

# Fourth International

## Fascism and Socialism

*By Daniel Guerin*

### Inside the Fourth International

---

Big Three at Potsdam . . . *By William F. Warde*

The Wavell Plan . . . . . *By K. Tilak*

The Atomic Bomb . . . . . *By William Wallis*

*Editorials on British Labor Victory,  
Soviet Planning, Lend-Lease*

September 1945

25 Cents

## Manager's Column

With the ending of the war, we will witness more and more an inevitable leftward swing in the American political scene. The revulsion against the war will, within time, unquestionably sweep the nation and find significant repercussions especially among the youth. For these reasons we can now look forward to broader and ever increasing audiences for our theoretical magazine. Advanced groups of trade union workers, returning soldiers and young intellectuals in the schools will show more and more interest in our rounded Marxist analysis of world events, and the program of the socialist revolution, the only program that offers a way out to humanity. Our agents should be very wide awake in discovering new channels for a wider distribution of our magazine.

\* \* \*

The newsstand sales of **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** continue to grow. With the August issue sold out on many stands soon after publication, we have again increased our press run. In New York, one newsstand, which had increased its bundle order in July, sent for additional copies of the August issue the day after the magazines were delivered. New York's bundle order has been increased by 100 copies, which will temporarily take care of the stepped-up demand.

### COMMENTS FROM OUR AGENTS:

Alma Seton, of Philadelphia, informs us, "This [July] issue went fast here. There are still people asking for it. Please send us additional copies."

A. Alexander reports that in San Francisco, for the past months, all copies of the **F. I.** have been sold out on the newsstands. "For that reason we have decided to increase our bundle order substantially. I hope it will be possible for you to do this immediately, beginning with the August issue."

Cleveland's order is for a one-third increase.

Flint requests that we double theirs with the September issue.

Readers in the Pittsburgh area will be interested in a new central location where the **F. I.** may be bought. Arrangements have been made with the book department of Kauffman's, the largest department store in Pittsburgh.

A newsstand near the campus of the University of California in San

## FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 6 September 1945 No. 9 (Whole No. 58)

Published monthly by the  
Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 20c for 5 copies and up. Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles, 21c for 5 copies and up.

Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Managing Editor: E. R. FRANK

### CONTENTS

Review of the Month	
Labor Victory in England	259
USSR's Fourth 5-Year Plan	261
End of Lend-Lease	263
Wheeler's Significant Speech	265
Capitalist Thinkers at Work	267
Fascism and Socialism	By Daniel Guerin 269
Big Three at Potsdam	By William F. Warde 273
The Atomic Bomb	By William Wallis 277
The Wavell Plan	By K. Tilak 279
From the Arsenal of Marxism	
Nationalism and Economic Life	By Leon Trotsky 281
Correspondence on Unity	284
Inside the Fourth International	286

Printed by Criterion Linotyping & Printing Co., Inc.

San Francisco was recently supplied with magazines containing Special Offer subscription blanks. We have already received a response from this effort. We suggest that other agents experiment with this method.

\* \* \*

The recent experiences of many of our agents demonstrate that meetings constitute one of the best

sources for the sale of the **F. I.** In New York, the **F. I.**'s are displayed on the literature table inside the meeting hall. The question "Have you seen the latest **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**?" has been sufficient to completely sell out the stock on hand. At the Trotsky Memorial meeting, in August, New York sold 37 copies.

### Subscription Blank

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL  
116 University Place  
New York 3, N. Y.

I am enclosing \$..... Send me  
**FOURTH INTERNATIONAL**

for  
( ) 6 months ..... \$1.00  
( ) 1 year ..... \$2.00

Name .....

Address ..... Zone .....

City .....

As a result of references in **THE MILITANT** to articles which have appeared in back copies of the **F. I.**, we have received orders for 13 copies of the June magazine. One reader said that the article "Interview With a Soviet Citizen" was what he had been looking for for a long time, because of his interest in an appraisal of the status of U.S.S.R.

\* \* \*

Our English readers continue to write us appreciative letters. One reader states: "I feel that I must write and say how much I have enjoyed and gained through reading **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** and **THE MILITANT**."

"Your journal **F. I.** is without equal in the field of Socialist literature, whilst for **THE MILITANT** I can only say that it has been invaluable to me in reaching a true analysis of the every-day activities of our American comrades.

"The election result here in Britain has borne out the prediction by Stuart in the **F. I.** of June 1944 when he wrote 'England is on the verge of great revolutionary events.'

"Governmental power is now vested in the hands of labor fakers who have no intentions of utilising it for Socialist legislation; true, they may put one or two acts on the Statute Book which might mislead the workers for a period, but sooner or later **Big Business** will call for a showdown. When that crucial moment comes the workers will know that other weapons are required for the winning of Socialism.

"They will also go through the bitter experience of having American Finance ranged against them. This will have the salutary effect, however, of bringing in the American workers directly.

"Yes, great days are at hand in the Socialist movement. Let us go forward in Marxist fashion to meet them.

"Which brings me to the request I have to make. I would very much like a copy of Trotsky's 'In Defense of Marxism' as it is unobtainable on this side."

Another British reader writes: "I have become very interested in the Trotskyist movement here in Britain after lengthy discussions with some of the comrades on this side.

"During the course of these 'talks' the American **MILITANT** and the **FOURTH INTERNATIONAL** have been referred to time after time on some topic or another. I should very much appreciate it if you would send me a regular copy of each of the above papers so that I may keep abreast of events in the U.S."

# FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME 6

SEPTEMBER 1945

NUMBER 9

## REVIEW OF THE MONTH

*The British Labor Victory and Revolutionary Tasks—The USSR  
and the Fourth Five-Year Plan—The End of Lend-Lease—  
Wheeler's Significant Speech on the "Peace"—  
Conference on Science and Philosophy*

### The Labor Party Victory in Britain

#### A SIGNIFICANT MILESTONE

The victory of the British Labor Party is a significant milestone in the history of the international class struggle. Not only the victory, but the size of the Labor Party majority came as a shocking surprise to the capitalist statesmen everywhere. Winston Churchill, calculating that Allied victory over Germany would immeasurably heighten his prestige, had called an early election despite the reluctance of the Labor Party officials to go to the polls. The Conservative Party, led by Churchill, confidently predicted a majority of 50 seats shortly before the first returns were made public. Yet out of a Parliament of 640 seats, the British voters gave the Labor Party 390. A tremendous victory! The consternation that ensued extended even to the timorous officials of the Labor Party.

The election reveals the great change in mass moods. It represents a dramatic demonstration of the leftward shift in class forces in Europe since the beginning of the war. With figures still incomplete, the soldier vote was more than 90 percent for the Labor Party. Working class districts were virtually solid for the Labor Party. Most significant was the support from the middle class. Petty bourgeois areas which had opposed Labor politics for generations repudiated in July the Churchill regime and voted the Labor Party to power. The Conservatives, principal party of the British capitalists, were reduced to a minority and the parties in between whittled down to virtually nothing. These shifts in class relations appear as a sharpening *polarization* in the political arena. The classes are lining up in Great Britain for a showdown struggle.

The shift of the middle class to the camp of the proletariat bears out the political law formulated by Leon Trotsky that in the major crisis of our epoch, fascism cannot come to power until the working class has first had its opportunity to establish socialism. The first titanic swing is a swing to the left. The petty bourgeoisie turns to the working class and says in effect, "We can no longer continue to exist under the present ruling class. Let the workers take the fate of the country in hand!"

Only if the workers fail to take power, fail to end the capitalist system, fail to boldly move forward to socialism, does the petty bourgeoisie become desperate, shift away from the working class and become prey for fascism.

#### THE SHIFT IN CLASS RELATIONS

The shift in class relations expressed in the victory of the British Labor Party is a direct consequence of the Second World War. The people of Great Britain are beginning to draw the correct balance sheet of the bankruptcy of capitalism. Within a quarter of a century after the First World War "for democracy," they saw the flower of Britain's youth marched onto the battlefields once again to save capitalism. In the bombings of the large centers of England, the people experienced far more directly than in 1914-18 the horrors of modern war. The blasted buildings, the queues, the hunger, the casualties, the nervous strain were daily reminders that the capitalist system was bankrupt. The threat of a Third World War weighed down like a nightmare. American workers returning from England during the war reported an almost universal phrase among the British workers: "After this war, then the real war will begin." By that they meant the working class struggle against capitalism.

The victory of the British Labor Party was a brilliant confirmation of the correctness of the slogan of the British Trotskyists: "Labor to Power." Throughout the war the British Trotskyists opposed the coalition of the Labor Party officialdom with the Conservatives. They demanded that Labor break the coalition and fight for power. The slogan "Labor to Power" has now been confirmed by events as in perfect consonance with the major working class political developments in Britain.

The mere ousting of the more reactionary capitalist statesmen does not automatically guarantee, however, the installation of a revolutionary socialist program. Even the avowed program of the Labor Party is not at all one of revolutionary socialism. It proposes instead a number of internal reforms, to be carried through in gentlemanly agreement with the capitalists; reforms which are supposed to *gradually* bring about Socialism. But the record of the Labor Party bureaucrats is a black one even with regard to their own reformist program. Time after time they have betrayed their own avowed political aims. Attlee, Bèvin and the rest have political records which few betrayers of the working class can match for perfidy. It is sufficient to recall that throughout the war they supported Churchill's policies on the war, the colonial and the domestic fronts, acting in many cases as Churchill's foremost agents.

## DEPENDABLE LAP DOGS

Consequently, while the capitalist statesmen were deeply disturbed by the leftward political swing of the British masses, they heaved a sigh of relief on recalling the record of the men who had been pushed into power. These were loyal lap dogs, long accustomed to licking the boots of Britain's despots. They could be depended upon. They were safe.

The newly installed Labor Government began conducting public affairs true to form. Attlee's first act was a betrayal of the mandate given him by the British workers. Instead of exposing and opposing the imperialist aims of Britain's ruling class in the war, he pledged "to finish the war with Japan." On Churchill's resignation as Prime Minister, Attlee took the still warm seat of the Empire's best watch dog at the Potsdam conference and agreed to all the measures advanced by his arch-reactionary predecessor, including the carving up of Germany and the imposition of the most rapacious "peace" in history.

Instead of exposing the fraud of the United Nations Charter, Attlee supported it, including the denial of freedom to colonial peoples. One of the acts leading to Churchill's defeat was the British provocation of civil war in Greece. The workers of Great Britain protested in great mass demonstrations the spilling of the blood of their Greek fellow workers. Attlee, however, is continuing Churchill's policy in Greece, apparently working from the same blueprints of imperialist rule followed by Churchill before him. On Sept. 5, scarcely more than a month since taking office, Ernest Bevin, the Foreign Secretary, made it brutally clear in a speech in Parliament touching on Greek affairs "that the Labor Government's policy was identical with that of former Prime Minister Churchill's Coalition Government."

A particularly crass instance of Attlee's betrayal of the interests of the workers who put him in power is his seizure of Hong Kong. This island, controlling a rich section of China, was first grabbed from the Chinese people by British imperialism in 1841. Although China and Great Britain were allies ostensibly fighting together for "four freedoms" in the Second World War, the British imperialists had no intention of actually living up to the lying propaganda which they utilized to drag the masses into the war. When Churchill demanded in Parliament that Attlee carry out the imperialist policy of fighting tooth and nail against the "liquidation" of the British Empire, Attlee humbly replied, "Yes, sir!"

## KARL MARX'S STATEMENT

Karl Marx long ago pointed out that no people which oppresses other peoples can itself be free. The betrayals of the Labor Party bureaucrats in the field of foreign affairs presage their coming betrayals of the British masses in the sphere of domestic policies. Labor bureaucrats who dare not challenge Big Business abroad will also not have the courage to challenge it at home.

Has nothing, therefore, been changed by the Labor Party victory? Superficial observers may believe that the British capitalists have simply changed their political glove while the hand inside the glove remains the same. Certainly the ultra-lefts of all shades and varieties will have a field day proving over and over again that the policy of the Labor Party in power remains essentially the same as Churchill's policy. That this would be the case, however, was known well to Marxists in advance of the victory. Ten years ago the Trotskyist movement stated:

Should the electoral successes of the Labor Party raise it once again to power, the consequence would not be a peaceful socialist transformation of *Great Britain*, but the consolidation of imperialist reaction, that is to say, an epoch of civil war, in the face of which the

leadership of the Labor Party will inevitably reveal its complete bankruptcy. The parliamentarian and trade unionist morons have yet to be convinced that the threat of fascism in England is no less real than on the continent.

If we approach the question dialectically—and that is the method of the Marxists in politics—we must consider the Labor Party as shot through with a deep contradiction. Its present leaders follow capitalist politics, but the Party is rooted in the working class. Thus it is not simply a question of Conservatives being replaced in government by a new set of representatives of the capitalist class. A qualitative change has occurred. The capitalist parties are now a minority. The working class party is in the administration with a solid working majority. As Trotsky remarked in considering the Labor Party and the Conservatives: "We are dealing here not with the rivalry between two parties, but with the destinies of two classes."

So long as the Labor Party remained in a minority or did not have a clear majority, the officialdom were able to present the semblance of an argument that they could not be held responsible for the ills of capitalist government or for failure to undertake revolutionary measures. Thus they succeeded in maintaining for many years the illusion of the bulk of workers: the illusion that all that was necessary in the struggle for socialism was to continue building the Labor Party until such time as it was strong enough to win office, and then it would be in a position to gradually, painlessly institute Socialism.

## LABOR OFFICIALS PUT TO TEST

But this alibi now suffices no longer. Once in power, these creatures are put to the decisive test. Trotsky in 1925 outlined what would happen under such circumstances: "Even a slight acquaintance with the qualities of the MacDonalds, Thomases, Clyneses, Snowdens, and all the rest (the last generation of Attlees, Bevins and Morrisons), is quite sufficient to prove to us how catastrophically the contradictions between the demands of the masses and the obtuse conservatism of the leading upper circles of the Labor Party will grow, particularly if this Party should come to power again." Trotsky's prophetic words of 20 years ago today gain burning actuality. Under the conditions of crisis following the Second World War, the inheritors of the tattered mantles of the MacDonalds will be compelled to expose themselves with startling speed.

But the exposure of the labor bureaucrats signifies at the same time an extreme narrowing of their base of support in the rank and file of the Labor Party. The mass of workers represented by the Labor Party is sure to shift leftward. Their previous victory in ousting Churchill will give the masses all the more confidence and make them all the more impatient as their illusions in the upper circles of the party are exploded. They will turn in anger and revulsion from those who dance on Churchill's strings. Their illusions in the reformist leaders, their belief that Socialism can, by the ballot, be voted into office, will be burned away. More and more workers will realize the iron necessity for a revolutionary policy. We can expect the left wing of the Labor Party to grow mightily in strength. At the same time the hundreds of thousands of workers newly awakened to political life will begin resorting to direct action to achieve their demands. Thus the Labor Party victory means above all that England stands on the verge of a new stormy development of the class struggle.

The British capitalists, however, will not remain inactive. Increasingly they will turn to reaction, to methods of terror and finally fascism. Trotsky foresaw this as early as 1925: "The

English bourgeoisie has been trained to mercilessness by all the conditions of its insular position, its Calvinist moral philosophy, its colonial practice, its national arrogance. England is being forced more and more into the background. This inevitable process is also creating a revolutionary situation. The English bourgeoisie, obliged to humiliate itself before America, to make concessions, to maneuver, to watch and wait, is being filled with extraordinary fury, which it will reveal in frightful forms in the civil war" (*Whither England*).

### BRITISH LABOR HOLDS STAGE

If the working class procrastinates too long, fails to push forward a resolute revolutionary leadership, then the middle class will begin to vacillate, to move

away from the working class, to fall prey to the fascist demagogues, and British fascism will begin its bloody march toward power.

But that is not the situation today. Today British Labor holds the public stage. Today British labor holds in its hands the opportunity of seizing hold of the economic system, expropriating the capitalist cliques, instituting Socialist measures, and thereby again sounding the tocsin of revolution throughout the world, the tocsin with which Lenin and Trotsky first aroused and gave new hope to all humanity.

The British Trotskyists will have the duty of utilizing the enormous opportunities now opening up to drive the wedge deeper between the leftward-moving masses and the traitorous labor bureaucracy; to fructify the left wing which will surely grow in the days ahead with the program and tactics of Trotskyism. On that road open up grandiose perspectives for the rapid growth of the Revolutionary Communist Party, the British section of the Fourth International.

## The Resumption of Planning in the USSR

### THE FOURTH 5-YEAR PLAN

Few dispatches in recent days could have competed for public notice against the blasts of the atomic bombs in Japan and the sudden termination of the "shooting war" in the Pacific. Nevertheless, such significant news did come, even though it has been virtually ignored by the bourgeois press in this country. Its source is Moscow. And its sum and substance is that planned economy will be resumed in the Soviet Union.

January 1946 is the official date set by the Kremlin for launching the fourth Five-Year Plan. Stalin's former boast, made in the era of the Stalin-Hitler pact, of far vaster undertakings, of launching "The Fifteen Year Plan" has been conveniently forgotten. The newly projected plan—the fourth in the series—is for a term of five years, scheduled to conclude in December 1950. Thus far, just the bare announcement has come. Neither the scope of the plan nor any of its major annual quotas have been made public. Therein the Kremlin continues its unrelenting policy of secrecy. Since 1939, the year of Stalin's alliance with Hitler, the lid of censorship has been clamped tight upon all official data relating to Soviet economic life. This same year likewise marked the beginning of the disruption of planning in the USSR, owing in large measure to feverish war preparations, and, subsequently, owing to the war itself.

The present news is of the utmost importance and must be carefully weighed by us, who follow with the greatest attention all developments inside that complicated and contradictory social structure which is the U.S.S.R. First and foremost, it signifies that the revolution is still not dead, in the land where Stalinism

has fostered and reinforced the counter-revolutionary tendencies for more than two decades. The revolution still lives in the USSR because planned economy is conceivable and realizable only on the basis of collectivized property, the highest and most progressive system of economic organization. It was one of the fundamental conquests of the October Revolution.

### CAPITALIST STATE AND PLANNING

Capitalism, as we know, is incapable of planning its economy. Only one social system in history has proven this ability—the workers' state that emerged from the October 1917 revolution. The very projection of the fourth Five-Year Plan constitutes the latest corroboration of the correctness of our analysis of the class nature of the USSR as a workers' state, although badly degenerated under Stalinist rule.

Our analysis may be briefly summarized in the following propositions:

The Soviet regime is a transitional regime. It is not definitively "socialist" as the Stalinists falsely maintain. Neither is it capitalist. Nor is it some new system of class rule, as the vulgar revisionists of Marxism have proclaimed.

From the Marxist standpoint, the regime is far closer to capitalism than to socialism. Because of the country's extreme backwardness, its subsequent isolation, the Allied blockade and the havoc of the First World War and the Civil War, the period of reconstruction at the time was simultaneously a period of forced retreat, under the New Economic Policy (NEP)—a retreat in the direction of capitalism which lasted far longer than any one had originally envisaged. But under Lenin, despite the retreat on the economic field, the conscious direction and the movement of Soviet society itself remained unswervingly toward socialism. With the death of Lenin, the capitalist tendencies became more and more reinforced in the direction of counter-revolution and capitalist restoration. This counter-revolutionary process in the superstructure reached its culmination during the recent war years when the Soviet masses, previously expropriated politically, were deprived of remaining social and cultural conquests achieved by the October revolution.

But while Stalinism was thus consummating its work of clearing the road for the capitalist counter-revolution in the superstructure, processes in a diametrically opposite direction were taking place in the economic foundation. The industrialization of the country—achieved through the Five-Year Plans which the Stalinist bureaucracy was compelled to undertake after the 1928 "Kulak crisis" in order to preserve its own regime—tipped the scales heavily in favor of the socialist sector of economy as against the capitalist sector. At the same time this acted to make agriculture and the peasantry—the classic soil of capitalist property forms—more and more dependent on expanding industry.

### CONTRADICTION NOT RESOLVED

The reintroduction of planning is an expression of the fact that this contradiction has not yet been definitively resolved by history. And it can be resolved in only one of two ways: *Either* a regression to capitalism, or more correctly, a plunge into the abyss; *or* the resumption of the socialist road. There is no third course.

If the original plans were carried out in a period of the raging economic crisis of capitalism, the new plan is being projected in the days of its death agony. The world working class suffered at the time a series of catastrophic defeats for which Stalinism bears the main responsibility. The period of the newly projected

plan coincides with the acutest economic and social crisis of the imperialist system in Europe, Asia and the United States, accompanied by the leftward swing of the masses in Europe as well as the colonies. Neither the crisis of imperialism nor the revolutionary wave will speedily subside. This cannot fail to have the profoundest repercussions in the Soviet Union, whose fate will be determined, in the last analysis, by the outcome of the class struggle on the international arena.

