

WORKERS  
INTERNATIONAL  
NEWS

EDITORIAL NOTES

BERLIN DISPUTE ...

VISHINSKY ON DISARMAMENT

THE TENDENCY TOWARDS  
STATIFICATION —

A NECESSARY CORRECTION

THE PURGE OF  
RUSSIAN BIOLOGISTS

BY DAVID JAMES

PUBLISHED BY THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY, FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Vol. 7. No. 6. -- Nov-December 1948

6d.

# EDITORIAL NOTES

## DEADLOCK AT U.N.O.

THE resolution adopted by the Security Council on the Berlin crisis was a defeat for the Russians. But since the Russians used the veto and put the onus of taking the next step onto Britain and America, it was a hollow victory for the Western powers, which leaves the issue in a deadlock as before. Nor is it possible to foresee an early solution to this crisis because of the fundamental nature of the issues involved.

All the powers in the dispute claim to base themselves on the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements. Russia claims that the Western powers have broken these agreements and are responsible for the present situation.

The Western powers in reply, declare that it is the Russians who have broken the agreements; that because of the actions of the Russians they were compelled to take the steps of introducing the currency reform and setting up a pre-Government in the Western Zones.

## THE WESTERN CLAIMS

According to the claim of the Western Powers "the history of Allied disagreement on the realisation of economic unity can only be made clear if the nature of Soviet claims to reparations is fully understood." At the Yalta Conference, it is claimed, Russia put forward the demand for "ten thousand million dollars of reparations from Germany." The Western powers considered these claims to be "impracticably high". No agreement, therefore, was arrived at.

At Potsdam, they claim, it was decided that "during the period of occupation Germany shall be treated as a single economic unit." "To this end common policies shall be established with regard to:

- a) Import and export programmes for Germany as a whole.
- b) Reparations and removal of war potential."

"Payment of reparations should leave enough resources to enable the German people to subsist without external assistance. In working out the economic balance of Germany the necessary means must be provided to pay for imports approved by the Control Council of Germany. The proceeds of exports from current production and stock shall be available in the first place for payment of such imports."

It was noted that "In applying these policies account shall be taken, where appropriate, of varying local conditions."

REPARATIONS FROM  
CURRENT PRODUCTION

Although the Control Council had agreed on September 20th, 1945, on a common export-import programme, on the 3rd May 1946, the Western Powers claim that the Russian General Dratvin interpreted the note given above, to mean that the conditions of the Soviet Zone as a whole, prevented the application of the economic principles of the Potsdam Agreement, and he categorically refused to agree that, until Germany was self supporting no occupying power should remove from its zone "reparations from current production."

In addition, the Western Powers claim that while they were prepared to give all information regarding their Zones during this period, the Russians refused information on any point.

In June 1946, the Russians refused to disclose figures for marks issues in their Zone. In December 1946, Molotov refused in New York, and again in December 1947 in London, to give any figures regarding reparations already taken from the Russian Zone unless the Western Powers agreed in advance that Russia should get ten thousand million dollars in reparations over a period of 20 years.

Bevin, at this time, declared that Russia had already taken 7,000 million dollars in reparations. Marshall estimated that in addition to capital equipment being dismantled and shipped as reparations, Russia was then taking additional reparations from current production at the rate of 500 million dollars per year. (Approximately £125 millions.)

The Western powers, it is claimed, were pumping into Germany food-stuffs alone amounting to 700 million dollars per year. (Approximately £175 millions). "German feeling" according to the White Paper, was at that time graphically expressed inside Germany as "a cow which was fed from the West and milked from the East."

In order to diminish the drain upon the resources of Britain and America, and to prevent the collapse of Western Germany, the Western powers claim that they were forced to introduce the currency reforms in their own Zones treating them as an economic unit.

In addition, the Western powers charge the Russians with "violating... the fundamental personal freedom of speech and of information..."

THE RUSSIAN  
CHARGES

On the other side, the charges of the Russian Government against the Western powers are summed up from the official Russian documents, published in "Soviet Weekly", as follows:

"The Government of the U.S.A., together with the Government of Great Britain, began a policy of dismembering Germany with separate economic unification of the American and British zones of occupation of Germany in 1946, despite the agreement of the Powers of the Anti-Hitlerite coalition at the Potsdam Conference on the German question. Thereby the agreement previously concluded between the USSR, Great Britain, the USA and France regarding joint control of the four Powers over occupied Germany was also grossly violated."

"...the operation of this policy of the three Powers in Western Germany, separated from the rest of Germany, is increasingly leading to a growth of influence of anti-democratic and Nazi elements.."

"Latterly, particularly in connection with the realisation of the Marshall Plan, a real danger has been created of a war economic potential being re-established in Western Germany, a situation that violates the Potsdam Agreement.."

The setting up of a Government for Western Germany was placed on the order of the day. This decision of the three Western Powers is leading to the consummation of the political and economic dismemberment of Germany with all its dangerous consequences.

With a view to preparing the fulfilment of the plan for the final dismemberment of Germany, in June of this year a separate currency reform was carried through in the British, American and French zones of occupation of Germany and in three sectors of Berlin, where a special currency - the Western 'B' mark - was introduced."

Had there been no currency reform, particularly in respect to Berlin, which is the centre of the Russian Zone, the Russians claim "no question of the situation in Berlin would have existed at all, as it did not exist before June of this year, i.e. before the currency reform which was carried through separately by the three Western powers."

WESTERN POWERS  
HARDEN THEIR STAND

The Western powers are prepared to accept Russian currency as the sole currency for Berlin. They demand in return, Four Power control over the emission of such money for Berlin. It is this latter demand which the Russians refuse to accept. For it



means that the Western powers have a block-house in the centre of Russian territory, preventing its completely seal-off from the Western Zone.

At UNO, the Western powers agreed to meet the four foreign ministers to negotiate on "problems concerning Germany as a whole" which was one of Stalin's demands for agreement during the negotiations, but were rejected by the West. In Moscow, they demanded the simultaneous lifting of the blockade of Berlin with the introduction of Russian currency under Four Power Control. But the resolution adopted by UNO insisted that the Russians first withdraw the blockade before the introduction of Russian currency. Thus, the Western powers have hardened their stand.

#### STALINISTS LOSING SUPPORT

The recent elections in Germany show a loss of support for the Russians. In the Ruhr municipal elections the Stalinists lost about 40 per cent of their vote. They also lost heavily in the factory elections. In Berlin, the movement against the Stalinists is evident. For this reason the Russians refused to allow the municipal elections to be held in Berlin. It is further demonstrated by the hasty reduction of the scandalous prison sentences imposed on the anti-Russian demonstrators as the result of popular resentment.

