

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Volume 9 No. 9

10 cents

Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission

O
C
T
·
1
9
4
4

CONTENTS

Leontiev Revises Marx

**«Punish The German-
Workers»**

Analysis Of Events In Paris

International Notes

Issued by the Revolutionary Workers League for the International
Contact Commission.

Affiliates

Revolutionary Workers League of the U. S.

Leninist League of Great Britain

Central Committee of the Red Front of Greater Germany

Mail address of publishers

708 N. CLARK STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Labor Donated

CAPITALISTS WELCOME LEONTIEFF'S REVISIONISM

To the degree that Anti-Marxist and capitalist elements within the country gain ground, and to the degree that Stalinism capitulates to one group of imperialists against the other group of imperialists the theoretical baggage of the Stalinists constantly undergoes revision in a general reactionary direction. New texts of economic theories coming out of the Soviet Union reveal further revision of Marxism and further capitulation of Stalinism to bourgeois economists.

Naturally the capitalists welcome this theoretical capitulation and proceed to muddy the water as much as possible. The capitalists show where the Stalinists present a theory today which repudiates a theory of yesterday, and then proceed to label the theory of yesterday as unscientific Marxism and the theory of today as science. The truth of course is entirely different. Stalinism does present a different position today from yesterday, but the past was not Marxism anymore than the present. The whole process only represents a series of zig-zag false steps in the general direction of a return to the bourgeois camp. The breach and revisionism between Marxism and opportunism grows wider and irreparable.

COVER FOR BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

The Spring issue of "Science and Society", a New York Stalinist quarterly, prints a condensed version of the latest Stalinist economic theories, but it has left out of the text some of the foulest parts of the text. Perhaps they thought that the American public must be given the revisionism in doses instead of all at once.

LEONTIEFF ON IMPERIALISM

Professor L. A. Leontieff and his associates dealing with imperialism, and Lenin's position thereon, proceed to make meaningless all that Lenin said about imperialism and try to justify their position that this is not an imperialist war, but a progressive peoples war because the Soviet Union is on one side of the imperialist conflict. American and British imperialism obtain this service, the covering of their real motives, very cheaply. What these Stalinist hacks say about Fascism and Hitler is correct and every revolutionary Marxist will agree that there can be no compromise and no end until Fascism is utterly defeated. But in the same breath they have sugar-coated words for the imperialists of the United States and England in particular and bourgeois demo-

cracy in general. This last theme is false in every respect.

PERVERSION OF LENIN

The Stalinists say "It is necessary to keep in view that the decay of capitalism... in no way excludes, as Lenin pointed out, the development of capitalism as a whole at a rate faster than in the preceding epoch. It is necessary to have in mind also Lenin's indication that imperialism is dying but not dead capitalism." The capitalists use this revisionism of Lenin's position to present the picture that Stalinism and Lenin said that capitalist development can still forge ahead and be progressive even though it is termed decay capitalism. That is Stalin's service to capitalism, but it has nothing in common with the position of Lenin.

Lenin's position of the economic possibilities was aimed at the ultra-lefts who saw in capitalism its last crisis because of the October Revolution, which was the beginning of the end of the Imperialist War. The ultra-lefts could not conceive that capitalism could reorganize and continue. They thought it was a push-over. Lenin pointed out to the contrary and laid down the premises for the capitalists defeat and for its possible reorganization on the basis of defeated revolutions.

Furthermore, Lenin and the Marxists who followed him, pointed out that capitalism could no longer be a PROGRESSIVE force in society either in its reactionary (Fascist) or bourgeois-democratic form. The Stalinists, on the contrary as well as other reformists (socialists, anarchists, etc.), maintain that capitalism in its Anglo-American imperialist form is progressive while in its Fascist form it is not.

But because Lenin stated that capitalism was no longer progressive and was in decay he did not conclude that its economy would automatically decline, dry up and blow away. The capitalist law of accumulation was not going to result in an AUTOMATIC breakdown of capitalism and a picnic revolution for the masses. On the contrary Lenin and other Marxists pointed out that economic life will have its ups and downs of depressions, prosperity---and wars, unless the proletariat through social revolutions put an end to capitalism.

