

# INTERNATIONAL NEWS

---

**D  
E  
C  
-  
1  
9  
3  
9**

**THE HITLER-STALIN PACT**

**The Franco-Soviet Pact**

**Notes on the Political Situation in Chile**

**THE ROLE OF  
THE UNITED STATES IN THE WAR**

**FASCISM IN U.S. AND WAR**

**5 cents**

VOLUME I

DECEMBER 1939

NUMBER 1

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Organ of the

Provisional

INTERNATIONAL CONTACT COMMISSION

---

CONTENTS

THE HITLER -- STALIN PACT	1
A REPRINT -- THE FRANCO -- SOVIET PACT	6
NOTES ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN CHILE	9
THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WAR	10
FASCISM IN THE UNITED STATES AND WAR	15

---

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO:

INTERNATIONAL NEWS, 1904 Division Street, Chicago, Illinois, USA

# THE HITLER-STALIN PACT AND THE WAR

EDITORS' NOTE: We publish an important document of leading comrades of the Revolutionary Communists of Germany who were formerly with the Trotskyites, but who broke with them on the principled questions around revolutionary defeatism, entry into the Pivert Group, Peoples Front, etc. These comrades, together with the Red Front of Germany and the Leninist League of Scotland are among the few groups in Europe that adhere to a Marxist position on the Soviet Union and present the Leninist position on revolutionary defeatism.

\*\*\*\* \* \* \* \* \*

The conclusion of the German-Russian non-aggression pact upset the balance of the imperialist constellations, wiped out the "clear front between democracy and fascism", and above all, caused renewed confusion in the international labor movement. It is taken for granted that the pact also gave the last push for the outbreak of the second imperialist world war. The pact signifies a sudden reversal of the Stalinist bureaucracy and its apparatus from support of the western camp of imperialists to the opposing imperialist camp. All the lackeys of western imperialism (reformists, centrists and various sections of the Stalinists themselves) scream; "BETRAYAL!" The ultra-lefts also consider the correctness of their concept of a "capitalist" Russia to be borne out. So far as an estimate of the Soviet Union is concerned, the right wing of the labor movement extends its hand to the ultra-left sections. For us revolutionary communists it is necessary to examine the general problem of whether a workers state ought to make alliances with capitalist states, and further, the nature and results of the German-Russian alliance.

Any workers state isolated by the non-arrival or wrecking of the revolution in other countries is compelled by the international character of the division of labor and world economy to conclude economic agreements with capitalist countries. The workers state can even conclude tactical military agreements, in the struggle for survival, in order to take advantage of the conflicts be-

tween the imperialists for the purpose of preventing an attack against the workers state. Such alliances are means of defending the workers state's interests, so long as the international working class carries on its independent revolutionary action simultaneously; but they become a direct danger to the international revolution, as well as to the workers state itself, if the revolutionary policy of the working class is subordinated to the workers state's policy of alliances.

The economic agreements which the Soviet Union, industrially wrecked by the civil war, concluded with capitalist nations, made it possible to build up Soviet industry. On the contrary, the maintenance of the oil agreement with Italian imperialism was, on the one hand, by no means necessary for the Soviet Union, and on the other hand, very seriously weakened the Abyssinian masses (in Italian imperialism's war against Abyssinia), as well as the revolutionary workers of Spain (Italian imperialism supported the Spanish fascists with Russian oil). Lenin made peace with German imperialism at Brest-Litovsk, but put forth all his efforts so that the German revolutionists, like Liebknecht and his comrades, might quickly prepare the overthrow of this same German imperialism. But the Stalinist policy of alliances is quite different. It concluded an alliance with French imperialism which actually delivered over the working class of France to the French bourgeoisie in the form of the Peoples Front policy. The Seventh World Congress of the C.I. made this treacherous policy the general line for the Comintern and thus subordinated its international political line to this agreement with western imperialism. The result was the giving up of all revolutionary principles, the enthronement of "democracy" and "collective security", and thus, the defense of all the "democratic" imperialists as a "proletarian peace policy". This was an open betrayal of the international proletariat for the good will of the western imperialists. And it is this criminal line which the Stalintern has today "betrayed". It turns back now, not to a proletarian revolutionary policy, but to follow in the wake of another imperialist camp (incidentally, the role of American imperialism in all this must still be made clear).