Internally the situation is likewise altered. By 1928-29 when the first Five-Year Plan was launched, the country had recovered by and large from the wounds of World War I and the Civil War of 1919-21. As a matter of fact planning was needlessly and criminally delayed by the bureaucracy long beyond the stage when it became feasible. In those years Stalin was among the bitterest foes of planning, which was then labelled as "super-industrialism," and, of course, persecuted as a Trotskyist "deviation." Prior to 1928-29 Stalin, together with Bukharin, Rykov and others, proposed to crawl into socialism, even if at the "pace of a tortoise."

Relative capitalist stabilization and the ensuing era of "pacifism" greatly lightened the load of militarism, one of the main obstacles to economic progress. In the initial phases of planning, Soviet expenditures for defense were officially estimated at from 5 to 10 percent of the annual budget. The "Victory Budget" adopted by the Supreme Council in April allots 45 percent to military needs, approximately the same proportion as during the war years. Nor is any tangible relief from this burden envisaged. Meanwhile the country has grown not richer but vastly poorer.

#### ANOTHER GRAVE OBSTACLE

This brings us to still another grave obstacle in the way of restoration of Soviet economy. After a lapse of more than half a decade, planning must be resumed in the USSR amid unprecedented ruination and pauperization. It is impossible to minimize the colossal task of bringing the devastated regions back to pre-war levels of production in industry and agriculture alike. The rigidly censored Moscow dispatch calmly acknowledges that the task of "reconstruction alone would absorb the economic energies of the USSR for many decades to come."

According to May 29 *Red Star*, official organ of the Red Army "more than 100 billion dollars" are required for restoration of the Ukraine. The official—and largely fictitious rate of exchange is 5.3 rubles to one dollar. Thus 530 billion (pre-war) rubles are required for the restoration of the Ukraine. This astronomical sum surpasses by approximately 100 billion rubles the total budget for both the first and the second Five-Year Plans. Or to put it differently, it is more than five times the highest pre-war annual national income (105 billion rubles in 1938). In other words, even if Soviet economy were immediately restored to prewar levels, it would take all of the national income for the period of the fourth Five-Year Plan to restore industry, agriculture, and the ruined cities and villages of the Ukraine alone. But the Ukraine is only one of seven Soviet republics in dire need of restoration, the other six being: Byelorussia, Moldavia, Finno-Carelia, Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia. Their cities and villages are by official report—likewise heaps of "debris and charred ruins."

Finally; it ought to be noted that the generations who carried the burden of the initial plans on their shoulders had a period of years to recuperate from the exhaustion of war and civil war, while new generations grew up in the meantime. The burden today falls on war-weary masses who have borne untold

sacrifices and losses. Their ranks have been decimated. In the Ukraine alone the loss of civilians is numbered in tens of millions. The Kremlin does not propose to mitigate the lot of the worker and peasant. The Moscow dispatch informs us that the previous policy of subordinating consumer goods production to capital goods production will prevail. The emphasis of the fourth Five-Year Plan is on the "restoration and expansion of basic industries."

The manpower problem affects planning today in still another way. The pinch in the available labor forces began to be felt at the close of the second Five-Year Plan. In 1938, in his report to the Eighteenth Party Congress, Stalin declared:

Now it is no longer a question of finding room in industry for unemployed and homeless peasants who have been set adrift from their villages and live in fear of starvation—of giving them jobs out of charity. The time has long gone by when there were such peasants in our country . . . If anything, it is now a question of asking the collective farms to release, say, one and a half million young collective farmers annually for the needs of our expanding industry.

#### THE INTRODUCTION OF CHILD LABOR

The "release" of the necessary labor force was obtained by the Kremlin through the introduction of child labor. As a result of the war and the huge casualty lists, today there is a labor shortage not only in industry but in agriculture as well. A further drain is placed on manpower through the maintenance of armies of unprecedented size, both for purposes of occupation as well as "safeguarding the peace." This explains the Kremlin's anxiety to utilize German slave labor in the work of reconstruction.

In the face of these and other obstacles the Kremlin still boasts that it will surpass "prewar economic levels by 1950."

The unreliability of Stalinist claims can be laid bare by one of the few "estimates" actually cited by Moscow sources. It is claimed that by the end of 1946 the steel output will total 20 million tons. This figure is, in fact, *above* the highest prewar output of steel (in 1938 Stalin claimed an annual production of 18 million tons). The Donbas areas which accounted for almost half of 1938 production (8 to 9 million tons) are in ruins. The official figure for steel production in the Urals for 1945 is given as 15 million tons. This means that steel production in the Urals must have almost doubled to have attained such a level. Yet another authoritative Stalinist source inadvertently lets slip that the output of one of the largest steel producing Ural combines, the Kuzbas, showed a far more modest increase. "The annual steel output [in the Kuzbas] is now 500,000 tons more than before the war" (*Information Bulletin*, Soviet Washington Embassy, vol. V, no. 81, August 9). This is a far cry from doubled production. Nevertheless, in the period of a single year the Stalinist "planners" propose to boost steel production by more than one-third, i.e., from 15 million tons to 20 million.

Is this plan realizable? Stalin himself branded as "sheer fantasy" the plan, suggested during the second Five-Year Plan, to boost pig iron production, which is simpler to produce than steel, by such big increases. Thus in 1938, when Soviet industry, according to Stalin, was completely switched over "on the basis of a new, modern technique," he set the annual increase in pig iron at *one-half* the figure now contemplated for steel. Here is what Stalin said in his report to the Eighteenth Party Conference:

But if we ignore these fantastic dreamers and come down to reality, we may consider quite feasible an average annual increase in the output of pig iron of two or two and a half million tons, bearing in mind the present state of the technique of iron smelting. The industrial

history of the principal capitalist countries, as well as of our country, shows that such an annual rate of increase involves a great strain, but is quite feasible.

But even this "feasible" increase, as was later acknowledged, proved impossible to achieve. The likelihood of fulfilling the 1946 steel "quota" is even more remote. What then is the likelihood of achieving the goal itself, which is to "surpass" prewar levels by 1950?

## WHAT ARE THE NEW PERSPECTIVES?

The sponsors of the plan themselves confess that it is impossible of achievement by the internal forces of the USSR alone.

For the same dispatch that carries the foregoing boast, goes on to add that in the accomplishment of the fourth Five-Year Plan, its Stalinist architects have the following "perspectives":

1. "Reparations in kind from former enemy countries such as Finland, Rumania and Germany.
2. "Trade relations with such countries as Poland . . .
3. ". . . High expectations of American and British credits in the form of machinery and some textiles."

Here we have another sharp departure from the previous plans, all of which based themselves only on the internal resources of the USSR. Stalin attempted to deny in the period of the previous Five-Year Plans the dependence of the Soviet Union on the world market: alas, the deflation in 1930 took cruel vengeance on Stalin and his theory that the Soviet Union could—and did!—build socialism solely on the basis of its own resources and forces. This fraudulent thesis is now discarded in practice, in the projects of the new Five-Year Plan. What then happens to Stalin's entire "theory"?

But the above-listed Stalinist perspectives imply much more than an admission that the Soviet Union cannot reconstruct its economic life without aid from the outside. Implicit in them is the Kremlin's apparent intention to base the fourth Five-Year Plan not only on the nationalized Soviet economy, but also in part on the various economies within its "sphere of influence" in eastern Europe.

As we previously indicated, the Stalinist regime has long had within it a fundamental contradiction. The rapid industrialization of the country by means of a *plan* tended to strengthen the Socialist sector of the economy. On the other hand, the Stalinist reaction, with its inevitable monstrous growth and consolidation of a new privileged caste standing above the population, constantly tended to pull the USSR in the capitalist direction. Now a new explosive contradiction is incorporated right inside the "plan" itself; Stalinist reliance not only on the nationalized property of the USSR but also on the economies of the Soviet "spheres of influence" which still remain capitalist.

## OPPOSING ECONOMIES CANNOT BE COMBINED

Collectivized property forms cannot be combined for any protracted period of time with capitalist property forms. One

or the other must give way. The Stalinist attempt at combination cannot solve any of the basic problems of the regime or of the country. It will, on the contrary, lead to further aggravation of an already badly aggravated situation. The problem poses itself thus: either the Kremlin oligarchy, despite its original intentions, will find itself compelled to nationalize all property in the occupied regions, which inevitably must lead to a new military explosion between imperialism and the Soviet Union. Or the capitalist "spheres of influence" attached to the Soviet Union will become the starting point for an accelerated develop-

ment in the capitalist direction looking toward the eventual full restoration of capitalism inside the USSR. [We will discuss this problem at greater length in a later issue.] All the old contradictions have been sharpened. To these has now been added the new explosive contradiction inherent in the Soviet occupation of eastern Europe.

Thus it is clear that Stalin's regime remains more than ever a regime of crisis, with the severest paroxysms still ahead. And just as clear is the fact that these contradictions are not resolvable except on the arena of the international revolution.

## The End of Lend-Lease

### WALL STREET'S MAJOR MOVE

President Truman's abrupt termination of Lend-Lease on August 21 must be viewed not so much as an inevitable consequence of the close of the war but as a major move in Wall Street's plans for securing economic mastery of the world. Lend-Lease originated before the United States officially entered the war as an instrument to help the allies and agents of American imperialism conduct their military operations against the two main rivals of Wall Street: Germany and Japan. Now that these enemies have been crushed and eliminated from the scene, Lend-Lease is discarded so that Wall Street can carry forward, in this new stage, its program of world domination.

The military might of the United States based upon its economic superiority has elevated the American imperialists to unsurpassed heights of world power. Holding the atomic bomb and the greatest army, navy and air force in the one hand and its superb industrial machine in the other, American imperialism today bestrides the planet like a Colossus. Now, through its governmental agencies in Washington, Wall Street is preparing to garner the spoils of victory.

This most terrible and destructive of wars was also the most colossal business enterprise ever undertaken by U.S. capitalism. The monopolists invested in this military venture no less than 330 billions of dollars belonging to the American people. Now they are getting set to cash in on this investment of the people's money by reorganizing the world in accordance with their class interests.

Even among the victors the United States is the sole beneficiary of the Second World War. It is the only great nation untouched by war's devastation. It is the only solvent power in the entire world. The banks and giant corporations have vast accumulations of capital crying for investment in foreign fields. The whole planet is not too big to accommodate these billions. The war-expanded industrial agricultural and transportation facilities require the world for their markets. That is why the Washington-Wall Street plutocracy moves to grab up the markets and spheres of influence not only of its military opponents but also its allies.

### DECLINE OF BRITISH EMPIRE

The most important of these belong to the British empire. England is in a very bad state of exhaustion. It emerges from this war very much like France in the last war: the victor in appearance only. England has become transformed from a creditor nation, living off the proceeds of its investments, into a debtor nation. Even to its own colonies! The British owe 16 billion dollars to their own subject countries, notably India and Egypt.

The march of military and political events has accelerated the economic disintegration of the Empire and deepened the crisis of British capitalism. A number of the dominions, like

Canada and Australia, have grown increasingly independent of England and fallen into the orbit of the United States. In Asia, Africa and the West Indies the colonial peoples are renewing their efforts to shake off the British yoke. Finally, the class struggle has flamed in the home country itself with the election victory of the Labor Party. The war has weakened British capitalism to the point where it can no longer survive without blood transfusions from the United States. It is doomed to become the lower-junior partner and agency of U.S. imperialism—or perish.

Britain is hardest hit by the stoppage of Lend-Lease shipments. Over and above munitions shipments the United Kingdom has been receiving about 2 billions a year in food, raw materials and industrial products on Lend-Lease. The sudden cessation of these shipments created consternation in the ruling circles in London. The agitated Prime Minister of His Majesty's Labor government, Clement Attlee, told the House of Commons that the blow had been delivered "without consultation and prior discussion." The head of the Tory opposition Winston Churchill complained because "so great a country . . . would proceed in such a rough and harsh manner." Both the Labor and Conservative agents of British capitalism find it difficult to adjust themselves to the fact that Wall Street is dealing with England in the same brutal manner as English imperialism has for centuries dealt with the rest of the world.

## WALL STREET POWER-DRUNK

The power-drunk and money-maddened American plutocracy will stop at nothing to bring their competitors to heel, to subjugate them, to squeeze the last drop of profit from them. By means of political pressure and economic power the American bankers and big businessmen are bent upon invading and taking over for themselves the rich preserves hitherto belonging to Britain. The inheritance of the British imperial domains is one of the prizes of the war for which the United States fought German imperialism. The Wall Street bandits have become so brazen they do not even bother to conceal their intentions. An Associated Press dispatch from Washington printed in the Sept. 3 *N.Y. Times* openly admits:

"The United States will propose that Britain jettison or drastically modify her system of empire trade preference controls as one condition of further financial aid from this country. This suggestion, it became known today, is one of several that will be made to British envoys in conferences due to begin this week over what monetary help this country may be willing to extend England now that lend-lease has shut down."

The dispatch proceeds to set forth the three main objectives of Wall Street in these forthcoming conferences. The first is to "persuade" the British to refund and scale down its \$16 billion dollar debt to the empire. This has a twofold purpose. It would enable Britain to pay for the credits it seeks from this country at the expense of its subject nations. And "it would tend to open to American business men the Empire and Near East markets now virtually closed to them because acceptance of British exports on account is the best visible means by which those countries can get their money back."

In the second place American officials hope to extort a British agreement to eliminate or drastically modify the empire preference system of trade controls. The present tariff arrangements between the units of the empire tend to exclude U.S. competition.

Thirdly, they want to break down the British system of pooling dollars in the sterling area countries. This dollar pool is a means by which the British control the amount and character of the American goods purchased in these countries. Since

the war began, American capitalists have been casting covetous eyes upon the lucrative markets and rich sources of raw materials in the India and Middle East areas. Several official commissions have visited the area which is already dotted with American air bases. Now Wall Street is ready to muscle in on these territories.

## OTHER COUNTRIES IN CRISIS

The ending of Lend-Lease confronts other allied countries with serious problems. France and China are already reported to be seeking new credits to bolster their shattered and sagging economies.

The fact that the Soviet territories remain closed to direct exploitation by American capital places the USSR in a different relationship to U.S. imperialism but its economic dependence upon the U.S. is no less great. In addition to military equipment, the U.S.S.R. has been receiving over a billion and a half dollars worth in food, raw materials and industrial equipment a year. If this trade is to continue, new credits must be negotiated. Washington will unquestionably try to exact further political and even economic concessions from Moscow in return for the credits which the Kremlin so desperately requires. It is certain that U.S. capitalism will exert incessant and terrific pressure upon the U.S.S.R.

New loans and credit arrangements with the United States have become life-and-death questions for the war-devastated, inflation-ridden and ruined countries. They are no less necessary for American capitalism itself. Wall Street has the most vital interest in the maintenance and extension of its foreign trade. During the war Lend-Lease was the principal prop of this trade. For 1944 this country's exports reached \$13 billion of which \$11 billion represented goods shipped on a Lend-Lease basis. It is estimated that in the year ahead exports will drop drastically to less than half. Reporting for the Committee of Banking and Currency in the House on July 13, Congressman Spence of Kentucky declared: "The markets of the United States are not in a position to absorb the production of our country. We must assume the economic leadership of the world."

The government is compelled to take a series of important steps. Of immediate concern is the disposition of the 42 billions of Lend-Lease war-debts owed to this country and the negotiation of new financial arrangements with the debtor nations. These are two aspects of the same problem: to clear the ground for Wall Street's super-exploitation of the globe. On August 30 President Truman told Congress that it should be prepared to write off the 40 billion dollar Lend-Lease debt. But Secretary of State Byrnes immediately made clear that this did not relieve every country involved from negotiating Lend-Lease settlements with Washington. In other words, Washington intends to put the gun to each and every one of them and squeeze out all possible concessions for the granting of new credits. Everyone, British imperialists, French financiers, Stalinist bureaucrats, not to mention the small fry, will come hat in hand to plead for loans from rich Uncle Sam, the banker.

## MAIN AGENCIES TO FOREIGN TRADE

To fill the vacuum left by the disappearance of Lend-Lease, the U.S. government is relying upon two agencies to finance exports in the coming years. One is the Export-Import Bank, the other is the World Investment Bank. The Export-Import Bank was organized in 1934 to stimulate foreign trade. Congress is now considering a proposal to increase its capital and lending authority. Complete control over its resources will be vested in the hands of the Foreign Economic Administrator, a direct agent of Wall

Street. Representative Spence, sponsor of the bill, stated in Congress that Mr. Burgess, the president of the American Bankers' Association, expressly approved the proposal. Another Representative, Buffet, explained why: "It assures them of an opportunity to participate in vast loaning schemes without risking their own money—with interest and profits being guaranteed by the Treasury of the United States and finally by the taxpayers of this country. Of course, the bankers are for this scheme. You would be too if you were a banker under such circumstances. No risk and sure profits is good enough bait even for a banker—as it was in Hitler land."

The Export-Import Bank, which now has only \$2,800,000,000 lending authority, is to serve as a stop-gap until the World-Investment Bank is set up. This latter bank, which is part of the Bretton Woods agreement, will offer about 8 billion in dollar credits.

In these measures we witness the increasing fusion of monopoly capitalism and the state. More and more the resources of the state are placed at the disposal of a small group of plutocrats. The state serves as a pliant tool in the hands of the monopolists in its struggle for markets, for sources of raw materials, for domination of the world. And all these predatory operations of the monopolists take place under the banners of "free enterprise" and "freedom of trade." American credits are today the most potent instruments, not only of economic domination, but of political intervention in the life of other peoples.

## Wheeler's Significant Speech

### WHEELER HEADS

### THE OPPOSITION

When Congress debated ratification of the United Nations Charter, opposition was confined to a tiny minority headed by Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana. The overwhelming majority of Congressmen applauded the Charter as the "only hope" of the world, as the only guarantee of "peace and prosperity," as the "greatest document ever conceived by the mind of man," and similar nonsense. Wheeler did not consistently oppose the United Nations Charter. He confined himself to making the record in a three-hour speech on July 24. He offered no alternative to the Charter, and he ended up voting for it.

His speech is nevertheless of considerable political significance. It represents the viewpoint of an important section of the capitalist class. It lays down the line for the former "isolationists" who were revealed during the war to be the most rabid imperialists. It will undoubtedly be considered a programmatic document by America's native fascists. As the postwar disillusionment deepens among the masses, the speech can play a dangerous role since Wheeler's statements and predictions will in many instances be borne out by events, thus giving him the aura of a prophet among the dupes of fascist demagoguery.

The capitalist press did not reprint Wheeler's speech nor even quote from its major sections. The liberal organs such as *The Nation* and *PM* made no attempt whatsoever to meet the issues but confined themselves to listing Wheeler as one of the "enemies of the charter," hitting at his parliamentary tactics and ridiculing his speech. The Montana Senator, who had just returned from a tour of Europe, began his speech by describing the general situation facing the victorious powers:

The problems we faced following the last war were child's play compared to the chaos with which we are now confronted. We can be certain that while our statesmen breathe an air of confident expectancy or of casual tolerance toward the future, the terrible truth of the matter is they are whistling in the dark. At this very moment

fear grips the hearts and minds of all men who honestly face the magnitude and complexity of the consequences of this war, which already threatens to overwhelm us.

The chaos in Europe is tragic beyond description. The threat of a rampant totalitarian tyranny everywhere raises its ugly head. [This is Wheeler's way of describing Communism.] The resurgence of a brutal and fanatical fascism lurks in every flooded cellar, behind every shattered tree, and beneath every ugly ruin in Europe. An almost inevitable triumph of disease, starvation, and frustration already challenges the sanity of men.

I talked with hundreds and hundreds of individuals in England, France, Germany, Italy, Egypt, Palestine, and Greece. Throughout my travels I did not hear the San Francisco Charter mentioned even once. The people with whom I talked, and the others whom I saw on my trip, were concerned with only three things. They wanted food, clothing, and coal with which to cook their food and light and heat their miserable shelters. They, as individuals, wanted protection against tyranny and starvation. Those were the things they feared.

### CAPITALIST SYSTEM BEING UNDERMINED

The political consequences of this situation in Wheeler's opinion are undermining the capitalist system. What to do to save this system?