THE NEW CRISIS PRODUCTION FOR DESTRUCTION

All this and more the Stalinist bureaucrats deliberately falsify. But when they speak of decay capitalist DEVELOPMENT at a faster rate this is the worst twisting of facts one can present.

The Marxian position on this is something different. First Marxism states that capitalist economy as a WHOLE is on the decline.

This was true since the last world war, even though some sections of capitalism could surpass their previous economic level at the expense of other sections and at the expense of the workers and colonial masses. Next the Marxists state that under one condition capitalist economy could surpass its previous level as a WHOLE and they stated, long before this war, long before Hitler took power, that that condition was the following: If the developing social revolutions are not turned into proletariat victories than on the basis of these revolutionary defeats a new imperialist world war will develop, more devastating than the last. On this basis, the basis of production for DESTRUCTION, for war, the economy as a whole will surpass the former level. This reflected how highly developed and powerful and over-ripe the capitalist productive forces were. If the workers and masses would not seize this powerful productive force of the world in at least one or more ADVANCED capitalist nations and use this productivity for construction, then the imperialists would use it for destruction. This is just what happened.

But there is day and night between the developing capitalism of yesteryear, when social progress was proceeding by expanding capitalist production, and today under capitalist decay when world destruction is proceeding under German, Japanese, Italian, French, British and American capitalist economies, either in the fascist or "bourgeois-democratic" FORMS.

The Stalinists do better than the capitalist apologists. They twist this production for destruction around and call it progressive production at a higher rate of speed.

While a traitor to the working class, like Earl Browder, sings praise to imperialism today and talks of its wonderful production of "plenty for all tomorrow", the Grey Advertising Agency of New York City and other capitalist writers urge debunking the talk about "dream production" and talk realistically of what production really will be like once the war of destruction is over and post-war adjustments are needed.

We repeat, the Marxists foresaw this type of gigantic production of destruction even before the 1929 crash, and pointed out that production of social construction (not destruction) is in decline under capitalism and will not surpass its former levels.

STALINISM AND DEMOCRACY

The Stalinists also juggle the concept of democracy. They point out, in condemnation of Fascism and in praise of the United States and England that Lenin wrote, "Socialism is impossible without democracy." Such filthy revisionism against Lenin and Marxism! If democracy is needed to build socialism, how is it that Stalinism has socialism in one country (their claim) with the most brutal

anti-democratic bureaucracy the working class has ever seen? If democracy is needed how is it that Stalinism does not allow any of it in the Soviet Union or in the Stalinist parties all over the world?

Everything is upside down here. In this quotation the Stalinists are quoting to defend their collaboration with Anglo-American imperialism vs German imperialism and not for democracy in the Soviet Union. In this quotation they speak of democracy as an abstraction while all of Lenin's writing clearly made the fundamental distinction between different types of class democracy. Lenin's position states that there can be no such thing as democracy in the abstract; that it is always this or that class democracy. Lenin revealed and history proved that bourgeois democracy is in decay AND LEADS TO FASCISM, (and not to socialism) as the decay reaches an acute stage.

Lenin spoke of worker's democracy as a necessity, otherwise socialism is impossible. Yes, without worker's democracy under a Worker's Council government positive steps toward socialism and socialism are impossible.

DEMOCRACY AND FASCISM

Stalinism in rejecting worker's democracy long ago has married the bourgeois democracy and dying capitalism. History will prove that Fascism merely represents more acute stages of dying capitalism than bourgeois democracy today. Bourgeois democracy represents dying capitalism while Stalinism represents a decaying Worker's State. Worker's democracy is negated by the Stalinist bureaucracy in Russia and Bourgeois Democracy is negated today in Britain and the United States by more and more government agencies, bureaucrats, and government by decree instead of by parliament.

