

The New _____ **INTERNATIONAL**

October . 1942

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Discussion On Congress

KREMLIN IN WORLD POLITICS

By Leon Trotsky

THE MIDDLE CLASS IN CRISIS

By Harry Allen

ECONOMICS IN FASCIST GERMANY

By Albert Gates

CHINA IN THE WAR II

By Max Shachtman

Special Features, Discussion Articles and Book Reviews

SINGLE COPY 20c

ONE YEAR \$1.50

Statement of Ownership, Etc.

Statement of the ownership, management, circulation, etc., required by the Acts of Congress of August 24, 1912, and March 3, 1933, of

The NEW INTERNATIONAL

published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1942.

State of New York, County of New York, ss.:

Before me, a notary public in and for the state and county aforesaid, personally appeared Albert Gates, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the editor of The NEW INTERNATIONAL and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in Section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business managers are: Publisher, New International Publishing Co.; Editor, Albert Gates; Managing Editor, none; Business Manager, Mimi Slater, all of 114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owners are: New International Publishing Co., Max Shachtman and Albert Gates, all of 114 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds or other securities than as so stated by him.

ALBERT GATES, Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 10th day of October, 1942.

(Seal)

NATE KIRSCHSTEIN.

(My commission expires March 30, 1943.)

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Vol. VIII

No. 8, Whole No. 67

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, 14c for 5 copies and up. Canada and foreign: \$1.75 per year; bundles, 16c 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: ALBERT GATES

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Notes of the Month:

DISCUSSION ON CONGRESS

By A. G. 259

Articles:

THE KREMLIN IN WORLD POLITICS

By Leon Trotsky 260

THE MIDDLE CLASS IN CRISIS

By Harry Allen 264

CURRENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS IN GERMANY

By Albert Gates 268

CHINA IN THE WAR—II

By Max Shachtman 272

JEWISH COLONIZATION IN PALESTINE

By Karl Minter 278

OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS

A Symposium 281

ONCE MORE: OPPORTUNISM ON INDIA

By H. J. 283

Books in Review:

PANACEA FOR VICTORY

By H. J. 283

HOW THE OTHER 2% LIVES

By James M. Fenwick 285

A CRY FOR IMPERIALISM

By Eugene Vaughan 286

A LESSON FROM HISTORY

By J. M. F. 287

Editor's Note

Owing to lack of space, we are compelled to omit from this issue the continuation of the Archives Section, containing Leon Trotsky's *An Answer to Stalinist Critics*, and also a discussion article on the National Question by Europacus. These will appear in a forthcoming issue.

The November issue of The NEW INTERNATIONAL, now in preparation, will be an All-Russian Revolution Anniversary Issue. Special analytical articles, fundamental reviews and historical reprints will make up the main features of the issue.

KARL MINTER.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME VIII

OCTOBER, 1942

NUMBER 9

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Discussion On Congress

For a considerable period of time, Congress has been the subject of public discussion. Political theorists, news commentators and political columnists have expounded their views on what is good or bad about Congress as the representative legislative body of American democracy. As a rule these discussions merely concerned themselves with the individual and collective stature of Congress as a legislative body in the midst of the war. It has become clear that from the point of view of America's imperialist interests in the war, Congress has been found wanting.

Congress is certainly a curious body, to say the least. Its political, educational and human level is fairly low grade. Both the Senate and the House are dominated by a group of reactionary bourbons and legislative servants of big business. The dominant congressional figures take pride in the fact that they know nothing, are narrow-minded bigots, reactionary to the core. Their greatest boasts are that they have succeeded to the core and again in defeating any and all legislation having the slightest taint of progressivism or liberalism, however faulty, incomplete and insoluble those proposals may have been. Congress is almost as completely subservient to big business and its lobbies as it is generally impervious to the influence of the liberals and labor.

There are plenty of millionaires and direct representatives of big business in the congressional halls. They are the most influential group in the representative body. Behind them stand a solid phalanx of smaller business men, large landowners, brokers, corporation lawyers, insurance agents and professional politicians, whose essential aim in life is to remain in office. In contrast, there is not a single representative of labor to be found in the Senate, or in the House with its several hundred members. It is this latter fact which epitomizes the Seventy-seventh Congress.

By its very nature, Congress is a body wracked by contradictions. Responding to the ideology of the bourgeoisie in general, responding to its over-all interests, its representative form gives expression to the inner-class conflicts of the American bourgeoisie. It also reflects the pressure of the petty bourgeoisie, of sectional economic interests, of special group interests and, at times, given certain objective conditions, reflects the pressure of the organized labor movement. But it is by no means the representative of the people; it is not a truly democratic institution. Congress is today a hierarchical political body composed of electees of the two bourgeois political parties.

How Much Democracy for the People?

What real intervention is possible for the people in the selection of the congressional candidates? Representation at best is indirect. The candidates are picked by the party bosses. The parties are dominated by big business. In the South, Roosevelt's party is directed by the genius of racialists, landowners and bourbons, whose ideological development is on a par with the old slaveholders and feudal lords. In the urban centers of the North, political machines decide, if not the presidential candidate of the party, then most offices below it. The masses have no power except to vote for machine candidates selected in the smoke-filled halls of the political factions. For the truth is that the early nineteenth century American democracy of agrarian and commercial capitalism has disappeared. It faded from the scene with the industrialization of the country and the triumph of monopoly capitalism. What is left is a residue, more precisely, the democratic form of popular election. How this has redounded to the benefit of the economically dominant ruling class is evident in another fact, i.e., the inferiority of the American electoral system to that which exists even in aristocracy-ridden Great Britain.

Who runs the political parties? Boss Hague, Jim Farley, Kelly-Nash, Senator Byrd, Senator Tydings, Senator Connally, to name a few of the Democrats. Or Col. McCormick, Congressman Joe Martin, Senator Taft, to name a few of the Northern bourbons who run the Republican Party. However much Roosevelt, Wallace and the rest of the New Dealers may crack the whip, and even get obedience, with the exception of Roosevelt, they are regarded by the bosses as political crackpots, visionaries and despoilers of the American system of "free enterprise." The latter do not, for example, guide the Democratic Party.

Congress is run by tradition rather than intelligence. Otherwise it could not be, even in the Senate and the House, that so many nincompoops could head all the important congressional committees. But seniority rules and thus the Southern bloc heads a majority of the important committees. Take the Senate Finance Committee as an example. It is composed of the following: Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia, a millionaire apple grower; millionaire Peter Gerry of Rhode Island; millionaire Robert Taft of Ohio; Joe Guffy of Pennsylvania, an underling of the Mellons; millionaire Jim Davis of Pennsylvania, and the well-to-do conservatives, Josiah Bailey of North Carolina, Walter George of Georgia and Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan. This is not an exceptional case. Most committees follow this pattern.

It Is Not Merely Low Esteem

When William Hard writes in the *Readers Digest* of October that: "Public esteem for the Congress has been falling, and today it is probably lower than ever before in history," he is stating a fact. His proposal that Congress improve itself by hiring technically trained experts to advise its committees,

or to educate itself, of course, misses the whole point. It is not merely a matter of the low caliber of Congress. What we are really observing is a bourgeois democratic parliamentary crisis and its day-to-day decline as an institution. Even under the best circumstances, with an improved composition of this bourgeois parliament, it would be faced with its own degeneration.

This degeneration is indigenous to the general decay of the social order, of which the war is the most striking expression. The totalitarian character of the war, the needs of the Administration in prosecuting it, tend to make more acute the parliamentary crisis. At no time has Congress actually directed a war involving the United States, but at no time was it so lowly regarded by an Administration. This is a sign of the times.

The recent Roosevelt message ordering Congress to act on his seven-point program of last April or face a presidential decree enforcing such a program above the heads of the Senate and House, accentuated the Administration-congressional conflict. Roosevelt said: You pass legislation by October 1 concretizing my program or I shall do so myself. Was anything more contemptuous of Congress ever uttered? This demand by the President was a reflection of the extreme urgency of the war, but it was also the reflection of the unmistakable totalitarian direction which the state is taking.

Roosevelt is completely aware of the meaning of his ultimatum. He referred specifically to the dictatorial nature of his demand by stating that the war made inevitable authoritarian actions, but he was giving his personal guarantee that when the war had reached its successful conclusion, the democratic rights of the people would revert to them. Yet the most dangerous significance of the President's request for authoritarian control of the most decisive domestic program he has ever presented is to be found in the manner in which the "liberals" and professional democrats have acclaimed his action. This is a symptom of the times. In their minds, Roosevelt's order to Congress, while not strictly democratic in content

and aim, is nevertheless to be acclaimed for its purpose: gearing the country toward a more efficient prosecution of the war. And since they are in accord with the war and its aims they applaud every action taken by the Administration, no matter how undemocratic it may be so long as it serves war aims. Thus the "liberal" world becomes party to the indicated totalitarian drift of the present war Administration.

Totalitarian Dangers and Labor's Awakening

Few writers who commented on the President's speech understood its fundamental import. Raymond Clapper, one of the more astute political writers, grasped its essential meaning. In his syndicated article of September 25 entitled *Listen, Congress*, he warns Congress that unless it met the demands of the time, "we are in the danger of going over to dictatorship." To give emphasis to his warning, he adds: "*I don't mean the temporary, quasi-dictatorship that war always brings to a brief life. I mean dictatorship, period.*"

There is a concurrence of events which makes this likely: totalitarian war which influences the economic, political and social life of the country; the complete domination over the war economy by big business, which would like nothing better than a totalitarian régime to strengthen its present domination, and most important, the absence of the only genuine democratic instrument which could fight the encroachments of dictatorship, an independent, courageous and militant party of the workers—a labor party—as the first organization of a politically awakening American proletariat. Such a party, representing the best interests of American labor, of the poor farmers, of a devastated middle class, is an urgent need.

This is the real task of the day, for the breaking away of the American workers from dependency upon the political parties of the economic ruling class would weaken the political rule of reaction, strengthen the progressive political tendencies of American labor and hasten the development of the mass movement for socialism.

A. G.

The Kremlin In World Politics

Moscow is being invited, Moscow is being cajoled, Moscow is being implored to join the "peace front" and come to the defense of the *status quo*. Moscow, in principle, consented long ago, but it now doubts that the capitalist democracies are ready to fight for the existing order with the necessary energy. This paradoxical redistribution of rôles shows that something has changed under the sun, not as much on the Thames and the Seine as on the Moscow River. As always in processes of an organic character, the changes have matured gradually. However, under the influence of a great historical impact they appear suddenly and this is precisely why they shock the imagination.

In the last fifteen years Soviet foreign policy has undergone an evolution no less great than the internal régime. Bolshevism declared in August, 1914, that the borders of the capitalist states with their custom-houses, armies and wars were obstacles to the development of world economics as great as the provincial customs of the Middle Ages were for the forma-

tion of the nations. Bolshevism saw its historic mission in the abolition of national borders in the name of the Soviet United States of Europe and of the world. In November, 1917, the Bolshevik government began with an implacable struggle against all bourgeois states, independent of their political form. Not because Lenin did not assign, in general, importance to the difference between military dictatorship and parliamentary democracy, but because in his eyes the foreign policy of a state is determined not by its political form, but by the material interests of the ruling class. At the same time the Kremlin of that period made a radical distinction between imperialist, colonial or semi-colonial nations and was entirely on the side of the colonies against the mother countries, irrespective, here also, of the political form of either.

It is true that from the beginning the Soviet government did not abstain in the struggle to defend itself from utilizing the contradictions between bourgeois states and made temporary agreements with some against others. But then the ques-

tion was of agreements of a limited character and specific type: with defeated and isolated Germany, with semi-colonial countries such as Turkey and China, and finally, with Italy, wronged at Versailles. The fundamental rule of the Kremlin's policy was, moreover, that such an agreement of the Soviet government with a bourgeois state did not bind the corresponding national section of the Communist International. Thus, in the years following the treaty of Rapallo (April, 1922), when an economic and partial military collaboration was established between Moscow and Berlin, the German Communist Party openly mobilized the masses for a revolutionary insurrection, and if it did not succeed in accomplishing it, that is not at all because it was hindered by Kremlin diplomacy. The revolutionary tendency of the policy common to the Soviet government and to the Comintern excluded in this period, of course, the possibility of the Soviet Republic's participation in a system of states interested in the preservation of the existing order.

Fear of the Kremlin's revolutionary rôle remained in force in the diplomatic chancelleries of Europe and America much longer than the revolutionary principles in the Kremlin itself. In 1932, when Moscow's foreign policy was entirely impregnated with a spirit of national conservatism, the French semi-official paper, *Le Temps*, wrote with indignation of "the governments which imagine that they can, without danger to themselves, introduce the Soviets into their game against other powers." A close contiguity to Moscow threatens "a disintegration of the national forces." In Asia, as in Europe, the Soviets "create disorder, exploit misery, provoke hate and the sentiment of vengeance, speculate shamelessly with all international rivalries." France, the country most interested in maintaining the Versailles peace, still remained Enemy No. One of the Kremlin. The second place was occupied by Great Britain. The United States, because of its remoteness, was in the third rank. Hitler's coming to power did not immediately change this estimate. The Kremlin wanted, at all costs, to maintain with the Third Reich the relations which had been established with the government of Ebert and Hindenburg, and continued a noisy campaign against the Versailles Treaty. But Hitler obstinately refused to answer these advances. In 1934 the Franco-Soviet Alliance was concluded, without a military covenant, however—something like a knife without a blade. Eden visited Moscow but was forced to resign. Meanwhile, Europe enriched itself with the experience of the Munich accord. Many diplomatic chancelleries and semi-official publications were hastily obliged to change their positions. On the 12th of June of this year, when Mr. Strang flew from London to Moscow, the same *Temps* wrote on the necessity of "inducing Soviet Russia to accelerate the conclusion of the Anglo-Franco-Russian Pact." The contiguity to Moscow has ceased, apparently, to threaten the "disintegration of the national forces."

Nationalism—The New Creed

The Kremlin's transformation from a revolutionary factor in world politics into a conservative one was brought about, of course, not by the change in the international situation, but by internal processes in the country of Soviets itself, where above the revolution and above the people a new social stratum has arisen, very privileged, very powerful, very greedy—a stratum which has something to lose. Since it has only recently subjugated the masses to itself, the Soviet bureaucracy does not trust them any more than any other ruling class in the world fears them. International catastrophes can bring it

nothing, but can deprive it of a great deal. A revolutionary uprising in Germany or Japan might, it is true, ameliorate the Soviet Union's international situation; but in return it would threaten to awaken revolutionary traditions inside the country, set in motion the masses and create a mortal danger for the Moscow oligarchy. The passionate struggle which unexpectedly and, as it seemed, without exterior inducement, was unfolding in Moscow around the theory of "permanent revolution," appeared for a long time to the external observer as a scholastic quarrel; but, in reality beneath it is a profound material basis: the new ruling stratum attempted to insure its conquests theoretically against the risk of an international revolution. Precisely at that time the Soviet bureaucracy began to tend toward the conclusion that the social question was resolved, since the bureaucracy had resolved its own question. Such is the sense of the theory of "socialism in one country."

Foreign governments have long suspected that the Kremlin was only screening itself with conservative formulas, and that it was in this way concealing its destructive schemes. Such a "military ruse" is possible, perhaps, on the part of an isolated person or a closely welded group for a short time; but it is absolutely inconceivable for a powerful state machine over many years. The preparation of the revolution is not alchemy which can be carried on in a cellar; it is assured by the contents of the agitation and propaganda and by the general direction of policies. It is impossible to prepare the proletariat for overthrowing the existing system by defending the *status quo*.

* * *

The evolution of the Kremlin's foreign policy has directly determined the fate of the Third International, which has been gradually transformed from a party of the international revolution into an auxiliary weapon of Soviet diplomacy. The specific weight of the Comintern declined simultaneously, as very clearly appears in the successive changes in its ruling personnel. In the first period (1919-23) the Russian delegation in the leadership of the Comintern consisted of Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin and Radek. After Lenin's death and the elimination of Trotsky, and subsequently of Zinoviev, from the leadership, the direction was concentrated in the hands of Bukharin under the control of Stalin, who until then had stood aside from the international labor movement. After Bukharin's fall, Molotov, who had never troubled himself with the theory of Marxism, who does not know any foreign country or any foreign language, became, unexpectedly for everybody and for himself, the head of the Comintern. But soon it was necessary for Molotov to act as president of the Council of People's Commissars, replacing Rykov, who had fallen into disgrace. Manuilsky was appointed to the direction of the "world proletariat"—evidently only because he was not fit for any other task. Manuilsky rapidly exhausted his resources and in 1934 was replaced by Dimitroff, Bulgarian worker, not lacking in personal audacity, but limited and ignorant. Dimitroff's appointment was utilized for a demonstrative change of policy. The Kremlin decided to throw away the ritual of revolution and to openly attempt a union with the Second International, with the conservative bureaucracy of the trade unions and through their intermediary, with the liberal bourgeoisie. The era of "collective security" in the name of the *status quo* and of "People's Fronts," in the name of democracy, was opened.

The Degeneration of the Comintern

For the new policy new persons were necessary. Through a series of internal crises, removals, purges and outright brib-

ery, the various national parties were gradually adapted to the new demands of the Soviet bureaucracy. All the intelligent, independent, critical elements were expelled. The example was set by Moscow with its arrests, staged trials and interminable executions. After the assassination of Kirov (December 1, 1934) several hundred foreign communist émigrés, who had become a burden to the Kremlin, were exterminated in the USSR. Through a ramified system of espionage, a systematic selection of careerist functionaries, ready to carry out every commission, was accomplished. At all events the purpose was obtained: the present apparatus of the Comintern consists of individuals, who by their character and education represent the direct opposite of the revolutionary type.

In order not to lose influence with certain circles of workers, the Comintern is obliged, to be sure, to have recourse from time to time to demagoguery. But this does not go beyond some radical phrases. These individuals are not capable of any real struggle, which demands independent thought, moral integrity and mutual confidence. Already in 1933 the Communist Party of Germany, the most numerous section of the Comintern next to the USSR, was impotent to offer any resistance to the *coup d'état* of Hitler. This shameful capitulation forever marked the end of the Comintern as a revolutionary factor. Since then it sees as its principal task the convincing of bourgeois public opinion of its respectability. In the Kremlin, better than anywhere else, they know the price of the Comintern. They conduct themselves toward the foreign Communist parties as if the latter were poor relatives, who are not exactly welcome and very greedy. Stalin surnamed the Comintern the "gyp-joint." Nevertheless, if he continues to sustain these "gyp-joints," it is for the same reason that other states maintain ministries of propaganda. This has nothing in common with the tasks of the international revolution.

A few examples will best show how the Kremlin makes use of the Comintern, in one way to maintain its prestige in the eyes of the masses, on the other, to prove its moderation to the ruling classes; moreover, the first of these tasks retreats more and more before the latter.

During the Chinese revolution of 1927 all the conservative papers in the world, particularly the English, represented the Kremlin as an incendiary. In reality the Kremlin feared, even more than anything else, that the Chinese revolutionary masses would go beyond the limits of the national bourgeois revolution. The Chinese section of the Comintern was, on the categorical injunction of Moscow, subordinated to the discipline of the Kuomintang, in order thus to forestall any suspicion of the Kremlin's intentions of shaking the basis of private property in China. Stalin, Molotov, Voroshilov and Kalinin sent instructions by wire to the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party to restrain the peasants from seizing large estates, in order not to frighten Chiang Kai-shek and his officers. The same policy is drawn now in China, during the war with Japan, in a much more decisive manner: the Chinese Communist Party is completely subordinated to the government of Chiang Kai-shek and by Kremlin command has officially abandoned the teaching of Marx in favor of that of Sun Yat-sen, founder of the Chinese Republic.

The task was more difficult in Poland with its old revolutionary traditions and its strong Communist Party, which has passed through the school of Czarist illegality. Since it was seeking the friendship of the Warsaw government, Moscow first prohibited the launching of the demand for the self-determination of the Polish Ukrainians; next it ordered the

Polish Communist Party to patriotically sustain their government. Inasmuch as it encountered resistance, Moscow dissolved the Communist Party, declaring that its leaders, old and known revolutionists, were agents of fascism. During his recent visit to Warsaw, Potemkin, Assistant People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, assured Colonel Beck that the Comintern will not resume its work in Poland. The same pledge was given by Potemkin in Bucharest. The Turkish section of the Comintern was liquidated even earlier in order not to dampen the friendship with Kemal Pasha.

