

**The New** \_\_\_\_\_  
**INTERNATIONAL**

**MAY • 1945**

*NOTES OF THE MONTH*

**END OF THE EUROPEAN WAR**

**THE LESSON OF GERMANY**

*By J. R. Johnson*

**World Trade Union Conference**

*By Albert Gates*

**HISTORICAL IMAGE OF NAPOLEON**

*By James T. Farrell*

**BURNHAM'S HEIR TO LENIN**

*By Ernest Lund*

**SINGLE COPY 20c**

**ONE YEAR \$1.50**

# THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

Vol. XI

No. 4, Whole No. 97

Published monthly by the New International Publishing Co., 114 West 14th Street, New York, 11, N. Y. Telephone: CHelsea 2-9681. Subscription rates: \$1.50 per year; bundles, 14c for five copies and up. Canada and foreign: \$1.75 per year; bundles, 16c for five and up. Entered as second-class matter July 10, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editor: MAX SHACHTMAN

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Notes of the Month:

THE END OF THE EUROPEAN WAR ..... 99

### Articles:

THE LESSON OF GERMANY

By J. R. Johnson ..... 102

STALIN AS LENIN'S HEIR

By Ernest Lund ..... 106

THE WORLD TRADE UNION CONFERENCE

By Albert Gates ..... 112

HISTORICAL IMAGE OF NAPOLEON

By James T. Farrell ..... 115

### For Discussion:

NEGROES IN THE REVOLUTION

By F. Forest ..... 119

SOME QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION

By the International Communists of Germany 123

### Correspondence:

ON YALTA ..... 126

REPLY TO LETTER ..... 127

# PLENTY FOR ALL

The Meaning of Socialism

By ERNEST LUND

*A Popular Presentation of the  
Socialist Viewpoint*

Why There Is an Age of Plenty

Why There Is Poverty in This Age of Plenty

Who Controls the Wealth Labor Produces

Why There Are Rich and Poor

What an Equitable Society Is

How It Can Be Achieved

Socialism as the Hope of Humanity

Ernest Lund has provided, in this pamphlet, an indispensable instrument for revolutionary socialist agitation. Avoiding the use of technical terminology, and confining himself to a simple and forceful exposition of the basic ideas of Marxism, he has written a pamphlet that any worker can read and understand.

Sixty Pages

10 Cents per Copy

Seven Cents per Copy in Bundles of Five or More

Published by the

WORKERS PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

114 West 14th Street

New York 11, N. Y.

I enclose \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ copies of PLENTY FOR ALL.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

# THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A Monthly Organ of Revolutionary Marxism

VOLUME XI

MAY, 1945

NUMBER 4

## NOTES OF THE MONTH

### The End of the European War

On May 8, 1945, the war in Europe was declared to have officially ended. It had taken five years, eight months and seven days for the Allied coalition to achieve a decisive victory over the once invincible armies of renescent German imperialism, the strongest single military power in the world. The defeat of Germany was certain after the Allied landings on the Normandy coast of France. The only question that remained was how soon the triumph would come. To say that the war is not yet over, that there is a great conflict going on in the Far East, is only to stress the global ramifications of a war which has engulfed, in one way or another, all the nations of the world.

It is too early to draw up a balance sheet of the victory of the Allies, but enough material is at hand to illustrate the point that humanity cannot live through another war like this one. Modern wars, employing the highest achievements of science, embrace the total society and leave nothing unmarked. Casualties are now estimated at 40,000,000. These include soldiers and civilians. A year ago the Allies estimated their own dead at seven and a half million, which exceeded the total casualties for all countries incurred in the protracted trench warfare of the First World War. The Russians admit to almost six million dead. A year ago, too, various estimates placed the German dead at over two and a half million. American casualties have now passed the one million mark. But that is not all.

Immense tanks with the fire power of artillery, a variety of big guns, fast bombers carrying heavy loads of block-busters and four-block-busters, incendiary and demolition bombs, rockets of every description—all that the modern science of destruction could produce and place at the service of imperialism—were used to destroy a continent. Cities centuries old, as well as the new, were reduced to rubble. The transportation and communications systems of Europe have been thoroughly disrupted. Vast industrial areas were totally destroyed. Perhaps as many ships have been sunk as now sail the seas of the world. Millions of people have been imprisoned and enslaved. Other millions have been taken from the lands of their birth and moved like cattle, in the most literal sense, to other lands to work the farms and factories of their enslavers, the first time in the name of the fascist reorganization of Europe and now in the name of democracy and the Atlantic Charter.

#### Capitalism in Decline

To grasp the degree of the degeneration and decay of capi-

talism, remember that this social order once boasted of its progress. It was justified in its claim of having advanced society and humanity along the path of progress. It built the cities of the world, constructed gigantic factories of production, raised the level of production and the standard of living of hundreds of millions of people, and created a world-wide network of transportation and communication. It created the world market, the world division of labor; it linked the peoples of the world, and established the interdependence of all nations.

All that was progressive in capitalism, however, was in the dim and distant past. It long ago lost its capacity for genuine and lasting progress. Capitalism is now capable only of destruction. Capitalism not only cannot provide for the needs of all the people (it did not do this even in its most progressive periods), but its path of development is toward a worsening of their condition. Capitalism is the guarantor of social retrogression, not progress. It is the guarantor of mass unemployment, mass starvation, mass misery and permanent war.

This war in Europe, as well as in Asia, is not distinguished from the First World War by any difference in origins or purposes, but only in the magnitude of the struggle, in the power of its destruction of wealth, property and lives, in the manner in which it brought about the economic ruin of Europe and engulfed the whole world. The causes for this war were rooted in the imperialist organization of the world, in the domination and division of the globe by a handful of powers. To exist on a capitalist basis, i.e., to continue accumulation and the production of surplus value on an expanding scale, German economy had to win the domination of the European economy and to break the control of the Allied powers over the markets and colonies of the world. Hitler described the needs of German capitalism in five graphic words which summarized the position of that imperialist power: "We export, or we die!" To an equal or lesser degree there were the needs of Germany's main allies, Japan and Italy.

Germany, Japan and Italy attempted to reorganize the world in the classic capitalist way, even though the techniques used were in many respect startlingly new. The resort to arms, i.e., war, was the only path open for these "have not" powers to achieve their aims. The magnitude of the war merely expressed the contraction of the world, the inability of *all* the powers to have a share of the markets and resources of the world. This, then, is one of the outstanding features of the present period of decay capitalism: it no longer permits of expansion of all the powers. At best one power, or a small group of them, can survive at the expense of the rest of the nations. The word "survive" is used in the scientific sense for, from the point of view of economy, that is the problem which confronts almost all the nations, Allied and Axis.

How was it possible for Germany and Italy to prepare for war on such a scale as this one was fought? Germany had been utterly defeated in the First World War. Its economy had been completely disrupted and the country was rent with sharp class struggles. Italy, which had been "cheated" out of her

share of the imperialist booty in the First World War, remained a second-class power, and there are many who doubted that she deserved that designation. Japan, which came out of the last war enriched by booty as a sort of silent partner of the Allies, had been preparing for this war for many years. But, characteristically enough, all three countries, on the basis of particular national developments and a peculiar conjuncture in world relations which can in one respect be summarized as an absence of riches and resources, had to first solve internal class relations to make it possible for them to prepare a total mobilization of the countries for the war. This the ruling classes did by adopting fascism, or quasi-facism, i.e., totalitarianism, in order to prepare for conquest and a redivision of the world. Italy, of course, merely followed in the wake of her real master, Germany.

Hitler's assumption of power in 1933 marked the beginning of the actual preparation for this war. So long as Hitler confined himself to "internal" tasks, to the liquidation of the class struggle, he had the support of the Allied ruling classes who had no difficulty understanding their kinship to Germany's bourgeoisie. So long as they thought it was possible to turn Hitler's attention to the East they aided him in the rearmament of the nation and bolstered his regime as they had Mussolini's. Were they shortsighted? Only to a limited degree. The Allied rulers could not have failed to understand that even if Hitler directed his first blows to the east it was only a matter of time before he would demand his due from the western powers, especially such western powers as Holland, Belgium and France, with their obviously exaggerated share of colonial possessions. For them to keep Hitler occupied in the east was a way to gain for themselves the necessary time to prepare for war with this "upstart." Their calculations were so wrong as to make any comment on them sound trite.

In the midst of diplomatic intrigue worthy of a comic opera, but with tragic consequences for the masses of the world, Stalin signed his pact with Hitler. It was an act which stunned the world, not because Stalin seemed to step out of character, but because the whole preceding period had been spent in negotiations with the Anglo-French military missions for the establishments of a military alliance. This alliance between totalitarian Germany and totalitarian Russia was not a pact solely for the purpose of gaining time for Russian arms. It was, as Stalin described it, "sealed in blood."

The German-Russian pact was the signal which started the war. The German invasion of Poland and the swift collapse of the "colonels' army" was followed by the partition of the country between Hitler and Stalin on the basis of arrangements made by them in their pact. Poland was not alone. Russia attacked Finland and annexed the Baltic States. German arms marched victoriously in the West. Holland, Belgium and France fell in rapid succession. German armies had reached the Atlantic Coast. Only the narrow English Channel stood between them and England. And here they hesitated.

With so much of Europe in his hands, Hitler now turned to the East. Vast Russia with its enormous agricultural areas beckoned. Without warning, his tremendous armies marched against his partner of yesterday. The armies pushed deep into White Russia, Great Russia and the Ukraine. Hitler turned southward and here too the path to the Mediterranean and North Africa was without formidable obstacles. And soon he stood astride the Continent.

Invincible German armies! Nothing like them had been seen before in history. Or, so it seemed.

The invasion of Russia gave the Allies the breathing spell they needed, and another war partner with seemingly unlimited manpower which was poured into battle by the millions. Thus, from the end of August, 1941, until the invasion of France, the Allies were able to prepare their vast forces and their enormous resources for the push that finally spelled the military defeat of Germany. Hitler had dragged Germany into a dreaded war on two fronts; of which the results were inevitable.

### "Outlived Tasks"

The rise of Hitler and his conquest of Europe, the destruction of the national independence of nations which had achieved their freedom in the early decades of the rise of capitalism pushed forward for solution "outlived tasks." The issue of national independence became momentous for all countries. Every nation occupied and sacked by German arms gave birth to national resistance movements. Thus, the struggle for national independence through the resistance movements became the means for the reconstitution of workers' organizations.

Under conditions created by the victories of Hitler, the issue of democracy assumed a new importance. Freedom of speech, assembly, organization, and the right of the people to form their own governments, while appearing as a throwback to conditions long past, were once more essential as a channel through which the revolutionary struggle for socialism could begin again. The issue of democracy in Europe (first under Hitler and now under the Allies) is not merely a question of reform, but is integral to the development of the revolutionary struggle for power. Observe how Lenin estimated the place of democracy and the struggle for it in the general movement of the masses toward socialist emancipation. In March 1916, in the midst of the first imperialist world war, when similar situations existed, he wrote:

Only those who are totally incapable of thinking, or those who are entirely unfamiliar with Marxism, will conclude that, therefore, a republic is of no use, that freedom of divorce is of no use, that democracy is of no use, that self-determination is of no use! Marxists know that democracy does *not* abolish class oppression, but only makes the class struggle clearer, broader, more open and sharper; and that is what we want... the more democratic the system of government is, the clearer it will be to the workers that the root of the evil is not the lack of rights, but capitalism... "Democracy" is nothing but the proclaiming and exercising of "rights" that are very little and very conventionally exercised under capitalism. But unless these rights are proclaimed, unless a struggle for immediate rights is waged, unless the masses are educated in the spirit of such a struggle, socialism is IMPOSSIBLE." (Emphasis in the original—AG.)

Revolutionary socialists, like Lenin, are not the only people who understand the indispensable nature of the struggle for democracy as an avenue for the conquest of socialism. The more intelligent bourgeois leaders (Churchill and Roosevelt), recognized in the national movement and the struggle for democracy a serious danger to the continued existence of capitalism. Their method of combatting it was to subvert the existing mass movements for reactionary purposes. How? by acknowledging the legitimate nature of the struggle, placing themselves at the head of it and directing it in to channels that would bar an effective struggle for socialism. In addition to this general course pursued by sections of the world bourgeoisie, the war itself intervened to produce a curious situation.

In the concrete circumstances of the German conquest of

Europe and the admitted perilous position of Great Britain and the United States, which had not yet entered the conflict, Churchill and Roosevelt made a grand gesture to win the support of the unenthusiastic masses of the world to their cause in the imperialist war. Their historic ocean meeting in August of 1941, produced the Atlantic Charter, which, while it was not a socialist doctrine, was not inimical to socialist aims. The Charter declared among its aims the following:

1. The Allies seek no territorial or other aggrandizement.
2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
3. They respect the right of all people to choose their own form of government; they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
4. They will guarantee equal economic rights to all nations, victor or vanquished.
5. They will secure freedom from fear and want for all the people of the world.
6. They will foster disarmament to guarantee the peace.

The Charter seemed to mark a turning point in the bourgeois thinking and policies, for it promised a new era in world relations. The apologists for imperialism rejoiced. They jeered at the handful of revolutionary socialists who remained true to the banner of international socialism. "See," they cried, "this is truly a war against fascism. This war is different. This is a war against tyranny, for lasting peace, freedom and security."

These cries did not last very long. For shortly after the turn in the military fortunes of the Allies, their real aims became clearer. Churchill announced that he had not become the King's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. Then he announced that the provisions of the Charter did not apply to Germany. The U. S. declared its intention of retaining all islands seized during the war in the Pacific. Stalin annexed territories in Eastern Europe and planned the destruction of an independent Polish state.