Whether military agreement with Germany, or non-aggression pact --- neither in any way changes the character of the Soviet Union as a workers state. It maintains this character despite the far-going degeneration of the workers state, so long as the October property relations remain intact, with private property still a secondary factor, and the monopoly of foreign trade is still maintained. It is hardly necessary to state that the pact, of course, does not change the imperialist nature of the bourgeoisie --- anymore than this was the case in the pact with French imperialism.

Since the Stalinist bureaucracy is in power, both the internal and the foreign policy (including the policy of the Comintern) of the Soviet Union, are without proletarian control. This is possible only through the destruction of all proletarian institutions of the proletariat (soviets, party democracy, etc.), owing to the defeat of the international labor movement. Both this defeat and the degeneration of the Soviet Union are merely two sides of the same coin; the fate of the workers state can not be separated from that of the international labor movement despite the reactionary theory of "socialism in one country". It is in the interests of the workers state to support and strengthen the international revolution; but, it is in the interests of the Stalinist bureaucracy to choke every revolutionary movement on an international as well as a national scale. Only thus can the policy of the "comintern" --- the bloody butchering of the Spanish Revolution, etc. --- and the policy of alliances by the bureaucracy be understood.

The degeneration of the workers state is not a necessary condition. Stalinism arrived in the Russian Communist Party as a reflection of the new conditions which arose from the defeat of the proletarian revolutions in western Europe, the reactionary pressure of the peasantry, and the economic backwardness of the country. This social basis of the Stalinist bureaucracy makes an independent revolutionary policy on its part impossible. Such a policy can be achieved only by the removing of the bureaucracy and the restoration of workers democracy (soviets, etc).

#### THE OCCUPATION OF THE WESTERN PART OF POLAND BY THE RED ARMY.

Stalin has "betrayed" again.--this time his own famous reactionary theory of "socialism in one country". After for fifteen years characterizing direct aid to the proletarian revolution in other countries and all overstepping of the "fixed" boundaries of the Soviet Union, as "counter-revolutionary", he broke in form with his own theory in a moment when the imperialists began the second imperialist world war. The labor movement, carried from defeat to defeat by the Stalinist theories of "socialism in one country", the "democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants"(in contradistinction to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat), "social fascism", and the "Peoples Front" --- was incapable of further delaying the outbreak of the war. By these defeats of the international working class the Soviet Union is also weakened to the utmost. Real aid to the revolutionary Spanish proletariat might have led to the victory of the Spanish Revolution, and its spreading to other countries, and thus perhaps might have prevented the outbreak of the imperialist war and aided the Soviet Union; but the occupation in the present counter-

revolutionary situation puts the existence of the Soviet Union in danger. But since the occupation is already a fact we must take a position on this fact.

Marxists are for revolutionary wars --- revolutionary occupations also being included. The occupation of the western part of Poland (western Ukraine, etc) is not wrong in principle, but whether the Soviet Union can maintain its gain in the present situation of internal counter-revolutionary and external imperialist pressure, is a question still to be answered. (A Marxist leadership depends upon mass action against the exploiters. But to march into Poland on the Stalinist basis of a bureaucratic-military absorption from the top is false -- EDITORS.)

Newspaper reports have not yet arrived. We do not yet know what social measures the bureaucracy is planning to take in the seized territory. But we can undoubtedly assume that the contradictions between the bureaucracy and the proletariat are going to sharpen a great deal. The majority of the bureaucracy --- which, as a whole, leads a parasitic existence on the basis of the positions seized by the October Revolution --- is compelled by its social position to carry out nationalization. Another section of the bureaucracy, which contains the capitalist stratum within it, will struggle sharply against such measures.

The proletariat and the peasantry will expropriate factories and build their revolutionary organizations (Soviets, etc.). These organs which are oppressed and liquidated in the Soviet Union today are also arising in the occupied territory in the sharpest conflict with the bureaucracy and they must be suppressed by the latter. Hence the bureaucracy will carry out measures toward nationalization in an administrative way, i.e., imposing itself on the revolutionary initiative of the masses. Even if they lead to the defeat of the revolution, these growing revolutionary struggles are the first beacons of the international revolution, which will make an end of the imperialist war and the entire capitalist system. Then the counter-revolution will assume concrete form. The appearance of the split among the bureaucracy reflects the real outbreak of the now latent contradiction between revolution and counter-revolution, which can result in the open break between the opposition of private property on the one hand, and the expropriations carried out in a revolutionary way, on the other hand. The settlement by force in the occupied territories will undoubtedly drag in its wake the settlement between revolution and counter-revolution in the entire Soviet territory.