The Stalinist fakers now sing a different tune than the one they sang when Hitler took power in 1933 or when Hitler invaded Poland and formally opened the imperialist war. Now they say, and correctly so, "The working class and all the progressive strata of contemporary society are in no way indifferent to the difference between the social structure of bourgeois democratic countries on the one hand and Fascist countries on the other." This is correct but the conclusions drawn from this generalized statement by the Stalinists are false. Yesterday in the above two examples given, the Stalinists even denied this premise they now present. Then they saw no difference between fascism and bourgeois democracy and expounded that concept theoretically in all their writings. Because they don't even understand their first premise they were wrong yesterday when they saw no difference between these two forces and played fiddler for Hitler and again today they are wrong when they play fiddler for Roosevelt and Churchill.

Yesterday Stalinism considered Fascism, and not only Bourgeois-democracy, but also Social Democracy as twins; today they consider them as two separate things. History proves that Bourgeois democracy and Fascism are merely two phases of the SAME disease of capitalist decay. Two different phases of one disease, the milder phase LEADING into the more acute Fascist stage when productive relations reach a breaking point.

The social doctor will treat the patient differently in the mild or acute stage of the disease, but in no case does the doctor advocate one phase of the disease against the other. Certain measures must be taken to prevent the mild form from reaching the acute form. But this is accomplished by different methods of eliminating the mild form, not of perpetuating the mild form or advocating its adoption. And what different methods does the Marxist social doctor present for these two phases of the disease of decay capitalism? If the patient has the Fascist phase of the disease there is no compromise. It is a fight to the death. It is a head-on civil war, now open, now concealed, now underground, at all times the class struggle through civil war even though our forces are completely underground.

And if the patient has the milder form of the disease of decaying capitalism, what then? We propose the INDEPENDENT ACTION of the working class based upon the political and organizational independence of the revolutionary workers party. The struggle to maintain and advance the workers' and oppressed masses' DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS vs the state machinery of bourgeois democracy. We advocate participation in parliamentary action but only as an auxiliary to mass action primarily at the point of production. Step by step as "progressive" capitalism developed it was the pressure of the masses AGAINST the bourgeois democratic institutions that brought about progress. And step by step as the mild bourgeois-democratic forms decay into fascist forms of dying capitalism, it will be the bourgeois-democratic state institutions that will take away the liberties, not only of the workers and oppressed masses but of larger and larger sections of the exploiters as well. That is the cry of the right wing Democrats and the Republican Party, but they only are interested in their own exploiters interests and not the whole problem or the whole historical process.

ECONOMIC LAWS AND SOCIALISM

Let us return to some of the other types of revisionist concepts. For example, the Soviet economists now repudiate the dogma "that economic laws fail to operate under socialism and present the new position that socialist economy is subject to its own particular laws." That dogma never belonged to Marxism. It was only a product of Stalinism. Many years ago when Stalinism revised Marxism and brought forth this trash as part of their theory of socialism in one country the Marxists repudiated this. But Stalinism is not

repudiating this false position of yesterday to return to Marxism. No, they repudiate this false position to proceed further along the path of the bourgeois apologists' unscientific theories.

Along the same line, Professor I. Lapidus and K. Ostrovityanoff, who yesterday, by Stalin's grace, preached such rot as the concept that the law of value did not operate in the Soviet Union. The new position of the new theoreticians is that "the law of value operates in a way peculiar to socialist economy." Yesterday these former revisionists were wrong but the new position is even worse. Yesterday they tried to claim that the economic and ideological "laws" of capitalism were not carried over in one way or the other. Now they adopt part of the theoretical baggage of decay capitalism.

In the first place Marxists stated that yesterday the Soviet Union did not have socialism, nor does it have it today. These capitalist laws of value do not operate under socialism, if by socialism we mean what Marx and Lenin meant, not what Stalinism talks about. But to understand that the capitalist laws of value and other forms of capitalist carryover operate under the transition period between capitalism and socialism is clearly presented by Marx in his works, the "Gotha Program" of 1875.

What the Stalinists denied yesterday was this Marxian position expounded later by Lenin. Now they not only admit this - they admit it in revisionist form, that bourgeois structures exist under what they claim is socialism, which is not socialism incidently but Transition Economy in decline back toward capitalist economy.

