of assertions which, whether true or not, one is asked to accept.

ALBERT GATES.

### DISCUSSION ARTICLE:

## THE RUSSIAN STATE

IT IS NOT BY ACCIDENT that it was the Russian question that brought about the split in the American section of the Fourth International. The revolutionary workers movement today can take no serious steps forward unless it has a clear theoretical grasp of the Russian experience, unless it can answer unequivocally the question: What is the present Russian state? Should we defend it or fight against it?

In recent years there were two theories concerning the character of Stalinist Russia represented among adherents of the Fourth International. Some were of the opinion that contemporary Russia, despite all manifestations of degeneration, is basically still a workers' state. Others held Stalinist Russia to be an exploiters' state. Many were for a long time of the opinion that both of these views could exist side by side in one international organization. Trotsky, too, believed that we could discuss this "theoretical question" within the framework of one organization, without splitting, as long as there is unity

on political conclusions. But in reality opposing evaluations of the basic character of Stalin's state *had* to lead, in the final analysis, to opposing political conclusions. For if Russia is really a workers' state—even if it be a degenerated one—then every one of its wars must be considered as basically progressive and just, and Russia must be defended. In that case, opposition to Stalin's régime can at most have the task of showing how the war may be better waged—how it could be won. It is a "political opposition" under the slogan of defense of the Soviet Union. If, on the other hand, Russia is an exploiters' state, where the workers and the peasants form the exploited and oppressed class, and if its wars are imperialist, unjust, reactionary, then the task of the Russian workers is to utilize the war to overthrow their exploiters and oppressors by means of a social revolution.

This deep contradiction could remain hidden or partly obscured as long as it was not faced with a practical test. War,



however, is the deepest social crisis; it tests every theory in practice and forces every tendency to show itself in its true colors. The war also sweeps away the illusion that the defenders of Stalin's "workers' state" can work peaceably together with adherents of the new social revolution in Russia, without fighting out their deep-going differences. The war has shown that it was impossible for them to do so.

If the Fourth International had had a section of Russia, its parts would now have stood on different sides of the barricades. The Russian "Cannonites" would have *supported* the attack on East Poland, the Baltic countries, Finland—even though critically; they would, so long as Stalin would not kill them, have been "the best soldiers of the Red Army" and they would most likely have had shot as "counter-revolutionary defeatists" and "saboteurs of the progressive war" those followers of the Fourth International who had been opposed to these predatory attacks, who would have agitated for evacuation of these countries by the Russian troops of occupation, and for a social revolution against the bureaucracy.

Comrade Trotsky once said, quite rightly, that just as a conscientious housewife will tolerate no dirt and no cobwebs in her household, so, likewise, in the long run, no theoretical rubbish can be tolerated in the household of the proletarian party. Even if today it perhaps does *not yet* lead to tragic political mistakes (the theory that Russia is a degenerated workers' state), it will, if not attacked in time, certainly do so tomorrow. I believe he was fundamentally right in this remark. Except that in my opinion the theoretical rubbish in the Russian question is not the theory of a new class society, but the false assertion that Stalin's Russia is still a workers' state. To prove this is the task of this article.

### Theory Is a Mockery of Reality

If you free yourself for a moment from the confused mass of "theoretical" juggling, if you visualize concretely contemporary Russian reality and apply to it Marxist criteria, then one must really marvel at the fact that there are still people who consider Russia to be a workers state. Here I do not have in mind the simple worker influenced by the Stalinists. He just doesn't know the facts. He imagines conditions in Russia to be entirely different from what they really are. But participants in discussions of the Fourth International are people who, presumably, know the facts. And they are these:

The Russian worker is exploited in the most shameless fashion. His standard of life is not only deeply below the level of the poorest European worker, but also way below the level of the Czarist times. The position of the worker in Russia has become monstrously worse since the end of the NEP. In the whole course of the Stalin régime, the *relative* income of workers (compared with the income of bureaucrats) decreased systematically, today the worker's real wages are decreasing even *absolutely*. The workers (and a large part of the kolhhoz peasants) are starving, whereas the bureaucracy is leading a "better and happier" life. The difference between the standard of life of the exploited and the exploiters in Russia is not narrower than, but rather at least as large as in the capitalist countries; the relation of 1:100 in income being no exception. And the disproportion is continually growing. According to conservative estimates, 15 per cent of the population receive over half of the national income. The appropriation of the surplus product by the exploiter is at least as extensive as in capitalist countries.

Furthermore, the workers have no political or economic rights at all. In the management of the factories and of the

state they have literally nothing to say. They cannot even express their opinion, except under the threatened penalty of death. Management of the economy and of the state is a monopoly of the bureaucracy. It alone decides what should be produced, where and how, and the manner in which the social product shall be distributed; it alone dictates all wages and prices. Not even in the determination of their wages and conditions of work do the workers have a voice. They may not go on strike nor bargain collectively for their wages, let alone complain of them. They are not permitted to leave their factory, the penalty being jail. They may go to prison for having once come to work 15 minutes late. They must upon order accept any and every kind of work for any wage. They are imprisoned if production norms are not reached, or if the quality of the product does not correspond to demands. They must not only accept, without criticism, prolongation of hours of work or reductions in wages, but also express thanks to the Leader for them in "unanimous" resolutions. In short, far from being lords of the means of production, the Russian workers are rather their living appendages.

The bureaucrats are no longer ashamed of their privileges. They live "better and happier lives." They display their luxury in the midst of widespread misery. They bequeath their privileges to their children by means of individual inheritance as well as monopoly of education and open nepotism. They have developed frankly exploiter and *nouveaux riches* tendencies in all fields of ideology and psychology. At the 18th party congress they constituted themselves rather openly as a special class with a new, fine-sounding name: the "Soviet intelligentsia."

These are all incontestable facts. Why then should not every worker ask: How can you call *that* a workers' state? And how can you expect him to be satisfied with the poor excuse: Yes, of course, it is not the *ideal* workers' state, but the ideal is one thing, you see, and raw reality another. . . . Such stutterings have been dished out from time immemorial by each and every defender of exploitation and oppression.

No one can argue away the simple truth that a workers' state is a state where the workers have control over the means of production. Or that such a state, where the workers have no voice at all in the management of the social means of production, where they are completely enslaved, politically and economically, is not a workers' state.

The defender of the workers' state can save himself least of all by the allusion to Bonapartism. However one may think otherwise of the theory of Bonapartism, this much is certain, namely, that Bonapartism at most means the *political* expropriation of the ruling class in order better to defend its *economic* power against the oppressed. Bonapartism never attacked capitalist ownership of the means of production. Quite the contrary, it promoted and defended it. Under Bonapartism the capitalists remained the lords of their enterprises. Have the Russian workers under Stalin perhaps remained lords in the factories? No; precisely there, they have become slaves. Reference to Bonapartism in this case has neither rhyme nor reason to it.

According to Marxist theory, the state is the organ of forceful oppression of one class by another. If the present Russian state were a workers' state, then it would be the expression of the organized power of the working class. Against whom? Against the Russian bourgeoisie which acknowledgedly does not exist? Against the world bourgeoisie, in whose plunderings it participates? Or perhaps against . . . the bureaucracy?

The theory that Stalin's state is a workers' state is a mockery of reality, a mockery of Marxist theory and of the exploited masses in Russia. Now let us take a look at the "theoretical arguments by which this theory is defended.

### What Does State Ownership Mean?

To be exact, there is *only one* argument in defense of the theory of the "workers' state" which most "defensists" repeat time and again like a mystical or magic formula, and which obscures the relations between people and classes. This argument is as follows: Russia is a workers' state because the means of production there have been "nationalized," that is to say, they have been statified. Consequently, there is also planned production. The plan, it is true, functions swinishly; nowhere on earth is there so disordered an economy as in Stalin's country. Nonetheless, according to the social type, virtually complete centralization of the means of production in the hands of the state, results in basis for statewide planning.