In addition, there are the purges which are now taking place in the Russian Zone, in justification of which, W.J. Pieck, Chairman of the Party, wrote in the official organ "Neues Deutschland":

"It had been established that the enemy had succeeded in infiltrating his agents into our ranks and that these agents have actually found supporters among our members for spreading enemy propaganda."

#### THE FUNDAMENTAL CONFLICT

The new policy of Britain and America to rebuild the Ruhr and centre it in German hands, which is opposed by the Russians and the French is a step taken to reconsolidate capitalism in the Western Zone. It stems from the general American policy of strengthening European capitalism, and is emphasised by the instability of France at the present time. The Americans must create a more stable base for the consolidation of a powerful anti-Russian bloc.

There is growing evidence that the Russians are attempting to consolidate their base in Germany by the creation of a German police and military state apparatus upon which they can lean, and that this may be a prelude

to propaganda for the withdrawal of all occupation forces in Germany. In this event, the Russians will no doubt reverse the present trends. For the German workers, the whole German population want a united and independent Germany, economically unified and politically freed from foreign domination. The exceptions are the large capitalists in the West who still remain a powerful factor and want the Western powers to remain until they have again consolidated their regime.

The fundamental conflict arises from the different social and economic bases upon which the principal contestants rest. In the West, the capitalist imperialist economy and the political and military policies which are necessary for the defence of their interests. First the consolidation of a capitalist Germany against further Russian expansion and later as a powerful economic and military lever against the Soviet Union. In the East, the nationalised, and therefore transitional economy and the need of the bureaucracy not only to defend that form of economy, but the privileges which they have wrested. Pursuing a nationalist policy, the Russian bureaucracy subordinates the Communist Parties to their own needs regardless of the real interests of the world working class.

The working class must call for an end to secret diplomacy; for a peace without annexations or reparations based upon the right of the German people to determine their own destiny without military force or terror either from West or East. Withdraw all the troops from German soil and unite with the German workers for the establishment of a Socialist Germany and a Socialist United States of Europe! That must be the clarion call of all advanced workers.

#### VISHINSKY'S DISARMAMENT PROPOSALS

There can be no doubt that Vishinsky's proposals on disarmament caused a certain amount of heart-burning in the imperialist camp. But there is also the danger that they will cause a great deal of confusion among the working class. The ever-increasing military budgets dive deeply into the workers' standard of living and it is only natural that they should look upon any measure proposing disarmament not only as a means of economic relief, but as a concrete step towards halting the approaching war. To add to the confusion, the Communist Parties in all countries blazen forth Vishinsky's proposals as if they created a real basis for a "peace" policy.

Lenin pointed out the fallacy of "disarmament" as a programme for peace, but of course, the teachings of Lenin have long ago become something to quote on holiday occasions with the Stalinist parties.

Proposals to disarm could be used by a workers' state to expose the war plans of the imperialists and to expose the blatant dishonesty of their oft-repeated avowals of peace. But side by side with this exposure it must be made clear to the workers of the world that only the destruction of capitalism, and no other method, can rid the world of the menace of war. Lenin was clear on the problem:

"Only after we have overthrown, finally vanquished and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world, and not only of one country, will wars become impossible and from a scientific point of view it would be utterly wrong and utterly unrevolutionary for us to evade or gloss over the most important thing, namely, that the most difficult task, the one demanding the greatest amount of fighting in the transition to socialism, is to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie..."

("PACIFISM AND THE WORKERS")

Even if Vishinsky's proposals for a one third disarmament all round were accepted, the balance of power would not be disturbed one iota. War is as natural to capitalism as the process which transforms capitalist competition into imperialist monopolies. And as the drive to war approaches its climax we would witness the speedy transformation of "peaceful" industries into armament factories, and on the field of battle the country with the greatest production potential will triumph just as if there had been no disarmament.

To propagate Vishinsky's proposals as a means of preventing war, is a deception of the people.

Similarly, the acrimonious discussion on international control of the Atom Bomb pointed to no solution. This terrible menace continues to hang over mankind. An "international" control by a capitalist dominated UNO would be no more effective than were the attempts to prevent Germany from rearming secretly even before Hitler came to power. And if Vishinsky's demand that all Atom Bombs should first be destroyed were acceded to, this would still leave the US with the industrial potential to commence the production of atom bombs at a moment's notice.

The only effective control of atomic weapons or any other form of armaments would be by the international organisations of labour - a demand which would find little support at a UNO assembly.

During the heated debates, both Bevin and Vishinsky invoked the name of Lenin in support of their arguments. It is necessary, therefore, to establish clearly what Lenin's position would have been in the present situation. Despite Vishinsky, Stalin, and Pollitt,

Lenin left us in no doubt that he never believed in the possible peaceful co-existence of Socialism and Capitalism. He wrote:

"...the victory of Socialism in one country does not at one stroke eliminate all war in general. On the contrary it presupposes such wars. The development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly in the various countries. It cannot be otherwise under the commodity production system. From this it follows irrefutably that Socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries.

It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for some time. This must not only create friction but a direct stirring on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the victorious proletariat of the Socialist country..."

For Lenin, as for the Trotskyists, there is only one certain road to peace - the road of the proletarian revolution.

. . . . .



# THE TENDENCY TOWARDS STATIFICATION

## A NECESSARY CORRECTION -

The Political Bureau considers it necessary to review the document entitled "CAPITALIST STATIFICATION", issued in 1947 for discussion. (The document was published in "Socialist Appeal" Mid-Aug, Sept, Mid-Sep, Oct)

In Marxist literature of the past, the inevitable development towards statification has been referred to on several occasions. Most notable of these references are by Engels in "ANTI-DUHRING", by Lenin in his polemic with Kautsky and in his remarks prefacing the work of Bukharin on Imperialism. In "CAPITAL", Marx also discusses this tendency, in passing reference, when dealing with the inevitability of the trend towards concentration and centralisation of capital.

Nevertheless, it was inevitable that in the above-named works, this question of statification did not receive an exhaustive analysis. The reason is to be found in the nature of the periods in which these works were written; periods which did not present this trend to the degree that it assumes today.

In view of the tendency towards statification in the capitalist economies on a world scale, which has assumed the character of a major trend, and in Britain has assumed an important place in the economy, the above named document was issued in an attempt to discuss the theoretical implications of this tendency, and so equip the Party to face up more concretely to the problem, and also to the problem of the Soviet Union.