### Dividing the Spoils

Within the short period of a few months, the mad scramble of the winning powers for imperialist aggrandizement, became a spectacle before the eyes of the people in Europe and America. Already before the victory was assured, the latent differences between the Big Three as the dominant core of the United Nations became open and sharp. The true political aims of the Allies were revealed as reactionary—different from Hitler's, to be sure, but reactionary just the same.

For Germany they advocated a "hard peace." Translated into simple language it meant to compel the German people, and in the first place, the working class, to pay for the war. Of the real criminals in Germany, the industrial and financial ruling class whom Hitler and his gang of beasts served, there was not a word. The bourgeois rulers of the United Nations, this time joined by Stalin, hold the working class and all toilers responsible for the crimes of their rulers and their enslavers. This is in keeping with the needs of the ruling classes in the Allied countries and happens to serve the immediate interests of Stalin in Russia. The bourgeois rulers are blood brothers of the German ruling class; their greatest fear in Europe is a revolution of the masses. But this is Stalin's great fear too. In that respect, the Big Three are firmly united as the most dangerous counter-revolutionary force in the world.

This unity against the masses of Europe is shaken only by the extreme rivalry which exists between them on the subject of how Europe and the world shall be reorganized. San Francisco is merely the arena in which the Big Three are fight-

ing out their differences on how the world shall be split among them. But one can readily see by the events of recent months that the Atlantic Charter was a fraud and farce from the very beginning. The liberation of the countries of Europe is still to be achieved. The democratic rights of the masses have still to be won. The main historical problem of the unification of Europe remains unsolved.

### Socialist United States of Europe

Hitler came closest to establishing a unified continent. His attempt was based upon reactionary doctrine and practice. But the Big Three are incapable of bringing about any kind of unification of the Continent. On the contrary, their plan for Europe is to keep the Continent divided and its hundreds of millions of people separated by artificial and long-ago out-lived boundaries, by the usurpation of the rule of the small countries, by chopping up Europe into spheres of influence, by the seizure of independent territories and the construction of puppet states, and by preventing any kind of social changes which would benefit the masses.

Europe must be unified, but its unification can take place only as a Socialist United States of Europe. This is the great task of European socialism. But this force, the only progressive force in society today, is weak and disorganized. Its great need is to reconstitute the European economic and political movements of the workers and the development of the broad struggle for socialism. To achieve the goal of freeing Europe from the fetters of capitalist decay, a revolutionary party needs to be built in Europe. This is the immediate great task of the scattered revolutionaries on the Continent.

There is no hope whatever in a new, peaceful, democratic, and secure world under the reactionary forces of "democratic" capitalism and Stalinism. The abolition of the profit system, the defeat of the capitalist ruling classes and the destruction of Stalinism will be an indispensable preliminary task before a free world, the socialist world of real peace, freedom and security can be achieved.

The task of American labor is to assist the European workers in their struggle for freedom. The future of humanity lies only on this road. It must be achieved before the world is once again plunged into a third world war which can end civilization.

Due to illness on the editorial staff of the *NI* and technical difficulties, the February issue of the magazine had to be skipped. All subscribers will therefore have their subscriptions extended one month. We hope that the readers will be indulgent with us and that this note will allay any concern over what happened to the February issue of the *NI*.

THE BUSINESS MANAGER.

## A COST-PLUS WAGE

*An Answer to the Wage-Freeze*

By MAX SHACHTMAN

PRICE: 5 CENTS

IN BUNDLES: 3 CENTS

# The Lesson of Germany

## Bourgeois Society and Totalitarian Barbarism

The ruin of bourgeois society in Germany is so colossal in its scope, so logical in its development, and so embracing in all its ramifications that it forms a characteristic microcosm of bourgeois society as a whole at this stage of its decay. We shall attempt here to point out a few of the outstanding features in so far as they enable us to understand our enemies more clearly.

Nazism was not *in essence* German. It was in essence capitalistic, bourgeois. In as much as it reached its most finished expression in Germany *the appearance* it presented to the world was German. But it was the representative of capitalism, in our day, and not only of German capitalism but of all capitalism. There must not be the slightest hesitation or confusion about this.

After ten years of the Weimar Republic the German bourgeoisie wanted above all things capitalist order in Germany. No advanced nation could continue to live as Germany had lived between 1918 and 1923, in continuous crisis, and as it had begun to live again after the crash of 1929. Naturally the German bourgeois and the Junkers did not *want* Fascism. They preferred to rule themselves without these upstarts. *They couldn't do it.* The old bourgeois ideology was exhausted. It could hold the nation together no longer. The bureaucracy, police and army of the democratic state could no longer be depended upon to maintain order. The Fascists supplied a new ideology and a new coercive force. Behind all the swastikas, the worship of Odin and of Thor, the outstretched hands and the Heil Hitlers, the persecution of the Jews, and all with which the world is familiar, there must be kept in mind the one central principle of Fascism—the destruction of the organized working-class movement. That was German Fascism. The German bourgeoisie had no choice. To understand this, and to give it its full value, is not to make excuses for the capitalists of Germany. It is in reality to become more fully aware of how necessary it is that bourgeois society be wiped off the face of the earth.

From 1918 to 1933 the German nation was going to pieces. Between the irreconcilable interests of the capitalist class and those of the working class, the economy, the social system and the political life of Germany were not only in decay; gangrene had set in. The only cure was the knife and the German bourgeoisie applied it. The fascists sought power, power to rule and to bring order into disintegrating Germany. They got it. They did not have to fight a civil war for it. The bourgeoisie and the Junkers gave it to them. The petty bourgeoisie gave them mass support. The Social-Democracy and the Communists capitulated shamefully. Unlike Franco, who inherited a country ruined by civil war, the Nazis got hold of a Germany that was economically more highly developed than it was in 1918. They had every opportunity to show what they could do.

### What Fascism Has Done to Germany

We have now seen. In twelve short years they have reduced what was the greatest nation in Europe to a pitch of misery, poverty, degradation, physical and moral humiliation such as has no parallel in all the centuries of Europe's troubled history. It is not only that Germany has been defeated in the

war. Kaiser Wilhelm's Germany was defeated. What is so striking is that even the basic elements of the power of the German bourgeoisie have been destroyed. The magnificent economy of Germany has been battered to pieces.

Many of the great cities of Germany, with Berlin at their head, are now mountains of rubble, with the culture of centuries buried beneath the ruins.

The German army, with the German general staff, one of the proudest achievements of bourgeois Germany and for generations one of the greatest forces of reaction in capitalist Europe, has been beaten, disgraced, humiliated, its traditions dragged in the mud, all its power at the mercy of foreign conquerors.

Anglo-American-Russian propaganda is now trying to create the impression that the German general staff and the traditions of the German army have remained intact. There is no limit to the effrontery of imperialist politicians and their hired hacks. The Junkers and their militarists have reached the lowest depths of degradation. Field marshals and generals, scions of Junker families famous not only in Germany but the world over, formed organizations in Moscow, broadcast on the radio and published propaganda calling upon the German army and their fellow officers to revolt. These brother officers and brother Junkers denounced the Muscovite Junkers as traitors before the whole German people. Junkers and officers tried to blow up or otherwise destroy their leader and the German general staff. They failed, the leaders were tried and *hanged*, and these too were denounced before the German people by Hitler and their own Junker brothers. Those who remained surrendered unconditionally and many of them are now in jail. Some are still seeking salvation from Moscow. Others are seeking to play Britain and America against Russia. Defeat, treason, assassination, hanging, contradictory policies all carried out before the German people, blared at them day and night on the radio, and hurled at them in speeches and in the press—and now we are asked to believe that the traditions of the German general staff remain intact. The German people have other things to think about for the moment than the German general staff and the military traditions of the Junkers. But when they begin to think about these things they will have plenty to think about.

The German bureaucracy was one of the best administrative bodies that bourgeois Europe could show, and ranked with the British Civil Service. In republics like France and the United States the spoils of government are fought for in accordance with the crudest immoralities of the capitalist market. In Britain and Germany, however, where the feudal tradition was blended with the bourgeois, the ruling classes maintained a sense of orderly government, particularly because, in the last analysis, the profits and the power remained all the more certainly in the hands of or at the disposal of the ruling classes. The fraud and the corruption of bourgeois government were kept within decent bounds, all of which redounded to the credit of the ruling classes and enabled them all the more surely to mulct the population as a whole. Even before 1933, the fascists and the bourgeoisie had begun the corruption of the German bureaucracy. By 1945 its venality

had become a byword of the German nation and the whole of Europe. Bribery was rampant from top to bottom of the German administration. This too was the work of fascism.

And so, Messrs. Bourgeois, you had your power and your order and above all your destruction of the German working class movement. You had every possible opportunity to show what you could do. Look at the result. You have reduced Germany in the eyes of the world to the lowest level of humanity. The suffering you have imposed upon Europe and the German people, the bestiality and ferocity which your gangsters had to practice and seek to instill into the German youth—all that will fester in the nation until the labor movement opens up for it a new perspective. But your greatest failure is that the very foundations of your own power, those you have destroyed also. All that remains now, in the words of Jodl after he surrendered, is to throw yourself on the generosity of the conquerors. Or, like Bismarck and Von Paulus, to try to sneak back sitting in the baggage-carts of the Russian army. Or, like Admiral Doenitz, to beg to be allowed to govern because otherwise the German people might swing to the right or to the left. The German people cannot swing to the right, Admiral. There is no further to the right to go. The Right did all it wished to do. The result is before us and before the German people too.

### The Deflation of Nazism

But the final, the complete, the never-to-be-forgotten disgrace of ruling class Germany, the most dramatic expression of its inner bankruptcy is that it went down without a word to the German people or to the world. Five years ago the present writer had occasion to write about these people. It was September, 1940. They were at the height of their power. I wrote then:

"... For the first time for over five centuries, a political system with a great fanfare of newness and solution to crisis, makes a political virtue out of tyranny, inequality; class, racial and national prejudice; and decries everything that European civilization has striven for, in theory at least, since the Renaissance. During Europe's worst periods of reaction, the period of the counter-reformation and the Holy Alliance, the most reactionary writers could find something plausible to say in defense of their cause. German imperialism plunders in order to live. Fascism is the decline of the West and its protagonists know it in their souls. Their writings on all subjects, except the seizure of power, are nothing else but lies and nonsense, cold-blooded, deliberate falsification. Not a flower blossoms on their arid heaths. There is no soil in which anything can grow. They are just a thin cover for exhausted bourgeois society. They can have nothing to say. Mommsen and Carlyle said all when the bourgeoisie still could preserve some illusions. If Trotsky's *History* does not guarantee the inevitability of socialism, *Mein Kampf* guarantees the fraud of fascism as a solution to the ill of capitalist society. (NEW INTERNATIONAL, September, 1940. Page 163.)

They were vigorous, able and determined but they were a gang in possession—nothing more. They knew it and the German bourgeoisie knew it too. *When the crash came, not one of them had anything to offer as a perspective for the future.* All through history, in periods of crisis, political leaders of great parties, revolutionary or reactionary, have been nourished and fortified by some vision. They could try to justify their work, if even only to themselves and their followers. They could hurl a word of defiance at their captors even when facing the rifle squad. The defeated Old Bolsheviks, as they stood confessing at Stalin's trials, were everything you like but not contemptible. If we deny all reason, all sense, all hope, all the historical circumstances, and assume for a mo-

ment that they *were* speaking the truth, even then they were trying to atone, to do what they could to bolster up the remnants of the system to establish which they had given their lives. If, as has been abundantly proved, they were lying, then the lie is covered by the fact that at the very least the lies would help the régime to maintain its credit. But Hitler, Goebbels, Goering, Ley, Von Ribbentrop, Himmler. They live or die like rats in holes. They kill themselves or are killed, they run into the mountains with their women and their loot. Himmler, to save his own hide, carries out negotiations with the enemy and as good as offers to murder his dearly beloved Feuhrer. Goering gives interviews to the press and complains about how badly his Feuhrer and his enemies in the party treated him.

The Von Papens and the Von Keitels, who had heiled Hitler with the best, merely shook off fascism as a man shakes off a dirty shirt. It had made a shrewd and at times a diabolically clever appeal to millions of the population but the rulers of Germany never believed in it. Fascism as a political system, its ideals, what it now offered to the German people, some hope to its millions of followers that out of the defeat would one day rise something—not a word, nothing. It said nothing because there was nothing to say. Nothing but shameful, mean, vulgar self-seeking. Isn't it clear now exactly what fascism was? Never have so cruel, so vicious, so degenerate a set of scoundrels ever ruled any modern country. In all of them added together there was not an ounce of dignity or of genuine faith, not even in themselves. Hitler, who had so many elements of the genuine fanatic, proved in the end to be essentially of the same breed as the rest. There is here a profound lesson in social and political psychology.

It was to these empty men that Von Keitel and Von Kesselring and Von Rundstedt, and Von Jodl, it was to these gangsters that so many of the German aristocracy remained faithful. A substantial section of the German bourgeoisie and the German Junkers went along with fascism to the end. For them that was German civilization, German culture, German society and, of course, German bourgeois society. This was what they had built and supported in order to save Europe from bolshevism, to prevent the working class from ruling.

