

The

NEW

INTERNATIONAL

**HOW TO
DEFEND ISRAEL**

by Hal Draper



**Marshall Plan:
American Way
of Conquest**

by Homer Paxon

●
AMERICAN SCIENCE GOES TO WAR

by Walter Grey

●
THE UKRAINIAN PROBLEM

by Andrzej Rudzienski

JULY 1948

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

●
*Saragat and Italy's Election . . . Victor Serge
Russia's Secret Documents on the Munich Deal
Theses on the Czech Coup . . . Books in Review*

IN THIS ISSUE

NOTES OF THE MONTH	131
<i>Saragat and the Italian Election</i>	
HOW TO DEFEND ISRAEL	133
<i>By Hal Draper</i>	
MARSHALL PLAN: AMERICAN WAY OF CONQUEST..	138
<i>By Homer Paxon</i>	
AMERICAN SCIENCE GOES TO WAR	144
<i>By Walter Grey</i>	
ON THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN COUP	147
<i>By Ernest Erber, Emanuel Garrett, Henry Judd</i>	
UKRAINIAN PROBLEM—PAST AND PRESENT	150
<i>By Andrzej Rudzienski</i>	
RUSSIA'S SECRET DOCUMENTS ON MUNICH	154
<i>By Philip Coben</i>	
THE YEAR ONE OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—III	155
THE FIRST FLAMES OF THE CIVIL WAR	
<i>By Victor Serge</i>	
BOOKS IN REVIEW	159
<i>By Gertrude Blackwell, Ted Enright, Vincent S. Wheelon</i>	

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Vol. XIV, No. 5 JULY 1948 Whole No. 127

Published monthly, except May and June, by the New International Publishing Co. at 114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y. Re-entered as second-class matter June 30, 1947, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 15c each for five copies and up. Foreign, \$2.25 per year; bundles, 20c each for five and up.

Address all editorial and business communications to The New International, 4 Court Square, Long Island City 1, N. Y. Telephone: 1Ronsides 6-5117.

Editorial Board

HAL DRAPER ERNEST ERBER MAX SHACHTMAN

Staff

REVA CRAINE HENRY JUDD WALTER KOCH

Managing Editor: HAL DRAPER

Business Manager: PAUL BERN

SUBSCRIBE NOW

The NEW INTERNATIONAL
4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Please enter my subscription for:

- 1 year, \$2; 6 months, \$1.25; 3 years, \$5
 Remittance enclosed. Bill me.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

CITY.....ZONE.....STATE.....

As we mentioned last month, the *NI* skips the months of May and June in accordance with its post-office registration, and so this issue is dated July. . . . At the same time the deal cooked up by our business manager, Paul Bern, has gone through and we appear this month in slightly smaller format. . . . In these days of constantly rising printing costs, the new setup means a comparatively tremendous *reduction* in costs for us. . . .

Also mentioned last month was the fact that the smaller format somewhat reduces the word capacity of our 32 pages. . . . Now, in this issue we've made up for that to an extent by using more eight-point type than usual (that's the smaller of the two type sizes we use, run in three columns). . . . If you object to that, we'd really like you to write in and grumble about it, so we'll know. . . .

We'd like to say a word about Comrade Rudzienski's article in this issue. . . . Not for the purpose of giving it a boost, since that isn't necessary for readers who have followed Rudzienski's work. . . . But to point out that his studies of the Eastern European picture in its historical context have been among the outstanding contributions to Marxist scholarship in recent years. . . . A book by Rudzienski on the Polish question is now in the process of being translated, and is looking for a publisher. . . .

James T. Farrell's series on Connolly skips this month. . . . It couldn't be completed in time because of the pressure of other work, especially the important case against police censorship of the *Studs Lonigan* novels in Philadelphia, in which Farrell and his publishers are involved.

Some notes on coming issues: Two articles on further aspects of the Marshall Plan are scheduled (see page 143). . . . While *Labor Action* has been discussing the politics of the Marshall Plan, the *NI* will concentrate on presenting solidly factual and analytical studies of the economic ramifications of the plan—naturally, a necessary foundation for political inquiry. . . . Ted Enright's article on the new book by Charles Beard, exposing Roosevelt's war drive up to Pearl Harbor, comes next month for sure. . . . Also a new contribution by Robert Stone of South Africa on the pattern of native segregation, a follow-up on the interesting South African series that appeared last year. . . .

Max Shachtman, national secretary of the Workers Party who has been in Europe for several months, is reporting on the political picture of the Continent this June 25 in New York. . . . According to present plans his speech will be carried, in whole or part, in the next issue. . . .

Just a spot of business: How about getting a subscription to the *NI* from your city or college library, if it isn't being carried now? . . . Or donate a subscription to such a library. . . . Getting the *NI* into your public library comes under the head of civic improvements. . . .

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOL. XIV

JULY 1948

NO. 5

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Saragat and the Italian Election

In retrospect, the Italian elections mark a turning point in the "cold war" between American and Russian imperialism for the mastery of Western Europe.

The Stalinist conquest of Czechoslovakia had heightened tension to the degree where both powers were obliged to pour their propaganda forces and strength into the Italian election with the sure knowledge that victory for one side or the other would be decisive in determining the character and tempo of the next phases of the planetary struggle. For America the future of the Marshall Plan was at stake; for Russia, the future of the "Molotov Plan" for Europe's subjugation.

American imperialism won this round, achieving its sharpest and clearest victory in the post-war political period. The comparatively unchallenged and easy march of the Stalinist totalitarian machine westward, basing itself on various combinations of direct Russian pressure and popular support among the anti-capitalist masses, came to a halt for the time being.

Stalinism began a strategic retreat, combined with the intensification of its consolidation process (completion of nationalization, for example, in Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia) in the occupied lands. Thus we find today that it is American imperialism which holds the offensive in Europe and, with its now-operating Marshall Plan, pushes hard against the Stalinist sector of the continent. This outcome was inevitable since Stalinism was unable to attempt the seizure of power in Italy by the launching of open civil war, in view of the serious steps toward resistance taken by the United States. From a world view, this is the turning-point significance of the election.

Stalinism, although suffering a severe moral and political defeat, did not do as badly as its eager opponents wishfully announced. Again illustrating a fundamental point in our analysis of Stalinism—namely, that it bases itself upon the popular masses by a demagogic perversion and twisting of the socialist program which, in the absence of a genuine revolutionary party, appears to be socialism—the Italian Stalinists got over 30 per cent of the popular vote, or almost nine million votes, from among the workers and poor peasantry, the most oppressed and exploited sections of the nation. Keen to pick up the needs and simple slogans of the masses, Stalinism exploited the well-known evils of Italian society (mass poverty, land hunger)

to the hilt with its socially demagogic but dynamic program.

It is idle to deny that Stalinism still exists as a great mass movement among the people. Though temporarily set back, it is far from defeated. To expect the Christian Democracy to defeat Stalinism in any definitive way is to expect the impossible.

Significance of the Saragat Vote

Between these two great reactionary camps of Stalinism and clericalism, there emerged—unexpectedly strong at the end of the campaign—the reformist social-democratic party of Saragat, polling close to two million votes. The significance of this vote lies not in the program of the Saragat party, which stands at the extreme bourgeois-coalitionist wing of social-democracy, but in the fact that millions of Italians seized upon this party banner as an opportunity to cast their vote against Stalinism and simultaneously for what they conceive to be democratic socialism, rather than for the reactionary, clericalist and papist program of the Christian Democrats. What makes the Saragat vote all the more significant is the fact that it was overwhelmingly the vote of industrial workers. The Saragat votes came almost entirely from the Northern industrial cities. Milan, often called the Detroit of Italy and an old revolutionary stronghold, gave a quarter million votes to the Saragat ticket, only slightly less than the Stalinist slate received in that city.

While it is true that there is at present no way of determining exactly the real political complexion of the Saragat voters—a vast unorganized mass that is several hundred times as large as the party's membership—it is extremely unlikely that this huge number of anti-Stalinist workers voted for Saragat's party as an endorsement of its class-collaborationist and coalitionist politics. It must be remembered that the Saragat party originated as a peculiar alliance of anti-Stalinists of the right and anti-Stalinists of the left.

The former opposed the pro-Stalinist policies of the Nenni leadership of the Italian Socialist Party from the traditional viewpoint of reformist social-democracy, identifying the "Communism" of Stalin with the Communism of Lenin. The anti-Stalinists of the left, however, identified themselves in a general sense with the traditions of the Russian Revolution and attacked the Italian CP for

its subservience to Russia's national interests. While the reformist wing has composed the leadership of the Saragat party, such of its left-wing leaders as Angelica Balabanoff and young Matteotti attract support to the party from the mass of workers who identify them with the best class-struggle traditions of Italian socialism.

The large vote which the industrial workers gave the Saragat party was primarily a vote *against* the domination of the Italian labor movement by the Stalinists, increasingly identified as puppets of the Kremlin, and *for* a free labor movement. We do not say that it was a vote for a revolutionary labor movement, in the Marxist sense. We ardently hope that events will clarify the need of such a movement to the Italian workers. What we mean by a free labor movement is what that term has traditionally meant in European labor history: a designation for those labor organizations whose prime function was to defend the interests of the workers and which were, to greater or lesser extent, democratically controlled by the rank and file.

The opposite of free labor organizations were those controlled by the employers (company unions), by the Catholic church (Christian unions), by the government (labor fronts) or by bourgeois politicians (adjuncts of liberal parties like the Schulze-Delitzsch unions in Germany before 1914). A Stalinist-controlled labor movement is the latest and worst variant of a fettered labor movement. It is doubly fettered—first, by an unscrupulous party bureaucracy which is beyond the control of the rank and file; and secondly, by a state bureaucracy located thousands of miles away in Moscow.

The three and a half years that have passed since Italy's liberation have brought home to hundreds of thousands of workers the full meaning of a Stalinist-controlled labor movement. They have rightly concluded that, as an alternative to Stalinism, the most reformist of genuine working-class parties and trade unions are to be preferred. In the absence of a revolutionary socialist party in Italy—and there is, unfortunately, not even a semblance of such today—the anti-Stalinist workers acted wisely in casting their votes for Saragat's socialist party.

Italian Workers and the Marshall Plan

However, it is not enough merely to vote for this party. Mere votes for its candidates will do nothing to change it into the kind of class-struggle party sought for, we are sure, by the bulk of the anti-Stalinist workers in Italy. It is necessary that such workers pour into the Saragat party and transform it from the vehicle of Saragat, Lombardo and the other careerist politicians into a mass party of free labor in Italy. Such a party would provide the best prospects for the re-establishment of a mass Marxist party able to oppose capitalism with a socialist program and able to drive Stalinism out of the labor movement.

Those liberal commentators in this country who interpret the large vote for the Saragat party as a vote for the Marshall Plan reveal an inability to view the Italian scene except through their own political spectacles. The campaign against the Marshall Plan waged by the Stalin-

ists was not only deceitful and hypocritical but was so patently absurd that all but the most faithful party-liners must have had more than one doubt about it. For those workers who were already fed up with Stalinist domination of the labor movement, the Stalinist campaign against the Marshall Plan served to open their eyes completely. They had to listen to Stalinist orators who, after praising the job "Comrade Gottwald" had done in Czechoslovakia, went on to warn Italian workers that the acceptance of Marshall Plan aid would "enslave Italy." This could only suggest to many Italian workers that there are two types of "slavery" threatening Italy, and many decided that in this case they preferred the American brand.

What does "slavery" to the United States mean to the Italian worker? To him it may connote mainly bread, shoes, revived industry and greater employment, without any curtailment of his liberties, including the freedom of the labor movement, in the foreseeable future. A socialist worker, even an anti-Stalinist one, will grant that the Marshall Plan also means a bigger military institution for Italy, an American-puppet role for Italy in foreign affairs, and the danger of being used as a pawn by the United States in the event of war. But these evils may appear long-term and somewhat abstract to the workers' thinking. What is more, they may reason, a Socialist Italy can always cancel them out.

In what sense, therefore, did the worker who voted for Saragat thereby endorse the Marshall Plan? In his mind he was voting for American aid to provide more grain, more shoes and more jobs. Since he had no better choice he was willing to tolerate the evil political implications of the Marshall Plan until he had his stomach full of food, his strength restored, his labor unions freed of Stalinists and rebuilt, the strategic position of his class improved against both Togliatti and De Gasperi, and till he was generally in a position to strike out on his own.

It is because the Italian workers' approval of the Marshall Plan took the above form that millions of workers voted for Saragat and against the dishonest and absurd position of the Stalinists. For an anti-Stalinist worker a vote for the CP ticket was a vote to convert Italy into another Poland or Yugoslavia, i.e., to make it another Russian province. For the same worker a vote for the Saragat socialist party, despite its fervent endorsement of the Marshall Plan, was a vote for a free labor movement, for the acceptance of American economic aid, and for a "breathing space" in which to rebuild a socialist movement that would be able to deal with both Russian and American imperialism.

Support for the Saragat party in this sense is no violation whatsoever of the main strategic slogan of international socialists in this period—"Neither Washington nor Moscow."

The future of post-election Italy is neither clear nor very hopeful. Of stability and orderly reconstruction there can be only as much as American economic aid makes possible; and the current post-election calm will not endure. The Christian Democracy, in full political control, will

resist pressures for important social reforms such as a partial distribution of the land.

The election of the bourgeois economist Einaudi as president of the new republic signifies how strictly the most conservative elements control this party. Einaudi does not even wear that vague title of "anti-fascist" that, for example, his principal rival for the post, Count Sforza, does. Only two years ago he voted for retention of the monarchy!

In these circumstances, despite a slight improvement in the economic situation, the Stalinists will retain their hold over the majority of the Northern proletariat and over the poor peasantry of the South *unless* the independent socialist party moves leftward and breaks its suicidal

coalition with the Christian Democrats. The fact that the short-lived revolt of a group of leaders of the pro-Stalinist Nenni "socialist" party collapsed is a bad sign.

The key to lifting the Italian class struggle out of the hands of the Stalinists lies, actually, within the Saragat movement—that is, it must be made an attractive force to the terribly exploited workers and the downtrodden peasants of Italy. If it is such today in part, it is so more by accident and default than by design. It is up to the left wing within this party to draw up and present the design of revolutionary socialism, distinct from the pseudo-socialism of the Stalinists and from the equally pseudo-socialist reformism of the SP leaders. All is far from lost in Italy, yet all remains still to be done.

How to Defend Israel

A Political Program for Israeli Socialists

An uneasy four-week truce has just been signed by both sides in Palestine. It may mean the end of formal, declared hostilities; it may mean only a lull. If the title of this article were to be read as promising military advice, its relevance would therefore be in doubt.

But we shall concern ourselves exclusively with politics, not with military strategy; and whether the present truce is indefinitely continued or not, a state of war and imminence of war will continue to exist in Palestine. Abdullah, after agreeing to the truce, declares loudly that no permanent settlement is possible while the Jewish state exists; he may only be bargaining for a diminution of Israel's borders and a restriction of its sovereignty, especially with regard to immigration, but over this there will be a struggle also. The consideration of a *political* program for the defense of the Israelis' right to self-determination is equally important for either war or peace.



A new state has been set up. A people have declared that they want to live under their own government and determine their own national destiny. They have taken a blank check made out to the Right of Self-Determination and have signed their name to it: *Israel*. And they have sought to cash it in.

They have done this in the teeth of the opposition—direct, concealed or weaselly—of the imperialist capitals. And invading their defenses and threatening their independence came the reactionary onslaught of some of the most backward and reactionary kingships and dynasties of the world, the semi-feudal oppressors of the Arab people.

This reactionary invasion was launched with but one end in view—precisely to deprive the Israeli people of their *right to self-determination*.

Now the decision to set up a new national state in the world of today is no light matter. It may be a wise decision or a mistaken one, quite regardless of the fact that one

has the *right* to make the decision. We have explained (especially in the columns of *Labor Action*) why, in our opinion, the decision was a *mistaken* one. This we did both before and after partition; and insofar as the question has significance now, after the accomplished fact, we consider that the course of events since partition has been proving that that opinion was correct.

We advocated a different course, a socialist plan to achieve a viable life for the peoples of Palestine, Jewish and Arab, and one which could not but meet with the opposition of the rulers of both peoples, the Zionist capitalists and the Arab effendis. We advocated that the workers, landworkers and peasants of both communities, joining their strength from below in common struggle, launch a united struggle for independence from their then common master, British imperialism; and that they fight for the creation of a free, democratic Palestine based on universal suffrage and a fully democratic constituent assembly.

The national antagonisms between Jew and Arab do not exist only at the tops—today more than ever is this true, unfortunately!—but they *stem*, not from the interests of the exploited masses, but from the interests of the top rulers. In such a joint struggle for national liberation, the already strong tendencies toward Arab-Jewish cooperation from below could flower, the fellaheen could be torn away from their ties with the Arab landlords and money masters, the Jewish workers could be pried loose from the chauvinistic aims of the Zionist leadership, and a united democratic Palestine achieved in which both peoples could live with full national rights assured. This in brief.

The Zionist leadership (at first) and the Arab cabal also opposed partition, because they too had an alternative. *Their* alternative was the complete conquest of Palestine and the subordination of the other people, by force of arms if necessary. This was their reactionary, chauvinistic alternative to partition—one that was at the opposite pole from ours. If the Zionists accepted the partition—including elements like the Hashomer Hatzair which had to

make a flipflop to do so—it was because the main Jewish leaders looked upon it as a necessary installment toward this end.

There was no such reason for *our* disagreement with partition to come to an end with the UN decision. As compared with the program we advocated, partition represented a setback on the road to getting the Jewish workers and Arab peasants together in fighting unity. The creation of the Jewish state has indeed set up a state wall between them and has inflamed national feelings—or rather, has given the most reactionary elements in both camps the best opportunity to inflame them.

This is why we rejected partition as a solution for the Palestine problem. Nor has it solved the problem. It has only posed new conditions under which that solution must be sought.

That is why socialist thinking on this subject must start by understanding the distinction between (a) the Jews' right to self-determination, and (b) the correctness or advisability of *exercising* this right to the point of separation under given conditions. We need only refer to the fact that, before and after the Russian Revolution, the Bolsheviks' program called for defense of Finland's right to self-determination: before the revolution, Marxists in Finland advocated separation; after the revolution, the Communists in Finland advocated unity with Russia; but both before and after, there was no question in their minds but that the Finns had the right to separate if they so willed. Never under Lenin did the Soviets attempt to deprive them of that right by force of arms.

But in the present case we do not even have the complication of a workers' state being involved. Far from it! The attack upon the Jews' right to self-determination comes from a deeply reactionary social class—the Arab lords—whose reactionary aims in this case are not alleviated by the fact that they themselves suffer from the exploitation of British imperialism (at the same time that they cling to that imperialism in order to defend their privileges against their own people).

In this conflict, as socialists—that is, as the only thoroughgoing and consistent democrats, we not only support the Palestine Jews' right to self-determination but draw the necessary conclusions from that position: for full recognition of the Jewish state by our own government; for lifting the embargo on arms to Israel; for defense of the Jewish state against the Arab invasion in the present circumstances.

But for us this is not the end of the question but only the beginning.