The old question of socialist planning and cost accounting is also revised by these Stalinists. The text states: "Socialist management is based upon the precise correlation of the expenditure of labor and material means, on the one hand, and the result of production on the other hand. Such a comparison is carried out in each socialist enterprise." But this comparison presupposes a common denominator, our Stalinists admit, and they say: "Such a common denominator exists: it is the cost of the commodity." Jumble, mumble, and big words and abstract clauses, but nothing to the point. The clear cut precise statements of Marx and Lenin are lost in the maze of this kind of rot. Those who revise Marxism cannot speak clearly.

The cost of the commodity is the common denominator. But HOW do you determine the cost of the commodity? That is the key. And it is not the cost of the commodity--but the value of the commodity. Not cost, but value. The exploiters' economists claim one thing (no matter what form) as the determining factor in cost and value; while the Marxists present a different position. When some one deals with cost accounting one must trace the problem back through the maze of economic relations until one gets to the core of the question, and that revolves around the determining of costs based on

value by the socially necessary labor time and not merely an addition of "cost" prices of what goes into the total.

The capitalists are glad that the Stalinists do not use the Marxian method of costs and values; while the Stalinists are caught in their own trap and cannot any longer extract themselves. If they would use the Marxian method the true nature of their economy and the direction of its evolution would be revealed. They would present evidence that they never had socialism, have not socialism now and that their transition economy, which under Lenin was moving TOWARD socialism, is now regressing back toward capitalism.

The Stalinist economists state that the building of socialism is not a distributive problem, but a technological problem. This is also false and non-Marxian. It is true it is not a problem of the distribution of commodities. And even though the problem of technological development cannot be separated from the question, the real decisive part of the problem is ignored. The building of socialism primarily rests upon the question of PRODUCTION. The method of production, the kind of production, the system of production---production. The socialist method of production is different from the capitalist method of production; just like the handicraft method of production differs in content from the capitalist.

Technological and distributive problems rest in the framework and grow out of the PRODUCTIVE FORCES. And the productive forces represent the total of the productive method.

To be continued.

7-7-44.

Publication Of The
INTERNATIONAL NEWS
Depends On Your Contribution
Don't Forget To Renew
Your Sub.

ANALYSIS OF THE PARIS REVOLT

The workers of Paris, in numbers greater than at almost anytime in its long revolutionary history, took to the streets and the barricades in August and delivered their crushing might against their slave-masters. And the bloody fight raged not only between them and their "Nazi oppressors" but broadside against every section and national group of the ruling class.

- CIVIL WAR -

That the war between the two international classes - civil war between the world working class and the world ruling class - is supplanting the war between imperialist nations was here proven a fact. Further, the vicious plan of the Allied boss-governments to use American military might as the iron fist of counter-revolution became even more criminally obvious.

- SOURCES OF THIS ARTICLE -

Despite a stifling government censorship and purposeful, misleading emphasis, the news dispatches from Europe covering the time between August 16th and the 26th contain every one of these facts. The following story is assembled from over fifty dispatches appearing piece-meal during that week and a half in the bourgeois press from Seattle to New York.

- THE TROOPS GO - THE SS REMAINS -

The Germans had begun to evacuate Paris from the first day of the invasion of Normandy. By the week of the Paris uprising only a few thousand regular troops were left in or near the outskirts of the city. But a relatively strong detachment of S.S. guards, famous for their ability to break up street demonstrations, were detailed to remain even after the advance of Allied troops around Paris made the position untenable.

They were not left behind to fight the Allied troops, for the U.P. reported August 24th that "the Germans had fortified the city against the population rather than against the invading army"! They faced the Parisian masses whose angry restlessness was intensified by the fact that Normandy, the city's chief source of food, had been cut off from them since the invasion.

- WORKERS VS DE GAULLISTS -

On Wednesday, August 16th, the first shooting of Parisians on the

street by the German S.S. precipitated fighting and a strike of the French police, most of whom from then on took orders from the De Gaullist Patriot group. Fighting was initiated by the masses in the streets, and the armed De Gaullist "resistance" groups (who had not yet set any date for an uprising!) only moved into the fight when it was obviously inevitable.