The United Nations Charter cannot be expected to accomplish this task, he believes. In order to clarify the task facing the capitalist statesmen, Wheeler slashes through the propagandistic camouflage hiding the reality of the Charter and characterizes it as follows:

Its provisions merely reflect the present relations of the victor powers which are themselves premised on a principle of power politics at its worst. For, the fact of the matter is that this alleged realism of the charter simply means that far from having "raised a standard to which the honest and the just can repair," this charter has translated men's hopes and dreams for peace into a mechanism to legalize and perpetuate the brutal realities which now afflict friend and foe alike.

To drive home his point, Wheeler draws a deadly parallel between the propaganda and realities of the First World War and the Second World War. Quoting extensively from such Allied statesmen as Churchill, Wilson, Painlevé, and Lloyd George, the Montana Senator compares their noble sounding promises about freedom and peace with the promise of Roosevelt, Hull, Churchill and Stalin in the Second World War. The declarations selected by Wheeler, are indeed startlingly similar. Roosevelt's entire Atlantic Charter, Wheeler tries to show, is based on Wilson's Fourteen Points proclaimed in 1918 as the war aims of the Allied powers. The fate of the Fourteen Points became the fate of the Atlantic Charter:

The Versailles peace was clearly not a peace of reconciliation or anything like it. It clearly was not designed to give the new-born German democratic state a real fighting chance to survive. Even the reparation provisions produced financial and economic chaos in Germany and had to be revised. Thus there was no winner in the Versailles Treaty. Clemenceau failed to gain security for France. Wilson failed to establish a just and enduring peace. Lloyd George achieved a glittering success by preserving for a time the precarious balance of power in Europe. But he, too, failed, for while Britain's greatest interest is peace, 20 years after his alleged triumph at Versailles, Britain was at war and close to destruction. Mr. President, the only difference between the fate of Wilson's declarations and the Atlantic Charter lies in the fact that in the case of the latter its death was more swift and sure.

To establish this fact, Wheeler quotes extensively from the leaders of the United Nations and concludes that at the close of the Second World War "the tragic mistakes of Versailles have merely been aggravated and earlier set in motion."

The United Nations face a perspective quite at variance

from the solemn assurances of unity handed out by the official propaganda bureaus, according to Wheeler:

The . . . grim historical fact which has been and which even now is being deliberately suppressed is that behind the slogan of unconditional surrender we have been compelled to wage a vicious war of power politics with Russia and Britain, ever since the tide of battle turned.

The main danger to American capitalism does not come from Great Britain so much as from the Soviet Union and from the working class revolution implicit in Europe today. Wheeler quotes a declaration made February 18, 1944, by John Middleton Murray: "Either a new Germany will be integrated into a new Europe, or a new Germany will eventually be integrated into the Soviet Union." Wheeler also cites the following interesting observation of a "well-informed Britisher" on December 22, 1944:

As the power of Germany declines, the struggle for power between the victorious Allies takes its new form. And its new form is that which was inevitable, the Allies being what they are, namely, Britain and Russia—the form is civil war. It is prevented only where one of the two allies is in effective military occupation. One may prophesy that wherever and whenever that military occupation is withdrawn, civil war will ensue. The next chapter of this fearful book of European history will begin.

## EVERY COUNTRY FEARS REVOLUTION

Wheeler himself is convinced that "There is no country in Europe today that does not fear revolution and anarchy the minute the American troops are taken out of that country."

The under-cover conflict among the Big Three is revealed in their handling of defeated Germany, in Wheeler's opinion:

A . . . fact which is just now coming to light . . . is such a basic and deep-rooted distrust between and among the Big Three that as the war turned in favor of the Allies these same Big Three did not trust each other sufficiently to permit Germany to emerge as an independent state or nation.

The destruction of Germany preoccupies Wheeler primarily because of its incalculable effect upon the ability of world capitalism to stave off the socialist revolution:

What I am about to say concerns facts the recognition of which may mean a matter of life or death for the whole of cultured and christianized humanity. [This is Wheeler's way of describing capitalism.] Mr. President, the outcome of this war has left a gaping vacuum in the heart of Europe. We have won an overwhelming military victory, but it is a victory which has left in its wake the destruction of every political, economic, social, and geographical structure in Europe. Where thirty-odd independent nations once stood, there is not a single stable government left. The realism of this fact to which I am referring is found in the simple observation that of all these social, economic, military, political, and geographical systems, the only stable government left is Russia. It is stable only because of the tremendous military and police power of the state.

Thus, the question at the very outset is how Russia can help but be sucked into this maelstrom of madness when such a terribly complete vacuum keeps tugging at Stalin's shirt sleeves. How can Russia keep from being drawn into the gaping emptiness that yawns like a deep abyss before her every step from the Ukraine to Bordeaux, and from the Scandinavian Peninsula to the Mediterranean?

Mr. President, a year ago last May when I talked with one of the very high ranking officers of this country I asked him, "How are you going to keep Europe from going Communist?" He replied that he did not believe Stalin wanted to take over Europe. I said, "It is not a question of Stalin taking over Europe. It is a question of whether or not Europe will fall into his lap."

Today every student of European history, and every person who has visited Europe believes and feels that that is one of the things which may take place in the near future.

In these remarks Wheeler expresses the fear of the senile capitalist class before the socialist revolution now gathering its forces throughout Europe. No doubt in their inner conclaves the capitalist rulers discuss this terrible threat to their outmoded system as one of the burning topics of the day. How prevent the rising revolution even with the assistance of such a counter-revolutionary agent as Stalin?

## ALL EUROPE LIKE BIG SPAIN

Wheeler dwells on the danger of a weakened Britain and a powerful Soviet Union in ruined postwar Europe; citing William Philip Simms:

All Europe, in fact, seems headed toward becoming one big Spain. Rightists and leftists are at daggers drawn over the larger part of the continent. Civil war is under way or threatened in Greece—I have just been in Greece, and I want to concur in that statement—Yugoslavia, Belgium, Italy, Poland, and other countries as, one by one, they are liberated. And in every case, as in Spain, the trouble is fundamentally the same.

That is, the fundamental struggle is between capitalism and the socialist revolution.

Wheeler then turns to the Far East. He takes as his theme a March 28 statement of Sumner Welles:

Immediately after the end of this Second World War a far more powerful surge toward freedom among the peoples of the east will be inevitable. Compared to the forces which it will unleash, the outbreak of the 1920's will be trivial.

Wheeler considers Japan in the Far East as symmetrical in world politics to the position of Germany in Europe:

Just as Germany's problems cannot be solved except in relation to Europe, so Japan's problems cannot be solved for the United Nations apart from Asia. If we continue on to the bitter end which our savage slogan unconditional surrender makes inevitable, without attempting to tell the Japanese what is in store for them after they have surrendered, we shall leave another vacuum in Asia and in the act commit one of the major political blunders of all time.

It would mean that while we may have won the war we would lose the peace, for we could never succeed in our present policy of rebuilding China under the present Nationalist Government as a stabilizing force in the Far East if Russia stepped into Japan's shoes.

With the destruction of Japan as a counter-revolutionary bulwark against socialist revolution, Wheeler sees a terrible threat to the capitalist system:

With Japan out of the way, and with no other stable power than Russia left to fill the ensuing vacuum, if Russia brings north China, Manchuria, and Korea under her domination and central and south China is left under the present Nationalist Government, civil war will rage for years to come in Asia.

## WORST THAN LAST WAR

Wheeler compares the present crisis with the crisis facing the capitalist system at the close of the First World War:

The whole world is hoping and praying for a speedy end to this most cruel and savage of conflicts ever to afflict mankind; the world wants no more of such a curse and affliction to endure; but the truth is that events have gone too far for any sane man to ignore the fact that whatever peace settlements now are reached, the steadily expanding conflict between the east dominated by Moscow and the west dominated by England and the United States will be uprooted bodily and transplanted into the very heart of this new world organization. The tragic repetition of the events following the last World War has already become a reality.

The situation after the First World War, however, was far less threatening to the capitalist system than the present situation in the eyes of Wheeler:

In 1918 the problems we confronted were largely confined to Europe and they were settled on the base of an attempt to free the peoples of Europe from the threat and scourge of famine, war, and chaos, by guaranteeing the political and territorial integrity of some twenty-odd separate states. At least the concept of individuality was preserved even in the artificial and arbitrary division of territory, minorities, and resources of Europe that comprised the Versailles settlements.

But in the year 1945 the problems we confront have not only been magnified a thousand times; they now extend to Africa and Asia. The settlement of these problems is not being left this time, however, to individual states, but to the division of the world into three tremendous spheres, one of which is determined that these problems and the destiny of hundreds of millions of human beings shall be left to the mercy of an ever-expanding collective state and totalitarian political tyranny.

## THREAT OF NEW WAR

Wheeler emphasizes the fact that the end result of the two world imperialist wars has been the fundamental weakening of the capitalist system. Moreover, far from being a "war to end wars," the Second World War, like the First, succeeded only in laying the base for more terrible future conflicts. Wheeler views the "threat of a Third World War" as "already rooted and growing in conflict between western civilization and the Communist totalitarian tyranny in the East." He continues:

Does any sane man in his right mind think that the horror that has been loosed upon a suffering and broken humanity has furthered the possibility of peace and security—or the guarantee of the "four freedoms"? Does anyone imagine that the chaos, famine, disease, immorality, suffering, and the stinking desert of conflict that has been made of Europe and that is fast being spread over the Orient, is fertile ground in which the roots of democracy can flourish? Are the proponents of this charter attempting to tell the American people that the catastrophic consequences of this most hideous struggle of all time are conducive to the development of stable governments and societies in which the lessons of the past are so integrated into the social, legal, and diplomatic structure of nations that we may look now toward reliance upon a new reign of law and not to a reversion to trust in brute force? Any man who holds out such an ethereal dream as a prospective reality to the American people is simply deluding himself.

Unless an unforeseeable and unlikely change in the present trend of world politics occurs, Wheeler predicts that "a third world catastrophe" will "befall us whether we want it or not."

After this annihilating exposé of the murderous conflicts now unfolding amongst the erstwhile "Allies" and the blind alley into which capitalism is hurling humanity, what does our redoubtable Senator propose? What does he offer? What is his alternative program? Literally nothing, except possibly vague implications that a new war should be prepared against the USSR.

Wheeler ends his eloquent speech with the announcement: "I am voting for the ratification of the charter because of the terrible conditions which exist throughout the world today. I am voting for it, because I do not see any other alternative."

Could a capitalist politician have made a franker confession of the utter bankruptcy of the system he defends?

## The Capitalist Thinkers at Work

### TWO BOMBS; TWO CITIES

The Wall Street rulers who decided to bestow on mankind the benefits of atomic energy—and made known their beneficence in the form of two bombs that blew up a half million human beings as a starter—also contribute to the public welfare in more subtle ways. Approximately three weeks

after the first blessings of the bomb were administered to the world, 120 "scientists, philosophers and theologians," according to the press, met at the Sixth Annual Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion at Columbia University, New York. This group includes some of the most capable thinkers the capitalists are able to buy through professorships, educational, editorial and religious posts. The agenda of their discussion had apparently been decided well in advance—certainly before Hiroshima and Nagasaki were entered on the pages of history. Consequently the first day of the Conference heard 31 papers, out of which only one happened to touch on the atomic bomb and its meaning to mankind. The other 30 papers dealt mainly with such lofty themes in the propaganda curricula of the capitalist war-mongers as "educating" the "peoples of the world" on "how to get along with each other."

One might imagine these highly-paid and highly-touted brains would surely not be so obtuse as to overlook the atomic bomb and its meaning to the world. But according to the press they were "perceptibly unaroused." In fact, they were so "calm, judicial and unexcited" some observers got the uneasy impression these intellectual giants of the capitalist class were fiddling "while the world burned."

Had such an impression become general, the reputations of these distinguished and authoritative savants might have suffered. However, during the night between the sessions of the first and second day, something happened. It is not clear what. Perhaps some information of a startling nature. The official explanation in next day's press was that the Conference had been "stung by the challenge of a magazine editor." As a result of this sting they "hastened to climb aboard the bandwagon of the Atomic Age."

## SECOND SESSION GOES INTO ACTION

Although in the first session the fate of humanity in a Third World War of atomic-powered weapons had not dawned on the assembled pontiffs as important enough for their profound deliberations, in the second session, according to the press, they suddenly accepted "the thesis that immediate action on control of atomic energies was vital, if humanity was to survive." No doubt many people breathed a sigh of relief when they read the report of this momentous decision. The greatest thinkers of the capitalist class had turned their attention to the problem of controlling the atomic bomb!

So alert had the assembled scientists, philosophers and theologians become in contrast to the previous day that in the second session "they ignored the formal papers they had prepared and indulged in old-fashioned pre-atomic dialectics." In fact their alertness reached such heights that the discussion "appeared tinged at times with a note of hysteria, or what modern scientists are wont to refer to as 'crisis thinking'."

To really appreciate why these ponderous thinkers could be moved so deeply "by the challenge of a magazine editor" it is necessary to know that the editor in question was none other than Norman Cousins and the magazine—*The Saturday Review of Literature*. Ferdinand Lundberg in his celebrated work *America's 60 Families* declares that Thomas W. Lamont "privately financed" Henry Seidel Canby (editorial predecessor of Cousins) "in founding" this magazine. Lamont is the brains of the Morgan interests. Lundberg reports that Perkins and after him Lamont have each "been the pacemakers of the Morgan banking house, the trouble shooters, the business getters, the schemers, the diplomats, and the apologists." Lundberg adds that "at least

half of Lamont's contact with the surrounding world is with publishers, writers that cater to mass audiences, newspapermen and editors." *The Saturday Review of Literature*, Lundberg reveals, "has for nearly two decades given J. P. Morgan and Company a strategic foothold in the book-publishing business." "Lamont," he discloses, "has continually footed deficits for this publication, which has given utterance to many Morgan theses."

## CAPITALIST THINKING AND THINKERS

In the light of this revealing combination of facts aren't we fully justified in concluding that the source of the sting to the assembled leaders of capitalist thought on the night of August 25 was the same source that decided to use atomic energy to snuff out the lives of possibly a half million human beings? Small wonder these "modern scientists" were suddenly caught in the grip of "crisis thinking"!

And what thinking! Wall Street's intellectual front freely admitted (1) We may be in even greater peril today than just after Pearl Harbor. (2) Man's survival on earth is now absolutely dependent on his ability to avoid a new war. (3) Far from banishing war, the atomic bomb itself will constitute a cause for war. (4) The greatest obsolescence of all in the Atomic Age is national sovereignty. (5) With the Atomic Age man now has it within his grasp to emancipate himself economically. (6) Unless atomic energy is controlled, man can revert to his condition in society in 10,000 B.C.

After these premises—which had already been reached by virtually everyone in the world who has given ten minutes thought to the consequences of the atomic bomb—the deepest thinkers in the pay of Wall Street reached the profound conclusion that humanity can be saved from destruction only if "civilization" develops a "sense of responsibility."

A practical as well as eminently realistic solution—one undoubtedly deserving the bestowal of a special honorary degree—came from a professor who proposed "a solemn pledge to humanity equivalent to the ancient Hippocratic Oath of physicians be adopted to save civilization from the perils of misused atomic forces." This fathead advocated "that the pledge be accepted by everyone as a vital principle of living and that school children be required to recite it after the pledge to the flag." If patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel, then it can be put down as absolutely certain that the murderers who order teeming cities blown off the face of the planet will be the first to take the oath to "save civilization from the perils of misused atomic forces." They will simply label the areas to be destroyed as outside the pale of "civilization."

## THE TIMES PITCHES IN

*The New York Times* editorialized after the Conference disbanded, that the atomic bomb had given the proceedings of the scientists, philosophers and theologians, "a turn and an importance that were not foreseen." By chance the publisher of *The New York Times*, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, is, according to Ferdinand Lundberg, among Thomas W. Lamont's "many . . . literary and journalistic friends." The *Times* editorial covered a point overlooked by the wise men in their excitement over the suddenly discovered importance of their meeting. "Somehow," declared the *Times* "the moral lesson of the war must be driven home not only to statesmen but to every worker in a factory." After thus expressing its concern over the morals of factory workers, the organ of the war profiteers concluded: "We

need more conferences of the same kind, held, perhaps, under the auspices of the new League of Nations."

Clearly, the arguments of the scientists, philosophers and theologians about the dangers of the atomic bomb could not have served Wall Street's purposes better if they had been thought up by the diabolically clever Thomas W. Lamont himself. All the premises, if correctly formulated, are true: Humanity faces extinction. National boundaries are obsolescent. A new economic order is possible. Atomic energy must be controlled. But what is Wall Street's conclusion? The solutions of the learned pontiffs are obviously nonsense calculated for no other purpose than to endow Wall Street's real plans, with a high moral tone and to divert attention from the simplicity of the only sensible solution, that of revolutionary socialism. If the outstanding figures in American thought can't solve it, the problem must be complex!

## A DEMONSTRATION OF BANKRUPTCY

What a demonstration of the bankruptcy and venality of capitalist thought is this conference! The intellectual leaders of mankind—professors, brilliant scientists, celebrated writers, theologians—all these intellectual leaders are supposed to teach the younger generation the truth, supposed to show them how the marvellous products of human thought and intelligence can be employed for the benefit and advancement of mankind. And every one of them (with but one or two notable exceptions), have sold themselves as but venal tools, clever sophists, jesuitical apologists and technical advisers to the bloodsoaked capitalist rulers. And today the crowning scientific achievement of the control of atomic energy has first been used by the Wall Street masters—the real rulers of our society—in order to wipe two populous cities off the face of the earth. If they had any common decency, these intellectual leaders would abdicate, they would publicly acknowledge that they, supposed leaders of thought, are bankrupt, and that the masses must turn elsewhere for guidance and leadership. But they are not honest. They are not independent. They continue, like the venal tools that they are, to spin sophistries, to give vent to pompous pronouncements in order to befuddle the minds of the people and keep them subservient to the powers that be.

Many American youths are attracted by science and intellectual effort. They feel their capacity to develop as technicians, scientists, thinkers, writers. For such youths the Conference offers an impressive lesson. In the capitalist world the best a budding scientist or intellectual can hope for is inclusion in the august group of clowns who are assigned to persuade the young to become docile cannon fodder, to "think" for public consumption as Wall Street dictates and to work out the secrets of nature in order to place these secrets at the disposal of ignorant, savage generals and profit-hungry monsters, people who are willing to lay mankind on the wheel of fortune as a stake in their insane gamble for universal power.

Against this forbidding and repulsive perspective only the science of Marxism and the struggle for socialism offer goals worthy of people who count themselves members of the human race and not anti-human beasts. And we say to the youth of America: turn your backs on this vile crew of capitalist spokesmen, on these men who have sold their souls to the generals and the money changers! And join with the only honest movement of today, the revolutionary movement for socialism, the only movement that offers humanity the possibility of achieving peace, well-being, freedom and the dignity of man.

# Fascism and Socialism

By DANIEL GUERIN

Readers of *Fourth International* are well acquainted with Daniel Guerin, the writer of this article. Guerin is the author of the well known work "Fascism and Big Business," issued in English by Pioneer Publishers at the beginning of 1939. The following article, whose title we have supplied, was written by Guerin in March 1945 as a preface to a new forthcoming French edition of this work.

\* \* \*

*Fascism and Big Business* was begun in 1934 shortly after February 6, and appeared in July 1936. Was it necessary to reprint the book in its present form or continue the investigation to the start of 1945?

The date on which we stopped writing was undoubtedly premature. The phenomenon of fascism was then still in the full course of development (above all in Germany). Certain of its traits had not yet been sufficiently revealed. It was necessary to probe further.

But perhaps there was an impediment in probing too extensively. The object of this book, if we can so express it, is the study of fascism *in its pure form*. Our purpose was not to write the contemporary history of Italy and Germany; but to better understand, with the aid of parallel observations of these two countries, *the essential* nature of fascism.\*

For, after 1939, the phenomenon of fascism tends to become confounded with the great upheaval of the imperialist war. Nothing so resembles a country at war as another country at war. The characteristic traits of fascism are, in large part (not completely) blurred by those now familiar traits, namely, universally unloosed militarism and war economy. Undoubtedly a materialist explanation of the war should be undertaken as well as the materialist explanation of fascism. But whoever embraces too much grasps too little. We leave this task to others.\*\* We have consciously limited the scope of this work to the study of the phenomenon of fascism by itself.