What, however, shall we say of self-styled socialists who do not make even this beginning? We are thinking of the Socialist Workers Party group (Cannonites), which finally had a few words to say about the Palestine situation in the May 31 issue of its *Militant*. They argue for supporting neither side. The result is pitiful and is worthwhile taking up only for the purposes of a Marxist lesson on how not to approach the question.

This lesson is simple enough: Marxists do *not* decide to support or oppose a war merely on the basis of whether they like or do not like the politics of the leaders of the state. Marxism has made this clear often enough: in supporting China's war against Japan, the Spanish loyalist government's war against Franco, the Negus' war against Mussolini.

The question which we have asked, following Lenin's method, was: *What politics does this war flow from?* War—so goes the platitude—is the continuation of politics by other, forceful, means. In the case of every concrete war, we try to analyze concretely the politics of which that war is the continuation. The Spanish loyalist government was an imperialist government; it exploited Morocco and oppressed the peasants (and shot them down when they revolted!). But when the Franco fascists sought to overthrow even this miserable government, we called for its defense—*in our own way, by revolutionary means, and without giving the slightest political support to the bourgeois People's Front leaders*—because our analysis of the concreteness of events showed that the anti-Franco war did not flow from the loyalist government's imperialist character but from the fascists' attack upon its democratic base.

This was ABC once. But the Cannonites' views seem to be founded solely upon an easy proof of the reactionary character of the Zionist *leadership* of the Jews: it "threatens to provoke new pogroms against the Jews and involve them in new calamities," it "must inevitably become a tool of American imperialism," it "solidifies the position of the reactionary Arab rulers and enables them to pervert the social struggle in their own countries into a communal struggle between the Arab and Jewish peoples." All very true, and precisely the reason why defense of the Jews' right to self-determination cannot mean support to these Zionist leaders or their policies. It was just as true that Chiang Kai-shek's war against Japan was used by him to try to gloss over and sidetrack the social struggle behind his own lines.

The Alternative to Defense

But don't the Jewish people have "the right to self-determination and statehood as other peoples?" Their full answer:

Yes—but even if we abstract this question from its aforementioned social reality, the fact remains they cannot carve out a state at the expense of the national rights of the Arab peoples. This is not self-determination, but conquest of another people's territory.

A dishonest reply. (1) It means that the Jews have a right to self-determination but *no right to exercise it*. This does not make sense. One may, as we said, *advise* against its exercise in favor of a different course; but it is pure fakery to grant the right and in the same breath denounce its exercise as "conquest of another people's territory." (2) If the Jews have the right to self-determination, *what* territory can they "self-determine themselves" in without infringing upon the national rights of the Arab people? Is there any? Obviously none, it appears from the argument. What then does the "Yes" mean?

The only honest answer would be to *deny* that the Jews have any right to self-determination in Palestine—and to explain why they thus differ from other peoples. The SWP cannot do the latter and so they wisely, if hypocritically, refrain from asserting the former.

If the setting up of the Jewish state was “conquest of another people’s territory” and an attack on the “national rights” of the Arab peoples, there can be only one conclusion: it is the Arab peoples, then, who have the right to defend themselves against this unprovoked aggression. How can this conclusion be avoided? Certainly not by arguing that the *leaders* of these (attacked) Arab peoples are no-goods! Yet this is exactly how our subjects evade the responsibility of coming out four-square for the Arab invasion:

They [the Arab rulers] are, by their anti-Jewish war, [what? isn’t it a war of defense against an unprovoked attempt at conquest?—H. D.] trying to divert the struggle against imperialism, and utilizing the aspirations of the Arab masses for national freedom, to smother the social opposition to their tyrannical rule.

Of course, of course—but in a war of defense against conquest by “tools of American imperialism,” it would be the duty of socialists to fight the Arab rulers by demanding, not merely prosecution of the war, but *consistent, uncompromising* prosecution of the war . . . opposition to a rotten compromise with the Israelis, for example, opposition to any cessation of the conflict short of complete reconquest of the whole territory of Palestine, war to the bitter end . . . just as our Chinese comrades advocated, as against the compromising bourgeois leaders, in the war against Japan.

Our subjects shrink from this conclusion, for unaccountable reasons. This, however, is the only consistent alternative to our own consistent policy.

Defense of Israel, then. But, we said, this is not the end of the question but only its beginning.

Against *whom* must the Jews defend themselves?

The Arab Legion, of course. But since even the Zionist leaders know that, we make bold to point out that there is a second enemy.

In the eyes of partisans of freedom, what is going on in Palestine is a death struggle between a people fighting for their rights and a reactionary invader. But this struggle is taking place on a stage where the preliminaries of the Third World War are being acted out. Bending over the scene are the giants of world imperialism—the Big Three—themselves locked in battle (without guns) for the really big stakes of power.

And if we look at the same scene through *their* imperialist eyes, we see in Palestine: two dogs snapping and tearing at each other for a miserable bone. They sic on now one, now the other; bet on the outcome; nudge their favorites—and wait only for one thing: to be the one to carry off the stakes. Through their eyes there is no aura of democratic or national rights (and certainly not of

humanitarianism) over the scene, any more than in a cockfight.

And ill will it be for Israel if, by dint of blood and sacrifice and heroic toil, they beat back the Arab invader only to fall over on the other side into the net of imperialism!

Defense Against the Big Three

Now we Marxists are notoriously cynical about the motives and designs of *all* the capitalist and imperialist governments. But the role that Britain, specifically Laborite Britain, has been playing makes cynicism pale. The Labor Party, which up to its assumption of power was denouncing the British government for its “betrayal” of the Jews of Palestine, has taken over the filthy, oil-reeking job of propping up the Abdullahs and Arab landlord-princes of the Middle East against the Jewish state:

Why? Because Ernie Bevin is a scoundrel? Far from it. Because the “socialist” Laborites, after one day in office, discovered that “justice to the Jews” conflicted with their higher loyalty—loyalty to the interests of British imperialism, of which they are the current caretakers.

We cynical Marxists have been a bit less shocked than the Zionist leaders. *We* never looked to British imperialism to give justice to the Middle East, as they did. *We* never promised to be good British cat’s-paws if only they granted a Jewish homeland, as did the Zionist leaders for decades, crawling on their bellies before Whitehall. *We* were never taken in by the fish story about the British Labor Party building a socialist England. “Perfidious Albion” is perfidious only to those who have been taken in by it: by its own lights, which have nothing to do with any ideals of freedom or justice, its leaders (Conservative or Laborite) have been consistently loyal and faithful servants of the real rulers of England, the London City.

We knew that the coming of Bevin meant only a different signature under British imperialism, and said so in advance. Now a lot of other people have found it out too. How much more must the rank-and-file Zionists find out, how many more disappointments with “friends of the Jewish people” must they go through before they too understand and say:

No interference from the imperialists in Palestine, singly or collectively in the UN!

We can expect nothing from these Greeks bearing gifts – not even from the “fair” proposal of an embargo on both sides. This basis for the present truce, presented by the British, was rightly denounced by the Israeli leaders when first proposed. How equitable it is to embargo both sides with even-handed impartiality!—after the Arabs had stockpiled British arms and equipment with feverish haste for months, while the Israelis were still scurrying around for rifles and mortars. How equitable it is to forbid the importation of men for both sides!—in a situation where men for Israel must come through the British blockade, while men for the Arab Legion need only cross over the land routes from the neighboring states. One might as well propose another perfectly impartial agreement, evenly ap-

plied to both sides—a proposal, for example, that *both* sides immediately stop worshipping Allah. . . .

We say to the imperialists: *Lift the embargo! Get out of the lives of the Middle East peoples! Keep hands off!* The Jewish and Arab peoples' road to fraternity may be a hard one, but *you* will intervene only to put both in your pocket!

And that must go for *all* of them. The British-proposed truce basis, so roundly denounced by the Jews before accepting it, came after long consultations with Lewis Douglas, U. S. ambassador to Britain, and was accepted (not too demonstratively) by the U. S. Truman, unlike Bevin, recognized the new state—bringing fulsome tributes from Zionist wheelhorses like Abba Hillel Silver—but what stopped him from immediately lifting the embargo on arms for the defense of this state whose existence he “recognized”?

“Perfidious Albion,” indeed! The British policy at least has been consistent with itself. Perfidious Washington has meanwhile been trying to carry water on both shoulders.

No Dependence on U. S. Imperialism

How many illusions can a Zionist retain? We are thinking of the fairly large number of Jewish socialists who consider themselves even “left-wing” Zionists. Can one give up illusions about “Socialist” Britain and retain the idea that Wall Street's government has any other intention except that of meddling in the situation in order to snare Palestine in its own net?

Or that Russia, which puts Zionists in slave camps, and whose satellites have not refrained from running guns to the Arab legions, has any other interest except to put Palestine under its own heel?

The truth is that all of the imperialist Big Three are playing for the Palestine stakes. Britain is betting on the Arabs. Russia, it would seem at the moment, is mainly wooing the Jews, at least in the diplomatic channels. The United States relies on a force without nationality, neither Arab nor Jewish nor even American—the force of gold. And it expects that whoever wins is going to be gathered into its golden fold and anointed with oil.

To all those disillusioned Zionists who are now parboiling over the perfidy of “Socialist” Britain: not a particle more trust in Wall Street! We want no Greeks bearing gifts from Washington either.

For Israel to become the cat's-paw, the outpost, for any of the Big Three means its doom for any really independent existence. It will then be assigned to play the role in the Middle East that Czechoslovakia played in Eastern Europe between the First and Second World Wars. And if the Middle East is allowed to remain the playground of imperialism up to the Third World War, then it may well be, as was written, that Armageddon will be in Palestine.



If not to the big powers, where then shall Israel turn for succor? Shall it rely only on its own arms? *Can* it rely only on the military forces of the Haganah, while the

Arabs are supported by their secondhand ally, Britain? Is its own military defense enough?

Far be it from us to pooh-pooh the fact that wars are won with guns and cannon and aircraft and the independence of states defended by armed force. Wars *are* won with guns and cannon—but not *all* wars are won *only* with guns and cannon.

There was a war (in 1919 and the following years) waged by a people seeking to defend their independence, and it was fought with muskets against machine guns and swords against tanks and, almost, popguns against airplanes. That was the war fought by revolutionary Russia against the Allied intervention after the First World War—and they won. *Because they had another weapon, and used it.*

There was another war (in 1936-38) fought, to be sure, with guns and cannon but against superior force. That was the war of the Spanish loyalist government against Franco. That war was lost. They too had another weapon, and did *not* use it.

The Spanish government relied *only* on bullets and bravery. Powerful weapons! But at hand was a greater one—the possibility of exploding an arsenal of weapons behind Franco's own lines. The loyalist government, restrained by the combine of bourgeois politicians and Stalin's counter-revolutionaries, refused to give its freedom to Morocco—and the Moors remained with Franco to the end. They refused to tell the peasants to take the land—and behind Franco's lines the peasants remained mainly quiet and passive. Because, much as they hated Franco, they were given no cause for great joy in a loyalist victory.

Facing the enemy on fourteen fronts and almost without an army, the Russian Revolution turned back the combined assault of the military powers of the world—because they demonstrated in action to the people and to the soldiers of both sides that *their victory had a social meaning.*

Road to Lasting Victory

I mention this to show that there is something else to be relied on besides guns and cannon and instead of a sellout for imperialist aid. What is that weapon in Palestine?

The road to a LASTING victory in Palestine is for the Israelis to wage the war *as a war against the Arab landlords and dynasts and NOT as a war against the Arab people.* And this not in tender expressions of sympathy and tolerance but in demonstrated deeds.

What does that mean concretely? And what is meant by a *lasting* victory?

One has to be blind not to see that the problems of the Palestine Jews will not be solved even if the Arab legions are beaten back by superior force or heroism.

The bitter harbinger of what may be a hollow victory, no matter how enthusiastically hailed, was visible in the reports from Haifa. Here was an Arab population which for years had lived in harmony with their Jewish neighbors. Even in the worst pogrom days of the past two decades, this population had not taken part in attacks on their Jewish brothers. *This Arab population moved out*

en masse when the Jews recently captured the city—like the Finnish workers fleeing their homes before the advancing Russian army in 1940.

The present situation in Palestine—the fruit of partition and the end product of Zionist policy toward the Arabs—can only continue to inflame national hostility and chauvinism on both sides. On the one hand, there is the disgraceful portent of the Deir Yassin massacre of Arab women and children by the Irgun, unpunished by the official Israeli leadership and therefore, in the eyes of the Arabs, endorsed. On the other hand, there is the godsent opportunity for the effendis to inflame the antagonism of the mass of Arab peasantry toward the Jews as such.

And as this situation is created, we must remember:

—that in this splinter state of Israel, 30 to 40 per cent of the population consists of Arabs!

—that it is a splinter quivering in the side of an Arab world;

—that *merely* military victories (accompanied by Deir Yassins, threats of expansion, and Haifa evacuations) can only result in a permanent state of war and warlike menaces, guerrilla skirmishing, border tension and border incidents, permanent national chauvinism and permanent national hatred.

Under these conditions, with all its economic life intertwined with its Arab neighbors', with its supply lines and commercial routes interpenetrating, with its national life economically dependent and helpless—what can be the future of a splinter country separated from the world on all sides and surrounded by a wall of hatred?

Only a chronic nightmare existence, a new horror of the twentieth century, a state-wide ghetto, a death trap for the Jews!

This is the direction in which the present rightist-bourgeois government of Israel is heading. And along these lines, its only avenue of escape—no, not escape, but its only possibility of even alleviating that nightmare is complete capitulation to one of the predatory imperialisms; to become its outpost in the Middle East, the harlot Jerusalem.

This is not a chimera conjured up. This is a reality of Israel's adventure into statehood. From these vicious alternatives of destruction, imperialist overlordship or permanent nightmare in a Balkanized Middle East, the Israeli people can escape only by relying on the only other force that they can seek to lean on: the mass of Arab workers and peasants who are exploited and oppressed by the very same rulers who invade Palestine.

Program for Israeli Socialists

The key is right at hand. It is the 30-40 per cent of Israel which is *now* Arab. Israel's future will be determined in the first place by how it acts toward *them*. It is not enough to "leave them be." The Israelis must demonstrate that they *seek* the alliance of the Arab masses, that they are carrying on a *social war*—not Jew against Arab, but a war of classes.

It must seek to integrate the Arabs into the country on a completely equal basis with the Jews:

(1) An end to the Jim-Crow trade unions by which those Arab workers who *are* organized are kept in "parallel" unions.

(2) Stamp out the policy of *kibbush avoda*—the ousting of Arab labor—in every sphere.

(3) Stamp out the policy of boycotting Arab goods.

(4) An end to every other form of economic nationalism.

(5) Organize the state as the home of *both* peoples with equal national status: in schools, in the government, in the use and teaching of both languages, in every aspect of national life.

(6) State aid to the Arab peasants, as to the Jewish colonists.

(7) Distribution to the Arab peasants of all lands vacated by Arab landlords and under Israeli control.

(8) The formation of a bi-national army and police. This outcome can be made possible by the successful prosecution of the other steps.

Such a program, we are perfectly aware, means a complete overturn of the policy of the Jewish leaders. But only such a program, of which the above points represent not the whole but a beginning and a token, can transform the war of defense into a *social war*, a war with the dynamic power to tear apart the national unity behind the Arab rulers' legions. Only such a program can prepare for the reunification of the splintered land into a community where Jew and Arab can live in fraternity.

Such a reunited state cannot come about while the Arab effendi, landlord and militarist remains in control of his Arab vassal. It cannot come about while Zionist nationalism rules Israel. It can come about only if the working masses of both peoples unite, from below, and tear themselves away from their own ruling classes. The working-class movement among the Jews is powerful; the majority of it calls itself socialist, many even left-wing socialist. Here is the only consistent socialist program for a reunited Palestine.

This is the program for transforming the war into a revolutionary war against the Arab feudal masters—and striking down the perpetrators of Deir Yassin massacres who call for Jewish expansionism against the Arab people. It has to be fought for against the present leaders of Israel, dominated by the Jewish capitalist class and trailed by the bourgeois labor leaders of the Histadrut.

It demands the fight for a workers' government in Israel, as the vanguard of the future United Socialist States of the Middle East.

Jews here in America, particularly those in the socialist Zionist organizations, can have more to say about realizing and aiding such a program than any others, outside of Israel itself. Out of the night of national hatred in Palestine, from the ranks of the working class there, there *can* arise a real Zion—a Middle East in which Jew and Arab build together a workers' world without exploitation and oppression.

HAL DRAPER

Marshall Plan: Road to Conquest

Analysis of the American Way of Imperialism

The Marshall Plan or the European Recovery Program has to be regarded from the viewpoint of (a) the internal contradictions of U. S. capitalism, (b) World War II and the destruction wrought by it, and (c) preparation for World War III.

For over 30 years U. S. capitalism has been exporting far more than it has imported. World War I saw the most rapid transformation of the U. S. from a debtor nation to a creditor. Fundamentally the change to a creditor nation—i.e., one exporting more capital and capital goods than it imports—was only an indication of the expansion of U. S. industry and finance to a dominant position in the world.

World War II accelerated this process of expansion. American industry experienced an enormous increase in plant and equipment (financed by the government), necessitated by the tremendous demands placed upon it by the requirements of the total war.

With the end of military hostilities the limitless market, created by war itself, ceased. The ravenous demand of the greatest imperialist war machine the world has ever seen suddenly became but a small child's appetite when Germany and Japan surrendered. While U. S. capitalism had to export prior to World War II in order to maintain a growing economy, now—with a far larger productive capacity—the drive to export has become a dominating force of U. S. capitalism's attempt to prevent disaster both at home and abroad.

In the first two years following World War II, the U. S. has exported a total of 30 billion dollars worth of goods (twenty billions in aid, ten billions military supplies).¹ This is more than the whole period from 1930-1940 inclusive! Now the ERP contemplates another 17½ billion, exclusive of military aid, during the next four-year period.

Picture of Destruction

In addition to the pressure of U. S. production, part of which the ruling class is forced to export, there exist the other two factors mentioned in the first paragraph. As a result of the unprecedented destruction wrought by World War II and the great imperialist rivalry of the two former allies, there exists a tremendous need for U. S. production. This has two aspects:

- (1) to rehabilitate those parts of the world which suffered great destruction during the war, and
- (2) to build a bulwark of "friendly" and subordinated capitalist countries in order to prevent their absorption into the Russian orbit and to prepare them for their part in the coming struggle for domination of the world.

Destruction of the European economy was most severe.

1. Senate Economy Committee Report, released November 1, 1947. This same committee estimated that there were several billions more spent on foreign aid but unaccounted for.

In Italy 30 per cent of industry was destroyed, 40 per cent of the railroads were wrecked, and shipping was reduced to 10 per cent of its pre-war size. In France war losses and damage are estimated at \$21 billion. Industrial production was reduced 40 per cent and one building out of every twenty-two was destroyed or damaged.

Similar destruction and loss occurred throughout the European continent. In addition the displacement of peoples and the demoralization of whole nations of peoples, plus millions slaughtered by war, have created economic and political problems of enormous magnitude.