They were not alone. From one end of Europe to the other, the ruling classes of Europe were in thorough sympathy with Nazism and only fought it when they felt that their own hides were in danger. Pétain, Laval and the French bourgeoisie, Franco and the Spanish bourgeoisie, Mussolini and the Italian bourgeoisie, the ruling classes of Hungary, Romania and Austria, from one end of the continent to another, in Britain and in the United States, this monstrous apparition in European society excited amid the great of the earth almost universal admiration, respect, fear and a desire to emulate wherever possible. Had it not been for the economic contradictions which compelled expansion and a threat to other economic interests, Hitler and his band of Dillingers would have been hailed as the restorers of order and the saviors of European society. The danger is that in the jubilation over the defeat and disgrace of these criminals the welcome bourgeois society gave them may be subordinated or lost sight of. The close harmony between fascism and the ruling classes everywhere was not any kind of mistake on either side. In these men bourgeois society recognized its indispensable medium of self-preservation. Their murderous cruelty, their greed, their ruthlessness, their vaunted fanaticism which turned out to be such a hollow mockery, everything about them was needed by bourgeois so-

ciety, created by bourgeois society, built up by bourgeois society. Capitalism needed this barbarism in the past, needs it today *and will need it in the future*. It is its only means of salvation. The form will change. The essential savagery of the content will remain.

### **Hitler as a Social Phenomenon**

We are accustomed to saying loosely that the European bourgeoisie not only welcomed Hitler but helped him to achieve power. That is a half truth. *They were the chief architects of his success. They made him from the ground up.* His rise appears to be the most spectacular in modern history. Yet a truly historical and realistic view will see that, far from being an Odyssey of individual will and achievement, no important career has been so essentially a social phenomenon. Comparisons with Napoleon are the fruit either of ignorance, stupidity or criminal intention. The young Bonaparte was sent to Italy as any number of young generals were sent to fight the campaigns of the hard-pressed Republic. The "lightning in the hills" of the Italian campaign revealed to Europe that a military genius of the first magnitude had arisen. This military star displayed diplomatic genius as well. He was a European figure when he began his bid for power. Hitler's career was the exact opposite. In 1923 he was nobody. Yet one year later he was attempting to capture Bavaria, being aided by the German hero of World War I, Ludendorff. The plotters believed that they had the support of the Bavarian military and governmental authorities and it is reasonable to believe that they had good cause for thinking that they did. His treatment in jail proved that. His hundreds of thousands of storm troopers represented an enormous expense. They were thugs hired by the German bourgeoisie to fight its battles against the working class. In the years 1930-33 the German bureaucracy engineered election after election. Through the system of proportional representation no government could find a sufficient majority to rule and by this means the bureaucracy and its masters hoped to discredit parliamentary government and open the way for authoritarian rule. Despite his immense influence over the petty bourgeoisie, Hitler, by 1932, was on the wane. The German bourgeoisie deliberately maintained Nazism to have some power in reserve against Bolshevism. True, he dominated them afterward. We do not mean for one moment to deny the energy, the inventiveness, the will, the tenacity of Hitler and the other Nazi leaders. We do not deny their skilful use of social contradictions. He himself was obviously a born leader of men and an orator the like of whom Europe has not often seen. But from the time he began, the German bourgeoisie, the military caste, the bureaucracy, all built him up and without their active conscious support he would have been nothing.

Napoleon built himself up by sheer achievement and compelled recognition by the French bourgeoisie. The German bourgeoisie recognized this Vienna ex-house painter, ex-artist, ex-bum, ex-soldier from early, picked him out of the gutter and made him what he was. When he finally was pushed into the power in Germany the international bourgeoisie took its turn. The process of Hitler-building was repeated on the international scene.

### **Hitler, Representative Man of Bourgeois Society**

At no time after the Eighteenth Brumaire could the French bourgeoisie have gotten rid of Bonaparte. And the European bourgeoisie was alike impotent before him. Coalitions innumerable of Europe were tried to drive him from power. He

broke them one after the other by his own military, diplomatic and administrative skill. He owed nothing to any of Europe's ruling classes. He spread the tenets and practices of bourgeois society throughout Europe by his skilful use of the revolutionary power developed in France. He was "Robespierre on horseback," the bourgeois Emperor, carrying war to European feudalism. Hitler was bone of Europe's bone and flesh of Europe's flesh. Hitler was bourgeois reaction, doing the work of the bourgeoisie. At any time between 1933 and 1936 and even later he could have been overthrown from the outside. In 1936, when he marched into the Rhineland, his power stood on the edge of a hair. If any army had marched against his troops, they would have had to retreat. Against the advice of his generals, Hitler took the chance. He was supremely confident that the British and French bourgeoisie would save him from disaster and his confidence was not misplaced. They helped him out because they wanted his rule in Europe to continue. They helped him to rearm. They gave him diplomatic support. The degradation and humiliation of Germany, the brutalization of German life, all this for them was not only to be endured but to be condoned. It kept the workers in their place. Lloyd George and Lord Lothian, pillars of British liberalism, were political defenders of Hitler. Sir Neville Henderson, British minister to Germany, compared his dictatorship to Cromwell's. As late as 1938 Winston Churchill, supposed arch-enemy of Hitlerism, paid the Fuehrer a distinguished compliment. If Britain lost a war, said Churchill, he hoped that the British would find a Hitler to restore the nation as Hitler had restored Germany.

The examples can be multiplied. These are not accidental or chance utterances. They fit into the whole pattern of the bourgeois attitude toward Hitler. For them, Hitler was the savior of Central Europe. He was not a German phenomenon. He was the representative man of bourgeois society. He was the enemy of their enemy—the working class—and for a time he seemed to be a bulwark against revolutionary Russia. They turned against him only when they could not come to terms with him and *when they were assured that Russia was no longer revolutionary*. What is called appeasement was no tactic, it was no mistake. It was the bourgeoisie doing all it could so that Hitler should remain in power. Hence Roosevelt's telegram to him congratulating him on Munich. Imagine then the boundless hypocrisy of Churchill when he told the world a few weeks ago that it would be a pity if the Germans had been driven out of Europe only to be replaced by totalitarian and police rule. Totalitarian and police rule were the joint creation of the German bourgeoisie and the European bourgeoisie as a whole. Already all this is being forgotten. Churchill and the Tories are actually going before the British people to claim their suffrage as the successful leaders of the struggle against tyranny. It is not only that they should be indicted for the present ruin. *They are at the same game today.*

### **Stalin Takes Hitler's Place**

Régimes of all kinds have to seek alliances where they can get them. That is nothing new in history. It is characteristic of our age, however, and the social rôle of the working class that governments find it necessary either to suppress the working class altogether or to justify their acts with some show of plausibility. Thus when Czarism was drawn into the alliance with France and Britain in the early twentieth century, there began a change in the attitude of the press toward Czarism. From being Nicholas the Hangman, the Czar became the Little Father of all his peoples and remained such until the revo-



lution in 1917. No longer able to lean on the most reactionary régime in Europe, the British and French bourgeoisie assisted the German bourgeoisie in establishing Hitler. As we have seen, this was no mere military entente. It was for more a social alliance, shot through of course with the economic contradictions which finally tore the alliance to pieces. Compelled to destroy him, they turned to Stalinist Russia and Stalin. They have turned to Stalinism, first for military reasons, but also because they have been given assurances open and secret that Stalinism is purged of all revolutionary aims. Let us look at the historical and concrete content of this. Nazism has collapsed not only without a bang but even without a whimper. Its leaders have simply ducked for cover. The generals have made a few arrogant but futile gestures. The German monarchists have not uttered a word. Of the great bourgeois state that was Germany, there is not one claimant for power. Of course some voices will be raised in time. But the collapse has been complete.

But Germany formed a central bloc in Europe, continuously contending for power in Eastern Europe, first against France and then against Russia. Italy, which added to the confusion in the Balkans, can do so no longer. The bankruptcy of France, the collapse of Germany, the disintegration of Italy, leave Eastern Europe as a congeries of states with bankrupt régimes. Russia is an imperialist power. We shall come to that in time. But the Russian domination of Eastern Europe, though a cause of bitter rivalry, is part of the whole Anglo-American-Russian plan for defending property and privilege and restoring their reactionary concept of order. Churchill's lamentations about police government and totalitarian rule in Europe is the most colossal lying and hypocrisy imaginable. The British and United States governments terribly needed Hitler's totalitarian and police rule in Europe so long as he kept his expansionism within bounds. Naturally they would have preferred to be able to do that whole job themselves. But they could not carve up Europe as they carved up Africa sixty years ago. In the historical circumstances, Hitler, a reasonable Hitler, was a God-send for them. But in much the same way Stalin's totalitarian police rule is a God-send for them, if Stalin is reasonable. The historical origins are different. Nazi Germany was the counter-revolution disguised as a new order and aiming at the destruction of the organized proletariat. Stalinism is the counter-revolution which for familiar reasons functions from within the proletariat. But while in fundamental conflict with Stalinist Russia, as it was in fundamental conflict with Nazi Germany, Anglo-American imperialism can only maintain its position in Europe against the masses of the people and the march of history by fraternization and the closest cooperation, first with the Nazi régime and now with Stalinism. Despite the differences between Nazism and Stalinism, both these totalitarian, police-dominated régimes are now necessities for the maintenance of the shifting and unstable equilibrium which are the conditions for the continued existence of bourgeois society. Note that the quarrel is only over Poland. For the time being Stalinism could be allowed to dominate Eastern Europe as Hitler was allowed to swallow Austria and Czechoslovakia. Tomorrow would be another story, but sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

### **Stalinism and Civilization**

And what is this régime which has been substituted for Nazism? Nazism was an enemy to be fought as an enemy of civilization? *Before the war* the Stalinist political régime committed internal crimes to which the bestialities of Hitlerism

against the German people were pale in comparison. Where and when has any modern régime carried out murders, massacres, repression and all kinds of violence against its own population as the Stalinist régime has carried out against the masses of the Russian people? Nothing that Hitler did to the Germans in time of peace can compare to the murder and transportation of millions up millions of peasants, done under the guise of "liquidating the Kulak." If Hitler liquidated Roehm and his companions in arms in 1934, Stalin has liquidated not only some eighty per cent of the old Bolshevik Party, but in 1936-38 carried out an official massacre of hundreds of thousands plus his own highest appointees and officials, an official holocaust for which you will search history in vain to find a faint parallel.

Millions of workers are condemned to forced labor and concentration camps. The totalitarian character of the régime had for years exceeded Hitler's most extreme excesses. All this the bourgeois world knew and commented upon in scathing terms. The bourgeoisie of Britain, France and America could not find words enough to condemn this barbarism and considered Hitler's "New Order" a highly satisfactory means of ridding the world of the "Bolshevik menace" to civilization. It condoned Hitler's "expansion" into Austria and into Czechoslovakia. It assisted his adventure in Spain. Only when his seizure of Poland threatened to upset the whole balance of European power did the Nazi crimes overnight assume the aspect of a menace to civilization. While Hitler was in alliance with Stalin, the bourgeois statesmen, with President Roosevelt at their head and the liberals trailing behind, took the propagandist offensive on behalf of civilization in condemnation of these twin barbarisms. With the change in alliances, however, the tune changed. Roosevelt's voice rang with praise for "our Russian ally" and Churchill called Russia one of the democracies. Hitler continued his depredations over Europe accompanied by the execration of all progressive and right-thinking people. This, we were told, was imperialism naked and unadorned, and was condemned as such. Hitler murdered his enemies in the conquered countries, established puppet régimes, seized their capital and transported it to Germany or wherever it was convenient, and rounded up the population to work in his factories. The bourgeoisie and the liberals excelled themselves in virtuous indignation.

Now, however, Hitler has been defeated. And as his armies retreated Stalin's conquering armies followed in their wake. They have shot down their political opponents, just as Hitler did. They have established puppet régimes, just as Hitler did. They have seized capital and transported it to Russia—just as Hitler did. They have rounded up thousands upon thousands of workers and sent them to Russia to labor—just as Hitler did. If they have not done it on the same scale it is because the war is now over and the immediate need is not as great. All this is done under the slogans of anti-fascism, defense of democracy, world peace and defense of Russia. The Baltic states were taken in order to defend Moscow better. East Poland was taken to defend the Baltic states. West Poland was taken to defend East Poland. Eastern Germany is invaded by the Lublin government no doubt, among other reasons, in order to defend Western Poland. The totalitarian régimes are, as far as possible, installed. The world press is told to get out and to keep out.

When Hitler began the same process the protests of the bourgeoisie were mild and the protests of the liberals were loud. Today we see progress. The protests of the bourgeoisie were for a long time non-existent at Stalin's imitation of

Hitler. They hated it but they couldn't prevent it. And as for the liberals, many were enthusiastic. But there is a limit. For the bourgeoisie Poland was the limit to Hitler's peaceful expansion with bourgeois benevolence. It was also the limit to Stalin's peaceful expansion and bourgeois benevolence. The struggle is on between the rivals for the domination of Europe. Poland is a key-point. Benevolent neutrality ceases. Russia is no longer a democracy. Churchill therefore begins to talk about totalitarian and police rule. The words should turn to dust and ashes in his mouth. Police rule in India, social entente with Hitler until rivalry puts an end to it; and now the same with Stalin. Field Marshal Alexander had to tell Tito, the democratic titan, that he would blow him out of Trieste if he did not go peaceably. First we heard the praises of Mikhailovitch, then we were deafened by the combined excoiation of Mikhailovitch and the praises of Tito. It may not be very long before we are treated to as long, as detailed and as ferocious an attack upon the crimes of Stalinism and its menace to civilization as formerly filled the air about Hitler. Nazism is beaten to the ground, but Stalinism rules in its stead. There are great differences but it is the similarity of these modern tyrannies which have followed one another with such swiftness that is revealed the essence of our society.