- THE MASSES MOVE -

Within the next three days scattered strikes grew to one general strike, and on the 19th street-fighting turned the city into a raging hell. Tanks and armored cars charged barricades and about a dozen of them were destroyed on the first day. Sixty machine-guns spitting death "at strategic intersections in a futile attempt to break up the massing of crowds" were captured. "Hundreds of thousands" people armed with only "pick-axes, clubs and revolvers" poured through the streets. One hundred Frenchmen burned in the Place' Grande.

By the 20th the better armed De Gaullist "patriots" had occupied most of the public buildings, the telephone exchanges and printing houses.

- THE IMPERIALISTS COLLABORATE -

Meanwhile the Anglo-American-French armies had by-passed the city, traversing its southern ring but had not attempted to enter it. During the next four days the machine-gun continued to mow down hungry workers, but the Allied Supreme Command revealed that it had absolutely no intentions of entering Paris. "It was not a military objective."

But on the 23rd the news that the great masses of Paris had successfully risen against the German police guard "caused a sensation" in the AEF headquarters. The Germans "are beaten everywhere," said the French Gen. Koenig's announcement. It "----forced an improvisation in the military plans of Lieut. Gen. Omar N. Bradley of the American army group, forcing him to divert forces to Paris." (London dispatch, August 25th.) It was a news scoop (by Charles Collingwood, August 23rd) which accidentally missed being censored by Supreme Headquarters that first let this damning cat out of the bag. (CBS had to print an explanation of how the story got out.)

The Anglo-American strategy was plain - to let the Germans take the onus of putting down the popular uprising. Then, when the Anglo-Americans at last enter as "liberators", they can finish the job - putting faithful servants of the bourgeoisie in government positions backed by Allied armed might.

Not the unarmed workers being machine-gunned in the streets, but the news of their triumph caused the Supreme Command to change its

plans and march tanks and armor into Paris on very "short notice".

- THE CLASS WAR IN PARIS -

What was the situation within Paris that caused this "grave" concern among the Allied war-lords? By August 23rd some Paris police and De Gaullists had gained possession of "all the public buildings". It was the group that granted the German general staff an armistice and carried the first announcement of "Paris liberated". But somehow it was found they needed an outside army to hold their victory.

The real strength was to be found in the worker's districts and factory districts from which the "hundreds of thousands" had spilled to do battle. It was their force that had reduced the German S.S. guard troops to isolated "pockets of ... resistance". They heard little or nothing about an armistice. They continued to fight as long as they had to, and they retained the guns they had captured completely out of the De Gaullists hands.

The "hundreds of thousands" sweeping irresistibly through the streets - not a small resistance group - held most of the city. Once before in history the working class of Paris has risen and gone forward to organize themselves without the aid of the ruling class or its stooges. And now the workers' next step could not be dictated by the boss class without a struggle.

Evidence continued to pile up in subsequent dispatches that the American and French armored units actually rescued the De Gaullist "patriots" from the insurgent Paris masses. That class war raged in the streets is certain.

- "JOURNALISTIC EXPLANATIONS" -

The Supreme Headquarters of the AEF allowed news correspondents entering Paris with American-French troops to describe the fighting there in no other words but "confused". "Some French are fighting Frenchmen", timidly explained one reporter from Paris and let it go with that. In descriptions of this "confused" fighting reporters covered their obvious embarrassment-by calling anyone who fired on Allied troops "Germans" or "collaborationists". But an American correspondent in a radio report from the Paris city hall had "Germans" setting fire to both the Navy ministry, which was occupied by the De Gaullist police and to the luxurious Hotel Crillon which turned out to be the German Staff Headquarters!

A dispatch said the Allied armies entering Paris on the 25th "relieved 5000 patriots (De Gaullists) holding out for five days" in the center of the city. Holding out against whom? Swamped by the populace, the Germans had already surrendered to the De Gaullists on the 20th. Indeed, the "First Allied detachment (of troops) found Paris in full battle. It had to carry out a definite mission:

to occupy the prefecture of police and the Hotel de Ville (city hall)... " (London, A.P. August 25th) But these buildings had been in De Gaullists hands since the second day of the battle! Were not these stooges of the bourgeoisie rescued from the grip of the workers feeling anew their revolutionary power?