The heating of homes and buildings and the provision of hot water in cities have already been reduced below the levels necessary for maintaining health.²

Production of coal is at a very low level and is one of the essential items of export in the Marshall Plan. Coal production has declined for numerous reasons:

- (1) Loss of miners and no replacements since young men were all drafted.
- (2) No replacement of machinery during the war.
- (3) Inadequate food, clothing, and shelter have decreased the productivity of the miners.
- (4) Some of the richest coal veins were exhausted during the war.

In Germany the calculated policy of dismantling the factories has added to the lack of production throughout the continent.

The division of Europe resulting from the war has only added to the crisis. Western Europe has lost one of its major coal producing areas—the mines of German Silesia—to Poland, and the products of these fields are not available to Western Europe to the same extent as before the war. The interruption of German production and trade and its disastrous effects upon European economy are easily seen.

Italy formerly received 50 per cent of its coal supply from Germany, and now receives only 10 per cent. To pay for coal Italy used to export to Germany fruit, vegetables and wine; now she exports none. German workers need the food, Italian industry needs the coal, but the trade is virtually nil, causing suffering to both.

Such is a small part of the European picture following World War II: a hideous picture of starving peoples, crippled industries, lack of exchange—capitalist and Stalinist debauchery at its worst.

The third factor behind the Marshall Plan is preparation for World War III. The capitalist rulers of the U. S. are, of course, consciously preparing and planning for it. Eastern Europe is being feverishly prepared in every way to play its part in the Stalinist camp; likewise Western

2. Select Committee of the House, Preliminary Report on coal.

Europe, through the Marshall Plan, for its part in the U. S. camp. Both the rulers in the Kremlin and the dominant section of the American capitalist class are perfectly aware of their "mission" to lead their respective peoples and satellite allies into a death struggle with the hated rival.

The preparations for World War III, which are an integral part of the Marshall Plan, will be explained in greater detail as we look at the realities of the plan. It is enough at the moment to recognize that the preparation for World War III is the over-all, dominant policy of the American ruling class.

This is the background of the Marshall Plan: the contradictions of American capitalism coupled with the destruction of World War II and the preparations for World War III. Specifically the ERP was concocted following the breakdown of negotiations between Russia and the U. S., negotiations which were conducted in the hope of arriving at a joint rehabilitation of Europe and a joint oppression and exploitation of the peoples of that continent—negotiations which were doomed to failure before they began due to the irreconcilability of the imperialist contenders' rivalry.

Master Plan of Imperialism

The most common misconception of ERP is that its applications are confined to Europe.

Technically speaking, the plan and the subsequent bill passed by Congress did indeed define it as economic aid to Europe in the interests of human welfare, world peace, national self-interest and other noble purposes. However, even Congress has recognized that military aid is an essential of the program and has now virtually made it so. Aid to China also was discussed and passed simultaneously and in conjunction with ERP.

Most important, however, are the facts bared by congressional committee reports—not all of which have been made available—revealing clearly and unmistakably the world-wide implications of ERP and the designs and plans of American imperialism to dominate and exploit no less than three-quarters of the world's resources, markets, and peoples. "To the victor belong the spoils" and "He who pays the piper calls the tune" are old saws as applicable to the world perspective of American capitalism as they are to capitalist morality in general. U. S. capitalism emerged victor in the war, and it intends to cash in. U. S. capitalism is to pay for rehabilitation, and it intends to call the tune.

The Marshall Plan in actuality is perhaps the most comprehensive and conscious expression of the course of imperialism, both as to the present and the near future, as was ever devised by a ruling class. The actual mechanics of this imperialist master plan are only too clearly outlined in the committee reports on ERP.

Roughly ERP can be divided into four parts:

(1) What must be sent to Europe and where will it come from?

(2) Provisions for administration and conditions attached to the expenditure of funds.

(3) Payment and security for the money loaned.

(4) Cost to the U. S. and its effect on U. S. economy.

All four points are germane to an understanding of ERP and its implications for the American working class.

Western Europe's most urgent needs may be classified as follows: (1) Foodstuffs, fuel, and fertilizers. (2) Commodities to be processed and certain types of specialized equipment (agricultural machinery, etc.). (3) Capital goods and equipment.

Foods, fuel, and fertilizer rank first both in urgency and in the dollar cost of acquisition. As stated by the Paris Conference of the sixteen European countries, they constitute about 50 per cent of the required imports from all dollar sources for the four years. Without the maintenance of an adequate food ration, there is no possibility of expanding production. Without increased coal to turn the wheels of industry, output will remain too low to provide any flow of exports to balance import requirements.³

Petroleum is also vital to industrial activity and fertilizer to the famished soil of Europe, for agricultural production. It is planned to ship into Western Europe about \$600 million worth of petroleum and petroleum products a year for the next four years.

Incentive goods such as clothing and tobacco will constitute about 5 per cent of the total. These goods are to be distributed to "key" workers in order to increase their production. ("Feed the horse more hay and you can work him harder" is the meaning content of the term "incentive goods.")

Whole World in Network

Where the goods to be sent to Europe will come from is another story. Obviously the major portion will come from the U. S. But not all of it can come from this country, and this entails the coordination of the Marshall Plan with other nations outside of Europe which can produce a surplus in certain articles.

Certain countries other than the U. S. which are in a position to supplement a program of aid, which have the same incentive as we to do so and which enjoy access to U. S. supplies, should be expected to cooperate each in relation to its respective capacity.⁴

The nations of the Western Hemisphere are thereby brought into the plan for two reasons. First, their food and petroleum products are needed. Secondly, they too are receiving "aid" from the U. S. and must pay for it. One of the purposes of the recent Bogota Conference was to establish the part that South America would play in ERP. The conference established a military and anti-Russian alliance but had to postpone, probably till fall, a decision on ERP.

An additional reason, and one of stark economic necessity, why the U. S. must include other nations in the supply program is that all European requirements cannot be met by this country.

For instance, Europe's requirements for food cannot be met wholly from U. S. agricultural production. Hence

3. House Select Committee, Preliminary Report No. 8.

4. Ibid.

South America must help. Petroleum, a product of prime necessity for Europe, is imported by the U. S. in order to meet its own demands. Obviously petroleum for Europe must come from sources outside of the U. S. The plan does in fact make provision for this.

This naturally does not mean that oil coming from foreign countries will not benefit American capital. In fact, quite the contrary. To quote but one example:

... it is reported that an Italian company has entered into a contract with Venezuela for one million barrels of royalty oil to be delivered over a period of two years at a bonus of 20½ cents per barrel over the base price. This will net the Venezuelan government a quarter of a million dollars which it would not have received had the oil been sold to the producers, who were most likely in large measure U. S. companies. . . . There is obviously a need for more careful screening than this procedure affords and for a control of competitive purchasing of petroleum and its products. . . .⁵

Clearly the Venezuelan government will not be allowed the profit from the oil produced in the country; the profits must go to the U. S. capitalists who "produce" the Venezuelan oil.

Another aspect of the supply problem involves petroleum and steel and concerns Germany. The world demand for petroleum products is outstripping the ability to produce petroleum equipment and the means of transporting it, primarily tankers.

Unless European and particularly German steel and petroleum equipment capacity is brought into early and all-out use there is a danger of persisting world shortage that may make impossible the realization of any such program as is anticipated by the CEEC. The limitation on petroleum available to Europe may be one of the most difficult factors limiting European recovery.⁶

After having originally proposed to make of Germany first an agricultural nation and then a No Man's Land, the American bourgeoisie here finally recognizes that the most advanced and largest industrial nation on the European continent is needed in a modern economy. This is at least a part of the explanation for the present policy of rehabilitating, instead of dismantling, German industry. (The other part of the explanation is undoubtedly the urge to use Germany and German industry in the coming battle with the rulers in the Kremlin.)

Another source of petroleum and its products is the cheapening of petroleum products now being produced for U. S. consumption. But more on this in connection with the cost of ERP.

Capital and capital goods will be supplied almost wholly from America. Steel and coal will be supplied by the U. S. to the utmost of its ability. Coal, which Europe needs most direly, will come from U. S. mines, supplemented by European coal to whatever extent possible.

Though a steel shortage continues to persist in the U. S., that is primarily due to the already large exports of this commodity, exports which will continue under ERP. The supplying of steel to Europe will continue the short-

age in the U. S. and thereby help maintain the high price. The shipping of steel to Europe creates an additional drain on the steel industry in that much needed scrap will not be forthcoming from steel which is exported. Needless to say, the U. S. is the only nation which can export capital at the present time.

Question of Repayment

Under the Marshall Plan loans will be made on various bases so that the sixteen nations of Western Europe can pay for what they receive. The programs for repayment of the loans, and the security which the European countries receiving aid must provide, constitute one of the most intriguing and ruthless imperialist plans ever devised. The administration of the plan, the provisions and conditions attached to it, and the repayment of the loans are the essence of the Marshall Plan. An examination of them will clearly reveal the world-wide imperialist aims of U. S. capitalism and its preparations for World War III.

Before any elaboration of the conditions attached to the Marshall Plan and the repayment of loans can be considered, two facts must be understood. The act of Congress providing funds for Europe contains only a broad outline of general policy. The details and actual workings of the plan are left to the administrator, Paul Hoffman, a representative of big industry.

Secondly, some of the most important aspects of the plan will emerge only in the form of the treaties which will be negotiated with each of the recipient countries. What these treaties will contain we cannot state unequivocally. Nevertheless, sufficient material has been published in the form of congressional committee reports to give a clear outline of the implications of the ERP.

Some of the committee reports are not yet published and the treaties themselves may never be published. Much of the material which follows is taken from preliminary reports of the Select Committee of the House (Herter Committee). Other material is taken from the Harriman Committee report and the report of the Committee on Foreign Aid. Newspaper and periodical material on these aspects of the plan is purposefully scarce.⁷ Voluntary censorship can be as effective as the legal type when the interests of the bourgeoisie are at stake.

The preliminary condition placed upon the European nations are well known. The demands made by the U. S. government that the Western European nations form an economic union, that they agree to exchange and cooperate with each other, that trade barriers be reduced to a minimum, and now the pressure for military alliance—all this is too well known to warrant great elaboration. Their significance is equally obvious and needs only an additional word of explanation.

No European country is self-sufficient. The need for an economic union was recognized decades ago by the revolutionary socialist movement and was expressed in the slo-

7. Of all the newspaper and magazine articles examined in connection with this study of ERP, I found only one brief article in one issue of the New York Times in reference to the material which I will cite on this aspect of the plan.

5. House Select Committee, Preliminary Report No. 5.

6. Ibid.

gan "For a Socialist United States of Europe." Hitler also had to unify the continent economically, in his own way, in recognition of an obvious economic fact. Now, in order to rehabilitate Western Europe and make of it an effective buffer zone against Stalinism, U. S. imperialism likewise demands the same end.

The free exchange of goods not only supplements this but also fills an obvious need of American capitalism, namely, the need to export. American capitalism can now flood the European market and meet little or no opposition in the way of tariffs, quotas, etc.

Tying Europe to the Dollar

The ERP Act itself requires all participating nations to abide by the terms of the act and the treaties under which they will receive aid. This is backed up by the power given to the president to shut off aid at any time. The very fact that the aid upon which these countries are dependent for their existence can be shut off at any time that the U. S. cares to do so—this constitutes a weapon in power politics of tremendous magnitude.

It underlines the state of European economy today and the overshadowing power of U. S. capitalism. Europe is shoved toward the position of a starving bondsman who, unless he pleases his master daily, may have even his crust of bread denied.

The ERP Act itself provides that each country receiving aid must set aside a fund of its own currency equivalent to the amount which it receives in the form of aid in American dollars. This fund is to be used for purposes mutually agreed upon by the U. S. and the country receiving aid. Given the relationship which exists—i.e., one of overlord and subordinate—one does not need to press his imagination too hard to understand just how "mutual" any such agreement will be with respect to the use of this fund. U. S. capitalism is in the dictator's seat.

In conjunction with this is the demand that the European countries stabilize their currencies. Stabilize them with what? With the pound sterling or the French franc or the Japanese yen? Naturally not: with the gold dollar.

With their currencies stabilized with the dollar, and with a reserve fund set aside to be used for purposes of "mutual interest," let us see what is going to happen. According to the Herter Committee reports on ERP, industries which will be of mutual benefit to both the U. S. and the recipient nation should be developed. This means, among others, the armament industry—which will certainly be of "mutual benefit" when the war with Stalinist Russia begins!

Again, the coal industry of Western Europe will probably come in for some development—Hitler-style. The problem of supplying coal, albeit a profitable one, is still difficult, and U. S. capitalism would like to alleviate the difficulties. Let us look at just two of their solutions for solving the European coal problem by "developing the European coal industry."

In England it is planned to require the British coal industry to turn to strip mining in order to increase coal production. In addition, a third shift of miners is to be

put on in order to work the strip mines. If British workers do not want to work a third shift or to flock into the mines, they will in all likelihood be "gently urged" by the Laborite government.

Hitlerite Solution

Here is another solution—truly a Hitlerian one, complete with population shift, etc. I quote in full:

There are approximately, at the present time, 85,000 Germans working in the French and Belgian coal mines, 50,000 in France and 35,000 in Belgium. These mines produce approximately 65,000 tons of steam coal per day which cannot readily or efficiently be used for coking purposes, as the productivity of labor is greater in the Ruhr mines than in France or Belgium. The military authorities propose that the German prisoners of war be returned to the Ruhr as soon as possible, where they can produce about 100,000 additional tons of coking coal. France and Belgium would be compensated for the loss of 65,000 tons of ordinary steam coal per day by receiving from Germany 65,000 tons per day of coking coal, a far more desirable grade of coal. There would remain in Germany an additional 35,000 tons per day of coking coal or a total of approximately 9,000,000 tons per year which would greatly assist the recovery of German industry, to the ultimate benefit of the whole of Western Europe. *If France and Belgium could replace the German miners with Italians and Poles and other Eastern and Southern Europeans, they might be able to continue the production of the 65,000 tons of steam coal per day which would be lost by removal of the German prisoners of war and thus enjoy an actual gross increase in coal supplies equal to the 65,000 tons of highly necessary coking coal to be imported from the Ruhr.*⁸

Send the German miners back to German mines, drag in as replacements Italians, Poles or anything else you can get your hands on, and a big step forward has been taken in "solving" the European coal problem. It is noted elsewhere in these same committee reports that, despite the heavy overpopulation of Italy, the Italians are reluctant to migrate. The reasons: (a) the restrictions placed upon their emigration, and (b) the lack of incentive offered by countries which desire them.

What incentive would be offered to Poles, Italians or others going to work in French and Belgian coal mines? Of this the Herter report says nothing. We do know that this entire recommendation comes from the military, and we do know from well-established precedent that the incentive ordinarily offered by the military is more often than not something closely resembling involuntary servitude.

And so goes the Marshall Plan with its rehabilitation of Western Europe for capitalism.

Let us look at another side of the same question—development of industries which will be of mutual benefit. Suppose the small-time European capitalists want to develop some of their industries which, when developed, would offer competition to the same industries in the U. S.? Will they be permitted to go ahead with their plans?

The answer is clearly given if we take but a brief look at the Herter Committee comments on the proposals for steel production made by the CEEC. For 1948 the CEEC

⁸ House Select Committee, Preliminary Report on Coal Requirements and Availabilities. Emphasis mine.

made estimates for the export of steel from Western Europe, excluding Germany, as follows: 1.47 million tons more than in 1938 to outside countries and 990,000 tons to colonial territories—660,000 tons more than in 1938.

U. S. Steel and "Mutual Benefits"

Thus total exports to outside areas will exceed 1938 levels by 2.13 million net tons, or roughly two-thirds of the prospective adverse impact of CEEC demands as indicated above. *The Paris Conference Steel Report does not provide any justification for the increased rate.* Again:

In this connection a review of the major steel expansion programs under way in the United Kingdom, France, and several other nations would seem appropriate. Such programs are large consumers of home-made steel as well as of scarce equipment to be supplied by the U. S. Can they be afforded at this time and what sort of world steel picture will they present when completed? Before building up export steel capacity for the future in Europe at very heavy cost to production for consumers' steel today, is there not a real need to look at the prospects for marketing the capacity that will result and its probable contribution to a lack of world balance harmful to all concerned?⁹

One must be pretty nearly blind not to be able to understand that the European steel industry is to be severely restricted so as to leave the world market to the tender mercies of the U. S. Steel Corporation.

It is worthwhile to note that, while it is definitely planned to limit European steel production, steel is not the only industry which will be restricted. Certainly the automobile and petroleum industries and others will have their say on that.

It might be interesting to point out in this connection that the oil industry plans not only to limit European oil production but actually to decrease it, thereby making Europe more dependent on U. S. capitalism than heretofore. This will be done by the virtual expropriation of foreign oil holdings of the European bourgeoisie.

Moreover, the simple restriction of the European steel industry by itself is like a clamp on the very life blood of any modern industrial economy. So necessary are both steel and oil to industrial production that both can be used as indexes of production. The implications of the Marshall Plan multiply as we examine its details.

Taken as a whole, the conditions attached to the ERP constitute an attempt to impose a straightjacket of control over the European economy, a control which is designed to ensure not merely the partial recovery of European economy, in the hopes of saving it from Stalinism and preparing it for the Third World War, but a control designed to ensure the continued predominance of U. S. capital on the European and world markets. The actual administration of this program of control over the European economy will be carried out by the "roving ambassador" and his staff of assistants and inspectors.

In Europe these economic dictators will swing more weight than the wealthiest bourgeois or the most royal of the royalty. To kiss their feet may mean the difference between business success or failure.

The payment which the capitalist class of the U. S. will receive for the services rendered to Western Europe must be commensurate with the power and prestige of the wealthiest and most powerful ruling class in the world today. Anything less would be a travesty on justice and a violation of all laws of profit held dear by that class.

Payoffs and Stock Piles

The Herter Committee reports are most enlightening in respect to this matter of payment. Like a small child who suddenly finds himself alone in a candy store, so the Herter Committee suddenly awakens to the realization that the possibilities of repayment are almost limitless if you look around alertly. I shall quote extensively on this subject for it is here that the world-wide imperialist character of the Marshall Plan most clearly reveals itself.

Here too we will obtain a glimpse of the stockpiling program for "national defense." Obviously most of the sixteen European countries cannot pay in cash for the aid they receive. But payment in kind for stockpiling purposes is found very acceptable. The act itself provides for stockpiling, through the agreements which each recipient country must sign

... facilitating the transfer to the United States by sale, exchange, barter, or otherwise for stockpiling or other purposes, for such period of time as may be agreed to and upon reasonable terms and in reasonable quantities, of materials which are required by the United States as a result of deficiencies or potential deficiencies in its own resources...¹⁰

A rather broad provision which can be interpreted as broadly as the demands of U. S. capital require! To transfer by sale, exchange, barter, or *otherwise* can certainly include any conceivable method, including expropriation, as we shall see. To supply materials which are deficient or potentially deficient can mean everything with the exception of sunshine and air. For stockpiling or other purposes also gives more than ample room for the broad interpretive powers of U. S. capitalism. This is the section of the ERP Act under which a large part of the payment and security for U. S. loans will be negotiated.