### Socialism or Barbarism

That is the world in which we live. These are the men who rule us. This is how they rule and fool the people. A spate of articles, books, pamphlets, lectures, radio comments, films will now descend upon us in increasing magnitude and velocity all directed toward underscoring, illuminating, probing, analyzing the origin, essence and manifestations of the

Hitlerite régime in Germany. The bourgeoisie of the democracies will seek to capitalize on its own heroic efforts and sacrifices to rid the world of this monster.

The working class will do well to ponder over these questions, to lay the responsibility where it lies, to see Hitlerism for what it was, a defense of bourgeois society in which all the bourgeoisie participated to the best of its ability. The way it has fawned upon Stalinism and covered up its crimes, the way it is now getting ready to turn upon Stalin if necessary, proves, if further proof were necessary, how self-motivated, how hypocritical are its cries about barbarism and the defense of civilization.

Everywhere it is the same. It sponsors the blood-stained régimes of Franco, of Chiang Kai-shek, of Peron in Argentina and Vargas in Brazil. Terror, murder, blood, persecution, wholesale robbery and innumerable lies—these are the weapons with which bourgeois society maintains itself. So deep-rooted is the decay, so all-pervading, that the democracies are compelled to build up these iniquitous régimes on one day and then set out to destroy them on the other. The workers of the United States in particular must see and learn. The time is coming when the American bourgeoisie will be driven into the same hole that the German bourgeoisie found itself. To escape the power of the workers there is no criminality which it will not embark upon to save its hide. The barbarism which descended upon Germany in 1933 will have its American counterpart because it was not German but capitalistic, capitalism fighting its war of survival. In saving itself from capitalism the American working class will save not only itself but the whole nation.

J. R. JOHNSON.

# Stalin As Lenin's Heir

## A New Stage in Burnham's Decline

### I—The Inner Contradictions of Burnham's Article

James Burnham's article on "Lenin's Heir" (*Partisan Review*, Winter, 1945) seeks to establish two major conclusions:

- 1) that Stalin is, after all, a "great man," and
- 2) that Stalin is "Lenin's heir," in the sense that Stalinism is the legitimate, consistent, and logical continuation of Bolshevism.

What is the relationship of these two questions?

An examination of these two questions reveals that they are *not* inter-dependent. The answer to the one does not follow from the answer to the other. The materials examined and the criteria established to answer the one question is not necessarily the same as used to answer the other.

Burnham holds that Stalin is a "great man" and that Stalinism is Bolshevism. He counterposes this to Trotsky's position that Stalin is a mediocrity and that Stalinism *betrayed* Bolshevism. From this, Burnham seeks to imply that you have to agree with one or the other. However, precisely because these two questions have *no* necessary interdependence, it is possible to hold views that agree with neither. It can be stated that Stalin is a mediocrity and that Stalinism is Bolshevism. This view is held by most of the Mensheviks, Kerensky, and others. It can also be stated that Stalin is a

"great man" and that Stalinism is a betrayal of Bolshevism. This view, given the proper definition of "great man"—*i.e.*, in the sense that Ghengis Khan and Napoleon were great men—is held by the author of this article.

Why and how, then, did Burnham come to interrelate these two questions and seek to solve them as an interdependent whole? It is here that the curious logic of Burnham's argument first reveals itself. The connection is made in the following manner:

So long as we believe that Stalin is a dwarf, it is hard to think that he can be the heir of Lenin, who was certainly a giant. The events of these war years help us to correct the one and the other error. As Stalin expands in size before us, we can more readily grant his legitimate succession. The truth—so weighty with consequences for our age—becomes more plausible: that, under Stalin, the communist revolution has been, not betrayed, but fulfilled.

Having satisfied himself by various miscellaneous data (including Stalin's sumptuous banquets and vodka toasts) that Stalin really is a great man, Burnham concludes that he is truly Lenin's heir and that Stalinism is nothing but the logical continuation of Bolshevism. For Burnham then, the relationship of Stalinism to Bolshevism must be sought in a correct appraisal of whether Stalin is a giant, like Lenin, or a dwarf. The statement of Burnham's method in this bald form reveals it to be so patently illogical as to suggest perhaps

a bad mis-reading or misunderstanding of the article. But the most careful and critical re-reading will yield no other result.

How can the discovery that Stalin is a "great man" shed light on the true nature of the present Russian régime and its historical relationship to Bolshevism? How can a true estimate even be made of Stalin's stature as an individual without first establishing the historical criteria with which to measure? And is not an understanding of the relationship of Stalinism to Bolshevism an essential ingredient of such criteria? A true estimate of Stalin's stature *does not automatically flow* from a correct understanding of the historical transition from Lenin's régime to that of Stalin. However, the latter does supply a necessary basis from which to judge Stalin's stature as a personality.

We conclude from this that the question of Stalin's stature is *subordinate* to the question of the historical rôle of the régime. Burnham, however, solves the subordinate question to his own satisfaction (Stalin is a great man) and then proceeds from this conclusion to solve the basic question (Stalinism is really Bolshevism).

But he is not satisfied with this illogical construction. It leaves the basic conclusion open to an interpretation which Burnham is unwilling to accept. The interpretation could be established in this way: What if Stalin had turned out to be a mediocrity? What if he had been killed in the Civil War? What if he had died as a child? If the greatness of Stalin proves that the present régime is a continuation of Bolshevism, would Russian events have inevitably followed the same course in the absence of a "great man"? Perhaps, if Bolshevism in other countries can have the good fortune to avoid producing great men it will not follow the same path as in Russia?

Such an interpretation is a logical extension of Burnham's method of reasoning in this article. But Burnham cannot accept such an interpretation. He cannot accept it because he has, long before writing the article in question, established for himself the conclusion that Stalinism is Bolshevism by following an entirely *different* set of reasons, none of which had anything to do with whether Stalin was a "great man" or a mediocrity. This brings us to the real enigma that Burnham's article presents. The "entirely different set of reasons" has reference to Burnham's theory of the managerial revolution which created such a sensation four years ago. The mystery of the present article is that it contains not a single reference to the managerial theory—neither direct nor by implication—despite the fact that the subject matter forms an important link in the theory of the managerial revolution. However, the quiet retirement of the theory from any rôle in the argument over the relationship of Stalinism to Bolshevism cannot go unnoticed. It leaves gaping holes in the author's logic. This is accentuated by the attempt to substitute for the missing theory an illogical construction based upon the newly-discovered greatness of Stalin. However, the latter construction establishes the conclusion in such a way as to permit the interpretation suggested above. Burnham must plug up this hole, also. After spending the greater part of the article proving that Stalin is Lenin's heir because Stalin, too, is a great man, Burnham now kicks aside this painfully constructed argumentation with these words:

Stalin's triumph was not "inevitable"—the revolutionary régime might never have taken power, might have been defeated in the Civil War or by the Allied intervention, might have marched into Germany in 1932-33; and another individual than Stalin might not have killed quite so many, lied quite so much, or caused quite such measureless suffering. But there is not any longer the slight-

est reason to believe that the development of communism in power could be expected to take any course differing except in lesser details from that it has in fact taken in Russia.

The greatness of Stalin establishes him as Lenin's heir and confirms the identity of Stalinism and Bolshevism. But had Stalin not been great or had he never existed, Stalinism and Bolshevism would still be identical! Then why all this elaborate argumentation about the greatness of Stalin? It is apparent that, in the end, these two questions are separate questions for Burnham also. Nowhere does he establish any logical connection.

## II—How Burnham Really Establishes the Identity of Stalinism and Bolshevism

What is the *content* of Bolshevism and Stalinism that makes them identical? Burnham essays to supply the answer in the following definition:

Bolshevism (communism), described in terms of its operations in real life from its start, is a conspiratorial movement for the conquest of a monopoly of power in the era of capitalist disintegration.

That is the beginning and end of Burnham's attempt to define the inner identity of Stalinism and Bolshevism in an article written to prove Stalin to be Lenin's heir! One single sentence! And upon this sentence rests, in actuality, the entire case which Burnham makes for his thesis of the identity of two. (We have already shown that the "greatness" of Stalin is not the real proof which Burnham offers since he ends by saying that it is a dispensable factor.)

Of what value is Burnham's definition of Bolshevism? It would likewise fit fascism, though Burnham is silent about this in the article. (Again the conclusions of the managerial theory speak out while the theory itself is not even hinted at.)

That Bolshevism was a "conspiratorial movement" in the sense of the European underground during German occupation does not tell us much about Bolshevism. All anti-monarchist parties were "conspiratorial movements" in Russia. With the exception of the United States and the British Commonwealths, opposition parties in most nations of the world to a greater or lesser degree are "conspiratorial movements." Used in this sense, the "conspiratorial" nature of a movement is not determined by that movement, but by the denial of legality to its activities by the powers that be. This is all fundamental and obvious as long as we accept the meaning of "conspiratorial movement" in this sense.

Does Burnham mean that a "monopoly of political power" was the avowed aim of the Bolsheviks since 1903? There is no evidence that the Bolsheviks had any "one-party dictatorship" ideas prior to the middle of 1918. Lenin for a long time contended that the Russian Revolution would establish a "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" in which the Bolsheviks were ready to share power with peasant parties. As late as 1916 Lenin denounced the view that the proletarian party could assume sole responsibility for the revolutionary government as a "Trotskyist" notion.\* Shortly after the seizure of power by the Soviets, the Left Social Revolutionary Party joined the government and remained part of it until the spring of 1918. Their exit from the government was not prompted by any Bolshevik theories of a monopoly of

\*Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, therefore, aimed at a greater "monopoly of political power" than did Lenin. This, according to Burnham's definition, would make Trotsky a greater Bolshevik than Lenin. Burnham, however, says that "If anyone betrayed Bolshevism, it was not Stalin but Trotsky."

political power. It simply turned out that the Bolsheviks were a peace party and the Left S.R. a war party on the question of the government's negotiations at Brest-Litovsk. (Documents relevant to this question may be found in *Intervention, Civil War and Communism in Russia*, by James Bunyan, based on the Hoover War Library materials.)

However, it may be argued that Burnham is not concerned with the conscious aims or intentions of the Bolsheviks, but rather that the very theories of Bolshevism, regardless of aims, carried within them the inevitable consequence of Stalinism as the next stage in their development.

In this case, we proceed from the viewpoint that Lenin's intentions (classless society and peace) betrayed their exponent in the process of application. But Burnham states: "It is of course true that Stalin, in practice, has acted counter to almost all of the expressed formal principles of communism." If Lenin's aims were dependent for their realization upon the application of his principles and these were not carried out by Stalin, was not Lenin betrayed? If the Russian Revolution was made to realize Lenin's aims and Stalin substituted *other* aims for them, was not the Revolution betrayed?

It may be argued that the principles of Lenin were impractical and unworkable in real life and that Stalin was forced to discard them and find his own workable solution. But could Stalin be called Lenin's heir on this basis? The lawyer who could not distinguish between an heir and a receiver-in-bankruptcy would be thrown out of court. Further, if Stalin was forced to act "counter to almost all of the expressed formal principles of communism" to find his own workable solutions what did these solutions have in common with Leninism (viewed as bankrupt in this argument)? If the ideas of Lenin ended in futility and Stalin worked out new solutions, how can Burnham say that Bolshevism has been a continuous and logical consistency from 1903 to date and that Bolshevism and Stalinism are identical?

It may be argued that Stalin did not substitute his own solutions but merely carried those of Lenin to their logical conclusion. In other words, the principles did not suffer shipwreck in real life but that Lenin used them to found institutions and practices which logically and inevitably flowered into the tyrannical rule of the bureaucracy. Burnham implies as much when he states that there is *nothing* basic in Stalinism, from the institution of terror as the primary foundation of the state to the assertion of a political monopoly, the seeds and even the shoots of which were not planted and flourishing under Lenin. Stalin, says Burnham, has acted "counter to almost all of the expressed formal principles of communism." And Lenin, who planted the "seed and even the shoots," who built the party organization and presided over the state institutions in their formative period, did he too act counter to the principles of communism? If he did not, why was it necessary for Stalin to do so when *he* took over the institutions and practices developed by Lenin? If the "seeds and even the shoots" were planted by Lenin in *violation* of the principles of communism, we must conclude that the principles are related to the practice only as a clever façade to fool the masses.

We have exhausted all arguments based upon accepting Burnham's definition of Bolshevism in the sense that the germs of Stalinism were concealed in the original principles and emerged contrary to the aims of Leninism. These arguments all lead to the conclusion that either the Revolution was betrayed or that the Revolution became bankrupt and Stalin took over to steer in a *different* direction. But in *neither*

case could he conclude that Stalin is Lenin's heir or that Stalinism is identical with, or a logical and consistent continuation of, Bolshevism. In the above sense, Burnham's definition is meaningless.

However, if Burnham uses "conspiratorial movement" and "monopoly of political power" in another sense, the definition takes on real meaning. Perhaps Burnham means that Bolshevism is in itself a great conspiracy by which the "inside group" have avowed aims for the "monopoly of political power" by themselves? Perhaps Lenin spoke of a classless society and peace and plenty in order to gain support to promote the real aims of the inner group, or, as Burnham would say, the Bolshevik "élite"? Perhaps the real "inner aim" of Lenin had nothing at all to do with the establishment of socialism? Perhaps the Bolsheviks did not at all represent the interests of the workers but merely used the workers' struggle to establish themselves in power to achieve their own aims?