Well and good. Now we are faced with the question: is statification of the means of production in itself identical with the essentially socialist method of production? If so, then essentially there is socialism in Russia, and all we can do is to agree with the wonder working rabbi in Radek's anecdote who, in answer to the question "Is socialism possible in one country?" replied "Yes," but immediately added "but you should live somewhere else." But *if not*, then the whole argumentation of the "workers' statist" fall together like a house of cards.

Fortunately Marxists have always had an unequivocal answer to this question: the statification of the means of production of and by itself is *not* identical with the socialist mode of production or with the rule of the working class. Even old Engels made fun of those who welcomed every statification as a piece of socialism. According to that, he said, the military regiment's tailor would be the first socialist institution. He also foresaw the possibility of a large measure of statification under the continuance of capitalist exploitation, and wrote as follows in "Anti-Duehring":

"But the conversion into either joint-stock companies or state property does not deprive the productive forces of their character as capital. In the case of the joint-stock company, it is obvious. And the modern state, too, is only the organization with which bourgeois society provides itself in order to maintain the general external conditions of the capitalist mode of production against encroachments either by the workers or by individual capitalists. The modern state, whatever its form, is an essentially capitalist machine; it is the state of the capitalists, the ideal collective body of all the capitalists, the more citizens it exploits. The workers remain wage-earners, proletarians."

And Lenin wrote in "The Threatening Catastrophe" in 1917:

"For, once a large-scale capitalist enterprise becomes a monopoly, this means that it serves the entire people. Once it has become state monopoly, this means that the state . . . directs the enterprise . . . in whose interests? Either in the interests of the landowners and capitalists; then we have not a revolutionary democratic but a *reactionary bureaucratic state, an imperialist republic*; or in the interest of revolutionary democracy; then this is in reality a step toward socialism."

In this last sentence of Lenin you have merely to substitute "exploiting bureaucracy" for "landowners and capitalists" in order to get a striking picture of the contemporary Russian situation. But it never occurs to the "workers' statist" to pose, together with Lenin, the question "*in whose interests?*" They repeat the magic formula "state ownership means workers' power" with the stubbornness of Stalinist believers.

Hundreds of quotations could be found to prove that revo-

lutionary Marxism *never* identified *per se* the statification of the means of production with socialism or workers' power. However, even without quotations, this is perfectly clear to anyone who has a head with which to think. And in case there were no quotations, bitter reality itself has taught us that statification of the means of production and the corresponding "planned economy" are compatible with the worst enslavement and exploitation. Not even an ostrich can bury his head from that.

Comrade Shachtman has quite correctly emphasized the difference between property *forms* and property *relations*. He proved that even under the property form of "statified property," real property relations can be such that one class exploits the other by means of this state property. What I can not understand is why he calls these exploiting production relations "state socialism." ~~One can of course choose any term he wants for new phenomena, if its content is clearly understood.~~ But why should we further disgrace the word "socialism"? Stalin's "state socialism" has as little to do with socialism as her Hitler's "national socialism."

But perhaps our friends who defend the "workers' state" will correct themselves a little. Perhaps they will say: statification *in itself* does not mean a workers' state; we know that too. But when the means of production are in the hands of the *workers'* state, then that is the socialist mode of production or at least a preliminary step to it.

Now, we can agree to this formulation. However, the position of the "workers' statist" in our fight is not bettered by it, but only made worse. Their position becomes simply ridiculous. They are saying that Russia is a workers' state because there are essentially socialist production relations. These production relations, however, are essentially socialist, because it is a workers' state which owns the means of production. Or, to put it briefly, Russia is a workers' state for the very reason that it is a workers' state. The whole method of proof is an insipid tautology: if the state which owns the means of production is really a workers' state, then the working class is the ruling class in Russia. However, simply pose the question "Is that really so? How do you prove it?" and the entire rotten spell will be broken.

### Is the Bureaucracy a Class?

The question as to whether or not Russia is a workers' state cannot be answered by mere reference to statification or to "planned economy." We have to ask, with Lenin, "In whose interests?" We have to analyze the real class relations within the statified economy. And here we come to the question: is contemporary Russia a class state? Is the exploiting bureaucracy a ruling class?

In order to answer this question, we must first clarify our conception of what a class is. Happily, all participants in this discussion—insofar as they profess Marxism—agree on this conception. They know that those people form a class, who have, essentially the same relation to the means of production, which relation is basically different from that of the members of other classes. The ruling class is that one which has a monopolistic control over the social means of production, and which exploits economically the other class, forced to work with these means of production. The oppressed or exploited class is that one which itself disposes of no means of production and which therefore is robbed by the ruling class, by those who control the means of production of a part of the product of its labor (the surplus product). We all know clearly, too, that differences in consumption (in the "standard of life") *alone*



do not yet determine class differences. On the other hand, we know that "distribution" is not independent of production relations, but that it rather forms their reverse side, as Marx so wisely proved in the preface to *The Critique of Political Economy*.

Armed with this knowledge, we now return to Russia. Comrade Trotsky once wrote that in Russia, it is true, the difference in consumption between a washerwoman and a red marshall is indeed tremendous, but that there is no difference as regards their relation to the means of production. In this example "washerwoman" means "worker" and "marshall" means "bureaucrat." And this statement is (and was even at that time) a heap of nonsense. For between the washerwoman and the worker on the one hand, and the marshall, the people's commissar and the party secretary on the other, there is a tremendous and basic difference *precisely in their relation to the means of production*. The washerwoman and the worker belong to that group of people who have *nothing* to say as to what should be produced, and how and where, how the means of production (and the workers) should be distributed, and how the social product should be divided. The marshall and the people's commissar, on the other hand, belong to that group of people which decides all these things in a monopolistic fashion, which distributes the social product and which keeps for itself the lion's share. The difference between these two groups is a difference in the relation *to the means of production*—one group controls them, the other is exploited because it does *not* control them. This is a classical class difference. And the differences in the standard of life, which Trotsky has so well described, are, as always, the result of this different position to the means of production, the result of this "production relation." These differences did not fall from the sky. To label them as "simple thievery" is just as witty as to substitute for the analysis of capitalist society the remark that capitalists are thieves and that property is robbery. This is a relapse from Marxism to Proudhonism.

### Who Owns the Means of Production?

But the bureaucrats *don't own* the means of production in Russia, do they? To this we must clearly answer: *Yes, indeed, they do own them!* They do not own them individually (each his own factory), but rather they own them collectively, as an hierarchically organized class. This is the "new form" of property, peculiar to the bureaucratic class.

Permit us then a counter-question: Who otherwise owns the means of production in Russia? Are they perhaps (in the class sense) without rulers, *res nullius*; do they lie around on the street, so to speak? There is no bourgeoisie in the old sense of the word. The only possible alternative to our answer is the assertion that the *working class* owns the means of production. The working class, which not only has no voice *at all* in management, but which is completely without rights, enslaved and exploited by these very means of production!

Upon what can this absurd assertion (that the workers own the means of production) base itself? Well—it says so in the Soviet Constitution. Now, we are not small children. Not for nothing have we undergone a Marxist education and learned that a society cannot be judged by what it says of itself, but rather by an analysis of the relations existing between people (and classes). Marxism has taught us to distinguish between juridical fiction and real social relations. We do not believe that all citizens are equal in capitalist society just because bourgeois law says so. Just as little do we believe that the

means of production in Russia belong to "all those who work," because it says so in the Soviet Constitution.

Then, however, there remains for the "workers' statist" only one escape, namely, the theory of the "unfaithful steward." The working class still owns, don't you see, the means of production, but an unfaithful steward, the bureaucracy, has taken over its management and enriches itself thereby. Well and good. Just try to imagine: I have a house. This is run by a manager. This manager gives me no accounts whatsoever. He manages the house entirely according to his own desires and for his own benefit. He pockets the entire profit. I have no change of removing him by legal means. And finally he locks me up in the cellar and, armed with a whip, makes me work for him.

Now I ask: who is the owner of this house, he or I? Perhaps here and there a juridical cretin will be found who replies: the house is yours, the deed says so! Every Marxist and every sensible person, however, will say: this house now, in reality, belongs to the robber.