It is this section of the act which will legally give to the U. S. the predominant position in the world which its victory in World War II and its overwhelming economic superiority demand for it. Let us see how the Herter Committee reports fill in the vacuum of the broad phraseology of the act.

The Herter Committee reports, speaking of replacement for commodities exported under ERP, say:

What form ought such replacement take? A few examples of such possibilities may serve to indicate the line that should be systematically explored in making every master agreement through whatever agency the Congress sets up to implement the foreign-aid program. The first is iron ore. Very high-grade deposits of iron ore are known to exist in Labrador as well as in neighboring Quebec. Labrador is a portion of Newfoundland, which in turn is a colony of Britain and not a dominion. Present efforts to arrange for a change of Newfoundland to the dominion status or to a partnership on federal terms with Canada might be made the basis for negotiations

9. House Select Committee, Preliminary Report on Steel.

10. Text of Foreign Aid Act (ERP), p. 17.

through the United Kingdom so that some participation in these resources be allocated as security against a U. S. loan to Britain. Similar treatment might well be considered in connection with the British Shell holdings in Venezuelan oil. A *systematic review of world resources on this basis would produce astonishing results in terms of possibilities of repayment.* New Caledonia, a French possession in the Pacific, has rich nickel and chrome deposits. We are pouring out our own resources to aid these countries. An equivalent guarantee of repayment through stockpiling or participation is only a fair return. When it is inexpedient politically or otherwise to attempt this direct solution of acquisition of mineral rights, a combination of *American private capital* for development under *government partial guarantee* plus stockpile deliveries over a 25-year period would go far towards repaying some of the Marshall Plan program loans and possibly securing interest coverage on previous advances.¹¹

Again from the Herter reports:

Because the production of strategic metals and minerals in Western Europe is considerably less than the over-all requirements of that area, Western Europe itself can make little contribution to the stock piles. If, however, the colonial territories controlled by the countries of Western Europe are included, a very respectable total can be shown. Therefore the ideal arrangement would be for the colonial governments involved to undertake a firm commitment to supply a stated annual tonnage for a period of several years—ten to twenty years being an ideal period for assuring a normal return on capital without either undue profit to the producers or unwise use of scarce equipment for developing and exploiting mining properties. If the U. S. agrees to take such a stated annual tonnage the colonial governments could then in turn make similar agreements with the individual producers [etc.]. [Ibid.]

And even more:

Provided that necessary safeguards are established there is no question that in the mineral field at least, American capital is available to take over or supplement European investments in many colonial areas. U. S. capital is already heavily invested in Rhodesian copper, Canadian nickel and aluminum, and Surinam bauxite. The new lead-zinc deposits in Morocco are being developed in part with American capital. Given a stable government, American capital would probably undertake the re-equipment of the important lead-zinc deposits in Burma. It is difficult to measure in terms of dollars just how far this might go . . . [etc.]. [Ibid.]

And these are only preliminary reports! The full reports are not yet available.

The American Way of Imperialism

Surely this material needs little comment! U. S. imperialism has never had need to operate in the traditional manner of the British, French or German imperialisms. These countries had to acquire direct political possession of the colonial areas in order to control, subjugate and exploit them. American imperialism, with its overwhelming capacity to produce, has always used economic penetration as its main weapon of gaining economic and political control over another country.

As Marx said in the *Communist Manifesto*, "The cheap prices of its [the bourgeoisie's] commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with

¹¹ House Select Committee, Preliminary Report No. 10. Emphasis mine.

which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate." It is with the cheapness and plentifulness of its commodities that U. S. capitalism invades not only the "Chinese walls" but the walls of its capitalist competitors, the nations of Europe. Needless to add, U. S. imperialism is in no wise averse to the use of arms to assist its economic invasions if necessary.

It is certainly clear that the Marshall Plan or ERP is revealed as the master plan of the American capitalist class to control the economies of Western Europe and to control and exploit without question a major portion of the colonial world. The exploitation of the colonial world is planned as "payment" or "security" against the loans made to Europe. The loans to Europe provide the levers to control European economy. This is the plan sold to the American workers under the guise of a plan primarily to rehabilitate Europe.

American private capital aims not only to supplant European capital but proposes to get assistance by "partial government guarantee" in its exploitation of the colonial areas. This is cost-plus extended to the world imperialist scale. American capital, through the vehicle of the Marshall Plan, plans to reign supreme as the economic overlord of the world, controlling, with the inclusion of China and Japan, no less than three-quarters of the world—everything outside of the area mastered by Stalinist Russia.

These are the realities of the Marshall Plan. These are the plans and this is the face of U. S. imperialism today.

HOMER PAXON

MORE on the Marshall Plan—

In coming issues: Homer Paxon follows up with an analysis of further aspects of the plan: significance of the stockpiling program, cost of ERP to the American workers, and the effect of Marshall Plan imperialism on the American economy. Henry Judd will take up the theme: Can the Marshall Plan succeed in reconstructing Europe's economy?

Leon Trotsky's

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

Now available!

\$3.50 cloth-bound

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

American Science Goes to War

The Dilemma of the Militarization of Science

American society continues to evolve toward increased technical complexity amid a general lack of confidence of all classes in their future security. This is decaying capitalism in crisis which can only seek to maintain itself through whatever outer political form, by increased stratification and centralization of government control. This movement toward stratification penetrates all aspects of our culture and, not least, science.

This is only to be expected since science together with its practical application, technology, is the great impelling force which has made possible the expansion of capitalism and is now pushing it headlong toward its own doom. The disintegrating and conflicting factors within American society which make such control of science necessary from the bourgeois point of view are worthy of analysis:

Technically, it can be said that science is just now beginning to grow up, to realize itself. Though science is essentially a cooperative intellectual movement, the science of the nineteenth century and earlier was carried out within the workshop (laboratory) of the individual scientist or inventor. But in the twentieth century the unit of coordinated research activity has become the large industrial, university, or government laboratory. Science has become so complex and its technical requirements so great that it can only advance by coordinated research on a national or international scale; capitalism, by its very nature, excludes the latter, but can and does seek a strong nationalistic science.

That such nationally organized research pays off big was driven home to the bourgeoisie by the results of the herculean mobilization of American scientific forces in the research on nuclear fission and the development of the atomic bomb. Likewise in somewhat less spectacular fashion with other military developments in World War II. Now American capitalism endeavors with feverish haste to build a controlled science through federal legislation and government mobilization. In conflict, however, in this process are the basic long-range aims of the capitalist state, the more narrow short-range desires of industrialists for immediate continuing profits, and the ideals of the scientists themselves.

Let us look at science in relation to the basic problems and resources of capitalism in America today. By its very nature capitalism is expansive, but now with its natural resources plundered to the full extent of its own frontier, with nationalism growing among the colonial peoples, and a devastated Europe and Asia threatened by Russia, the remaining raw material resources of the world are available to the United States only in limited quantities. As a result, one of the forlorn remaining hopes of the American capitalist class for an expanding economy is in the increased sources of energy and materials made available by the advances of science.

It is the deadly dilemma of capitalism, however, that more and more of the facilities of science must be applied to feed the military machine, thereby nullifying the possible healthy effect of an expanding science on capitalist economy. In addition, American science and technology can no longer live on the accumulated basic and theoretical research of Europe. To quote from the Bush report *Science, The Endless Frontier*:

It [is] imperative to increase pure research at this stage of our history. First, the intellectual banks of continental Europe, from which we formerly borrowed, have become bankrupt through the ravages of war. No longer can we count upon those sources for fundamental science. Second, in this modern age, more than ever before, pure research is the pacemaker of technological progress. In the nineteenth century, Yankee mechanical ingenuity, building upon the basic discoveries of European science, could greatly advance the technical arts. Today the situation is different. Future progress will be most striking in those highly complex fields—electronics, aerodynamics, chemistry—which are based directly upon the foundations of modern science. In the next generation, technological advance and basic scientific discovery will be inseparable; a nation which borrows its basic knowledge will be hopelessly handicapped in the race for innovation. The other world powers, we know, intend to foster scientific research in the future.

Conflicting Pulls on Science

Not for nothing has the American bourgeoisie corralled all the European scientists possible into the United States. But this is not enough; for American capitalism to be supreme in the scientific race, a strong basic-research movement must be built on American soil. But this requires money and manpower for both equipment and teaching as well as for the actual research itself. It is the second dilemma of American science that this demand for long-range basic research, which yields no immediate results or profits, must be met with the dwindling resources of a decadent capitalism.

However, the greatest drain on science, as well as American economy as a whole, is the military. In our highly developed society, with the possibility of "push-button" war looming, the needs of expensive military research leave few scientific resources for research which is basic or applicable to a peaceful economy. What little funds are available for such fields as medicine and health are given, albeit with humanitarian phrases, only with an eye to future military manpower.

These fundamental considerations, as well as the specific scientific aims of American capitalism, are contained in official government reports for all to read. In addition to Bush, there are the five volumes of the Steelman report, *Science and Public Policy*. The difficulties encountered in furthering these aims were apparent in the conflict within Congress, and between Truman and Congress, on the passage and veto of S526 in 1947. This bill was to have estab-

lished a National Science Foundation to promote basic research by increasing the scientific and teaching manpower through scholarships and grants-in-aid. It undoubtedly will be made law in some form in 1948. Conflict relative to the NSF revolved around the following issues:

(1) *Administration of the Foundation.* Truman desired to have the organization run by a director appointed by himself; but the scientists, influenced by their feeling for "freedom of science" and also the interests of private industry, wished to have the funds controlled by a group of scientists selected by the scientific organizations of the United States. The Republican Congress, wishing to harass Truman and favoring industry control, passed the draft favored by the scientists themselves.

(2) *Patents.* This is a struggle over patent rights obtained by public funds. The industrialists desire not only the funds for research but also the full right to exploit its fruits. The NSF as passed by Congress favored the continuation of the present patent setup which favors the large industrialists.

(3) *Social Science.* Both Congress and Truman were in agreement that the spending of money on the social sciences is not necessary. As one senator expressed it, "a pretty good definition" of social science is a "group of individuals telling another group how they should live." Obviously, the bourgeoisie feels it does not need the help of social science to teach it how to rule the masses.

How the Science Budget Is Spent

Broadly speaking, however, the government does not have to wait for congressional action to mobilize for its ten-year scientific program. It can coordinate science well enough through existing government agencies. Within the existing official research bodies in the army and navy, Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Commerce, etc., applied military research in industry and basic research in the universities can be directed and controlled by the simple means of guiding the flow of funds in the desired direction. To guide this research within government agencies, Truman in December 1947 established the Interdepartment Committee for Scientific Research and Development, and appointed Steelman as his liaison agent for the committee, the scientists and their learned societies.

That scientific activity is directed towards the needs of the ruling class at any particular period of its development has never been more evident than today. The means of this control is no more obscure than the flow of money or funds for research. The analysis of research expenditures—past, present and future—will illuminate the direction of science in the United States.

The foundations of science are built with basic or fundamental research which in the United States has been the product of the colleges, universities, and privately endowed research institutions. Now, however, industry and private philanthropy are both unable and unwilling to support this basic research which does not lead to immediate practical results or profits. Rather, industry during the past twenty-five years has been pouring funds into its own

applied research and development program from which profits are more assured.

During the period 1930-40 industrial research funds increased from 116 million dollars yearly to 240 million, and scientific research in government (mostly military or semi-applied) from 24 to 69 million dollars yearly. At the same time research in the colleges increased only from 20 to 31 million, and privately endowed research institutes declined from slightly over 5 million to 4½ million dollars yearly.

It is evident that if the colleges and universities are to meet the rapidly increasing demand of industry and government for new scientific knowledge they must be financed by public funds. To carry out the research, large numbers of talented scientists are needed. It is estimated, however, that by 1955 the accumulated effect of the wartime drain on the training of scientists will result in a deficit of 150,000 B.S.'s and 17,000 Ph.D.'s. This deficit, concludes Bush, can only be made up by mass education in the sciences through federal-sponsored scholarships. The possibility of mass unemployment of technicians during an industrial depression is not considered by Dr. Bush, but should not be overlooked by the working-class movement.

During World War II the overwhelming expenditure for research in the United States was governmental. Of the total average yearly expense of 600 million dollars during 1941-45, 500 million or 83 per cent was expended by the federal government, 13 per cent by industry, while colleges and other organizations accounted for only 4 per cent, practically all for military purposes. All this is exclusive of atomic-energy research, for which two billion dollars was spent in all forms of activity to bring the atomic bombs to the people of Japan. Until the support of military research during the war the American bourgeoisie had no unified or comprehensive policy on scientific research or on the support of science. With the need of bolstering capitalism and its war aims, the big bourgeoisie can no longer leave scientific development to chance. Also, the need for the expenditure of large sums requires the utmost control and planning by a budget-harassed government.

Capitalist Science in Dilemma

From the bourgeois viewpoint a well-balanced research program would be one which would economically provide for expanding military research and development, an expansive industrial program, and yet support basic research in the universities. The difficulty of obtaining such a balanced program is apparent from an analysis of the 1.1 billion dollars expended for research in the United States in 1947. Of this, 500 million was spent by the War and Navy Departments, overwhelmingly on military development. Another 450 million was spent by industry, almost all on applied research and development. As a whole, then, of the total 1947 "peacetime" research budget, more than 40 per cent was devoted to military purposes; of this over 90 per cent to development and less than 10 per cent to basic science. From the long-range point of view, this is considered even by the bourgeoisie an unhealthy ratio. The di-

lemma of capitalist science in the United States, to quote Steelman, is:

(1) Our national research program is unbalanced in the direction of military research and of applied or developmental research.

(2) It is undesirable and impracticable, at least in the immediate future, to reduce our national expenditures for either military or industrial research. It is entirely possible, in fact, that the military sector will have to be increased.

(3) The balance cannot be redressed immediately by the expansion of our basic-research program or of non-military research and development because the supply of trained manpower is not adequate for the expansion of the magnitude required.

And, continues Steelman, "we cannot substantially increase the expenditures of any sector of the research triangle in the next year or two without reducing the output of the other sectors. This is the inescapable logic of the current manpower situation." To resolve the difficulties of the "inescapable triangle" is the purpose of the ten-year science program, to be complete in 1957. This program calls for a total yearly budget by 1957 of well over two billion dollars, to be composed of 20 per cent basic research, 14 per cent health and medical research, 44 per cent non-military development, and 22 per cent for the military.

To a Marxist, such a science budget in America today can be nothing but a capitalist mirage. With a society whose increasing concern has been only preparing for or fighting a war, research funds will be overwhelmingly military, from the 40 per cent of 1947 to the "practically all" of World War II or III.

The exact mechanism by which the federal agencies direct science within industry and the colleges is plain from the manner in which they spent their 625 million dollars in 1947. Less than a third was actually spent within federal laboratories, the remainder being given to industry and colleges under the contract system. This is particularly true of the War and Navy Departments' funds, which were 80 per cent of the 625 million, and of which four-fifths was paid out to college or industry-conducted research.

Science's Class Basis

The army and navy penetration of American research continues apace. Thus in 1948, 75 per cent of the air force fund of 149 million dollars for research will be for commercial companies with main emphasis on heavy bombers and guided missiles, radar, aircraft armament, and supersonic flight. At the same time, however, research in the government laboratories is not neglected. In such ordnance centers as Aberdeen, Frankford, Picatiny, as well as the White Sands Proving Grounds, research on tanks, artillery, ammunitions, proximity fuses, rockets and guided missiles is hastened. Interesting also are the potentialities of toxicological warfare, incendiary materials and flame agents. "Civilization" can look forward to startling developments in these fields. The distribution of navy research funds in 1947 clearly shows the trend. Practically all was spent on

ships, aeronautics, ordnance yards, and docks, with less than one per cent applied to medicine and surgery.

Though controlled by "non-military," the Atomic Energy Commission's research overshadows all others. Its activity has pervaded all parts of American science. Government agencies, industrial concerns, universities and other research organizations have been brought into the program under contracts and agreements. Thus, the Argonne National Laboratory with research centers in the Chicago area is operated by the University of Chicago with the participation of twenty-nine midwestern universities and research institutions. The Oak Ridge Clinton Laboratories are operated under contract by Carbide and Carbon Chemical Co., while the Hanford Works (Oregon) run during the war by DuPont, is now operated by General Electric. In the East, on Long Island, the Brookhaven National Laboratories are administered by nine northeastern universities.

In contrast to the above large military expenditures for research is the meager sum spent for the health and safety of the masses of the people. The whole Bureau of Mines research budget for 1947 was only 12 million dollars, of which that devoted to safety in the mines was only about \$700,000.

Thus, not only materially does the American bourgeoisie mobilize science but also ideologically. By witch hunts, loyalty tests and other means, the scientists are to be "cleansed" and brought into line. The Condon case, which will be followed by others, clearly illustrates the efforts to incorporate "thought control" in American science. Accordingly, it should be increasingly apparent to clear-thinking scientists that, although scientific methodology and knowledge may be "classless," the control and utilization of science today is on a class basis.

And since science, above all else, is a means of production, its ownership by a ruling class which is decadent and reactionary can only result in the negation of the very spirit of science itself. The material effects of the reactionary control of science are even more evident in the possible impending destruction of our civilization. The implications to all sincere scientists as well as the revolutionary working-class movement should be obvious.

WALTER GREY

Off the press!

\$3.00

**1947 Bound Volume of
LABOR ACTION**

WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

On the Czechoslovakian Coup

Theses on the Nature of the Stalinist Revolution

The following is an interpretation of the Czechoslovakian coup of the Stalinists, submitted in resolution form by the three undersigned comrades, which should be read in conjunction with the discussion material on the same subject published last month. The point of view of the Editors was expressed under "Notes of the Month" in that issue (The Czech Coup As Test of Theory). Aspects of the question not covered in that editorial are the particular themes of the present discussion. In addition to longer contributions, which as usual will be published depending on space availability and quality, short letters of comment are also invited for our correspondence columns. The Workers Party Bulletin, which is a discussion organ on sale to the public, is also open to longer articles not used in the NI.—ED.

(1) The events in Czechoslovakia are of great importance for the additional light they throw on the role of Stalinism as a social revolutionary (or, in another sense, counter-revolutionary) force in destroying capitalism and instituting bureaucratic collectivism. The evidence presented by the Czech events strengthens the view that under favorable international conditions, the Stalinists are capable of overthrowing a capitalist state (as Italy or France) and establishing their party dictatorship by means of an insurrection that bases itself upon the proletarian masses, in the same manner as fascism based itself upon the petty-bourgeois masses.