On reconsideration, the Political Bureau has arrived at the conclusion that whilst Part II of the document "THE TENDENCY TOWARDS STATIFICATION IN BRITAIN" (which was voted upon and carried at the 1947 Conference of the B.C.P.) is substantially correct, Part I - "THE EVOLUTION OF CAPITALIST MONOPOLY AND THE WORLD TENDENCIES TO STATIFICATION" (which was not voted upon by the Conference on the grounds that further discussion was necessary) contains certain basic errors which must be corrected.

### ABSTRACT CHARACTER OF THE QUESTION

The whole of Part I of the document was abstract in character. That is to say, it confined itself to a discussion of economic processes without concretely relating them to their historical context, the social processes in which the laws of the economy operate.

For example, assuming the characterisation of the economy described in the document as "State Capitalism" to be correct, it does not necessarily follow

from the thesis in the document that the development of such a society from "private" capitalism is inevitable. The conflict within the national economies, and between the various national economies, the convulsions of war and the class struggle, the dialectical process of forward surges and backward lapses, all in turn militate against a smooth development of the trends in the economy, and make for a background of crises and explosions. They pose the conclusion, previously formulated by Lenin, that long before such a "state capitalist" society could develop, the class struggle would cut across the process.

But despite the abstraction of the document in the sense described above, an attempt was made to discuss the the features of such an economy and its laws.

#### BASIS OF ERROR

The Political Bureau has come to the conclusion, quite apart from the abstract ions referred to above, that "State Capitalism" is a contradiction in terms, insofar as it is considered that such an economic form embraces the whole of a national economy.

In Part I of the document, the sections headed: "The State as Arbiter Between the Monopolies", "The State as Buyer of Commodities", "State Bonds as a Field of Investment", "The State as Regulator of the Labour Market", "The State as Investor of Capital" can remain as written. They are, in essence, an A.B.C. statement of the process in the development of the concentration of capital. This, of course, provided it is understood that the references to "State Capitalism" apply to partial measures of statification - i.e. measures in relation to that or that sector of the economy, while the main sector remains on the basis of "private" property.

It is in the conception that an economy in which the entire means of production are in the hands of the state would remain capitalist. that the error is committed. In the document, particularly in the section "State Capitalism and the Capitalist Crisis", the whole schema of such a hypothetical "state capitalism" is presented in an entirely incorrect and formalistic manner, briefly thus:-

- (a) The development from the laissez-faire period of "free" competition to the period of monopoly, whilst developing a certain planning within larger sectors of the economy, accentuates the contradiction between the various units and deepens the anarchy in the production relations as a whole.
- (b) The development from monopoly capitalism to "state capitalism" therefore, has the same effect, and far from eliminating the crisis, merely aggravates it.

The reason for this is:-

(a) Whilst in the development of monopoly there is established a greater equilibrium in the various sectors of the economy, there is in effect less equilibrium in the economy as a whole. The disproportion between accumulation and consumption has been accentuated in the economy as a whole, the contradiction between the various sectors becomes sharpened. The increased lack of equilibrium can only be met by more intense crises than previously.

(b) So with "State Capitalism." Just as the contradictions and lack of equilibrium are accentuated by the development of monopoly, so, ipso facto, with the development of "state capitalism" the acuteness of the crisis must be proportionally deepened.

#### STATIFICATION OF THE ENTIRE ECONOMY PREVENTS CRISES

Statification of the entire means of production, not only gives the possibility of planning production, but makes such planning an indispensable corollary of this production relationship, and cuts completely across the process which under private ownership makes for crises. Control of the operations of industry through such a plan is not only one of technical detail. On the contrary, by far the most important factor, indeed the basic factor, is that such relationships create the basis for a conscious control of the division and allocation of the surplus value.

Under "private" capitalism, the anarchy of competition between the different enterprises, the different industries, gives rise to certain basic laws. Competition spurs on the development of technique, and consequently a changing ratio in the composition of capital, i.e. between the two basic component parts of capital - constant and variable. And whilst, through the attraction and repulsion of capital between the different sectors of the economy, there is an equalisation of the rate of profit into an average, the heightening of the value composition of capital brings in its wake a tendency to a decline in the rate of profit.

The "two-faced law" of capitalist accumulation, i.e., that the general extension of accumulation must take place at such a pace as to offset the effects of the falling rate of profit, does not contain within itself the solution to this problem of the capitalists. Even assuming the most favourable conditions for capitalist accumulation, there is a limit to this process. The absolute limit is the exhaustion of the reserve army of the unemployed. (The consideration that under the whip of a totalitarian state the living standards of the masses can be depressed even below the physical minimum, does not alter the problem. It may stave off the evil day of crisis for a time, but it will not eliminate it.)

### DILEMMA OF CAPITALISTS IN OVERCOMING CRISES

At such a stage, when there is an absolute over-production of commodities, when capital has presented itself as the absolute barrier to further capitalist production, the capitalist class is placed on the horns of a dilemma. Either raise the consuming power of the masses and thereby eliminate the "glut", or depress the consuming power still further and restore the rate of profit. Whichever way the capitalist turns he cannot avoid the crisis, but he is compelled by the blind laws of the economy to follow the latter course as one of the basic means of restoring equilibrium in the economy.

Wages and social services are slashed, the over-produced commodities go further beyond the reach of the masses, production slows down, masses of machinery and masses of workers stand idle - this is the only way out for capitalism. Constant capital is devalued and allowed to waste without replacement; consumers' goods, however slowly, percolate through the economy; the rate of exploitation is increased. Thus the rate of profit becomes restored and the economy revives.

The reason why the capitalist class cannot adopt the first course, that of raising the purchasing power of the masses, is very simple: to do so would be to aggravate the very cause of the crisis itself. The fall in the rate of profit leads directly to the crisis. To increase the consumption of the masses at such a stage would mean to eat further into the rate of profit. It would be like giving a man who is dying from poisoning, more poison instead of an emetic.

This is the factor that the reformist economists of the "Under-Consumptionist" school fail to recognise.

That this problem remains with capitalism in the transition from "free" competition to the stage of monopoly, and is even aggravated, is undoubtedly true. But in an economy where the entire means of production are in the hands of the state, there is an entirely different relationship.

### WHY CAPITAL BECOMES A BARRIER TO CAPITALIST PRODUCTION

In the crisis of capitalism, whilst the need to depress the living standards of the masses is a vital necessity, by far the most important factor is the de-valuation (by whatever means) of the constant capital. This essentially flows from the fact that the barrier to further capitalist production is capital itself. What does this latter statement mean? It means that, on the basis of the laws of the market, the anarchy of competition, too much capital has been produced in relation to the needs of capitalism itself.