In such a settlement, owing to the far-reaching degeneration of the Soviet Union and the reactionary international situation, the counter-revolution has the greater probability of success. But this does not mean that the workers should not employ every revolutionary means for defeating the counter-revolution.

The German bourgeoisie can by no means tolerate revolutionary movements in the territory occupied by the Red Army, since these can provide an impulse for the Poles suppressed by them. In this case the German imperialists would intervene on the side of the counter-revolution. Temporary truces, depending on the strength of the opposition of the revolutionary forces, are not excluded. Should the Stalinist bureaucracy fail to carry out nationalization in the occupied territory, due either to the pressure of German imperialism or from its own reasons, this would furnish an even greater impulse to the counter-revolution.

So far the tendencies which up to now have been developing in strength will lead, but their measure can only be taken in the light of further events.

Without a new revolutionary leadership, a new revolutionary Communist International, a real revolutionary struggle is excluded. The workers in the Soviet Union, in the occupied territory, and in all countries of the world, but especially in the warring countries, must build new Communist Parties.

**FOR A NEW COMMUNIST (4th) INTERNATIONAL!**

Several members of the  
Revolutionary Communists  
of Germany

September 17, 1939

**Editors' Note:** We republish below excerpts from a document of volume 2, Number 7 of the Fourth International (November, 1936) formerly the theoretical article of the Revolutionary Workers League. This document, dealing with the Franco-Soviet Pact and the inter-imperialist antagonisms, we consider to be of theoretical importance today, as when it was written three years ago, in shedding light on the inter-imperialist struggles that have now culminated in the second imperialist world war.

....The Franco-Russian alliance has meaning only against Germany. French imperialism can fight Germany only with England's help. Thus the usefulness and continuation of the Franco-Russian alliance depended all along on the inclusion of England. Its perspective had to be from the very beginning an English-French-Russian alliance, and this has been the goal towards which the Stalinist bureaucracy has worked. But such an alliance would mean the abandonment of the plan of the English bourgeoisie of an English-French-German-Italian alliance, supported in the Far East by Japan, against the Soviet Union on the one hand, against the United States on the other....

....Within the framework of this fundamental trend of British policy, the present British co-operation with the Stalinist bureaucracy has only an auxiliary and temporary character: as a club over Germany. This, of course, does not exclude the possibility of England being forced to fall back ultimately on the policy of attempting an alliance with Russia against Germany. But such a course would be forced on the English bourgeoisie not by the Stalinist bureaucracy, but by American imperialism. And then --- and that is the spectre haunting the British bourgeoisie --- it may be even too late to win even Russia as an ally: for if it comes to an American-German alliance against England and Japan, the American bourgeoisie would do its utmost to include Russia in such an alliance. In fact the value to America of Germany as an ally would be so doubtful without the latter's access to the raw materials (above all the oil) and the man power of Russia, that the possibility of an American-German alliance depends on the inclusion of Russia....

....In 1933 the Stalinist bureaucracy betrayed the German proletariat and thereby laid the basis not only for the equally spectacular rise of German imperialism, but likewise for similar "co-operation" with German imperialism. True, in the West the Stalinist bureaucracy turned first away from German imperialism and towards French imperialism. But it remains nevertheless true that it is the defeat of the German proletariat which led to Russia's "return to the concert of nations" and the participation of the Stalinist bureaucracy in a system of



alliances with imperialist powers. From an alliance with one imperialist, on the conditions on which the Franco-Russian alliance was concluded, to an alliance with another imperialism is but a short... step. All the ballyhoo about "anti-fascism" cannot conceal this essential fact. Once broken in by the French bourgeoisie, the Stalinist bureaucracy can be used by any bourgeoisie, "democratic" or fascist.

The British bourgeoisie is today playing France and Russia against Germany, and Germany against France and Russia. But since its basic tendency today is towards an all-European bloc against Russia and the United States, the Franco-Soviet pact, while at the moment still useful as a club over Germany, is no essential part in its scheme. To the American bourgeoisie, dead set to prevent this all-European bloc, the Franco-Soviet pact has greater, though likewise only temporary value: as long as it continues that bloc (i.e., an all-European bloc--Editors) is impossible....