(2) Czechoslovakia was the arena of struggle between three social forces in the period since its liberation: the *bourgeoisie*, striving to maintain capitalism; the *proletariat*, striving to achieve socialism; and the Stalinist *bureaucracy*, striving to achieve bureaucratic collectivism. As in every decisive struggle for class domination, the central objective of each social force was the control of the means of production. For the bourgeoisie this meant private ownership. For the Stalinists this meant nationalization with bureaucratic control. For the proletariat, this meant nationalization with democratic control by the workers. The Stalinists' struggle for nationalization clashed directly and immediately with the bourgeoisie. The proletariat supported the Stalinists in this struggle, accepting the Communist Party as a workers' party and seeing in its nationalization measures the beginnings of socialism. Clashes between the new bureaucratic-collectivist managers of the economy and the organs of workers' democracy, like the Works Councils, were confined to isolated enterprises and, in the absence of an anti-Stalinist revolutionary movement, remained subordinated to the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

(3) In the February events in Czechoslovakia the state power was not overthrown and replaced by a new one since the essentials of state power were already in the hands of the Stalinists. The February action represented the final step on the Stalinist road to total state power by

means of eliminating the opposition parties and establishing the dictatorship of the Communist Party. In its purely political aspects it is similar to the coup of Hitler in 1933, carried out with the support of Hindenburg and the Reichswehr generals and supported by the petty-bourgeois masses, or the coup of Louis Bonaparte on the 18th of Brumaire basing itself upon the army and state bureaucracy and supported by the peasantry. In its *social* aspects the Stalinist coup is, of course, decisively different. Unlike the coups carried out by Bonapartist and fascist regimes, which left the social basis of the old regime intact, the Stalinist coup served as the last stage in the destruction of the social power of the old ruling class.

(4) The real Stalinist revolution took place during the liberation of Czechoslovakia by the advancing Russian army and the uprising of the resistance in Prague. These events placed the Stalinists in control of the police and the army—the essence of state power.

Stalinists and the Masses

(5) The ability of the Stalinists to dominate the state apparatus after the Russian armies were withdrawn was made possible by their considerable mass base, predominantly composed of the industrial proletariat.

(6) The Stalinist coup, carried out by police measures, became an easy unopposed victory due to its support by the bulk of the proletariat and large sections of the poor peasantry. The Stalinists brought the pressure of these masses to bear through techniques traditionally associated with the proletarian struggle for power—street demonstrations, work stoppages, workers' militia, and extra-legal seizure of key points by the Action Committees.

(7) The fact that the masses participated in the events in a restrained, orderly and disciplined manner was the result, not of their disinterest or apathy but of the absence of serious opposition. The minority of the workers who were apathetic or even hostile could play no role in the absence of an organized means of showing their feelings. In the absence of an anti-Stalinist, revolutionary socialist party, the Stalinists experienced little difficulty in controlling the working class. To see a "fear of the masses" on the part of the Stalinists in the Czech events is to conceive of the revolutionary action of the proletariat in terms of spontaneity and to discard our traditional view on the role of the party. Especially is this true where the Stalinists lead the masses in a struggle against the bourgeoisie.

(8) A majority of the industrial workers of Czechoslovakia have followed the Communist Party almost continuously since 1920. The only other party they have known is the Social-Democracy, which has stood at the extreme right wing of European reformism since the First World War, and has often participated in coalition governments with

the usual disappointment of its working-class followers. Out of a population of 14 million, more than a million Czechs and Slovaks (overwhelmingly the former) belonged to the Communist Party before the coup. This is a higher percentage of the population than composes the membership of the Russian CP. In the 1946 elections to the National Constituent Assembly the CP polled some 2,702,452 votes and won 38 per cent of the seats in the Assembly, while the Social-Democracy won 13 per cent of the seats. The trade-union movement was almost totally under CP leadership, as were the factory committees.

Why Workers Supported CP

(9) Because of the tremendous lowering of socialist consciousness and understanding, which is a principal feature of our epoch; the Czech workers accept the Communist Party as a revolutionary and socialist movement. In the absence of a genuine Marxist party, the CP appears to the workers in this light mainly as a result of its anti-capitalist role: (a) The CP has waged a policy of destruction of capitalism and the political power of the bourgeoisie; (b) the CP policy of nationalization has given the workers a feeling of liberation from capitalist exploitation and, despite bureaucratic domination, a voice in economic control; (c) the CP has waged a struggle against all the old symbols of reactionary power—the Church, the landowners, the big banks, the newspaper syndicates, etc.; (d) the CP has taken the progressive and popular side in many secondary matters like education, cultural organizations, etc.; (e) the CP represents Russia, which, despite misgivings the workers may have (offset by references to Russia's backwardness), appears to them as a progressive, pro-working-class, socialist force, while the enemies of the CP represent Anglo-American imperialism, long considered centers of world reaction by the socialist workers of Europe; (f) In the top leadership of the CP stand old labor veterans, like Zapotocky, who have appeared before the masses over several decades as leaders of workers' struggles. As a consequence the bulk of the class-conscious workers see the program of the CP as a program of socialism. In addition to these reasons, many workers, and a large petty-bourgeois and peasant following, have been attracted to the CP as a result of its national chauvinism, expressed through Pan-Slavism, above all, since the expulsion of the German and Hungarian minorities gave the Stalinists billions of dollars worth of land and houses to distribute and many bureaucratic posts to dispense. The susceptibility of the Czech workers to racist propaganda is one of the terrible aftermaths of Munich and the Nazi occupation.

(10) The presence of the bulk of the proletariat in the Stalinist camp cannot afford a basis for our support to it, as both the Cannonite and Johnsonite brand of self-styled orthodox Trotskyists contend. The support of the Stalinist struggle for power cannot be put on the plane of "making a mistake along with the masses," in the sense of the July Days of the Russian Revolution. Support of the Stalinists in such circumstances is to help the workers to commit mass suicide and to destroy all possibility of a free labor

movement, the best soil for the re-education of the workers in revolutionary Marxism.

With the Anti-Stalinist Camp

(11) The Stalinist coup was aimed at achieving a totalitarian state and all opposition to it, short of that by avowed fascists, was progressive. The correct course of the Marxists in the Czech events therefore, was to support any democratic opposition to the Stalinists, especially such as the demonstration of the Prague students.

(12) In countries where the big bourgeoisie has been expropriated, as was the case in Czechoslovakia, there is a very favorable possibility of organizing a mass, popular, anti-Stalinist movement upon a democratic basis, and with less chances of its domination by bourgeois reaction. Marxists must not withdraw from such an anti-Stalinist camp merely because reactionary elements attach themselves to it. Wherever Stalinism becomes the immediate danger, as in Czechoslovakia, even the most conservative bourgeois democrats must be supported against it.

(13) It is false to describe such a popular, anti-Stalinist opposition as a "bourgeois restorationist movement." The petty-bourgeois and peasant masses, plus the anti-Stalinist minority of the proletariat, will not struggle against the Stalinists in order to restore the Skoda and Bata families to their industrial properties. These elements of the population want freedom from police rule and from Stalinist domination of every aspect of their lives.

(14) The struggle between the Stalinists and the bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia never reached the stage of mass struggles only because the domination of the Stalinists was so complete that the bourgeoisie considered it an irresponsible adventure to oppose them. Had the relation of forces been less one-sided and had a mass struggle broken out, there is no reason whatsoever to believe that the Stalinists would not have utilized measures associated with revolutionary proletarian warfare to achieve their victory. The complete domination of the mass movement by the Stalinists under conditions of military conflict does not become less but greater, as a consequence of military rule on both sides.

(15) The further the country in which the Stalinists struggle for power is removed from the pressure of the Russian military power, the more must the Stalinists rely upon the forces of the proletariat to achieve the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Stalinist policy is therefore carefully attuned to keeping its proletarian mass base in countries like Czechoslovakia (and many more times so in countries like France and Italy) until the Stalinist dictatorship is firmly established. Stalinism, however, does not appear openly as a separate force, apart from the working class, as long as the bourgeoisie remains the main obstacle to Stalinist power. Though there was considerable friction between the aims of the Stalinists and the desires of the workers in Czechoslovakia, due to the dominant role of the CP in the government and the economy, this friction was overshadowed by and subordinated to the dominant struggle between the Stalinists and the bourgeoisie. This

experience once more underscores the fact that wherever Stalinism is a mass movement that is waging a struggle against capitalism, the proletariat, as such, is incapable of playing an independent role, except where there is a sizable anti-Stalinist, revolutionary socialist party to give the workers a program. In the absence of the latter, opposition to the Stalinists from the workers' ranks can only be incidental, local and isolated, and easily eliminated by the Stalinists through control of the trade-union apparatus, levers of information (press and radio) and, in the last analysis, armed detachments.

(16) Marxists must frankly recognize the terrible consequences of supporting a camp which opposes itself to a Stalinist-led proletariat, especially where the struggle reaches the stage of a civil war. This cannot be minimized by saying that we have often opposed movements that had the support of the bulk of the workers. The crucial difference is that in the past all of these movements (Ropsevelt, People's Front, etc.) were of a reformist character or of a social patriotic character and sought to preserve capitalism rather than destroy it. Under conditions of a Stalinist struggle for power, the proletariat in the Stalinist camp does wage an anti-capitalist struggle, but as part of a deadly anti-socialist and anti-democratic movement. To oppose ourselves to such a Stalinist-led proletariat by supporting a camp that contains bourgeois elements and yet seek to break the workers away from the Stalinist illusions requires that we work out tactical problems such as we have not confronted in the past.

Role of Marxist Party

(17) The role of a tiny revolutionary Marxist propaganda group in conditions like those of the February events becomes extremely difficult. Its policy must, however, be guided by these two main lines: (1) support to all anti-capitalist *economic* measures, with constant emphasis upon workers' democratic controls in economy, and (2) support to all pro-democratic political measures, without regard to their past bourgeois-democratic associations, like freedom of the press, assembly, organization and speech for all classes and for all parties, except avowed fascists.

(18) The socialist ideal toward which we strive was placed upon a scientific basis by Marx, especially through linking its achievement to the struggle of the proletariat against wage slavery. The proletariat remains for us the only class which can overturn the rule of the bourgeoisie. The fact that under given historical circumstances the proletariat has in some countries fallen victim to illusions about the nature of the Stalinist parties and that a Stalinist-led proletariat can overturn capitalist rule to institute not socialism, or even a step toward it, but totalitarian bureaucratic collectivism, does not afford a basis for rejecting the proletariat as the bearer of the socialist struggle. However, where the proletariat does enter the Stalinist camp, our prime loyalty is not to the class *as it is* but to our socialist aims and to the kind of proletarian movement that must be created if our aims are to be realized. Given the terrible consequences of social retrogression, in

both its capitalist and Stalinist forms, the Marxists in the countries under the Stalinist heel and in the countries torn by a civil war between the Stalinists and the semi-fascist bourgeoisie as in Greece and China, must be prepared to devote themselves to preserving the program and lessons of the socialist struggle and teaching it to necessarily small circles, especially the youth, to again re-establish the revolutionary cadres. However, even though a small group, the Marxists will enter every struggle that promises to defend or enlarge those freedoms necessary for the rebirth of a free labor movement and a new mass revolutionary party.

(19) The fate of the proletariat, and of the people as a whole, in the countries that have fallen victim to Stalinist rule cannot but penetrate to increasing numbers of workers and intellectuals in the rest of the world, especially to those in closest proximity to the Iron Curtain. This knowledge will contribute greatly to clarifying the terrible illusions that still persist among the masses as to the nature of Russia and the Stalinist parties. Such a growing clarity on Stalinism will greatly facilitate a counter-offensive against the influence of the Stalinists among the masses in countries like Italy and France. Such a counter-offensive can be successful only if (a) Western Europe experiences a period of economic revival which eases the most pressing problems of the masses; and (b) a socialist regroupment takes place which produces strong anti-Stalinist, anti-reformist parties.

(20) The extent to which Stalinism can make further inroads upon the masses of Western Europe depends in an increasingly decisive manner upon the future development of the American working class. The emergence of an independent labor party with a firm anti-Stalinist and anti-capitalist orientation would have a resounding effect upon the masses of Europe, including those behind the Iron Curtain. The developments in the American labor movement in the next years will be crucial for the future of European labor and, consequently, of Europe itself.

ERNEST ERBER
EMANUEL GARRETT
HENRY JUDD

MARXISM FOR TODAY

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM	Cloth	\$2.00
by Max Shachtman	Paper	1.00
THE NEW COURSE	Cloth	2.00
by Leon Trotsky	Paper	1.50
(Including THE STRUGGLE FOR THE NEW COURSE, by Max Shachtman)		
PLENTY FOR ALL25
by Ernest Erber		
MARXISM IN THE UNITED STATES35
by Leon Trotsky		
SOCIALISM: HOPE OF HUMANITY10
by Max Shachtman		

Order from

WORKERS PARTY PUBLICATIONS

4 Court Square

Long Island City 1, N. Y.

Ukrainian Problem--Past and Present

From Czarism to Stalinism

"In the next period the Ukrainian problem is destined to play a very important part in the life of Europe."
Leon Trotsky.

The punitive expeditions of the Stalinist Warsaw government against the Ukrainian "bands" call the attention of the whole world to the forgotten Ukrainian problem.

The Ukrainian resistance is struggling not only in the southern provinces of Poland but in the territory east of the Curzon line as well, in the Carpatho-Ukraines, in Slovakia, and in the Moravian part of Czechoslovakia. Thousands of Ukrainians have passed through the cordon of the American occupation in order to be interned in the displaced-persons camps; hundreds of thousands of Soviet and Polish Ukrainians refuse to return to live under Stalin's rule. In these camps, as in the Ukrainian colonies in America, there is an intense political life, a desperate struggle against the Stalinist invader and oppressor.

BIRTH OF A NATION

The Slavs of Northern Europe are divided into two principal branches: the western, to which belong the Poles, Czechs, Slovaks and the Slav peoples annihilated by the Germans (Serbians, Wends, Pomeranians, Letts, etc.); and the eastern branch, to which belong the Great Russians, the White Russians, and the Ukrainians, although the latter two peoples occupy an intermediate position.

The two branches enter the theater of history almost simultaneously, on the one hand the Czechs and Poles and on the other hand the Russians of Kiev. The Greco-Roman culture and its heir, Christianity, penetrated the Slav plains of Europe with two simultaneous currents: from Rome to Bohemia and Poland, and from Byzantium to the Russia of Kiev. The Poles and Czechs received Catholicism and submitted to Latin-Western culture, while the Russians accepted the Orthodox religion of Byzantium with a different alphabet, Eastern traditions, and hostility towards the "Latinists."

Up from the Black Sea on the road of the Dnieper came Byzantine commerce, and with it the missionaries of the Orthodox faith, to the old Russia of Kiev. In the tenth century, Vladimir the Great built a powerful state on the basis of the new Christian civilization. His success-

The situation of the Ukrainian people is even more tragic than that of the Polish people, since the Ukrainian workers' movement was completely crushed by Stalin. The weak and backward Ukrainian petty bourgeoisie, caught between the Russian fire and the sword of the Polish bourgeoisie, yielded despairingly to Hitlerism, gambling with the fate of the popular masses. The cause of Ukrainian national and social liberation finds itself isolated and unheard in the camp of the international working class. The bourgeoisie draws the Ukrainian question from the archives only insofar as it is moved by imperialist aims.

Inert and stunned by Stalinist propaganda, the proletariat has abandoned its class brothers, the Ukrainian workers, to their own fate. It is therefore the duty of Marxism and the working class to raise the Ukrainian question and thrust it onto the broad field of the international struggle of the proletariat. In order to deal with this important problem, we must begin with its historic antecedents.

ors divided the empire, but fell weakly under the Mongolian invasion which destroyed the Russian culture of Kiev. Only on the western borders, on the Polish frontiers, did the free Ruthenian states of Galicia and Lodomeria maintain themselves.

These countries formed one unit called Red Ruthenia, as the lands to the north were traditionally called White Russia and the intermediate part Black Ruthenia. Red Ruthenia fell under Poland's influence; its princes intermarried with the dynasties of Poland, forming alliances with them against the Mongolian invasions. The Russias, White and Black, fell under the influence and political domination of the Lithuanian state. The old Russia of Kiev fell apart completely under the blows of the Mongolian invaders.

Later, in the thirteenth century, a new Russia in the vicinity of Moscow and Suzdal took shape under decisive Mongolian influence, with a well-centralized state power and an absolutist ruling prince. With the decline of the Mongols, Muscovite Russia freed itself under the leadership of Dymitr Donski, who defeated the Tatars. The founder and builder of the Muscovite czarist empire was Ivan the Terrible, who proclaimed himself the successor of the emperors of

Constantinople and czar of "all the Russias" and declared Moscow "the third Rome." The Grand Duchy of Lithuania took advantage of the disintegration of the old Russia of Kiev and the domination of Muscovite Russia by the Tatars to subject White and Black Russia and parts of Red Ruthenia to its own sovereignty. Lithuanian influence extended to the very walls of Moscow, including Minsk, Polock, Novgorod, Wielikie Luke in the North and Kiev and the lower Dnieper in the South.

In 1386 the Grand Duchy of Lithuania united with Poland and received Christianity from Polish hands. All this enormous territory fell under the political, economic and social influence of Poland. The Polish-Lithuanian union signified an economic and social revolution in the Rutheno-Lithuanian territories.

Poland had already emerged from the period of feudal divisions and had entered the period of pre-capitalist development. Its cities were organized on the basis of the Magdeburg law which created independent "burgs" within the feudal world. Under the influence of German colonization, its agriculture introduced the rotation system of cultivation, the so-called "three-field system," which revolutionized agriculture in comparison with the previous system of cultivating one field and then letting it lie fallow for seven years.

From the viewpoint of religion, language and nationality, its culture was already well defined. The "king of the peasants," Casimir, brought Italian teachers and architects to his country, beginning the epoch of its renaissance. Its writers began to use the Polish language instead of Latin as had been the custom till then. The political and social structure changed radically in the fourteenth century; instead of divisions into "states" and feudal principalities, a centralized state, with a parliament of the nobility and the character of a constitutional monarchy was formed. All these advances spread to the Rutheno-Lithuanian territories, where cities were built on the basis of the Magdeburg law. The new agriculture was introduced. The newly granted rights of the bourgeoisie and artisans were guaranteed and safeguarded.

In the course of time, the Grand Duke of Lithuania, absolute master of his subjects in the Muscovite or Tatar style, lost his prerogatives, evolving in the direction of a constitutional monarch, since in Poland he had to submit to the will of the Diet (the parliament). The Ru-

tho - Lithuanian nobility, previously subject to the will of the sovereign, now emancipated itself in the Polish style. The Polish families accepted the Lithuanians and Ruthenians as "the free among the free and equals among equals." The new structure stood firm and the personal union between the three peoples was converted into a real union, a federated Polish-Lithuanian state being formed in 1569. The Ruthenian and Lithuanian nobility was completely assimilated, accepting the Polish language, customs, institutions, and, in its majority, the Catholic religion.

With the passing of time, the economic and social structure, progressive and revolutionary at the end of the fourteenth century, became reactionary by the beginning of the seventeenth century. The feudal democracy of the nobility degenerated into anarchy and the arbitrary sway of the feudal magnates who oppressed the bourgeoisie and the peasants. Having conquered a privileged position, the Catholic religion began to oppress the Orthodox faith and the Protestants, who were few in number. The consolidation of this regime of the nobility was accomplished at the expense of the peasants who had been relatively free but were now degraded to the position of serfs. The political and social reforms foreshadowed by those writers under the influence of the Western German and Czech reformation were replaced by the Catholic reaction under the domination of the Jesuits.