Some readers will, no doubt, consider it insulting to the intelligence of a "scientific" thinker like Burnham to even suggest this possibility on so little evidence as is afforded in his article. It is not, however, necessary for us to try to wring this "conspiracy" theory out of the logic of Burnham's article, because the definition of Bolshevism is not based upon any evidence submitted in the article. It sums up, however, Burnham's conclusions on the question as given in his *Managerial Revolution*. His position on the Russian Revolution can be summed up in the following quotations from *The Managerial Revolution*:

The Marxist movement separated along the lines of the great division of our time, capitalist society and managerial society. Both wings of Marxism retained, as often happens, the language of Marx, though more and more modifying it under new pressures. In practice, the reformist wing lined up with the capitalists and capitalist society, and demonstrated this in all social crises. The Leninist wing became one of the organized movements toward and expressed one of the ideologies of, managerial society (p. 195).

One pattern of development is illustrated in surprisingly schematic fashion by the events in Russia since 1917. What has happened in Russia is the following: The first part of the triple problem was solved quickly and drastically. The capitalists were not merely reduced to impotence but, most of them, physically eliminated either by killing or emigrating.

The second part of the managerial problem—the curbing of the masses—was left suspended until this solution, or partial solution, of the first part was achieved. Or, rather, the masses were used to accomplish the solution of the first part just as the capitalists in their early days used the masses to break the power of the feudal lords. In a new stage, the beginning of which merged with the first, the solution of the second part of the problem was carried through. The masses were curbed. Their obscurely felt aspirations toward equalitarianism and a classless society were diverted into the new structure of class rule, and organized in terms of the ideologies and the institutions of the new social order. (Pp. 209-10.)

Lenin and Trotsky, both, in the early years of the revolution, wrote pamphlets and speeches arguing the case of the specialists, the technicians, the managers. Lenin, in his forceful way, used to declare that the manager had to be a *dictator* in the factory. 'Workers democracy' in the state, Lenin said in effect, was to be founded upon a managerial dictatorship in the factory. (P. 214.)

The class of managers that steadily rose was not altogether a new creation; it was the development and extension of the class which, as we have seen, already exists, and is already extending its power and influence, under capitalism, especially during the latter days of capitalism. (P. 215.)

Leninist doctrine expresses in terms of the managerial ideology the lessons of the Russian and similar experiences from the point of view of the interests of the managers. (P. 217.)

Thus Burnham's explanation of the Russian Revolution in terms of his managerial theory. The alleged identity of Stalinism and Bolshevism, which from a reading of his arti-

cle, "Lenin's Heir," it would appear he has only now discovered, was set forth four years ago. We quote:

Lenin died, and Stalin headed the managerial wing... So far as historical development goes, there really cannot be much question: Stalinism is what Leninism developed into—and, moreover, without any sharp break in the process of development. Stalinism is different from Leninism, and so is a youth from the background; the difference is to be accounted for by the change in the background against which development took place. Nazism is much more different from Italian fascism than Stalinism is from Leninism, as might be expected from the differences in origin and conditions of development. But it is clear enough that Nazism and fascism are closely related as general social movements and as social ideologies. (Pp. 195f.)

There may be some who, even after a presentation of these views of Burnham, will doubt that this means that Burnham holds Bolshevism to be historically a "great conspiracy" to establish managerial rule. They may contend that Burnham is extremely objective, "super-scientific" in his writing and not at all, therefore, concerned with Lenin's conscious aims. Burnham is, accordingly, neither interested in establishing that Lenin really aimed at achieving a classless society nor, on the other hand, in contending that Lenin led a "great conspiracy" of the "managers." If Burnham seems to imply the latter in the above-quoted statements, the argument may continue, it only *seems* that way because of his objective approach.

We do not have space to devote to the question of scientific method in historical analysis. Suffice it to say that it is childish posing about "scientific method" and not at all childish to declare that the conscious aims and beliefs of men are of no concern. What men *do* is, of course, basic. But an understanding of history requires that we investigate men's conscious aims, what produced them, how they affected events and were in turn affected by events, etc., regardless of whether those aims are contradicted in action or not. This is so necessary to historical writing that Burnham frequently resorts to it despite his pose to the contrary.\* It is only when dealing with a question like the relationship of Leninism to Stalinism that he remembers how terribly "scientific" and cold-blooded he is in dismissing what men's aims are.

The argument that Burnham is merely being scientific and does not impute a "conspiracy" to Lenin brings us back to the area of argument previously traversed. We repeat: If Lenin consciously aimed at a classless society, if he acted in accord with his avowed principles, if it was under Stalin that these principles were discarded, then Stalinism is not Bolshevism and Stalin is not "Lenin's heir."

However, we will introduce two telling statements from *Managerial Revolution* which most definitively indicate that Burnham *does* view Bolshevism as a "great conspiracy of the managers."

We must not make the mistake of supposing that the Russian changes were dependent merely on the presence of one or another individual, on the personal wickedness or nobility (depending on our point of view) of, for example, Stalin. If Lenin himself had lived, there is no reason to think that the process would have differed greatly. After all, there is more than passing significance in the fact that, for many years, probably the most intimate colleague of Lenin's, the man with whom he exercised hidden control over the Bolshevik Party underneath the party's formal apparatus, was

\*An example is Burnham's explanation of why the managers in the United States today still *consciously* believe in capitalism while the *public exponents* of the managerial ideologies are not managers but intellectuals. Further, Burnham points out that the intellectuals are not usually conscious ("aware") of what they are doing. Some, however, like the Technocrats, are. (See page 194, *ibid.*)

the brilliant and successful engineer—the manager—Krassin. (P. 211.)

What meaning does this have for Burnham except to say that "there is more than passing significance in the fact" that Lenin, the "master conspirator" of the managerial revolution, was linked up with a "manager"? But, of course, this clever conspirator Lenin knew better than to make a public display of this "intimate colleague" of his. As a result they "exercised hidden control over the Bolshevik Party underneath the party's formal apparatus." How much Burnham knows about Krassin is difficult to say. If he knows even the salient facts about Leonid Krassin,\* so much the more definitely does it establish the "conspiracy theory" as Burnham's real explanation of Bolshevism. For the fact is that the closest collaboration between Lenin and Krassin took place from 1903 to 1906—during the very infancy of Bolshevism! Does this not further establish that Burnham believes that Bolshevism was a managerial "conspiracy" from its birth?

The second statement we introduce further underlines our contention. Burnham writes on the decline of the workers' committees in the factories and the passing of control to the managers:

These experiences have, as a matter of fact, received recognition in Leninist doctrine (both the Stalinist and Trotskyist variants), not so much in public writings as in the theories elaborated *primarily for party members*. [My emphasis—E. L.] "Workers' control," the doctrine now reads, is a "transitional slogan," but loses its relevance once the revolution is successful and the new state established.

Here Burnham again seeks to reveal a "conspiracy." There exists an inner line—"primarily for party members"—and there exists another line—for the pliable workers. The workers will swallow the bait about the gullers' control and make a revolution. But the smart insiders, who really aim at managerial rule, will then proceed to take over.

But if Burnham believes that Bolshevism is a "great conspiracy" which aims at establishing a managerial society, why does he not openly and clearly state this, the reader may ask. Why does he not elaborate in detail the design of this "conspiracy"? Why should he permit any ambiguity about it (particularly since he is such a "lucid" writer)? The fact is that Burnham knows better than to believe in anything as nonsensical as the "conspiracy" theory. Yet the entire logic of his identity of Stalinism and Bolshevism on the basis of a mana-

\*It is our primary interest at this point to establish the existence of a "conspiracy" theory about Bolshevism on Burnham's part. However, it is interesting to note that the use made of Krassin in this connection is based either on ignorance or distortion. The collaboration of Lenin with Krassin in the leadership of the Bolshevik Party was not "for many years," but only from 1903 to 1906. Krassin was associated with Lenin within—and not underneath—the party's formal apparatus. Both were members of the Central Committee. Krassin's main activity in the party was not political, nor, in the broad sense of the term, organizational. He was mainly known for his brilliant technical direction of the underground printing establishments in Russia, for which purpose his experience and connections as an engineer served him well. Following the collapse of the 1905 revolution, Krassin, like thousands of others, lapsed into inactivity and dropped out of the political movement. He worked as an engineer for Siemens-Shuckert in St. Petersburg from 1908 to 1918. During 1917, when Burnham's managers were "using the masses" to depose the capitalists, Krassin viewed the July events through the eyes of the frightened, yet smug, bourgeoisie and wrote in a letter: "The so-called 'masses,' principally soldiers and a number of hooligans, loafed aimlessly about the streets for two days, flitting at each other, often out of sheer fright, running away at the slightest alarm or fresh rumor, and without the slightest idea of what it was all about." (Quoted by Bunyan and Fisher in *The Bolshevik Revolution*, Hoover War Library, from *Leonid Krassin: His Life and Work*, by Lubov Krassin, London, 1929.) In 1918 Krassin once more assumed a rôle in political affairs, but devoted himself primarily to technical and commercial affairs of the new Soviet enterprises.

gerial revolution in Russia in 1917 leaves no other alternative than to fall back upon explanations in terms of "conspiracy"—Krassin!—"primarily for party members" (!)—Bolshevik duplicity as seen in variance of actions from principles, etc. However, the "conspiracy" is only darkly hinted at ("there is more than passing significance in the fact that... the manager... Krassin"), it is implied, it is permitted a shadowy existence in the background. But permitted it is—because without it the managerial explanation of the Russian Revolution would have too many gaping holes in its logic. The implications as to "conspiracy" are therefore borrowed to fill the holes. Borrowed is correct, for the conspiracy lunacy is anything but original with Burnham. It exists in various schools—from Alexander Kerensky (Kaiser's gold) to Alfred Rosenberg (Protocols of the Elders of Zion). Burnham "scientifically" borrows to bolster an untenable theory but is smart enough not to openly identify himself with such a ludicrous (detective story) method of historical explanation. We must conclude, therefore, that the ambiguity of Burnham's definition of Bolshevism—"a conspiratorial movement for the conquest of a monopoly of power"—is not accidental. The ambiguity of the definition affords Burnham a cloak under which he can simultaneously deal in various intellectual wares: (1) the "great man" argument about Stalin, (2) the managerial theory, or (3) the "great conspiracy" of Bolshevism. Having probed the contention that Bolshevism is identical with Stalinism on the basis of all three of these approaches, we conclude that Burnham has failed badly with all of them.

### III—How Burnham Converts Stalin into a Revolutionist (And Trotsky into a Counter-Revolutionist)

Burnham carries his theory of the identity of Stalinism and Bolshevism to its logical conclusion. Stalin is the defender of the Bolshevik Revolution and Trotsky is its enemy. Writes Burnham in his article:

But did he [Stalin] not, it might be replied, "betray" the proletariat, the masses, and the "principles" of the revolution? It is of course true that Stalin, in practice, has acted counter to almost all of the expressed formal principles of communism, and that in practice the masses who have followed the Bolsheviks with such heroism and sacrifice and hope... have been rewarded with slavery and terror and suffering. This, however, is not a betrayal of the revolution but an instance of a general law of revolutions; and in particular, not a violation of Bolshevism, properly comprehended, but a triumphant application. We cannot understand the nature of revolutionary or any other social movements by their "principles," by their avowed and verbalized programs, but only by what they disclose themselves to be in action. Revolutionary movements are defined not by what they say but by what they do...

If anyone betrayed Bolshevism, it was not Stalin but Trotsky. Stalin was the best Bolshevik just for the reason that he did not try to impose on history an *a priori* conception of the nature of the revolution, but was ready to accept the revolution, with all its historic consequences, as it revealed itself to be in real life.

If we accept Burnham's premise that Bolshevism was from the start a "great conspiracy" of the managers, then, of course, Trotsky betrayed the managerial revolution in the interests of the proletarian revolution. Necessarily then, Stalin is both the heir to Lenin and the defender of the (managerial) revolution.

But even Burnham, in his weirdest moments, does not claim that the masses themselves aimed at a managerial society when they made their revolution. On the contrary, one gathers from passages in *Managerial Revolution* that Burnham sees the Russian Revolution as a mass socialist revolu-

tion. If it was the latter, it was the outgrowth of the class struggle in Russia. (In his *The Machiavellians*, Burnham quotes his teacher, Pareto, to the effect that Marx's views on the class struggle were "profoundly true.") If the proletariat made the revolution to achieve a socialist goal, if Trotsky fought to continue the struggle toward that goal, if Stalin substituted for the socialist goal a bureaucratic slavery, how can one in his right mind write that Trotsky betrayed the revolution while Stalin proved its defender?

But someone may argue that Burnham did not quite say that. He stated that Trotsky betrayed *Bolshevism* and that Stalin was the best *Bolshevik*. In this case we must make a distinction between the mass, socialist revolution in Russia and the Bolshevik movement which was its general staff. The socialist revolution can be explained in terms of the objective situation and the class struggle. But if Bolshevism was something that arose and existed *outside* of the class struggle, it can only be explained, once more, on the basis of Burnham's "great conspiracy" theory. A group of clever conspirators (aiming at a monopoly of political power) rode the socialist revolution to power like a surfboard riding the waves.

Perhaps Burnham denies that Trotsky's fight against Stalinism had any connection with the proletarian revolution, since he speaks of Trotskyism and Stalinism as being variants of Leninism which, according to Burnham, is a managerial doctrine. In this case the struggle between the Stalin machine and the Left Opposition was merely a struggle for control between two managerial "élites." How then explain the fact that the consolidation of the Stalin élite required the physical annihilation of almost the entire generation of Bolsheviks associated with Lenin and the Revolution? The victory of Stalin did not merely eliminate a few dissidents. It wiped out tens of thousands. These did not only include former Trotskyists, Zinovievists or Bukharinists. They likewise included practically the entire early generation of Stalinists. The purgers of 1929-36 were purged from 1936 to 1938. Yagoda engineered the first mass trial and was a victim in the third. Yezhov took his place to engineer the third and then disappeared from the scene. Mass murders unknown to history since Attila and Ghengis Khan were required to stamp out the last vestiges of 1917 and establish the new bureaucratic class in power.