....If French imperialism, in spite of this left-handed support by the Stalinist bureaucracy, will have to capitulate to Germany, thereby at last opening the way for England's cherished plan of an all-European bloc, the Stalinist bureaucracy will most certainly try to break it up from another angle --- by a new rapprochement with German imperialism. Whether the latter will be able to come to terms with Russia will to a decisive extent depend upon the development of its (i.e., Germany's) relations with American imperialism. But the German bourgeoisie has already laid the basis for this eventuality, not only by its never-interrupted economic co-operation with the Stalinist bureaucracy (the greatest loan extended to Russia since 1933 has been that of the fascist government of Germany), but even in the form of an open feeler: Schacht's offer to the Stalinist bureaucracy to reach an understanding with the Soviets and work with them towards "settlement of world economic and political problems", if the Russians would "give up their virulent propaganda which is troubling the world". The very significant fact that Schacht made this offer two days after the Stalinist bureaucracy had executed 16 potential opposition leaders, reveals the meaning of this mass murder: a demonstration, in the midst of the civil war in Spain, of the fundamental solidarity of the Stalinist bureaucracy with world imperialism against the workers, in Russia, in Spain, and everywhere.

There are indications on all sides that the Stalinist bureaucracy, while frantically trying to utilize the workers' heroic struggle in Spain in order to hold together the Franco-Russian pact on the basis of "anti-fascist" front of "democratic" countries, and to prevent another Locarno conference (of England, France, Germany, Italy, without and against Russia) at the same time prepares the ground for

the possible collapse of their efforts. Not only are they preparing to support any government in France, Peoples Front or not, which would be willing to continue the alliance with Russia; not only do they declare their willingness to support any regime in Poland, if Poland only returns to its alliance with France, but they come out in so many words in one country after another for "national unity" including the fascists. From a united front with fascists in France, Austria, Italy, and Poland to a united front with fascist governments is only a small step, certainly not a greater one than that from the co-operation with Germany against the Versailles front, to co-operate with that same Versailles front and its "thieves' kitchen" against Germany. The communist (i.e., revolutionary Marxist) vanguard must, therefore, prepare itself and the masses for the eventuality of such a new about-face of the Stalinist bureaucracy with all it would imply --- support to the German regime as a whole or to one section of the German bourgeoisie (including, of course, friend Schacht), which the proletariat will then be called upon to support for the "liberation of the German people" whatever the new slogan will be. The attitude of Stalinism today towards Italian fascism may be an indication of what may come in Germany, the Stalinists today demand nothing more than the elimination of Mussolini and "those guilty for the enslavement of the Ethiopian people" (in which they themselves have aided Mussolini!). There is no reason to assume that the Italian and German bourgeoisie would not be willing to drop their present leaders, if that in a certain situation would be the best way of securing the continuation of Italian and German capitalism. For that supreme goal they would even be willing to become "anti-fascist".

"Anti-fascism" and the "peoples front" have been the devices by which the Stalinists have completed their work of confusing and disorienting the international proletariat. Their only too successful identification of Communism with "anti-fascism" in the minds of the masses has done more to discredit Communism than any anti-Bolshevik propaganda of the bourgeoisie and the social-democracy could ever have done. It is not possible to predict now whether the end of the "anti-fascism" and the "peoples front" is near and whether they will only change their functions, from the instruments of the French and British bourgeoisie to the instrument of the German-American bourgeoisie. But whatever the form may be, it is certain that the series of Stalinist services to world imperialism will come to an end only when Stalinism itself goes down, dragging with it into the abyss of another world shambles the masses of the Russian and international proletariat and peasantry.

Only an intensification of the struggle for a new Communist International can prevent the complete subordination of the world proletariat to the interests of imperialism, which the two agencies of the bourgeoisie, that is, the Second and Third Internationals, objectively aided by the Trotskyites, are threatening to bring about, and the annihilation of what still remains of the October Revolution. Only the growth of the movement for a new Communist Fourth International will make it possible that the readiness of the world proletariat and its actual struggles, today cannalized by the bourgeoisie and their social-democratic and Stalinist agents for anti-revolutionary ends, will become steps on the road to the seizure of power, from the bourgeoisie, and in Russia steps to the wresting of the usurped proletarian power from the Stalinist bureaucracy.