"Ukraine" Comes Into Being

All these changes found unmistakable crystallization in the Ruthenian territories, where the peasant, accustomed to his ancient liberty, defended himself against the abuses of the nobility. Besides, the Ruthenian peasantry in its majority persisted in the Orthodox faith, while the Polonized nobility had accepted Catholicism. Apart from the old provinces of Red Ruthenia, Galicia, Lodomeria and Podolia, the Russian territories of Kiev Russia and the lower Dnieper also belonged to Poland, which in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries began to be called the "Ukraine," a name derived from the Polish word *okraina*, meaning frontier territory and here indicating the last confines of Poland. With the passing of time, this name came to be applied to one province only, and was later applied by the awakeners of the Ruthenian people to their whole nation.

The Grand Duke of Lithuania, previously master of all untilled lands in accordance with Eastern law, now gave them to the nobles, who colonized these tracts by subjecting the hitherto free Ruthenian peasantry to serf labor. The peasants fled en masse to the valley of the lower Dnieper which is called Zapo-

rog, where there were neither kings nor nobles.

These fugitives from Russia, Turkey, Ruthenia, Lithuania, Poland proper, Hungary, and the Balkans in time formed a free army called "the Cossacks" (a Mongolian word), who lived by war and plunder. Among themselves they maintained a kind of comradeship of war, a primitive democracy, based on the equality of warriors and the free elections of their chiefs, called "Het-

THE COSSACK WARS

Under the growing feudal oppression the desperate peasantry took to arms against the Ruthenian-Lithuanian nobility. The peasant rebellion took on the ideological and religious character so typical of this epoch: they rose up with the slogan of "Defend the true and holy Orthodox faith" against the heresy of the "Latinists." They destroyed the Catholic churches and convents, the Polish (more accurately, Polonized) cities and castles, and at times reached the borders of Poland proper and even the walls of Warsaw.

Socially, the wars were based on the alliance of the Cossack army with the peasant masses and the lower Orthodox clergy, who played the part of the "ideologues" of these peasant wars. In the seventeenth century, a Polish-Ruthenian noble, Bohdan Chmielnicki, organized the great "Ukrainian" rebellion and penetrated the heart of Poland. The whole Ukraine, Red Ruthenia and Zaporog lit up with the flames of the rebellion. There almost existed a state governed by Chmielnicki and the Cossacks.

But when the nobility were expelled and their power destroyed, the Cossacks and Chmielnicki installed a government of the privileged Cossack caste over the peasants. This was the beginning of the end. With the breaking of the Cossack-peasant alliance, the revolution lost its motor force, its main impulse, and was destroyed by the Polish-Ruthenian army in the battle of Beresteczko in 1651.

Chmielnicki was neither a peasant chieftain nor a revolutionary but a nobleman, a corrupted military leader who followed his own interests and those of his caste. Betraying the peasants, he was defeated by Poland and was forced to seek the protection of the Tatars and the Russian czar. In the end, he had to surrender all of the Eastern Ukraine (from the right shore of the Dnieper) to the czar, accepting his sovereignty. This signified the end of the "Golden Liberty" enjoyed by the Cossack army and the rebellious peasantry. The czar was an "absolute sovereign" who oppressed his subjects more than did the slack, weak Poland of the nobility. In time, the Cossack army ceased to exist and was con-

verted into a czarist army, the supporter and defender of Russian reaction. *Czarist and Stalinist historians try to present the Cossack wars as Ukrainian national wars against Poland. In reality it is a question of a phenomenon similar to the religious and peasant wars in Germany, France and Bohemia—a social war.* The one difference is that the Ruthenian peasants, driven to desperation by the Catholic reaction in Poland, rose up not under the Protestant banner but under the banner of the Orthodox faith. The peasants fought, not in the name of the Ukrainian national program, but in the name of the Orthodox faith; not against the Polish nation but against the Polonized Ruthenian nobility. It is false to impart a national character to the social wars of the eighteenth century, wars which had the typical character of civil war, peasant class wars.

The Cossack wars were defeated through lack of support by the Polish and Ruthenian bourgeoisie and because of the betrayal by the Cossacks of the Ruthenian peasants. Chmielnicki cannot be considered as a national hero of the Ukraine, but as a traitor of the Ruthenian peasants who at that time represented the future Ukrainian nation, since the entire Ruthenian nobility considered itself Polish. Chmielnicki sold the Ukrainian peasantry and the Cossack army of Zaporog to the Russian czar, burying the Ukrainian cause from then until the nineteenth century, until the new national awakening of the Ukraine took place.

Although the peasant rebellions were crushed in blood, the social antagonism between the Polonized nobility—who professed the Catholic faith and spoke Polish—and the oppressed peasantry—who remembered the Cossack wars, spoke the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) language, and professed the Orthodox faith—lived on.

Catherine II knew how to take advantage of this fact, proclaiming the program of unity of "all the Russias," which meant the partition of Poland. When the Polish and Ruthenian nobility rose against her in defense of Polish independence, the czarina, with the aid of her armies, organized peasant uprisings,

calling herself the "defender of religious freedom and the holy Orthodox faith."

"Religious toleration—that was the word wanted to put down Poland. Poland had always been extremely liberal in religious matters [the reference is to feudal Poland—AR]; witness the asylum the Jews found there while they were persecuted in all other parts of Europe. The greater portion of the people in the eastern provinces belonged to the Greek faith, while the Poles proper were Roman Catholic. A considerable portion of these Greek Catholics had been induced, during the sixteenth century, to acknowledge the supremacy of the pope and were called United Greeks, but a great many continued true to their old Greek religion in all respects. They were principally the serfs, their noble masters being almost all Roman Catholics; they were Little Russians by nationality. Now this Russian government which did not tolerate any other religion at home but the Greek and punished apostasy as a crime; which was conquering foreign nations and annexing foreign provinces right and left; and which was at that time engaged in riveting still firmer the fetters of the Russian serf—this same Russian government came soon upon Poland in the name of

religious toleration, because Poland was said to oppress the Greek Catholics; in the name of the principle of nationalities, because the inhabitants of these eastern provinces were Little Russians and ought therefore to be annexed to Great Russia; and in the name of the right of revolution arming the serfs against the masters." [Engels, *The Doctrine of Nationality Applied to Poland*, NEW INTERNATIONAL, July 1944, p. 214.]

This precise and excellent paragraph of Engels constitutes the first Marxist position with regard to the Ukrainian problem. Oppressed by the Polish nobility, the Ruthenian peasantry, the Ukrainian people, were small change for the Russian reaction, which used them in furthering its expansionist and oppressive aims. The Polish nobility had been slaughtered by the Russian armies and the Ruthenian peasants. But as soon as the Polish rebellion had been crushed, the same Russian soldiers forced the Ruthenian peasants to submit to the feudal yoke of the landlord. The partition of Poland and its annexation by Russia not only did not better the situation of the Ruthenian peasants, but delivered them to the double oppression of the Polish landlord and the Russian czarist police.

from the persecution of the Polish aristocracy as from the czarist autocracy. His principal work *Kobsar* prepared the national renaissance of the Ukraine and created the basis for modern Ukrainian literature and culture.

The new movement did not base itself on religious arguments about the struggle for the holy Orthodox faith, but rather on the national program of uniting all the territories and peoples of the Ukraine in a single national framework, without taking into account the religious differences. It was at that time that the terms "Ukraine" and "Ukrainians" were adopted to describe the new movement and underline the national unity of Red Ruthenia (Galicia and Volhynia) as well as of Podolia, Zaporog and the Ukraine proper.

The figure of Shevchenko headed a movement that was more cultural than political. Nevertheless the czarist police understood the political ramifications of his work and subjected the adherents of the movement to a persecution that often led to prison. The social and political content of this movement was bourgeois, of course, anticipating the future development of capitalism in the Ukraine.

The definitive theoretician of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie was Dontzow, who began as a socialist and ended as a nationalist. Dontzow proclaimed the program of the unity of all the Ukrainians and the creation of an independent Ukrainian state. With the growth of the workers' movement, the problem of Ukrainian independence and self-determination took on primary importance in the breast of Russian and Ukrainian social-democracy.

The Russian Cadets (Constitutional Democrats) and the reformists supported the program of "cultural self-determination," excluding political self-determination and the separation of the Ukraine from Russia. Lenin and the Bolsheviks fought for a self-determination which included the right of separation from Russia. Apropos of the conference of the Cadet Party in Kiev in 1914, Lenin wrote that the Cadet Koshkin opposed the recognition of the right of self-determination. "In effect, the Cadets have never thought of defending the right of the nations to separate from the Russian state," wrote *Proletarskaya Pravda*, commenting on the Cadets' program.

The Ukrainian Mensheviks Yurkevich and Semkovsky held a point of view similar to that of the Cadets, although using different arguments. Even the great Rosa Luxemburg considered the Ukrainian national question to be the artificial product of a handful of nationalist intellectuals. But historical development and the Russian Revolution proved that the Bolshevik program of national self-determination was correct.

THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL RENAISSANCE

The partition of Poland and the replacement of Polish domination by Russian czarist oppression bettered the condition of the Ruthenian peasant masses not at all. The once rebellious Cossacks now formed the legions of czarist reaction and were used to crush all opposition and every revolutionary movement against the czarist autocracy. The Polish revolutions did not win over the Ukrainian masses, just as they did not win over the Polish peasants against the czar.

In spite of the generous slogan, "For our and your liberty," the insurrectionary Polish democracy, linked to the nobility and the feudal economy of the country, was not capable of leading a peasant war against the czar and the Polish aristocracy, the only form the democratic revolution in Poland could

then have taken. The Austrian government could raise the peasants against the democratic revolution of Cracow in 1846; the czarist government could use the Ukrainian peasants to disarm and hand over the Polish revolutionary students, who wanted to stir up the peasantry, to the czarist police. The antagonism which divided the rebellious nobility from the peasantry paralyzed the democratic revolution in Poland, Lithuania and the Ukraine. The generous slogan, "For your and our liberty," had no social appeal, being limited exclusively to the privileged classes.

The national awakening of the Ukraine had to come from the very heart of the oppressed peasantry itself.

Shevchenko, national poet of the Ukraine, was born of humble, oppressed peasant parents, and suffered as much

COMING!

THE MYSTERIOUS "BRUNO R."

A review of the book, *The Bureaucratization of the World*, which was often referred to by Trotsky in the 1939-40 discussion on the Russian question, which is skruited to be an ancestor of Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution*, but which has remained completely unknown on this side of the Atlantic since it was first published in French in 1939.

FROM LENIN TO STALIN

The Russian Revolution of 1917 awakened the worker and peasant masses of the Ukraine.

The Ukrainian bourgeoisie created a Germanophile camp led by Skoropadsky, an agent of German imperialism, who formed a reactionary government, a puppet of the Germans. When Skoropadsky was unmasked before the masses, the petty-bourgeois radicals and the Mensheviks formed the "Central Council" in Kiev which collaborated with Kerensky and the Russian bourgeoisie. In Galicia the "Ukrainian People's Republic" was formed with the Ukrainian army, led by the Hetman Simon Petlura. Petlura proposed an alliance to Pilsudski, whose aim was the defeat of the Bolsheviks and the creation of a Ukraine separated from Russia and supported by Poland. The product of this alliance was the Polish campaign against the Bolsheviks in 1920 and the occupation of Kiev by the Poles. But the promises made by Petlura and Pilsudski to the Ukrainian people, to provoke them into an uprising against the Bolsheviks, were completely empty.

In the struggle against Denikin, the alliance between the Russian workers and the Ukrainian proletariat was forged. The Bolshevik Party and the Russian Soviet Republic recognized the independence of the Ukraine, a platform which caused all the Ukrainian people to rise up against Denikin. The Ukrainian Communists and "Borotbistas" (*Borotba* is Ukrainian for struggle) fought side by side with the Russian Bolsheviks, a fact which underlined the necessity for the absolute independence of the Ukraine.

"We, the Great Russian Communists, must stamp out with great severity, the least manifestation of Great Russian nationalism . . . since these manifestations constitute a betrayal of communism, harm us enormously, separating us from our Ukrainian comrades, and thereby benefit Denikin and his politics. For this reason, we, the Great Russian Communists, must accommodate our differences with the Ukrainian Bolshevik-Communists and Borotbistas when these differences refer to the state independence of the Ukraine, the forms of alliance with Russia, and in general, the national question." [Lenin, *Selected Works*, IV.]

However, continues Lenin, the Russian and Ukrainian Communists must be intransigent on the fundamental questions of the revolution which are common to all nations, such as the dictatorship of the proletariat, the inadmissibility of conciliation with the bourgeoisie, and the inadmissibility of the division of forces that struggle against Denikin. This program, whose real content was the dis-

tribution of the land among the Ukrainian peasants, the destruction of the feudal Polish aristocracy and Russian imperialism, defeated not only Denikin but Pilsudski as well in his alliance with Petlura, and gave the victory to the proletarian revolution in the Ukraine. The Ukrainian proletariat under the banner of Lenin conquered not only over czarism, over the Hetman Skoropadsky, but over the Ukrainian bourgeoisie too. The armies of Pilsudski were thrown back to the very walls of Warsaw. The Russian, Ukrainian, Polish and international counter-revolution was defeated by the alliance of the workers and peasants.

For the first time in history a free Ukrainian national state, led by the proletariat, had been created.

The Counter-Revolution in the Ukraine

The Riga peace treaty between Lenin's Soviet Russia and Pilsudski's Poland was a compromise between the bourgeois democracy of Poland and the socialist revolution in Russia. The compromise divided the Ukrainian and White Russian territories into two unequal parts.

The new Russian-Polish frontier extended west of the second partitioning of Poland in 1793. About five million Ukrainians remained within Poland's borders. Before the Polish-Russian war Lenin had proposed a more favorable frontier for Poland which would have given the latter Minsk, capital of White Russia, Kamieniec and Mogilev, important centers of Polish population. The division of the Ukrainian and White Russian territories was an inadequate and unsatisfactory solution demonstrating the isolation of the Russian Revolution. Aside from the Polish Ukraine, Ukrainian territories were held by Rumania (Bessarabia and Bukovina) and Czechoslovakia (Carpatho-Ukraine).

The Soviet Ukraine had its own government headed by the old Ukrainian Bolsheviks, Lenin's collaborators. But the advent of Stalin to power opened the doors to Great Russian chauvinism and the national oppression of the Ukraine. "In the years of the Thermidorean reaction, the situation of the Soviet Ukraine, and with it the manner in which the question of the Ukraine was posed in its entirety, changed radically. . . . Nowhere did the purges, repressions, restrictions and in general all the forms of bureaucratic hooliganism acquire such a criminal character as in the Ukraine, in the struggle against the strong and well-rooted aspirations of the Ukrainian masses for greater liberty and independence," wrote Trotsky in his article on "The Ukrainian Problem" in 1939.

"The Soviet Ukraine," Trotsky con-

tinues, "was converted by the bureaucracy into an administrative part of the economic unit and a military base for the USSR. Certainly, the bureaucracy erects statues of Shevchenko but only in order to crush the Ukrainian people with greater force and compel them to sing the praises of the bandit clique in the Kremlin in the tongue of Kobsar." (Trotsky, *ibid.*)

As this analysis indicates, the offensive against the Ukrainian people began with Stalin's purge of Lenin's old collaborators in the Ukrainian Bolshevik Party, headed by Skrypnyk, who expressed the aspirations of the Ukrainian people for "greater liberty." The socialist Ukrainian intellectuals and writers underlined the independence of Ukrainian culture and the need that this culture had of a western orientation. In this the Stalinist bureaucracy discovered a mortal danger to its domination. Representing literature, the writer Chwylowyj was attacked and purged. The old Bolshevik, Skrypnyk, considered an accomplice and protector of the independent orientation of the Ukrainian writers, was excluded from the party and driven to commit suicide.

Having beheaded the Bolshevik Party of the Ukraine, led by Rakovsky, having defeated the Trotskyist opposition, Stalin proceeded to the offensive against the masses of the people. The famous collectivization of the Ukraine, the offensive of hunger against the peasants, according to general calculations, ended in five million deaths from hunger. The Ukraine was depopulated and millions of peasants carried off to Siberia. The bureaucracy wiped out all the social and national conquests of the Ukrainian people, converting it into the lackey and slave of Great Russian chauvinism.

The Reaction in Poland

The Polish Ukrainians formed a "People's Republic" which conducted an armed struggle against Poland. Petlura agreed to liquidate this movement in exchange for Pilsudski's support against the Bolsheviks. The Council of Ambassadors surrendered Galicia to Polish administration, with the condition that it enjoy political and cultural autonomy. The Riga treaty also gave Volhynia and Western Polesia to Poland. Although the promised autonomy was never granted to the Ukrainians by the Polish bourgeoisie, the Ukrainian bourgeoisie enjoyed greater liberty in Poland than in the Soviet Ukraine.

The Galician bourgeoisie was split into two tendencies: one was for collaboration with Poland, and the other was the intransigents. The first was represented by the UNDO (National-Democracy of the Ukraine) and the second by the OUN (Nationalists). The National-Democracy had its representatives in the

Warsaw parliament and championed the program of autonomy, with an autonomous government and a parliament of the Ukraine. The Nationalists, on the other hand, rejected all collaboration with Poland, agitating for a war without truce against Polish domination and the program of "an indivisible, independent and united Ukraine."

Aside from these two tendencies there existed a "Russophile" current which had formerly favored union with the Russians but now collaborated with the Poles. The peasants had their Radical Party; there also existed a Ukrainian Social-Democratic Party of Galicia led by Hankewicz.

The Communist Party of Eastern Galicia (KPGW) had a basically Polish character in its first period, which corresponded in a certain degree to the national character of the industrial proletariat of Galicia—the factory workers, railroad and transport workers and the workers in the oilfields. Aside from this, there persisted in the CP the traditions of Rosa Luxemburg which considered the Ukrainian question as something artificial, "the caprice of the intellectuals." Later, a party congress led by a Polish majority came out for the self-determination of the Ukrainians and created an autonomous party, the Communist Party of Western Ukraine (KPZU).

The turn was carried out in accordance with the interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the Polish worker elements being pushed out of the party and replaced by Ukrainian intellectuals and Ukrainian workers and peasants. The Polish language was replaced by the Ukrainian language in the party, Ukrainian nationalism and chauvinism being fomented by all possible means. The party sought to come closer to the Nationalists, agreeing to collaborate in the wave of individual terror, of setting fire to Polish farms, of all kinds of excesses, etc. The Polish bourgeoisie responded with repressions. The police and military detachments invaded the Ukrainian villages and countryside, engaging in collective punishment of the rebellious population. In the cities a wave of terror was unleashed against the Communist Party and against the Polish and Ukrainian workers.

Although the Polish "pacifications" gained an abominable fame and sowed much deadly hate for Poland among the Ukrainian people, they were innocent child's play compared to the Stalinist pacifications, purges, and collectivizations in the Soviet Ukraine. The policy of the Polish bourgeoisie tended toward the Polonization of the Ukrainians in accordance with the nationalist program of the National-Democrats. It was a

policy that was as absurd as it was unrestrained, since the Ukrainians constituted an element with a developed national consciousness, well organized from the economic as well as the social-political aspect, at times better organized than the Poles themselves.