The policy of the "People's Fronts" carried out by Moscow signified in France the subordination of the Communist Party to the control of the Radical Socialists, who, in spite of their name, are a conservative bourgeois party. During the tempestuous strike movement in June, 1936, with the occupation of the mills and factories, the French section of the Comintern acted as a party of democratic order; it is to them that the Third Republic is indebted in the highest degree for preventing the movement from taking openly revolutionary forms. In England, where, if the war does not intervene, we can expect a supplanting of the Tories now in power by the Labor Party, the Comintern directs a constant propaganda in favor of a bloc with the Liberals, in spite of the obstinate opposition of the English Laborites. The Kremlin fears that a purely workers' government, in spite of its moderation, would engender extraordinary demands by the masses, provoke a social crisis, weaken England and untie Hitler's hands. Hence comes the aspiration to place the Labor Party under the control of the liberal bourgeoisie. However paradoxical it may be, the concern of the Moscow government nowadays is the protection of private property in England!

Stalinism and the Spanish Revolution

It is difficult to conceive of a sillier invention than the references of Hitler and Mussolini to the Spanish events as proof of the revolutionary intervention of the Soviets. The Spanish revolution, which exploded without Moscow and unexpected by it, soon revealed a tendency to take a socialist character. Moscow feared above all that the disturbance of private property in the Iberian peninsula would bring London and Paris nearer to Berlin against the USSR. After some hesitations, the Kremlin intervened in the events in order to restrict the revolution within the limits of the bourgeois régime. All the actions of the Moscow agents in Spain were directed toward paralyzing any independent movement of the workers and peasants and reconciling the bourgeoisie with a moderate republic. The Spanish Communist Party stood in the right wing of the People's Front. On the 21st of December, 1936, Stalin, Molotov and Voroshilov, in a confidential letter to Largo Caballero, insistently recommended to the Spanish Premier at that time that there be no infringement of private property, that guarantees be given to foreign capital; not to violate the freedom of commerce and maintain the parliamentary system without tolerating the development of Soviets. This letter, recently communicated by Largo Caballero to the press through the former Spanish Ambassador in Paris, L. Araquistain (*New York Times*, June 4, 1939) summed up in the best manner the Soviet government's conservative position in the face of socialist revolution.

We must, moreover, do justice to the Kremlin—the policy did not remain in the domain of words. The GPU in Spain carried out ruthless repressions against the revolutionary wing ("Trotskyists," POUMists, left socialists, left anarchists). Now,

after the defeat, the cruelties and frame-ups of the GPU in Spain are voluntarily revealed by the moderate politicians, who largely utilized the Moscow police apparatus in order to crush their revolutionary adversaries.

Especially striking is the Kremlin's change of attitude toward the colonial peoples, who have lost for it any particular interests, since they are not the subjects but the objects of world politics. At the last convention of the party in Moscow (March, 1939) the refusal of the Comintern to demand freedom for the colonies which belong to democratic countries was officially proclaimed. On the contrary, the Comintern enjoined these colonies to sustain their masters against fascist pretensions. In order to demonstrate to London and Paris the high value of an alliance with the Kremlin, the Comintern is agitating in British India, as in French Indo-China, against the Japanese danger and not at all against French and British domination. "The Stalinist leaders have made a new step in the way of treason," wrote the Saigon workers' paper, *La Lutte*, on April 7th of this year. "Taking off their revolutionary masks, they have become champions of imperialism and express themselves openly against the emancipation of oppressed colonial peoples." It merits attention that in the elections for the Colonial Council, the candidates of the party, represented by the quoted newspaper, received in Saigon more votes than the bloc of the Communists and the governmental party. In the colonies, Moscow's authority is declining rapidly.

As a revolutionary factor, the Comintern is dead. No force in the world will ever revive it. Should the Kremlin once again turn its policy toward revolution, it would not find the necessary instruments. But the Kremlin does not want that and cannot want it.

* * *

The triple military alliance, which must include a covenant of the general staffs, supposes not only a community of interests, but also an important degree of mutual confidence. It is a question of a common elaboration of military plans and the exchange of the most secret information. The purge of the Soviet command is still in the minds of all. How can London and Paris agree to confide their secrets to the general staff of the USSR, at whose head only yesterday were "foreign agents" If Stalin needed more than twenty years to discover spies in such national heroes as Tukachevsky, Yegorov, Garmarnik, Blucher, Yakir, Uborevitch, Muralov, Mrachkovsky, Dybenko and others, what ground is there for hoping that the new military chiefs, who are absolutely drab and unknown persons, will be more secure than their predecessors? London and Paris were not affected, however, by such fears. Not astonishing: the interested governments and their staffs read very well between the lines of the Moscow indictments. At the trial in March, 1938, the former Soviet Ambassador to England, Rakovsky, declared himself sole agent of the intelligence service. The backward strata of Russian and English workers can believe this. But not the intelligence service; it knows its own agents very well. Only on the basis of this single fact—and there are hundreds of them—it was not difficult for Chamberlain to make a decision as to the relative value of the accusations against Marshal Tukachevsky and other military chiefs. At Downing Street as well as on the Quai d'Orsay there are no romantics, no naïve dreamers. They know there with what materials history is made. Many people, of course, frown at the mention of the monstrous frame-ups. But in the long run the Moscow trials, with their fantastic accusations

and their entirely real executions, strengthened the confidence of these circles in the Kremlin as a factor of law and order. The wholesale extermination of the heroes of the civil war and of all the representatives of the younger generation connected with them was the most convincing proof that the Kremlin does not pretend to use cunning, but liquidates the revolutionary past seriously and definitely.

The Kremlin as Counter-Revolutionary

From the time they prepared themselves to enter a military alliance with the state spawned by the October Revolution, England and France answered in reality for the Kremlin's fidelity before Rumania, Poland, Latvia, Esthonia, Finland, before all the capitalist world. And they are right. There is not the slightest danger that Moscow, as it was predicted many time before, will attempt to use its participation in world politics to provoke war: Moscow fears war more than anything and more than anybody. Neither is there reason to fear that Moscow will take advantage of its rapprochement with its western neighbors to overthrow their social régimes. The revolution in Poland and Rumania would convert Hitler in reality into a crusader of capitalist Europe in the East. This danger hangs as heavy as a nightmare on the conscience of the Kremlin. If the very fact of the entrance of the Red troops into Poland, independently of any plans, gives, in spite of everything, an impulsion to the revolutionary movement—and the international conditions in Poland, as well as in Rumania are favorable enough for that—the Red Army, we can foretell with assurance, would play the rôle of subduer. The Kremlin would take care in advance to have the most reliable troops in Poland and Rumania. If they were, nevertheless, seized by the revolutionary movement, this would menace the Kremlin with the same dangers as the Belvedere. One must be deprived of all historical imagination in order to admit for a single instant that in case of a revolutionary victory in Poland or in Germany, the Soviet masses will support patiently the terrible oppression of the Soviet bureaucracy. The Kremlin does not want war or revolution; it does want order, tranquility, the *status quo*, and at any cost. It is time to get accustomed to the idea that the Kremlin has become a conservative factor in world politics!

L. TROTSKY.

Coyoacan, D.F., Mexico,
July 1, 1939.

Subscribe to the
ONE CENT

LABOR ACTION

**Rates: 60c a year. \$1.00 New York
City and Foreign**

LABOR ACTION
114 W. 14th St.,
New York, N. Y.

Name.....

Address.....

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

The Middle Class In Crisis

Effects of the War Economy

The juggernaut of the war is rolling along rapidly and sounding the death knell of large sections of the middle class. Hundreds of thousands of small businesses, ranging from the smallest of retailers to small wholesalers, service and distributing concerns, amusement places, construction companies and industrial manufacturing concerns, either have been or will be wiped out as the war plunges ahead. The destruction of tremendous numbers of the lower and upper middle classes will, in the course of the war itself, hasten the growth of social dissatisfaction and disturbances in these groups. Equally important, this development has a direct relationship to the economic and political course of the American working class.

Big business—monopoly capitalism—is not much concerned over the fate of small business. To the extent that it recognizes a business and social problem in the mass elimination of large sections of the middle class, it is also aware that nothing substantial can be done to improve matters for these minor capitalists. For the great financial and industrial lords know very well that the war has only accelerated the process of the centralization and concentration of wealth, business and power in the hands of the monopoly trusts. Many lose their property (capital) as it becomes concentrated and centralized. "One capitalist always kills many" (Marx). This process may take place through outright loss, bankruptcies or sales by the small-property capitalists. In any event, either a single powerful capitalist takes over; or, as is more commonly the case at this phase of centralization of capital, a group of monopoly capitalists take over control, ownership or both, of the former wealth of small business or capitalists. Moreover, big business intends to let this process of capitalist centralization and concentration take its course still further, during the war and after.

Thus, as this development is speeded up as a result of the war economy, the great mass of the remaining petty bourgeoisie of varying size and importance are caught in the middle even more firmly between the major classes in society—the big bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The imperialist war compels the stream-lining of production and distribution along the lines of big business aims and methods. These are: to win the war for the American bourgeoisie; and, at the same time, to make profits. Vast numbers of the middle class (independent owners of property and salaried employees) must pay the price as victims of imperialism's course. So, too, in a sharper and more direct exploitive manner, capitalism passes the burdens of its system and its war on to the workers.

The Roosevelt Administration undoubtedly is concerned with the effects of the mass destruction of small businesses, and thus of the middle class, in relation to its present war plans and in relation to the social-political effects in the future. Nevertheless, the Administration also recognizes as inevitable the overwhelming domination and ownership of private property by the great monopolies; just as it realizes that the conduct of the imperialist war requires the highest degree of governmental control from above—through a highly bureaucratized and military administration. An imperialist war economy can only be managed through a powerfully centralized and authoritative government. Thus, while the Administration "recognizes" small business, even notes its "usefulness" at

times, it knows very well that the efforts of small businesses are powerless to affect significantly the course of economic-political developments. The government knows it has an economic and political problem on its hands, *but cannot offer a serious solution.*

The Administration has established numerous committees and agencies intended to help small business out of its hopeless dilemma. These committees and agencies fuss, fume, procrastinate and then produce duds, so far as any serious aid to small business is concerned. Whatever remedies are proposed or administered can at best be only temporarily, if at all, ameliorative, and can only cover an insignificant number of businesses. Small business men, while despairing, recognize this. For big business runs the big show and takes the proceeds of war orders as well as other business. The struggle of the middle class is a lost cause.

The Death Rate of the American Middle Class

It is interesting and important to observe the swift decimation of this social category (which Marx clearly indicated) and the reaction of several segments of small business.

The Department of Commerce lists 2,750,000 small businesses of all kinds. *The Index*, publication of the New York Trust Co., makes manifest (*New York Times*, September 21) that the "small manufacturers unable to convert to war production or to continue their normal output, face a bitter struggle for survival, as do many of the nearly 2,600,000 small businesses engaged in distribution or services."

This dark statement is concretized in the case of the small industries as follows:

1. There are a total of 184,000 (both large and small) manufacturing concerns. Of these only 45,000 (or less than 25 per cent) can be converted to war production in some form.

2. By October 1, 24,000 manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers would be forced out of business as a result of priorities and war needs, according to the prediction, as early as last May, by Philip Reed, chief of the war industries branch of the War Production Board.

3. Since then, the death rate of small business wholesalers and retailers has increased considerably beyond that prediction, as is abundantly clear from the report of government economists (Department of Commerce) to the Senate Small Business Committee (*New York Times*, September 30). They estimated that 300,000 retail stores, 20 per cent of the total, would close up shop by the end of 1943.

These same economic analysts recommended the "orderly liquidation" of large numbers of small enterprises as against the continuation of "profitless competition." Thus, as Marxism demonstrates, monopoly capitalism coldly permits or ordains the destruction of the middle class elements whenever their tenuous preservation interferes with "normal" economic development or profits. Capitalism is the great expropriator of the many capitalists by the few, as well as the exploiter of the laboring majority by a parasitic minority.

In desperation, small industrial plants have pooled their resources in order to obtain war orders, in accordance with the recommendations of the Senate Small Business Committee and the War Production Board itself. Five hundred such pools were quickly formed. (Three hundred are already dis-

solved for lack of work report of the Senate Small Business Committee). The war orders received by the remaining pools proved meager.

The procurement procedure of the government's own procurement agencies is greased for big business, for the large prime war contractors. So complains small business as it continues to hope for "extensive revisions" in their behalf. But will this policy of, by and for big business be changed in any important way for the benefit of small industries? No, because small business does not have the economic strength, the resources or possibilities, nor does it have the political strength (despite its numbers) to make serious and significant requests for favors. It is unable to make demands or to encroach upon big business and monopoly government. Still less is it able to exercise economic force (strikes, boycotts, etc.), should such a thought even enter its head.

Listen to the lament of a representative small steel operator and the revealing testimony of others before the Senate Committee investigating the "defense" program, in which the government is virtually the sole customer:

"Unconsciously (sic!) and by reason of circumstances," sadly stated a small steel operator (J. M. Budke, Parkersburg, W. Va.), "the business (steel orders) was given to these large companies."

And how does big business so easily direct orders its way? The Office of Production Management (OPM) recommends the appointment of steel company representatives to serve on the OPM sub-committee which decides the priority orders. This sub-committee (Bent Committee) includes former or present officials of five large steel companies (Carnegie-Illinois-U. S. Steel subsidiary, Bethlehem, Republic, Inland and Youngstown Sheet & Tube) but not one representative from the small steel companies.

Question to Roland C. Allen, deputy chief of the WPB's iron and steel branch: "Why did you not appoint representatives of smaller companies?"

Reply: "It never entered my mind. . . . I just looked upon them as individuals. . . ."

A direct, even honest, answer, showing that the monopolies take a certain set-up for granted. They regard the markets as theirs; especially the market provided by government orders for imperialist war needs. It is their war and their profits, too.

The Decline of Free Enterprise

The complaints which fall upon deaf ears are that "small business does not have adequate representation in the administrative agencies . . . many of which overlook that the future of free enterprise is dependent on its maintenance" (Senate Small Business Committee, October 5). But twenty and more years of the steady decline of capitalist "free enterprise" and the persistent, unchecked and inevitable growth of the centralizing and concentrating tendencies of capital toward ever greater domination by industrial and finance (monopoly) capitalism, indicate that the future of free enterprise is past. Longings, nostalgia and day-dreaming will not re-create the old conditions. The historic order of the day is: monopoly capitalism full-blown, with its devastation and wars. Or proletarian power and the reorganization of the means of production along socialist lines. Meanwhile, as illustration and development show in all important aspects, big capital continues and will continue to take a "thumbs down" attitude toward the laments, requests and demands of small business; and the government will heed its master.

Briefs issue forth opposing either monopoly capitalism or "regimented" socialism, and calling for a system of capitalist "free enterprise" on modern wheels. Peter F. Drucker, widely known for his work on "The End of Economic Man," is one of these (see "Total War Requires Free Enterprise, *Saturday Evening Post*, October 3). So far as his comments bear on the subject of this article, one must declare that Drucker also exemplifies wishful thinking. Even his presentation of the facts on the manner of functioning of the capitalist order runs contrary to his proposals. Nor is there any serious evidence adduced that capitalism can possibly be transformed along his conceptions.

Individual enterprise and responsibility, he fears, "will be undermined without anybody's noticing it." The American people are apathetic, feeling, he acknowledges, that they have no personal stake in "free enterprise." Drucker recognizes the "monopolistic tendencies" of big business. He examines the Administration's taxation policy on war profits; specifically, that profits shall be regulated on the basis of invested capital, and shows clearly that the government's policy "makes it possible only for a very rich man or corporation to start a new business." But government tax policy is only in accord with the functioning or innate direction of business and reflects it in all essentials. It is a big business war which the government runs and regulates and, with minor allowances, business and governmental policies (economic and political) run along parallel lines.

This is the only reasonable, sound explanation and reply to Drucker's criticism and lament that government policy is dealing heavy blows to small business. Government tax policy, says Drucker, is "generous to heavy industries which stand to make the war profits (if any)." It "discriminates against the very businesses which are likely to suffer most under a war economy. Above all, it penalizes individual initiative and enterprise and favors the big corporations. . . ." What particularly surprises Drucker in all this is that a New Deal group, professing particularly opposition to big business, sponsored a big business policy. This only shows that even an astute man, such as Drucker, when he wants to see something else, fails to see that the New Deal is now simply the War Deal and has no choice but to cut its cloth to the imperialist pattern.

Such remedies or sops as the great monopolies toss to the middle class have proved futile. They are either abandoned outright or they lie dormant. For example, the American Business Congress—composed of small manufacturers—declares that the Stanley plan to aid small manufacturers in obtaining sub-contracts has had some success, particularly in the Chicago region. But opposition from the War Production Board, beginning with the suspension of the Stanley plan's Directory of Contract Opportunities, has practically destroyed this instrument for succoring small concerns. Small business protests, even calls mass meetings. But big business, ignoring or not taking seriously its own proposals (via WPB and other government agencies) to hold together dying small business, allows them to be scuttled. This attitude toward the weak trades or industries was expressed in still another way in the war and post-war program of the National Association of Manufacturers when it advised the government to "refuse to subsidize distressed industries."

Basically, today, the government is equivalent to big business, and *vice versa*. Just as workers have no say in the dictation or direction of the fundamental policies of the govern-

ment, so likewise is small business, or the middle class, shut out, *except to pin-prick and lament*. This is clearly, if dejectedly, recognized by representatives of small business. The president of the national wholesale druggists, serving 60,000 retail druggists, says:

"The government is dealing directly with corporations of tremendous size . . . monopolistic in character. . . . The small retailers and the small wholesalers would be a thing of the past." And, interpreting capitalism to their likes, interests and prejudices, this small business representative declares that such would be "directly contrary to the true system of private enterprise." But the monopolists do not appear disturbed thereby, and indeed are satisfied with the change from myriads of small private businesses to a handful of huge private monopolies.

Big business is conscious that its sops to small business are not even a drop in the bucket. Even here, however, as in the government's grant of \$150,000,000 for loans to smaller war plants, its first concern is of the rival imperialist nations with which American imperialism is waging war for world domination of markets and resources: "Will the money (the proposed loan) help to kill a Jap or German?" (*New York Times*, October 1.)

"The Government as Undertaker"

In all other respects, in reality, "the government is taking an undertaker's attitude in regard to the retailers' wartime problems" (L. Hahn, general manager, National Retail Dry Goods Assn.). Washington, he complains, is giving attention to "how the retailer may go out of business in an orderly fashion." He would like to know "how to keep alive, not how to have a fancy death." But little help of consequence will be forthcoming, it may be predicted, even though Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board, proposes to create still another board (this one a war liabilities adjustment board to help small concerns in war efforts and post-war adjustment). Still, he acknowledges, small business casualties would be "high" despite all the government might do. The more realistic or brassily bourgeois-minded Senator Robert Taft of Ohio, opposes even the formation of such a board, saying that it is a "hopeless" task to aid 1,800,000 retailers because survival is possible for only a year or two for those that might be granted help. Hence, big business policy toward small business is, in substance, for "orderly liquidation."

Like the bourgeoisie itself, government economists (Department of Commerce) likewise are precisely clear concerning the fate of small business and the direction of American economy. Therefore proposals and recommendations made before the Senate Small Business Committee (September 30) included, besides proposals for countless outright liquidations, the following measures:

(1) To limit the entry of new concerns into trade fields except in "defense" localities; (2) to limit stores in one field taking on new lines of another; (3) to concentrate the remaining businesses "in a few nucleus concerns," with compensation for closed firms.