\*\*\*\* \*\* \* \* \* \* \*\* \*\*\*\* \*\* \* \* \* \* \*\* \*\*\*\* \*\* \* \* \* \* \*\* \*\*\*\*

## NOTES ON CHILE

EDITORS' NOTE: We publish below some information on the Chilean situation from the Espartaco, vol. I, #1. It is not stated directly what group or tendency the Espartaco represents.

According to these comrades, the openly bourgeois parties are divided in that the oligarchic parties back British and German imperialism, while the radical bourgeois parties back American Imperialism. All electric power (hydro-electric) in Chile is leased to U.S. capitalists for ninety years, and leased not by some holding company or other means, but by the state.

The so-called workers parties -- Socialist and Stalinist -- are bankrupt. There are two groups for the 4th International: the Revolutionary Workers Party (POR -- Partido Obrero Revolucionaria) and the International Workers Group (GIO -- Grupo Internacionalista Obrero).

The POR is "ultra-left", the GIO is "centrist" (we quote here from Espartaco) because the POR refuses to "penetrate (enter??) into the Socialist Party; while the GIO supported bourgeois democratic candidates in the last election.

The recent course of the Chilean Labor Federation saw a sharp factional struggle between the SP and the CP, with the SP emerging with the leadership. The Socialist Left has been liquidated by the SP leadership....

# ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WAR

The imperialist war is only in its first stage; only Britain, France and Germany are as yet involved, and the struggle as yet is for domination of Europe. The broader phase --- the struggle for world domination, primarily domination of Asia, a struggle in which all the major powers will be involved --- is yet to come.

The war could not have been possible without the previous defeats of the proletariat and the preliminary struggles of the imperialists in their maneuvers for positions of advantage. On the basis of the defeat of the Chinese Revolution Japan could begin her invasion of Asia. Similarly, the defeat of the German Revolution became the springboard for the onmarch of German imperialism; and the defeat in Spain the basis for the further expansion of the German, Italian and Japanese empires. These defeats, expansions and preliminary imperialist struggles provide the setting for the present world conflict.

In this first stage of the struggle the United States holds the key position. Its geographical isolation from Europe heightens its favorable position as the only imperialist power in the Americas. With its enormous natural resources, its skilled labor power, its industrial technique, its capital investments and trade throughout the world, the United States stands foremost among the powers of the world.

The last war, which saw the U.S. rise to a position of economic pre-eminence, left the new giant also in a fearful contradiction. Having gained trade and markets, new spheres of investment of capital and export, having enormously expanded the industrial plant, the very needs of the new economy dictated the next step: The driving aim of American imperialism is to achieve a political domination in keeping with her economic domination, as a basis for her ultimate aim to redivide and reorganize the world to the needs of American imperialism.

Such an aim involves a struggle against all the other imperialist nations, but especially against British imperialism which occupies and controls the favorable position to which the United States aspires and must have to satisfy her economic needs. The armed struggle for the control of Europe is related to the coming show-down between the United States and Britain for the domination of the world. The struggle for the control of Europe is not something separate from the struggle for the redivision of the world. They are two aspects of one general problem. Because of this fact American Imperialism cannot play

an "isolationist" role. There is no question that the majority of the American imperialists desire to obtain their dominant position by "peaceful" means of economic penetration, and by continuing the policy of "neutrality" (at least as long as possible). But the objective conditions, as well as the defense of the interests of the world empire of the United States, is forcing the nation into the direct military conflict. The U.S. cannot allow any bloc of nations to win a decisive victory over another, to then find herself confronted with the necessity of "settling" with the victor. The U.S. will see to it that she settles with ALL the other imperialists and especially with Great Britain in such a manner that the outcome (excluding, of course, the explosive effects of the proletarian revolution) enables the United States to come out on top.

In the two months of the war the first major victory, outside of the Polish conquest, belongs to the United States; a victory over both Germany and Britain in grabbing the South and Latin American markets and extending political control over the Americas. The closed door, the policy of the Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere, has to a greater extent than ever before been realized by the American imperialists. If America's trade and capital investment structure is to maintain itself, and a severe depression possibly followed by revolution is to be avoided, the reorganization of its trade and capital export must be on a higher basis than that of the period before the outbreak of the war. Toward this end the South American markets and the trade with Europe is a start. Asia will be next. (cf. pp. - ).