Were these mass murders the normal transition by which an heir comes to power? Or were they rather the bloody deeds by which the impostor has always sought to legitimize himself? Were these merely shifts in personnel and adjustment in the course of the "consistent and logical development of Bolshevism" under Stalin? Or were they rather the bloody civil war (even if entirely one-sided) by which the new ruling class wiped out the last shadows of the old?

Since only Stalin survived from the Old Guard of Lenin (to exclude here the errand boys—Kalinin, Molotov and Litvinov) is it perhaps possible that only *he* inherited the secret Protocols of the managerial conspiracy from Lenin? Perhaps all the others too, like the great mass of the people, were taken in by Lenin's clever conspiracy? (Poor Krassin! Intimate collaborator and "hidden controller" in the conspiracy since 1903, he never did live to see its greatest triumphs under "Lenin's Heir.") Of course it is all possible. All that is missing is Mr. O'Malley and Henry the Ghost. And with a copy of Burnham's volumes under each arm, we are all set for a flight to the land of the jabberwack and the jub-jub bird.

#### IV—What Is Burnham Groping For?

After analyzing "Lenin's Heir," one begins to wonder what the author's purpose was in writing it. None of his conclusions are new. His discovery that Stalin is a "great man" has, in the end, no significance for Burnham either, as he himself establishes with the argument that Bolshevism would have followed the same course regardless of the stature of its leader. The main conclusion he arrives at in the article, the identity of Bolshevism and Stalinism, was put forward by Burnham long ago in his book, on the basis of his managerial theory. Why does Burnham suddenly attach such vast importance to Stalin's "greatness" as the clue to the connection between Bolshevism and Stalinism?

There is only one explanation that is plausible. Burnham feels that Stalin tricked him! Burnham wrote an imposing volume on the coming managerial world in which Stalin and Hitler were jointly to knock out capitalism and then—the two "managers" are at each other's throats. But this is not the worst. This can still be "explained" by a footnote that their war was a premature conflict between the coming managerial super-states.

Much worse, however, is the fate of Burnham's geo-political exposition based on his managerial theory. According to this prediction, the future world will group itself into super-states based upon three great industrial areas—the United States, Japan and northwestern Europe. The latter will come under the domination of the German super-state. Russia just doesn't count. Its huge land mass will gravitate toward the two poles—the German and the Japanese. Russia will, in short, be divided between the German managers and the Japanese managers.

This is where Stalin really tricked Burnham. Not only has Russia survived the war, but has emerged as the Number Two power. The German and Japanese super-states go up in flames lighted by bombs manufactured in "old-fashioned" capitalist democracies. There is something radically wrong here, says Burnham. Evidently a miscalculation somewhere. Aha! We have overlooked the "greatness of Stalin"! We thought him a dwarf, and he emerges a giant! But it is not Stalin who tricked us, not really. It is Trotsky! Trotsky with his nonsense that Stalin is a mediocrity. This is what threw us off. This is why we consigned Russia to be partitioned, instead of to become a great world power. Had we but not had so much faith in Trotsky and his faulty biography of Stalin, our managerial theory would have survived the war in much better shape. We now must examine where this leaves us. Aha! New phenomena! Multi-national Bolshevism! Communism is a world conspiracy! (We have discovered this "terrible truth" a bit late, but the more profoundly.) We will "retire" the managerial theory for a while and occupy ourselves with the threat of world communism.

The article marks a further decline in Burnham. Armed with the tools of Marxism, Burnham proved himself a cogent thinker and lucid writer. With his break from the intellectual discipline of Marxism, Burnham began groping and floundering. His *Managerial Revolution* marked an attempt to substitute a new total concept of societal development for that of Marxism. In this he still showed the effects of the Marxist approach in feeling compelled to erect a rounded theoretical system in explanation of his thesis. He still dealt with classes, class ideologies, the economic bases of classes and class struggles for political power. He sought to round out the previous efforts at a bureaucratic state theory by showing, in accordance

with the Marxist concept, the need for a class as the bearer of the new society and pointing to the "managers" as the answer: The theoretical structure erected in the book, however, was badly wanting in supporting evidence and, still worse, in giving convincing answers to a whole series of assumptions (like that stating that the working people could not rule themselves). This led him into a new excursion—*The Machiavellians*. Even compared with *Managerial Revolution*, the latter showed the disintegration of Burnham as a "theoretician." Instead of completing a theoretical system, he only succeeded in opening new questions, developing new contradictions, and leaving himself as rudderless, anchorless and compassless as the article "Lenin's Heir," finally reveals him. Gone is the managerial theory, gone any reference to Machiavelli and "scientific politics," gone any attempt at internal consistency or cogency in argument. Beginning with the discovery that the managerial society is inevitably (how he once shuddered when that word was used in reference to socialism) the next stage of social development, he ends up by discovering Stalin to be a great man (because of, among other things, immense vodka orgies in the midst of misery) and, as becomes a giant, the legitimate heir to Lenin.

(The question of Stalin's stature as an individual will be left to a future article.)

ERNEST LUND.

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT INDIA:

### 'INDIA IN REVOLT'

By HENRY JUDD

Order from the **WORKERS PARTY** **PRICE: 25 CENTS**  
114 W. 14th St., N. Y. C. In Bundles of  
Five or More—20 Cents

### INCENTIVE PAY

THE SPEED-UP, NEW STYLE

By ALBERT GATES

Editor, Labor Action

Your boss's new scheme to squeeze more profits and more work out of YOU! What it is, who's behind it, how you can fight it!

Five Cents per Copy **Thirty Pages**  
Three Cents in Bundles of Five or More

THE WORKERS PARTY

114 West 14th Street

New York 11, N. Y.

# The World Trade Union Conference

## *The Labor Voice of Imperialism*

The World Trade Union Conference met, with the blessings and assistance of the ruling classes of the United Nations, in the County Hall of London on February 6 of this year. When the war began, the conservative and bourgeois-minded leaders of the International Federation of Trade Unions closed up shop and decided that it was impossible to carry on the work of an international trade union center. In closing down the IFTU, the conservative Sirs of the British Trade Union Council, the most influential section of the "Amsterdam International," acted in the tradition of their predecessors. It would have been too radical a departure for them to do otherwise than the leaders of the IFTU did in 1914.

Citrine, Schevenels & Co. transferred the IFTU Center from Australia to London and pretended to keep the Federation alive. Beyond issuing bulletins containing information on the various European affiliates, the leaders of the IFTU did nothing. They pointed to the occupation of Europe as an insurmountable obstacle to international trade union activity, when what they really meant to say was that they were too occupied with aiding their national ruling classes to prosecute the imperialist war to function as working class leaders, even in the limited sense in which they had always conducted themselves.

Obviously, if the leadership of the IFTU had the will to carry on the working class struggle instead of pursuing a bourgeois policy in the ranks of labor, the means for keeping the IFTU alive and active would easily have been found. But in the absence of a functioning trade union International, the efforts of the Stalinist "unions" of Russia and the Stalinists in the world labor movement to force the organization of a new world trade union body were guaranteed of success. The Stalinists were aided in this struggle by the determination of the CIO officialdom to seek international affiliations despite the opposition of the AFL, and the confused policies pursued by the British Trade Union Council.

For Stalin and his agents throughout the world, a new international trade union center in which they played a leading part meant to break through the isolation imposed on them by their exclusion from the IFTU. In the event that a new center could not be achieved, any kind of reorganization of the IFTU to permit their adherence would have been acceptable, because Stalin's paramount aim in this field of politics is to obtain a solid foothold in the labor movements of Great Britain and the United States in order to use them as weapons in his future relations with the two other great powers of the United Nations.

The call for the World Trade Union Conference which the British Trade Union Council had initiated was just what the Stalinists were praying for. The reasons for the call given by the British, through Sir Walter Citrine, were that the IFTU was non-existent and that the change in the world situation (read: Russia's new rôle in the war as ally of Great Britain and the United States), and the prospects of an early victory over Germany made it necessary to call together the trade unions of the United Nations to prepare for the post-war period in Europe. Sir Walter and his comrades did not

have in mind the construction of a new trade union international. They merely wanted the reorganization of the IFTU to permit the seating of Russian "unions" and the CIO, and held that the Conference had only advisory powers.

For many years, the IFTU refused to admit the Russian "unions." This policy was consistently adhered to even when these organizations were truly trade unions during the days of Lenin and Trotsky. At that time, the opposition to admittance of the Russian unions was the fear of the British and American (AFL) trade union leaders that the Russian trade unionists would have a revolutionizing effect upon the IFTU and thus destroy the stranglehold which the conservative and class collaborationist leadership had on the International. The opposition to the trade unions in the early days was on grounds that they were not free trade unions but organs of the Russian state, a lie which was nailed time and again by militant and progressive trade unionists the world over. While the AFL retains its old position, the other leaders of the IFTU have been won over to support admission of the Russian "unions" precisely at a time when Stalin has destroyed every vestige of trade unionism in Russia, and transformed these bodies into state organs for enslaving the workers. The British trade union leaders and their international associates are motivated, not by consideration of trade union internationalism and unity, but by the politics of the capitalist governments they serve. Their action was dictated by the needs of the Allied imperialist coalition. The actual deliberations of the Conference bear this out completely.

Thus, in calling the London Conference, Sir Walter and his cohorts on the Trade Union Council violated two provisions of the IFTU to which they had so ardently adhered for so many years: first, they invited the Russian state organizations to participate and, second, they invited the CIO on an equal basis with the AFL. The AFL, in turn, refused to participate on the ground that the IFTU constitution provided for national representation from only one federated body.

There is no doubt that the conservative British trade union leaders went into the conference with mixed feelings of confidence and fear. The political situation made the convening of such a conference without the Russians and the CIO ludicrous. On what basis could the British Trade Union Council, partner-in-crime of Churchill, champion of the Anglo-American-Russia alliance, reject the participation in the conference of Stalin's appointed seers over the Russian working class? On what basis could they keep out the CIO leaders who conducted themselves as Roosevelt's agents in the labor movement, even as they enacted the same rôle as Churchill's agents? Merely to please their own consciences of what a real trade union is, or to placate the AFL? Hardly, since they are fully aware of what they had done to the trade union movement during the war.

Could they seriously object to Russian unions on the ground that they were not free trade unions but organs of the state, when this would force them to cast reflections on the democratic pretensions of the great ally in the East?

At the meeting of the executive committee of the IFTU which was convened a week before the opening of the London conference, the AFL, through its representative, Robert Watt,



reiterated its position, pointing out that the call for the London conference violated the IFTU provision for national representation. The British leaders pleaded with the AFL to attend the conference in order to help balance off the Stalinist strength, emphasizing the advisory character of the conference. There would be no voting, said Citrine, since you can't legislate international trade union unity.

The dull British leaders did not fully reckon with the determination of the Stalinists to win a place in any trade union international, to break their isolation or to carry through their plan for the constitution of a new world labor body. Nor did they fully understand the Stalinist strategy prior to the conference. It could not have been a matter of secrecy, for the Stalinists made their position months beforehand throughout the world. Apparently, the British Trade Union Council believed it had enough power to defeat the Stalinist plan. But Citrine & Co. did not reckon with Sidney Hillman, head of the CIO delegation, whose current policies coincide so happily with international Stalinism.

When the conference opened there were more than two hundred delegates reported, representing nearly fifty million workers from fifty-one countries. The Russians, claiming to represent 27,000,000 workers (!), attempted to reorganize the conference on a voting basis, speciously protesting the disfranchisement of their delegation which was placed on equality with other national delegations. The British objected to the Russian voting plan on the ground that on the basis of their claimed membership they had an automatic majority of the conference. But the Russians were merely fencing. They were quite prepared, as we shall soon see, to compromise on this issue, considering the number of cards they had to play.

Since this was essentially a political gathering, the political spirit of the conference was in keeping with the decisions of "Moscow, Teheran and Crimea." Whatever concrete differences separated the Big Three union delegations, they were united on what the political tasks of the conference were and they dominated the meeting. The three presidents selected represented the "big nations," R. J. Thomas, for the CIO; George Isaacs for the British Trade Union Council, and Vassili Kuzmetsov for the Russian slave organizations. The Stalinist hand was strengthened organizationally by the fact that at least two of three vice-presidents (Louis Saillant of France and Lombardo Toledano of Mexico) were either Stalinists or fellow travelers, long associated with Stalinism.

The Stalinists had additional strength in the conference since many representatives from other countries were clearly Stalinists or under their influence. The Russians could also count on support from the CIO for two reasons: first, the CIO had finally reached a position where it could get back at the AFL and, second, its policies under the leadership of Hillman coincided with the current line of Stalinism. Thus when the conference threatened to bog down on the very first day, R. J. Thomas, assuming his customary rôle as special pleader for unity, prevented a blow-up over the seating of delegates from "enemy" countries, whom the Stalinists championed. Sir Walter very heatedly asked: "How can you discuss the treatment of the enemy with people who until yesterday were themselves enemies?" (He conveniently forgot about the Hitler-Stalin pact and Molotov's historic utterance that "fascism is a matter of personal taste.") With the exception of Finland, he did not think that Italy, Rumania and Bulgaria could claim a stable or democratic trade union movement. All of this was an unpardonable lack of confidence in the GPU, but

the Russians were adamant. Perhaps Sir Walter did not know the ways of Stalin's efficient Gestapo.

In addition to this question, the Standing Orders Committee had recommended the seating of the Lublin Polish delegates, whose "credentials had been flown from Moscow."