Thus, succinctly and coldly, these government economists, proclaiming the early demise of hordes of middle class businesses, declare at the same time that old style (*laissez-faire*) capitalism is forever gone. For what becomes of "free enterprise" and "rugged individualism" when one may not enter any field of business? When one may not freely invest capital in order to expand in new directions? Capital investment

ceases to be free. And the final recommendation for the concentration of business "in a few business concerns" (following British example) is a direct recognition that the concentration and centralization of business and industry are not only the natural developments of capitalist economy but, moreover, that they constitute the only means of economic survival for the remaining sections of the middle class financially equipped for such combinations. Thus, too, the government economists, whose business it is to know the truth about the course of American economy, proceed to reduce to euphemisms the conceptions of Thurman Arnold, the advocate of unrestricted competition and free capitalist enterprise as the American post-war economy.

Petty Bourgeois Elements Enter Working Class

What do these developments mean for the middle class, and what is their meaning in relation to the working class? This is our prime consideration. Only a small part of this middle class will be re-absorbed into other businesses, continuing as private property institutions with a degree of "independence." Another portion will find minor jobs and posts as part of the constantly increasing government bureaucracy and apparatus.

The major portion of these elements, however, will be forced into the working class, except in so far as the armed forces now absorb them. They will carry over the psychology, interests and ambitions of the petty bourgeoisie. As a part of the working class or labor movement, they can become ideological and organizational obstacles toward labor's progress. First, because of their previous private property associations and interests, such elements could easily be duped, baited or utilized by employers for reactionary and anti-labor ends. Employers could dangle enticements and hopes for economic and prestige advantages to many of them and thus hold in check incipient dissatisfaction and a turn to a common life and interests with their fellow workers.

Second, and more significantly, because of their residual conceptions and desires, they could especially become a prey to demagogues of a fascistic variety appealing to their property instincts. True, these uprooted small business people haven't any property any longer, and had very little before. But the constant din about property rights employed by fascist demagogues is a drum which can catch their ears.

Thus, wittingly or unwittingly, these déclassé middle class forces can become tools of the most reactionary forces in society. In fact, out of their ranks could emerge also some of the leaders of reaction. This is the record, among other factors, of the rise and advance of fascist organizations in Italy and Germany. Such groups—the middle class in general—provide the social basis for fascism as democratic capitalism disintegrates; and particularly if the proletariat under the leadership of the revolutionary party does not step forward to establish socialism, taking the petty bourgeoisie with it.

On the other hand, these elements can become an integral, organic and progressive part of the organized labor movement. Their business experience and intelligence, their initiative and even their enterprise could well be utilized by the working class movement. This, provided the labor movement recognizes here a special problem and consciously endeavors to educate, organize and integrate these elements into the ideas and practices of a militant labor movement. Teaches them, for example, that they must cease to look backward, in the hope of re-absorption again into a small business or mid-

dle class existence; teaches them, further, that they are now a part of the working class, and must actively link their interests and actions to the labor movement.

In so far as there are also involved the workers formerly employed in these thousands of small businesses, they can and will enter more swiftly, directly and easily into the industrial life of mass scale production; and can, without difficulty, become a living part of the labor movement.

Labor Movement Must Integrate New Elements

The labor movement must be careful to avoid the pitfalls of anti-Semitism and, instead, to welcome and absorb the numbers of former small Jewish petty bourgeoisie into its ranks. Past experience shows that this can easily be accomplished if the labor movement holds out a fraternal hand. Discrimination and prejudices, hurtful to labor and helpful to the employers, are also easy to develop among the workers. This is demonstrated in the discriminatory and Jim Crow policies pursued in the past and still followed by many labor unions toward the Negro workers, who also entered the industrial field relatively late. Such labor unions fall for and play the bosses' game.

The fascists and Nazis cleverly carried anti-Semitism to its logical extreme. First they expropriated the larger and upper middle Jewish bourgeoisie (crying, "See! See! Here are your enemies!") for the benefit of their bureaucracy and the big "Aryan" bourgeoisie, thus combining demagoguery in politics with profit and wealth. Then they further developed the scapegoat methods to cover their intensified exploitation of the working class and peasants and their wholesale extermination, incarcerations and deportations of the Jewish masses. This invidious development and result in America must be guarded against by the conscious policy of the organized labor movement toward the integration of all new workers, including the Negro, the former Jewish petty bourgeoisie or "alien," into the labor movement upon a completely equal basis.

What, finally, must be concluded concerning the latter-day developments in a large section of the middle classes? The social picture and class divisions are, in certain respects, altered. Properly seen and analyzed, these developments are in the interests of the working class, now and ultimately.

The specific weight and gravity of the industrial proletariat, already the great majority of the population, thus become even greater in relation to the capitalist class. The needs of the imperialist war today give employment to the masses as in no other period. This will include the hundreds of thousands of former petty bourgeoisie. Thus, too, the imperialist war enlarges and helps to consolidate the workers, first, at the point of production in the mass production industries and, second, through the impulsion and need for union organization, among these larger numbers engaged in factory life as workers for the first time. Not even "frozen" union organization can stop this process of education, ideological change and organization in due course.

The class lines and cleavages between the major classes—big bourgeoisie and proletariat—come to stand out more clearly. These changes in class relations—the greater polarization of the classes at extremes—thereby actually narrow the basis of capitalism. Specifically, the social-economic upheavals in a substantial layer of the middle class, particularly the lower middle class, must therefore be utilized in the immediate and coming period of the advantage and interests of the organized labor movement and, ultimately, the aims of the revolutionary movement.

Labor Must Lead Toward Socialism

American capitalism is emerging with its own "collectivist" order: the rigid control and ownership of the means of production and distribution in the hands of a small group of monopoly capitalists. The problem of today and tomorrow is the transformation of this anti-people's "collectivism" (not yet fascist in its political manifestation) into social ownership and control, that is, the control and ownership of the means of life by the masses; by all those able and willing to engage in socially useful tasks, physical and intellectual. These forces will include, besides the proletarian masses, the millions found today among the functionally useful middle classes in production and distribution and the services (professionals, teachers, etc.) and also the functionally necessary managerial and supervisory forces employed in production.

Continued control of the destiny of the world by the monopoly capitalists, by imperialism, can only mean strangulation of the masses and world-wide reaction. In its narrow profit and power interests, imperialism limits production itself. Imperialism prevents the full utilization of all technological and scientific advances. Imperialism uproots all peoples, the middle classes, the working class, the exploited colonial peoples, placing them at best on a subsistence basis, and then finishes them off by death through imperialist war. A way out of this chaos and horror does exist.

Only socialist production, socialism, can freely and abundantly utilize the forces of production and distribution and make possible consumption on a scale never yet realized. Socialism is ready for the task of making use of all forces, machine, science, the human forces, in the social and cultural interests of the masses. Socialism, not imperialism, alone can be the architect of the future of humanity.

The main instrument in the direction and road toward socialism is the working class. It is decisive in this task because capitalism and history have placed the workers in an indispensable position in relation to production itself. The political task of the working class is to realize that their decisive relation to the productive forces is also the key to the struggle in defense of their daily interests, and their social interests of tomorrow.

The middle class forces now dislodged and tossed to the dogs by capitalism and also the millions of the lower middle class elements and salaried employees still in existence, must learn, and learn soon, that their destruction or liberation is bound up with the choice they make: the linking of their lives with the big bourgeoisie or with the proletariat. The proletariat and the revolutionary movement must consciously help them to make up their minds to choose the side of history, of the advancing proletariat. This choice will be a positive factor in the political road the working class itself must take: the road to independent class power by the masses and the establishment of the socialist order.

HARRY ALLEN.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Requires the JULY, AUGUST and SEPTEMBER, all in the year 1941, copies of the magazine for binding purposes. We will appreciate your sending these copies to:

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL
114 West 14th Street New York City

Current Economic Developments In Germany

It used to be the custom of many social "theorists" during the peace years of Hitler's reign in Germany to describe that fascist-totalitarian state as a new society based on new economic and political principles and upon new class relations. We were told that the bourgeoisie no longer ruled socially; that the position of the proletariat in German society was altered to that of a slave class and that the government bureaucracy, in the guise of the National Socialist Workers Party, was the new social ruling class. The successive stages of the war economy which began even before Hitler became Chancellor were described as a "new economy" by professionals who apparently forgot all the economic lessons of the First World War and, having forgotten them, were unable to understand the demands which would be made on economy in the present war.

Germany's efforts to break through the Anglo-American monopoly of the world market by the production of cheap goods, the employment of "unorthodox" financial practices, and her militant war-threatening seizures of European territories, were described as a "Brown World Revolution." No real efforts were made to study the all-impelling economic reasons which drove Germany to "fight the whole world" in the interest of her monopolist capitalist class because the "democratic" theorists, reflecting the mood of the "democratic" empires were slovenly-minded, contented and alarmed, bellicose and meek, strong and weak, and above all bewildered and confused. That Hitler would dare to carry out the program of *Mein Kampf* seemed unjust, unworthy and, above all, unreal. Living in nations content in their domination of the colonial areas of the world and the international market, they could not conceive why Germany would go to any limit to bring about a new "redivision of the earth." Hitler's cry, "We export or we die," was regarded in many circles as a rhetorical pacifier of Germany's financial and industrial ruling class, whom Hitler was supposed to have destroyed and made his servant.

When the war came and the overwhelmingly superior German war machine began its series of astounding victories culminating in the fall of France, a veritable hysteria was recorded in the Allied nations. The social "theorists" above referred to were then certain that the easy German victories could only result from the fact that a new social order prevailed in that country and, more than that, a superior social order. We learned, among other things, that the basis for the German victories was to be found, not in its military preponderance, but in the superiority of its "managerial society." The blitzkrieg was explained on the basis of this superior social order, and in some quarters we learned that it was due to the liquidation of the profit system, the internal market and, above all, by the liquidation by Hitler of the world market! No more, no less!

After three years of a war which has engulfed the entire world, the conjunctural phenomenon of the blitzkrieg disappeared and has been replaced by a war of position and attrition. But it had already become clear after the first year of the war, or to be more exact, when Great Britain routed

the Luftwaffe in the air over England, that this war was really not so strange and that it exhibited, despite new means and weapons of warfare, the same fundamental strategies which prevailed in the First World War. The war is no longer "startling" and saner analyses get a better hearing these days. The truth about German society under Hitler has become clearer: Hitler is the agent of a small group of the most powerful financial-industrial overlords of German economy; German economy in the war has reached the highest development of monopolist-capitalism. No fundamental class changes have taken place; the bourgeoisie has become a more concentrated class accumulating greater wealth; the middle classes are being wiped out, the proletariat is more intensely exploited.

The war has solidified the main economic tendency within Germany and the conquests of the German armies now enable us to see how this tendency takes effect in the conquered countries. The main tendency within the country is toward a greater concentration and rationalization of industry to meet the ever-increasing needs of the new phase of the war. Definite material is now available to demonstrably prove that, in the conquered areas, the bourgeoisie follows the path cut for them by the military victories to gain control and ownership over the whole of European economy. It is these two aspects of economy development which we wish to deal with now.

In the June 20 issue of the *Foreign Commerce Weekly* there appeared the third installment of a study on German wartime economic policies. The title of this particular review is "Concentration and Rationalization of Industries in Germany." It proceeds to an elaborate analysis of a German economy which it described throughout as a private property-profit economy dominated by a group of monopolists. Nowhere in the entire review can one find a single allusion to a collectivized property under state control. Thus at the very outset we learn that...

One of the outstanding economic results of the National Socialist régime in Germany has been a sharp acceleration in the trend toward economic concentration. The rearmament policy, with its definite emphasis on substitute materials which could be produced only by the financially strong concerns, the rationing of raw materials, labor and transportation and, finally, the tremendous economic demands of the war, have compelled the government to concentrate a very large part of the country's production in the large and efficient plants."

It should not be difficult to understand this tendency, which is deep-going in Germany, because we observe the same development in the United States. The great demands of the war make it inevitable that the heavy industries, the highly concentrated and centralized combines will benefit from the war orders of the government. In the interest of military victory, the effect of this process on the small manufacturer, i.e., the large middle classes, is unimportant. If the German rulers are more callous than the Americans when they prepare the doom of these elements in the economic structure, the result is all the same. The longer the war lasts, the more intensified becomes this tendency toward concentration and rationalization.

The article in question quotes from a résumé on this particular problem contained in the German press which we believe is instructive. The résumé says in part:

The year 1942 will be characterized by a higher degree of concentrated utilization of all production means to further the conduct of the war. Since the beginning of the new year, the placing of the national economy on a total war basis is in the process of being realized. The intent is to give maximum industrial support to the Army at a minimum loss of production capacity and with a minimum use of manpower. . . . This can be attained by two methods—rationalization and concentration. . . . It may be necessary to that end to eliminate smaller and medium-size plants and concentrate production in a few larger ones, which could be particularly adapted to manufacture rationally. It is, however, not the intention to sacrifice unnecessarily small and medium concerns if they are able to cooperate economically. . . . As stated, in the new phase of economic war development, a further restriction in the production of consumer goods cannot be avoided, or the immobilization of those concerns which are of no direct value to national war economy. . . .

Where will this begin and whom will it eliminate? Concentration begins among the already highly concentrated mass industries and elimination continues among the small enterprises where liquidation of enterprise has been going on for a long time or where subsidized idleness has been the rule since the war began. The firms to be retained are naturally the most efficient in the employment of labor, machinery, fuel and raw materials, those "capable of sufficient standardization of output to produce articles whose manufacture is worth while only if they are produced on a large scale." They will be the large monopolies, firms with the most modern machinery. For example, in a field where sixty-five firms exist the three largest and most efficient will be maintained, the rest either to be swallowed up by the three, or eliminated entirely. Thereby, the process of consolidation, an inherent tendency of monopoly capitalism, is intensified by the demands of the war and aided by a state régime completely in accord with the dominant steel, coal and chemical monopolies. The new combinations will further the merger of finished goods producers and those making and trading in raw materials and semi-finished goods. In each instance, the big monopolies will be the winner and that is why "the large concerns are apparently only too ready to cooperate with the state in achieving this concentration. . . ."

Near the close of 1941 the following combinations took place: An agreement between Siemens & Holske (AG) and the Allgemeine Elektrizitätsgesellschaft (AEG) involving the redistribution of certain subsidiaries; the formation of Phrix-Zellwollkonzerns; the establishment of Francolor, allying the German chemical trust (IG) with the French dyestuff industry. At the beginning of this year "the Metallgesellschaft and the Ver. Aluminium-Werke exchanged their participation in the Ver. Dt. Metallwerken and the Ver-Leichtmetall-Werken." And now we have had the amalgamation of Hoesch (AG) and Maschinenbau und Bahnbedarf (AG). The Allgemeine Elektrizitätsgesellschaft (AEG) has absorbed the Gesellschaft für Elektrische Unternehmungen. The magnitude of this merger is demonstrated in the fact that GEU in assigning its holdings to AEG received shares amounting to 100,000,000 marks.

The State Society for Mutual Aid (another body allocating government aid to business) which has already been helping closed factories, will be called upon to further aid defunct institutions. This organization "undertakes to maintain the buildings and machinery of a factory which is closed down, pay the rent and interest on debts and in some circumstances provide for the subsistence of the owners of the factory if there are no possibilities of reemploying them." The society, which was founded in February, 1940, paid out until May, 1941, benefits to business men totalling 8,000,000 marks. This subsidy was henceforth increased to roughly 20,000,000 marks, and an enlarged subsidy is expected in view of the new prospects

of concentration and the elimination of thousands of other small enterprises.

The Relation of the State to Business

In all of these developments, the state plays an inordinately integral part. The state passes the legislation; it has set up the bodies for effecting its decisions. Thus the process of continued and accelerated concentration and rationalization in industry will be carried through with the aid of such governmental bodies as the Reich Industrial Group, commissioned by the Ministry of Economics, the Office of Economic Direction, the Agricultural and Labor Offices, jointly with the Ministry of Economics, the Ministry of War Economics and the Ministry of Munitions. The article in question goes on to say:

It is intended that private business shall be coordinated to an extent never before undertaken. Private economy, insofar as it still remains a part of the "civil section," will be drawn, it is stated, to even a greater degree under the control of the state, and private interests will be subordinated more than ever to public welfare.

One might conclude from the above that there is truly something fundamentally new in German state-industrial relations. Only a superficial observation permits such a conclusion. For, in fact, what exists in Germany is a situation similar to that in all the warring countries. By their direction of the war, the national states conduct the most colossal venture in all history. Economy is completely subordinated to the needs of war; the market is the state and all production takes place on the basis of the requirements of that market: production of war goods, consumer goods consonant with the maintenance of the national population upon whom war production is dependent, and the production of all necessary auxiliary goods. Public welfare means doing everything necessary for a successful prosecution of the war. But in none of the bourgeois states, especially Germany, has any fundamental change taken place in property relations and, therefore, production for the profit of the dominant economic class, the bourgeoisie. This is why the above review comments:

The whole process, it is maintained, however, cannot be achieved entirely by government decrees. It is contended that it must primarily have the full support of industry. Emphasis is placed on the execution of the plan through the application of the self-government policy of industry. Not orders from above, it is stated, but only the initiative of responsible entrepreneurs can achieve a further real increase in output. Those who are placing the armament orders, namely, the officials of the German government, it is pointed out, must also show the ability to accommodate themselves.

If we were to accept the theories of the champions of the new social order in Germany, we could never understand why a state which has presumably liquidated all classes, or at least reduced them to impotence, is unable to proceed with its managerial prerogatives other than by asking the indulgence of big business. Why, for example, would not a decree be sufficient? It is in the Soviet Union. But in Germany we find that it is necessary for the state to issue its decrees and then depend upon the competing sections of the ruling class to adjust themselves to such decrees and to carry them out as independent financiers, industrialists, or, as the article says, entrepreneurs.

The truth is that in Germany you have the classic development of fascism as the final form of monopolist-capitalist rule. It is being acknowledged by an ever-widening group of observers that Hitler is merely the tool of the dominant monopolistic combines, the steel, coal, iron and chemical groups.

which, through the fascist state they helped to create, have finally eliminated or weakened rival capitalist groups. They sit in the council chambers of all the important state ministries. They initiate the main economic decrees. They receive the essential benefits of Hitler's victories in concrete economic gains, as we shall shortly prove.

The problem of the dominant monopolist groups in German economy is to bring about the elimination of competitive and small industries, to control labor, raw materials and prices. There is no need to control the market, because through the state they dominate the market too. But the fascist state is the instrument through which the other classes and strata are controlled and cajoled into accepting the economic rule of the dominant group of the bourgeoisie.

The point to be remembered is that this singular process is followed in Great Britain and America without, as yet, the need of such a totalitarian régime. The bourgeois need for a fascist state in Germany is to be explained entirely by the pre-war position of that country in world economy and inner-class relations. In Germany the state is truly the servant of the dominant economic class. Observe in the following how the various aspects of economic conduct have served the interests of the top layer of the German bourgeoisie.

Some Inner Features

Cartelization in Germany, which preceded other countries, has developed intensely under the Nazi régime, resulting in even greater power for the large monopolists. This cartelization is the antithesis of state nationalization, or collectivization. The "anti-capitalist" elements of the Nazi Party have long been liquidated. Germany's war, as we pointed out in our dispute with Dwight Macdonald in 1941, is the war of the German monopolists fighting to win world economic hegemony.

Just as in the United States, most contracts are with big business, and these are "ruled mainly by the 'cost-plus' principle," a system by which the bourgeoisie profits enormously.

In the pre-war years of Hitler's reign, production in Germany (essentially for war) nearly doubled. In this same period, wages and salaries increased 66 per cent, but other incomes increased 146 per cent. The figures in Maxine Sweezy's *The Structure of Nazi Economy* show that profits of corporate industry has not only been recovered but approximates the high years of the pre-Hitler era. As compared to a more than 10 per cent loss in 1931, profits rose in 1937 to 6 per cent. Almost immediately after Hitler's rise to power, i.e., with the destruction of the proletarian organizations, their resistive strength and, consequently, their already impoverished standard of living, profits reappeared for the bourgeoisie. Profits have again increased during the war, but this increase is to be recorded almost entirely for the heavy industries. This, however, is not atypical a monopoly capitalism. Finally, inequality in income and wealth, as a fundamental feature of capitalism, has been intensified.