If we can speak of the Asiatic markets as the goal of all the imperialists, this is all the more true of American Imperialism. America's fight for the "open door" in Asia has clearly reflected her struggle to prevent the expansion of the other imperialists, particularly Japan and England, so that the U.S. could extend her own economic and financial penetration and trade. But today Japanese aggrandisement in China confronts the U.S. with a new situation and a growing threat.

In war as in peace American Imperialism will pursue that course which best conforms to her own aims and interests. Because of her position and relative strength she has been able up to now to steer clear of "entangling alliances"; that is, she has played her own game in her own way. In the war, however, she will need allies. This same strength will enable her to dominate any bloc she enters, or at most carry on a policy of "parallel action" with certain imperialists against a common enemy bloc. There can be no question of "mutual aims"

and "common interests. Even in such "parallel action" the economic and financial interests of American imperialism will give her, in the process of the struggle, a dominant position over the bloc as a whole. We can expect that the American rulers will reject out of hand any subordination of the U.S. to another force, as France is subordinated to Britain.

Considering the war in its present "narrow" Euro can form, it is to the interests of the U.S. to remain "neutral", allow both sides to exhaust themselves, and thus be in a position not only to strengthen its world position outside of Europe, but also to drive forward in an attempt to organize Europe to America's needs. But the conclusion of an armistice on the present basis is unlikely unless it can be directed into the channels of an attempt at a united attack on the Soviet Union, which despite Stalinism, still rests on the socialized property relations established by the October Revolution. This is an ever-present possibility which would alter the entire situation. Nevertheless, even under this variant of an imperialist attack upon the U.S.S.R., the antagonisms among the imperialists would continue and play a big part throughout.

Failing such an outcome, it is unlikely that there will be a completion of the military cycle in its present form. More probably, one or more of the big "neutrals" will be drawn into the military conflict, and eventually all of them. Such a new factor will alter the line-up and give one or the other side the advantage. The American imperialists would be forced to adjust themselves to the new relationships. Turkey's commitments tip the scales in the eastern Mediterranean in England's favor, but they represent no decisive shift as yet.

From the standpoint of American Imperialism the following can be posed as possible variants to achieve her aims:

I -- A policy of parallel action with the Anglo-French bloc. This parallel action could be brought about by a number of conditions such as the danger of the consummation of a four-power European-Asiatic bloc consisting of Germany, Italy and Japan with Russia, under Stalinism as the tail. If the U.S. is forced into parallel action she still stands to gain. Such a course would enable the U.S. to gain a stronger foot-hold in Britain's colonial structure and break away such sectors as Canada, try to break the British rubber and tin monopolies, etc. It would put the U.S. in a stronger position against Japan and England in Asia; the U.S. would take over the defense of the Asiatic markets. The U.S. would seek to confine most of her military battles to Asia, if Japan joined the German bloc, thus

assuring herself the greatest share of the spoils at the end of the war. For Japan to join a U.S.-British bloc would mean that Japan would have to share her present position in Asia with a powerful and insatiable America.

Furthermore, with the U.S. in Asia "on the side of" Britain the U.S. would be in a far better position to choke off or channelize the colonial uprisings and revolutionary struggles that will inevitably break out in the British Empire under the stress of the war.

In Europe such parallel action would remove any threat from a German bloc for European hegemony by American aid to the Anglo-French forces.

Perhaps the main problem for the U.S. in this course of action is that Britain cannot be expected to sit back and watch her American rival make such gains. She is likely to try to involve the U.S. more and more into the European struggle; failing this, it is not excluded that Britain may conclude that the United States is out to get more than she is willing to give. Furthermore, while the U.S. could make gains, to share a victory with England would not satisfy the needs of American Imperialism which requires the defeat of Great Britain.

II -- A less likely variant than the above, but more favorable to American Imperialism in the long run, if it can be accomplished, would be a bloc between Germany, Russia and probably Italy under the hegemony of the United States. In such a bloc the Soviet Union under Stalinism would be a tail. Such a bloc would deliver smashing blows against British Imperialism and pose the whole question of the struggle for world domination on a clear, forthright plane. In such a bloc the United States would face the problem of a two-ocean navy and a war on two fronts since Japan would probably line up with Britain. But the U.S. bloc would still have the greater strength. Under this relationship the United States could hope to emerge dominant in Europe and Asia --- if only she could find a way to do the impossible --- avert proletarian revolution.