According to Margaret Stewart in *The Nation* of February 17, "this issue, urged Citrine, was still under consideration by the government. Why should the trade unions rush in where ministers feared to tread?" Good old Citrine! The bold working class approach! He countered the Stalinist move by appealing to the bourgeois conscience of the conference. More than that, however, Citrine added, the committee had recommended that voting should be by country (one country, one vote), with a two-thirds majority making up a decision. This did two things: it precluded any possibility that the AFL would attend and was "contrary to the spirit and purpose of the conference which was intended to be only advisory."

Thomas made the pleas for unity and the conference returned the matter to the committee. The committee then decided that the "ex-enemies" should be invited to send representatives who would be seated as delegates or observers on the advice of the Credentials Committee.

### **New or Old Federation**

The big fight at the conference was whether it should decide definitely to set up a new international federation of trade unions. The British opposition to this step was overcome and although no vote was taken which said that the conference constituted itself as the new world federation, it did set up a Continuations Committee to further the work of the London conference. The World Trade Union Conference Committee of forty-five members, representing all the groups present in London, established its headquarters in Paris. The committee will reconvene the world conference in September, 1945, in that city to adopt a constitution and set up a permanent world federation. This date was decided upon because immediately before that the IFTU is scheduled to meet. The aim is to put enough pressure upon the IFTU to force its "voluntary" dissolution and thus guarantee the establishment of the new federation without opposition.

Without doubt the decision to form a new trade union center was the important result of the conference, but it would be a mistake to overlook the ideological aspects of the parley. From a political point of view, the London conference was only another facet of Big Three group rule of the United Nations. When the chairman of the London County Council said at the opening session that "this is the first peace conference," he only emphasized the fact that the gathering was the labor wing of the imperialist powers which dominate the United Nations.

The conference endorsed the policies of Great Britain, Russia and the United States. Echoing the refrain of the monarchs of the Big Three, the leading spirits in London called for a Vansittartist peace for Germany, endorsing the enslavement of German labor with the most reactionary anti-working class arguments. Calling for a successful prosecution of the war, they answered the needs of the ruling classes by admonishing the proletariat to continue its one-sided sacrifices for the victory of one camp in the war and to do nothing that will disturb the profit-grabbing of big business in the capitalist nations.

### **Working Class Issues Ignored**

It is easy to understand the true nature of this trade union

gathering by observing the number of vital working class interests which were completely omitted from consideration. For example, the conference did not concern itself with promoting international labor solidarity except in so far as it had anything to do with promoting the war and the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie. It said little and did nothing about organizing a campaign for raising the economic standards of the masses. It refused to treat the question of colonial oppression in a frank and revolutionary way, calling for the liberation of all colonial peoples. Thus, it identified itself with the imperialist policies of Russia, Great Britain, France, Holland, Belgium and the United States. It studiously avoided the question of national oppression and self-determination, merely reaffirming its adherence to the Atlantic Charter, while it endorsed all decisions of Moscow-Teheran-Crimea, which flouted the Atlantic Charter.

What the conference did and did not do merely rehearsed the manifesto—the language, structure and aims of which echoed the Big Three, and in many respects, the Russian side of the international question. The tone of the manifesto is contained in its very first paragraph, which says:

From the World Trade Union Conference, which has concluded its immediate tasks in London, we address this message to the people of all lands who are of one mind in their hope and desire that a new world shall arise from the devastation and ruin wrought by the war. The Second World War has involved all nations in the gravest crisis of human history. In their long and terrible struggle against aggressor powers, the United Nations have fought for freedom and their own way of life. They have successfully withstood the most dangerous assault ever made upon the foundations of democracy and free citizenship. They have resisted the most determined attempt ever made to lead mankind back into servitude and to impose upon the free nations a political system, an economic order and an ideology which, had they achieved their purpose, would have given domination over all free peoples into the hands of those who have claimed by their armed might to exercise the rule of self-styled "superior race," or to fulfill a so-called "historic destiny."

Thus, you see, the main task of the World Trade Union Conference is not to promote the interests of labor against capitalism, but to support capitalism, its continued existence and exploitation of the masses, spreading illusions about the prospects of a "new world" arising from the chaos and destruction of an imperialist-capitalist war.

The manifesto perpetuates the illusion that there is a fundamental difference between fascism and capitalism, upholds the pernicious view that there is a fundamental difference between aggressors and "defenders" in an imperialist conflict and that a victory of the Allies means a victory for democracy and permanent peace. The imperialist "democrats" are described as the defenders of freedom, as gallant warriors who have prevented the enslavement of "all free peoples" (India, Belgian Congo, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Morocco, Puerto Rico are a few of the "free peoples" who have apparently been saved).

Elsewhere the manifesto says that the conference will work for a complete victory over fascism in order to "establish a stable and enduring peace [under imperialism] and to promote in the economic sphere the international collaboration which will permit the rich resources of the earth to be utilized for the benefit of all its peoples, providing full employment, rising standards of life, and social security to the men and women of all nations."

Perhaps the framers of this manifesto had in mind a struggle against barbarous capitalism for a new social order to accomplish these things which capitalism finds it impossible to

grant the masses? No, the capitalist-minded labor leaders who directed the London conference, aided by the Stalinist betrayers of the working class of the world, really mean that capitalism will bring about the millenium. They have learned nothing from their own experiences. But they are now engaged in an imperialist conspiracy to delude the masses and to prevent any revolutionary struggle against capitalism.

And to achieve "these ennobling aims and purposes," the World Labor Conference, of course, "pledged the organized millions we represent to support the heroic armed forces of the United Nations. . . ."

### **The Labor Voice of Imperialism**

There you have the real political purpose of the conference: promoting the interests of the Allied capitalist countries and Stalin's Russia. The conference went even further than just acclaiming a general support to the bourgeois system. It called for the support within a given country to those parties and institutions which have supported the war or the war régimes. "Our World Conference," the manifesto stated, "placed on record its profound conviction that the freedom-loving people of the earth should give support and countenance only to those governments, political parties and national institutions which are pledged to wage war against fascism in all its forms until it is rooted out of the life of all countries."

How it will be possible to root out fascism "in all its forms" from a capitalist nation, the writers of the manifesto do not say. Nor do the Stalinist betrayers help them any. On the contrary, the manifesto is clearly intended to oppose any social change. In that respect it is thoroughly reactionary. In addition, the thought behind this paragraph is to maintain support for those régimes which now rule in the countries of the United Nations. Concretely, the London leaders had in mind retaining the status quo régimes in Europe and America. The Stalinists had in mind obtaining international labor support for their dictatorships in Eastern Europe, to keep Roosevelt in power in the United States and those other régimes in other countries which established their peace with Stalin.

The London Labor Conference demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt that it is the labor voice of imperialism. The grandiose aims it develops in its manifesto, all postulated upon the maintenance of the reactionary imperialist social order, will be shattered long before the war is over. Bourgeois-minded labor leaders will find themselves, irrespective of their formal actions in London, fighting for the very lives of their union movements at the hands of the régimes to which they have sworn fealty. The reality of capitalism will destroy the reformist and class-collaborationist hopes which these backward labor leaders hold out to the masses and they will be driven to one degree or another to fight the profit system with which they now identify the interests of the masses.

But even more important than this aspect of the conference is the grave danger the Hillmans, Citrines and Schevels have created by giving Stalinism the opportunity to penetrate the Western and American labor movements. This is just what Stalin wanted: the establishment of his battalions in these labor movements where they can carry on the struggle in the interests of his bureaucratic régime in Russia. For Stalin, they are an invaluable prop in the world labor movement. For the working class of the world, they are the most dangerous force of destruction and betrayal of the labor movement and the interests of the oppressed masses of the world.

ALBERT GATES.

# Historical Image of Napoleon

## The Emperor as Prince of Glory

(The following is the first of two articles by James T. Farrell, one of America's leading novelists and literary critics, on the historical significance of Napoleon, as a product of the French Revolution during its Thermidorean reaction. The articles are really one essay which will appear in a book now in progress evaluating Tolstoy's epic work, *War and Peace*. [Copyright, 1945—James T. Farrell]—Ed.)

Napoleon has frequently been characterized as "the child of the revolution." And in *War and Peace*, Tolstoy remarks: "The sum of men's individual wills produced both the revolution and Napoleon; and only the sum of these wills endured them and then destroyed them." This sentence embodies one of the major ideas of Tolstoy's theory of history. On the basis of it, an analysis could be expanded in order to demonstrate how Tolstoy posed the problem of history in his time, and how he failed clearly to meet the conditions which would have permitted an answer more satisfactory than the one he did provide. However, we have dealt with this in another part of this book. Because of the relationship of Tolstoy's ideas of history to the ideas of the great French Revolution, and more directly, because of the rôle which Napoleon plays in this novel, it is appropriate here to focus some attention on the revolution, and on Napoleon as its "child."

"The Revolution had been accomplished in the minds of men long before it was translated into fact," wrote Mathiez in *The French Revolution*. This is correct. However, it does not follow from this that first men willed the Revolution and that then, by a combination or addition of their wills, they caused it to happen precisely as they had willed it. Behind the triumph of the ideas of the Revolution—i.e., those of individualism—there were historical needs. The ideas of the Revolution, the actions of unknown *sans-culottes* on the streets of Paris and of angry and rebellious peasants of the countryside who seized land, burned houses and murdered nobles—all these were in response to human historical needs. Feudal absolutism had become a shell, an empty shell. Intellectually and economically, the French middle class was ready to become master of France. As a class, it was confident, intelligent, determined. The triumph of the ideas of the Revolution prior to the effective change of property relationships carried out in the Revolution signified the ideological defeat of the ideas of feudalism and medievalism. These new ideas had been spreading and gaining in the world for centuries, most emphatically since the Renaissance. Long before 1789 the English had accomplished their bourgeois democratic revolution. The Americans, influenced by the French and the English, had achieved their colonial revolution prior to 1789: they had written their constitution, begun their career of nationhood, and their example was, in turn, a powerful influence in France. The intellectual and historical preparation of the Great French Revolution was thorough, complete.

Ideologically, then, the triumph of the ideas of the Revolution signified the rout of medieval ideology. The medieval idea of the world was that it was the stage on which was played out the drama of the eternal salvation or damnation of

the souls of all men and women: this emphasizes an otherworldly ideal. To it, bourgeois ideology opposed an idea of the world as the arena in which man, armed with reason, creates his own free society: its ideal was this-worldly. The medieval idea of society was that of a static, "functional" organism established in the terms of set conceptions of duties, status, prerogatives, and rights, all of which were assumable derivations from God's natural law. As such, it was a society conceived in terms of the fatherhood of God. The Church was the supervening authority between God and man: Church and State were associated in authority and privilege. And derivable from this conception was that of the divine right of kings. Bourgeois ideology opposed all of these conceptions. To the medieval idea of natural law, it opposed its own idea of natural law based on the nature of man. To the divine right of kings, it counterposed the natural rights of man. To the idea of a society based on the fatherhood of God, it countered with that of a society established by a social contract. To the Divine Will, it affirmed the Will of Man. The static idea of medieval society was ideologically battered with the idea of progress. Instead of man saving his soul in the next world, bourgeois ideology offered to man the prospect of making his own history in this one. Instead of the authority and will of God then, it emphasized human reason, that "telescope of the intellect" which Pierre Bezuhov, at one point in his career, tried to use as the means of discovering the good life. The triumph of the ideas of the Revolution in the minds of men meant the acceptance of these new ideas.

All revolutions in history are explosive efforts to achieve economic emancipation. These are, to repeat, preconditioned on material and human needs. The great human tides in history which move toward economic emancipation by revolutionary means are tides made up of real human beings, not of abstracted economic men. These movements are dramatic moments in the long and bloody effort of mankind to achieve real individuality. In all real, i.e., progressive, revolutions, man takes a step forwards toward the end of becoming the human individual. The ideas in the heads of men express these hopes, these aims. But these ideas at the same time seem to exist as if in their own right. So it was in the case of the triumph of the ideas of the French Revolution prior to 1789. Further, it is to be remembered that in the realm of ideology, revolutions begin on the theological, the moral, the political plane. Ideologically, the bourgeois democratic revolutions began theologically and morally. From theology, the emphasis shifted to the moral, and then to the political plane. The authority generally appealed to in the English Revolution was theological: formally, the source of this authority was *The Bible*. In the American Colonial Revolution, and in the French Revolution, the appeal was to reason and human self-interest. The process of the triumph of the ideas of the Revolution in the minds of men was one which involved the secularization of ideas. And this demanded a complete revaluation of human values. These new ideas became weapons of the mind, used as later the guns and the pikes were used in Paris. It was an intellectually well armed French middle class which was prepared to take power in the year 1789. Kautsky, in *Ethics and*

*the Materialist Conception of History*, wrote: "The fight of the democratic and rising class against the governing power, independent of the bourgeoisie and subject to the feudal aristocracy with their court nobility and their state church, commenced in England more than a century before France, at a time when only a few had got over the Christian thought. If in France the fight against the state church became a fight between Christianity and atheistic materialism, in England it became only a struggle between special democratic sects and the state-church organized sect." The French middle class, ready for the Revolution, was materialistic. The writings of its ideologues had grown into a mounting and pitiless series of attacks which increasingly emphasized this materialism.<sup>1</sup> "Thus," as Mathiez wrote, "criticism was working underground which long preceded and prepared for the explosion. The opportunity had only to arise, and all this accumulated and stifled rage would lend force to the attacks . . . stirred up and directed by a host of malcontents."