The continental aim of the German bourgeoisie (sensationalized in Booktab's *Sequel to Apocalypse*, a study written to prove that Hitler is the agent of Farben, Krupp et al.) is to reduce Europe to a colony of German industry, to agrarianize the other countries, expropriate their industries and enormously expand German industry on the basis of an all-European market. Thus, just prior to the outbreak of the war, general production increased to 135 (taking the year 1929 at

100). Of this increase, consumption goods rose from 76 to 120, while investment goods (principally armaments) jumped from 34 to 147. The monopolist concerns profit from these increases. The "Aryanization" of business was merely another form of capital accumulation through the elimination of Jewish concerns. Private capitalists and Nazi Party leaders took over these firms. In both cases, friendliness for the fascists and "heroic" party deeds were rewarded. In each instance, the maintenance of private property was guaranteed by the state.

The Hermann Goering Works began as a state institution to engage in the costly manufacture of low grade ores. The reason for this governmental venture was to socialize the losses attendant upon such production—to make the masses pay for it. But when the German armies began to march and the Goering Works took over the profitable heavy industries of other countries, almost immediately the private monopolists sat on its directorates and increased the specific weight of private capital in this enterprise. The Nazi marauders found them indispensable to aid the organization and conduct of a business now purported to be the world's largest monopoly.

In an examination of what has happened to Germany's middle classes we see another aspect of the monopolist-capitalist character of German economy. There was a "large-scale massacre of small businesses" (*The Economics of Barbarism*, by Kuczynski and Witt), a process now taking place in the United States also. Taxation and the curtailment of raw materials, a product of the war economy, served to destroy the small producers. The state enacted measures for the liquidation of these concerns. In 1937, over 10,000 independent retail business were liquidated in the Brandenburg Province alone. In two years, from April, 1936, to March, 1938, "one hundred and four thousand small independent craftsmen had to close their businesses." Just prior to the outbreak of the war, this figure rose to 200,000 and we are reasonably certain that in the past three years this figure has been left far behind. The disappearance of these businesses served the interest of big business, which absorbed the labor, raw materials and contracts of these concerns.

Basic Class Relations

The condition of the German proletariat is well known. The standard of living of these masses is maintained only at a point which permits continued labor and reproduction of the race. There is only the limit of physical endurance which decides the length of hours which the industrial proletariat labors and the conditions of this labor. Food and clothing are of poor quality and they are rationed. The sixty-four hour week is the rule, although large numbers of workers labor seventy-two or eighty-four hours a week. In one particular locality, a 104-hour week was provided for through a "collective agreement." In general, physical, moral and spiritual degeneration of the German people follows.

Another phenomenon produced by the war, more precisely, by German victories, has been the forced mass movement of conquered peoples. Hitler plays a game of checkers with these peoples. The main purpose behind these shifts is to meet the economic requirements of Germany's war production. The number of foreign workers employed by Germany is an indication of what has taken place on the continent. The German bureaucrats, by their own admission earlier in the year, have transported more than two and a quarter million workers to work in German industries and farms. This figure has been enormously increased in recent months.

In sharp contrast to the conditions of the German masses and the conquered peoples is the position of the German bourgeoisie. It is not necessary to measure the wide gulf between these classes in terms of loaves of bread. One can deduce it from empirical evidence present in bourgeois society as it exists in the "democratic" United Nations.

The German monopolists are not awaiting the conclusions of a victorious war to gain their spoils. They have enriched themselves *now*, in the very midst of a war which has not approached a conclusion and where victory is terribly uncertain. But we are in a position to demonstrably prove by the following, how intimate is the relationship of the German state to the German bourgeoisie and how slavishly it serves the latter.

The German rulers, i.e., the dominant bourgeoisie and their state bureaucracy, have employed several methods in dealing with the economy of conquered countries. They have either taken over the most important sectors of these economies, obtained controlling interest, or destroyed them entirely. In each case, however, the fundamental aim of the victors has been to subordinate everything to German requirements.

How Big Business Is Enriched

The Hermann Goering Works, the one important government business and the basis upon which many "theorists" based their analysis of the new social order, has been altered by the German victories. It is no longer a state institution for the production of iron and steel from low grade ores. It has become a colossal monopoly whose capital has increased from 5,000,000 marks in 1937 to 400,000,000. The capital increase of this concern was accompanied by an invasion from the private monopolistic interests, principally Ruhr industrialists, who were enamored of the new sources of wealth of this enterprise.

With the invasion of Austria, the Goering Works obtained control of the Alpine Montangesellschaft, the Veitsche Magnesitwerke, an oil-distributing agency, Fanto AG, and "numerous iron and steel concerns." Upon the occupation of Czechoslovakia, it obtained control of the great Skoda works, the Brno armaments concern, and other iron and steel companies.

French capital in these Czech organizations, mainly the Schneider-Cruzot interests, "sold out to the German monopolists, who paid them off with Czech gold held by the Bank of International Settlements." But, in turn, the same German monopolists have obtained control of the Schneider-Cruzot combine. The Goering Works also took over the Koenig and Laurahuette mines of Poland.

Sudeten German mines were unified either by expropriation or the buying out of the large shareholders. German industrialists then organized the Sudetenlandische Bergbau AF, which in turn organized the Sudetenlandische Treibstoffwerke AG, one of the largest producers of synthetic oil.

The German monopolists really went to work on Poland. The policy there was simply to destroy the national economy or to Germanize it. Through their organization, the Haupttreuhandstelle Ost, they expropriated within one year 294 big industrial works, 9,000 medium-sized industrial works, 76,000 small industrial enterprises, 9,120 big mercantile companies and 112,000 small ones. The iron works of Koenigs and Laurahuette were *given* to the German Roehling company. Krupp was *given* the Bismarckhuette coal and iron business. The Fuerstengrube concern was *given* to I. G. Farben.

The great landed estates of the Wirek Kopalnie were split three ways and *given* to three great estate owners of Eastern Germany: Herr Schaffgotsch received 50 per cent, Herr Ballester 30 per cent, and Herr Donnersmark 20 per cent. The combined wealth of "these three estate owners and industrialists is estimated to be...over 100,000,000 marks. (Quoted from *Die Zeitung*, in *The Economics of Barbarism*.)

The Kattowitzer Lokomotivfabrik of Chrzanow, Poland, was *given* to the German locomotive manufacturers, Henschel & Co., AG.

German policy in Poland is one of confiscation. Former owners receive no compensation. In this way the German industrialists have been enormously enriched to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars in capital wealth (mines, factories and machinery). This, then, is the fruit of the Polish conquest. And it is for this that the German youth have sacrificed their lives—for the enrichment of the top layer of the German capitalist class.

The methods pursued in other countries, France, Belgium and Holland, are different. In these countries, "the factories and concerns belonging to one industry are grouped together into one economic unit—a syndicate, a holding company, a ring, and so on." For this type of arrangement, the Germans usually place a collaborationist at the head of the new organization (usually one who has had close relations with German big business prior to the war and one who is usually a fascist or near-fascist). These organizations function as native combinations in name only. They really serve their German masters. Thus, the National Committee of Economic Collaboration in Holland, headed by the fascist Rost Van Tonnigen and Dr. Fentener Van Flissingen, former president of the International Chamber of Commerce (!), is actually engaged in solidifying the control of the German monopolists over Dutch economy.

The German Vereinigte Stahlwerke, through the above set-up, took over the iron and steel works of Ymuiden Co. and Van Leersche Iron Works. These companies were amalgamated under the ostensible head of the above Van Flissingen. But the real power is the Ruhr industrialist, Ernst Poensgen, who, together with four other German industrialists, make up the majority of the directorate. Dutch power stations are now being technically linked to German plants in the Ruhr. German banks have taken over the Dutch Koopmans Bank, Amsterdam, N. V. Rijnsche Handelsmanschappij, Handelstrust West N. V., retaining only their names.

In France, the German policy is rather well known. There, many *comités d'organisation* have been formed of native fascists, collaborationists and profit seekers, to facilitate German control of French industry, or to link French concerns to German. The Germans seek to recoup their losses of 1918, and more. The ore resources of Lorraine and the de Wendel companies in Lorraine are now part of the Goering Works. A combined administrative committee of the Hermann Goering Works, the Vereinigte Stahlwerke and Klöckner Works act as a trust for other plants in this region. In return, German coal and coke is to be supplied to these "French" organizations.

German banks play a similar rôle to that of the large industrial combines with which they are intimately associated and which they in large part already control. Thus, German influence in the French banks of Lazard Frères, Crédit Lyonnais, Banque de l'Union Parisienne and others is very strong. Through these banks the Germans manage to influ-

ence or control other French industrial organizations. (The precise extent of German banking influence and control in France is not yet entirely clear.)

The French automobile industry has been reorganized and has established an "understanding" with German and Italian concerns. At present these companies work almost entirely for Germany. The Cuttat machine-tool company of Paris is now under control of the Leipziger Maschinenfabrik Pittler AG. The French chemical and dye industry, reorganized into Francolor, a single monopoly, is controlled by the German dye trust, which owns 51 per cent of its shares.

The same situation holds for Belgium. The Otto Wolff AG, heavy industrial "promoters," have obtained large shares in the iron concern of d'Ougrée Marihay. The Vereingte Stahlwerke "acquired" shares in the John Cockerill Co. Klöckner and Stinnes have also invaded the Belgian field, as have German banks. This "pattern of economic conquest" extends to the Scandinavian countries and in the Balkans. Everywhere, the Germans seek the expulsion of British and American economic interests and thus corral the whole of European economy. So far, their military victories have made possible unbelievable economic gains, all of which go into the hands of the German bourgeoisie.

We have touched only briefly on some of the main developments of German economy since the war began. But even

such a cursory examination is sufficient to demonstrate the unmistakable imperialist-capitalist nature of the war and of German society in particular. The presence, for example, of state officials on some of the new monopolies, is no evidence of a new social order as it is a living proof of the fact that the fascist state is the best servant of the monopolists. These officials do not represent the state in their industrial positions as much as they insure the rights of big business. They become, in fact, business men themselves. Therein lies the main attractiveness of a state career under fascism. It rewards the loyal and "capable" party men with pecuniary gains—they become industrialists!

How soon the whole story of German society will be available, we cannot tell. But the historians of the future will be able to record how the victory of Hitler in Germany marked the triumph of monopoly capitalism over the German working class, middle class and rival capitalist elements and how it enabled this same group to enrich itself through the early victories of the German war machine. It will be a tale so simple and lurid in its description of plunder and self-enrichment that one will regard people as queer who overlooked the actual simplicity of this primitive accumulation and called it a new society and an anti-capitalist society at that.

ALBERT GATES.

China In The War

Continuing A Reply To Shamefaced Critics

We dealt last month with the attempts of Felix Morrow, in the August *Fourth International*, to justify the Cannonite policy of defensism in China in the war today, and showed that he had no greater success with the method of ignoring Lenin's teachings than his suppressed colleague, Wright, had had before him with the method of distorting those teachings. Drawing on the unequivocal revolutionary traditions of the modern Marxist movement, we pointed out that not all wars are reactionary; that, among others, the wars of the colonial countries for freedom from imperialist rule are progressive and just; but that Marxists cannot and do not *always* and *under all circumstances* support even those wars which they characterize as just. Marxists approach *concretely* the problem posed by each war—support or non-support, and if support, then in what manner and under what conditions—as well as the problem posed by each important change in a war. Marxian theory declares that once the more or less isolated war between a colony and an imperialist power becomes an integral part of a war between two imperialist camps, once the colonial country becomes an ally—and in the nature of the relationships between the two, a subordinate ally—of one imperialist camp in the war against another, the revolutionary socialists are obligated to alter their position of support to the colony in the interests of their opposition to the imperialist war in general, to both imperialist camps.

Hence, while we could and did support the struggle of China against Japan from the day it broke out, in spite of the

fact that China was under the domination of its own bourgeoisie, in spite of the fact that it received some material aid (precious little!) from one imperialist country or another—we could not continue this support after the imperialist world war had extended to Asia and the Pacific and after China had become an ally, that is, an integral part of the Anglo-American imperialist camp.

As for the Cannonites, their support of China became stronger and more vehement, if anything, following the spread of the world war to the Orient. What has changed? they demanded with pugnacious bellicosity. Isn't the Chinese bourgeoisie the same today as it was a year ago? Isn't its struggle the same today as it was a year ago? Why is it any more the agent of imperialism today than it was in the past? And furthermore: What is this new, treacherous, anti-Leninist theory enunciated by Shachtman that from now on we can support only those colonial struggles that are led by the proletariat? Does that mean we not only abandon the struggle of China against Japan but also the newly broken-out struggle of India against England? In fact, in the September issue of the *Fourth International*, Morrow adds a positively vile supplement to his attack on us, in which he calls into question our position on India. Let us therefore try, by means of a popular example from modern history to illustrate the differences and similarities between the struggle in China and the struggle in India.

Ireland vs. Servia in 1914 and India vs. China in 1942

No better, simpler and clearer illustration can be found than to compare the Marxian attitude, as expressed by Lenin, toward Servia in the First World War and Ireland. None of

the spurious evasions with which the Cannonites seek to duck other comparisons—"One is a workers' state and the other isn't"; "One is a great, big, decisive country, the other is an insignificant, little country," etc.—will work here. Serbia and Ireland stood on the same class plane in the last war; their political position was, to all intents and purposes, and certainly for the purpose of our comparison, the same; their "size" and specific weight, so to speak, were substantially the same. Yet Lenin adopted a radically different attitude toward the two countries. Why?

Lenin regarded the long struggle of Serbia against Austria as a just national struggle which revolutionists should support even though Serbia was ruled by the bourgeoisie under the "protection" of the Russian Czar. The struggle of Ireland against English imperial rule was regarded by Lenin in substantially the same way.

The national element in the present war is represented *only* by the war of Serbia against Austria (which, by the way, was noted in the resolution of the Berne Conference of our party). Only in Serbia and among the Serbs do we find a national movement for freedom, a movement of long standing embracing millions of "national masses," and of which the present war of Serbia against Austria is a "continuation." Were this war isolated, i.e., not connected with the general European war, with the selfish and predatory aims of England, Russia, etc., then all socialists would be *obliged* to wish success to the Servian *bourgeoisie*—this is the only correct and absolutely necessary conclusion to be drawn from the national element in the present war. (*Works*, Vol. XVIII, p. 299.)

Like China, Serbia was continuing a war of a "national movement for freedom"; it represented a "movement of long standing" which had been fighting even before the imperialist war broke out; it embraced millions. Had the war in Europe been confined to a duel between Servian nationalism and Austro-Hungarian imperialism, socialists would have been obligated to work for the victory of Serbia. But in the war that is actually going on, said Lenin, we do not support Serbia. Why? Because it is only one part of one of the two major, all-determining camps; because it is an ally *and consequently* a subordinate, a tool, of one of the imperialist camps. "A war *between* imperialist great powers . . . , or war in *alliance* with them, is an imperialist war." How categorical and unambiguous are these words of Lenin! So much so that, despite repeated efforts on our part, Morrow and Wright have not yet dared to deal with them, or even acknowledge that they exist.

Now contrast this view of Serbia in the war with Lenin's no less unmistakable view of Ireland in the war, specifically of the Easter, 1916, rebellion in Ireland.

The Irish national-revolutionary movement, like the Servian, was bourgeois by virtue of the class that dominated it and the social and political objectives it set itself. It was, like the Servian, "a movement of long standing embracing millions of 'national masses.'" As Lenin put it, "the century-old Irish national movement . . . expressed itself, *inter alia*, in a mass Irish National Congress in America . . . [and] in street fighting conducted by a section of the urban petty bourgeoisie and a *section of the workers* after a long period of mass agitation, demonstrations, suppression of papers, etc." Like the Servian, furthermore, this movement was connected, at least in part, at least in its upper spheres, with imperialism, now American, now German. As the French did with the Czechs and the Russians did with the Servians, so the Germans sought to utilize the Irish nationalist movement for their own purposes. Who that has read Captain von Rintelen's *Dark Invader* does not know how this chief of German espionage in the United States during the last war helped to finance and promote and stimulate the Irish nationalist movement in this country—to be sure,

from the standpoint of the interests of German imperialism's war against British imperialism? Who that has read the moving journal of Sir Roger Casement, the martyred leader of the Irish rebellion, does not know how he visited Germany during the war, negotiating for arms and munitions for the Irish rebels, which were later put ashore, as he himself was, by a German U-boat? The Irish nationalists did not hesitate to take money and rifles from one bandit, who had interests of his own, against another bandit who was despoiling their land and people as he had for seven centuries.

Lenin knew these facts, as did pretty nearly everyone politically alive at the time. "From their [the imperialists'] standpoint, they are acting quite properly. A serious war would not be treated seriously if advantage were not taken of the slightest weakness of the enemy." Yet Lenin supported the Irish nationalist movement and violently assailed Radek, who wrote deprecatingly about the Easter uprising as a "*putsch*" conducted by a "purely urban petty bourgeois movement which, notwithstanding the sensation it caused, had not much social backing."

Why did Lenin support the Irish and not the Serbs? Why did he distinguish between their national struggles when the two countries were seemingly so indistinguishable (nationalist mass movement, movement of long standing, bourgeois-national, i.e., bourgeois-democratic movement, anti-imperialist movement, etc.)?

Because in one case, you had a rebellion of a class seeking power and independence in an oppressed country; in the other case, you had a struggle that had become decisively subordinated to the struggle of one of the imperialist camps in the World War. Because in one case, you had an oppressed country, or the bourgeoisie of an oppressed country, merely taking material aid from one imperialism against another; in the other case you had the oppressed country as a subject-ally of one imperialism against another.

Ireland was not Germany's ally, did not work for Germany's victory, did not sit in Germany's war councils, did not gear its struggle against England, either politically or militarily, with Germany's struggle against England; Ireland's "collaboration" with Germany was confined, at bottom, to taking rifles and cartridges from her with which to fight to free herself from English rule. Serbia was Russia's ally, *did* work for Russia's victory, *did* sit in Russia's war councils, *did* gear her war against Austria to mesh with Russia's war.

How They Compare to India and China

Isn't the difference between the two cases clear and simple? Lenin *rejected* war, even a "just war," in alliance with one imperialist power against another; he was prepared to *accept* material aid—"potatoes and rifles," as he one put it—from one imperialist in the fight against another. For an honest man to give a bandit whiskey in exchange for a pistol with which to shoot a tyrant is a perfectly legitimate affair, particularly when pistols are nowhere else to be obtained. That is how Lenin explained essentially the same problem in 1918. But there is nothing legitimate in joining one group of highwaymen to hi-jack another group of highwaymen. No matter how noble the purpose of the man who joins such a gang, it is not his aims that will mark the activities of the others, but the aims of the overwhelmingly superior forces of the highwaymen that will mark his activities.

In China today, as in Serbia in 1914, the bourgeoisie is "in power," and it is the ally of one imperialist camp at war with

another. To support "the war in China" now is to support one imperialist alliance against the other, so long as the bourgeoisie heads the war in China, so long as the proletariat has not replaced the bourgeoisie as the leader of the national struggle for liberation. Why? Because the colonial bourgeoisie *cannot* lead a struggle against imperialism; it can only conduct a struggle against *one* imperialist power in order to get a "better deal" from another imperialist master. That is an ABC of Trotskyism, even if Morrow continues with liberalistic indignation to challenge us to "prove" that this holds true in China. Before the imperialist war extends to a country like China, and converts it into an area of battle between the two imperialist alliances, the proletariat can support the national struggle even when it is under bourgeois leadership. But after the imperialist war spreads over China, to support the war of the national bourgeoisie, which is now part of one imperialist camp and fight the other, is to support a sector of the imperialist front. What Lenin set down so categorically is verifiable in every concrete case.