Such a bloc would require a drastic political shake-up in Germany and in Russia. German Imperialism under Hitler is set on large scale expansion and is unwilling to act under the hegemony of another power --- even in the event of military victory it would yield far too meager spoils. Germany alone could not successfully face Anglo-French Imperialism, but Germany's position at the moment is fairly strong, with Italy and Russia serving as bases of supplies and materials. The development of the war will force these latter two off the fence and in regard to Russia, the last two months have

made it evident that German Imperialism has the inside track in the pact with the Soviet Union under Stalinism.

The prevailing line of march of American Imperialism's forces is at present in the direction of the variant of parallel action, with the Anglo-French bloc. The steps already taken by the U.S. indicate this clearly: the lifting of the arms embargo provision; handing over secret military airplane information to the French; the acquiescent tone of the press to Canada's declaration of war; (it is well known that Canada is virtually economically dependent on the U.S.); the officially inspired campaign against Nazi spies; the statements of Roosevelt that we must be neutral in act but cannot be neutral in thought --- directed against Nazi Germany. the much publicized statement of Roosevelt made in secret committee that France is our first line of defense; the official campaign of incitement over the City of Flint incident, whereas all news of British holding and delaying of American ships is virtually suppressed; etc. etc.

But this by no means can be taken as definitive. A powerful sector of American Imperialism is driving for the second variant of direct struggle against Britain. It should be noted that officially inspired propaganda has a strong undercurrent of anti-British sentiment, although not as strong as the anti-Nazi sentiment. Should Germany and Russia be brought into line, U.S. strategy can shift almost overnight.

Like the other imperialist nations, the U.S. is proceeding with great care. But internally, intense preparations are on the order of the day. Mobilization-day plans are perfected and kept up to date, armaments industries are operating full blast, the two billion dollar war budget will probably be sharply increased. Measures for consolidating ideological and organizational control over the workers mass organizations have been strengthened by the "state of limited emergency" proclamation --- a new blow against the class-conscious forces and the revolutionary elements in the country. Unofficially the U.S. is already in the war, tomorrow the dough-boys will be fighting.

NOTE --- For sake of convenience in discussion, this article limits itself to the role of the U.S. in relation to the other imperialist nations. It is obvious that overshadowing the whole is the problem of colonial uprisings, and proletarian revolutions which the war is generating. The imperialists hope to come through the war without revolutions, or at any rate, without victorious revolutions. The hope is vain. The dynamite of the revolution will raze to the ground the whole structure of murder and plunder.

November 5, 1939



# FASCISM & WAR IN U.S.

To confuse Fascism with a War Regime, to consider them as one and the same, is to put blinders on the revolutionists; blinders which may well blur out the clear path to the Social Revolution.

Under war conditions the exploiters and their state subject the working class to their dictatorship, without the necessary process of smashing its mass organizations. The revolutionists are outlawed, but the mass organizations are brought into the capitalist "civil peace" through the reformists who blossom forth as social patriots. The war dictatorship of the bourgeois democratic imperialists is the handwork of class collaboration.

But in the conditions leading to a fascist dictatorship, only the crushing of the forces of the working class through superior force, or betrayal, make the ascendancy to power of the Fascists possible. Defeat, demoralization and disintegration of the proletarian forces --- these are the conditions in which the Fascist State roots its tentacles deep into the proletarian masses. Only on this foundation can a Fascist State repose.

To speak, as the Trotskyist centrists and all social-democratic groups do, of the immediate danger of fascist dictatorship in America, is to ignore, first, the fact that bourgeois democracy in America, far from being politically in decline, has experienced a period of revival. Never were the agencies of class collaboration stronger. Never was the need for class collaborationist agencies as clearly recognized by the exploiters as today. While force has ever been the weapon of exploitation, the role of class collaboration has increased enormously, with its successes fully commensurate to its growth. Though this growth is purely a temporary phenomena contingent upon the further stabilization of an American capitalist economy caught in the evolution of the war process, for the revolutionist only one conclusion can be drawn: Class collaborationist agencies can only function efficiently where the basis for concessions --- amelioration of the conditions of one section at the expense of another section, economic upturn, old age utopias, etc --- exist, where on the basis of the vast and expanding profits in the colonies the home capitalists can give bribes to the aristocracy of labor. With the shattering of this basis class conflict breaks out anew.