In its last period, Stalinist policy inspired local uprisings that on the one hand exhausted the Ukrainian nationalist and workers' movements, and on the other hand provoked Polish reprisals and pacifications digging an abyss between the two peoples and opening the door for Russian imperialism and the future invasion of Poland. The Communist Party of Western Ukraine, which existed independently of the Polish Communist Party, passed into direct dependence on Russia, weakening its ties with the Polish CP. Corrupted to the very marrow, it degenerated into an organization of Ukrainian petty-bourgeois nationalism, a docile instrument in the hands of the Stalinist counter-revolution which could be used to annihilate the Ukrainian people and dig an abyss between the Polish proletariat and the Ukrainian people.

ANDRZEJ RUDZIENSKI

October 1947

(Translated by Abe Stein. To be concluded next month.)

Russia's Secret Documents on Munich

In March or April of this year the Russian government published its promised revenge for the State Department's collection of documents on the Nazi-Stalin Pact. As announced, it deals with the period of the Munich Pact, *Documents and Materials Relating to the Eve of the Second World War, Volume I, November 1937-1938*, (Mezh-dunarodnaya Kniga, Moscow, .50 cents), from the archives of the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs captured when the Russians entered Berlin. Consisting of forty-four documents, it is in the Russian language.

Eleven of these documents are now available in English in a supplement to the *New Times* (No. 16, April 14). Our remarks are based on this selection, which presumably provide the most important of the documents.

As expected, it is not an "answer" to the State Department's exposé of the Nazi-Stalin deal; it does not even deal with that period. Instead it documents the utter cynicism and brutality with which the British and French statesmen sold out Czechoslovakia to Hitler. One is merely supposed to conclude that Stalin's alliance with Hitler to carve up Poland and Eastern Europe was no worse than

Chamberlain's and Daladier's operations. (The role of the Roosevelt government in America is not touched upon in the eleven documents; after all, Roosevelt's lieutenant and "heir," Wallace, is at the moment running as Stalin's candidate for president. Will a subsequent volume, to be published after Wallace's usefulness is ended, remedy this omission?)

Four of the eleven documents are not from the secret archives, being thrown in to round out the picture (three public announcements of the Munich powers and a Czech statesman's already published account of his experience in the Munichites' anteroom); two are reports by Polish ambassadors to their home government; two are minutes of conversations with Hitler by Lord Halifax and Neville Henderson, full of diplomatic double-talk; and only three are internal documents of the German Foreign Office. It was the last-named type of paper which was most illuminating in the State Department collection; here it is used mainly to give a report on the conference itself.

There is no statement made by the Russians that the documents are printed complete and without omissions. It must be said that, unfortunately, no really

new light is thrown on the Munich deal. Our memory is refreshed and some vivid details added; that which was known is now more fully documented out of the mouths of the British and French sell-out leaders themselves.

Thus, in the negotiations leading up to Munich, November 19, 1937, Lord Halifax told Hitler (as summarized in the third person in the German minutes):

"The great services the Führer had rendered in the rebuilding of Germany were fully and completely recognized, and if British public opinion was sometimes taking a critical attitude toward certain German problems, the reason might be in part that people in England were not fully informed of the motives and circumstances which underlie certain German measures. . . . In spite of these difficulties he (Lord Halifax) and other members of the British government were fully aware that the Führer had not only achieved a great deal inside Germany herself, but that, by destroying Communism in his country, he had barred its road to Western Europe, and that Germany therefore could rightly be regarded as a bulwark of the West against Bolshevism. . . .

(Continued on last page)

The Year One of the Russian Revolution

III—The First Flames of the Civil War

This month's installment from Victor Serge's great historical work comes from the first half of Chapter 4, "The First Flames of Civil War and the Constituent Assembly." The second half, dealing with the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly, will appear next month. Ellipsis points (. . .) which appear within quotation marks are thus reproduced from Serge's text.—ED.

The General Headquarters—in Russian, the *Stavka*—of a country at war is a sort of military capital, no less important than the civil capital. After the proletarian insurrection, the *Stavka* became the last hope of the counter-revolution. It barely managed to hold out until November 18.

Fortunately for the counter-revolutionists, the General Staff was situated a goodly distance from both Petersburg and Moscow, in the little town of Mogilev in White Russia, a town of sixty thousand inhabitants where the proletariat and the Bolshevik Party were equally weak. An Army Committee elected at the beginning of the revolution in March 1917 and under the influence of the S-Rs was the highest "revolutionary" authority at the *Stavka*. It got along well enough with the General Staff, reproved Bolshevik leaders, affirmed the undying loyalty of the army to the country and the Allies, and announced the "firm determination of the soldiers to continue the war to its end."

On October 31 it officially announced its resolve to "reply to the Bolsheviks force for force." Its troops were to "march on Petrograd" to re-establish law and order.

"Not one unnecessary drop of blood will be spilled," the S-Rs announced. "If the reactionaries are reinforced, we shall turn all our forces against them."

On the same day, the commander in chief, General Dukhonin, summoned the Bolsheviks to submit unconditionally to the Provisional Government. This threat was nothing but words. The majority of the soldiers received the news of the second [Bolshevik] revolution with transports of joy. The S-R Army Committee suffered a sudden change of mind, and announced that it would be content with a socialist coalition government. It changed back again when the leaders of the S-R Party, Chernov and Gotz, arrived in Mogilev. The Ukrainian national parliament, the Rada, came out against the Bolsheviks. The counter-revolutionary socialists conceived the idea of an alliance with this parliament.

The Army Committee proposed the formation of a law-and-order government with V. M. Chernov as its president. The Allied representatives at the *Stavka* encouraged these efforts. While these negotiations, intrigues, and conspiracies were being formulated the soldiers and the masses acted. The armies of the North and the Northwest went over to the Bolsheviks. The crack battalions of St. George proved to be more than doubtful. Hostile to both their own generals and the S-Rs, they hindered the departure of the *Stavka* for the South. The soldiers began to arrest their officers more and more frequently.

On November 9 Lenin, Stalin, and Krylenko called Dukhonin on the telephone and ordered him to begin armistice negotiations with the Germans and Austrians immediately. Receiving only evasive answers, they terminated the conversation by dismissing Dukhonin from his post: "Second Lieutenant Krylenko is appointed commander in chief."

But how to disarm the General Staff? The People's Commissars did not yet dispose of any governmental apparatus. They were ignorant of the weakness of their adversary. Once more they put their faith in the masses. A radio message drawn up by Lenin called upon the troops to intervene:

"Soldiers, the cause of peace is in your hands. You will not let counter-revolutionary generals sabotage the great work of peace; you will place them under guard to protect them from the indignation of the revolutionary army, and to keep them from escaping the trial that awaits them. You will observe the strictest revolutionary and military discipline.

"The front-line regiments are to elect representatives immediately to enter into formal armistice negotiations with the enemy. The Council of People's Commissars authorizes you to act. Inform us of the progress of the negotiations. The Council of People's Commissars alone has the authority to sign the final armistice."

This text aroused a discussion in the All-Russian Soviet Executive during which Lenin explained his idea:

"We cannot overcome Dukhonin," he said, "except by relying on the initiative and sentiments of the mass organizations. Peace will not be made solely from the top. We must conclude it from the bottom. We haven't the slightest confidence in the German generals, but we have confidence in the German people. The struggle with the *Stavka* must be carried through without regard for the

formalities. . . . I am opposed to any half-way measures."

The *Stavka's* own troops turned against it. On November 18, the date set for the flight into the Ukraine, the General Staff was confronted by the soldiers. The émigré Stankevich, who was an eyewitness, wrote:

"The *Stavka* had barely commenced preparations for its departure when crowds of excited soldiers appeared, saying that they would not let the officers depart. . . . The *Stavka* had not one soldier left. Dukhonin was at the mercy of his own artillery."

The Allied officers, several generals and a few reactionary bands alone escaped. On the arrival of Krylenko with some Red sailors, General Dukhonin was arrested and shot in the Mogilev station.

Democracy Vs. Private Property

The resistance of the *Stavka* saw the first intervention of the Allies in the Russian Revolution. The leader of the French military mission, General Lavergne, and an American officer officially encouraged General Dukhonin's resistance. Trotsky pointed this out in a menacing note to the powers.

On every front, the revolution was similarly reduced to a conflict between the masses on one side and the command and its staff on the other. And the result of the conflict was the same almost everywhere.

Broken in the capital cities and broken at the *Stavka*, the resistance of the counter-revolution then concentrated in the South. The asylum of the vanquished combatants of Petersburg, Moscow, and Mogilev was the Ukraine, nationalist and hostile to everything reminiscent of the old Great Russian yoke. Others took refuge in the southeastern provinces and in the Don and Kuban Cossack territories.

As a rural petty bourgeoisie, with a strong military tradition and privileges even under the czarist regime, the Cossack population appeared to the counter-revolutionary generals as an ideal recruiting ground for counter-revolutionary armies. Autonomous governments had been instituted in these provinces. The Don country was a sort of Cossack republic, ruled by an elected military chief, General Kaledin, who promptly joined forces with the counter-revolution. A vague parliamentary Rada was seated at Ekaterinodar, the capital of the Kuban country. It was composed of Cossacks and intellectual socialists—such frank representatives of the weal-

thy that their constitution deprived the poor non-Cossack peasants and the workers to the right to vote.

Thenceforth, during many bloody years, the history of the typically rural petty-bourgeois Don and Kuban Cossacks was a history of endless hesitation and splits. Encouraged and recruited in turn by the revolution and counter-revolution, they showed conclusively that they could not decide for themselves.

As democrats they were hostile to the restoration of the old order; as strangers to the patriotism of the Great Russian bourgeoisie, they were constantly in open or concealed conflict with the White generals; an embarrassing Cossack question constantly preoccupied the councils of the nationalist armies. But as resolute partisans of private property, the same Cossacks fought violently against the proletarian communists. After the October Revolution their ideal became regional independence. They wanted to preserve their territories from "Bolshevik anarchy." In this, as in everything else, the second-rate politicians of the Don and Kuban showed characteristic blindness.

Kornilov Reappears

While Krylenko was taking over the Stavka at Mogilev, the man who had engineered the unsuccessful September coup d'état, the man who had restored the death penalty in the armies, the would-be dictator of the Russian bourgeoisie, General Kornilov, simply walked out of the Bykhovskoye Monastery, where he had been interned by the Provisional Government.

Was it through duplicity or weakness that Kornilov escaped? Both. Kerensky had confided the care of his accomplice, who was imprisoned merely for the sake of form, to a detachment of cavalry entirely devoted to the prisoner. Kornilov put himself at the head of this detachment and started out for the Don country, where he arrived the end of December, alone and disguised as a peasant, after narrowly escaping from arrest by his own most devoted soldiers.¹

The old General Alexeyev had been raising a volunteer law-and-order army in the Don since the beginning of November. Thousands of officers and Junkers came from all over Russia to Rostov and Novochoerkask.

The White Guard, General Denikin, described the nature of the counter-revolutionary armies with praiseworthy clarity. To the call for volunteers came "officers, Junkers, students, and very, very

few other elements. The nation did not respond. Under these recruiting conditions the army had a grave organic fault from the outset. It had the character of a class army as was to be expected. . . . It is evident that such a volunteer army could not fulfill its mission in Russia." What then did the White generals expect? They wanted to surround the Bolsheviks, whose powers of organization they did not yet know, and await the outcome.

The formation of the army was difficult. The majority of the officers hesitated, went into hiding, or adapted themselves to the new government. Once the military hierarchy collapsed, the professional soldiers were completely disoriented. And finally the hatred of the masses barred their road wherever they turned. Those who did reach the Don underwent innumerable dangers; the fugitive officer en route to the South was for the soldiers an outlaw to be killed on sight.

Alexeyev had to work day and night to form his first units. Money was lacking. If the urban bourgeoisie gave anything at all, they gave too little. The day soon came when they could give nothing. "The Allied ambassadors were fearful," said Denikin.

Even the Cossacks regarded this mobilization of armed Great Russian patriots on their soil unfavorably. The reactionary monarchist generals in their appeal of December 27 were forced to include the sovereignty of the people and the power of the Constituent Assembly. Nevertheless, the Don Cossack Council decided to keep an eye on the volunteer army and "purge counter-revolutionary elements."

This army never contained more than three or four thousand men at its best. But it was overrun with officers. The two generalissimos in command, Alexeyev and Kornilov, were constantly at odds with each other. Together with Kaledin they formed a ruling triumvirate in the Don country.

The army began by suppressing workers' insurrections at Rostov and Taganrog on November 26 and January 8, after the Cossacks had refused to take action against the workers. The volunteer army found itself in a shameful situation. The ground slipped from under its feet. The workers in the neighboring regions were menacing. The Cossacks defied the generals and left the army to defend their own villages. The Red Guard and the Caucasian Army re-entered the country to surround the Don and lay siege to the Kuban.

The Council of People's Commissars outlawed the leaders of the Cossack counter-revolution in an appeal on November 28: "Local garrisons are urged to act immediately, without waiting for orders, against the enemies of the people. Negotiations with them are forbidden. Any workers or railway men who lend

them assistance will be punished to the fullest extent of the revolutionary law."

The Soviet government did not rest at this measure. The Red Guard of the cities of Petrograd, Moscow, and Khar'kov, and of the Donetz mines, together with sailors and several units of the regular army, all under the command of Antonov-Ovseyenko, began a vast converging movement calculated to separate the Don from the Ukraine and capture Rostov and Kiev.

Cossack Counter-Revolution Defeated

It goes without saying that in this guerrilla warfare, which was fought mostly along the railways with armored or simply armed trains, the Red General Staff on the southern front could give only the vaguest orders. Two remarkable leaders were members of Antonov's staff: a Left S-R named Sablin who commanded the workers from Petrograd and Moscow, and a non-commissioned Bolshevik officer, Sivers, who was soon to be killed, in command of the Don army.

At first the Reds were defeated at Matveyev-Kurgan near Taganrog, but a workers' uprising in the latter city chased out the Whites and restored the situation. The Cossacks fell prey to hesitations, and split into old and young, rich and poor, soldiers and civilians. Red Cossack units were formed. The workers went into action. The counter-revolution was doomed—only the officers continued to support the volunteer army. The struggle ended on January 29 with the suicide of the Ataman, Kaledin, and the hazardous retreat of Kornilov into the Kuban.

A passage from the last speech made by Kaledin in the Don Cossack Council as the Reds entered Novochoerkask describes the debacle that overtook the first phase of the counter-revolution:

"When Kornilov departs we shall have left only a handful of men, one hundred to one hundred forty rifles at best. . . . How can we account for this shameful defeat? The vilest kind of egotism has betrayed us. Instead of defending their native land against the enemy, the Russian officers, its finest sons, flee shamefully before a tiny army of usurpers. There is no duty, no honor, no patriotism, not even simple morality left."

There was nothing left for the Ataman but suicide. His successor, Nazarov, was unable to organize any resistance or flee the collapse of the Cossack democracy. The Reds surprised him during a session of the Cossack Council on February 12 and shot him.

Confused struggles similar to those in the Don, because they involved the same social forces, broke out in the Kuban and ended on March 1 with a victory for the Reds. Soviet power was installed at Ekaterinodar, but only for a short time.

The uprising of the Ural Cossacks under the command of General Dutov

1. "Tired out and not understanding the events which only made them anxious, the cavalymen said they had done everything possible and that they still remained devoted to the general, but—'Ah, general,' they asked, 'what can we do when the whole of Russia is Bolshevik?'" From Denikin's *Notes*.—V. S.

was momentarily victorious in the capture of Orenburg, but likewise ended in defeat on January 18.

The Ukraine

In the south of the great Russian plain, the Dnieper region is to Russia what Provence is to France.

A milder and sunnier climate and a more fertile land, gayer and easier customs and a less modulated but more sonorous language, all serve to differentiate the native sons of the Ukraine from the Great Russians. There is an economic basis for this difference. Before the World War three-quarters of the coal produced in the Russian Empire came from the Ukraine; two-thirds of the ferrous minerals; three-quarters of the manganese; two-thirds of the salt; four-fifths of the sugar; and *nine-tenths* of the wheat exported by Russia.

It was by far the richest country of the empire. The theoreticians of the Ukrainian national movement, bourgeois theoreticians naturally, reproached czarism with having systematically drained the capital and wealth of the Ukraine into Great Russia proper; with having encouraged the Baltic ports to the detriment of the Black Sea ports; with having blocked the progress of Ukrainian industry; finally they made the most of denouncing the unbearable harshness of Russification.

The Ukrainian national movement sprang into life almost the moment the autocracy fell. A Ukrainian national assembly, called the Rada, was soon formed, and engaged in a struggle with Prince Lvov's Provisional Government. The Ukraine demanded almost complete autonomy. The Bolsheviks alone supported this demand. Thus the Rada greeted the October Revolution as a great liberation, but after seeing the example of the Great Russian bourgeoisie, the Ukrainian bourgeoisie had no intention of following the proletariat on the road to social revolution.

At the same time the Ukrainian workers' soviets kept pace with the Great Russian soviets. The Kiev Soviet had maintained a Revolutionary Committee since October 22 with the purpose of seizing power. The soviet and the Rada formed a temporary bloc against the Cadets, Mensheviks, and S-Rs in the Kiev municipal administration who were defending the Petrograd Provisional Government.

No sooner was Kerensky defeated than a new bloc was formed. The Rada formed a bloc with the Cadets (*Russian Constitutional Democrats*, the party of the Great Russian big bourgeoisie) against the Bolsheviks. The struggle between the "People's Republic of the Ukraine" and the Kiev Soviet was thenceforth ruled by force of arms. . . .

The rural petty bourgeoisie, consisting of the wealthy and middle peasants with their intellectual representatives, was

the backbone of the national movement; like the Don and Kuban Cossacks, it was democratic and counter-revolutionary at the same time. Independence, a republic, private property: the Ukrainian petty bourgeoisie was ready to fight fiercely for these bourgeois ideals.

The Kiev Rada numbered 230 peasant representatives, 132 army representatives, and 100 representatives of the workers, salaried employees, intellectuals, etc.

This Rada tried to maneuver among the various social forces of the Ukraine. Its manifesto of November 7 was a curious medley of Soviet phrases. . . . At the very moment that it issued this high-sounding manifesto, the Rada gave White officers and troops that were trying to reach the volunteer army of the Don free passage across its territory, refused the same privilege to Red troops marching into the South, and disarmed all Ukrainian Soviet units. The Council of People's Commissars addressed an ultimatum to the Rada on December 4 which began with these significant words:

"We recognize without reserve or condition the national rights and the national independence of the Ukrainian people. . . ."

The Rada was forced to unmask by this declaration. Its reply to the Council confused extreme rightists and the Bolsheviks in the same criticism, and the anarchy of the Red troops with the class war in Russia. The Rada demanded a socialist coalition government and a federated republic. This document signed by Vinnishenko, Petlura and Mirny was tantamount to a declaration of war.

The battle was already under way, in any case. A general strike broke out in Kiev, and the Rada fell under the combined blows of the Petrograd, Moscow and Kharkov Red Guard under the command of the victor of Pulkovo, Muraviev, and of Red troops from the Rumanian front. The Reds entered Kiev on January 26, but their victory was incomplete; guerrilla warfare continued in the Ukraine until 1921. A Ukraine Soviet government was set up in Kharkov.