Of more concrete importance is the question: how does this express itself? The answer to this is the only means of explaining how competition really begins with the period immediately prior to the slump.

So long as accumulation takes place at a sufficient rate to offset the effects of the falling rate of profit, the capitalist class, collectively and as individuals, are not confronted with any important problem. Providing that the mass of profit is sufficient to make further investment profitable, the particular rate of profit (whether it be 5%, 3% or 1%) is not decisive under such circumstances. It is at the stage when the decline in the rate of profit has become so catastrophic as to make further investment unprofitable, that the real problem arises.

At that stage there inevitably develops an intensified competition between the various individual capitalists. There is a process of "jostling" to decide whose capital shall remain "fallow" and whose shall remain in the process of production and accumulation. There is a conflict between the old capital and the new. That, nothing else, is what is meant when we state that too much capital has been created for the needs of capitalist production. And the further creation of capital merely makes more formidable the barrier to further production. At that stage the economy "jams."

#### THE ESSENCE OF CRISIS IS "PRIVATE" CHARACTER OF CAPITAL

The essence of this "jostling", the essence of this competition, is the existence of various private capitals, organised into separate units within the national economy. Once there has been established a unity of all these capitals in the hands of the state, once there has been established a single capital, the basis for the clash of the various capitals has been eliminated.

The distribution of capital in the various sections of the single unit of economy is consciously planned. The "jostling" as a result of the blind laws of the market is a thing of the past.

Will accumulation still take place? Will there still be a tendency to a falling rate of profit? The answer to these questions is in the affirmative. But to imagine that they will have the same meaning as in a capitalist society, i.e. where there are private owners competing, is to completely miss the essence of the matter.

It is necessary to look here at the other side of the process of the heightening of the organic composition of capital. There are two sides to this process - that of value and that of technique - both indissolubly linked. The heightening of the value composition means the development of technique and vice versa. Thus, another way of expressing the tendency to the falling rate of profit is in the increase of productivity through the introduction of new machinery.

Far from this becoming a barrier to further production in an economy where the total capital is one single entity, it in fact can only act as a spur to further production. The cheapening of the means of production gives the possibility of an enormous extension of production itself, because, the limits of production are no longer determined by the limits to which the process of "jostling" between the individual capitals can be taken. The limit to production is in the capacity of technique, which means that there are no limits.

In this sense, accumulation, which under capitalism is the "raison d'etre" becomes merely the medium for the limitless extension of production, where the division of the surplus value is something which is consciously controlled and not pre-determined by the blind laws of the market.

### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACCUMULATION AND CONSUMPTION

The relationship between the purchasing power of the masses and the extent of accumulation becomes entirely different from that under private ownership of the means of production. As we have seen, not only the individual capitalists, but the capitalists as a class, force the depression of the masses' consuming power in the period of crisis. The reason is that the depression of the wages of the coalminer is just as vital to the engineering capitalist as it is to the mineowner. The rate of profit throughout capitalism is averaged out. Any lowering of this specific rate of profit in the mines through a successful struggle of the miners also makes inroads into the general "pool" of profits, and consequently the average profit, which is as vital to every capitalist as it is to the mineowner. Thus, the alignment of the capitalists as a class against the struggle of any section of the workers.

But while there is this alignment of the class, all is not well within. There is the struggle of each against all. This struggle reaches its sharpest expression at the approach of the crisis. And in this competition, based upon nothing other than the private ownership of the means of production, each and every capitalist strives to reduce the costs of production and heighten the rate of exploitation in his individual enterprise. This means that each and every capitalist must strive to depress the living standards of the masses. Thus with the individual capitalist, so with the class. Under-consumption in relation to the needs of the masses, and over-production in relation to the needs of the economy are but the two sides of the same resultant, flowing from the division of the total capital in the economy into various privately owned sectors.

However, just as capital no longer confronts society as the absolute barrier to further production when there has been established the unity of the various capitals in the hands of the state, so the other side of the picture no longer remains. The inevitability of the underconsumption of the masses no longer exists. With each rise in the productive capacity there is no law which prevents the raising of the standards of the masses.

The level of consumption has no limiting factor other than the level of technique (here we are not discussing bureaucratic excesses, mismanagement, wastage, etc. - what we are concerned with are the laws inherent in the economy).

### THE TWO DEPARTMENTS OF PRODUCTION

Of particular importance in this connection is the relationship between the two departments of production - that producing producers' goods and that producing consumers' goods. In a "private" capitalist economy, the relationships between these departments are blindly conditioned by the market. In the disproportion which develops between the departments, the chaos in capitalism receives one of its sharpest expressions. There is no controlled relationship between the two.

Production has a certain logic. Producers goods have their outlet in the production of articles of consumption. The overproduction of capital in the crisis means that the disproportion between the two departments has become so acute that the outlet for new capital goods is "blocked up." The struggle between the competing capitals intensifies - but chaos remains and increases. Profit is the motive force; there are no means by which the process can be consciously regulated.

Under a unified economy the possibility is immediately given for a conscious planning of the two departments. The "blind" flow of capital to and from the various sectors, is replaced by a conscious regulation. Disproportions are eliminated as they arise. The development of technique assists this. The "overproduction" of consumers goods is replaced by a raising of the living standards of the masses. The relationships between constant and variable capital are consciously controlled. What is impossible under capitalism now becomes a conscious feature of the economic process.

### NECESSITY AND FREEDOM

This does not mean that, depending upon the level of technique, society can arbitrarily play around with the relationship between consumption and accumulation. Within limits, this can be done, but the limits are strictly set by the level of technique. Society does not leap overnight from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom. But the higher the technique develops the less will be the problems, and what is central to this question is that the problem which periodically besets capitalism, with its private ownership of the means of production, - the problem of "overproduction" - is completely abrogated.

That is why we now consider that the characterisation, "State Capitalism", in relation to an economy in which the whole of the means of production are in the hands of the state, is a contradiction in terms. It is, in fact, no longer capitalism. The basic law of capitalism, the law of crisis, no longer applies.

### NATIONAL "STATE CAPITALISM" AND WORLD ECONOMY

However, it is necessary to discuss the relationship between a national "state capitalism" and world economy in dealing with Part I of the Statification Document. The idea set forth in that document is that even if the whole of a national economy were in the hands of the state, the relationships between such a national economy and world economy would be basically the same as those between the individual enterprise and the national economy under "private" capitalism. That is to say, the relationships which make for crisis would still remain, but on a tremendously extended scale. Crises would not be eliminated, but on the contrary would be aggravated.