In India today, however, as in Ireland in 1916, you have a rebellion of the masses against their rulers, the British imperialists. The native bourgeoisie, in order not to lose its leadership and authority over the no-longer-controllable masses, "goes along" with the uprising and even claims it as "its own" in order to prevent "excesses" and to prevent a real struggle against imperialism with which the Indian bourgeoisie has not broken and will not break its connections for a single moment. The Japanese would like to utilize this mass uprising for their own imperialist purposes, as they succeeded to a large extent in doing in Burma. The Indian bourgeoisie—we mean of course the real bourgeoisie which decides things, and not impotent petty bourgeois ideologists like Nehru—flirts with the idea of "playing" with Japanese imperialism (with which it wouldn't hesitate a fraction of a second to unite in order to suppress a too exigent working class and peasantry, any more than it has hesitated in the past to unite similarly with British imperialism) and, in any case, holds the possibility of such a "game," i.e., such a capitulation, in reserve for possible eventualities. But one would have to be blind, deaf and even incapable of reading Braille to put the Chinese and Indian situations into the same bag at the present time.

Neither the Indian bourgeoisie nor its political movement is allied to Japan as China is to England and the United States; it does not sit in the war councils of Japan or the Axis, as China does with its master-allies; its "troops" are not under the command of Japanese, as Chinese are under American, command; its "airfields" are not under the control or "at the service" of Japan, as China's fields are "at the service" of the U.S.; it does not send "its troops" to fight for Japan in, let us say, Afghanistan, as Chiang sent his troops to fight for General Alexander in Burma. And so on and so forth. In the one case you have a big Serbia, in the other case you have a correspondingly big Ireland. That is why, following Lenin, we distinguish between the two.

It would be interesting to learn from Morrow, or from his cruelly gagged predecessor, Wright (1) how *he* distinguishes between the present struggle of the Indian and the Chinese bourgeoisie, if he distinguishes at all. (2) Applying the criteria he employs for supporting China in the imperialist war today, to Serbia in the First World War, why would it not have been correct to support that country in 1914—not Russia or France, but Serbia. (3) Why did Lenin consider it inadmissible to support the just war of Serbia if she was allied with imperialism, whereas it is quite admissible in this world

war to support China when she is allied with imperialism? Is it because the Servian bourgeoisie could not lay claim to independence in its alliance, whereas the Chinese bourgeoisie can make such a claim? (4) If Morrow considers this claim "legitimate," will he explain by virtue of what historical, social, economic, political or any other reason is the Chinese bourgeoisie endowed with fundamentally different properties than was the Servian a quarter century ago? Interesting questions. What a pity that we shall never get answers to them. Slanderous abuse? Yes. Answer? No.

Concretely, Now, How Far Did China Capitulate??!!

Morrow is not so dull that he does not see the fatal results of Wright's venture into a justification of the SWP position on the grounds of Marxian theory and tradition. So he skips that detail. After all, that's for pedants and scholiasts; for a man of the masses, for a man of deeds, it is a luxury that can be dispensed with. What Morrow insists on is the "concrete." Shachtman "does not venture beyond empty generalities about China's 'complete capitulation to Anglo-American imperialism'—which is precisely what is incumbent upon him to prove." Except, he grants, for one attempt, namely, our reference to the Chinese "already fighting on Burmese soil to maintain the imperialist rule of the British bourgeoisie." Whereupon Morrow proceeds to apply "the test of events in Burma" in order to prove his thesis and disprove ours.

He opens up this chapter with a startling argument. "If it is correct to defend China at all," writes Morrow, "then there is no reason why the Chinese army should not have defended the Burma Road, including the section of it in Burma and the port of entry for Chinese supplies, Rangoon."

The whole problem, in the first place, is to decide *whether or not* "it is correct to defend China at all"! By the same fantastic manner of arguing, one could say: "If it is correct to defend England at all, then there is no reason why the English army should not 'defend' Iceland, and 'defend' Madagascar, and 'defend' Ireland." But what needs proving is precisely *whether or not* British imperialism should be defended. One of the arguments made by Marxists is precisely this: England's *holding* of Ireland, her *seizure* of Iceland, her *seizure* of Madagascar, these are the acts which show the imperialist nature of the war. In a word, Morrow *assumes* precisely that which has to be *proved*. It may be a very convenient way of arguing; it is not a convincing one.

In the second place, we cannot understand why Morrow has suddenly fallen into such narrow-minded provincialism, which sits badly on a man of such military-strategical parts. "If it is correct" to defend China, and there is "then" no reason why China should not defend Rangoon, the port of entry for her supplies, and the Burma Road, which is the last leg of the journey of these supplies, why would it not also be correct for China to defend the "Pacific Road" over which her supplies were brought in Anglo-American ships, with Anglo-American naval escort? "Shachtman has always had a queasy attitude toward frontiers," says Morrow, with his uncanny knack for accuracy. But surely, he has no such queasiness. Where would he draw the line beyond which he would not "permit" China to fight side by side with the troops of Anglo-American imperialism (in fact, as auxiliaries of these troops)? "Shall China," he asks, "a non-imperialist country, leave undefended a vital area extending beyond its borders, simply because some imperialist rival of Japan would also benefit by its defense? This is the logic of the madhouse of petty

bourgeois radicalism." Magnificently put. But is Rangoon the end of the "vital area extending beyond its borders?" Is the Burma Road the only extra-Chinese part of the supply line that China should not "leave undefended"? What about British Singapore and the British Federated Malay States, which covered British Burma to begin with? And the Dutch East Indies, upon which so much of the defense of Singapore depended? What good would Chinese control of the port of entry for her supplies, Rangoon, be (we can just picture Britain turning over the control to China!), if, for lack of Chinese coöperation, the rest of the supply line, to say nothing of the supplies themselves, were not "defended"?

Does not the reader see, from the very point cited by Morrow, how it lies in the very nature of an alliance between a colonial bourgeoisie and an imperialist coalition, at war with another imperialist coalition, that the colony enacts the rôle of *integral* but *subordinate* sector of the imperialist camp? That is what Lenin meant in the last war when he said, over and over again, that because of the "all-determining" character of the imperialist war, *you cannot support even the "just wars" of the colonial countries or small nations without sinking into the service of imperialism! And that is what we mean when we say that there is a spreading social-patriotic tendency in the Socialist Workers Party.*

Morrow, after his hollow "if-then" argument, proceeds with his proof by the test of "concrete" events. And what does his proof consist of? Of the very well known fact that in spite of its desperate plight during the Japanese invasion of Burma, the British military command hesitated up to the last minute to send into battle the "Chinese mechanized units" made available in Chinese Kunming for use in the Burmese campaign and, at the very end, allowed a small number to enter, with British agents standing at the border counting them as they passed by. When it was all over, the Chinese author, Lin Yutang, who is a sort of semi-official agent here of Chiang Kai-shek, revealed many of the details of the sordid affair in a letter to the *New York Times*.

How the Morrow-Marlen Theory Looks in Practice

What conclusions does Morrow draw from these incontestable facts? With shattering sarcasm he writes that "General Alexander, the British commander, appears to have been abysmally ignorant of the fact, so well known to Shachtman, that the Chinese wanted to enter Burma merely to serve British imperialism. [That "merely" is of course not our term, but a sly and dishonest insertion by Morrow.] On the contrary, Alexander refused to let Chinese troops into Burma except in token numbers."

And further: "... the British preferred to lose Burma to Japan, with the hope of winning it back later, than to let China hold Burma against Japan. The line of demarcation is so clear that the backward peasant in India understands it as well as does General Alexander from the opposite side of the class line. But Shachtman does not understand the class line, as he already showed by his position on the Soviet-Finish war. *The events in Burma demonstrate that China, far from 'complete capitulation to Anglo-America imperialism,' is feared and thwarted by its imperialist 'ally.'*" (My emphasis—M. S.)

There it is and if you don't believe it, you can read it for yourself in the original, on pages 247 and 248 of the August, 1942, issue of this organ of the Fourth International.

But that isn't the only place you can read it. In the paper

of the Master of Pseudo-Marxian Thaumaturgy and Obfuscation, G. Marlen, we read exactly the same story Morrow tells us, only better. Marlen scorns the halting, half-way conclusions drawn from the "concrete" facts by Morrow. When the latter stumbles, Marlen, product and embodiment of the law of combined development, leaps like a mountain-goat. Where Morrow complicates matters by the theory that there are two wars going on in the world today—the reactionary war between the two imperialist camps, and the progressive war between the Soviet Union and China, on the one hand, and imperialism on the other—with non-decisive connections between the two, Marlen simplifies it with an even more startling theory. According to him, there is but one war going on: the war between the allied imperialists (England, Germany, France, Italy, America, Japan) on one side, and Soviet Russia and China on the other side. Literally? Yes, literally! You don't mean that? Yes, we do, or at least Marlen does. You mean that the battles between England and Germany, Germany and Poland, Italy and Greece, Greece and Germany, Germany and France, Belgium, Holland, Scandinavia, the United States and Japan, Japan and England—that all these battles are a fake? Yes, exactly and literally, at least according to Marlen. But surely you don't mean—Excuse, please, but we do mean it, at least Marlen does. Then the whole thing—Yes, the whole thing is a fraud, a show, a façade, a trick, a bitter joke. The imperialists are not fighting among themselves at all. The fact is—Marlen has it on a reliable tip—that *all* the imperialists are secretly allied, and they have an agreement to help Germany crush Russia and Japan crush China, and then all will be well with the world. But this is dirty business! Yes, and to cover it up they are going through an elaborate presense at fighting each other. But try as they will, they won't fool Marlen. Shachtman? Yes! Marlen? No!

The Shachtmanites, flying in the face of the whole course of events before and after September, 1939, hold that the imperialists are engaged in a real, life-and-death struggle amongst themselves, like in 1914-18. (*The Bulletin*, September, 1942.)

What, therefore, asks Marlen, is this business of the English refusing to permit more than a few Chinese into Burma? Marlen is ready to acknowledge that the cunning English can dupe God knows how many people, but not him. The alliance between Britain and China? The real truth is, there is no such thing in actuality.

The "alliance" of the British with China "against" the Japanese fascists is patently of a most "peculiar" character. Its "peculiarity" points to the *factual existence of the inverse kind of alliance, with the paper British-Chinese "alliance" serving as a cover for that hidden inter-imperialist collaboration.* (*Ibid.*, my emphasis—M. S.)

In other words, what really exists in the East is an alliance between British and Japanese imperialism, by which the former agrees to keep withdrawing out of Asia in order that the latter may take it over, crushing China, India and at least the Eastern part of the Soviet Union. The attack on Pearl Harbor? The fighting in the South Pacific? Don't take them seriously, they're just smoke-screens. Why the Anglo-Japanese ally does not provide instead for Japan retiring from Asia and taking up a position on, say, the Sverdrup Islands in the Prince Gustav Adolph Sea, leaving England to crush China, India and Russia, is not always very clear in Marlen's fantasmagorias. Come to think of it, the same criticism might be made of everything else he deals with.

But, as the poet says, *nunc amisso quæramus seria ludo*—now let us leave the ludicrous and attend to the serious.

Every time Morrow tries "concretely" to show that the war of China against Japan is "independent" of the Imperialist World War, he finds himself sliding to within an inch of Marlen's "phony war" theory, and, what is worse, to painting up the colonial bourgeoisie and justifying its imperialist alliance, justifying its service in the imperialist camp. That is all Morrow shows by his reference to the "events in Burma," because understand them he does not.

The Fundamental and Secondary Reasons

The very fact that virtually the entire imperialist press in the United States criticized (condemned would be more accurate, even if in language befitting "allies") the policy of General Alexander toward the Chinese troops in the battle of Burma, that a goodly section of the British imperialist press did likewise, would suffice to blow the bottom out of Morrow's shallow and essentially demagogic argumentation. There are any number of reasons why Alexander and his like waited till the last minute before allowing any sizeable number of Chinese to enter the Burma campaign, but they are reasons that relate primarily to the peculiarities of British imperialism's development in the East, to the character and traditions of her representatives there, and have so serious relationship to the question of whether China is an integral part of the Anglo-American imperialist camp.

One is the contempt felt by Britain's military and political whiskey-and-soda aristocracy for the "inferior Jap" and its inability to believe that the latter could whip the high-born Englishman.

Another, of the same order, was the need of "saving face" which the British white overlord felt when confronted by a situation in which everyone could see that his rule was saved not by troops of his own training but by "inferior" colored troops trained by their own officers. That's why the British hesitated as much to call upon Chinese natives in Singapore as they did Chiang's troops in the Burma fighting.

Still another is the inner-imperialist rivalry and jealousy between the British and Americans, and the not too well concealed irritation of the English at anything that smacks of "being saved" by Americans or those who, like "Stilwell's Chinese," are led by Americans.

Still another is sheer stupidity, typical British imperialist stupidity when dealing with colonial peoples, and an inability in the concrete case to utilize a colonial army, which offered itself "voluntarily," in the best interests of the imperialists. Is this so rare in the history of British or other imperialism as to cause surprise when it manifests itself with unusual force?

Morrow uses the refusal of the British to work militarily with the Chinese in Burma to prove some sort of incompatibility between imperialism and the colonial bourgeoisie. We recall that Goldman once argued that Stalinist Russia and British imperialism were also fighting two different kinds of wars *in spite of* the flawlessness of their military cooperation in the seizure of Iraq. In both cases, the argument is altogether superficial. What is decisive is not the imperialist pig-headedness and Jim Crow mentality of some Colonel Blimp. The important thing is that Chiang offered his troops to fight for British imperialism in its war against Japanese imperialism in Burma. That only a few were allowed to fight is not due to Chiang or to the character of the Chinese alliance with imperialism.

Given a Stilwell instead of an Alexander, i.e., a less pig-

headed imperialist, the Chinese would have fought in Burma. Under whose leadership? Anglo-American imperialism. *Objectively*, for what purpose, with what aim? To maintain the rule of British imperialism in Burma. *That can be denied only if you believe that the defeat by the "Anglo-American allies" (the Chinese fight, the English direct the fight and have the victory) would have liberated Burma from British as well as Japanese imperialism, or at least would have put that country in the hands of China.* But if the Chinese army, that is, the Chinese bourgeoisie, is thus really capable of fighting both imperialist camps, that is, of fighting *imperialism*, and triumphing over it, let it be said flatly and unambiguously. *Then let us proceed to a revision of the fundamental position of Trotskyism on the rôle and character of the colonial bourgeoisie.* That's what the "test of the events in Burma" brings us to, even if Morrow does not realize it.

He does not realize it for one simple but fundamental reason: All that Trotsky taught in the struggle against Stalinism about the *basic* character of the colonial bourgeoisie, about the *basic* character of its relationship to imperialism, has left only the most superficial impression upon him. The most general and, if you will, most abstract formulation of the problem of the colonial struggle for freedom—namely, the war of a colony for liberation from imperialist rule is a just and progressive war—is usually accepted by most petty bourgeois liberals, by social democrats, by Stalinists. Morrow accepts it as though it were the essence, the most important feature of Lenin's and Trotsky's, especially the latter's, contribution to the question. When he cites them as authorities (in actuality, he does not mention Lenin at all), he quotes only what is said in general about the colonial struggles being progressive. In other words, *given the very concrete fact that the imperialist-democrats and liberals praise countries like China for being lined up with the "right side" in the imperialist war*, Morrow is quoting, as Lenin used to say, "what is pleasing and acceptable to the liberals."

Once Again—Lenin and Trotsky

What Lenin and Trotsky said about the *alliance* of the colonial or national bourgeoisie with imperialist coalitions during an imperialist war, that is, what they said *concretely* about the *concrete* problem before us, he deliberately ignores. We repeat, deliberately, for if at first he did not know what Lenin and Trotsky said, we called it to his attention. Deliberate evasion of these teachings, apart from the contempt for one's readers that it shows, cannot but have a political purpose. In the present case the purpose is to cover up a social-patriotic line which would be more speedily revealed for what it is if it were confronted with the texts of Leninism.

Lenin said: A war *in alliance with* imperialism, is an imperialist war. Not so in China, says Morrow.

Lenin said: During the Imperialist World War, you cannot support the ally of imperialism, Poland, even though the cause of Polish independence is progressive, "without sinking into mean servility to *one* of the imperialist monarchies." In China, it's all right, says Morrow.

Lenin said: We reject *in principle* a victory attained in a formal or factual alliance with the "friendly" imperialism. The victory of China and English imperialism in Burma would be a wonderful thing, says Morrow.

Trotsky said: Chiang Kai-shek cannot oppose Japanese imperialism without becoming a servile tool of British imperialism. Trotsky wrote this, of course, before the World War

came to China. Now, after the war has broken out there, Morrow writes that "we are separated from Shachtman by an unbridgeable gulf. We support the struggle [of China]; he brands it as 'serving one imperialist camp against the other. That is today the course of the bourgeoisie in every colonial and semi-colonial country.'" You see, *Shachtman* "brands" it! No, Shachtman merely quoted Trotsky. The gulf that Morrow cannot bridge separately him not only from the former but also from the latter.

Did not Trotsky support China in the past? To be sure he did and so did we. Did not Trotsky say that if the World War broke out the colonies would and should exploit the conflicts between the imperialists? Yes, and we said and say the same thing. In what sense? In the sense clearly indicated by Lenin during the First World War. China's war against Japan would continue to merit support in spite of Japan's rivalry with the United States provided it remained a "war for national liberation in which imperialist rivalry is a contributory element of no great importance" (quoted last month. My emphasis.—M. S.) But the "rivalry" has led to a war which is being fought in the Pacific and on Chinese soil; instead of being a "contributory element of no great importance," the war between the U.S. and Japan is obviously of decisive importance. That's the difference. Therein lies the *concreteness* of the change in the situation.

China is now committed to the war aims of Anglo-American imperialism and that is what she is fighting for. Her struggle against Japan is now decisively subordinated to the Anglo-American struggle against Japan. She is part and parcel of the Anglo-American Pacific War Council in Washington (a subordinated and not very seriously consulted part, to be sure, but an integral part nevertheless) and her rôle in the war is dictated by this council. Her military forces are under the "symbolic" leadership of the American General Stilwell, and what that leadership symbolizes is precisely the dependence of China (given the continued rule of the bourgeoisie, it must be repeatedly emphasized) upon America in the war today. Her aerial forces are the American forces, and her aerial bases are nothing, literally nothing, but the bases of American imperialism. Her military activities are decided by the imperialist masters in the alliance. The refusal of the imperialists to allow the Chinese into Burma, and China's acceptance of this order, is *only a sensational example, not of Morrow's claim of China's independence in the war, but precisely of the opposite claim*, namely, that China is completely subservient in the war to the commands, even the most stupid commands, of her imperialist master-allies. Morrow says it was to China's interests to hold Burma (for whom?). Yet the Chinese did not go into Burma when the imperialist command said "No!" Why not? Because China is now an integral and minor part of the Anglo-American camp. That derives from the inherent nature of the relationships between a colonial bourgeoisie and modern imperialism. Lenin and Trotsky did not create this relationship; they only revealed it and explained it. Morrow's contribution is to ignore it.

We would not be doing Morrow justice, however, if we did not add that he does admit the possibility of a "change." "If China's war effort collapses, or is so weakened that in the end the land front in China is dominated by Anglo-American troops, then victory over Japan would not be a victory for China." You will admit that this sure is a delicate way of putting it. Morrow spends pages denouncing us for speaking of Chiang's "complete capitulation to Anglo-American imperialism." All the facts already available are not enough for him,

and therefore he won't say that. But if the "land front in China is dominated by Anglo-American troops," he will say it, more or less. The military aspects of the relations between the colony and the imperialist power are of course very important. But what is even more important for us here is that Morrow establishes *purely military* considerations as decisive for his *political* conclusions. This utterly preposterous "tomorrow" point of view, calculated to serve "some day" as the opportunist's way out of a jam, is a natural product of the false point of view of the Cannonites today. It leaves the door open for a purely arbitrary right-about-face which could be dictated by any number of motives except objective political considerations.

How will Morrow determine when the "complete capitulation to imperialism," as we have already called it, will take place? Will he stand at the Chinese border counting the "Anglo-American troops" as they file in, as British bureaucrats stood at the Burmese border counting "Stilwell's Chinese"? At what point—we're not asking for exact figures down to a man, you know, just for approximate figures—would he raise the sign: "No more imperialist troops wanted today. Leave name and address at the gate for future call"? Would 50,000 "Anglo-American troops" be enough to "dominate the land front in China"? A hundred thousand? Half a million? Would Morrow compare Anglo-American and Chinese troops man for man and "allow" the former only 49 per cent, maximum? Or would he take into account the differences between armored divisions and motorized and regular infantry divisions? between square and triangular divisions? between airborne and land troops? Will he give as many "points" to a Chinese division of infantry as to an American regiment equipped with half-tracks and sub-machine guns, or would he give more to which? Whom would he call in as military expert, as special consultant in weighing the variables, as technical people call them—Joe Hanson or Hanson Baldwin?