What is property, according to bourgeois jurisprudence? Property is the right to dispose of something as one sees fit. This right of disposal—originally absolute—is limited in many ways in practice. When, however, *nothing* of this right any longer remains, then property also disappears. Of the right of disposal by the working class over the means of production in Russia, *nothing* has really remained. To say that the working class owns the means of production is utter nonsense.

The bureaucracy does not own the means of production individually, but collectively. Collective bureaucratic ownership of the means of production has been substituted for the private property of the capitalists; the bureaucrats are not organized democratically, within their class, but hierarchically. Is there such a thing as a class without individual private property? Of course. History contains countless examples of class property, which was not individual private property. Up to now no one has contested the class character of these societies.

W. KENT.

(To be concluded in the August issue)

---

"No one wants to make profits out of the country's danger. . . . After providing for debenture service, provision for depreciation of \$800,000 and reserving for our taxation liabilities of all kinds, the profit for this year is shown as just over \$4,000,000, which is \$70,000 more than last year." (S. R. Beale, chairman of Guest, Keen & Nettlefolds, *Sunday Times*, June 30, 1940.)

\* \* \*

"His reply to the bankers who, in the first days of the war, had made \$52,000,000 extra profit by increasing the bank rate, which had increased the cost of living by three points, was that they ought to hand back their ill-gotten gains before lecturing the working classes of this country." (Ernest Bevin, March, 1940.)

\* \* \*

"Britain now has 1,024 millionaires. This is an addition of 107 in a year. (*The Bulletin*, April 24, 1940.)

\* \* \*

"This war is, in one of its minor objectives, a war to make the world safe for the gold standard." (Oscar Hobson, *News Chronicle*.)

# Archives of the Revolution

Documents Relating to the History and Doctrine of Revolutionary Marxism

## Concerning Historical Materialism

**M**ORE AND MORE has the human spirit become master over the dead mechanism of nature; and in the spiritual mastery of the process of production has the progressive development of the human race been completed and is completing itself.

"Upon skill in the production of the necessities of life depends the entire question of the mastery of mankind over the earth. Man is the only being of whom one can say that he has obtained a complete mastery over the production of the means of nourishment, in which he had no superiority over other animals at the beginning. . . . Thus it is highly probable that the great epochs of human progress are more or less directly correlated with the extension of the sources of subsistence." (Morgan, *Primitive Society*.)

If we should follow Morgan's division of human prehistory, then the first stage of savagery is marked by the creation of articulate speech, the second by the use of fire, the third by the discovery of the bow and arrow, which is a very complex tool and which to build presupposes long, accumulated experience and sharpened mental powers, thus also knowledge, at the same time of a number of other discoveries. On this last level of savagery, there is already established a certain mastery of production by the human spirit; it is acquainted with wooden vessels and implements, plaited baskets of bast and reeds, polished stone tools, etc.

Morgan dates the passage to barbarism from the introduction of pottery, which marks the lowest stage. Its middle stage is reached with the taming of domestic animals, the cultivation of food plants by means of irrigation, the use of stones and bricks for buildings.

Finally the highest stage of barbarism begins with the smelting of iron ore. With it the production of the material life already attains an extraordinary rich development. The Greeks of the heroic age; the Italian tribes shortly before the founding of Rome; the Germans of Tacitus belong to it. This age is acquainted with the bellows, the kilns (*Erdofen*), and the forge, the iron axe, the iron spade, and the iron sword, the spear with copperpoints and embossed shield, the hand mill and the potter's wheel, the cart and the war chariot, ships built of beams and planks, towns with walls and battlements, with gates and towers and marble temples. A visual (*anschauliche*) picture of the progress in the production attained at the highest stage of barbarism is given in the Homeric poems, which are themselves classical products of the spiritual life arising from this mode of production. Thus mankind is not the will-less plaything of a dead mechanism but its progressive development is rooted in the growing mastery of the human spirit over the dead mechanism of nature. But the human spirit—and this is asserted only by historical materialism—evolves through, with, and out of the material modes of production. The spirit is not their father, but the modes of production are its mother. This relation appears most strikingly and significantly obvious in the primitive societies of mankind.

The transition from barbarism to civilization is brought about by the discovery of the alphabet and its employment for literary records. The written history of mankind begins, and at this stage the spiritual life appears as if it were completely severed from its economic foundations. But this appearance is misleading. With civilization, with the dissolution of the organization of the gentes, with the creation of the family, of private property, of the state, with the progressive division of labor, the splitting of society into ruling and ruled, into oppressing and oppressed classes, the dependence of the spiritual development upon the economic becomes endlessly more obscure and complicated, but it does not cease. "The fundamental ground upon which the distinction of classes has been defended: that there must exist a class which does not have to wear itself out producing its daily livelihood, so that it will have time to take care of the spiritual work of society, has had, until now, great historic justification" (Engels). Until now, i.e., until the industrial revolution of the last hundred years, which has turned every ruling class into an obstacle for the development of the industrial forces of production.

"But the splitting of society into classes rose only out of the economic development. Thus the spiritual labor of no class can be separated from the economic foundation to which it owes its origin. Deep as was the sinful fall of man from the simple, moral heights of the old gentile society to those of the new society governed by the most depraved interests, which was never anything more than the development of the small minority at the expense of the exploited and oppressed great majority, yet the spiritual development was tremendous from the gentes, still attached by the umbilical cord to the natural society, to the appearance of modern society with its enormous productive powers." (Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*.)

But great as was this progress of the human spirit in becoming a fine, supple, strong, instrument with which irresistibly to subdue nature, yet its springs and driving forces remain always the economic conflict of the particular classes, the "existing conflict between the social forces of production and the relations of production"; yet mankind has posed for itself only such tasks as it could solve, or more exactly, thought continually finds, as Marx declares, that the task only arises where the material conditions for its solution already exists, or at least are in the process of being created. One recognizes most easily this relationship when one investigates to their source the great discoveries and inventions, which according to the ideological conception both of historical idealism and scientific materialism have sprung from the creative, human spirit like Athena from the brow of Zeus, and thereby brought about the most tremendous economic transformations. Every one of these discoveries and inventions has had a long previous history.\*

\*Morgan writes: "The phonetic alphabet was, like other great inventions, the final result of manifold, successive efforts." See also Marx, *Capital*, I, 285: "A critical history of technology would show how little of any particular invention of the 18th century belongs to any one individual."

And if the simple stages of this pre-history is traced, it would be to recognize above all the necessity which called them forth. There already exists good evidence for this, because many of the most significant inventions, like the discovery of gunpowder and the art of printing, which "have altered the face of the earth," are hidden in a mist of legends. They are not the work of single individuals, who created them out of the mysterious depths of their genius. If some have rendered, by their inventions, a great service, this was so only because these individuals recognized most sharply and deeply the economic need and the means to satisfy it. The discovery or invention does not call forth the economic transformation, but the social transformation, the discovery or invention; and only in this fashion, when a social transformation brings about a discovery or invention does it become a world-shaking event. America was discovered long before Columbus; already Norsemen had, in the year 1000, been along the northeast coast of America, even as far as the territory belonging to the United States today, but the discovered lands were immediately forgotten and not heard of. As soon as the capitalist development, in its beginnings, called up a need for rare metals, for new labor power, and for new markets, then did the discovery of America signify an economic revolution. It is well enough known that Columbus did not discover a new world out of a dark impulse of his genius, but that he was searching after the fabulous treasures of the ancient civilized land of the Indies. The day after the discovery of the first island, he wrote in his day book: "These good-natured people ought to serve as very useful slaves," and his daily prayer ran: "May the Lord in his goodness let me find the gold mines." The "Lord of Goodness" was the ideology of that time, as the even more hypocritical ideology of today is to bring "humanity and civilization to the darkest corners of the world."

The proverbial tragic fate of the inventor of great genius is not a result of human ingratitude, as the ideological conception implies in its superficial way, but an easily understood consequence of the fact that the discovery does not make the economic transformation but the economic transformation the discovery. Sharp and deeply-sighted spirits recognize the task and its solution, even before the material conditions of this solution are yet ripe and the extant social formation has developed all its productive forces for which it would be sufficient. It is a remarkable fact that the inventions which more than any of the earlier ones contributed most in extending human productive power brought their inventors misfortune and, in fact, disappeared more or less without a trace for hundreds of years (Müller ribbon-loom, 1529; Denis Papin, steam engine and boat, 1707).