It is not a question of "democracy vs. fascism"; rather it is a question of WORKERS RIGHTS vs. all forms of CAPITALISM (bourgeois democracy and fascism). The key position of American imperia-

lism, as a neutral, with free access to the world markets while the other leading imperialists are in military conflict, enables the bourgeois democrats to strengthen their hold upon the American working class. One must not draw the conclusion from this that the war has stopped the process of development already pointed out before. Remember Russia in 1912. The crisis was maturing. The imperialist war altered the process, but at the same time the war intensified ALL of the contradictions, and when the equilibrium was shattered, it brought forth greater fury of the class struggle. Likewise, France in the summer of 1939 was heading into the storms of gigantic class battles but the war cut these short; however, we will again witness these struggles on a higher plane after the war breakdown. So, too, will the aftermath of the imperialist war have its effect upon the American working class.

For American capitalism the prior question today is not fascist dictatorship of bourgeois democracy. For American capitalism the prime question is the survival of American capitalism through imperialist expansion. The crisis of bourgeois democracy in America has not arrived. The outbreak of the war pushes into the background the inner dangers to the present form of capitalist hegemony in America.

It is the further evolution of the war process --- its effect on capitalist accumulation: further wealth at one pole, greater poverty at the other --- the cumulative effects of war on the broad masses of the army and civilian populations and their political results that Marxists must now consider and give answer to.

Does war render still more favorable the relationship of forces in favor of the capitalist dictatorship (democratic or fascist) as against the forces of the proletarian revolution? Does democracy enhance its value in the eyes of the proletariat and the lower middle class through the visitation of the "fascist repressions" of its war regime? Does the tradition of a war regime broaden the base necessary for a fascist dictatorship? Can the existent Fascist Fungi --- the Bundists, the Coughlinites, the Winrodites, Silver Shirts, Black Legion, etc. --- survive the "democratic" war and war regime? Is the political development of the American Army of 1919 the index by which revolutionists must draw the political development of the American Army of the new imperialist war? Will the economic conditions of the American workers show improvement?

To answer these questions correctly is to answer them negatively.

He who says that the veterans of the European powers came home ripe for fascism in the last world war distorts history. The veterans of the last war came home ripe for socialism. To confuse the actions of the American Legionnaires with the action of the European veterans is to ignore the effects of four years of front line environment. The political expression of war veterans and war rookies are diametrically opposed one to the other. The rookie (who joins the army, not the draft) is a patriot; the veteran is a rebel in thought and action.

Without a clear understanding of these facts the various transitional slogans which in their totality comprise revolutionary defeatism will not be understood nor applied by the revolutionary party of the present revolutionary epoch.

To assume that the existent forces of Fascism in America will survive without revolutionary changes in class composition, etc. is to ignore the effect of war environment upon the army eligibles who now compose their membership. Even the followers of the Catholic Coughlin will find their concepts on morality, religion, economics, the state, patriotism, etc. shaken or completely changed as a result of war erosion. Bourgeois idealism stripped bare of its idealist trappings --- revealing in all its ghastliness of capitalist production, capitalist war (and capitalism idealism).

To draw the conclusion that the American working class, undefeated, hardened in the fires of imperialist war and the repressions of a war regime at home, will provide the broad base necessary for the installation of a fascist regime is to stand the Dialectic on its head in the manner approved by Hegel.

The revulsion of opinion of the proletarian and petty-bourgeois masses against the imperialist war and imperialist repressions will break through within the armies and civilian population. The task of the revolutionists prior to, and in that period is the never-ending, merciless exposure of capitalism and its state, the extension of the slogans of defeatism (the brotherhood of the workers, we have no country, peace-fraternization, liquidation of the armies, arming of the people), the seizure of the factories and the demolition of the bourgeois state. This is our task in America: In the international arena where class brothers claw at the throats of class brothers at the behest of their imperialist masters; into the arena: "Peace Between Class Brothers" "War! War on the Class Enemies!" "Class War to the End!" "Capitalism Must be Destroyed!" "Turn the Bosses War For Profits Into A War Against the Bosses and Their Profit System!"

October 25, 1939

Provisional  
**International Contact Commission**  
for the New Communist (4th) International.

---

Central Committee of the Red Front of  
Greater Germany.

Leninist League, Scotland.

Revolutionary Workers League, U.S.A.

OFFICIAL ORGAN

**International  
News**

---

Address:

**INTERNATIONAL NEWS**

1904 W. Division Street, Chicago, U.S.A.

---

LABOR DONATED