In the first place, it is necessary to remind ourselves that when Marx discussed the problems of the laws of capitalist economy, basic among which is the law of crisis, he did not take into consideration the external factors of the world market. Whilst not attempting to minimise the effects of the world division of labour, and whilst showing the importance and the interconnection of that world division of labour, he assumed for the purpose of his investigation a shut-in national economy, independent of its connections with the world market, and devoid of the problem of the supply of raw materials.

He showed that the cause of crisis was inherent within that national economy, inherent in every stage of the process of production. In the foregoing we have shown how these inherent laws are abrogated by the complete statification of the means of production.

### WORLD DIVISION OF LABOUR

Would the world division of labour have any effect on the functioning of such a national "state capitalism"? The answer is - yes, but not in such a way as to alter its basic laws.

The world division of labour has two sides: the division of labour in the production of raw materials for industry, which has a geographical basis (tin is mined in Malaya, coffee is grown in Brazil etc.), and the division of labour in a technical sense due to the diverse manner in which modern industry has been developed. At the root of this



world division of labour is the division between industry and agriculture.

The interdependence of the capitalist countries through the world division of labour, an interdependence which prevents any insulation for any section of world capitalist economy against the crisis of overproduction on a world scale, is not just a series of links between the various national economies. It is constituted by a whole network of threads linking the various units within each national economy to the various units in the rest of the world, etc.. All of these units are in competition one with the other. The process of the production of surplus value and of accumulation are dictated by this competition; each individual capital is controlled blindly by the market on a world scale.

The insulation against the shocks of the world market, which exist only very partially (protection etc) in "private" capitalism, becomes a reality in "state capitalism" through the monopoly of foreign trade based on the unity of the national capital. With the world slump, such a single national economy, would not be beset with the same problems as the capitalist countries.

In the first place, the whole of world economy does not shut down. Production is considerably reduced, but trading relationships continue. Such a national economy with a high level of technique, which required to exchange industrial products for other commodities necessary to its own economy, would not find the pressure of the capitalist countries sufficient to prevent the functioning of its own economy. The heightening of the organic composition of capital, the curse of the capitalist countries, would be its greatest weapon. "Dumping" would become possible on an unprecedented scale.

On the other hand, such a national economy in the process of developing its technique, like the Soviet Union, could consciously develop its plan on the basis of the existing world division of labour, and thus make it even more free from the shocks of the world market.

What is important in this whole connection, is that whatever the particular productive capacity of such a national economy, the abrogation of the laws of capitalism within the economy, by way of the statification of the means of production, also provides the basis for an insulation against being dragged down into the vortex of a world slump involving the capitalist countries.

---

### EFFECTS OF WORLD CRISIS

But once having said that, it is necessary to state that such an isolated national economy will obviously suffer certain disabilities as a result of the madhouse of the capitalist world, in which machinery and men stand idle. It will limit the pace at which it can advance its productive forces, even though it cannot prevent that advance taking place. In the same way, so long as such an economy remains isolated, the fetters imposed on production in the capitalist countries will compel it to adopt wasteful measures and deploy sections of its capital into uneconomic enterprises. In short, its advance would be prevented from receiving its fullest expression so long as capitalism remained in the rest of the world.

But with the statification of the means of production, the unification of the capitals in other countries, which would then extend the range of planning from a national to an international level, then these temporary expedients forced upon the isolated national economy would become absolutely unnecessary. Every wasteful process would be cut out. Technique and the standards of the masses would advance with seven league hoots.

### CONCLUSION

The conflict between  
the Social Mode of Production and Private Appropriation.

Thus, the Political Bureau has reached the conclusion that the basic laws, the crises, of capitalist society cannot be separated from the ownership of the various sectors of the economy in the hands of private, individual capitalists. The conflict between the social mode of production and private (i.e. capitalist) appropriation is the root from which all else flows. At the stage when the state takes the entire means of production into its hands, whether or not capitalism still remains in the other countries, the capitalist relations are "transformed into their opposite". A new society exists.

The establishment of such relations in the economy is possible only by the revolutionary action of the working class. The establishment of such relationships in the economy is the first basic task of the working class in power. To conclude, from the fact that to-day there is a general tendency in world capitalist economy towards the statification of the means of production, that capitalist society can peacefully evolve in this direction, is to ignore the tremendous social convulsions brought about by capitalism itself.

---

Economic contradictions produce social antagonisms, which in turn develop their own logic, not awaiting the further growth of the productive forces. "Time is by no means a secondary factor when historic processes are in question". The social process has its transitions from quantity into quality. The tendency towards stratification finds its expression in a period of capitalism in decline, a period in which the convulsions of wars and revolutions have become a permanent feature. The peaceful development of this trend, which in its conclusion would transform capitalism into its opposite, is absolutely excluded. Thus, "State Capitalism" is not only a theoretical absurdity, but an entirely unhistoric notion.

# THE PURGE OF RUSSIAN BIOLOGISTS

By David James

"Purges" are a commonplace in Stalinist Russia, and the news that biologists are to suffer the fate of musicians, artists, politicians and administrators, would not seem particularly startling. But in reality it is a new departure. Previous heresy-hunts covered only the world of man and his social institutions. Now Nature herself must toe the line.

The "new genetics", founded by one Michurin, and whose arch-priest is T.D. Lysenko, were known in Russia before the war, as a minority trend. Most Russian biologists held ideas in common with their Western counterparts, and their work was held in high regard. In August this position was changed. "Reactionary" biologists were dismissed from leading posts, and Lysenko's ideas were declared the only true faith. His report to the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences has now been published in English, and helps to throw light on the matter.

## LYSENKO'S "MARXIST" GENETICS

Lysenko's scientific ideas are almost inextricably mixed with his political and philosophical views, and it is difficult to deal with them alone. But the following is a very brief sketch.

The generally accepted Morgan-Mendel theory of heredity states that inherited characteristics of organisms are determined by ultra-microscopic bodies called genes. These are located in the chromosomes, which are fibre-like materials in the nucleus of each cell. Every body-cell contains two duplicate sets of chromosomes (cases are known of more than two, but they are a minority). When the cells divide during the organism's growth the chromosome outfit divides too, and each new cell contains an identical double set of chromosomes to the original. Now the reproductive cells -- sperms and ova -- are obtained by a "reduction division", which halves the chromosome outfit: these reproductive cells contain only one set of chromosomes. Fertilisation consists of the uniting of two such cells -- one from the mother, one from the father -- making a new cell containing a normal double set, which can then divide and re-divide as the embryo grows.