\* \* \*

An economic transformation brought about the disintegration of feudalism and nowhere was the political superstructure of the material modes of production so clearly and quickly transformed than in the military. Concerning this, bourgeois historical writing, particularly in the Prussian military state, has been especially clear. Thus, writes Gustav Freytag, who, if possible, prefers to spin German history out of the "German soul," but because of his particular interest in the life of the masses of little folk, he is driven by progressive compromises toward historical materialism:

"The Frankish military force of the Merovingians, the lord of the knightly lancers, the Swiss, and mercenaries of the Reformation, and again the army of mercenaries of the thirty years' war, were all highly characteristic growths of their time. They arose out of these social conditions and changed as these changed. Thus the oldest foot soldier of the

propertied classes is rooted in the old municipalities and shires, the mounted knight in the feudal life of luxury, the groups of mercenaries in the growing power of the bourgeoisie, the companies of wandering mercenaries in the growth of the territorial power of the prince. The permanent army of well-drilled mercenary soldiers appears afterward in the despotic states of the eighteenth century."

And only with the appearance of these "permanent armies of well drilled mercenary soldiers" in the days of Ludwig XIV and Prince Eugene was the spear finally displaced by the firearm, for the infantry, drafted more or less forcibly from the lowest ranks of the nations, could only be held together by the cane and, since it lacked individual initiative or push, could only be used as shooting machines. Such an infantry of mercenaries was each and every one of them, the very opposite of the foot-soldiers who were responsible at Morgart and at Sampach in the 14th century for the first smashing defeats of the feudal knights. This foot-soldiery fought with spears and even with such primitive weapons, as the throwing of stones, but their ferocious power, irresistible for the knights, was created from their old municipal associations, which bound them together one for all and all for one.\*

From these simple contrasts, the weakness of the assumption already follows, that the invention of powder was the cause of the breakdown of feudalism. Feudalism fell because of the growth of cities and of the monarchy supported by the cities. A barter economy underlaid the financial and industrial economy. Thus the feudal nobility had to be the foundation of the cities and the princes. The new economic powers created for themselves the military forms corresponding to the economic forms. With money, they raised men from the proletariat, thrown upon the highways by the disintegration of feudalism; with their industry, they produced weapons which were as superior in their strength over feudal weapons as the capitalist modes of production over the feudal. They did not discover powder—for this was handed down by the Arabs to the west Europeans in the 14th century—but shooting with powder. Basically the firearm established the unconditional superiority of bourgeois over feudal arms.

The town walls could as little withstand the cannon balls of the artillery as the armor of the knight could withstand the bullets of the blunderbuss. But the art of shooting was not invented in a single day. As always, economic necessity was here too the mother of invention. The conquest of feudalism was completed so impetuously, the power of the cities and the princes grew so quickly that the inventive power of the human mind was little stimulated to better the firearms which at the beginning were very poor and hardly superior to the cross-bow and arrow. How could it be otherwise when an army of nobles are defeated, as at Granson and Murten, although they happened to have the superiority in firearms! Thus the improvement of these weapons went very slowly; we see how late the flintlock, a very useful weapon, was employed as equipment for an entire infantry. This weapon was only possible at a certain level of capitalist development. With the weapon monarchial absolutism was able to wage its commercial wars with a military organization, strategy and tactics demanded by its basic economic structure. But should anyone lament the slow development of firearms in the earlier centuries as a stupid misfortune, then a glance directed at our century ought to comfort and give him the pleasant certainty that the human spirit is truly inexhaustible in the invention of lethal weapons, provided that the economic development, in this

\*Concerning the above see the splendid writings of Karl Bürkli: *Die wahre Winkelried, die Taktik der Urschweiger, Der Ursprung der Eidgenossenschaft aus der Markgenossenschaft* and *Die Schlacht am Morgarten*.

case, the frantically savage, competitive struggle between big capitalists, drives it with a hunting whip.

Thus, historical materialism does not assert that mankind is a will-less plaything of a dead mechanism; nor does it deny the power of the mind. On the contrary, it entirely agrees with Schiller from whom the Philistine aspiring for culture preferably takes his idealism:

*The higher the human spirit develops,  
The finer sphinx arises in the night,  
The richer is the world which it embraces,  
The wider streams the sea with which it flows,  
The weaker is the sightless power of Fate.*

Only historical materialism understands the law of this spiritual development. And it finds the root of this law in that which first makes humans into humans, the production and reproduction of life. That beggarly pride which once scoffed at Darwinism as an ape-theory may struggle against it and find its satisfaction in the belief that the human spirit flutters about like an incalculable goblin forming with divine creative power a new world out of nothing. Lessing has already completely dismissed this supernatural belief both in his satire concerning the "empty possibility which can be handled under certain conditions in this or in that way," and in his wise saying:

*The iron pot  
Would rather be upraised with a silver tongs  
That it might think itself a pot of silver.*

In short, we can meet the objection that historical materialism denies all ethical standards of measurement. It is not at all the task of the historical investigator to employ ethical norms. He ought to tell us what has happened upon the basis of an objective scientific investigation. What he thinks concerning this, in terms of our own subjective, ethical point of view, we do not demand to know. The "ethical standards or norms" are continually undergoing a transformation and if any living generation with its changing ethical norms would criticize past generations, that is like measuring solidified geologic strata with the drifting sands of the dunes. Schlosser, Gervinus, Ronke, Janssen—each has a different ethical measuring rod, each has his particular class morality, and more faithfully than the times which they evaluate, they reflect the classes in their works, of whom they were the spokesmen. And it is obvious that this would not be otherwise for a proletarian historian if he were to pass judgment upon earlier times from the present ethical standpoint of his class.

So far historical materialism denies in every way all ethical mores, but only "insofar"; it bans them from historical investigation, in general, because they make impossible any

scientific historiography. But if the same objection means that historical materialism fundamentally denies the power of ethical drives in history, then the opposite is true. It so little denies them, that it, in general, has made possible the first understanding of them. In the "material transformations of the economic relations of production which can be truly scientific," it possesses the only true norm with which to investigate sometimes more slowly, sometimes more quickly, the resulting transformation of ethical points of view. They are, in every instance, the product of the mode of production. Therefore, Marx attacked the Nibelungen text of Richard Wagner, who seeks to make his love situation more piquant by bringing in, in an entirely modern way, a little incest. He asserted: "In primitive times, the sister was the wife; and this was moral." Just as historical materialism put in their proper place the great men who make history, so it properly places the portraits of historical characters who, enmeshed in the hate and favor of parties, have dropped in and out of history. It is just to every historical personality because it knows how to consider all the driving forces which have determined his activity or inactivity, and it is able, therefore, to define the morality of this activity and inactivity with a fineness of distinction of which the gross "ethical norms" of ideological historiography are one and all incapable.

One takes in hand once again Kautsky's remarkable book on Thomas More: "For the ideological historians, Thomas More is a true cross. He was a pioneer fighter for the bourgeois class a well educated and free-thinking man, a learned humorist and the first pioneer of socialism. But he was also the minister of a tyrannical principality, an enemy of Luther and a heresy hunter; he was a martyr of the papacy, and he is today a saint of the Catholic Church, if not yet officially, which he may yet become, still unofficially. What now can ideological historiography do with such a character, even though it may derive its "ethical norms" from Berlin or Rome or wherever it wills? It can glorify or defame him, or half glorify and half defame him, but with all its "ethical norms" it can never disclose an historical understanding of the man. On the other hand, Kautsky has brilliantly solved this problem with the aid of historical materialism. He has shown that Thomas More was a complete man and that all of the apparent contradictions of his life indissolubly hang together. One learns to know infinitely better the ethical powers of the medieval Reformation from Kautsky's thin little book than from what Darke with his five and Janssen with his six thick volumes have brought to the surface by means of diametrically opposed "ethical standards of measurement." That is why Kautsky's book was so completely hushed up. Today, the "ethical standard" of bourgeois historiography demand it.