An objection might perhaps be raised that fascism and war are inseparable, that the present war is the monstrous product of fascism. But that's precisely what we deny. There is, certainly, a direct link between war and fascism. They grow out of the same dunghheap; they are, each in its own way, the monstrous products of the capitalist system in decline. They both flow from the fundamental vice of the system: first, the incompatibility between the tremendous development of the productive forces, and private ownership of the means of production: second, the partitioning of the world into national states. They both aspire, by different roads, to break the iron ring of the contradictions

\*It has been objected that this book is somewhat schematic. We are not certain that this criticism is well founded. It would be if we had proposed to press into the same mould the evolution of the two countries studied, without taking into account their dissimilarities in every domain. Such was not our purpose. In confining ourselves to their common traits which are specifically the traits of the phenomenon of fascism, we never intended to depict Italian Fascism and German National Socialism as strictly identical. We have proceeded no differently than physicians who, on the basis of specific observations, noted in respect to dissimilar patients, establish the same general symptoms of a given disease.

\*\*Cf. Henri Claude: "From The Economic Crisis To The World War, 1929-1939, an attempt at a materialist explanation of modern war."

in which this system is henceforth enclosed. They both aim to restore endangered capitalist profits. Finally, both of these phenomena, while aiming to prolong the system, actually hasten the hour of its collapse. Moreover, beyond these general ties, a more direct interconnection can be observed between fascism and war in Italy and in Germany: because these two countries lack raw materials and markets, because they are in the category of "hungry nations" as opposed to the "sated" nations, the crisis in which the whole capitalist system is convulsed takes on in their case a particularly acute character, and imposes upon them, *in advance of the others*, a "strong state." They act as "aggressive" powers with the aim of seizing part of the plunder from the "sated" nations. They aim at a new division of the world by force of arms, while their adversaries, opposing this redivision, assume the attitude of "peace-loving" powers.

## Fascism and War

Thus fascism and war are, to be sure, related. But the relationship is *not one of cause and effect*. Eliminate fascism (assuming that could be done) and the causes of rivalries and of imperialist wars will not in the least thereby be eliminated. For four years, from 1914 to 1918, two groups of great powers fought over possession of the world market. In neither camp was there a "fascist" country. In reality, fascism and war are both the effects, *different* effects, of the same cause: though the two phenomena criss-cross, though, at times, they seem to be confounded with each other (and every conscious effort is made to confuse them) still each has a distinct existence and demands a separate study.

The study of the phenomenon of fascism should be continued beyond 1936. But, aside from a few additional facts, some confirmations and dotting of the i's, we have not believed it necessary—for the reason indicated above—to bring the investigation up to date. That is why we have adopted a compromise: we have taken as a basis for the present reprint, the text of the American translation which appeared at the beginning of 1939 under the title of "Fascism and Big Business." This translation was made with the aid of documentation up to the end of 1938. The original text was then very carefully revised (above all in that which concerns Germany). We confine ourselves merely to adding to it several corrections which seem indispensable at the beginning of 1945.

\* \* \*

Do the events since 1939 cast a new light on the phenomenon of fascism? At the risk of disappointing the reader, we reply in the negative. At the risk of appearing presumptuous or of clinging to outlived positions, we will say that the events of these last years, in our opinion, do not modify to any marked degree the conclusions of our book. The only thing that fascism has brought, since 1939, is renewed proof of its barbarism. But who can be surprised at this, after witnessing the manner in which it crushed the Italian and German proletariat before crushing Europe? And can this barbarism which is "fascist" in its most hideous traits, be considered solely "fascist"? The whole war is barbarous.

Apart from that, the war and the German occupation, by

giving us the opportunity to observe the phenomenon more closely, taught us, as we had already suspected, that the fascist regime, despite its "totalitarian" pretensions is not homogeneous. It never succeeded in dissolving into one single alloy the different elements of which it was composed. Its different wheels did not function without friction. Despite Hitler's attempts for several years to find a compromise formula between the party and the army, the Wehrmacht on the one hand, and the Gestapo and the SS on the other, continued their cat and dog fight. Behind this conflict is a class question. The fascist regime, despite appearances, appearances that it delighted in maintaining, never domesticated the bourgeoisie. When we upheld the thesis several years ago, that fascism is an instrument of big business, it was objected that in Italy as in Germany (in Germany above all) big business marches in step. This is not exactly true. The bourgeoisie remained an autonomous force, pursuing its own ends in the totalitarian state. It made others don the brown shirt, for the Hitler bands were indispensable to crush the proletariat, but thus far it has not donned the brown shirt itself (or, if it has, it was only for the gallery). Hermann Rauschning led us into error with his thesis according to which the ruling class was eliminated by the Nazi plebians, people who respected nothing, "nihilists." Undoubtedly there have been individual cases where big capitalists have been ill-treated or forced to emigrate. But big business, taken as a whole, was not engulfed by the brown tide. Quite the contrary.

## Army and the Regime

At all times the army is the instrument par excellence of the ruling class. The relative independence of the army with regard to the regime, its refusal to permit itself to be thoroughly nazified, makes clear the autonomy of big business (and the big landlords) towards the fascist regime, its refusal to be brought into line. We will be told: Hitler dealt some secret blows within his General Staff; insubordinate generals were successively eliminated. No doubt; but this continual "purge" was only a confirmation of the resistance that the army, backed by the big bourgeoisie, put up against complete nazification.

But what about July 20, what about those generals, those big capitalists, those country squires who were hung or shot, following the attempted assassination of Hitler? July 20, 1944, in Germany, just like July 25, 1943, in Italy (the day that Marshall Badoglio and the King had Mussolini arrested) carries striking proof that the capitalist ruling class was never absorbed by the self-styled totalitarian state. After subsidizing fascism and pushing it into power, the bourgeoisie tolerated, in spite of minor inconveniences, the overrunning of the state by the Nazi plebs: this conformed to its interests. But from the day when it appeared that the inconveniences of the regime outweighed the advantages the bourgeoisie, with the support of the army, did not hesitate to throw it overboard. As early as 1936, in the conclusions of our book, we set forth this hypothesis. The move succeeded in Italy. It has failed, for the time being, in Germany. But since the attempted assassination of July 20, Hitler is virtually finished. Big business, the top circles of the army, do not follow him any longer.\* He only survives artificially by means of unheard of terror that the police and

\*"Since the attempted assassination, Hitler knows that . . . the nobility and the military caste, the big industrialists, the bankers . . . are against him." Extract from an account of the July 20 attempt, by Mr. Lochner, Associated Press war correspondent, published in *Le Monde*, Mach 21, 1945.

Himmler's SS exercise within the very midst of the army and the population as a whole. He survives only because the plans for the dismemberment of Germany, agitated from abroad, have aroused in the masses, a desperate reflex of the instinct of self-preservation. The regime, although abandoned by the people, has been able to take momentary advantage of this. He survives only because the ruling class fears to let loose open civil war in the midst of total foreign war. This last episode proves that the redoubtable instrument of repression forged by fascism can prolong the life of the latter for a moment, even after it has been abandoned by big business. The bullet destined for the workers can also serve to make a hole in the skin of a few capitalists. But not for long. No political regime can govern against the class which holds the economic power. Although it may not please some naive people, the old laws which have always governed the relations of classes, have not failed this time either. Fascism has not suspended them, as with a wave of the magic wand. The link between fascism and big business is so intimate that the day when big business withdraws its support is the beginning of the end for fascism.

\* \* \*

## Fundamental Thesis

From our fundamental thesis, according to which fascism is essentially the instrument of heavy industry, certain people wish to infer today that it would suffice, in Germany, to confiscate heavy industry to extirpate every germ of fascism. We strongly protest against this false and tendentious deduction. Undoubtedly, heavy industry is the most aggressive, the most reactionary segment of capitalism. It incontestably subsidized and then hoisted to power the fascist bands. But the "confiscation" of its wealth would not suffice (quite the contrary) to resolve the contradictions in which the whole of German capitalism is struggling. Furthermore, who will profit from this confiscation? "The majority of shares, it is said, would inevitably fall into the hands of the Allies." This is the clue. What's involved here is not a matter of political cleansing aimed at destroying the germs of fascism, but an attempt of the Anglo-American powers to strangle their German competitor. Not long ago, for similar motives, the industrial region of the Ruhr was occupied by the troops of Poincaré. This action, as is well known, served as a springboard for National Socialism. Only the proletarian revolution can free the world once and for all from the Hitlerite nightmare.

We pointed out, in the conclusion of this book, fascism's extraordinary *will to endure*. The desperate tenacity with which it defends itself today, although knowing itself lost, evidently surpasses all expectations. Nevertheless the phenomenon is comprehensible if one remembers that fascism is not only an instrument at the service of big business, but, *at the same time* a mystical upheaval of the pauperized and discontented petty-bourgeoisie. Although a large part of the middle class who had helped fascism to power is cruelly deceived today, such is not the case with the *militant* sector. There are many playboys and corrupt people in the enormous bureaucratic apparatus of the Fascist state, but there are also some *real fanatics*. These not only defend their social position, even their lives, in defending the regime, they also defend an idea to which they firmly cling to the death. (Let us note in passing: it is not by brute force, much less foreign bayonets, that one loses faith. Only the powerful wind of the proletarian revolution in Germany would be able to clear their brains.)

Fascism, in the countries where it attained power, stands a chance of surviving for another reason: in its decline, as at its

birth, it owes much to the complacency of its "adversaries": the "democratic" state which succeeded it remains completely infected with the fascist virus (just as the "democratic" state which had preceded it was entirely infected with the fascist virus). The "purge" is nothing but a shameful comedy, because to really disinfect the bourgeois state, it is necessary to destroy it. The administrative tops, the army, the police, the judiciary remains staffed with auxiliaries and accomplices of the former regime, the same personnel for the most part who, a short time ago, delivered the keys of power to fascism. In Italy, Marshall Badoglio is the man who once placed the cadres and resources of the army at the disposition of the "black shirts." Who can be surprised if, as Mussolini's successor, he lets the Duce escape from prison? Bonomi, in 1921-1922, knowingly paved the way for fascism. Who can be surprised if in 1945, under his government, with the complicity of his functionaries, the fascist general Roatta succeeded in escaping? When will the complacent Bruening return to Germany? Only the revolutionary proletariat will be able to nail to the wall the fascist bandits and their accomplices without any delays or hesitation.\*

## Fascism's New Forms

After its downfall as the political regime, fascism appears to borrow entirely new forms. It seems to have learned much from the tactics adopted by the Resistance movement in the occupied countries. It studies the lessons of the Maquis. Already, the fascists in Germany are organizing themselves for future underground struggle. It is possible that we shall see something of this kind even in France. Perhaps we are not as fully rid of the bands of Doriot and Darnand as we thought. Can such undertakings be successful? The problem is not *technical*, it is *political*. The Maquis owed their success above all to the fact that they were supported by a part of the population. Insurgent fascism could not stand up against a powerful movement of anti-fascist and revolutionary masses. But if such a mass movement does not develop or if other factors (of which we will speak a little further on) push a part of the middle classes and peasantry back towards reaction, then underground fascism could become a real danger.

Perhaps in the conclusions of this book, there is a point which has not been sufficiently stressed: the underground development of the class struggle beneath the fascist lid. We stressed, and it was necessary to stress, the formidable methods employed by the totalitarian regimes to break up, to "atomize" the movement of the working class, to scientifically track it down, if one can so express it, and to destroy in the embryo every form of opposition. But gradually and to the extent that the fascist lid is lifted, we perceive that beneath it, the class struggle, supposedly destroyed forever, continues right on its way. As we are writing these lines, Northern Italy has not yet been liberated. But we have already heard many echoes of the extraordinary fighting power displayed in these last years by the workers of Milan, of Turin, within the great industrial combines on which the red flag waved in 1920. More than twenty years of fascist dictatorship have not succeeded in changing the Italian worker.

In Germany, the grip of the regime and the police terror have been infinitely stronger. But, in spite of the savage muz-

zling of the German people,\* we find once more traces of a revolutionary vanguard, especially in the concentration camps and the prisons. Fascism has not halted humanity's continuous march toward emancipation. It has only delayed it temporarily, if at all.

\* \* \*

Is it necessary to reissue this book at the moment when the fate of Mussolini and Hitler would appear to discourage their imitators in other countries? Outside of its retrospective interest, does it retain its timeliness?

Re-reading it, we are impressed with the fact that its real subject is *socialism* much more than it is *fascism*. For what is fascism, at bottom, but the direct product of the failure to achieve socialism? Behind fascism, the shadow of socialism is ceaselessly present. We have only studied the first in relation to the second. More than once, in the course of these pages, fascism has served us simply as a counterpoint with which to define better by contrast certain essential aspects of socialism. When, as we hope, the day comes in which nothing remains of fascism but a bad memory, this book will remain an attempt to contrast socialism to what was, at one time, its most redoubtable opponent. On this score perhaps *Fascism and Big Business* will not become outdated too quickly.

## A Widespread Illusion

But, as a matter of fact, is it really certain that the fascist epidemic has been definitively checked? We can only hope so, but we cannot at all be certain of it. It is a widespread illusion that the defeat of "The Axis" sounds the death knell of fascism in the entire world. Fascism, if you will pardon us for repeating it, is not a product that is specifically Italian or specifically German. It is the specific product only of decaying capitalism, of the crisis of the capitalist system which has become a permanent one. It has a double origin in the determination of big business to revive the profit mechanism by exceptional measures and in the revolt of the pauperized and despairing middle classes. In the aftermath of this second world war, capitalism in Europe will be convulsed with far greater contradictions which will differ in their acuteness from those that followed the last world war. It will need a "strong state" to survive. "Controlled economy," this rickety expedient which it can no longer dispense with, is incompatible with "democratic" politics. It requires a stable central power which is not subject to the control of the masses. "Controlled economy" is not specifically fascist; it exists, in varying degrees, in all countries. But it accommodates itself much better to fascist regimes than to "democratic" regimes.

On the other hand, the tremendous impoverishment of large sections of the middle classes (much more advanced than that observed in Italy and in Germany in the period "between the two wars") will create a state of profound social instability. Big business could very well, once again, bring to its feet the petty bourgeoisie driven to frenzy, arm them, inspire them with fanati-

\*Not only the repression of the Gestapo, but also the mobilization of all able-bodied men, the dispersion in the country of the population of the destroyed urban and industrial centers, the systematic efforts of the Allies to prevent the revolution in Germany even at the price of dragging out the monstrous slaughter, the bludgeoning effects of the defeat, the desperate flight before the Red Army, which spoke in terms of vengeance and not of liberation, all these factors have contributed to demoralize and to momentarily paralyze the German proletariat. But perhaps certain people rejoice too soon at its present apathy.—(End of May, 1945.)

\*The execution of Mussolini by the red partisans, an event which occurred after this preface was already written, confirms our thesis. As was to be expected, this resort to direct action displeased "the right kind" of people.

cism, if, unfortunately, the worker's parties prove incapable, once again, of showing them another way out.

Let us turn our attention also to the youth. Our young rebels have gotten into the habit of living outside the law; they have been shaped by the grim and extraordinary experiences of the Maquis. Today, they experience some difficulty and distaste in readapting themselves to prosaic "normal life." The inglorious conclusion of the Resistance struggle plunges them, moreover, into discouragement and doubt. Let us not forget that, following the armistice of 1918, the volunteer corps of world war veterans, for similar psychological reasons, provided Mussolini and Hitler with their first recruits. Beware!

## Foreign Aid

Fascism, moreover, can secure support abroad. The big "democracies" do not always tell the truth. They fought Hitler, not, as they claim today, because of the authoritarian and brutal form of the National Socialist regime, but because German imperialism, at a given moment, dared to dispute with them the hegemony of the world. It has been too generally forgotten that Hitler was hoisted to power with the blessings of the international bourgeoisie. During the first years of his rule, Anglo-American capitalism from the British aristocracy to Henry Ford, gave him, according to all evidence, their support. They viewed him as "the strong man," who alone was capable of reestablishing order in Europe and saving the continent from Bolshevism.\* Only much later, when the capitalists of the "democratic" countries found their interests, their markets, their sources of raw materials menaced by the irresistible expansion of German imperialism, did they start to preach against National Socialism, to denounce it as "immoral" and "un-Christian." And, even then, there were capitalists and princes of the Church, who, more anxious to ward off the "red peril" than the German peril, remained partial towards the policeman of Europe.

Today the big "democracies" proclaim themselves "anti-fascist." That's the word they're always mouthing. In reality, anti-fascism became necessary as a platform for them to overcome their German competitor. They could not gain the full allegiance of the popular masses in the struggle against Hitlerism solely by exalting national sentiment. Despite all appearances, we are no longer in the age of national wars. The struggle of the classes, the social war, dominates our epoch. The toiling masses could not have been brought to sacrifice themselves to liberate Europe unless sentiments of a social order were aroused in them, unless an appeal was made to their class instinct. They were told that it was necessary to finish off fascism. And as they understood more or less clearly, that Fascism is the exacerbated form of detested capitalism, they consented to all sacrifices. The Parisian barricades of the end of August 1944, the exploits of the various Maquis, will live as admirable examples of proletarian devotion.

But tomorrow the big "democracies" may very well put *anti-fascism* back on the shelf. Already, this magic word, which inspired the workers to rise up against Hitlerism, is considered by them undesirable as soon as it becomes the rallying point of the adversaries of the capitalist system. Already in Belgium and Greece, the Allies did not hesitate to brutally crush the very resistance movement which they had been only too happy to utilize for their own purposes. To reestablish "order," they

\*Note: It is also forgotten that the "upper crust" of Paris, London and New York paraded before the Palazzo Venetia to cast admiring looks at the Caesar who had made the trains run on time.

will sooner or later be compelled (as is already the case in Greece) to find points of support in the midst of the liberated populations. Against the people's vanguard they will support formations of a clearly fascist character. Naturally they will be baptised with another name, for the word *fascist* is definitively "played out." But, under the new label, the old merchandise will remain the same. It is to be expected that, tomorrow, the Allies will see in a *neo-fascism* more or less camouflaged, a guarantee against the "chaos" and "anarchy" rising in Europe; that is to say, against the proletarian revolution.

Big business, native as well as Anglo-American, will of course hesitate, in one country or another, to hand over the power to fascism (the distasteful experiences of Italy and Germany will undoubtedly make them somewhat cautious on this score) but it is quite likely that it will at least utilize the fascist gangs as anti-labor militias. In short, fascism, by whatever name it is called, will remain the reserve army of decaying capitalism.

## The Basic Conclusion

Thus our basic conclusion is seen to be confirmed by the most recent developments, namely, that fascism, outgrowth of the failure to achieve socialism, can be effectively fought and vanquished definitively only by the proletarian revolution.

The evil cannot be warded off by palliatives and patch-work. The world tosses about in chaos and the intervention of the "strong state" is made necessary because the capitalist abscess has immeasurably prolonged itself. The abscess can not be removed except by the surgical intervention of the proletariat. Outside of this radical solution there is no salvation; all "anti-fascism" that rejects it is but vain and deceitful babbling. The misfortune is that we have permitted the bourgeois-democrats to seize hold of anti-fascism. These gentlemen fear the fascist knout for their own skins, but they fear the proletarian revolution at least as much. They conjured up a bastard solution to reconcile these two fears, that of the "Popular Fronts." The "Popular Fronts" declaim against fascism but without taking a single thoroughgoing measure to attack its material roots. They refrain from laying a hand on capitalism despite their demagogic tirades against the "two hundred families," against the "trusts," and, an even graver crime, by their economic and social policies, they deepen the causes of friction between the proletariat and the middle classes; and thus they push the latter towards the very fascism from which they pretend to divert them.

The fascist menace has made many people discover the problem of the middle classes. Only recently, the parties of the left saw in them only an easy, faithful and stable electoral clientele. But from the day when it was demonstrated that in the course of their oscillations, amplified by the economic crisis, the middle classes could enter the opposite camp, that they could be seized with collective madness, that they could don the fascist uniform, these same parties have known the anguish of the mother hen menaced with losing her chicks; the question has become an obsession with them—*how to retain the middle classes?* Unfortunately, they have understood nothing (nor do they wish to understand anything) of the problem. We must apologize for only having, in this book, skimmed the surface of this problem. In effect, the logic of our analysis has led us less to research concerning how socialism could have been able to turn the middle classes away from fascism than to showing why and how it, fascism, succeeded in conquering them. The reader will therefore permit us a brief digression here.

The middle classes and the proletariat have common inter-

ests against big business. But there is more involved than common interests. They are not "anti-capitalist" in the same fashion. Undoubtedly the bourgeoisie exploits, sharpens at will these differences of interests, but it does not create them out of the whole cloth. It is therefore impossible to bring together the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie around a common program which will completely satisfy both. One of the two parties must make concessions. The proletariat, naturally, can agree to some. Whenever possible, it must see that the blows it directs against big business do not strike at the same time the small investors, artisans, merchants, peasants. But on certain essential points, it *must remain intransigent*, for if it yields on these points in order to retain influence over the middle classes, to reassure the small shopkeepers or peasants, it would renounce dealing capitalism the decisive blows. And every time that it failed in its mission to destroy capitalism, every time it has not pushed its advantage right to the end, the middle classes, caught between menacing big business and an aggressive working class, have become enraged and turned toward fascism.