For, the German general staff itself was rescued. On the 25th, through an angry multitude (estimated at over 100,000) the Germans were escorted out of the Place de Concorde by De Gaullist "patriot" Tommy gunners with orders to "shoot to kill" if the crowd closed in. (H.R.Knickerbocker in Paris, Chicago Sun, August 28th.)

Held up in this light the one report of an attack by entering American troops on a factory "held by Germans" more than hints at an open attack on workers' stronghold. For, all other reports repeatedly gave the German positions as entrenched rear guard posts at the key south gates to the city.

- FRATERNIZATION -

Surrender to the Allied general staff signed by the German commander on the 25th was that any man firing after "the order to cease fire was transmitted" would be shot as a rioter. The very unusual condition of the surrender points to only one fact: that some of the German draftees had joined the workers in their struggle.

On the 28th, the Allied high command, determined not to expose itself "to the accusation of using Nazi methods," officially delivered over "the job of policing the city" to the De Gaullist Gen. Koenig. At Gen. De Gaulle's request, it was planned for two divisions of British and American troops to parade through the streets of Paris as a "demonstration of military might". For the workers were not cowed. And they would not be.

- THE FIGHT CONTINUES -

On the 28th, three days after its "liberation", "the city is still in an uproar" and "the streets present no semblance of order". And "a rough element....do not intend to give up the weapons" they had fought for. "There are sporadic out-bursts of rifle-fire...". (Howard Cowan in Paris, Chicago Tribune, Aug. 28th).

The workers continue their fight as the mighty armor of their "liberators" clanks through the streets. People on the boulevards are told they are free and are promised food, and they cheer. All must bow and follow now in the name of keeping order and safeguarding private property as the ruling class moves in to make the iron fist of its "liberation" felt once again.

-LESSONS OF PARIS -

The international working class again witnesses and responds to

another tremendous incident in its total world wide struggle. It knows that the masses of Paris have once again risen against the ruling class. It knows that the German and Anglo-American-French general staffs timed their respective exit from and entry into Paris - thus effectively joining hands to ruthlessly fight the current working class uprising in that historic city of the communards. It knows that the workers of Paris are not finished - that they've not yet begun in this era. It hails them and invites them to join in a concerted international workers' revolutionary struggle.

For this, the first act in the struggle of the Paris workers, has not ended in a workers council government or a new Paris commune. They find themselves under the heavy heel of the De Gaullist-American bourgeoisie. They find themselves looking into machine guns held by the same police who served under the Nazi occupation. The curtain will not fall on a workers' complete triumph until the most decisive element in this development - a clear, Marxian party - appears on the stage.

In their continued fighting against the master-class they will forge this party. It will be an experienced, militant part of the new world workers' party - the 4th international. For they have proven in Paris' bloody streets that the cruel, modern field weapons now in the service of the bosses' governments will be no match for the workers of the world as they unite to seize the power and wealth that they alone create. WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

"PUNISH THE GERMAN WORKERS"

Says British ILO Delegate

One of England's labor foot-boys to the British ruling class visited the U. S. A. as Britain's Trade Union Delegate to the International Labor Office Conference, which was held during the month of May last, at Philadelphia. This knighted tool of British Imperialism is none other than Sir Walter Citrine, head of the British Trade Unions.

SIR WALTER LIES ABOUT THE GERMAN WORKER

Sir Walter nearly lost his knightly dignity at Philadelphia, when an American delegate simply suggested that the German workers should be helped to rebuild their trade unions after the war. That was really too comradely for the Honorable Walter, and thereupon he gave vent to his hatred of the German workers by shouting the following: "The rank and file of the German people must be punished along with the Nazi leaders. There must be some sort of punishment of the millions of German workers who, by their tacit approval of the war, have made its conduct possible".