FRANZ MEHRING.

## War Policy in England

IN OCTOBER OF 1940 the Socialist Workers Party (Cannon group) formally adopted what has since been termed a "military policy for the Second World War." This policy—proclaimed as a *new* weapon in the storehouse of revolutionary Marxism advanced to meet the problems of our militaristic epoch—advocated military conscription and training of the workers under trade union auspices and control. The original impulsion for this policy came from Leon Trotsky,

although he was unable to elaborate or defend his new conception. In the words of Cannon—its chief exponent and *sole* elaborator to date—it is based upon the strategy of a "simultaneous" or "telescoped" war on two fronts—against fascist-Hitler imperialism and against the bourgeoisie in one's homeland.

In the nine months that have passed since adoption of this policy by the Cannon group it is perfectly clear to all but those who delight in self-deception that insofar as the workers' move-

ment in general and the revolutionary movement in particular are concerned, it has produced no positive effect and has met only with the most severe criticism. As a result, the "new policy" has remained an abstraction, stillborn, incapable of sinking a single root into the soil of class struggle politics. At the moment of writing it graces the pages of Socialist Workers Party propaganda only as a forlorn and pathetic remnant of something which—fortunately—died a-borning.

In THE NEW INTERNATIONAL and LABOR ACTION the Workers Party has stated and explained its categorical opposition to the proposed policy. It has elaborated its own "military policy"—the traditional policy of Leninism, modernized in accordance with the needs and experiences of the Second World War.

### The Situation in England

From the standpoint of revolutionists, the most significant development that has occurred in England since the outbreak of the war is *not*, as stupid American correspondents and journalists put it, the ability of the English masses "to take it." What an insult this is to the English proletarians—to compare them with some insensate shock absorber, brutally bombed, but ready to "take it some more"! Much more important and significant to us has been the awakening of the masses of the trade union front: the revival of the famous British shop stewards movement. This act signifies for us the instinctive desire on the part of Britain's workers to *act independently* of their own ruling class in the war. Fourth Internationalists in England are concerned—and rightly so—to enhance the development of this movement so that it reaches a nation-wide, all-England level and, at the same time, to raise it to the level of *independent political action*. This is the main concern and task of revolutionary socialists in England today.

Based on absolutely authentic information, we must report a significant change in Fourth Internationalist fortunes in England. Whereas before there were three or four competing, mutually disunited groups, it now appears that one—and only one—Trotskyist group is of any importance. This group—known as the Workers International League (WIL) and publishing a paper known as *Workers International News*—has resulted from the merger of two of the former groups and has experienced considerable growth in recent times. It represents at the moment the most serious revolutionary organization on the English scene and the gathering center for Revolutionary Marxists. Its active and militant youth section publishes *Youth for Socialism*.

The WIL has formally endorsed the orthodox viewpoint held by Trotsky and the Cannon group on the so-called Russian question. It is in political agreement and sympathy with the Cannon group (SWP) and opposed to Workers Party policies. This agreement has included with it, in our opinion, a rigidly mechanical transplantation to the shores of England of the Cannonite "military policy." It is this that we are most concerned about.

### The Policy of the W.I.L

As explained in the paper of its youth group, *Youth for Socialism* (February, 1941), this policy has the following basis and application.

(1) The British ruling class, precisely as was the French ruling class, is *defeatist* in the war. "The British bourgeoisie is sitting behind its Maginot Line" (the English Channel). It "is not fighting Hitler's fascism." Drawing still further its analogy with the French rulers, *Youth for Socialism* states that

the British rulers are even now preparing a "betrayal" to Hitlerism rather than see the advance of socialism in England.

(2) In view of the above the workers of England must prepare to take over the struggle against Nazism. The "feeble pacifism of the Stalinists and the British ILP" are worse than useless. Workers in England must demand officers' training camps (they already have universal military training) controlled by the trade unions and "financed by the government." There must be a universal arming of the workers so that an invasion attempt can be resisted by the people.

(3) In order to put the above into practice, aside from political education of and agitational work among the masses, it is necessary that "control of the army must be taken out of the hands of the reactionary officers' class and put into those of the workers." Once this is accomplished then a genuine war against Hitlerism can be waged.

We must state candidly that it is our opinion that the above analysis and practical programmatic conclusions are marked by inept and false descriptions, plus major political blundering. These mistakes can be grouped under the following headings: (a) False political analysis of the general situation; (b) False analysis of the rôle of opposition workers' parties; (c) false characterization of the nature of Britain's war and (d) A false program for revolutionary work among Britain's armed forces.

We said before that this policy and program can have disastrous consequences for the English Revolution. This is underscored by the fact that the WIL is the only English organization at present capable of revealing a revolutionary road to the proletarians of their country. The hopelessly pacifist and confusionist British ILP has no future before it. But what if—as we shall attempt to prove—the WIL policy leads only toward social-patriotism, toward a sharp diversion from the path of revolutionary anti-war opposition? But first it is necessary to examine what is wrong.

### The French Experience

(a) The French bourgeoisie was *defeatist*, that is, it capitulated to Hitler rather than face the threat of social revolution in France. Generally speaking, true enough. But how absurd and nonsensical to say the same of the British bourgeoisie! If faced with a clear-cut alternative: a Hitler peace or English bolshevism, there is little doubt what the English bourgeoisie would do. But is *that* the situation today? This superficial analogy ignores (1) the bitter war waged between Britain and Germany for almost two years now and (2) the existence of Roosevelt and American imperialism which, having gained already a mighty grasp on British capital, would not and could not permit a capitulation to Hitler. The quick quelling of "appeasement" tendencies that arose with the Hess affair is surely sufficient evidence of British imperialism's intention to fight on for its world empire (or at least as much of it as Roosevelt will permit it to retain). The world-wide resistance of Britain's imperialists, their desperate efforts to reorganize their economy for totalitarian war purposes, their willingness (symbolized in the person of Churchill) to make sacrifices of capital—and even of profits—in the struggle against rival German imperialism, all these facts demonstrate how false it is to call the English rulers "defeatist." From such a shallow analysis comes nothing but false strategy, for when the bourgeoisie is "defeatist" it is time for the proletariat to consider becoming "defensist."\* At the moment, British and German imperialism are locked in death battle with no serious signs of a compromise imperialist peace. *Britain's ruling*



*class remains in firm control of every phase and aspect of the war it conducts.*

(b) The WIL's analysis of the opposition working class parties refers to the "feeble pacifism" of the Communist Party. We find it singularly inept and misleading to speak of Stalinist "pacifism." What is meant by this? Does it mean that the Stalinists—as agents of the Moscow régime, which is, in turn, the ally of German imperialism—attempt to forward their *military defeatist* propaganda by means of demagogic and deceitful pacifist slogans? If so, then we share this analysis, but we must express our belief that it is far more vital in exposing Stalinism and its actions in the present war to explain before workers the *demagogic* and *military* defeatist character of its slogans. Surely the WIL does *not* mean that the British Communist Party—agency of what they still consider to be a "workers' state"—is a bourgeois or petty-bourgeois pacifist organization! Stalinism cannot be effectively met by taking its program at face value any more than one can take the "pacifist" expressions of the Nazi Bund and its "Fifth Column" organizations at their face value.

(c) The WIL gives a confused and contradictory characterization of the war conducted by Britain—quite similar to that given by the pacifist British ILP. On the one hand, it calls it an "imperialist war," then it speaks of "a genuine war against Hitler," of the need for an "effective" war against fascism, etc. We believe this confusion results from two factors: (a) a mixing up of what the war is *today* with what it may become *tomorrow* under revolutionary leadership; (b) a failure to develop a practical program to bridge the gap between today's imperialist war and the potential revolutionary war of tomorrow. Most significant of all is the fact that the WIL appears as a left-wing critic of the war—not disputing its fundamental premises, *but criticizing its conduct!* This, of course, is quite consistent with the Cannonite military policy which presupposes the possibility of critical support to an imperialist war ("simultaneous" war on two fronts). But it is a far cry from Leninist revolutionary opposition to the war.