### Revolutionary Action

In short, the proletariat cannot win over the middle classes by renouncing its own socialist program. The proletariat must convince the middle classes of its capacity to lead society onto a new road; by the strength and firmness of its revolutionary action. But it is precisely this that the inventors of the "Popular Fronts" do not wish to understand. They have but one idea in their heads: to catch the middle classes on bait-hooks, and they do this with so much skill that they eventually throw them back towards the fascist bait.

When they face the dilemma, *fascism or socialism*, these rabbit-skinned democrats get red with anger. What right has anyone to disturb the pure waters of their "anti-fascism"? But the day comes when (such was the sad fate of some among them) they themselves succumb to the fascist knout. Let us honor their memory while denouncing their bankruptcy.

Anti-fascism cannot triumph as long as it drags along as the tail to the kite of bourgeois democracy. Beware of "anti" formulas. They are always inadequate because they are purely negative. One cannot conquer a principle except by opposing to it another principle—a superior principle. The world of today, in the midst of its convulsions, is not only looking for a form of property that corresponds to the collective character and the gigantic scale of modern production; it seeks also a form of government capable of substituting a rational order for chaos, while liberating man. Bourgeois parliamentarianism offers only a caricature of democracy, ever more impotent and more corrupt. Deceived and disheartened, the world turns towards the strong State, the heaven-sent man, towards the "leader principle." On the plane of ideas, Fascism will be defeated only on that day when we present to humanity and when by example we shall make triumphant a new form of government of men, an authentic democracy, complete, direct, in which all the producers take part in the administration of things. This new type of democracy is not a chimera, an invention of the spirit. It exists. The great French Revolution—as we will demonstrate in another work—let us hear its first birth cries. The Commune of 1871 was the first attempt at its application, as Marx and Lenin have shown in a masterly manner. The Russian soviets of 1917 provided the model to the world in unforgettable fashion. Since then, Soviet democracy has gone through a prolonged eclipse in Russia itself, for reasons too numerous to outline here. This eclipse coincides with the rise of Fascism.

Today fascism lies crippled. We will give it the finishing blow by proving in action that true democracy, democracy of the Commune or soviet type, is viable and superior to all other types of government of men. *All Power to the Soviets*, said Lenin. Mussolini shamefully caricatured this slogan, making of it the slogan of the totalitarian state: *all power to fascism*.

The totalitarian state is a tottering monster. We shall be forever rid of it by assuring the triumph of the antithesis: the Republic of the Workers' Councils.

## The Big Three at Potsdam

By WILLIAM F. WARDE

Like robber chieftains discussing the division of their plunder, the representatives of the Big Three huddled in complete secrecy at a 17-day conference at Potsdam from July 17 to August 3. Out of this meeting came the most ferocious treaty inflicted by the victors in a modern war upon a crushed and conquered nation.

In his report delivered at the Second Congress of the Communist International, July 19, 1920, Lenin thus castigated the Versailles Treaty which the Allied Powers imposed on Germany, Austro-Hungary and Bulgaria after their defeat in the first World War: "By means of the Versailles Treaty, it (the war) imposed upon these countries such terms, that advanced peoples find themselves in a position of colonial dependence, poverty, starvation, ruin, and without rights; for they have been bound by this treaty for many generations, and have been put into conditions that no civilized nation has ever lived in . . . The Versailles Treaty has put Germany and a number of other vanquished countries in conditions in which economic existence is materially impossible, in conditions of utter lack of rights and degradation."

Lenin would have been hard-pressed to find phrases adequate

to express his indignation at the super-Versailles now imposed upon Germany by the Anglo-American imperialists and their confederate Stalin. In the Potsdam declaration hypocrisy vies with infamy and impudence. The preamble to the section setting forth their policies toward Germany blandly states: "It is not the intention of the Allies to destroy or enslave the German people. It is the intention of the Allies that the German people be given the opportunity to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of their life on a democratic and peaceful basis."

What colossal deceit! As both the terms of the declaration and the actions of the Allies conclusively demonstrate, the conquerors are bent upon exterminating and enslaving the German people, pillaging and ruining their economy, depriving them of all rights, and clamping the most brutal despotism upon their mutilated country. They aim—and they are now carrying out their aim—to out-Hitler Hitler in their treatment of defeated nationalities. If they are permitted to fulfill their plans without resistance or hindrance, the Allies will convert Europe into a prison-house and a wasteland.

"The political and economic principles" by which the Allies are "to govern the treatment of Germany in the initial

control period" call for the dismemberment of the country, the despoliation of its resources and the strangulation of its economy, together with the indefinite occupation and control of Germany. In place of Poland it is now Germany's turn to be partitioned. Part of East Prussia, including the port city of Königsberg, has been incorporated into the U.S.S.R. A sizeable slice of Eastern Germany, including the rich farm and industrial areas of Silesia, the Baltic port of Stettin and the former free city of Danzig, go to Kremlin-dominated Poland. Austria has already been cut off. Nor does this end the dismemberment of bleeding Germany. France is seeking choice morsels of the Rhineland and Ruhr. And the Big Three have set up a Council of Five Foreign Ministers "to continue the necessary preparatory work for the peace settlements" when the boundaries of Germany are to be definitively set.

In accord with these redrawn boundaries millions of Germans settled in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary are to be forcibly uprooted, dispossessed and deported. These 12 to 14 million Germans are to be thrown into a country the size of Montana incapable of supporting the 58 million people now living there. With the characteristic cynicism of diplomatic documents the Potsdam declaration assures us that this process is to be carried out "in an orderly and humane manner." The executioner will place a bandage over the victims' eyes before strangling them to death!

The Allied Supreme Command is made absolutely master of Germany. The country is to continue indefinitely under the occupation of four Allied armies. The commanders-in-chief are to exercise supreme authority in Germany, "each in his own zone of occupation, and also jointly as a whole. For the time being no central German government shall be established." No democratic rights, no independent political activity even of the most rudimentary type is to be permitted. In Bavaria, the largest zone occupied by the Americans, all parties have been banned except the Bavarian People's Party, the spokesman of blackest Catholic reaction. Thousands of Nazis remain in the administrative posts, many of them appointed by the AMG itself. According to an AP dispatch of June 25, the military governor of Bavaria, Col. Charles Keegan, ordered the stamping out of an anti-fascist party which demanded "the right of the anti-fascist working class to hold meetings, to freedom of speech, press and religion, and the formation of anti-fascist committees in all towns and communities." This Gauleiter of Wall Street declared: "The Germans are conquered people and have no right to demand anything." Similar reports have come from Berlin, Duesseldorf, Munich and other cities. Such is the state of the "four freedoms" in Germany today.

### Allied Economic Provisions

The oppressive and predatory character of Allied rule stands out most sharply in the economic provisions of the Potsdam communiqué. Industrial Germany, the principal producer of heavy goods for Europe during the past half century, is to be wiped out. Its assets are to be divided among the victors. The vultures propose to strip the country bare and pick its bones clean. All important plants are to be dismantled, destroyed or delivered to the conquerors as reparations payments. No aircraft or ships may be owned by Germans. The German Navy and merchant marine will be parcelled out to the Allies. The Western powers will keep the gold their troops captured. The external assets belonging to Germany will be taken over by the Allied Control Council, which will regulate all foreign trade transactions.

Moreover, the Germans are to be saddled with the costs of maintaining the Allied armies of occupation. They will also be made to pay for the damages done other nations by Hitler's armies. The total amount of reparations has still to be determined but in the meantime the Allied marauders have the right to seize whatever machinery and equipment they want . . . and destroy the rest. Here is the warrant for Germany's despoliation: "Productive capacity not needed for permitted production shall be removed in accordance with the reparations plan recommended by the Allied Commission on Reparations and approved by the governments concerned, or if not removed, shall be destroyed." The reparations plan provides that Russia take whatever machinery and goods it wants from Eastern Germany, settling Poland's claims from her share. The United States, the United Kingdom, France and other countries will satisfy their claims with 75 per cent of the "surplus" machinery and equipment in Western Germany. In addition, Russia and Poland will seize German property in the Balkan states and elsewhere in Eastern Europe. The German property in Western Europe will go to the Western Allies. But twenty-five percent of this will also be handed over to Russia.

### Ferocious Regime

The ferocity with which these piratical measures are being enforced may be seen from the following dispatch in the Sept. 6 *N. Y. Times*: "The four-power Kommandatura, which supervises Berlin, recently issued an order to the people to turn in all precious metal and specie. A few days ago the council received a pleading letter from the Oberbürgermeister asking if he could not exempt an old collection of 600 gold and 3,500 silver coins in the mint. The Kommandatura told him no.

"A similar sort of plea came from the city asking for a guarantee that the factories the Germans were rehabilitating would not be seized by the occupation forces once they had been fixed up. The Kommandatura replied that it would extend no such guarantee. One officer remarked—to loud cheers from his auditors—that the Allies would not guarantee not to pick up the Berlin City Hall and ship it to Moscow if they felt like it."

In the *N. Y. Times* magazine, Sept. 9, Curt Reiss wired from Berlin the following description of the system and sweeping way in which Stalin is pillaging Germany. "It is well known, that wherever the Red Army came it proceeded to take apart speedily what was left of Germany's industrial plants and ship everything to Russia. This has been going on, and still is, on a genuinely 'total' basis. I visited a number of such plants which were in relatively good working order when the fighting ended. Now the machines are gone. So are the freight cars and even the rails. So are the typewriters, fountain pens and all office equipment. Only the empty buildings remain."

The Germans are being handled like colonial slaves, subjected to the vilest oppression and the deepest degradation by their new masters who have replaced the Nazis. Their living conditions too are to be depressed and deliberately held down to Asiatic levels. It is openly admitted by the Allied authorities that Germany faces mass starvation and epidemics this winter. The majority of the population now has to live on 900 to 1000 calories. This is little more than half the number of calories required simply to sustain life without violent exercise or labor. The Eastern provinces which ordinarily produce about 45 percent of Germany's major foodstuffs are in Russian hands. The Kremlin does not intend to ship food into Western Germany where the largest part of the population is concentrated.

Nor do the other Allies propose to send much food. AMG officials have estimated that "an acute food shortage of near-starvation proportions faces the 7 million residents of the Rhineland." Lt. Gen. Lucius Clay stated that "the food supply is going to be a very tight squeeze and we will be lucky if the current stocks last until harvest time," but, adds the *N. Y. Times* correspondent: "No food is going to be shipped from the US merely on the assumption that some Germans are going to starve." The Germans can expect no more mercy than the people of India where during this war millions perished from famine under the eyes of the imperialist ghouls.

## Fearful Prospects

The Potsdam plan holds out the most fearful prospects for Germany. The costs and consequences of the war combined with the calculated destruction of Germany's industrial life prevent economic recovery. How can amputated Germany pay for the importation of the foodstuffs and raw materials it needs without the products of industry? How can the people rebuild its rubble-filled cities? How will they provide food and work for the millions of expelled Germans dumped into the narrowed boundaries? How will they pay for the maintenance of the occupying forces when they themselves lack the means of life?

The wrecker's crew at Potsdam were not in the least concerned about the fate of the German masses. For their monstrous measures are deliberately designed to demolish Germany's industrial capacity; to smash Germany once and for all as a world competitor. Allied plans were debated and discussed at length in official circles during the war. In England Lord Vansittart demanded the total dismemberment of Germany. In the United States Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau envisaged the transformation of Germany into a purely agricultural land. And in the USSR Stalin's economist, Varga, proposed dismemberment, deindustrialization, the payment of billions in reparations plus the use of 10 million German workers as slave labor in the East.

In a memorandum to government officials the millionaire Wall Street operator and senior statesman, Bernard Baruch, bluntly set forth the material motives behind the U.S. plans for Germany. Here is what he said as reported in the *N. Y. World-Telegram*, May 31:

"We must keep Germany—and this applies equally to Japan—from re-establishing herself as a great industrial nation ready to make war. We must keep Germany and Japan from re-establishing themselves in the exports of the world. By eliminating the subsidized, sweated competition of 170 to 200 million Germans and Japs—among the lowest cost producers in the world—we not only deny the enemy the wherewithal to make future war, but we expand the industrial opportunities for the rest of the world . . . The United Nations will have more trade with one another, instead of with Germany.

"By keeping our standards high and exerting our influence to swell the purchasing power of the rest of the world, we can keep to a minimum the disruptive effects of the inflation already loose in the world, and can pay off debts and reduce taxes . . ." Mr. Baruch said the reparations policy he suggested would be accompanied by increased business and jobs in the United Nations, thus strengthening the determination to occupy Germany as long as is necessary. "It may be argued," he said, "that the program envisaged must mean a great transformation of the German economy. That is true. But such a transformation is unavoidable even should a 'be nice to Germany' policy be adopted."

Here the economic calculations of the Anglo-American imperialists are laid bare. By destroying and appropriating Germany's productive forces, they aim to monopolize the world's markets and sources of raw materials. At the expense of the

conquered and colonial peoples they hope to save themselves from looming financial bankruptcy and postpone the next industrial crisis. The handful of billionaires, bankers and industrialists who have drawn up and dictated this plan know very well that the destruction of German industry inevitably dooms all Europe to impoverishment, starvation, and ruin. German industry has been the mainstay of European economy. The German steel industry, machine tool and electrical plants, locomotive shops and shipbuilding yards have been the largest on the continent. Out of Germany has come 60 per cent of Europe's coal, 50 percent of its pig iron and steel and even greater proportions of aluminum, electrical machinery and machine tools. With the destruction of this great industrial apparatus the other sections of the continent's economy are bound to collapse. On top of the devastation of the war will be piled the impoverishment and decay of the imperialist "peace." The continent that formerly marched at the head of civilization will be hurled back into semi-colonial servitude.

The justification for this brutal enslavement of Germany and the Allied dictatorship over Europe is the war-guilt of the German people. The Big Three write: "They cannot escape responsibility for what they have brought upon themselves, since their own ruthless warfare and the fanatical Nazi resistance have destroyed German economy and made chaos and suffering inevitable . . . The German people have begun to atone for the terrible crimes committed under the leadership of those whom in the hour of their success, they openly approved and blindly obeyed."

Not a word about the heroic struggles of the German workers to prevent Nazism from coming to power. About the mass resistance of the underground movements to Hitler's regime. About the German workers who were Hitler's first and principal victims. About the tens of thousands of fighters against the Nazis who filled the jails and concentration camps, who gave their lives for a free and independent workers republic in Germany.

Not a word about the help these very imperialists gave to Hitler, their avowed admiration for his deeds in the early 1930's, their hopes that, after crushing the labor movement in Germany, he would get rid of the "Bolshevik menace" in the East. Not a word about Stalin's shameful pact with Hitler in 1939 that cleared the way for the Second World War.

## Inevitable Questions

Even a person unfamiliar with these facts might ask: why must all of Europe pay for the crimes of the German ruling class? Why are Germans to be condemned and punished for following the orders of the Nazi war-lords when today not only the Japanese people but the Koreans as well are ordered by the Allied conquerors to obey the commands of the Mikado's military men? Why aren't anti-fascists allowed to clean out the Nazis? Why aren't workers permitted to organize free trade unions, hold public meetings, participate in politics?

Here we penetrate to the innermost core of the conspiracy hatched by the Big Three at Potsdam: their unholy alliance against the European and the German revolution. References to this question were carefully excluded from the communiqués and even from the capitalist press reports emanating from the Tripartite Conference. Nevertheless, the counter-revolutionary program is the main unifying factor in the unholy combination of the Big Three. The end of the imperialist war has witnessed the beginnings of the proletarian revolution in Europe. In Greece the resistance of the masses reached the point of civil war. Thanks to Anglo-American and Red Army occupation,

the treacherous policies of the Stalinist and Social-Democratic parties, and the unpreparedness and illusions of the working masses, the first wave of the revolutionary offensive was pushed back. But the political situation throughout Europe remains extremely unstable. Only the first encounters between the contending class forces have taken place. The great and decisive battles between the forces of the socialist revolution and the camp of the capitalist counter-revolution are still ahead. As Europe plunges deeper into starvation and ruin, as the true nature of the Anglo-American "liberators" and the role of their Stalinist accomplices dawns upon the people, as the hopelessness of their future under capitalism strikes them even more forcibly, then a mighty tide of revulsion against the new masters of the continent will rise in one country after another. If Germany will not be the first country in which this revolt erupts, it will in any event be the place where the struggle must be fought to a finish and decided. It may take some time for the German workers to recover from the shocks of the war and the betrayals of their leaders, to reorganize their ranks, to reform their political parties. But in time they can be expected to resume their rightful place in the vanguard of the European revolutionary movement.

## Plans of Counter-Revolution

That is precisely what the Allies are determined to forestall. The Anglo-American bandits fear the revival of German industry; but they fear far more the resurrection of the revolutionary German proletariat. Stalin fears the German imperialists—but he dreads even more the prospect of the resurgence of an independent socialist-inspired German working class on the march to power. For the victory of such a working class, or even large-scale successes in struggle against the present rulers, would imperil Stalin's power, would stimulate the Soviet masses to recover their own capacities for organized class action against his totalitarian regime.

The Allies are seeking in every way to keep the German workers divided, demoralized, pinned down so that they will not become the mighty power they were after the last war. That is the main reason why they refrain from extending the most elementary rights to the German people. After winning the war against their capitalist rivals, the Anglo-American imperialists are pitilessly prosecuting class war against the German workers. That is the political essence of their Potsdam policy.

The nature of Allied political rule over the German people is made fully clear by the recent press dispatches. After the behavior of the Allied generals had become a scandal, General Eisenhower on Aug. 6 told the Germans that they would be permitted to form local unions and engage in local political activities and hold meetings "subject to approval of the local military government." But local unions are not permitted to carry on any political activities or to strike. They are forbidden to federate or even to establish contacts with each other on a regional or national scale. AMG earlier dissolved the Central Office for Trade Unions in Hamburg on the grounds that its officers had tried to turn it into an active political organization and had also "made a premature attempt to establish a trade union administration for the entire country." No national political parties are permitted to organize.

Such is the "democracy" which the Allies are bringing to Germany on the tips of their bayonets.

While the workers are being kept in a state of forced dispersion and disorganization, many Nazis retain key positions in the few factories which have been restored to operation as

well as in the state and municipal administration. "The Saar coal and iron mines have reopened with 5000 of the former workmen back on the job," reported the *N.Y. Times* correspondent Raymond Daniell late in May. "The management consists pretty much of the same people who ran them as feeders for the Nazi war industry and who, to the knowledge of Military Government officials, were supporters of the Hitler regime." When a delegation from the population in Rosenheim, Bavaria, called at the military government office to protest the AMG appointment of a Nazi mayor, "they were informed that 'the military governor is too busy' and the Nazi will have to remain in office until he has more time to look into the case."

Who but a madman expects peace, democracy or well-being to flow from policies which have already brought two world wars, rampant reaction, fascist dictatorship, and ruin to the entire continent? Who can expect the peoples of Europe and above all the workers of Germany to submit unprotestingly to the Big Three's projected regime of starvation and terror? They will be compelled to fight against the new overlords, the capitalist rulers and their Stalinist and reformist agents simply in order to exist. And their struggles must inescapably acquire a sharper class edge, a more and more pronounced revolutionary character. At the same time the illusions of the European masses about Stalinism—above all in Germany—will become dissipated through direct experience with the agencies of the Soviet oligarchy. This has already occurred to some extent. Here is what Reiss reports from Berlin:

"What the Russians did has made an enormous, one might say staggering, impression on the German working population. I talked to quite a few workers in the northern and eastern Berlin districts. They are horrified, to say the least.

"While most Germans were terribly afraid of the advancing Russians, mainly on account of what Goebbel's propaganda taught them, this cannot be said of the workers. Though most of them were not Communists, they nevertheless believed the Red Army to be the protector of the working class. In many Berlin districts the Russians were greeted as liberators, in some instances there were even flowers. Now there is only resentment.

"German workers told me that, while they are grateful to the Russians for having liberated them from Hitler, they reproach them for having deprived them of their livelihood, at best, degraded them, for a skilled worker without machines becomes an unskilled worker."

## The Coming Struggles

The coming struggles of the agonized European masses against the Big Three enslavers and their super-Versailles and against the Stalinist and Social-Democratic misleaders can find the correct program and necessary leadership only in the parties of the Fourth International. The Trotskyists proclaim that without a socialist revolution the European peoples cannot escape from the prevailing chaos, gain their freedom, rebuild their economic life. Only through joint struggle for the Socialist United States of Europe can they liberate the continent and move forward again.