To leave himself a loophole through which to crawl tomorrow, in a moment of desperation, Morrow has found himself resorting to the preposterous criterion of purely military considerations. That is what comes of the abandonment of the clear-cut political criteria of Marxism. That is what comes of the abandonment of the concrete, even if under the smoke-screen of insistence upon its importance.

Morrow talks not only about China but about India, too. He says it is "obviously the duty of every revolutionist to support India's fight for freedom . . . even if the Indian bourgeoisie leads the struggle at present, and no matter what imperialist powers find it expedient to aid India." That is quite right.

BUT, suppose the situation in India changed a "little bit." Suppose the various actors on the scene in India were playing the rôles they now play in China, with the situation and the uniforms changed a little. Let us put it this way:

Suppose Gandhi and the Indian bourgeoisie had risen a year ago and driven the British forces out of the eastern portion of India. Would we have supported them? Yes!

Suppose that Japan had provided the Indian forces with a little money and some rifles, because of her rivalry with imperialist Britain. Would we still have supported the Indians? Yes! We would still be, to use Morrow's *New Republic* language, for "Free India."*

*When Marcel Pivert once referred to the strikebreaker Blum as "Comrade," Trotsky said that from this one word, from this title which Pivert conferred upon Blum, it was possible to estimate his whole political mentality—it didn't contain a genuinely revolutionary-intransigent cell. By the same token, one can estimate the political mentality and outlook of Morrow when he characterizes Chiang Kai-shek's political and social tyranny as "Free China"—yes, "Free China," says Morrow, and without quotation marks.

So far, so good. Now, however, let us suppose that the war between Japan and Britain broke out (as it has) and extended to India. (Remember, in all that follows, that we are trying to draw the strictest possible comparison between this hypothetical Indian example and the real situation in China.)

Suppose that in what they consider the interests of the just cause of India against her imperialist oppressor, England, the Indian bourgeoisie and its political representatives, Gandhi & Co., made an alliance with Japan. That is how *they* "utilize the antagonisms of imperialism." Suppose "Free India" proclaimed her solidarity with the war aims of Japanese imperialism—not the Atlantic Charter but the Asiatic Co-Prosperity Charter of Japan. Gandhi then sends his representatives to sit on the Pacific War Council in Tokyo, as Chiang's agents sit in Washington. Together with the Japanese, these agents work out the military strategy and the tactics of the war against the "common foe," British imperialism. To "defend" their "supply line" from Japan, the Gandhi régime joins with the Japanese in driving the British out of the Malay States and the Dutch out of the Java Sea. In addition, the "Free India" government makes General Yamamoto the "chief of staff," as it is so delicately phrased in the East, of the "Free India" troops, and gets a "loan" from Japan of several million dollars with which to buy off Indian politicians and militarists who are flirting with the idea of capitulation to Britain. Furthermore, the Japanese send some of their military, aerial and naval forces into Gandhi's India—oh, to be sure, not enough to "dominate the land front" in India! Also, Gandhi's airfields are turned over to the Japanese air fleet as bases from which to carry on their aerial warfare against Britain. And so on and so forth, just the way it is in China now, except for the change in names.

Now, let us ask bluntly, though without any serious hope of getting a reply from Morrow: Under those circumstances, would Morrow continue to call for the defense, the support of "Free India"? In other words, if the *only* difference between the two cases was the fact that in one the imperialist "ally" was a good "democrat" and in the other he was not so "democratic," would Morrow nevertheless put forward the same policy?

In our minds, there is not the slightest doubt of what Morrow would actually *do* in the hypothetical case of India allied with Japan against Britain. He would *not* call for the defense of India under the circumstances outlined above. And at

bottom, the only reason why he would not apply to India the same policy he so belligerently demands for China today is that the one would be allied with a "bad imperialism" whereas the other is allied with a "democratic imperialism." And therein is revealed again the social-patriotic tendency represented by Morrow.

We repeat: there is no doubt in our minds about what Morrow would do in the case cited. This certainly is not based upon some "intuitive feeling" or other, but upon what Morrow, elsewhere in his writings, indicates with enough clarity for the observant reader. In the September, 1942, issue of his magazine, he comments with quivering indignation upon what Comrade Henry Judd wrote in these pages about the inclinations of the Indian bourgeoisie to shift from dependence upon British imperialism to dependence upon Japanese imperialism. The way Morrow splutters at this outrageous assault upon the integrity of the Indian bourgeoisie, the fierceness with which he condemns Judd for this elementary analysis of the dynamics of the Indian struggle, make you think of Miss Frieda Kirchwey or at least Mr. Louis Fischer when the genuineness of one of their democratic idols is questioned. You can read the original text of Morrow's literary writings in Stalin's *Pravda*, where appeared the denunciations of Trotsky in 1926 for his daring to say that Chiang and the Chinese bourgeoisie were the tools of one imperialist power—or another.

But what is important from the standpoint of the hypothetical question we asked above is Morrow's violent reaction to the very idea of the Indian bourgeoisie passing into the service of Japan. Nobody can read his indignant sentences without coming to our conclusion: *Morrow gives his blessings to China's alliance with imperialism only because it is a "democratic" imperialism.* In the language of our movement, this is known as social-patriotism.

* * *

In our concluding article next month, we will consider the significance of the SWP's position on the struggle in India and on the national question in Europe, as related to the question of China with which we have already dealt. In the course of our considerations we shall learn, we hope, who is "slandering" the poor Indian bourgeoisie and what is the political meaning of the "slander."

MAX SHACHTMAN.

Jewish Colonization In Palestine

A Discussion Article

The following document by no means deals with working class policy in Palestine as such. Neither is it intended to describe the economic conditions and problems of its growth. The discussion is limited to those topics relating to institutions which are supported by the overwhelming majority of the Jewish labor movement in Palestine in its aspiration to create a Jewish or partly Jewish state. Expressing my fullest agreement with the aim of those striving for the creation of a Jewish homeland, it is nevertheless my contention that a long range perspective will prove the present policies in Palestine erroneous and only capable of giving the Jews an immediate advantage at the sacrifice of their class positions. But the sacrifice of class positions is never in the interest of any minority, for only the social revolution

can in the last analysis provide favorable ground for the solution of the national question. In this sense, Zionism must be subordinated to socialism.

Those who search in this thesis for a confirmation or criticism of Zionism will be disappointed. Its sole purpose is to dispel any illusions that the pioneering rôle, whatever its virtues might otherwise be, has anything in common with internationalism. In my bid for brevity and condensation, I have given whatever background is needed sketchily, since factual material can easily be gathered from other publications.

I—National Land Policy in Palestine

1. At the close of the First World War, 140 Arab land owners owned one-seventh of the area of Palestine. Most agri-

cultural enterprise was conducted under a semi-feudal latifundia system. The Arab peasant, the majority of the population, was directly exploited in this state of serfdom since an external capitalist market for goods thus produced had not as yet been created.

2. Jewish mass immigration into Palestine meant the immigration of capitalism as well. Jewish capital sought returns not only in the industrial enterprise of the cities, but also in land by more rational exploitation. The Arab land holder, through the price obtained in a sale of part of his land to Jews, invested sums on the capitalization of their remaining land. In the extension of the capitalist market into all spheres of Palestinian economy, many Arab fellahin (small peasants) were turned into wage laborers, in addition to the Jewish immigrants.

3. The purpose of Jewish National Funds* is to facilitate the settlement of incoming Jews. In undertaking investments felt to be too risky by private capital, Jewish National Funds economically fulfill a pioneering rôle for private capital to follow. They operate along strictly national lines. Through prevention of speculation, joint-purchase schemes, etc., they attempt to create the conditions most favorable for the acquisition and cultivation of land by Jews, regardless whether by national or private capital.

4. Still considerable sections of the Jewish bourgeoisie in Palestine oppose the national land policy. This, on the one hand, because national capital often proves inconvenient for private enterprise, on the other because Jewish National Fund land harbors and other national funds encourage "dangerous" experiments for it in so far as they demonstrate the superfluousness of the private capitalist. (Contrary to popular belief in radical circles, Jews, not Arabs, are faced by the danger of exclusion from industry.) Nonetheless national ownership of land, although desirable, in and of itself changes nothing fundamental in the economy as long as a capitalist market remains; all that is changed is the share of surplus value accruing to the landlord.

5. Jewish National Funds are progressive to the same degree to which a capitalist economy marks a gain over the outmoded feudal relations of production. They fulfill the objective need for a capitalist economy. As part of the capitalist system, as part of the *status quo*, as part of the general impotency of the bourgeoisie to carry out that program that marked it as progressive in its infancy, national funds can be no solution to colonization needs, to the agrarian problem, and to the evils caused by capitalism anywhere.

6. National funds, made to function as part of capitalism and in no way designated to oppose that system, therefore naturally lend uncompromising support to British and American "democratic" capitalism which is still in a position to tolerate its already circumscribed economic activities. This even more so since they aim to set up a JEWISH economy in opposition to an ARAB economy in Palestine and are still hopeful of help in this from the Allied powers.

7. Even from the viewpoint of colonization, national funds have always lagged behind needs. Rising land prices, British imposed restrictions, the fact that the Arab land owners will not voluntarily, as a class, allow themselves to be bought out of their privileges, and the elimination of large sections of world Jewry from the contributing lists, all go to prove that Palestine cannot be bought.

8. Rejecting the very idea of the possibility of the attainment of Zionism as long as the barrier of capitalism exists, we cannot possibly support an institution functioning to build capitalism while it in no way aids the development of the subjective factors of class struggle. We cannot risk the spreading of the reformist illusion that capitalism can build Palestine for the Jewish people.

II—The Rentability of the Kibbutzim

9. The kibbutzim (collective settlements) are by no means a unique feature of Palestine; neither are they socialism. The risk of private investments, on the one hand, and the growth of cities on the background of an undeveloped agriculture, on the other, have forged the kibbutz as the instrument of capitalist development in agriculture. The abundance of steady labor (within the kibbutz), an economy of collectivized consumption and the absence of any large agricultural trusts have all combined to make them the most rentable of the various types of settlement. (For statistics on the yearly surpluses of kibbutzim see Weitzman, Rupin, etc.)

10. Yet the kibbutz is the creation of the Jewish working class. Unable to compete against cheaper Arab labor in the Jewish settlements, the first chalutzim banded together into a state of forced communism, since otherwise they would have perished. Soon these groups, with outside help, started their own enterprises on the same basis, the kibbutz now serving as a base (in the same way as the fella, working his paviel, wage-labor in the colonies merely serves as an additional source of income) from which to enter as wage labor in the colonies left to the Arabs meanwhile (see Point 23).

11. An integral part of present capitalist Palestine and not the prototype of the new society, the kibbutz movement nevertheless exerts a strong leftward influence over the whole yishuv. And this, because of the backwardness of the Palestinian labor movement. Instead of guiding the class struggle against the Palestinian and British bourgeoisie, they stand in the forefront as an instrument of national labor policy. One hundred per cent Jewish labor and a society on the eve of its transformation into socialism, do not go hand in hand. Further, with the growing industrialization of the country, the center of gravity will shift to the cities. As finance capital gains a stranglehold on agriculture, so the kibbutz declines in importance; as the relative number of workers engaged in agriculture decreases, so its weight in the ensuing revolutionary conflict is lightened. The development of a normal class struggle will, in addition to dispelling national illusions, permanently destroy the idea of "building socialism" in the same way as the utopian concepts of Owenism gave way to the more realistic program of Chartism.

12. In spite of the verbal insistence upon class struggle by a considerable section of the Palestinian kibbutz movement, they cannot transform the capitalist society into a socialist society. The industrial proletariat has failed in organizing collectives, victim to the greater strength of private capital in the city. It is in aiding the city workers in the political organization of the peasants and supplying the revolutionary city in time of crisis with necessary food that the importance of the kibbutz will probably enter, but in a subordinate rôle.

13. These collective settlements are, then, not the transition into socialism, but the product of every aspect of the

*The most important are the Jewish National Fund, exclusively devoted to land purchase, and the Foundation Fund, to directly aid settlement.

**It has been stated by Granovsky, the land expert of JNF, that some of its money has actually been turned over to private institutions. Further, they cannot solve the problem of agricultural credit.

backwardness of the country, mixed with an adulterated, imported western socialism. After the socialist revolution, though, the kibbutz might well become one of the cornerstones of the emerging socialist society. Otherwise through a continuous development of capitalism, as already in the city, kibbutziut will be crushed by the stronger capitalists, economically, and superceded by forms of more militant class warfare, politically. The kibbutz is therefore, more accurately to be labeled collectivist than socialist.

III—The Chalutz* Movement and Its Background

14. The dominant character of the Jewish youth movement anywhere is chalutzit. As the expression of Jewish youth from those social strata whose free social and economic development was stifled, it led youth to seek escape from a dismal future through lofty ideals, all of which were to be realized through Zionism in the creation of the social form of a kibbutz. The very essence of this movement is escape in preparation for its own ideal society. Hence little can be expected from this group in the way of socialist political action.

15. Ideologically kibbutziut is a revolt against abstractions, a revolt not against the capitalist character of the intellectual but against all form of intellectualism, a revolt not against private individualist capitalist forms of huckstering, capitalist forms of profit sharing, etc., but against all manifestations of individual life itself, and thus it is for collective consumption, collective artistic expression, etc. (all outmoded in our highly industrialized society). Therefore, while naturally, internal compromises had to be reached, externally, the chalutz movement is the object of the play of forces larger than itself. It is the living example of a philosophy that is to instigate action without a corresponding action that leads automatically to a realization of the above philosophical thought.

16. The "socialism" of this movement (and there are sectors which are definitely non-socialist because of the purely economic need for kibbutzim) lies in a process of self-realization" in which the individual realizes the "necessity of becoming a wage laborer" for himself, culminating in the transformation of "middle class Jews into workers in the only possible place, Palestine, the historic Jewish homeland." With this goes the desire to "live socialistically," i.e., sharing in one's community on a collective basis. This cannot be socialism since it goes on as part of capitalism. Acceptance and rejection of a thing are both determined by the existence of the thing. The background or "thing," capitalism, still determines the action. The group rejects outside capitalism, lives its own "socialism" within, and does not care to be disturbed by the "degenerate outside."

17. But it is necessary to accept capitalism while it exists; this is certainly better than rejecting it consciously while unconsciously one is forced to accept it. Therefore, only conscious revolutionary action under capitalism will bring us nearer to socialism. We see the inevitable iron will of forces toward proletarianization; the subjective factor is class struggle, and thus objective conditions have to be exploited to further this class struggle.

18. The natural self-realization lies in the subjective need of class struggle which, because of its universality, becomes objective. A "Religion of Labor" (A. D. Gordon) is only for those whose life work in the form of wage labor is not a normal aspect. Otherwise it is nothing but the petty bourgeoisie counterpart of the bourgeois glorification of all labor,

and thus fits beautifully into the capitalist upbuilding of Palestine. Such labor is needed.

IV—Jewish and Arab Labor

19. About 55 per cent of Palestinian Arabs are fellahin, while about 20 per cent are engaged in industry and transportation. The former include about 17 per cent who constitute an agricultural proletariat in a broader sense. The remaining layers consist of land owners, professionals and merchants. The city proletariat is in the most unskilled and lowly paid positions. Jewish immigration here has resulted in the doubling of the real wages of Arab workers and the provision of new fields of employment in the Jewish plantations and building industries primarily.

20. The Jewish working class, with few exceptions, strives toward a penetration of rural as well as urban economy. This policy is manifested in Kibbush Haavoda (conquest of labor: Arab industry by Jews) aimed at the progressive expulsion of Arabs from positions created by the influx of Jewish capital. Not only the Jewish working class believes that it can thus gain firm roots in the country. The Jewish bourgeoisie, sometimes at the sacrifice of profit, in the interest of a Jewish dominated Palestine, occasionally supports Conquest of Labor.

21. Jewish-Arab labor relations are further complicated by the existing wage differentials between the "European" Jew and the "Oriental" Arab, the seasonal character of Arab help in the pardessim (orange plantations), the high organization and class-consciousness of the Jewish proletariat, which stands in contradiction (not only to the development of the objective conditions of class struggle as shown above) to the low degree of Arab organization and class-consciousness and the firmness of national unity on both sides.

22. Somewhat favoring an early understanding are the absence of an aristocratic, purely Jewish labor crust, an already partially achieved Jewish penetration of many spheres of industry, the rise of Arab wages toward closer approximation to that of the Jews, and a resulting awakening of Arab class-consciousness with the development of the country.

23. The degree to which Jewish labor is successful in its competition against cheaper Arab labor depends in the last analysis on the general conditions of the labor market (secondary factors not being excluded). In time of economic crisis Jewish workers, who in the preceding era had flocked into the more highly paid construction and factory jobs in the city, are thrown back on agriculture as a sole means of support; the policy of Conquest of Labor is taken up with renewed vigor in order to vacate the Arabs from those positions left open to them previously. But Jews are only partially successful in "reconquering" those fields, and their wages are forced down to par or only little above that of the Arabs. Depression always has a leveling effect on wages, and the national aspirations and higher organization of the Jewish workers are effective solely within the law of wages.

24. Extensive expansion of capital has its limitations. At a stage the organic composition of capital is changed and with it the intensity of exploitation. This results in the formation of a relative surplus population which acts as a constant depressor of wages down to a minimum. This minimum is today set by the mass of unorganized Arabs. Through their pressure, Jews in the long run will be forced down to the Arab standards of living, or they will be faced with an eventual exclusion from industry except for a few privileged positions. Despite the procrastinating drive of Jewish national unity, rapid industrialization, the efforts of the histadrut, the kibbutz in economizing expenses, the somewhat greater wage equaliza-

*Pioneer. Those going to Palestine to take part in the colonization task.

tion, etc., a general wage leveling cannot be prevented. This will either cause greater workers' solidarity or separate the two nationalities into one which supplies the reservoir for the masses of toilers, and another which occupies the privileged positions.

25. Is the Jewish working class sincere in its desire to participate in the productive process as a healthy working class? Then it cannot circumvent the problem of organizing Arab labor. It is only by raising the Arab wage minimums that Jewish wages can be maintained. Despite wage discrepancies and other political difficulties, this organization must proceed with a view toward joint unionism, unless unions are to become another tool with which national rivalry can be conducted more effectively around the present privileged position of the Jewish working class.

26. One Jewish-Arab union exists in the field of transportation (government controlled transportation). Both Jewish and Arab wages are on par here, and all efforts to raise them effectively were blocked by the Palestine administration. Yet this union is an historic example of things to come.* In agriculture also a fertile field for joint organization exists. Instead, the histadrut concentrated on improving the conditions of only Jewish workers by establishing free dwellings for them and encouraging and otherwise aiding early settlement for more effective competition.

V—Class Versus National Interests

27. The support of the above mentioned institutions, Jewish National Fund, Foundation Fund, Kibbutziut, Chalutzit, Conquest of Labor, separate unions for Jews and Arabs (we have mentioned only those generally incorporated into the program of the Jewish labor movement) are supported "in the interest of immediate colonization beneficial to all classes alike at the present stage of development in Palestine." In the interest of immediate immigration, the mandate was supported. To absorb incoming refugees, Jewish national funds are supported, the Conquest of Labor and the Kibbutz raised to an ideal. For fear of Arab domination, even labor Zionists reject a constituent assembly based on popular suffrage in Palestine.

This is the ugly face of politics "in the interests of all classes." It helps the bourgeoisie, certainly; for practical bourgeois politics such a program is necessary. Also we recognize

the *fait accompli*; we recognize the limited achievements. Ours is a revolutionary socialist criticism of these limitations. Capitalism, in line with its uneven development, cannot build Palestine, much less help the working class.