In its intervention on the side of the counter-revolution, France did not stop at a hasty recognition of Ukrainian independence, nor at sending a French military mission to the Kiev Rada. M. Stéphen Pichon negotiated a loan of 180 million francs for the Ukrainian counter-revolutionists in the early part of January. Thus supported by the French government and advised by the French agent General Berthelot, the Rada proceeded to solicit the aid of Germany against the Bolsheviks.

The Massacre of Officers

It was during this period that the Red terror was spontaneously born from a number of events. It was the direct consequence of a whole series of causes.

The General Staff had always maintained discipline by a liberal use of the death penalty, that is, by the exercise of systematic legal terror. Both the army and the fleet remembered the pitiless repressions of 1905-06. After the revolution the officers everywhere appeared as the most active agents of the counter-revolution. They demanded the restoration of the death penalty.

Accustomed by the war to regard mutiny as a dangerous monster to be slain without ceremony, the officers had come to rely on terror. Episodes like the massacre of the Kremlin arsenal workers were common wherever the officers had power. They sowed a harvest of hate that ripened in a few weeks' time.

General Denisov [a White Guard] gave some interesting figures on the massacre of officers in the Don region alone, where between February 13 and April 14, 1918, fourteen generals, twenty-three colonels and 292 commissioned officers were slain.

Several specific instances reveal the nature of this wave of terror:

An officer was walking down the street of a small Crimean city. No one paid any attention to him until a crippled beggar started after him shouting, "Tear off your epaulets, comrade, tear them off!" The officer hurried on while the beggar roused a mob with cries of "Comrades, there goes the counter-revolution!"

On another occasion a group of Red sailors occupied the railway station at Sevastopol. Every arriving naval officer was examined. If he had served in 1905-06, when the sailors were so brutally suppressed, he was instantly stood up against a wall and shot. The other officers passed unmolested through the bloody square of execution under the threatening eyes of the sailors.

After the first encounters of the civil war, the treason on the Rumanian front, the conspiracies and uprisings in the Don, the Kuban, the Urals, and the Crimea, the fury of the soldiers and sailors ceased to make distinctions among the officers.

The first dispatches from the south announcing the mass execution of officers were published in Petrograd during the latter part of January. At the head of a Tatar army, the officers had made themselves masters of the Crimean peninsula and proceeded to shoot all their Bolshevik prisoners. The arrival of Red sailors restored the situation.

A telegram dated January 20 told of the bombardment of Yalta by two Red torpedo boats and concluded with these lines:

"Several dozen officers were executed. They were led down to the water front and drowned with stones around their necks. Their bodies were later seen floating in the port. Two big merchants were shot."

There were like events in most of the smaller Crimean cities. The Red terror

was born in one of the gayest and most beautiful Russian provinces.

The massacre of officers by their own soldiers was limited to the territories where the civil war raged. In the capitals and throughout most of the country the revolution still displayed a magnanimity which was to last for several months.

To Work: Record of Two Months

The period from the first days of November until the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly (January 7, 1918) was marked in the interior of Russia by the economic resistance of the former ruling classes, the political struggle around the Constituent Assembly, and the struggle for peace. We are forced to analyze these three struggles separately, although in reality they were different aspects of the same process.

We have already outlined the general situation in the country. The simple enumeration of the main acts of the Soviet government will clarify the work accomplished:

November 10—castes and civil titles were abolished.

November 22—warm clothes requisitioned for the army.

November 26—the commissar of foreign affairs, Trotsky, recalled twenty-eight Russian diplomats and consular agents in foreign countries, including all the Russian ambassadors to the great powers.

December 1—the Supreme Economic Council was formed.

December 7—the Extraordinary Commission for the Struggle Against Sabotage and Counter-Revolution, known as the Cheka, was formed.

December 9—the Brest-Litovsk peace parleys were opened.

December 11—the eight-hour day was enforced on the railways; the Commissariat of Public Education, which took

education out of the hands of the church, was formed.

December 16—grades and ranks in the army were abolished; the Russo-Belgian Metal Company was confiscated.

December 17—the 1886 Electric Company was confiscated; apartment speculation was banned in the cities.

December 18—civil marriage was instituted.

December 19—divorce was instituted.

December 21—written Russian was simplified; a code for the revolutionary courts was decreed.

December 24—the Putilov factories were confiscated.

December 29—the payment of interest and dividends on bonds was forbidden.

December 31—the Institute for the Protection of Mothers and Children was formed.

January 3—the Russian Federation of Soviet Republics was proclaimed; provisions were made for the organization of the Socialist Red Army.

This was a remarkable creative work, but sabotage hindered and counter-revolution undermined every step. The most active counter-revolutionary elements were: the big bourgeoisie grouped around the Cadet Party, twenty or thirty thousand officers, and the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. On November 6 Purishkevich, the leader of the "True Russians," an ultra-reactionary group, was arrested. On him was found a letter to the Ataman, Kaledin, which said in part:

"The situation can be saved only by the formation of officers' and Junkers' regiments . . . power is in the hands of a criminal mob that can be brought to its senses only by public shootings and hangings."

In a document drawn up by Trotsky on November 7 and published in the name of the Military Revolutionary Committee are to be found the first intimations of the measures which were later to characterize the period of "War Communism." Stating that the sabotage was leading the country to famine, the MRC warned the wealthy classes that they were "playing with fire."

"They will be the first to feel the consequences of the conditions they are creating. The wealthy classes and their allies will be deprived of the right to purchase supplies. All their goods will be requisitioned. The goods of the principal culprits will be confiscated." The working class was urged to boycott the saboteurs.

In the early part of December, the situation in Petrograd suddenly became worse as mobs started to sack the wine cellars. Drunken, angry and demoralized crowds menaced the capital with anarchy. An Extraordinary Commissar

with full powers to deal with the situation was appointed.

In response to the activities of the counter-revolution, Lenin proposed in a speech to the All-Russian Soviet Executive Committee on December 1 to declare the Constitutional Democrats (Cadets) enemies of the people. He said:

"When a revolutionary class is at grips with owning classes, it must break their resistance. And we shall break the resistance of the owning classes by the very means they employ against the proletariat. No others have yet been invented."

Lenin refused to persecute individuals: "We must strike the general staff of the whole class." There was, he said, no question of more or less justice toward this or that person. Miliukov's Cadet Party found unexpected champions in Maxim Gorky and in the Left S-Rs. The great author was misled once again by his love of culture. "The Cadet Party," he wrote, "contains the most cultivated men in the country." (*Novaya Zhizn*, December 7.) But did not the party of Gallifet and Thiers [butchers of the Paris Commune] contain the most cultivated Frenchmen of 1871? Basically the measure was correct. Several arrests of leading Cadets followed.

A few days later the Left S-Rs finally decided to participate in the government, after they saw the All-Russian Congress of Peasant Soviets endorse the October Revolution. Six of their leaders entered the Council of People's Commissars: Proshian, Algasov, Trutovsky, Steinberg, Mikhailov, and Ismailovich. Lenin believed that the bloc of the Bolsheviks with the Left S-Rs, who had great influence in the rural districts, "can be an honest coalition because there are no fundamental conflicts between the interests of the workers and the interests of the exploited and toiling peasants. . . . Socialism can satisfy both; and only socialism can." Even if they had programmatic differences with the peasants, Lenin thought the Bolsheviks should support them against the bourgeoisie.

Lenin's general outlook at that period was expressed in a speech made [November 22] at the Congress of the Fleet:

"The oppressed masses are confronted with a most difficult task; they have to build up a state unaided. You see what capacities for resistance the bourgeoisie possesses, how they block our activity by sabotage, what a flood of lies and calumnies are spread about us on every occasion and without occasion.

"We are for a strong government power, for constraint and violence. But we shall use it against a handful of capitalists, against the bourgeois class. . . .

"The working class must rely on itself. . . . Let us have faith in our own forces. . . . Divided the masses are impotent, united they are invincible."

VICTOR SERGE

BUILD YOUR MARXIST LIBRARY!

For Books and Pamphlets by

LEON TROTSKY

Write for free booklist to

Labor Action Book Service

4 Court Sq. Long Isl. City 1, N. Y.

Books in Review

Boom Days

PROSPERITY DECADE: FROM WAR TO DEPRESSION 1917-1929, by George Soule. Rinehart, 1947, \$5.50.

The period covered by this book is important to contemporary understanding; even in the 1920s the long-term forces of permanent crisis were already piercing sectors of the American economy. Soule's book is valuable insofar as it presents the essential facts with clarity and scholarship. It makes no attempt at a basic analysis, limiting its conclusions to an eclectic interpretation of different phases of the period.

The '20s constituted the last great period of the classical form of capitalist prosperity. Industry, particularly in its highly monopolized sections, enjoyed large profits and expansion of output. Since manufacturing output grew 30 per cent merely keeping pace with productivity, the industrial labor force remained stationary and after 1927 began to decline. In Britain and Germany there were permanent armies of unemployed.

Two important tendencies were evidenced in the industrial picture of this period. The first was the saturation in the growth of particular industries. Resident construction began to drop in 1926 and kept declining thereafter. The auto industry grew phenomenally in the early part of the decade. By 1927, however, replacements had become 50 per cent of sales. This development meant a contraction in profitable areas of investment in a period when such opportunities were already too narrow.

The second tendency was the decline of those productive sectors where heavy competition prevailed. Outstanding among these was agriculture. Although the situation was somewhat alleviated during the latter part of the decade, agriculture never fully recovered from the recession of 1921. Thousands of farmers lost their land during the period and millions of acres went back to wasteland. The decline in agriculture was based on the long-term decline in American farm exports, reflecting the expansion of farming areas outside the United States, and gradually rising costs in this country.

It was increasingly apparent during the period of the '20s that there was a contraction in opportunities for profitable investment in domestic industry. New industries were becoming saturated and monopoly dominated the areas of high profits. The excess of capital coming from high profits went either abroad

or into the stock market. Many large companies used part of their profits to expand their own operations abroad. Investment companies competed for foreign loans which were issued at exceptionally high rates of interest. Since they were not used primarily for productive purposes, they were obviously not going to be repaid; by 1928 foreign countries began to default.

The most important feature about the stock-market boom was the disparity between conditions in the stock market and conditions in industry. Industrial profits were high but nowhere approached the profits made in speculation. Industrial prices were practically stable while security prices were inflated enormously. Since stock-market profits ultimately reflect industrial profits, a crash was imminent.

The inflation of stock prices was due to the plethora of capital and the lack of profitable investment opportunity in American industry. Capital competed for stocks and bonds and sent security prices zooming far out of proportion to the industrial profits which supported them. The constant rise in security prices caused a greater demand and the practice of buying on credit developed. The only people who lost money in this period of constantly rising security prices were those who based their speculation on a dip in the market. The surplus of capital was further aggravated in 1927, when American capital withdrew from precarious foreign loans and sought high profits on the American stock exchange.

By 1928 we see the following economic situation: a decline in capital formation, private investment and the number of employed, a saturation in the development of auto and residential construction, a world-wide agricultural depression and a breakdown in American support for foreign economies. The rise of investment in 1929 was based on an anticipated increase in sales which never matured.

The Marxian analysis of crises states that the declining use of labor per unit of production due to the development of technology causes a declining rate of profit (or profit per unit of output). This occurs because it is only from the application of labor that surplus value can be extracted. When less labor is used absolutely the mass of profits declines. The world-wide crisis of 1929 occurred when the labor force was declining in the major countries of the world. Monopoly was able to keep commodity prices and profits on a high level, utilizing standard monopolistic practices. It

invested its profits abroad or in the stock market. When the international structure began to totter, capital (both foreign and American) came into the United States and was invested on the stock market.

Stock-market profits were, however, unrealizable since they were far out of proportion to industrial profits. Industrial profits in themselves were based on the artificial methods of monopoly in keeping prices high. It is interesting that right up to the crash the rate of industrial profit kept increasing. The collapse of 1929 was the reversion of prices back to real values and below them. Since the world industrial machine was already geared to a smaller labor force a chronic decline in the mass of profits was in the offing. This was the beginning of chronic depression—a depression from which the capitalist world could extract itself temporarily only by means of a war economy.

The author attempts no systematic interpretation of the facts, mealy as they are. He discusses patchy solutions briefly, without mentioning the alternative of social revolution. The only economic theory discussed is underconsumptionism. But the important facts are given in a well-integrated fashion.

GERTRUDE BLACKWELL

Mealy-Mouthed Martyrs

HOLLYWOOD ON TRIAL, by Gordon Kahn. Boni and Gaer, N. Y., 1948, \$1.00, 227 pp.

Hollywood on Trial was written as a defense of the ten indicted fellow-traveling screen writers; but as a defense it is so worthless as to amount almost to an indictment itself.

No one expects them to reveal facts which they refused to divulge to the Thomas Un-American Committee, or to answer Thomas's \$64 question about membership in the Communist Party. But surely these rather well-known writers, adopting the role of heroic embattled martyrs for the right to believe in their own political ideology without persecution, cannot expect readers to believe that their ideology consists *solely* of respect for the First Amendment!

What do they stand for? What are their social ideas? Here in this book they could have expressed their social philosophy without prosecutors' interruptions or distortions, and, if they are to go to jail for their ideas, at least make clear to the people what are those ideas for which they are being penalized.

Nowhere in the 227 pages of the book is the opportunity found to do this. Instead—

First, they repeat their testimony, which amounted to nothing. Second, they set out to prove that they are every bit

as jingoistic, super-patriotic and crude as J. Parnell Thomas. (Says Gordon Kahn: "Nor did J. Parnell Thomas or any of the hundred newspapers covering the hearings ever mention the fact that nowhere in that room was there an American flag.")

Third, they swear: We never put any Communist propaganda in a picture—name one, they demand! Look at our works: *Destination Tokyo*, *Back to Bataan*, *Objective Burma*, *Behind the Rising Sun*, *Hitler's Children* . . . they shamelessly peddle their wares.

Fourth, no matter what we believe, the Constitution protects our right to privacy; no one asks Eisenhower to swear whether he is a Democrat or Republican, why ask us?

This is the totality of the book. And in his foreword, that incomparable political muddlehead, Thomas Mann, testified that he never saw any Communist propaganda in a Hollywood film.

Mann, of course, is right, even though Kahn does not mention the film *Mission to Moscow*. This film too was not propaganda for a communist society or ideology: it was simply a crudely lying white-wash of a totalitarian despotism which happened to be allied with American imperialism at the moment. But while there was not a trace of communism in these pictures, there was a ton of chauvinism, jingoism, hate incitement, anti-internationalism and flag-waving imperialist propaganda — propaganda of a kind without which the Thomas Committee itself could not exist. If there is today a spiritual climate of intolerance, suspicion and hate, are not these writers themselves partly responsible?

TED ENRIGHT

Crisis of Leadership

THE LABOR LEADER: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY, by Eli Ginzberg, assisted by Joseph Carwell. Macmillan, New York, 1948, 190 pp.

Union officials, says Eli Ginzberg, are up against the problem of coaxing monopoly capitalism to give and give, in terms of higher wages and better working conditions. But: "Business unionism is predicated on certain margins. If these no longer exist, or if they have been substantially narrowed, then the survival of business unionism is threatened. This is the nub of the crisis."

Once unionism clashes head on with this "nub," leaders can no longer depend on bargaining strength for higher wages but must transform their organizations into political instruments capable of challenging, in the arena of politics, the capitalists' attempts to utilize state power to whiplash the workers into moderating or arresting their economic struggles.

Insufficient attention has been given,

the author regrets, to just what makes leaders tick, labor or otherwise. Consequently Ginzberg takes up sociological and psychological attributes of leadership—subjects a bit burdensome for a volume only 190 pages in length—and then poses the labor leader as one who, on the American scene up to now, has followed the Gompers tradition of organizing the workers and winning conditions but eschewing political action.

Capitalizing on the indifference of the rank and file to active participation in the organized labor movement outside of demanding more pay for less work, leaders have entrenched themselves in power, consolidated their positions, and assumed control over fat treasuries.

But rather than deal with the careers of typical union figures such as William Green, John L. Lewis, Philip Murray or Walter Reuther, Ginzberg turns over one section of the volume to his co-author, Joseph Carwell, who produces the best part of the book. Entitled "The Parkinstown Local," it is a case study based on actual experiences in a struggle to organize a local among indifferent, frightened pottery workers who lived under slave-wage misery in a small Pennsylvania town.

Against the background of discouragement, defeats, boss pressure and the restraining ideology of Catholicism, Carwell focuses attention on young Corsi, the most energetic and forceful personality among the employees of the Burnside-Rogers plant. Emerging from an atmosphere of patient deference to long hours and low wages, hot-blooded Corsi catches fire when union organizers appear. While the officers of the International utilize his close contact with the ranks to lay the basis for raising the workers to union consciousness, they finally bridle the men into accepting a five per cent wage cut—for the purpose of preserving the new local.

The ideology of the pure-and-simple union bureaucrat is vividly dramatized: Unionism is a function of capitalism; fiery perspectives implying a struggle beyond its boundaries must be purged from the convictions of young labor leaders before they can be tempered for service in the union apparatus.

Chief value of Ginzberg's book lies in its succinct verification of facts about the labor bureaucracy which observers of the movement already know. Its chief weakness arises from an apparent inability to gauge the intensity of the

workers' emerging struggle with the state, with monopoly on the one hand and the possible failure of AFL and CIO political action on the other.

It may be assumed from the tenor of the book that if unions fail to heed the call for political action in a manner capable of producing effective results, the consequent inability of labor leaders to find "margins" allowing further improvements in wages and hours will drive them from their presiding chairs and shake the labor movement. Is that right, Mr. Ginzberg?

VINCENT S. WHEELON

Munich Deal—

(Continued from page 154)

"Britons were realists, and were perhaps more than others convinced that the errors of the Versailles dictate must be rectified. Britain always exercised her influence in this realistic sense in the past. He pointed to Britain's role with regard to the evacuation of the Rhineland ahead of the fixed time, the settlement of the reparations problem, and the reoccupation of the Rhineland. They must try to speak the same language. . . ."

"[Besides the question of amending the League of Nations in order to bring Germany back in] All other questions could be characterized as relating to changes in the European order, changes that sooner or later would probably take place. To these questions belonged Danzig, Austria and Czechoslovakia. England was only interested that any alterations should be effected by peaceful evolution, so as to avoid methods which might cause far-reaching disturbances, which were not desired either by the Führer or by other countries."

Besides all that, Hitler demanded African colonies. In the following March Neville Henderson formally offered the Congo Basin as the British appeasement proposal. The disposition of this votive offering is not indicated in the documents.

Another point around which these pre-Munich conversations turned was Hitler's demand that the anti-Nazi British press be muzzled and his accusation that the British government was too much the "slave" of public opinion and "the parties." Halifax protested "that the British government also acted independently of the parties. It was certainly not the slave of demagogic party maneuvers. In the English view no government which was worthy of the name was under the domination of the parties."

It was this attitude of doglike placatory submission that reached its climax in September.

Next month we will briefly excerpt the more interesting passages relating to the Munich tragic farce itself.

PHILIP COBEN

ALL BOOKS REVIEWED

in *The New International* may be obtained through

LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

4 Court Square
Long Island City 1, New York
Price includes postage