In the United States we Trotskyists are exerting every effort to inform the American workers of the crimes being plotted and perpetrated against Europe. Appealing to their class sentiments of international solidarity we call upon the labor movement to support morally and materially the struggles for life and liberty conducted against their oppressors by the workers across the Atlantic. The slogan of our party: "Withdraw the Allied Occupation Troops from Europe" will become the rallying cry of all advanced workers who recognize that the masses on both continents have one common enemy to fight in the criminals of the Potsdam Conference.

# The Atomic Bomb

By WILLIAM WALLIS

On Aug. 6 President Truman first announced to the world that an atomic bomb had been dropped on Hiroshima, Japan. This bomb was said to have possessed more power than 20,000 tons of TNT, a destructive force equal to the load of 2000 B-29s. President Truman further described this new scientific achievement as involving the "harnessing of the basic power of the universe . . . the force from which the sun draws its powers" and went on to warn the Japanese that "they may expect a rain of ruin from the air the like of which has never been seen on this earth."

According to the *World-Telegram* of Aug. 7, "Informed sources at Pearl Harbor said the bomb was understood to have the power to blind persons within a five-mile radius and to kill within four miles. The searing blast was said to fuse the earth into silicate-like formations."

In reporting on the first test firing of the atomic bomb in the remote desert lands of New Mexico, the *New York Times* of Aug. 7 said, "A blinding flash many times as brilliant as the midday sun and a massive multi-colored cloud boiling up 40,000 feet into the air accompanied the first test firing of an atomic bomb on July 16 . . . at 5:30 AM. At the moment of the explosion a mountain range three miles distant stood out sharply in brilliant light."

After the blinding flash came a tremendous roar and a heavy pressure wave which was so great that two men outside the control tower more than five miles away were knocked down. A steel tower on which the bomb was hung was vaporized and in its place gaped a huge crater.

The bourgeois press reported on Aug. 8 that a second atomic bomb had been dropped on Nagasaki, Japan, a city of 252,000 persons. In the words of the *New York World-Telegram* correspondent, the city was "virtually blown off the map."

Tokyo reported the same day that most of Hiroshima, a city of 343,000, had been destroyed by the single bomb and that blasted and blistered corpses "too numerous to count" littered the ruins; also that "the impact of the bomb was so terrific that practically all living things, human and animal, were literally seared to death by the tremendous heat and pressure, engendered by the blast." The *New York World-Telegram* of Aug. 8 further reported that the dead and wounded might exceed 100,000. On August 22 it reported a Tokyo broadcast as saying "the number of dead are mounting as many of those who received burns cannot survive their wounds because of the effects the atomic bomb produce on the human body. Even those who received minor burns looked quite healthy at first only to weaken after a few days for some unknown reason and frequently died." The War Department had earlier denied the published report of Dr. Harold Jacobson, one of those who had participated in the atomic research work at Columbia University, to the effect that the bombed area in Japan might cause death for persons entering the area for a period of 70 years.

Despite these denials subsequent eye-witness accounts by US correspondents who visited Hiroshima and Nagasaki seem to confirm, at least tentatively, these indications of the horrible after-effects of the atomic bombings. "Thousands are in hospitals around Kure with only minor burns the size of a quarter on the hand or face," said NBC's correspondent Guthrie Jansen. "But these victims suffer from extreme nausea with temperatures as high as 104. They cough up blood. Their white

corpuscles count decreased rapidly. All of these will probably die." (PM, Sept. 4).

*N. Y. Times* correspondent, William H. Lawrence, wired Sept. 3 that the atomic bomb was still killing 100 people daily in devastated Hiroshima. "Japanese doctors told us," he said, "they were helpless to deal with burns caused by the bomb's great flash or with the other physical ailments caused by the bomb. Some said they thought that all who had been in Hiroshima that day would die as a result of the bomb's lingering effects."

The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* discloses that prolonged exposure of the human body to radiation from radioactive substances leads to atrophy of the parts affected and to cancer. However, under carefully controlled conditions, the rays have been successfully used in the treatment of cancer and in the destruction of bacteria which cause typhus, cholera, anthrax and similar diseases. This is a typical illustration of how resources that promise so much in the way of benefit to humanity are actually used by the capitalist ghouls for its destruction.

What is this new death-dealing machine? In order to grasp its physical meaning certain terms must be defined and described. Briefly these are:

**Element**—this is the chemical name given to any substance which we are not able, by any known chemical or physical means, to decompose into, or make by chemical union from, other substances.

**Atom**—the smallest part of an element that can exist either alone or in combination with similar particles of the same or of a different element.

**Electron**—the most elementary charge of negative electricity, the electrical opposite of the proton. (The electron has extremely small mass.)

**Proton**—a particle *within* the atom exhibiting a positive charge of electricity, the electrical opposite of the electron. The proton has a mass substantially equal to 1. (The proton weighs approximately 1840 times as much as the electron.)

**Neutron**—a particle which is electrically neutral. It is a combination of one proton and one electron.

**Atomic weight**—this is the weight of the atom and is equal to the number of protons existing within the atom, including, of course, those protons present in the neutrons.

**Atomic number**—atoms are like miniature solar systems. A number of relatively free electrons (equal to the atomic number) travel in orbits about a central nucleus. An equal number of protons are present in the nucleus. The nucleus also contains a number of neutrons equal to the difference between the atomic weight and the atomic number. The atomic numbers determine the chemical properties of each element.

**Isotope**—these are chemically identical atoms of different atomic weights.

**Beryllium**—a metallic element with an atomic number of 4 and an atomic weight of 9. It is derived from the mineral beryl, found primarily in Brazil and Argentina.

**Radium**—a metallic element with an atomic number of 88 and an atomic weight of 226. It is produced from the mineral pitchblende, found primarily in Canada and the Belgian Congo; also from carnotite, found principally in Colorado and Utah. It continually undergoes disintegration, emitting electrons, pro-

tons and neutrons. The end product of this process of disintegration is lead.

One type of radiation emitted from radium is known as alpha rays. These rays consist of particles each of which is a combination of 2 protons and 2 neutrons. This particle may be considered to be an atom of helium which has lost 2 electrons. (Helium is the non-combustible gas found in the Texas Panhandle and used to inflate balloons and dirigibles.)

When beryllium is bombarded by alpha particles, neutrons are emitted. These neutrons are moving at high velocities but may be slowed down by material containing atoms of hydrogen, such as paraffin or water.

**Uranium**—a metallic element, also occurring in pitchblende and carnotite, with an atomic number of 92. Several isotopes of different atomic weights exist, among which are U-235 (atomic weight of 235) and U-238. When U-235 is bombarded by slow-moving neutrons the uranium atom absorbs a neutron in its nucleus to produce U-236. Slow-moving neutrons are necessary because they have a far greater chance of colliding with the uranium nucleus instead of passing unscathed through the atom; the proportion of "empty space" within the atom to that occupied by the particles is tremendous.

U-236 has a very short average life, measurable in tiny fractions of seconds. In other words, it disintegrates explosively to simpler elements of lower atomic weights and numbers. In this disintegration more neutrons are liberated, which further accelerates the disintegration of the mass. This process is known as a "chain reaction" by the physical chemists.

During this disintegration a net loss of mass occurs; the mass is converted to energy. This conversion may be expressed mathematically as the Einstein mass-energy law:  $E=MC^2$ , in which E is the energy evolved, M the mass consumed and  $C^2$  is the velocity of light squared. It is not hard to realize what a tremendous amount of energy is liberated by considering that the multiplication factor  $C^2$  is the product of two very large numbers (light travels at the speed of 186,000 miles per second). This equation was first deduced mathematically by Einstein and later verified experimentally. Calculation further reveals that the energy equivalent to one pound of matter is one and one-half million horsepower acting for ten thousand hours. This gives a faint idea of the tremendous amount of energy—explosive force—liberated. At the same time it indicates the amount of useful work available if the energy were utilized in power plants instead of the destruction of mankind.

The composition of the atomic bomb may be, according to information received and reported by the New York American Museum of Natural History, "a form of the element uranium which supplies the principal explosive force, and radium and beryllium which form the detonating apparatus for releasing this force. This detonator perhaps acts in the following manner: radium emits rays which strike the beryllium, which in turn emits neutrons. Paraffin or water slows the neutrons as they pass through on their way to smashing the uranium atom and thus releasing the atomic energy." This conjecture is based on scientific facts published prior to 1939 when the iron lid of censorship was clamped on research in the field of atomic physics. Undoubtedly the vast amount of research work done during the years has brought new and improved methods of effecting the operations involved.

On Aug. 12 the War Department released a 30,000 word report by Professor H. D. Smyth of Princeton in which he traces in general terms the development of the atomic bomb project. The report is full of vagaries, omissions and misleading information. The summaries of this report that appeared in

the press, e.g., that in the Aug. 16. *N. Y. Times*, are far worse; in fact, errors seem to be the order of the day. But from this hodge-podge it is possible to glean some information regarding the results of the research carried on during the war years and applied in the tremendous government projects.

According to the Smyth report, the production units at the Hanford Engineer Works located on a government reservation at Pasco, Washington, are several huge uranium "piles." Each is a very large block of graphite with holes in which are placed uranium metal cylinders. These are sealed in aluminum cans to protect the uranium from corrosion by the cooling water constantly pumped through the pile. Each pile runs itself, so to speak. Once started, the design, size and control of the unit must be such that the chain reaction will continue at an even rate—neither die down nor overshoot into an explosion.

The report indicated that the U-235 present in the uranium mass is utilized to furnish neutrons, in the manner described above, for the bombardment of the nucleus of U-238. This bombardment converts U-238 to U-239 by virtue of the fact that a neutron (mass = 1) is added to the nucleus of U-238. However, the U-239 then loses two nuclear electrons which pass into the electronic orbits, converting two neutrons into two protons. This means that a new element has been produced which has an atomic weight of 239 and an atomic number of 94. It is called plutonium. This nuclear reaction may be better understood by studying the following sequence:

U-238 nucleus = 92 protons plus 146 neutrons.

Add one neutron from U-235 to obtain:

U-239 nucleus = 92 protons plus 147 neutrons.

This is short-lived and loses two nuclear electrons to the orbits to obtain:

Pu-239 = 94 protons plus 145 neutrons (Plutonium)

The carbon in the piles acts as a "moderator" to slow the neutrons.

Plutonium is then capable of fission in a manner similar to U-235. There are two advantages in conversion of U-238 to plutonium. One is that natural uranium contains 99.3 percent U-238 and only 0.7 percent U-235 (traces only of U-234). This renders available for fission one hundred and forty-two times as much uranium as would be available if only U-235 were used. The other advantage is that plutonium, being a different element with different chemical properties, may be readily separated by chemical means, thus avoiding the extremely difficult physical operations necessary for separating isotopes.

## Trotsky's Warning

This, then, is the generally known data in scientific circles about this most terrible instrument of destruction unloosed by man upon our planet. It was prepared in secret; unleashed in secret; its feverish development is proceeding in the same way.

At the present time the advantages are on the side of the American imperialists. But this new scientific discovery can no more remain the monopoly of any single group or country than those which preceded it. What does the inescapable further development of the atomic bomb both here and in other countries signify for mankind under the continued role of capitalism?

Leon Trotsky warned the working class in his last great May 1940 manifesto on the *Imperialist War and the Proletarian Revolution*: "Today it is no longer a question, as was the case in the nineteenth century, of simply assuring a more rapid and more healthy development of economic life: today it is a question of saving mankind from suicide."

The atomic bombing of Japan, has turned this prediction into a fearsome reality.

# The Wavell Plan—A New Form of Old Slavery

By K. TILAK

The following article on the Wavell Plan by one of the leaders of Indian Trotskyism was written July 2, 1945 before the results of the Simla conference were known. As the article predicts, the Indian Congress party accepted the Wavell proposals. However, the conference fell through, we are informed by the press, because of the Muslim League's insistence on naming all the Muslim members to the Executive Council.

General Wavell is now in London meeting with the newly elected ministers of his Majesty's Labor government. Undoubtedly the British rulers are hatching new schemes for the purpose of confusing world public opinion while tightening their hold on India. That is why this analysis of the moving forces of the Indian political scene remains so timely today.

\* \* \*

The proposals of the British Government for a solution of the "deadlock" in India, which have been transmitted through the Viceroy Lord Wavell and have come to be known as the Wavell Plan, are being hailed by the world capitalist press as a real advance on the road to Indian independence and an honest attempt on the part of the British Government to meet the national aspirations of the Indian people. This latter contention is tantamount to saying that British imperialism has suddenly decided to give up its richest single field of colonial exploitation, in fact, that it is preparing voluntarily to liquidate itself—a tale that even the most gullible will find difficult to swallow. And as for the Wavell Plan being an advance on the road to independence, the most cursory examination of the proposals is sufficient to dispel this illusion.

In the first place it should be noted that there is no concrete proposal whatsoever for the granting of self-government of any kind to India even after the war—only a re-affirmation of the pious intentions of the British Government in this regard. The Wavell Plan frankly claims to be only an interim arrangement for the war period. And what about the interim arrangement? The only change is that the Viceroy's Council (which is a purely advisory body), with the significant exception of the portfolio of Defense, is going to be manned by Indians of the principal political parties. And even this is hedged in by the conditions that the selection of the councillors will be made by the Viceroy (from panels to be presented to him by the leading parties), and that the Council itself will be responsible only to the Viceroy and not to the Central Legislative Assembly which will have no power to overthrow it by a vote of no-confidence. But the really important thing is that the all-powerful power of veto of the Viceroy (which can be used not only negatively to disallow but also positively to initiate policy) is to be retained in full. The assurance that it will not be used "unreasonably" (has it ever been used "unreasonably" in the past?) is valueless. And finally, even all these sham concessions are made dependent on full cooperation in the war against Japan. These are the essential features of the Wavell Plan. It is clear that the plan makes not the slightest attempt to transfer any real power at all, but is only an attempt to get the main political parties in India (and particularly the Indian National Congress) to assume the responsibility for the further fleecing and impoverishment of the country in the interests of the war effort. To complete the picture, it only remains to add that the question of the release of the thousands of political prisoners languishing in jail is to be left to the central and provincial governments which will come into existence if the

Wavell Plan is accepted. In other words, these men and women are to be held as hostages by British imperialism pending a settlement with Congress.

## The Crucial Question

The crucial question in Indian politics at the moment is: "Will Congress accept the Wavell Plan?" for the success or failure of the plan depends on this one fact. As a matter of fact, Congress has already acquiesced. By sending their representatives to participate in the Viceroy's Conference in Simla, the Indian National Congress already signified its assent to the basic principles of the plan. There only remains to fill in the details, that is, to agree to the specific allocation of seats in the Viceroy's Executive Council. There is little doubt that final agreement will be reached and that Congress will soon be back in office (which it abandoned after the outbreak of the imperialist war in 1939), only this time it will be in office not only in the provinces but also at the Centre, thus assuming full and complete responsibility for the British imperialist administration of India. Eating its own words in the past, it will be accepting and working under the slave constitution of 1935, and it will be actively supporting the imperialist war which it has hitherto refused to support on the ground that Indian independence was the crucial test of the honesty of the professed war aims of the United Nations.

The plain fact is, Congress has not only compromised, it has abjectly surrendered. This surrender cannot come as a surprise to those who, employing the Marxist method of analysis, realize that the Indian National Congress is the party of the bourgeoisie of India which can only play an oppositional role to imperialism and places itself at the head of the mass movement only in order to strike a bargain with imperialism and betray the movement. Of all political parties in India, the Indian Bolshevik Leninists alone were able to foresee and foretell the event, publicising their views to the limited extent that their small organization and the conditions of illegality permitted. The changing policies of the Indian National Congress since the outbreak of war have followed with remarkable accuracy the changing immediate interests of the Indian bourgeoisie. It is instructive to recall them.

After the commencement of the imperialist war in September 1939, the Congress, which was then in office in the provinces, resigned, calling for a declaration of Britain's war aims, meanwhile following a policy of political non-cooperation in the war effort, as well as non-embarrassment of it. In other words, it wanted Britain to state the price it was prepared to pay for Congress support of the war. The reply came in the Viceroy's declaration in August 1940—nothing! The Congress therefore continued its policy of non-cooperation in and non-embarrassment of the war effort, but, in order to preserve its prestige among the masses was compelled to embark on the symbolic gesture of selected individuals courting imprisonment on the restricted issue of freedom of speech in relation to the war. The campaign, of course, petered out, and the situation continued, with the Congress still holding out for a bargain. This policy perfectly suited the interests of the bourgeoisie. It stood to gain nothing much by cooperation as things were (the entire economy had not been geared to the war effort by a rigid

system of government controls at the time), and on the other hand, the war would continue and the bourgeoisie could wait. All along up to then there was no question of playing with the fire of a mass movement in order to extract concessions. The cowardly Indian bourgeoisie did not even raise the threat of it.

### Change in Military Situation

The situation, however, was suddenly transformed by the change in the military situation to the disadvantage of Britain in early 1942, and particularly by the Japanese victories and the threatened invasion of India itself. The bourgeoisie now felt its position much stronger, as indeed it actually was. The Cripps offer represented the urgent desire of British imperialism to come to some sort of settlement with Congress. The Indian bourgeoisie however were not prepared to throw in their lot with British imperialism in a situation where the victory of Britain in the war was by no means assured, *except in exchange for a very substantial consideration*, which the Cripps offer did not provide. It is this that explains the Congress rejection of the Cripps offer. Now for the first time Congress spoke in terms of a mass struggle and passed the well-known August resolution authorizing Gandhi to commence a mass struggle if his last appeal to the Viceroy failed. As we know, at this stage the Government arrested the Congress leaders, an act which was the signal for a spontaneous mass upsurge in the country. The August struggle was thus never formally launched by Congress, a fact which has enabled the Congress leadership today to disclaim all responsibility for it. But would the Congress have launched a mass struggle (even on non-violent lines) if the arrests had not interfered with the course of events? The writer believes it would have, for the hopes and demands of the Indian bourgeoisie at the time were so high that British imperialism could not have afforded to grant them. But the important thing is, even if Congress had actually launched a struggle, its perspective would have been a compromise with imperialism. It is significant that not even in August 1942 did Congress characterize the war as imperialist. On the contrary, while questioning the validity of the allied war aims, it offered to support the war provided its own demands were met. Thus on the universal question of today, the question of the war, the position of Congress all along revealed the huckstering bourgeoisie behind it.

With the smashing of the August struggle and the growing prospect of victory for the allies, the attitude of the Indian bourgeoisie changed. They now wanted settlement, and settlement at any cost. And they wanted to be back in office. For, unlike in 1939-41, the end of the war was in sight, and, in addition, the governmental stranglehold of the economy was so complete that they wished to be back in office even as administrators, if only to secure some of the minor advantages that such a position would give them. This changed attitude of the bourgeoisie was voiced by Gandhi, who, on his release in early 1944, stated his terms for settlement. Although support for the war was offered, his terms were still too high and the deadlock continued. At the beginning of 1945 Bhulabhai Desai, the leader of the Congress Party in the Central Legislative Assembly, discussed proposals for settlement with the Viceroy (it now transpires that Gandhi had privately given his consent to these proposals). The proposals (with a characteristic imperialist twist) form the basis of the present Wavell Plan, which Congress is in the process of accepting. Thus, the entire policy of Congress since the war, in all its left and right zigzags right down to the present surrender, and with all its apparent contradictions, reveals an inner logic which confirms fully our characterization of the Indian National Congress as the party of the Indian bourgeoisie

What has been the attitude of the other major political parties in India to the Wavell proposals? The Muslim League, the reactionary party of the Muslim landlords, which obtains support from the backward Muslim masses by rousing communal feeling against the Hindus, and which grew in strength under the direct patronage of the imperialists in the war period in which Congress has been in opposition, has also accepted the basis of the Wavell Plan, but is at present engaged in a squabble to secure as many as possible of the Muslim seats of the Executive Council for itself. In fact, it demands all of them, which, at the moment, is the only obstacle in the way of putting into practice of the Wavell proposals. The Hindu Maha Sabha, the reactionary party of the Hindu landlords, which shares equally with the Muslim League the responsibility for fostering communal differences between Hindus and Muslims, is opposed to the Wavell Plan, not, however, because it transfers no real power, but because it, the Sabha, demands greater representation for Hindus in the Viceroy's Executive than the 50-50 proposition between caste Hindu and Muslims that is proposed in the Wavell Plan. The Liberals, who today represent nobody but themselves, also support the acceptance of the proposals, as do all other sectional organizations of the bourgeoisie.