### What Should Be Done

(d) With respect to revolutionary work among the armed forces we have two criticisms to offer of the WIL program. This program demands (1) military training of officers under trade union control at government expense, and (2) removal of the officers' reactionary caste and its replacement. Like their co-thinkers in America from whom they took point (1), the WIL has nowhere explained precisely what it means by this. Is it the same thing as workers' and union defense guards? If not, what is its difference? Most important, what is its objective, how does it advance Britain's revolutionary development? As for (2), here we must remind the WIL that they have adopted precisely the same slogan put forward by the Stalinists in Popular Front days, and developed most clearly by the French Communist Party—"Democratize and reform the army by removing its reactionary officers." Trotsky, at that time, denounced the *reformist* conception behind this slogan and point out that the revolutionary objective in the bour-

\*We have an excellent illustration of this in the entirely correct policy of our French movement during the present war. When French resistance collapsed and the defeatist French bourgeoisie fled, along with its corrupt régime, our French comrades executed a strategic about-face and—dropping their revolutionary anti-war slogans—became revolutionary *defensists*, propagandizing among workers for independent resistance to the Nazis, re-creation of the Paris Commune, creation of a French workers' power to replace the defeatist régime of Daladier & Co., etc. They based this reorientation on the fact that the *character* of the war—insofar as France was concerned—had changed. That is, ceasing to be an inter-imperialist war between Germany and the French Empire, it had become a war of Nazi imperialist conquest and subjugation of France. But the situation is entirely otherwise with respect to England today.

geois, imperialist army is not to "reform" it, but to disintegrate, break up and dissolve it, while creating the workers' or people's army in its place. This is no idle quibble over formulations, but is based upon a fundamental conception of the army as a military weapon of the imperialist state.

We cannot permit our revolutionary anti-war tactics and strategy to be diverted by the poisoned premises of the bourgeoisie. We cannot allow our practical program to revolve around any—or any share of—the fundamental "defensist" concepts of the bourgeoisie. Sections of Britain's ruling class differ among themselves solely as to the best methods of preserving their empire. The WIL has allowed itself—in a small but dangerous measure—to be drawn into the quarrels of the English ruling class as how best to conduct the war. But revolutionists cannot argue on *that* level.

It will be objected that our criticism is negative in nature, that we propose no alternatives. It would, however, be presumptuous on our part to offer any detailed revolutionary anti-war program for British Marxists. Certain generalized concepts and tactics are, we believe, worth being considered.

In the first place, it is necessary for the WIL to reaffirm in blunt terms its understanding of the nature of this war. That this is an *inter-imperialist* war in each and every dominant respect; that under no circumstances can revolutionists support (no matter how "critically" in the manner of Harold Laski and the *Tribune* group) this war; that the *main* enemy of Britain's workers is at home—the financial ruling oligarchy of The City symbolized by arch-Tory-imperialist Churchill; that—as revolutionary Fourth Internationalists—the broad strategy is Lenin's, i.e., the establishment of workers' power in England.

If the present British régime should begin to crumble and collapse, then we shall consider a strategic change in the above fundamentals. But—as the experience of France has shown—a collapse resulting from the internal corruption and division of the bourgeoisie, and *not* accompanied by independent revolutionary action can only end in the victorious intervention of Hitler as ruler and arbiter. But this independent revolutionary action can arise only under revolutionary leadership, the prerequisite for which is *complete independence from one's own ruling class*. This is the first principle in wartime one well worth reaffirmation.

And what of work among the armed forces? We believe that the program of the American Workers Party, changed to meet specific English circumstances, answers this question. This program, using democratic demands of the soldiers as the transitional lever, aims primarily at the formation of soldiers' collective bargaining agencies or councils. These democratically elected soldiers' councils, thrown into opposition against the officers' corps, will form the embryo for the people's or workers' army. As for the British labor movement in general, the answer has already been given by the revival of the shop steward movement—a movement that almost immediately clashes with the ruling class *and* its Labor Party and Trade Union Congress bureaucracy.

Finally, what does all this add up to? To repeat the sound words of *Youth for Socialism*, "in order to wage a genuine revolutionary war for the liberation of the peoples of Europe and for the defense of the rights of the British working class it is necessary that power should be in the hands of the workers." Precisely the point. The WIL has allowed itself to be led off on a false tack. A serious and immediate re-study and re-evaluation of its course during the war is needed. This is what we urge and propose.

HENRY JUDD.

# + BOOKS +

## Workers in Russia

WORKERS BEFORE AND AFTER LENIN, by Manya Gordon, New York. E. P. Dutton & Co., 1941, 524 pages.

Manya Gordon has written an extremely interesting, valuable and well documented book about the conditions of the Russian workers. Unless one has read equivalent material (which would be much more difficult to gather), *Workers Before and After Lenin* is a MUST book for anyone who wishes to discuss the Russian question or who merely wishes to be conversant with what is taking place in Russia today.

"Without political freedom all forms of workers' representation will continue to be a fraud. The proletariat will remain as heretofore in prison."—Lenin, 1905, quoted by the author on the frontispiece. It is impossible to overemphasize this statement. Contrast it with the attitude of Stalin, as expressed by one of his journalists in *Za Industrializatsiu*, April 9, 1931: "We are not in the habit of worrying about people. Rather we feel that of that bounty—people—we have more than enough." This callous, bureaucratic indifference to the fate of the people has assumed monstrous proportions during the past decade, making the Stalinist régime one of the most hideous and oppressive in all the tortured history of mankind.

### The Author's Bias

The book, unfortunately, is much more than a factual study from official Soviet sources on the standard of living of the Russian workers. Miss Gordon, wife of Simeon Strunsky, ex-member of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, ex-member of the Socialist Party, current supporter of La Guardia in the American Labor Party, has a political axe to grind. Her thesis is a very simple one. The Russian workers never should have made the revolution. Look how bad their conditions are today. Had capitalist democracy been permitted to survive in Russia, the gigantic strides made by the Russian proletariat after the 1905 Revolution would have resulted in just as much production as exists in Russia today and, in addition, there would be freedom for the masses instead of slavery. Besides, the Russian workers really didn't want to make the October Revolution. Lenin, "the crafty demagogue," "the clever opportunist," "the master politician," took advantage of the Russian workers and slipped the October Revolution over on them against their will and, certainly, against their best interests.

This thesis runs through the book like a red thread. It appears in one form or other in virtually every chapter. Even if the author were correct in her appraisal of the October Revolution, which we don't admit for one moment, it would still represent a serious blemish on an otherwise excellent work. Repetition becomes tedious, even when it is a sound historical statement that is constantly reiterated. In this case, however, it is a compound of the Menshevik thesis that Russia was too backward for a socialist revolution, of the current bourgeois slander that Stalinism represents an inevitable and logical outgrowth of Leninism, and of the author's plain ineptitude and ignorance in interpreting history.

One example will suffice. On page 355, in discussing Lenin's *Imperialism* as a theoretical justification for the Russian revolution, the author states: "He (Lenin) insisted that monopoly is the final phase of capitalism which during a war is inevitably converted 'into an era of proletarian revolution.' Lenin had no difficulty in finding these conditions in Russia. Because of its large-scale production, its cartels and syndicates and their affiliation with the banks, Russia like western Europe was ripe for the socialist revolution. Later, in 1920, when Lenin was faced with closed banks and huge empty plants he forgot completely his previous statements about Russia's readiness for the socialist scheme of things. But it was too late, or rather, Lenin died too soon, and as a result the Russian people had to pay for his folly."

### The Nature of the Russian Revolution.

It would be difficult to crowd more errors in interpreting history into one short paragraph than Manya Gordon does in the above. The Bolshevik leadership did not conceive it possible to build socialism in Russia alone. Russia, to them, was the weakest link in the capitalist chain. Being the first link to break, Russia would become the starting point of the world revolution, which was an indispensable prerequisite for the building of socialism. And, certainly, capitalist society as a whole was and is rotten-ripe for the building of socialism. The theory of socialism in a single country was a Stalinist perversion of Marxism. The Bolsheviks were hardly to blame if Noske and Scheideman, Manya Gordon's political counterparts, slaughtered the main base of the first world revolution in Germany. The NEP was a necessary retreat, but an *organized retreat*. That Stalinism came to power during this period does not prove that the revolution should not have been made, but that the Russian workers were too weak after three years of imperialist war and four years of civil war (for which the bourgeoisie were responsible, not Lenin and the Bolsheviks, Miss Gordon) to withstand the inroads of Stalinism.