According to this theory, the genes are normally unaffected by the conditions of life of the organism. Since they are the sole bearers of hereditary characteristics, these are also unaffected. In other words, acquired characteristics are not inherited. Changes in the genes - "mutations" - normally occur spontaneously and are not evoked by external conditions. It must be understood that this theory does not deny the effect of the conditions of life on the organism, for instance inherited characteristics may not be manifested under unfavourable conditions. But inasmuch as the genes are unaffected by these conditions, the heredity also will be unaffected, and favourable conditions will bring out the inherited characteristics in the offspring.

Lysenko completely denies this view. He claims that not the genes alone but the whole organism is responsible for heredity, which in consequence is affected by the conditions of its life. He affirms the inheritance of acquired characteristics, and claims that he can back up his statements with facts, whereas the Morgan teaching "can cite no evidence to prove its point." (p.13 of his report)

Only an expert biologist who is thoroughly familiar with the field can affirm a view on the correctness or otherwise of Lysenko's ideas, and the author of this article makes no claim to do so. It is necessary to say, however, that all the most famous biologists in Russia as well as such leading biologists as C.D. Darlington and J.B.S. Haldane have opposed Lysenko's views. Clearly his statement that his opponents "can cite no evidence" in their favour is absurd in its bombast. In any case, whatever the merits of the dispute, it is the Stalinist methods of Lysenko which are our main concern. First, however, a few words in general on his apparent value as a scientist.

#### LYSENKO'S "SCIENCE"

One remarkable thing is the slender experimental evidence which he cites in order to overthrow the whole structure of modern genetics. In his report he described some experiments on tomato plants which are supposed to prove his point. Eric Ashby (Harrison Professor of Botany at Manchester University, author of the Pelican book "Scientist in Russia"), who has seen these experiments, dismisses them, saying that the plants used were too small in number, of uncertain pedigree, and infected with a virus disease that would materially affect the result.

Again, replying to the Academician Zhukovsky who had said he would believe Lysenko if he saw vegetative hybrids. Lysenko referred to "dozens and hundreds" of such examples to be seen in Russia for at

least a decade. Either the good Zhukovsky must have been a blind hermit, or Lysenko was indulging in another piece of bombast.

He makes a truly remarkable claim: "Once we accept the absolutely true and generally known proposition that the reproduction cells, or the germs, of new organisms are produced by the organism, by its body, and not by the very same reproductive cell from which the given, already mature, organism arose, nothing is left of the "neat" chromosome theory of heredity." (p.15). So apparently the beliefs of most biologists, J.B.S.Haldane included, are so absurd that a "generally known proposition" will refute them! And still Morgan's genetics stand, the standard textbook in many Russian colleges until recently expounded this genetics (as Lysenko admits, p.17), and the new genetics "is not so far taught in our universities and colleges." (p.34). Indeed, bourgeois-idealist sabotage and suppression of the truth has been effective!

In one place Lysenko ventures outside the field of biology with remarkable effect. He is attacking the use of statistics in genetics (Professor Haldane's forte by the way). It arises as follows. Since the hereditary character of the organism is determined when the reproductive cells which originate it unite, the thing which determines this character is the chromosome outfit of these reproductive cells themselves. This in turn is determined by the "reduction divisions" in the parent organisms which have given rise to these cells. Now in these reduction divisions, elements of chance enter into the formation of the (single) chromosome set of the reproductive cell: its chromosomes may be drawn from either of the two sets in the parent cell, and may be further complicated by "crossing" of these chromosomes, not to speak of mutations. The results of breeding experiments therefore show a randomness: but by doing enough experiments, and applying statistical analysis to the results, valuable information may be obtained about the structure and behaviour of the chromosomes.

Lysenko fulminates against such "idealistic" methods.

"Unable to reveal the law of living Nature, the Morganists have to resort to the theory of probabilities, and, since they fail to group the concrete content of biological processes, they reduce biological science to mere statistics... Physics and chemistry have been rid of fortuities. That is why they have become exact sciences... By ridding our science of Mendelism-Morganism-Weissmanism we will expel fortuities from biological science. We must firmly remember that science is the enemy of chance."(p.48)

Let Nature take note! Chance is a Trotskyist - sorry, Morganist-deviation, and will not be tolerated in Russia.

And is it true that physics and chemistry have been rid of fortuities?

One of the most important advances in chemistry of the last quarter-century has been the growth of chemical kinetics, the study of the progress of chemical change. This branch of the science essentially studies the collision of molecules and their absorption of energy. Such phenomena are completely random as far as individual molecules are concerned, but display exact laws when the vast numbers of molecules concerned in ordinary reactions are considered. Thus we may say that after a certain time a given proportion of molecules, say  $\frac{1}{3}$ , have reacted, and this may be determined exactly: but for any individual molecule we can only say that it had a probability of reacting of one in three. Thus in one of its most important fields, chemistry is an entirely statistical science.

In physics the case is even more emphasised. In his little book "WHAT IS LIFE?", the physicist Schroedinger explains that all the exact physical laws are statistical, and depend for their accuracy on the vast numbers of molecules that are concerned. Lysenko can hardly have been ignorant of this, for he bitterly attacks the book in another connection. The trouble is even deeper than this, however. For study of the atom has revealed a law known as the Uncertainty Principle, according to which it is impossible to know simultaneously both the position and momentum of a body. There is a degree of uncertainty, minute indeed, but of significance when we deal with minute bodies like electrons. Max Born explains the significance of this ("ATOMIC PHYSICS", 1937): "The law of causation, according to which the course of events in an isolated system is completely determined by the state of the system at time  $t = 0$ , loses its validity, at any rate in the sense of classical physics." He goes on to say that further development of theory makes it possible to establish a chain of causes and effects, but in that case we do not know the initial state exactly. "In this sense the law of causation is therefore empty; physics is in the nature of the case indeterminate, and therefore the affair of statistics."

It would appear that Lysenko's ignorance of the ABC of modern physics and chemistry does not prevent him from making crass assertions about these sciences. This gives us a measure of his value as a scientist in general.

## LYSENKO'S "MARXIST" PHILOSOPHY

It is Lysenko's philosophy and politics that necessitate our closest attention.

He claims that his theory alone is compatible with dialectical materialism: "The materialist theory of the evolution of living nature involves recognition of the necessity of hereditary transmission of individual characteristics acquired by the organism under the conditions of its life: it is unthinkable without recognition of the inheritance of acquired characters." (p.9). And symmetrically, his opponents represent philosophical idealism.