Thus did Citrine reveal the British ruling class attitude and intentions as to a postwar Germany.

Obviously, this slavish wag has conveniently forgotten the death struggle the German workers waged against their Nazi oppressors: so let's note, therefore, a few facts pertinent thereto.

THE TRUTH

Reliable foreign sources have reported that hundreds of thousands of German workers still languish in concentration camps; that more than a million have passed through such camps and German prisons, and that since 1933, thousands more have been put to death in various ways for resisting to the end the Nazi political "axe-men" of German Capitalism. But Citrine, who openly supported the late British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, when he was plotting with Hitler at Munich against the Soviet Union in 1938; and now again, Churchill's reactionary policy which has for its purpose the restoration of out-dated and universally rejected Monarchies, in Spain, Italy, Greece, and Yugo-Slavia; in the hope of frustrating the aims of the working peoples of those countries to achieve real freedom and democracy; this same Sir Walter Citrine brazenly came forward to propose to the workers of this and other countries that their German fellows be further enslaved, (punished), after

eleven long years of brutal enslavement under the lash of the same Nazi-capitalist tyrant who, at Munich, was encouraged by the British ruling class in collusion with the French capitalist politicians to dismember Czecho-Slovakia, and to make war on the Soviet Union. The fact that their plans went astray and they were themselves finally drawn into the war is one of the great ironies of history.

FOOL OR KNAVE?

By way of further showing his contempt for the knowledge and understanding of his fellow delegates to the I.L.O. conference, Citrine also delivered the following "mountainous" absurdity. Mark well his words: "Without the submission of the German workers to Hitler this war would not have been possible." What an exhibition of crass ignorance! Yes, to such stale minds as Citrine's an imminent world shaking convulsion (war), evolving out of world wide forces in conflict with each other, a mere non-controlling factor (the German workers), of all the forces involved, could have prevented the inevitable explosion. Such an idea is simply the product of a mind that feeds on illusions.

When broken down Citrine's absurdity comes to this; the German workers alone could have ended the rivalry between the world imperialisms, and particularly, the rivalry between the British and the Germans; had they not submitted to Hitler, and therefore, there would not have been a second World War. But, assuming the German workers could have resisted to the extent that Hitler could not have gained power, then what, Sir Walter? And, which class in German society would they have struggled against in order to keep Hitler out of power? And further, assuming that the German workers had successfully resisted, what goal would their movement have carried them to? To the preservation of decadent German Capitalism which was then turning to Fascism? And furthermore, if their struggles had led the German workers to overthrow German Capitalism in order to defeat Hitler, what would your British ruling class have done to help, or prevent, such a historical ending to the conflict between the German workers and the Nazified German bankers, Junkers and industrialists, on the one hand, and the bitter rivalry between German and British capitalism for markets, raw materials, and Empire on the other.

Even you, Mr. Citrine, should be able to see that the British Capitalists would have tried to send help to their fellow German exploiters; the Krupps and the Thyssens, Goering and Hitler, Himmler, Goebbels, and all, to save them from the German workers. In the face of such a situation where would you have stood, Sir Walter? As the head of the British Trade Unions, would you have urged the British workers to help their German fellows by refusing to load ships, or to make munitions for British soldiers sent to help put down the German worker's revolt against the Nazi tyrant of German

Capitalism? We already know the answer: Your record as a misleader of British Labor speaks for itself.

AIMS OF SIR WALTER'S MASTERS

What Citrine could have truthfully said at Philadelphia, but dared not, is that the British imperialists desire the total subjugation of Germany to British dominated coalition of European States: the end in view being, the complete elimination of German Capitalism as a future competitor of the British for markets and Empire. Hence his stand for continued enslavement of the German workers disguised as punishment. Obviously a free German working class would be incompatible with such aims of the British exploiters.