Moreover, it seems to me that the author, anxious to prove her case, overstates it substantially when she speaks about the decade of progress under Czarism prior to the revolution. Time and again, in referring to the advanced labor legislation adopted under the Duma (and won by the magnificent fighting power of the Russian workers), she is forced to admit that it remained largely or entirely on paper. For the sake of argument, however, I can grant all that Miss Gordon says about the progress of industry and the standard of living under Czarism. This does not prove that had a bourgeois democratic régime maintained itself in Russia after the overthrow of Czarism that there would have been just as much industrialization (with a comparable rise in the standard of living). Why should a capitalist Russia have made any more progress during the 1920's and the 1930's than the rest of the capitalist world? And, if the argument is made that Russia would have been a young capitalist country, one can point to China, or India, or Canada, or Australia or other young outposts of capitalism and demonstrate that the progress of their industrialization during the last two decades, particularly the last one, has been absolutely feeble in comparison with that of Russia.

### The Standard of Living Declines Under Stalin

The real value of Miss Gordon's book is certainly not its political interpretation of Russian history, nor even the light it throws on the economic conditions in Russia under Czarism and prior to the beginning of the first Five Year Plan. Rather,



it lies in the painstaking and detailed picture of the Russian standard of living since the introduction of the first Five Year Plan. And this, in spite of an inadequate economic analysis of the development of Russian industrial and agricultural production. No wonder the Stalinists have condemned the book. It constitutes a damning and irrefutable indictment of the Stalinist régime. At one stroke, out of official Stalinist sources, it destroys all the myths carefully nurtured by the kept Stalinist press and their bourgeois dupes such as the Webbs and the Dean of Canterbury.

While production has increased considerably, the standard of living in this "paradise for workers," conducted by the "genial and greatest of the great," Stalin, has declined by about one-half since the introduction of the first Five Year Plan in October, 1928. Facts are stubborn things, as Lenin was very fond of saying, and it is a *fact* that the standard of living of the Russian workers and masses has declined tremendously since Stalin came to power. No amount of fake statistics and idiotic rationalizations can get around this fact.

It requires a separate economic analysis to deal with the facts concerning the declining standard of living and the reasons for this phenomenon. Remember that Russia under Stalin represents the first country in the history of the world where a tremendous increase in industrialization has been accompanied by an equally tremendous decline in the standard of living.

Those who are interested in learning something about the real situation of the Russian workers today, about wages, nominal and real, housing, clothing, medical care, education, child and woman labor, food budgets, social security, the depreciation of the rouble, taxes, hours of work and conditions in the factories will read *Workers Before and After Lenin*. Those who wish to perpetuate their own illusions and demonstrate their ignorance in discussing the *reality* that is Russia today will ignore Miss Gordon's book or shrug their shoulders and dismiss it as the work of an enemy of the Russian revolution. Genuine Marxists, however, will understand the value of Miss Gordon's book for it has made available in English a valuable compendium of facts concerning the status of the Russian worker today.

FRANK DEMBY.

## In Search of Light

DARKNESS AT NOON, by Arthur Koestler.

**T**HE AUTHOR OF *Darkness at Noon* mishandles a dramatic theme; he assumes that the confessions at the world-famous Moscow trials can be understood merely in the light of some revelations about the methods of "persuasion" used by Stalin's secret police. That is why Arthur Koestler's novel is weak, if interesting.

The story, a very simple one, revolves about three characters: Rubashev, the old Bolshevik, who confesses to crimes he could never have committed; Ivanov, an examiner of the "old school," who is himself liquidated for the incorrect handling of the star prisoner and Gletkin, Neanderthal man of the Stalin régime, humorless, stolid, and skilled in the use of GPU torture methods.

Rubashev is arrested shortly after his return to the Soviet Union from a diplomatic mission. Having several times previously recanted and denounced the Russian Left Opposition, he is in serious danger. Convinced by Ivanov's gentle methods that he has nothing to gain by holding out and "dying in si-

lence," he decides once more to denounce the opposition. Ivanov, however, is removed for his "soft approach" and Gletkin takes over. Representative of the "hard school," Gletkin soon induces him to confess attempts against Stalin's life and collusion with foreign powers.

From the time that Rubashev is arrested until he is tortured and broken by Gletkin he goes through a rationalization of his confession which is an exposition of the problem of ends and means as only one who accepts the Stalin régime can view it.

### Morality and Truth

History has taught Rubashev that lies very often serve her more adequately than the truth; because man is sluggish and has to be "led through the desert for forty years" prior to every stage in his development. And he must be whipped and coaxed through the desert by creating terrors and imaginary consolations.

The extent to which a people may retain their freedom "depends upon the degree of their political maturity." The maturity of the masses can be determined by their ability to recognize where their interests lie. This, in turn, assumes a certain understanding of historical processes. The ability of the masses to govern themselves therefore is in proportion to the degree to which they understand how society is constructed and how it functions. Until they understand it they cannot be permitted the luxury of a democratic form of government.

What in the long run will be revealed as having been true is today considered false. He who will eventually be justified is today condemned as wrong and of harm to society. So Rubashev reasons.

It is only in the future that men will discover whether one of them was right or wrong. In the meantime one who chooses to advance ideas and act on them must act on credit and hope that coming events will find him solvent.

Still there must be some basis upon which the present can decide what will be judged true or false in the future. The followers of Stalin have recourse to faith, to an "axiomatic" conviction in the absolute infallibility of their leader.

Not a small part of this is due to the fact that Stalin, among them all, seems to possess the most solid foundation of conviction. As Rubashev contemplates his own, he discovers that it has been eaten away by repeated defeat and capitulation in recent years. Actually he has lost faith in the correctness of his convictions and he feels that he is doomed. His credit has run out.

If this were a period in which the masses had reached the required stage of maturity it would be correct for the opposition to appeal to them. But to appeal to the better judgment of the masses during a time of political immaturity is to act like a demagogue. The opposition is therefore faced with two possibilities: to take over the reigns of government without an appeal to the masses, or to permit themselves to be destroyed without raising their voices.

### Stalinism as Intellectual Gangsterism

A third choice, seemingly no less consistent, presents itself to Rubashev. To facilitate this choice has become in the Soviet Union a great national occupation. The third alternative is to repudiate and suppress one's own ideas when no opportunity is present to realize them. Since what Rubashev calls "social utility" is the only criterion he recognizes, one must come before the masses and renounce one's beliefs

without any squeamishness as to honor or any romanticism about fighting the bureaucracy to bitter defeat and destruction. If one cannot win the party to one's ideas, then it becomes necessary to be subservient to other ideas.

A Bolshevik can not tolerate prejudices against self-debasement or entertain personal considerations such as tiredness, repugnance or the fear of disgrace. That is Rubashev's conclusion.

Having thus brought himself to the state of mind in which self-abasement and a confession to lies seems permissible and even honorable, Rubashev is induced by Gletkin's methods of torture to confess to crimes which he knows to have been historically impossible. After having made this confession at a public trial he is shot.

The mental processes through which Rubashev is led have two sources: the first is his lack of conviction in the validity of his own ideas; the second a failure to recognize that the rules of morality by which he guides himself are not those of the revolutionary movement led by Lenin, but of the perversions of that morality to suit the purposes of the Stalinist bureaucracy, perversions which by this time Rubashev has unconsciously substituted for the revolutionary concepts he once held.

To act on "faith" or on "credit," to suppress one's ideas, to revise history in favor of victorious disputants and to publicly renounce one's criticism of a bureaucratically degenerated leadership were not the actions of those who believed in the Marxian method of historical justification. The real oppositionists in Russia did not advocate capitulation to the GPU. Many of them died shouting the slogans of the Opposition.