### The Indian Stalinists

The most insistent demand that the Wavell Plan should be accepted comes, perhaps, from the Communist Party of India. In its paper, *Peoples War* it hails the proposals as a "split inside our enemies' camp, the British ruling class, because behind it is the pressure of our allies, the peoples of Britain and the freedom loving world" (*Peoples War*, June 24, 1945.) Are these people unaware that the Wavell Plan had the united approval of the Conservative, Liberal and Labor members of the late Coalition Government, and is the pressure of the peoples of Britain and the freedom loving world so meagre a thing? Pressure there certainly is, but the only pressure that we can discern behind this proposal to continue to keep India in bondage is the pressure of the British imperialist bourgeoisie. They also urge settlement in India since it would help China in the war against Japan. No mention, of course, is made of Burma, where Indian troops are being used now to bring Burma back under the yoke of British imperialism. One thing can, however, be said for the Stalinists. Their slogan of "National Government" is now in the process of realization. In the period of the August struggle, when the masses were facing British tanks and bullets, and the bourgeoisie itself was in opposition, the Stalinists did their best to sabotage the struggle going even to the extent of betraying militants to the police. They called frantically for a "National Government" on the basis of Congress-League unity to support the war, that is to say, for a united bourgeois-feudal-imperialist oppression of the masses. This is now about to become a fact. A "National Government" is coming into being. Only it will be a National Government against the nation.

How will Congress square its abject surrender of today with its heroic professions of the past? Its leaders have already declared in public that the Wavell Plan is only an interim arrangement for the war period, and that Congress has not ceased to pursue its aim of independence. Jawaharlal Nehru in particular is emerging to the forefront as the chief spokesman of Congress in this regard, and with demagogic praise of those who fought in the August struggle and denunciation of war profiteers, is attempting to palm off the Congress surrender as a step forward. But there are two facts which no amount of quibbling and evasion can dispose of. Firstly, Congress is going to work under the 1935 Act, which it has in the past boycotted as a slave

constitution with which it could not have any truck. Secondly, it will unconditionally support the imperialist war, which means it will be assuming full responsibility for the unbearable war burdens imposed on the masses of India and for sending Indian troops to Burma, Malaya, etc., in order to recapture these countries for British imperialism. In other words, no amount of ingenuity on the part of Congress can succeed in convincing the masses that the surrender is anything but a surrender.

This is not, however, to say that there will be any mass opposition to the settlement. On the contrary the first reaction of the masses to the settlement is likely to be one of relief. After having suffered three years of acute repression, the masses are likely to welcome Congress in office, in the hope that things will improve under it. In this they will be disillusioned, but that will be later. The first period will see a growth of mass activity, a revival of the hopes and aspirations of the masses, which they will strive to achieve through Congress. A revival of political activity is already visible among fairly wide strata of the petty bourgeois intelligentsia. This is the other side of the Congress surrender. While on the one hand, by providing a facade for British imperialism, the Congress is postponing the question of a direct mass struggle against imperialism, on the other hand, by the hopes its action creates, it is setting in motion new processes which must ultimately develop to a clash with both British imperialism and itself.

### The Congress Left Wing

The situation, however, is a far different one with the militant rank and file of the Congress, particularly with those who took an active part in the struggle or have come under the Congress banner since August 1942. To them the settlement is coming as a sad disillusionment. Already there are signs of opposition among left elements within or owing allegiance to Congress. The entire leadership of the so-called Congress Left (e.g., the Congress Socialist Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party in Bengal) has capitulated to the Congress leadership. But the better elements of the rank and file of the Congress Left are coming together in opposition to the settlement. This opposition by and large appears to be developing at present on the basis of opposition to the Congress leadership and not yet to

the Congress itself. But continued opposition to the settlement would mean opposition to the so-called National Government which will be formed by Congress, which would in turn force these elements organizationally out of Congress. How many of them will draw the necessary political conclusions, namely, that Congress is the party of the bourgeoisie and that the need is for building the revolutionary party of the Indian proletariat?

The young Bolshevik Leninist Party, formed only in the middle of 1942, is now faced with its first real opportunity of expansion. In the past, in addition to meeting the full blast of the repression and having to conduct its activities underground, it had to meet, in its efforts at recruitment, with the difficulty of widespread loyalty to Congress. Also, the apathy and dropping away from politics, which is the aftermath of every great defeat, was visibly present in India, and effectively prevented any significant growth of the party in the lean years of 1943-44. This situation is now changing, and there is no doubt that of all political groups and parties in India, the BLPI stands to gain most from this change.

But most important of all is the possibility of recruitment to the party from among the ranks of the Congress Left, whither, without doubt, a large portion of the best revolutionary raw material in India has flowed since August 1942. Where can the best of these elements, disillusioned today in the Congress leadership and tomorrow in the Congress itself, turn? The Communist Party of India is hated by them with a hatred born of bitter experience. The BLPI alone offers them a clear program and policy, while on the other hand the name of the Fourth International has today a power of attraction for revolutionary elements which flows from an instinctive recognition that it is now the continuator of the revolutionary traditions of the Third. The speed and extent to which these elements will be drawn into the ranks of the BLPI will depend not least of all on the extent to which the BLPI is able to reach them, and on the correctness of its policy in relation to them. At all events, the Indian section of the Fourth International stands on the threshold of a great opportunity, an opportunity of transforming itself from a small, persecuted group with a revolutionary program into a party with sufficient cadres to turn confidently to the next and real task of facing the masses.

# From the Arsenal of Marxism

## *Nationalism and Economic Life*

By LEON TROTSKY

The article was specially written by Trotsky for *Foreign Affairs*, the authoritative political quarterly of the American capitalists. It appeared in the April 1934, Vol. 12, No. 3 number. The authorized translation was made at the time by John G. Wright who has made minor stylistic corrections in the text for our publication.

\* \* \*

Italian fascism has proclaimed national "sacred egoism" as the sole creative factor. After reducing the history of humanity to national history, German fascism proceeded to reduce nation to race, and race to blood. Moreover, in those countries which politically have not risen—or rather, descended—to fascism,

the problems of economy are more and more being forced into national frameworks. Not all of them have the courage to inscribe "autarchy" openly upon their banners. But everywhere policy is being directed toward as hermetic a segregation as possible of national life away from world economy. Only twenty years ago all the school books taught that the mightiest factor in producing wealth and culture is the world-wide division of labor, lodged in the natural and historic conditions of the development of mankind. Now it turns out that world exchange is the source of all misfortunes and all dangers. Homeward ho! Back to the national hearth! Not only must we correct the mis-

take of Admiral Perry, who blasted the breach in Japan's "autarchy," but a correction must also be made of the much bigger mistake of Christopher Columbus, which resulted in so immoderately extending the arena of human culture.

The enduring value of the nation, discovered by Mussolini and Hitler, is now set off against the false values of the nineteenth century: democracy and socialism. Here, too, we come into an irreconcilable contradiction with the old primers, and worst yet, with the irrefutable facts of history. Only vicious ignorance can draw a sharp contrast between the nation and liberal democracy.

As a matter of fact, all the movements of liberation in modern history, beginning, say, with Holland's struggle for independence, had both a national and democratic character. The awakening of the oppressed and dismembered nations, their struggle to unite their severed parts and to throw off the foreign yoke, would have been impossible without a struggle for political liberty. The French nation was consolidated in the storms and stresses of democratic revolution at the close of the eighteenth century. The Italian and German nations emerged from a series of wars and revolutions in the nineteenth century. The powerful development of the American nation, which had received its baptism of freedom in its uprising in the eighteenth century, was finally guaranteed by the victory of the North over the South in the Civil War. Neither Mussolini nor Hitler is the discoverer of the nation. Patriotism in its modern sense—or more precisely its bourgeois sense—is the product of the nineteenth century. The national consciousness of the French people is perhaps the most conservative and the most stable of any; and to this very day it feeds from the springs of democratic traditions.

## Growth of World Economy

But the economic development of mankind which overthrew mediaeval particularism did not stop within national boundaries. The growth of world exchange took place parallel with the formation of national economies. The tendency of this development—for advanced countries, at any rate—found its expression in the shift of the center of gravity from the domestic to the foreign market. The nineteenth century was marked by the fusion of the nation's fate with the fate of its economic life; but the basic tendency of our century is the growing contradiction between the nation and economic life. In Europe this contradiction has become intolerably acute.

The development of German capitalism was of the most dynamic character. In the middle of the nineteenth century the German people felt themselves stifled in the cages of several dozen feudal fatherlands. Less than four decades after the creation of the German Empire, German industry was suffocating within the framework of the national state. One of the main causes of the [First] World War was the striving of German capital to break through into a wider arena. Hitler fought as a corporal in 1914-1918 not to unite the German nation but in the name of a supra-national, imperialistic program that expressed itself in the famous formula—"Organize Europe!" Unified under the domination of German militarism, Europe was to become the drill-ground for a much bigger enterprise—the organization of the entire planet.

But Germany was no exception. She only expressed in a more intense and aggressive form the tendency of every other national capitalist economy. The clash between these tendencies resulted in the war. The war, it is true, like all the grandiose upheavals of history, stirred up various historical questions and in passing gave the impulse to national revolutions in the more

backward sections of Europe—Czarist Russia and Austria-Hungary. But these were only the belated echoes of an epoch that had already passed away. Essentially the war was imperialist in character. With lethal and barbaric methods it attempted to solve a problem of progressive historic development—the problem of organizing economic life over the entire arena which has been prepared by the world-wide division of labor.

## No Solution

Needless to say, the war did not find the solution to this problem. On the contrary, it atomized Europe even more. It deepened the interdependence of Europe and America at the same time that it deepened the antagonism between them. It gave the impetus to the independent development of colonial countries and simultaneously sharpened the dependence of the metropolitan centers upon colonial markets. As a consequence of the war, all the contradictions of the past were aggravated. One could half-shut one's eyes to this during the first years after the war, when Europe, aided by America, was busy repairing her devastated economy from top to bottom. But to restore productive forces inevitably implied the reinvigorating of all those evils that had led to the war. The present crisis, in which are synthesized all the capitalist crises of the past, signifies above all the crisis of *national* economic life.

The League of Nations attempted to translate from the language of militarism into the language of diplomatic pacts the task which the war left unsolved. After Ludendorff had failed to "organize Europe" by the sword, Briand attempted to create "the United States of Europe" by means of sugary diplomatic eloquence. But the interminable series of political, economic, financial, tariff, and monetary conferences only unfolded the panorama of the bankruptcy of the ruling classes in face of the unpostponable and burning task of our epoch.

Theoretically this task may be formulated as follows: How may the economic unity of Europe be guaranteed, while preserving complete freedom of cultural development to the peoples living there? How may unified Europe be included within a coordinated world economy? The solution to this question can be reached not by deifying the nation, but on the contrary by completely liberating productive forces from the fetters imposed upon them by the national state. But the ruling classes of Europe, demoralized by the bankruptcy of military and diplomatic methods, approach the task today from the opposite end, that is, they attempt by force to subordinate economy to the outdated national state. The legend of the bed of Procrustes is being reproduced on a grand scale. Instead of clearing away a suitably large arena for the operations of modern technology, the rulers chop and slice the living organism of economy to pieces.

In a recent programmatic speech Mussolini hailed the death of "economic liberalism," that is, of the reign of free competition. The idea itself is not new. The epoch of trusts, syndicates, and cartels has long since relegated free competition to the back-yard. But trusts are even less reconcilable with restricted national markets than are the enterprises of liberal capitalism. Monopoly devoured competition in proportion as the world economy subordinated the national market. Economic liberalism and economic nationalism became outdated at the same time. Attempts to save economic life by inoculating it with virus from the corpse of nationalism result in blood poisoning which bears the name of fascism.

Mankind is impelled in its historic ascent by the urge to attain the greatest possible quantity of goods with the least expenditure of labor. This material foundation of cultural growth

provides also the most profound criterion by which we may appraise social regimes and political programs. The law of the productivity of labor is of the same significance in the sphere of human society as the law of gravitation in the sphere of mechanics. The disappearance of outgrown social formations is but the manifestation of this cruel law that determined the victory of slavery over cannibalism, of serfdom over slavery, of hired labor over serfdom. The law of the productivity of labor finds its way not in a straight line but in a contradictory manner, by spurts and jerks, leaps and zigzags, surmounting on its way geographical, anthropological and social barriers. Whence so many "exceptions" in history, which are in reality only specific refractions of the "rule."

In the nineteenth century the struggle for the greatest productivity of labor took mainly the form of free competition, which maintained the dynamic equilibrium of capitalist economy through cyclical fluctuations. But precisely because of its progressive role competition has led to a monstrous concentration of trusts and syndicates, and this in turn has meant a concentration of economic and social contradictions. Free competition is like a chicken that hatched not a duckling but a crocodile. No wonder she cannot manage her offspring!

Economic liberalism has completely outlived its day. With less and less conviction its Mohegans appeal to the automatic interplay of forces. New methods are needed to make skyscraper trusts correspond to human needs. There must be radical changes in the structure of society and economy. But new methods come into clash with old habits and, what is infinitely more important, with old interests. The law of the productivity of labor beats convulsively against barriers which it itself set up. This is what lies at the core of the grandiose crisis of the modern economic system.

## A Tragic Paradox

Conservative politicians and theorists, taken unawares by the destructive tendencies of national and international economy, incline towards the conclusion that the overdevelopment of technology is the principal cause of present evils. It is difficult to imagine a more tragic paradox! A French politician and financier, Joseph Caillaux, sees salvation in artificial limitations on the process of mechanization. Thus the most enlightened representatives of the liberal doctrine suddenly draw inspiration from the sentiments of those ignorant workers of over a hundred years ago who smashed weaving looms. The progressive task of how to adapt the arena of economic and social relations to the new technology is turned upside down, and is made to seem a problem of how to restrain and cut down productive forces so as to fit them to the old national arena and to the old social relations. On both sides of the Atlantic no little mental energy is wasted on efforts to solve the fantastic problem of how to drive the crocodile back into the chicken egg. The ultra-modern economic nationalism is irrevocably doomed by its own reactionary character; it retards and lowers the productive forces of man.

The policies of a closed economy imply the artificial restriction of those branches of industry which are capable of fertilizing successfully the economy and culture of other countries. They also imply an artificial planting of those industries which lack favorable conditions for growth on national soil. The fiction of economic self-sufficiency thus causes tremendous overhead expenditures in two directions. Added to this is inflation. During the nineteenth century, gold as a universal measure of value became the foundation of all monetary systems worthy of the name. Departures from the gold standard tear

world economy apart even more successfully than do tariff walls. Inflation, itself an expression of disordered internal relationships and of disordered economic ties between nations, intensifies the disorder and helps to turn it from a functional into an organic one. Thus the "national" monetary system crowns the sinister work of economic nationalism.

The most intrepid representatives of this school console themselves with the prospect that the nation, while becoming poorer under a closed economy will become more "unified" (Hitler), and that as the importance of the world market declines the causes for external conflicts will also diminish. Such hopes only demonstrate that the doctrine of autarchy is both reactionary and utterly utopian. The fact is that the breeding places of nationalism also are the laboratories of terrific conflicts in the future; like a hungry tiger, imperialism has withdrawn into its own national lair to gather itself for a new leap.

## Bourgeois Rationalizations

Actually, theories about economic nationalism which seem to base themselves on the "eternal" laws of race show only how desperate the world crisis really is—a classic example of making a virtue of bitter need. Shivering on bare benches in some God-forsaken little station, the passengers of a wrecked train may stoically assure each other that creature comforts are corrupting to body and soul. But all of them are dreaming of a locomotive that would get them to a place where they could stretch their tired bodies between two clean sheets. The immediate concern of the business world in all countries is to hold out, to survive somehow, even if in a coma, on the hard bed of the national market. But all these involuntary stoics are longing for the powerful engine of a new world "conjuncture," a new economic phase.

Will it come? Predictions are rendered difficult, if not altogether impossible, by the present structural disturbance of the whole economic system. Old industrial cycles, like the heartbeats of a healthy body, had a stable rhythm. Since the war we no longer observe the orderly sequence of economic phases; the old heart skips beats. In addition, there is the policy of so-called "state capitalism." Driven on by restless interests and by social dangers, governments burst into the economic realm with emergency measures, the effects of which in most cases it cannot itself foresee. But even leaving aside the possibility of a new war that would upset for a long time the elemental work of economic forces as well as conscious attempts at planned control, we nevertheless can confidently foresee the turning point from the crisis and depression to a revival, whether or not the favorable symptoms present in England and to some degree in the United States prove later on to have been first swallows that did not bring the spring. The destructive work of the crisis must reach the point—if it has not already reached it—where impoverished mankind will need a new mass of goods. Chimneys will smoke, wheels will turn. And when the revival is sufficiently advanced, the business world will shake off its stupor, will promptly forget yesterday's lessons, and will contemptuously cast aside self-denying theories along with their authors.

But it would be the greatest delusion to hope that the scope of the impending revival will correspond to the depth of the present crisis. In childhood, in maturity, and in old age the heart beats at a different tempo. During capitalism's ascent successive crises had a fleeting character and the temporary decline in production was more than compensated at the next stage. Not so now. We have entered an epoch when the periods of economic revival are short-lived, while the periods of de-

pression become deeper and deeper. The lean cows devour the fat cows without a trace and still continue to bellow with hunger.

All the capitalist states will be more aggressively impatient, then, as soon as the economic barometer begins to rise. The struggle for foreign markets will become unprecedentedly sharp. Pious notions about the advantages of autarchy will at once be cast aside, and sage plans for national harmony will be thrown in the waste-paper basket. This applies not only to German capitalism, with its explosive dynamics, or to the belated and greedy capitalism of Japan, but also the capitalism of America, which still is powerful despite its new contradictions.

The United States represented the most perfect type of capitalist development. The relative equilibrium of its internal and seemingly inexhaustible market assured the United States a decided technical and economic preponderance over Europe. But its intervention in the [First] World War was really an expression of the fact that its internal equilibrium had already been disrupted. The changes introduced by the war into the American structure have in turn made entry into the world arena a life-and-death question for American capitalism. There is ample evidence that this entry must assume extremely dramatic forms.

The law of the productivity of labor is of decisive significance in the interrelations of America and Europe, and in general in determining the future place of the United States in the world. That highest form which the Yankees gave to the law of the productivity of labor is called conveyor, standardized, or mass production. It would seem that the spot from which the lever of Archimedes was to turn the world over had been found. But the old planet refuses to be turned over. Everyone defends himself against everybody else, protecting himself by a customs wall and a hedge of bayonets. Europe buys no goods, pays no debts, and in addition arms herself. With five

miserable divisions starved Japan seizes a whole country. The most advanced technique in the world suddenly seems impotent before obstacles basing themselves on a much lower technique. The law of the productivity of labor seems to lose its force.

But it only seems so. The basic law of human history must inevitably take revenge on derivative and secondary phenomena. Sooner or later American capitalism must open up ways for itself through the length and breadth of our entire planet. By what methods? By *all* methods. A high coefficient of productivity denotes also a high coefficient of destructive force. Am I preaching war? Not in the least. I am not preaching anything. I am only attempting to analyze the world situation and to draw conclusions from the laws of economic mechanics. There is nothing worse than the sort of mental cowardice which turns its back on facts and tendencies when they contradict ideals or prejudices.

Only in the historic framework of world development can we assign fascism its proper place. It contains nothing creative, nothing independent. Its historic mission is to reduce to an absurdity the theory and practice of the economic impasse.

In its day democratic nationalism led mankind forward. Even now, it is still capable of playing a progressive role in the colonial countries of the East. But decadent fascist nationalism, preparing volcanic explosions and grandiose clashes in the world arena, bears nothing except ruin. All our experiences on this score during the last twenty-five or thirty years will seem only an idyllic overture compared to the music of hell that is impending. And this time it is not a temporary economic decline which is involved but complete economic devastation and the destruction of our entire culture, in the event that toiling and thinking humanity proves incapable of grasping in time the reins of its own productive forces and of organizing those forces correctly on a European and a world scale.

## Correspondence on Unity

### Letter From Workers Party on Question of Unification of the Workers Party and the Socialist Workers Party

James P. Cannon, Secretary  
Socialist Workers Party  
116 University Place  
New York, N. Y.

August 22, 1945

Dear Comrade:

I am enclosing to you a copy of a statement, adopted by the unanimous vote of our National Committee at its recent plenary session, on the question of the unification of the Workers Party and the Socialist Workers Party. As instructed by our Committee, I request that you bring its statement to the attention of the Political Committee and National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party so that they may be able to consider it at the earliest possible moment and arrive at a decision on the question of unity which will promote the growth and consolidation of the revolutionary Marxian movement in this country.