29. The colonization policy is basically on the wrong track because its point of departure is the identity of interests between bourgeoisie and proletariat, however limited this may be to the upbuilding period. It is therefore necessary to formulate clearly why the interest of capital and labor are never identical,** regardless of the truism that:

... capital presupposes wage-labor and wage-labor presupposes capital; one is a necessary condition for the existence of the other; they mutually call each other into existence....

Capital can only increase when it is exchanged for labor-power, when it calls wage-labor into existence. Wage-labor can only be exchanged for capital by augmenting capital and strengthening the power whose slave it is. An increase of capital is therefore an increase of the proletariat, that is, of the laboring class....

So long as the wage-laborer remains a wage-laborer, his lot in life is dependent upon capital. That is the exact meaning of the famous community of interests between capital and labor....

30. Since the growth of capital is of aid to the working class only in as far as it provides the objective conditions for its emancipation, an internationalist program must make for speediest Jewish-Arab working class unity. National funds as instruments of *national* policy stand in the way. Our program must provide for the solution of the whole agrarian problem and, therefore, call for a division of land to those who till it, regardless or whether Jew or Arab. We stand for the socialization of all industry through the seizure of political power by the working class, and not alone for the abolition of private ownership of land and communist forms of living within our collective as called for by the statutes of the kvutzat. It is necessary to guard ourselves against all such (and other) Utopian and pseudo-socialist ideological contortions. Our main task is to stand on the forefront of the class struggle and our fund raising, agricultural, educational and labor policy must be directed toward those ends. Yet all the existing institutions could have great values were their content to change. In a socialist society, doubtless, these institutions, result of the just and sincere aspiration of the Jewish people, could reach full blossom.

KARL MINTER.

Out of Their Own Mouths

What They Said They Would Do If War Came

In June and September of 1935, the then existent radical magazine, *Modern Monthly*, held a symposium entitled "What I Will Do When America Goes to War." The editors of *Modern Monthly* composed three questions which they sent to a number of public figures, including a state governor, a leading poet and two playwrights, among others. The replies of these individuals are extremely interesting in light of the opinions some of them hold today, especially in view of the activities in which the quoted gentry presently engage. It was not that they were poor prophets who exhibited a woeful lack of understanding of the realities of world imperialism. For the questions put to them by the

editors were very real and the war today fairly accurately represents a situation which now prevails in the world.

We reprint their answers not merely because these gentlemen have failed to do what they so fervently declared would be their individual determinations, though that would be reason enough. But in one way or another, some militantly, some protestingly, they all support the Second Imperialist World War and, directly or indirectly, they have attacked revolutionary socialist opponents of the war, those who remain true to their proletarian internationalist principles, i.e., all those who stand for socialism now as the only way out of the impasse of decaying capitalism. Note in particular the replies of Norman Thomas, Archibald MacLeish and Elmer Rice. Below are the questions and the answers.

*According to some sources, whose accuracy I have been unable to check, this union has been rendered completely ineffective by the combined efforts of reactionary Jews and Arabs, the administration and the Stalinists.

***Wage-Labor and Capital*, by Karl Marx.

The Questions

1. *What will you do when America goes to war?*
2. *Will your decision be altered if Soviet Russia is an ally of the United States in a war with Japan?*
3. *Would a prospective victory by Hitler over most of Europe move you to urge U.S. participation in opposition to Germany in order to prevent such a catastrophe?*

VAN WYCK BROOKS:

1. I should oppose any conceivable war up to the point of an outbreak. If the country were actually at war, I should join as a writer with those who were seeking the best possible outcome of the war. But the question strikes me as vague.
2. No, I should not advocate war with Japan under any conceivable circumstances.
3. No, though I should feel like doing so. Definitely no.

JOHN DEWEY:

1. Do my best first to keep the country out and then if it happens, to keep out myself.
2. No.
3. No, as at present informed.

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH:

The wording of these three questions constitutes a very interesting contribution by the editors of the *Modern Monthly* to their own symposium. The moment the *possibility* of a justifiable war is admitted the strongest position against war is vacated. The question then becomes: What *would* be a justification for war? And upon that question the issue shifts from *war against peace to one man's war against another man's war*. To X, war is justified if the United States is invaded; and "invasion" may mean anything from the seizure of Manhattan Island to the violation of the extra-territoriality of a United States ship in a Japanese port. To Y, war is justified if Hitler is about to make Europe unsafe for democracy—or for anything else but Hitler. To Z, war is justified in support of Russia against Japanese imperialism. But to all three war is, on the proper occasion, justified.

It is very clear that the admission of this possibility implies that war is not the greatest of human evils but that there are evils worse than war. If that is the position of the editors, I agree that history is with them. The whole history of wars of liberation, of violent revolutions—even of the usual dishonest imperialistic war—proves that there are conditions, real or imagined, which men find unendurable and to which they prefer the miseries of war. But the danger of an anti-war program built upon that admission, historically sound though it may be, is nevertheless obvious. For it is precisely those deepest human emotions to which the propaganda (!) machinery always addresses itself in time of war... of *any* war.

The last war against Germany was fought, you will recall, to make the world safe for democracy. The next war against Germany might very well be fought, as your third question suggests, to make the world safe against Nazism. With war in the offing the realistic and skeptical journal is not read; the newspapers echo the common cry; the propaganda machinery whips up the dust of its own choosing. If enough people believe that a certain type of war might be justifiable then the War Department will see that they get that kind of war—in print. The kind of war they have gotten in fact they will discover for themselves some years afterward.

The consequence is that my answers to your second and third questions would be No. And that I should answer your

first question as follows: I should do everything in my power to prevent the United States going to war under *any* circumstances. There is only one possible position against the menace of militarism: absolute hostility. Any other is romantic. Any other supplies the forces desiring war with the means of securing it.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT:

1. In case the United States goes to war, I shall take my stand on the Kellogg Pact, in which, by treaty having equal force with the Constitution, this country has renounced war as an instrument of national policy. I shall take no part myself and shall do my best to defend others who take a similar stand.
2. No.
3. No.

STUART CHASE:

1. Accept the fact. In the last war I registered as a conscientious objector, and this I would do again, but the gesture would be futile as I am too old for the draft. . . .
2. Decision for what? A war against Japan is a war against human beings.
3. No. Fascism is governed in the long way by economic forces, not by tin-pot Hitlers and Mussolinis. I would rather wait a few years, for the technological imperative to get in its fine work, than ship 5,000,000 doughboys to be butchered in Europe. I am not afraid of fascism any more than I am of capitalism. Both are scarcity systems and are incapable of operating for long under power age conditions. The real alternatives are collectivism in the public interest—mass consumption unrestricted or chaos and old night. I will admit I am afraid of the latter, but going to war will not help very much.

ELMER RICE:

1. Go to jail probably; or get shot.
2. No. I don't subscribe to the theory that there are good wars and bad wars. I am bored with all this adolescent shrilling about barricades and street fights. I think that physical combat is a stupid, lazy and irrelevant way of solving any problem or settling any argument.
3. No.

CHARLES BEARD:

1. I never cross a bridge until I come to it and have a look at it. If, however, I am called upon to fight for the promotion of oil profits in China, or the collection of defaulted bonds in Peru, they will have to come and get me—to use the picturesque of that forthright soldier, Smedley Butler.
2. No.
3. No; let them fight it out.

REINHOLD NEIBUHR:

I can give you my answers to your questions very briefly: I do not intend to participate in any possible war now in prospect. I take this position not on strictly pacifistic grounds, for I am not an absolutist, but simply because I can see no good coming out of any of the wars confronting us. The position of Russia on the one hand and of Germany on the other hand in any of these wars would not affect my decision.

NORMAN THOMAS:

1. I shall do all I can to keep the United States out of any new international war. If and when America enters new wars I shall keep out myself, do what I can to bring about

prompt peace and take whatever advantage I can of the situation in order to bring about that capture of power in government by the workers which is the true basis of freedom, peace and plenty.

2. My decision would not be altered on the basis of the present facts or any facts that are likely to exist. A war between Soviet Russia and the United States on one side and Japan and possibly some other powers on the other would not be fundamentally changed in character by the participation of Stalin's Soviet Russia. It would still be a war of rival imperialisms.

3. I suppose my answer to your third question is "No," but I think the question rather unfair. A prospective victory by Hitler over most of Europe is highly unlikely. The circumstances of such victory would not be conditioned primarily by the triumph of fascism over democracy but by a host of other considerations. The nations of Europe will not fight against Hitler out of love for democracy and hatred for fascism. They will fight because of competing national interests. Out of that sort of maneuvering no victory for a genuine workers' democracy can come. The victory we want over fascism must be won by the workers themselves on other than a basis of nationalistic war. I view with profound regret the recent acts of the Communist International in going back to the position of the majority Socialists in 1914; that is to say, the position of supporting a possible "good war," in this case a war against fascism, as that was allegedly a war against imperialism.



Once More: Opportunism on India

In the September issue of *The New Internationalist* we gave our reply to Felix Morrow and the Cannonite publication *Fourth International*, which had accused us of "criminally slandering" the Congress Party of India and refusing to recognize its "leadership" in the present struggle.

As a fitting—and, in our humble opinion, devastating—commentary upon the opportunist Morrow position of uncritical support to the Congress, we quote from the May, 1942, Transitional Program of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India (section of the Fourth International).

Hence the Indian situation not only demands that the Indian proletariat advance by all the means within its power its own class struggle against capitalism, imperialist and native alike. It is also imperative that the proletariat should participate actively in the wider national political movement, with the aim of wresting the leadership of the anti-imperialist struggle from the hands of the reactionary native bourgeoisie....

The necessity to participate in the national political movement does not, however, in the least imply a policy of mass affiliation (individual or collective) to the Indian National Congress which, though predominantly petty bourgeois in composition, is completely dominated and led by the Indian bourgeoisie and functions as the servile instrument of its class policies.... The Bolshevik-Leninist Party therefore characterizes the Indian National Congress as the class party of the Indian bourgeoisie, and calls upon the workers to place no trust whatever in the Congress or its leaders. This does not of course absolve the Bolshevik-Leninists from the task of doing fraction work (of course, in all cases under strict party discipline) within the Congress, as also in other political mass organizations....

Nor does the Bolshevik-Leninist Party follow a sectarian policy with regard to such activities of the Congress as are progressive. It will discern the progressive acts of the Congress and support them, but critically and independently, without confounding its organization, program or banner with the Congress for a moment. "March separately, strike together" must be the watchword of the policy of the Bolshevik-Leninist Party in relation to all progressive actions under the aegis of the Congress as well as to every oppositional and revolutionary action undertaken by other

political organizations in India. At the same time the Bolshevik-Leninist Party must put forward its own slogans, foresee the inevitable betrayals of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois leaders, warn the masses against them, and thus gain the confidence of the masses on the basis of their revolutionary experience. (Our emphasis.—H. J.)

Note how carefully they pose the question: we shall discern and support concrete progressive acts of the Congress Party; unlike the Morrow manner which demands, "Yes or no, do you support the Congress?" To this projected strategy of the Indian Fourth Internationalists, we have nothing to add. It is Trotsky's colonial revolutionary strategy.

But behold the joke of jokes! The above flagrant violation of Morrow's "strategy" on India (along with an introduction by the editor—the same Morrow) is published in the October issue of *Fourth International!* Does Morrow agree or disagree with this strategy? His introduction is silent. He will not reply to us; but the revolutionists of India will demand an answer from him!

H. J.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Panacea for Victory

VICTORY THROUGH AIRPOWER, by Major Alexander P. De Seversky. Simon & Schuster, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1942

There are now 5,000,000 American youth and young workers, an entire generation, in the armed forces of the United States. According to Assistant Secretary of War McCloy, 600,000 are already overseas, and the armed forces will total close to 10,000,000 by the end of 1943. Clearly, the militarization of American imperialism is proceeding at a rapid rate. And since American imperialism cannot fight on its own shores, but must meet its rivals in foreign lands, these ten millions of armed forces are destined to fight on the continents of Europe, Africa, Asia and Australia.

A book by a bourgeois specialist has caused a national sensation in America, and is still hotly debated. It is a fascinating book, well worth reading by any socialist, particularly with the above in mind. The fact that Walt Disney is planning a super-technicolor production based upon this book, and showing world victory by America through its air arm, should not repel the reader, even though the transformation of America's most enjoyable cultural contribution (Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse) into a pictorial projection of organized destruction and horror illustrates well what is happening to our nation under present conditions. This fact, rather, reflects upon some of the more fantastic and unreal characteristics of de Seversky's sensational book!

The book is a compilation of various articles written and published by the author over a period covering the early years of the war, before American entrance, when the world was first attempting to grasp the shocking revelation of what a Luftwaffe blitzkrieg could do. The book suffers stylistically and technically from a vast amount of repetition and padding placed at various points to give the articles some sense of continuity and form, as well as to blow it up to book size. Actually, its central theme could be stated in a few paragraphs and defended in a single long article.

WHAT DE SEVERSKY OFFERS THROUGH AIRPOWER

This theme is as follows: We of the United States wish to win the war in the shortest, cheapest and easiest way. Here

is the way to do it: We will build a gigantic fleet of super-bombing planes, with a flight radius of 6,000 miles and return. This radius will enable them to bomb and blast to kingdom come every major city, base and strategic location in the world. With this air arm we shall rule the world by (1) wiping out those nations that dare oppose us; or (2) wiping out threatened opposition by the *threat* to use our air arm. De Seversky does not propose military conquest by armies and by occupation, he proposes the physical destruction of our enemies from the air. "... British aims must be to wreck German economy rather than to take it over" (page 103). Extended to America, de Seversky's thesis is American mastery of the world by control and patrol of the skies, as once the British controlled the world market with their navy.

To give another concrete illustration of de Seversky's method: his idea is that we should have planned a completely aerial warfare against Japan, planning to destroy its cities and industries from huge air bases located in the Aleutians, Hawaii, Guam, Midway, etc.

In the author's scheme of things, airpower is the *sine qua non*, the common denominator of all military action. He ridicules navies as outmoded and also the traditional imperialist method of launching huge land armies into motion for purposes of territorial conquest. There is no place in his plan for such proposals and military conceptions as the Air-Navy-Army team combination of Hanson Baldwin, wherein all the branches of modern militarism are trained and prepared to strike offensively in a coordinated, integrated manner. De Seversky is a fanatic on the subject of the airplane and its potentialities against rival forces. He subordinates every other military weapon to the plane.

Before we consider some of the rather obvious flaws in the schema of de Seversky, it is worth dwelling upon the meaning of his book. It is, probably, an expression of one of the most cold-blooded and ruthless militarists who ever existed. De Seversky can wipe out a nation and its economy with his adumbrated air force with the same ease and *sang-froid* that a Potsdam general wipes out a Polish, Czech or Russian village. A Russian White Guardist by birth and experience, an aristocratic specialist of an extremely developed type, de Seversky is as fascist-minded an individual as one is likely to find in the war today. His projected plan of American world aerial mastery is, of course, but the latest and most fantastic in various schemes for American world empire. That is why all bourgeois critics have attacked him *only* with regard to the possibility of his plan's realization, and not its aims or objectives, with which they are in accord. De Seversky is welcomed more by the "far-sighted" militarist-minded section of the American army officers' corps for this reason than by the conservative bureaucrats and brass-hat functionaries, whom he ridicules over and over again.

The fundamental mistake that makes de Seversky's thesis a fantasy and Utopian imperialist pipe dream is that it lacks any material basis while possessing only the crudest and most over-simplified political basis. His plan is an abstraction, based upon desire and dreams conjured up from his wish to see America master of the world. Thus, the task of building the huge air force he envisages is never even considered. The problems of production, labor, raw materials, relation between capitalism and the all-dominant aircraft industry he proposes—these and a host of other material problems are simply ignored by de Seversky. He reduces the task to the simple one of constructing 100,000 or 200,000 long-range bombers and then going out to smash up everything! The productive limi-

tations of America, its isolation from the world market as a result of war defeats, the capitalization of such a huge industry—such questions do not concern him.

Secondly, the sort of war he pictures (great armadas of planes flying out to lay waste the enemy territory) conflicts with the aims and objectives of imperialist warfare. Why wipe out your rival's industry and physically destroy his economy when expanding capitalism demands that you seize it for exploitation and use? Even if you destroy and paralyze your enemy from the air, you must still occupy and attempt to organize his territory. This can only be done by armies, still the backbone of imperialism. Besides, the history of capitalist warfare proves the impossibility of completely nullifying the effect of your imperialist rival, except for a short period. Defeat of an imperialist power inevitably sets other forces in operation, forces that (given the continuation of world capitalism) inevitably bring back the defeated power as a new challenger. Germany and the Versailles experiences are the classic illustration of this. To achieve de Seversky's goal, America would have to systematically annihilate every rival or potential rival. Then it would sit—master of a world of ruins!

EXPLANATIONS OF OTHER THINGS

De Seversky is a political ignoramus and displays his simple, brute-force mentality each time he touches a political question. There is, for example, his proposal about war with Japan that we have already cited. From the imperialist standpoint it sounds wonderful. But then, why wasn't it done? Because the imperialist world isn't so simple and American policy *vis-à-vis* Japanese imperialism has, since the Russo-Japanese War of 1905, been one of compromise and agreement if possible. How could gigantic air bases be built against Japan when the first Roosevelt sided with Japan in its first expansionist war against Russia; when large sections of American capitalists helped arm Japan to the teeth and gave open support to its predatory war against China? De Seversky does not realize that military preparations and plans must be subordinated to the broader, long-range strategic aims of the imperialist power; that military strategy must give the right of way to imperialist (political) strategy.

His explanation of the collapse of France is, of course, a purely military one in which he takes advantage of the opportunity to emphasize the superior organization and strength of the Nazi Luftwaffe. He credits the Germans with being the first to understand the possibilities of air power. Naturally, there are the usual stupid cracks at French labor and the Popular Front régime. De Seversky's knowledge of French politics is, to say the least, limited.

But when he writes of aircraft, its power, comparisons of different types and styles of planes, bombing tactics and protection of air armadas, etc., then we recognize a voice of authority from whom the layman can learn a good deal. His description of the various shortcomings of American aircraft models seems to be borne out in the various complaints that come in from Britain, where the American planes are getting their first serious test. His blasting of the conservative army bureaucracy (de Seversky took an important part in the famous "Billy" Mitchell vs. "brass hats" controversy), is a delight to read and emphasizes the Marxist point about the backward and lagging technological methods employed by all reactionary cliques and army corps. De Seversky has apparently had plenty of first-hand experience in the rejection of new designs, models and ideas! De Seversky further blasts the

ridiculous method by which the imperialists run their war with *separate* air forces, under separate commands, for the various branches of military service. There are Army planes, Navy planes, Marine planes, Coast Guard planes, etc.—all without coördination, all functioning independently of one another, if they so choose! It is in the technical and critical parts of his book that we have something to learn, something that makes *Victory Through Airpower* worth reading, despite its various fantasies. A first step to understanding the meaning of modern warfare and the tools it employs could well be a study of the Second World War's greatest innovation—the use of airpower.

H. J.

How the Other 2% Lives

WAGES AND PROFITS IN WARTIME, prepared by Labor Research Association. International Publishers, New York, N. Y. 1941. 32 pages, 5 cents.

Paul Lafargue once said: "Capitalist development has dragged humanity down to so low a level that it no longer knows, and can no longer know, other than *one* incentive: *money*. Money has become the prime mover, the alpha and omega of all human action. Balzac calls it '*ultima ratio mundi*' (the world's last argument)."

Thurman Arnold recently granted the public a quick glance at this very material basis underlying the business deals between some of the largest corporations in the country and Nazi Germany, with which malicious gossipers (no doubt) would have us believe the country is at war. Labor is also not unaware of the golden torrent which is making the capitalist class rich beyond the dreams of a Fortunatus.

It is undoubtedly a recognition of this awareness existing in the ranks of labor that impelled one of the official simpletons heading one of the prominent corporations of this country to confide to a union friend of ours: "We are not making a penny on our war orders. We take them only as a patriotic duty. Believe me."