To lead the masses through history by creating "whipping boys" and oppositionist "devils" by means of public trial and private torture, to conceive of mass education as a system of rewards and punishments for acts contrary to the personal ideas of the silent ikon in the Kremlin (designated by Rubashev as No. 1), this was never the practice of the Revolution before the advent of the Neanderthal men of Stalinism.

To assert this Koestler would have to practice the historical perversion which is the subject of his ironical attacks.

### Leninism Means the Revolutionary Spirit

Differences of opinion in the pre-Neanderthal era were respected and independent thinkers admired for their brilliancy and analytical ability, even when they were in the minority, as party members. Lenin himself never feared to place himself in the minority when he felt his point of view justified it. To have a minority in disagreement with the party majority was considered a natural component of every important dispute and to deny that minority public expression on issues of tremendous importance was an action taken only under the most exceptional circumstances.

Certainly the party régime of Lenin and Trotsky never substituted for loyalty to the party, an axiomatic faith in No. 1, or justification in the eyes of "The Leader," for historical justification.

It would be unfair to Koestler to deny that there are suggestions in *Darkness at Noon* that the twilight of the Stalinist period is a radical retreat from the revolutionary Russia before the Gletkin.

In making these suggestions Koestler half admits the inadequacy of his psychological explanation for the process which destroys the integrity of the old Bolsheviks.

There are many characters and scenes in the novel which serve merely as background and incidental color to the story

and which, by slight alterations, could serve to elaborate the more objective factors in Rubashev's destruction, namely the growth and victory of the bureaucracy: Rip Van Winkle, who comes to the Soviet Union after twenty years in the prison of a foreign power and is condemned to a Russian jail for his "nonsensical ideas about the revolution"; the peasant from province "D" who is jailed as a "reactionary" for opposing the inoculation of his children against epidemics; the royalist in solitary confinement whose difficulty is to reconcile himself to spending the next nine hundred nights without a woman. These could be used to far greater advantage than they are as symbols of the victorious counter-revolution.

Without these elaborations *Darkness at Noon* leaves the implication that the rule of the Neanderthal man is the consequence of Bolshevik concepts of the party and the state and it did not require elaborate stretches of the imagination for the reviewers of Koestler's book to draw these conclusions.

If Koestler avoids being reduced to social patriotism by the premises he attributes indirectly to Bolshevism, it can only be because he possesses, unlike his reviewers and interpreters, a greater measure of intellectual honesty.

EUGENE VICTOR.

## Clippings

### THIS REALM, THIS ENGLAND\*

*"Wider still and wider  
Shall Thy bounds be set;  
God who made Thee mighty,  
Make Thee mightier yet.  
Rule, Britannia, Britannia rules the waves."*

### Dissenting Views on the Above

*"You had the Bible, we had the land,  
Now we have the Bible, you have the land."  
(Zulu saying)*

\* \* \*

*"The British Empire shines afar,  
It's not as other empires are,  
It isn't merely—so it boasts—  
A thing of parasites and hosts;  
Its parasites, if suck they must,  
Suck only as A SACRED TRUST."*

\* \* \*

"A party of great vested interests banded together in a formidable confederation; corruption at home, aggression to cover it abroad, the trickery of tariff jugglery; the tyranny of a well-oiled party machine, sentiment by the bucketful, patriotism and imperialism by the imperial pint; an open hand at the public exchequer, an open door at the public house; dear food for the millions, cheap labor for the millionaires. That is the policy which the Tory Party offers you." (Winston Churchill, May 8, 1908.)

NB: Churchill is the leader of the Tory Party today.

\*The quotations in this article are all taken from Oliver Brown's *War for Freedom or Finance?*, published by the British Independent Labor Party.

## Among Those Responsible for War

"The solid promise that we gave, not merely in the treaty itself but in a document which I took part in drafting and which was signed by M. Clemenceau on our behalf, that if Germany disarmed we should immediately follow her example, was not carried out, and there is no government that is more responsible for that than the present National Government which came into power in 1931. . . .

"They had the opportunity. Germany was prostrate. The creation of this terrible power in Germany, the spirit which is behind it, and what makes it so formidable at the present moment is due to the fact that we did not carry out our pledges." (Lloyd George, May 9, 1940.)

"Hitler's success and indeed his survival as a political force would not have been possible but for the lethargy and folly of the French and British Government since the war and especially in the last three years (1932-1935). (Winston Churchill, *Great Contemporaries*.)

"The British Government is a traitor to democracy and to the interests of its own country. It prefers to drift on without an intelligible foreign policy, engage in competitive national rearmament, fatalistically moving toward an imperialist war of the old order. Then I suppose we shall be expected to support it." (Herbert Morrison, *Forward*, July 3, 1937.)

"We must ascertain what are the contributing factors to the present world situation, and it will be found that possibly the biggest contributor is this country, and not Germany, for one of the most potent causes of world disorder has been our dominant financial policy." (Ernest Bevin at Southport Labor Conference, 1939.)

## The War for Democracy

Above all, the Italian genius has developed in the characteristic fascist institutions a highly authoritarian régime which, however, threatens neither religious nor economic freedom nor the security of other European nations." (Lord Lloyd, *The British Case*.)

"I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in war I hoped we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among nations." (Winston Churchill, November 11, 1938.)

"If I had been an Italian I should have been wholeheartedly with you (the fascists) from start to finish in your triumphant struggle against the bestial appetites and passions of Leninism." (Winston Churchill, January 21, 1927.)

"Both (England and Japan) are ultimately striving for the same objective—a lasting peace and the preservation of our institutions from extraneous and subversive influences." (Sir Robert Craigie, English Ambassador to Japan, *London Times*, March 29, 1940.)

"Many of Herr Hitler's social reforms, in spite of their complete disregard of personal liberty of thought, word or deed, were on highly advanced democratic lines. . . . The great achievement of Hitler, who restored to the German

nation its self-respect and its disciplined orderliness." (Sir Neville Henderson, *Government White Paper*.)

"The British Commonwealth has never allowed itself to be circumscribed by geographic limitations." (*London Times*, November 5, 1940.)

"We should never forget that our empire was won by the sword, that it has been preserved safe by the sword through generations, and in the last resort in the future it could only be safeguarded by the sword." (Field Marshall Viscount Gort, VC, July 27, 1939.)

## The Fuehrer's Original Friends

"I will say a word on an international aspect of fascism. Externally your movement has rendered a service to the whole world. Italy has provided the necessary antidote to the Russian poison. Hereafter, no great nation will be unprovided with an ultimate means of protection against cancerous' growths.' (Winston Churchill, January 21, 1927.)

"We certainly credit Hitler with honesty and sincerity. We believe in his purpose, stated over and over again, to seek an accommodation with us, and we accept to the full the implications of the Munich document." (Lord Beaverbrook, *Daily Express*, October 31, 1938.)

"Great numbers of people in England regard Herr Hitler as an ogre, but I would like to tell them how I have found him. He exudes good fellowship. He is simple, unaffected and obviously sincere. He is supremely intelligent. If you ask Herr Hitler a question he makes an instant reply full of information and eminent good sense. There is no man living whose promise given in regard to something of real moment I would sooner take.

". . . a man of rare culture. His knowledge of music, painting and architecture is profound.

"Herr Hitler has a great liking for the English people. He regards the English and Germans as being of one race." (Lord Rothermere, *Daily Mail*, May, 1938.)

"But if I may judge from my personal knowledge of Herr Hitler, peace and justice are the key-words of his policy." (Sir Thomas Moore, MP, *Sunday Dispatch*, October 22, 1935.)

## War, Profit and Big Business

"Heaven help the Stock Exchange if it is peace." (*Financial News*, August 29, 1939.)

"Investors in Lancashire cotton mill shares during the boom of twenty years ago . . . now find that their holdings have increased in value by more than \$120,000,000. This new boom is due to the increased demand for yarn for government contracts since the outbreak of war." (*Sunday Express*, December 10, 1939.)

"Disarmament following the war would seem unlikely, and with an excellent goodwill established with a number of foreign powers, with the Admiralty and with individual owners of speed boats, the outlook is promising." (Chairman of Vospers, *Evening Standard*, January 25, 1940.)