Fraternally yours,

Max Schachtman, Secretary  
Workers Party

1. The National Committee of the Workers Party takes note of the fact that a minority group of the Socialist Workers

Party, led by Comrades Goldman, Morrow and Williams, has presented a resolution to the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party in favor of the unification of that Party with the Workers Party. The principal ground given in the resolution for unification of the two parties is that the main political question in dispute in 1939-40, which led to the split in the Socialist Workers Party and the formation of the Workers Party, namely the difference over the slogan of "unconditional defense of the Soviet Union" is today no longer as acute and topical as it was when the dispute first arose; and that the two Parties today have a similar position on the main task in Europe, namely, defense of the European revolution from the threat of Stalinism and Anglo-American imperialism.

2. The National Committee also takes note of the fact that the Socialist Workers Party itself has officially taken the view that the slogan of "unconditional defense of the Soviet Union" does not, at the present time occupy the prominent position it was given at the beginning of the war, that it has receded into the background.

3. The Workers Party stands for strengthening the forces of the Fourth International in all countries, the United States in-

cluded. Therefore, it also stands for the unity of the Fourth Internationalists in this country in a manner and on a basis calculated to give the greatest assurances of healthy progress.

4. We are obliged to record our disagreement with the motivation for the modification of the Socialist Workers Party's position on the defense of Russia in the war. It is also well known that we still have important differences with the Socialist Workers Party on a number of political and theoretical questions. However, the range of these differences do not go beyond what is permissible within the ranks of a single revolutionary party. Furthermore, our estimate and criticism of the official regime maintained by the representatives of the majority in the Socialist Workers Party has not been changed. The fact that these representatives are now so categorically opposed to unity with the Workers Party, as well as their opposition to any united action with the Workers Party, is confirmation of our estimate.

Nevertheless, the interests of uniting the Fourth Internationalists in the United States on a sound foundation are more important than the regime in the Socialist Workers Party.

5. The Workers Party is therefore prepared to discuss the question of unity with the Socialist Workers Party.

6. However, our National Committee proposes that, in order to test the practical possibilities of living and working together harmoniously in one united Party, as well as to promote the common cause in the working class and the labor movement, the Workers Party and the Socialist Workers Party, through their National Committees, should arrange for joint consultation and cooperation in all fields—trade union, political, defense, etc.—where it is possible, necessary and fruitful.

National Committee, Workers Party  
Max Schachtman, Secretary

## Reply to Workers Party

**(Adopted by Socialist Workers Party Political Committee, August 27, 1945)**

Max Shachtman, National Secretary  
Workers Party  
114 West 14th Street  
New York 11, New York

Dear Comrade:

Your letter of August 22 with the enclosed statement of your National Committee "On the Unification of the Workers Party and the Socialist Workers Party" has been received and discussed by our Political Committee. We especially note your declaration in Point 5 of your statement, that the Workers Party is "prepared to discuss the question of unity with the Socialist Workers Party." We are in favor of such a discussion and will so recommend to the next Plenum of our National Committee.

In view of the sharp conflicts which resulted in the split between us and the formation of your own organization five years ago, and in view of the deep differences which have separated us since, we believe that the National Committee's consideration of the question will be facilitated if you will indicate more precisely and more concretely your view of how the unification is to be brought about and what form it should take.

We have always proceeded from the point of view that programmatic agreement on the most important and decisive questions is the only sound basis for unification; and that, when divergences of opinion occur, unity can be maintained only by the scrupulous observance of the democratic principle of the subordination of the minority to the majority and strict discipline in public activity and action.

If, in the course of the discussion, it appears that we are approaching agreement on the most important political questions, as well as upon the organizational principle referred to above, and that unification is a realistic perspective, then systematic joint consultation and plans for the cooperation of the two organizations for the carrying out of practical work pending the formal unification, would follow as a matter of course. But to attempt to begin with such practical cooperation, prior to a definite approach to unification, would seem to us to put things upside down and lead to a sharpening of conflicts over secondary questions rather than to their moderation. In our view, "the practical possibilities of living and working together harmoniously" flow naturally and inevitably from a basic agreement on the fundamental questions, not vice versa. Friction and conflict arise from political disagreement rather than from per-

sonal incompatibility. In the long run, the latter is always subordinated to the former.

In our opinion, the question of unification must be discussed with complete frankness and seriousness. The aim must be to effect a genuine unification on a firm and long-lasting basis. We, for our part, believe that unity would be a good thing if it is firmly based and leads to the strengthening of the party and the building up of the party. On the other hand, a unification followed by a sharp faction fight and another split would be highly injurious to the party.

The views set forth above are designed to give a concrete basis to the preliminary discussions between us. Naturally, we are perfectly willing to hear and consider any different form of preliminary approach which you may wish to make. If you think that an exploratory verbal discussion would facilitate the preparation and organization of the agenda for a thorough-going consideration of the whole problem of unification in all its aspects, a sub-committee of our P. C. is prepared to meet with you for such a preliminary discussion. Such a meeting can be arranged on short notice by a telephone call to Comrade Stein, Organizational Secretary, at the National Office of the S.W.P.

Yours fraternally,  
J. P. Cannon, National Secretary  
Socialist Workers Party

# FASCISM

- WHAT IT IS
- HOW TO FIGHT IT

*A Compilation*

By LEON TROTSKY

*With An Introduction*

By E. R. Frank

15 Cents

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

# Inside the Fourth International

With the formal end of hostilities between the imperialist powers, and the reestablishment of international communications, it is becoming more obvious than ever before that the Fourth International has come through the tests of war-time terror with flying colors. News reports and letters, coming to us now with greater frequency and from constantly new sources, prove that the sections of the Fourth International not only survived but grew and became hardened in struggle wherever they existed before the war. Under the repressive measures of the "democracies" as well under the very noses of the totalitarian police in the Fascist countries. Even amidst the tortures of Hitler's concentration camps, the Trotskyists persisted in the struggle and went forward to new gains!

Terrible and irreplaceable losses accompanied this fierce fight against the stream. Leading militants of the International, headed by Leon Lesoil, the valiant spokesman of the Belgian Trotskyists and Marcel Hic, the secretary of the French party—both members of the Executive Committee of the Fourth International—fell as martyrs for our ideas in the Nazi hell holes. But their inspiring example of fearless devotion to the revolutionary program of Trotskyism has brought to our ranks new fighters, tempered in the hard and tenacious school of the underground, to carry on the struggle with ever greater enthusiasm.

Almost everywhere in Europe, the practical tasks of the Trotskyists are at present confined to the reconstitution of their organizations and the struggle for a legal existence. For the so-called "liberation" of the Allied imperialists has not brought any basic change in the conditions of existence of the revolutionary Marxists. The Anglo-American and Stalinist rulers of Europe hate and fear the proletarian revolution no less than the Nazi and Fascist imperialists whom they conquered. They are no more inclined to grant the Trotskyists freedom to fight for the revolutionary proletarian ideas of the Fourth International than their predecessors. But, in reorganizing their forces for the great mass struggles ahead, in pursuing their fight for free and full agitation among the workers and peasants, the European Trotskyists have gone over to the offensive in the struggle for legality against their "democratic" persecutors.

We are confident that in this task, too, our European comrades will achieve success. They have been prepared for it by their whole past. The same tenacity and courage which helped them to survive the raging terror of Hitler and Mussolini, will undoubtedly enable them to overcome the persecutions of de Gaulle, of Van Acker, of all the puppets of the Anglo-American imperialists and their Stalinist allies. Their voices will be heard and their program, the program of the Fourth International—which the European masses today only feel gropingly as their own—will tomorrow find a clear and conscious echo among the oppressed of that tortured continent.

Below and in coming issues under this heading, we are recording the progress of the European Trotskyists, country by country.

## France

Repeated requests by the Internationalist Communist Party (Parti Communiste Internationaliste), French section of the Fourth International, for authorization to publish its organ, *La Verite*, under the same legal conditions as the rest of the press, have been refused by the de Gaulle government ever since the "liberation" in August 1944. Instead, the government, spurred on particularly by its Stalinist ministers, Tillon and Billoux, has hung the threat of prosecution for "conspiracy" over our comrades. With the GPU frame-up machine in the van, a furious campaign against the "Hitlero-Trotskyists" was unleashed. In the Spring, the campaign in the press was followed up by arrests of Trotskyist comrades and sympathizers.

Several militants were arrested for "plotting against the state," *La Verite* of July 25 informs us. The worker La Poumeyroulie was interned on the charge of "intent to sabotage" after 500 fellow workers in his plant signed petitions solidary themselves with him against this false charge. The former party member Fred Zeller was arrested after police "seized" a document in his apartment which was obviously planted there—a document which has "disappeared" from the police files, following demands of the defense to examine it. In the departmental General Council of the Seine, the Stalinist councillor Bossus demanded action against the PCI for "attacks against the morale of the nation." *La Verite* of the above date writes: "He read as emanating from the PCI statements published by an adventurist ultra-left group inciting to desertion and rejecting defense of the Soviet Union."

"We shall not slander this group, even if they do commit the crookedness of claiming to belong to the Fourth International. Against bourgeois oppression we are in solidarity with them as with every other tendency in the labor movement. But we will not take responsibility for their sectarian outpourings (some among them even go so far as to accuse members of the C.P. of having done roof-top sniping in August 1944). We shall combat them politically because we believe that we have been right in advocating for the past 15 years unconditional defense of the U.S.S.R. against all imperialism as well as against the reactionary actions of the Stalinist bureaucracy and because we believe that we have been right in remaining faithful to the politics of Lenin in the question of military service as well as in other questions."

The workers Brunet and Lefevre, from the Amiot aircraft factory, were arrested on charges similar to those used against La Poumeyroulie, at the direct instigation of Tillon, the Stalinist Minister for Air in the de Gaulle government. Other comrades were arrested on charges of distributing *La Verite*, "an illegal organ." The arrests appeared to be inspired in part by Bogomolov, Stalin's ambassador to France, who is known to have discussed the Trotskyists with various government authorities.

Our comrades of the PCI replied to this wave

of persecution by a defense campaign among the workers in the factories. *La Verite* was the first underground paper published under Hitler and became well known among the workers under the Nazi occupation. The PCI militants were defended by workers in the shops, large numbers of workers signing petitions for the release of the imprisoned Trotskyists. Last June, the PCI publicly challenged the government by registering the organization with the authorities. It published the names of its Executive Committee in *La Verite* and defied the government to prosecute them.

The bold action of our comrades has taken the government by surprise. They do not dare initiate prosecution because every one of the members of the PCI Executive Committee is a veteran of Petain's and Hitler's concentration camps, with unchallenged records of struggle against Vichy and Nazi occupation. They are:

*Albert Demaziere*, of Marseilles, who reorganized the Trotskyist party in his section of the country after being demobilized from the army in 1940. He organized two national conferences of the party in the "unoccupied" zone thereafter. In June 1942 he was seized by Petain's police and in September of that year he was condemned for "communist activity" to hard labor for life. Imprisoned in Marseilles, Lodeve, Marzac and finally at Puy, he escaped from the latter in October 1943 along with 85 others, aided by an attack from the outside made by partisans belonging to the F.T.P. From then on he has been active in the P.C.I.

## French Leaders

*Max Clemenceau*, metal worker. Persecuted continually by the Vichy police under the occupation, he carried on the underground struggle and in August 1944 he led the workers in the occupation of the Bloch factory in Paris. For this work and the organizing activities flowing from it, Clemenceau received a laudatory citation from the commandant of the famous Fabien Column of the F.T.P. Since the "liberation," he has been singled out as the butt of repeated attacks by the class-collaborationists in his factory.

*Marcel Beaufrere*, postal worker, Trotskyist youth leader. Arrested in August 1939 for his anti-war stand. Escaping from prison in 1940, he worked illegally throughout the occupation as an organizer for the party. In October 1943 he was seized by the Gestapo in Brest, where he was engaged in setting up Trotskyist groups for underground work in the German Army and in obtaining arms for partisan groups. 30 German soldiers were arrested with him and shot immediately. Comrade Cruau, a French comrade seized at the same time, was shot two hours after his arrest. Beaufrere was submitted to ten days of torture, after which he was deported to the Buchenwald concentration camp in Germany, where he remained until the inmates of the camp liberated themselves upon the approach of the Allied troops this Spring.

*Maurice Laval*, well-known as a Socialist Youth leader before joining the French section of the

Fourth International in 1937. As National Secretary of the youth hostels organization in 1941-42, he organized the party's work of recruitment among the youth and was arrested by the Vichy police in March 1944 "for reconstituting a dissolved organization," for "arms traffic aiding the F.T.P." and for "illegal" aid to Jews. In June 1944 he was deported to Germany, being detained in the concentration camps at Neuengamme (Hamburg), Grass Raven (Silesia), Matthausen (Austria) and Oranienburg (Berlin). Upon his liberation last Spring, he immediately took his place in the leadership of the PCI.

Forced out into the open by the party's challenge, the government has also had to drop its charges against the comrades arrested, all of whom have been "temporarily released" for lack of evidence. The campaign against "Hitler-Trotskyism" is boomeranging against its Stalinist initiators. But the struggle of our comrades has only begun.

Authorization for the legal publication of *La Verite* is still being withheld. Public meetings of the PCI are being dispersed by de Gaulle's police. The government has placed itself in the ludicrous position of recognizing the French Trotskyist party as legal without granting it the right to a legal press and without permitting it to exercise the right of free assembly.

The PCI is taking advantage of the partial victory achieved in the formal legalization of the party and the liberation of its imprisoned members and sympathizers by pressing forward its campaign for full legality—for a free *La Verite*, for free assembly, for full rights to participate in the coming elections. The PCI is also calling for a public hearing before a workers' jury on the slanderous charges made by the Stalinists and their allies in the government. The French Trotskyists have taken the offensive in the struggle for full legalization of their party.

## Belgium

In Belgium, *La Voie de Lenine* (Lenin's Path), central organ of the Revolutionary Communist Party (Parti Communiste Revolutionnaire), section of the Fourth International, was suspended by the government in April for an editorial calling for fraternization with the German workers. Our comrades of the PCR replied to this attack by publishing *La Lutte Ouvriere* (The Workers' Struggle), in the name of their Charleroi district, doubling the format and the size of their suppressed paper. The strength and influence of the Belgian Trotskyists among the miners and metal workers of this highly industrialized section of the country is so substantial that the Van Acker government has been constrained to stop in its tracks with the indicated campaign it contemplated against the PCR.

In the crisis around the question of the return of King Leopold, comrades of the PCR—among them Trotskyist miners' leaders like comrade Jules Davister—led a tremendous demonstration at Charleroi. Originally called by the reformists and Stalinists, the demonstration was transformed under the leadership of our comrades from a pure and simple anti-Leopold action into a demonstration against the monarchy and for a republic with the workers' parties in power, a Socialist-Com-

munist government. A leading article in *La Lutte Ouvriere* of July 14, which describes the demonstration and a subsequent battle between the demonstrators and royalists, points out that the attempt to bring Leopold back is merely the facade for a whole campaign to establish a totalitarian dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Reactionary forces, it points out, have been arming all over the country and in one locality after another armed bands have conducted terrorist raids against labor militants and victims of the German concentration camps. Despite the abject servility displayed by the Stalinists in the monarchical crisis, the bourgeois press has launched a violent anti-Communist tirade.

"The masses want to reply," says the leading article, "they want to struggle, they want to prevent a victory of the Bourgeoisie, the establishment of a reactionary dictatorship. . . ."

"The immense majority of the workers wants class objectives for its struggle. The 'democratic coalition' forbids them from fighting for anything but the *abdication*, that is, the replacement of Leopold by Baudoin (his son) under the regency of Charles (his brother)."

"The immense majority of the workers knows that only the action of the masses can bring about a real solution of the crisis by broadening the objectives of the struggle."

That's what Van Acker and Co. fear, the article continues, as much as the return of Leopold III. That's why they refuse to arm the masses. That's why they cling to the monarchists' shirttails. But the workers will overcome the resistance to struggle of their leaders just as they will defeat the plots of the bourgeoisie.

"The action of the masses will arm workers' militias by disarming the reactionary bands. That's the surest way to make the bourgeoisie retreat."

"The action of the masses will prepare the general strike by means of vigilance committees organized in the shops and pits. That's the surest way to prevent the capitulation of the 'leaders' of the Communist Party and the Belgian Labor Party."

"The action of the masses will throw out the capitalist ministers. That's the surest way to force the C.P. and the B.L.P. to assume full power."

"The action of the masses will force a C.P.-B.L.P. government to undertake a bold program of nationalization without indemnity under workers' control. That's the surest way of disarming the banks and the trusts, of rebuilding the country by plan, for the benefit of the masses and not of the capitalist hyenas."

"The action of the masses will realize a complete workers' democracy. That's the only way to prevent conscription, to prevent every new attempt by the bourgeoisie to establish a dictatorship."

On the basis of this program, the article concludes, the PCR calls upon the masses to come out in force to the demonstrations called for July 15.

Stalinist attempts to frame-up and smear our comrades have met with dismal failure. But the success of the PCR impels the Stalinists to

frenzied efforts again and again. At the town of Gilly, for instance, the Stalinists held a mass meeting with an announcement: "We accuse the Trotskyists of having collaborated with the Nazis." Naturally, the Trotskyists came to the meeting in force to defend themselves. The Stalinist chairman announced that there would be no debate. The audience vigorously protested and would not be silenced until assured that Comrade Davister, National Secretary of the PCR, would be given the floor. The Stalinists preferred to disband the meeting rather than meet the challenge of our comrades. Numerous rank and file Stalinists, disgusted with these tactics, openly declared their sympathy with the Trotskyists.

The PCR is on the offensive against the Stalinists, with continual demands for united front action against the reactionary monarchist bands and for the transformation of the "People's Front" (Vigilance Committees) into workers' front committees of action. In Charleroi, for instance, the PCR addressed the Stalinists, explaining that it demands affiliation to the regional Vigilance Committee on the following basis:

"the immediate broadening of the Vigilance Committees by representatives from the shops, the mines, the public services, delegates of housewives' committees, handicraftsmen's and small merchants' committees, youth organizations;

"serious action against the blows of reaction, against the return of Leopold, against formation of a reactionary government;

"build the united front of all parties claiming to represent the working class, which are threatened by the slander campaigns in the press. . . ."

The press of the PCR is replete with articles on specific issues before the workers in all localities and testifies to the proletarian roots which the Trotskyists have already struck in Belgium. The comrades of the heroic Lesoil are doing full justice to his memory. They honored him last May with a magnificent cortege of workers on the anniversary of his tragic death at the hands of the Nazis. But it is their constant and persistent headway among the revolutionary miners and metal workers, whose imperishable love he gained in his own lifetime, that he would undoubtedly have been most proud of.

The Belgian comrades, like the French, have recently had the joy of seeing tested old comrades return alive to them from Hitler's torture camps. Among them are comrade Florent Galloy who came back from Buchenwald and Gaston Maes returned from Dachau. We join with the PCR in greeting warmly these valiant revolutionary warriors.

## Denmark

The following information concerning the Danish section of the Fourth International was transmitted to us from Stockholm:

". . . The group in Copenhagen did excellent work for many years and had three illegal newspapers. They were smashed by the Gestapo in the summer of 1944. Some of the members succeeded in escaping to Sweden. The leader was the first to be caught by the Gestapo. He was badly tortured. No news of what happened to him later on has been received."

**PIONEER PUBLISHERS announces the forthcoming publication of**  
**Two Great Works By**  
**LEON TROTSKY**

# The First Five Years of the Communist International

## Volume I

This volume contains the manifestoes, articles and other documents written by Leon Trotsky in the period of the first three World Congresses of the Communist International, 1919-1921.

—“In translating and printing this book Pioneer Publishers not only carries out a historic duty in making available to the present generation basic materials of this almost forgotten period of the Third International, but even more important it provides model analyses of the great postwar problems of the Second World War now confronting us, problems similar in essence to those which confronted the Bolsheviks at the close of the First World War.”

*From the foreword by Joseph Hansen.*

384 pages

Paper \$1.50, cloth \$2.50

---

# The Revolution Betrayed

A re-printing of this Marxist classic, long out of print, for which Pioneer has acquired all publication rights.

Trotsky's analysis of

- What Is the Soviet Union and Where Is It Going?
- Socialism and the State
- Is the Bureaucracy a Ruling Class?
- Foreign Policy and the Army
- “Socialism in One Country”
- The Inevitability of a New Revolution

320 pages

Paper \$1.00, cloth \$2.00

*Order now from*

**PIONEER PUBLISHERS**

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.