Needless to say, our friend, not being a graduate of the Harvard School of Business Administration, didn't believe a syllable of what the official said. Which, of course, seemed to the official a very arbitrary attitude to take, as readers of *The New Internationalist* can well understand. The Stalinists, by one of those occasional and fleeting intersections of truth (or *near* truth) and political expediency which their policy evokes, have published a very useful pamphlet which every trade unionist will find handy in combatting corporatist piety on the wages and profits question.

Since the pamphlet was published during the Hitler-Stalin honeymoon and since truth, for the Stalinists, is a function of the interests of the bureaucracy in Russia, it is probable that the pamphlet is not now easily available. Such being the case, fairly extensive quotation will not be amiss.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF PROFITS

On profits during the First World War:

Skyrocketing of profits marked the First World War of 1914-18. In this country, net profits of 18 leading corporations shot up from \$74,650,000 in the pre-war years 1912-14 to \$337,000,000 in 1916-18, a rise of over 350 per cent. A group of electric machinery and appliance companies in 1917 had net income of 18,204 per cent on their capital stock.

On current corporation profits:

A group of 230 corporations producing iron and steel and other metal products, coal and heavy and light machinery showed net profits

of \$599,152,269 after all taxes and charges in 1940, the best profits in ten years and 71 per cent above the 1939 level. These profits of companies most directly involved in war production were more than 450 per cent in excess of the amount earned by these same companies in 1938.

On aircraft profits:

Twenty-four makers of aircraft in 1940 earned \$69,866,405, more than double the profits shown in 1939, nearly three times 1938 results and more than five times their earnings in 1937.

On net profits per employee for seven of the largest corporations:

Company	1940 Net Profit	Net Profit Per Employee
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	\$86,945,000	\$1,649
Aluminum Company of America	44,146,297	1,471
General Electric Co.	56,241,000	865
Standard Oil Co. of N. J.	110,000,000	820
General Motors Corp.	195,715,000	785
American Tel. & Tel. Co.	188,344,000	608
U. S. Steel Corp.	102,211,000	402

On wage increases as contrasted with increases in net profit:

While in 1940 average weekly wages in all manufacturing rose only 6 per cent over 1939, the net profit of industrial corporations rose by 27 per cent.

In certain industries the discrepancy was even greater. In aircraft wages rose 5 per cent, profits 191 per cent. In iron and steel, wages rose 5 per cent, profits 98 per cent.

On the distribution of corporation dividends:

The government's Temporary National Economic Committee reported that less than 75,000 persons—fewer than the number employed by, say, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey—get fully one-half of all corporate dividends. It found also that in 1935-36 some 800,000 families, or the top 2.7 per cent of all families in the United States, received 71.2 per cent of all dividends paid.

On the total value of corporation dividends:

Dividend payments, even counting only the *New York Times'* incomplete listing, came to the stupendous sum of about \$4,888,000,000 in 1940, a rise of 14 per cent above the previous year. No other form of income payments rose so much. Wages and salaries combined rose less than 6 per cent.

On the wages of corporation officials as contrasted with the wages of workers:

Eugene G. Grace, for example, as president of Bethlehem Steel Corp., received \$478,144 in salary and bonus for the year 1940. This was \$9,195 a week, nearly \$230 an hour on a 40-hour week basis.

Weekly earnings of employees in the iron and steel industry in 1940 averaged \$29.44 or only about \$1,530 for the year.

On the expenditures of the rich—the MONTHLY budget of Gloria Vanderbilt:

Rent	\$1,000.00
Groceries	450.35
Milk	67.34
Poultry and eggs	106.58
Fish	83.44
Coal	67.34
Telephone	61.95
Garage	113.46
Laundry	10.65
Newspapers	15.17
Servants (10)	950.00
Detective	372.00
Incidentals, etc.	951.72
Month's total	\$4,250.00

On the contrast between the wage necessary to maintain "the American standard of living" and the actual wage level in industry:

But in *no American industry* do the wages average as much as \$48 a week, the amount required to meet Ezekiel's American standard of living. In all manufacturing industries in 1940, weekly earnings averaged only \$26.05, or nearly \$22 below that standard.

INCOME SHARES AND OTHER FACTS

On the distribution of the national income in 1935-36:

More than a million (1,162,890) families had yearly incomes of less than \$250.

Over 19,000,000 families, or about two-thirds of all, had yearly incomes of less than \$1,500.

Over 23,240,000 families, or more than three-fourths of all, had yearly incomes of less than \$2,000.

A few families were getting all they needed—and more. At the very top was a little group of only 75 families each having an income of \$1,000,000 and over. These are the real "Rulers of America," the richest monopolists, including the Rockefellers, Morgans, Astors, du Ponts, Mellons, Ford and Vanderbilts.

Next came about 284,000 families, less than 1 per cent of all, who had incomes of \$10,000 and over. Only about 793,000 families, or less than 3 per cent, had incomes of \$5,000 and over.

Taking the whole national consumer income of fifty-nine billion dollars in 1935-36, nearly a tenth of it all went to about 178,000 families and individuals who had incomes of \$15,000 and over. This little group of men and women at the top represented only one-half of 1 per cent of the whole population. But they got almost as much income as the whole lower third of the population.

On the standard of living under the war economy:

And *Barron's*, financial weekly, January 6, 1941, declared that "the defense program will mean a curtailment of civilian consumption. There can be no sure protection of a subsistence minimum."

On the tax burden on lower income groups:

Already, the Temporary National Economic Committee has shown, families with incomes of \$500 to \$1,000 are now paying 18 per cent to 20 per cent of their meager incomes in taxes.

On the assumption that an increase in wages will mean a proportionate increase in the price of commodities:

Since labor costs form such a comparatively small proportion of the value of the product, it is clear that wages paid can rise by a considerable amount and still remain a small percentage of the total value of the goods. Labor cost is only a minor element in retail price. Take the apparel, or clothing, industry, for example, where labor cost is only 19.6 per cent. It is estimated that if the clothing workers win a 10 per cent increase and the manufacturers and retailers pass this entire burden on to the consumer, the increase would amount to only 49 cents on a \$25 suit of clothes.

On production possibilities in the United States, based on a survey made in 1934-35:

If the existing plant and manpower in the United States were fully employed in the production of honest goods and services for the consumer, the total output, value in 1929 dollars, would be not less than 135 billions, or an average per family of approximately \$4,400.

On the possibilities of securing wage increases in this period:

The Congress of Industrial Organizations, in its *Economic Outlook*, April, 1941, said that it had won in the first four months of 1941 wage increases totaling \$380,000,000 annually.

On the utilization of the slogan of "national defense":

War hysteria is a sharp weapon in the hands of such employer groups. In the name of "national defense" they advocate longer working hours in defense industries and abolition of overtime pay. Speeding up production in their plants because of the "national emergency" often means greater output per hour with no corresponding increase in numbers employed.

On labor's answer to the campaign of the employers:

Labor's program in answer to war hysteria and employer attacks on labor standards calls for wage increases and extension of social and labor legislation.

On the answer of the employers and their press to such a program:

The employers will undoubtedly oppose every point of this program. They will continue their blitzkrieg against the economic and legislative gains of the people. In this reactionary drive they will be supported as always by the capitalist press pouring out slander against progressives of every shade whether in the AFL, the CIO or other workers' organizations.

It seems almost unnecessary to add that time has witnessed the overnight ascendancy of the Stalinists and the *Daily Worker* to a leading position in the drive against the working class. Today, naturally, they disavow or conveniently forget nearly every point made in this pamphlet.

Lest some naive individual brusquely conclude that there is a direct connection between the abrogation of the Hitler-Stalin pact and the change in policy of the Stalinists, we hasten to point out that changes of this sort are resolved in the more ethereal realm of Stalinist "dialectics." The demonstration is very simple: as is well known, truth is not an absolute. What was true and good a year ago may be false and evil today. QED.

One may safely assume that any other explanation is Trotskyist slander.

JAMES M. FENWICK.

A Cry for Imperialism

AMERICA AND WORLD MASTERY, by John J. MacCormack;
Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Publishers, New York; 338 pp., \$2.75.

This book, as one can gather from its title, deals with a question which at the present time is uppermost in the minds of the politically conscious. What future is in store for the United States, the centrifugal center of the Allied camp, and what sort of society is in store for the world at large? As such, this analysis would merit serious consideration were it not for the lugubrious treatment of the problem presented by the author.

MacCormack, a newspaper correspondent turned political scientist by the exigencies of the war, presents a crassly pragmatic and unprincipled analysis of the United States in World War II.

A thesis that imperialist United States with imperialist Britain as a second-rate partner are the only logical heirs to world mastery, may be accounted for on the ground of ignorance of political facts. The theorist may have overlooked the potentialities of the labor movement in the United States, the teeming masses of India and China in their struggles for freedom, the labor movement in England, the growing resentment of the South American millions toward Yankee imperialism. The thinker may have overlooked the third camp of labor that spreads itself far and wide over the four corners of the earth. But to insist that the United States and Britain should dominate the world in the name of all that is right and holy is nothing less than wishful thinking. "Better than no world order, is a world governed by two strong nations."

Why does he insist, however, upon domination by the United States and Britain? "Because one cannot imagine England or America using such a system to enslave the world, but one can *imagine* that of another nation." There you have the crux of the argument. With a sweep of the pen, MacCormack does away with British enslavement of the Indians and the American abuse of Central America. His views, completely nationalist, devoid of knowledge of social forces, can only see a world dominated by one or another power—but this power must be American.

MacCormack tries to sell the American ruling class the idea, as if they are not already sold on it, that they should come out of their isolationist shell and rule the world. In doing this, he bunches together "historical materialism," the "New Order," "the American way of life" and what have you. The book abounds in contradictions, half-truths and sentimentalities. Like the fundamentalist who proves creation by reference to the Bible, MacCormack proves that America and Britain should rule the world by reference to such sentimentalities as "the English-speaking people" and "the Anglo-Saxon family." "But for the English-speaking people it would mean the loss of their last opportunity to create a world safe for their kind," i.e., if the United States refused to rule with Britain as a partner.

"The two economies," claims our writer, "are complementary in important respects: From the United States the British Empire obtains cotton, tobacco, petroleum, refined oil, steel and iron, electrical and industrial machinery, copper, autos, chemicals. From the British Empire the United States obtains rubber, tin, pulp, paper, nickel, wool." While it is true that in some important respects the two economies are complementary, it is more true that in many decisive respects they are contradictory.

In his own word, "her (U.S.) investments with the British Empire at the beginning of 1940 constituted nearly 42 per cent of her total foreign holdings." In other words, British capital had been squeezed out of its own wallowing grounds just that much. What is more, he is conscious of the Mexican oil wars between Britain and the United States, the struggle between British and American imperialism in China, the rubber wars of the twenties. Furthermore, an argument of this nature assumes a static society. But with the expansion of American capital investment in Australia, Canada and even India, with the development of rubber plantations to take the place of bananas in Central America, with the development of Bolivian tin and tin smelters in Texas, even those elements of the two economies which were at one time complementary will become more and more contradictory.

Will these two imperial camps remain compatible in the future even if they do manage to dominate the world? It is already clear that in this decayed stage of capitalism one or the other must dominate any bloc, political, economic or military. And it is not difficult to ascertain that it is the United States which has obtained hegemony over the United Nations.

Like many other people our author insists that this is a democratic war: a war waged between the Anglo-Saxon way of life, and the Teutonic totalitarian way of life. Yet, hidden among the welter of words we find the following passage: "In 1936-37-38 Germany supplied respectively, 15.4, 15.3 and 17.1 per cent of Latin American purchases. From 1936, Germany, not Britain, was her (U.S.) chief competitor." Thus, the author provides a glimpse into the sharp economic rivalry which exists between the United States and Germany and which is the essence of the great conflict.

"If there will be no Anglo-American alliance, then there will perforce be an Anglo-German alliance (after the war), not with Nazi Germany, but with a Germany blood purged of the apostles of that diabolical scheme." This of course would be bad in the opinion of the author. But if one must assume that an alliance is necessary to control the post-war order, what is wrong with an alliance between democratic Britain and peace-loving Germany to rule the world benevolently, if it is world peace and benevolence for which the present slaughter is being waged?

What sort of world does our author foresee? Of course, he pays lip service to the "New Order" by equating communist Russia and fascist Germany. He predicts a "New Order" for the world with a dash of a new and better League of Nations—to begin again the bungling leading to new wars. In the same breath he also adds: "It would be the instinct of the English people to maintain a Germany strong enough to act as a counterweight to Russia."

"Freedom of the seas is a policy for a weak trading nation. The United States will have the biggest navy in the world." It would therefore be against American interest to advocate freedom of the seas after the war. There we have the same old rot: power politics and military alliances post-war preparations for new wars.

America and World Mastery does not present a new thesis. It is an additional effort by a large section of American intellectuals to take the lead in preparing the ideological ground for a new American imperialism.

EUGENE VAUGHAN.

A Lesson from History

THE EPIC OF THE BLACK SEA REVOLT, by André Marty.
Workers Library, New York, 1941. 47 pages, 10 cents.

Early this July, after a siege of nearly a month, the fortress and naval base of Sevastopol fell before the onslaught of the Nazi war machine.

Twenty-three years ago, at the beginning of 1919, French, Greek, Polish, Serbian and White Guard troops were in control of the Crimea. Sevastopol was occupied by the interventionist troops. The French fleet was in command of the port. Yet in a few months, despite the too frequent superiority in arms of the interventionist forces, workers' power held sway over not only Sevastopol but the whole of Russia as well.

The contrast between the unrelieved defeats of the Russian army today and the Red Army's smashing successes in 1919 which amazed the world is to be explained not by superior Soviet armament in 1919 (it was generally quantitatively and qualitatively inferior to that of the interventionists) or by superior military thinking (there was that) but especially by the revolutionary propaganda disseminated among the ranks of the interventionist troops.

The chief propaganda whip which Hitler today cracks over the heads of "his" troops is the fear of another Versailles treaty. Yet the threat of another Versailles Treaty is all that the counter-revolutionary Stalin régime, working hand-in-glove with Allied imperialism, can proffer to the rank and file of the German army. Consequently...the German soldier, weary though he may be of the war and of the totalitarian régime, keeps on slogging forward....

André Marty, today a broken-down GPU pensioner, but in 1919 a proletarian revolutionist and a leader of the Black Sea revolt in the French fleet, has written a small pamphlet which shows with what devastating completeness revolutionary propaganda worked upon the soldiers and sailors of the interventionist armies besieging the young workers' state.

The pamphlet, *The Epic of the Black Sea Revolt*, has several defects. It is scattered; it does not have, in the Aristotelian sense, a beginning, a middle, or an end. The pamphlet is obviously a quick job, culled from an earlier work written during the "third period," and forced into service to help spread the "defeatism without revolution" ideology sown with liberal hand in France during the period of the Hitler-Stalin

pact. With all its defects, however, the pamphlet shows the power of Bolshevik policy and indicates what a sharp turn history would take today were such a policy to be applied on the Russian front.

The Black Sea revolt, which ended French intervention in Russia, extended from February to August, 1919. Besides the sailors on the ships in the Black Sea, the mutinies involved sailors on French ships at Bizerte in North Africa, Vladivostok, Itea in Greece, and at the great French naval base at Toulon, among other cities. The revolt also involved French troops in the southern Ukraine, the Crimea, and French cities like Toulouse, where they demonstrated jointly with sailors.

HOW THE MUTINY BROKE OUT

The two chief causes of the revolt were the continuation of the war after the armistice of November 11, 1918, and the poor conditions endured by the soldiers and sailors. The intervention of Bolshevik agitators introduced the necessary subjective consciousness which assured the success of the revolt. The attitude of the French soldiers and sailors, and the approach made to them by the Bolsheviks, is revealed in the following passage:

In January the first shots were exchanged with the Red Army and the partisans.

"Our officers have lied to us, they have deceived us!" the French soldiers and sailors could be heard saying everywhere. "We are starting the war here all over again!"

Immediately a leaflet, or a worker propagandist, or a soldier propagandist would appear: "Yes, you are starting the war all over again! The French capitalists are not satisfied with the riches they have stolen with the blood of the soldiers and the misery of the workers and peasants! Look at the mines in the Donetz basin; they are no longer the property of your exploiters—the French capitalists; they belong to the Russian workers. And you have to suffer and die while your family is waiting for you in misery, in order to seize these mines for the 200 ruling families!"

Simple ideas, which everyone could understand. The arrival of reinforcements of men and material further confirmed these statements. The soldiers and sailors now wanted to know against whom they were fighting. Who was the enemy, and where was he? Who were the Bolsheviks? What did they want?

They found prompt and clear answers to these questions in the Bolshevik leaflets.

How effective such agitation was the following description shows:

The agitation was most serious in Toulon [France's big navy yard on the Mediterranean]. Despite the state of the siege, the sailors held meetings on the *glacis* of the ramparts, after having driven out the commander of the naval fortress, Vice-Admiral Lacaze. On June 11, demonstrations of sailors and soldiers took place in the city. The crew of the battleship *Provence*, the flagship of the first admiral, refused to sail for the Black Sea. The demands were: "Release of all the mutineers of the Black Sea, cessation of the war of intervention in Russia, immediate demobilization." A committee of sailors took upon itself the functions of a revolutionary committee and invited delegates of the soldiers and the Navy Yard workers to join it. The mounted military police and the cavalry succeeded in preventing an attack upon the naval prison, but only after a real battle with the sailors.

The following scene describes conditions on shipboard:

In the meantime Vice-Admiral Amet, commander-in-chief of the Black Sea fleet, arrived on board the *France*, accompanied by the commander, his executive officer and first lieutenant.

The mutineers came out to meet him. The sailors and the admiral stood facing each other. The admiral began his speech with an attempt at intimidation.

"There are 200 bad Frenchmen among the crew!" he said.

But he was immediately interrupted with shouts of "Death to the

tyrant! Catch him! Death!" The admiral then changed his theme. First he announced that Sevastopol would soon be evacuated. Then he started to describe what Bolshevism meant. When he said that the Bolsheviks were bandits, one of the mutineers interrupted him: "You're Bandit No. 1 yourself! For having the itch you let me rot in a dark cell! It was you who condemned sailors to five and ten years' hard labor on the slightest pretext!"

Every phrase of the Admiral was interrupted with shouts and hisses: "He lies! He is trying to sing us a lullaby! What nerve! It's all lies!"

The admiral, realizing his mistake, changed his tone: "My children, I entreat you to maintain order."

But he was interrupted again: "This is no time for preaching!" and then: "Death to the tyrant! Bandit! Murderer! Back to Toulon! To Toulon!"

The admiral then asked: "What do you want?"

Notta came forward and courteously laid before him the demands of the crew:

1. No coaling either on the 20th or on the 21st.
2. Cessation of intervention in Russia and immediate return to France.
3. Shore liberty.
4. No harsh discipline.
5. Better food.
6. More frequent mail service.
7. Demobilization of the old classes, etc.

"The war in Russia is against the Constitution," he said. "Clemenceau has violated the Constitution."

Admiral Amet answered by referring to the iron discipline in the Red Army. Notta then asked him how many soldiers had been executed in the French army, particularly after the mutinies of April, 1917. Another sailor interposed: "I spent four months in a cell on board, with only one hour of fresh air a day." Another sailor shouted: "Beat it, you tyrant!" The demonstrators then turned their backs on the admiral and marched to the fore-castle deck singing the *Internationale* and shouting: "To Toulon! To Toulon!"

The admiral, furious, turned around to leave, threatening Notta: "Tomorrow you'll repent this!"

The singing was continued on the fore-castle deck. Together with the crew of the *Jean-Bart* they sang the *Internationale*, the *Song of the Beans*, and the *Song of Odessa*.

It is easy to see why in a few weeks direct French intervention against the USSR was brought to an end: the "demoralization" among the soldiers and sailors was complete. The French land and sea forces were withdrawn to the mother country.

There is a lesson for the Stalinists in the history of the Black Sea revolt—were they interested in learning revolutionary lessons. Fortunately, there are those who are interested.

J. M. F.

Subscribe Now to

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

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

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$1.50 per Year
\$1.00 for Six Months
New York City and Foreign: \$1.75 per Year
\$1.25 Six Months**

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____