WHY HITLER CAME TO POWER

It must be admitted, however, that in the decade from 1923 to 1933 the German workers, misled by Social-Democracy and Stalinism, were doing the wrong political things at the right time. That is to say, in the heretofore best moments of their history they acted like political babes in the woods. Futilely they tried to exact from the emaciated hulk of German capitalism substance which it no longer possessed. They sought to reform a social system which history already had ripened for overthrow. Moreover, the Weimar German political democracy could never serve as the vehicle of socialism as most German workers were misled to believe by the Social-Democrat politicians. On the contrary, it only could serve to stifle the workers' movements, while the reaction got ready to finish it off together with the workers' organizations that precariously existed under it.

By November 1932 German capitalism had reached the cross-roads. Hitler's party lost heavily at the polls and lost many seats in the Reichstag, while the German Communist (Stalinist) party gained strength. Thus a sharp shift to the left appeared to have begun. The ruling class of Germany was quick to sense the need for swift and resolute action; and the anemic Weimar republic having never achieved stability on the decayed foundation of German Capitalism was easily swept out of existence by Hitler when summoned in March of the following year to wield the ax.

Obviously had the German workers understood as clearly as did the ruling class, the real essence and meaning of those historical moments they would have fought to achieve the social revolution; the only way that Hitler could have been defeated, and the one sure way to have evoked the displeasure and active opposition of the Citrine's and the exploiters everywhere.

OUT WITH SIR WALTER

It should be clear to every worker that there can be no question

as to what labor's attitude should be toward the German workers following the war, nor how labor should regard men of the Citrine character who infest its organizations. Neither scorn nor contempt suffices to repel such as they, for their ideas are but those of the decaying ruling classes, whose feet they anoint for a cheap title or a job of deceiving and betraying the workers. They are the enemies within; the corrupters of labor's household; and the debauchers of its class ethics; to rebuke them is not enough; they must be driven out everywhere.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

In the near future the Russian policy in Rumania, Poland and elsewhere where capitalist property relations are permitted to remain, will have far reaching effect. For twenty years Stalinism has been reversing the process of Lenin of narrowing down the differences in individual incomes. For twenty years numerous engineers, Party men, GPU agents, Stakhanovites, factory and collective farm managers, and intellectuals, have been increasingly permitted to widen the gap between their income and that of the average worker. Their savings have been accumulating in the form of savings accounts or state bonds. But up to now they have not been permitted to invest such funds in the productive process itself. The money has been what might be called "primitive accumulation".

But now Stalinism is permitting capitalist production and accumulation under the very shadow of the Red Army. The capitalist elements (please note "elements") within the Soviet Union undoubtedly played a major role in forcing the government, at the behest of the Allies, to permit such things. The same elements are undoubtedly prepared now to demand an outlet for their surplus funds. "You are willing to permit native capitalists", they will say to Stalin, "to exploit Rumania, Poland, etc. Why don't you permit us, who are your strongest supporters, to invest our funds there?".

Will Stalinism say no? It is doubtful. Most likely this will be the form of the first major breach in Soviet property relations, the biggest single step toward re-establishing capitalism within Russia itself. The whole thing is fraught with dangers, not only to the Soviet Union as a Workers State, but to Stalinism as well. The average soldier-worker will ask: "Is this what I have been fighting for, dying for? So that the bureaucracy can invest capital in foreign lands? Is this what they meant by fighting fascism and exploitation?" The base of Stalinism is bound to narrow to the breaking point. And the breach in property relations will poise on the edge of a knife the question of counter-revolution or political revolution inside Russia itself.

Stalinism is not growing stronger. It is growing weaker. Its nationalist policy is undermining it from within. Unfortunately it is undermining the Soviet Union as well. Admittedly the situation is very complicated. But the complication is in objective reality, not in the Marxian analysis. Before the capitalists regain state power in Russia they are fencing for economic concessions - capitalist property relations in at least part of the Soviet sphere of influence. Some people may call this "red imperialism". Actually, however, it is a major step of the counter-revolution. It will be followed very rapidly by force, armed revolt - from either side, the proletariat to re-establish the democracy and property relations of October, or the capitalists to re-establish bourgeois relations. In the ensuing struggle Stalinism will be crushed like a pancake, no matter who wins. The greatest impetus to a proletarian victory will be the proletarian Revolution elsewhere in Europe.