Unfortunately he makes no attempt to argue his philosophical case, and show the necessary connection between the scientific theories and the corresponding philosophies. In fact, he grossly perverts Marx's teaching. He attempts to transplant Marx's theory of the inter-relationship of man and his environment to the world of natural science.

Marxism teaches that the conditions of man's life determine his consciousness, and at the same time his consciousness reacts back and affects his conditions of life. The materialist doctrine of the first postulate is qualified by the dialectical approach of the second. Marxism teaches that inheritance of acquired characteristics in the realm of man's mind and his life in society. Man is born heir to a social tradition, which changes as a result of changed external conditions.

This does not conflict in the least with the idea of the inheritance of bodily characteristics which are independent of environment (we should add: independent in the short run, i.e. leaving out natural selection.) Thus a man may have a liking for music and an appreciation of its value, as a result of being born into a family where such things are esteemed. But he will not have a gift for musical composition or execution unless he has the right gene structure, for a musical gift is apparently a physical, hereditary characteristic.

Lysenko's conception of a "materialist" genetical theory and its alleged accordance with Marxist ideas is in actuality a vulgarisation of Marx's whole method.

The value of Marx's teaching lies in its correspondence with the facts.. For that reason bourgeois historians, where they are genuinely concerned with truth, are compelled to adopt the essence of Marx's analytical method. Of course, they reject the positive world-changing side of Marxism. But we must emphasise that the latter would have no significance if it were not for the objective truth of the theory.

Similarly, the test of a natural-scientific theory is in its agreement or otherwise with the facts. Moreover, natural science is more fortunate than historical in that its facts can be established at will by experiment. If the Morgan theory fits the facts then it is correct, at least unless new contradictory facts are discovered. This is true irrespective of whether or not its proponents are idealists: the theory itself stands the materialist test.

Lysenko's error - if we can call it that - lies in trying to erect scientific theories to fit an a priori philosophical conception. In so doing his philosophy is in reality idealist - for all that he calls it "materialism" - for the laws are deduced from his mind and Nature bidden to fit them. Engels had a fitting reply to Duhring who attempted a similar thing:

"If we deduce the world schematism not from our minds, but only through our minds from the real world, deducing the basic principles of being from what is, we need no philosophy for this purpose, but positive knowledge of the world and what happens in it: and what this yields is also not philosophy, but positive science."

Lysenko's method is not merely idealist, but obscurantist. The mediaeval Schoolmen obtained their natural science by studying the Bible and the works of Aristotle. Any individual such as Roger Bacon or Copernicus who studied nature and obtained results contradicting these authorities, was pursued and forbidden to publish his works. In Russia today, scientists who dare to obtain results contradicting the Stalinist "interpretations" of Marx and Engels are liable to be expelled and imprisoned.

"THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN GENETICS" As well as denouncing their theories, Lysenko attacks his opponents as idealists, bourgeois reactionaries and foreigners. The genetics dispute is a facet of the class struggle. "Two worlds - two ideologies in biology" is the sub-title of one of his chapters.

It is a fact, of course, that the majority of the world's scientists come from capitalist countries. Many are reactionary, many hold idealist and mystical views. Up until now, no-one has thought of attacking their work on these grounds. The objective merit of their work is the criterion, among Marxists as among all other people with a scientific outlook. Where such views do affect the work - as in the social sciences, where the results depend on selection of significant facts, and the conception of "significance" varies with the investigator's bias - the case is of course different. It is notorious that, despite their false views on philosophy, the greatest scientists of our day were bourgeois in outlook. Thus, Newton firmly believed in God; yet his mechanics, by enlarging man's understanding of the universe, has materially helped to undermine religion. If Lysenko had been alive perhaps he would have denounced Newton's work as the product of an idealist?

Even in the social sciences a scrupulous worker has been known to produce results detrimental to the interests of his own class. The economist Ricardo was one of the most capable and conscious spokesmen of the English capitalist class. How did Marx assess him? Speaking of the bourgeois theory that when workers are displaced by machinery there is always a corresponding liberation of capital to employ them again, he says:

"Originally Ricardo held the same opinion; but after a time, with the scientific impartiality and love of truth characteristic of the man, he expressly renounced it."

(CAPITAL, Vol I, Chapter 13, Sec.6  
footnote)

Nor should we forget that Marx drew largely on the work of the bourgeois Ricardo when he wrote "CAPITAL."

Scientific objectivity is a priceless heritage, gained by capitalism from the obscurantism of the Middle Ages, and except in fascist countries capitalism has not destroyed it. Socialists must recognise and welcome this fact, not deny it and bury it under a dung-heap of slander.

The truly reactionary nature of Lysenko's attitude appears when he attacks his opponents as bourgeois or friends of foreigners. Thus, he talks of "foreign reactionary biology hostile to us." (page 21). "PRAVDA" (11.9.48) pointed out that Weissmann was a German, Morgan an American, and Mendel an Austrian and a monk to boot! The choicest flower in this appalling attitude is to be found in a statement quoted in the Russian paper "LITERATURNAYA GAZETA" (8.9.48):



"We the undersigned, members of the collective farm 'The Road to Socialism' (Ramensk Region, Moscow Province) demand that the hangers-on of bourgeois science, vile lackeys of the foreigners, should be expelled from our universities. They have no place among the scientists of our Fatherland. What have they given to the people who are advancing with sure tread to Communism?"

Against these reactionary foreigners, "PRAVDA" and Lysenko hold aloft the banner of "Marxism". Marx, of course, was a Russian born and bred!

#### USEFULNESS AS A SCIENTIFIC CRITERION

According to Lysenko, his opponents' work does not lead to results of practical usefulness, and apparently that is enough to condemn them. Thus he attacks Zhebrak's institution for studying polyploidy, because "although it has for some years done nothing besides its work on polyploidy, (it) has produced literally nothing of practical value." (page 23). The paper "BOLSHEVIK" (15.8.48) delivers itself of the general statement: "A science which does not help production, which does not arm practical workers, which does not help Soviet citizens to build a better life, has no right to call itself science."

"The test of theory is practice." That is Marxist teaching, and in the natural sciences it means experimental observations are decisive, a familiar and generally accepted principle. But it bears no immediate relation to the criterion of usefulness. It is well known that "pure" science is seldom of any immediate practical value; but were it suppressed for that reason, information of great ultimate usefulness would be lost. Only in technology can the criterion of usefulness be applied. And technology itself would be meagre were it not for the "pure" science on which it is based, which often has been conducted in a spirit of pure inquisitiveness.

Of course, the development of science is dependent on the needs of society. The one interacts upon the other. It would be entirely reactionary to say that the scientist can sit in an ivory tower, indifferent to the society in which he lives. In the last analysis, all science serves the needs of society and in that sense there is no "pure" science.

Once again, Lysenko's idea is a perversion of Marxism, which can only serve to discredit Marxism among serious people.

Is it in fact true that Mendel-Morgan genetics are useless? Let us repeat, even if they were it would not condemn them if they correspond to the facts. But a geneticist of L.Fyfe, writing in the Stalinist "MODERN QUARTERLY", Autumn 1947, had the following to say:

"In my own view this (Lysenko's influence) must have caused serious losses to the USSR. In North America plant breeding avowedly based on genetics has two successes to its credit - hybrid corn and rust-resistant wheat - which are so striking that it has been seriously argued that they did more than any other discovery or invention towards winning the war. Plant breeding in the USSR cannot claim successes of this magnitude."

What, then, is Lysenko's practical value? It appears that he is a very capable practical farmer, and has been responsible for many ideas which have helped to improve Russian farming, though they do not depend at all on his genetical theories. Professor Ashby says that "when the much-advertised pre-treatment of grain by low temperatures, called vernalisation, proved a great failure, Lysenko cleverly substituted another pre-treatment, which is virtually a germination test, but which appeared under his name in the decrees for the spring sowing in 1945 and 1946."

("SCIENTIST IN RUSSIA" page 115)

#### THE PARTY AND THE PURGE

If Lysenko's ideas and activities are so monstrous, how has he succeeded in rising to the top in the

Russian genetical sphere? The answer is simple: behind Lysenko and his theories stands the Russian Communist Party; behind that stands the NKVD.

"The question is asked in one of the notes handed to me. What is the attitude of the Central Committee of the Party to my report? I answer: the Central Committee of the Party examined my report and approved it", says Lysenko. Thus far the English version. "PRAVDA" 10.8.48 remarks that this was greeted with frantic applause and interminable ovations, all rose and swore fidelity to the great cause of Lenin-Stalin.

"The condition in the Academy has now sharply changed thanks to the interest taken in it by the Party, the Government, and

Comrade Stalin personally. A considerable number of Michurinists have been elected members and corresponding members of our Academy, and more will be added shortly, at the coming elections." (Page 22 of Lysenko's report)

Prescience!

That well-known geneticist, Molotov, quoted in "WORLD NEWS AND VIEWS" (6.11.48) approves the inheritance of acquired characteristics, remarks that "the scientific discussion on biological questions was conducted under the guiding influence of our Party." And the Party never jokes.

Already in the 1930's a small-scale purge had occurred. Academicians Levitsky and Ardylov were imprisoned. Professors Agel and Ferry were shot. Lysenko's greatest opponent, Vavilov, who in 1921 was entrusted by Lenin with the task of organising Russian agricultural research, and who won world fame as a biologist, was sent to a concentration camp in 1940, where he died in 1942. But still has ideas held the field.

All this has changed. The Council of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR issued a decree on August 28th, 1948. Orboly, secretary of its biological section, is dismissed. Schmalhausen, Director of the Institute of Morphology, is dismissed. The Laboratory of Cytology (study of animal and plant cells) is abolished. The "Five Year Plan" of the Biological section is revised along Michurin lines. The Council also sent a letter to Stalin, admitting its past errors and promising to occupy a "leading position in the struggle against reactionary teachings."

In 1945 Professor Zhebrak wrote to the American magazine "SCIENCE" defending the freedom of Soviet science, pointing out that many Soviet geneticists were sharply critical of Lysenko's theories. After two years "PRAVDA" wakes up and thunders: "Zhebrak as a Soviet scientist should have unmasked the class meaning of the struggle which is taking place around questions of genetics. But blinded by bourgeois prejudices, by detestable fawning on bourgeois science, he has adopted the attitude of the enemy's camp..." (Quoted from "TIME", 22.9.47)

Until recently, Stalinists abroad could maintain a critical attitude towards Lysenko. Thus did Fyfe, in the "MODERN QUARTERLY" article quoted (it is interesting that in that article he referred to Zhebrak's "SCIENCE" article as proof of the freedom of Soviet science! Little knowing he was in the "enemy's camp"...) So too has

J.B.S.Haldane. But the British C.P. is reacting to this new orthodoxy by publishing glowing reviews of Lysenko's report. Stung by A.J.Cummings' taunts, Haldane has written an article in the "DAILY WORKER" (1.11.48) criticising some of Lysenko's genetical ideas - but oh, so tactfully! - not a word about his attacks on statistics, on foreigners, not a word about the philosophical question or the purges. No matter: Haldane is on the spot and cannot escape from the dilemma of his position. Let him ponder on the example of Tito: people have been excommunicated for lesser heresies than Haldane's.

WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

Why, we may ask, does the Stalinist Government take so much interest in this question.

The reasons are probably manifold. Lysenko is the practical man, the peasants' demagogue", as Ashby says. He is supported as the man who rouses the peasants from their sloth, whose practical genius can force the raising of agricultural production. If this be at the cost of destroying the edifice of Russian genetics, that must be borne.

Again, the Stalinists are whipping up hostility to the West, not only against capitalism, but against all liberal ideas that might encourage a critical spirit and threaten the Stalinist totalitarian regime. Is it an accident that Western biologists are attacked not only as reactionaries but as foreigners?

Under Stalinism, objective research into history and economics is already impossible. All books dealing with the history of Russia must paint Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev and many others as saboteurs of the revolution: anyone who dared mention their leading role in

the revolution and the early Soviet state would not spend a day free. Nor would an economist who submitted a statistical analysis of the distribution of the national income between groups and classes in Russia, unless he carefully obscured the true position. Now biology joins the list of "controlled" subjects. Nature must conform to the Party's dictates: if it happens that she fails to, no-one must dare to mention the fact.

A regime which does this demonstrates its absolutely reactionary character. No government which fears and suppresses science can stand the test of history. Economic successes may be achieved by applying known techniques; technology may even make some advances. But when the free development of science is stopped, the source of progress dries up.

Socialism, by liberating man from his class exploitation, frees his spirit for the pursuit of truth and beauty. Such was the effect of the Russian revolution, although it was only a first step to socialism. By its suppression of the human spirit, together with its infernal exploitation of the body, Stalinism demonstrates how far it is from socialism, and how it undoes the work of October, 1917.

PUBLISHED BY BILL HUNTER, for the Revolutionary Communist Party,  
(Trotskyist), 256 Harrow Road, London, W.2.