The last days of the Bourbon régime were ones marked by a financial and economic impasse. Feudal absolutism served as an excuse for every form of abuse. A doomed class, with its apparatus, sought to hold onto every privilege which it could no longer really exercise or defend. And at the same time France was a land of flourishing prosperity. The Revolution was preceded by successive crises. Also, waves of popular emotions, peasant rebellions, sacking of factories, cries for bread, shouts of "*Vive la liberté*," troop mutinies, all this and more dramatically announced the coming Revolution. Arthur Young and other foreigners in France had predicted it. In France there was the most intense ferment. Lawyers, priests, publicists of every kind wrote pamphlets attacking the social system. The idea of a new freedom in the minds of men was alive, active, dynamic. Thus we see that this sum of individual wills, of which Tolstoy spoke, was being not only added up, but added up on a new sheet of paper. In other words, new wills were being forged.

The ideological preparation of the Revolution planted newer, fresher, fuller ideals of freedom in hundreds, thousands, hundreds of thousands of human wills. In his formal theory of history, Tolstoy placed the consciousness of free will in the minds of men. In France, prior to 1789, there grew in that consciousness—the will to be free. Formally, this was expressed in the idea of the nation, the idea of the will of the nation. But all of these ideas were differently interpreted by different individuals and, more importantly, by different social classes. The bourgeoisie and its ideologues controlled the pen. There was no proletariat in the modern sense: there were craftsmen, artisans, the lower middle class and what most historians call the urban "rabble"; and there was the peasantry. But at the head of this movement was the French bourgeoisie. Mathiez, in *The French Revolution*, also comments: "The class which was about to take the lead in the Revolution was fully conscious of its strength and its rights. It is not true that it allowed itself to be led astray by an empty ideology: it had a thorough knowledge of realities and possessed the means of adapting its interests to their exigencies."

### **The King, the Bourgeoisie and the People**

Thomas Jefferson was in France during the first days of

1. "None of the great noblemen who applauded the audacity and impertinence of the *philosophes* took into consideration that the religious idea was the cornerstone of the existing order. Once free criticism was turned loose, how could it be expected to confine itself to mocking at superstition? . . . It spread doubt and satire everywhere. Yet the privileged orders did not seem to understand."—*The French Revolution*, by Albert Mathiez, New York, 1928, page 13.

the French Revolution. On July 19, 1789, he wrote to John Jay, giving an account of some of the first revolutionary events. Prior to July 14th, the excitement in Paris had been intense, feverish: the tense atmosphere which immediately precedes the first elemental eruption of social revolution. The States General was meeting at Versailles. The Parisians, armed with stones, had frightened one hundred German cavalry and two hundred Swiss. The cavalry had retired in fear to Versailles, lest they be massacred. The people armed themselves with what weapons they could get, and they were roaming the streets. And "... the States pressed on the King to send away the troops, to permit the bourgeoisie of Paris to arm for the preservation of order in the city." A committee of magistrates and electors of the city was formed to take the function of government. The King refused these propositions. The "mob," joined by soldiers, broke into the St. Lazare prison, released prisoners, got some arms, took a great quantity of corn. "The committee determined to raise forty-eight thousand bourgeois, or rather to restrain their numbers to forty-eight thousand." The governor of the Invalides told the representatives of this committee that he could not give out arms without orders from above. But the people took arms.

Such is part of the story of the prelude to Bastille Day, as Jefferson described it. And then, in the same letter, Jefferson penned an illuminating account of the return of Louis XVI from Versailles to Paris after the storming of the Bastille. His picture can be divided into two parts.

Here is Part One: "... the procession . . . the King's carriage was in the centre, on each side of it the States General, in two ranks afoot, and at their head the Marquis de La Fayette, as Commander in Chief, on horseback, and Bourgeois guards before and behind." The Bourgeois Revolution marched in procession with pomp, the King in a gilded carriage, but controlled and protected by the representatives of the leading class of the Revolution. The parliamentarians trampled on foot on either side of the King; they were legislators, the representatives of the people, but not men of formal pomp and power. And this procession was protected by the Praetorian Guard (Kropotkin and other historians have quite properly described the Bourgeois National Guard as such) which marched arms in hand. And lest we forget, there was a commander in chief on horse: in fact, we can say that the Marquis de La Fayette here revealed himself in his true historic role, that of the transitional man on horseback of the Bourgeois Revolution.

And now, let us look at Part Two of this picture: "About sixty thousand citizens of all forms and colors, armed with the muskets of the Bastille and Invalides, as far as they would go, the rest with pistols, swords, pikes, pruning hooks, scythes, etc., lined all the streets through which the procession passed, and, with the crowds of people in the streets, doors and windows, saluted them everywhere with cries of '*vive la nation*'; but not a single '*vive le roy*' was heard." Remembering what Tolstoy said of wills in history, we can here observe that the separate wills had not been properly combined: the process of historical addition had not as yet been made thoroughly. For the two parts of our picture show us two separate combinations of wills. The picture is uncomposed. "When a revolution," Kropotkin said in *The Great French Revolution*, "has once begun, each event in it not merely sums up the events hitherto accomplished; it also contains the chief elements of what is to come; so that the contemporaries of the French Revolution, if only they could have freed themselves from momentary impressions, and separated the essential from the accidental,

might have been able, on the morrow of July 14, to foresee whither events as a whole were thenceforth trending." Kropotkin's observation was made in reference to the consequence of July 14 at Versailles: it relates directly to the scene we have just described.

Let us return to this picture and some salient points of its background. Here is what Kropotkin wrote in his history: "On the 14th, in proportion as royalty lost its menacing character, it was the people who in a corresponding degree, inspired terror in the . . . Third Estate. . . . The King had only to present himself before the Assembly, recognize the authority of the delegates, and promise them inviolability, for the whole of the representatives to burst into applause and transports of joy. They even ran out to form a guard of honor round him in the streets, and made the streets of Versailles resound with cries of 'Vive le roi.' And this at the very moment when the people were being massacred in Paris in the name of the same King. . . . The middle class revolutionaries, of whom very many belonged to the Freemasons, made an 'arch of steel' with their swords for the King on his arrival at the Hôtel de Ville."

Let us now note what Jefferson wrote of the King's arrival at the Hôtel de Ville. "The King stopped at the Hôtel de Ville. There Monsieur Bailly presented and put into his hat the popular cockade, and addressed him. The King being unprepared and unable to answer, Bailly went to him, gathered from him some scraps of sentences, and made out an answer, which he delivered to the audience as from the King." Superficial observation would have suggested that at this moment the French Revolution had been achieved. Jefferson, who was very close to La Fayette, thought so. It was his interpretation that with this scene, the Revolution had been tranquilized and that the future would then be a mere matter of the countryside catching up with Paris in order that there be orderly progress and freedom in France. And the bourgeois hoped that tranquility had been gained. But these wills had not really been composed. This picture has not, as yet, been really put together. There were still those thousands in the streets, the armed masses which composed the most revolutionary class of the eighteenth century and who had entered the arena of politics. And there were thousands and thousands more of them in town and country. Concerning them, Mathiez commented: "The workmen and peasants were capable of a brief movement of revolt when the yoke became too heavy, but could not see their way toward changing the social order. They were only just beginning to learn to read." They were—the masses of town and country—the beasts of burden of this society. But thousands of them, these beasts of burden from the villages, from the hovels, from such sections as the *Faubourg Saint-Antoine*, had gotten weapons and had glimpsed something of the light which is cast by the ideas of human freedom.

To repeat, they were grabbing muskets, pistols, knives, pruning hooks, scythes, everything they could and, arms in hands, they were combining their wills as they ". . . saw in the growing anarchy a chance to revenge themselves upon the social order. . . ." Mathiez here further added that: "The rising was directed not only against the feudal system, but against monopolies of commodities, taxes, bad judges, all those who exploited the people and lived upon its work." Mirabeau had thundered at Versailles that the States General represented the people. But this body was no sooner starting to assert authority than the people also took into their own hands the task of representing themselves. Scarcely having learned to read, they had clearly grasped the meaning of some

of the ideas in the air. When the procession had passed them from Versailles, they cried out: "*Vive la nation!*" They had become part of the nation in fact; they had entered history. But they were not, as yet, properly composed into that picture which Jefferson painted for us.

### The Bourgeois Coaches the Monarchy

To continue, it is significant to note that at the Hotel de Ville, Louis XVI did not know what to say. A not unsympathetic biographer of Louis XVI, Saul K. Padover (*The Life and Death of Louis XVI*), says of him: "In a crisis he showed himself as helpless as a paralytic."<sup>2</sup> Padover remarks on how a streamer inside the throne room at the Hôtel de Ville expressed the new situation. It was worded: "Louis XVI, Father of the French and King of a *Free People*." Louis XVI was without assurance. When the fires of revolution were lit in France, he could only stutter and mumble: he was unable to perceive, in fact, the difference between a street riot and a revolution. Just prior to this scene, when Bailly had met the procession at the gates of Paris, Bailly had told him: "The people . . . have reconquered their King." Further, contrast Louis XVI and Bailly. He had just previously sworn that "nothing in the world would induce him to deliver his welcoming speech [to Louis XVI] in any position other than an upright one" (Padover). Bailly, the bourgeois mayor, hero of the hour along with La Fayette, revealed his full presence of mind. He told the King what to say and, then, he said it for the King to the people. Clearly, we can here see a summing up of the Revolution in the sense in which Kropotkin spoke.

Here, likewise, is the implied prediction of events to come. Bailly's actions, words, gestures reveal a consciousness of power. Surrounding the Hotel de Ville is the instrument of that power, the Bourgeois Guard, composed of Paris bankers and others. And checked by the "arch of steel" is the people. Also present is that popular man on horseback, the Marquis de La Fayette. He understood what was happening, Bailly understood. The people understood less, but they knew what they no longer wanted, and they stood watching, armed. But Louis XVI knew nothing. The significance of these events was not clear in his head. He woke up one morning in the year 1789, an absolutist monarch; he went to bed that same evening, a bourgeois king.<sup>3</sup>

### History as the Greatest of Artists

The bourgeois program seemed, at this moment, to have been attained. Bailly, telling the King what to say, symbolized that program: the bourgeois wanted the reins of power in its hands: It seems that this had been gained. For Jefferson writes further of this scene: "On their return, the popular cries were '*vive le roy et la nation*.' He [Louis] was conducted by a Garde Bourgeoise to his palace at Versailles, and thus concluded such an *amende honorable* as no sovereign ever

2. In other portions of this book, some of Tolstoy's characterizations of aristocrats are analyzed. It is noted how Count Rostov, of *War and Peace*, for instance, can only mutter and mumble when faced with a personal crisis, and how his characteristic gestures in such moments is that of waving "his arms in despair." Similarly, it is noted how Czar Alexander I, fleeing after the rout of Austerlitz, is overwhelmed because of the difficulty of leaping, on horseback, across a ditch, and how he is impelled to tears. The incapacity of feudal princes and nobles to meet crises in the modern period is quite observable in history and in literature. Trotsky, in passing, offers some brilliant observations on this in his comparison of Louis XVI and the last Romanov in *The History of the Russian Revolution*.

3. Concerning this "tranquility," Kropotkin observed: ". . . the mass of the people preserved an attitude of reserve and mistrust. . . . King of the middle classes as much as they liked, but not a King of the people." And Nicker, following this scene, said to the National Assembly: "Today, gentlemen, it is in your hands that the salvation of the state lies."

made, and no people ever received. Letters written with his own hand to the Marquis de La Fayette removed the scruples of his position. Tranquility is now restored to the capital."

Studying this picture, it seems as if history were the greatest of all artists. Here, in this scene, there is revealed an art as seemingly miraculous as that of Tolstoy in *War and Peace*. But it is a real historical scene. And in it, the gestures, the words, the rôles are so correct, so proper. There is perfection of characterization. History comes before our eyes, yes, with pregnant artistry. Let us further note this "artistry." The red cockade is put onto the hat of the King in the name of the nation. The man who does this is the leader of the bourgeoisie. Consider the symbol. There is no crown. And its color is the red of revolution. The class leading the revolution asserts itself: it bestows the revolutionary symbol on the monarch. The symbol attracts the people. And what of Louis XVI? There he stands, merely a bewildered spectator. How perfect his rôle, how proper that he has nothing to say, how artistically adequate that his best is a stutter! And, to the contrary, how quick, how ready is Bailly to speak in his name. And yet all of this would not have been possible, would not have been necessary but for those armed thousands out there in the street, standing determined and ready behind that bourgeois "arch of steel." From that day forth the masses of humanity became revealed as a force that always must be reckoned with.

This scene embodies and predicts the course of the Revolution. But here there is not space for any detailed account of that course. In addition, I believe that I can assume a sufficient familiarity with it on the part of my readers. Suffice it to say that the French bourgeoisie triumphed in the Revolution; it gained its economic emancipation, became the master of France and, in fact, almost became the master of Europe. The American Colonial Revolution made possible the conditions which permitted the capitalist exploitation of a whole continent under one unified government: the French Revolution created the conditions which almost made possible, with Napoleon, the same accomplishment. Of this, we will comment later. Here, let it be stressed that in this scene we can see the program of the Revolution. That of the people was to create the nation, that is, to create themselves as rulers and free men. But they were not then capable of performing this task. The program of the bourgeoisie was to create a constitutional monarchy based on the English model, and to rule through this form. The program is here presented to us in picture, spectacle, in word, gesture, movement. But it has not been, at this date, really composed. The scene is only temporarily tranquilized. Before the tranquility is attained, before this picture is really composed, there will be war, terror, misery. Before the bourgeoisie can really attain its revolutionary aims it must first be pushed by these masses, and then it must tranquilize them.

With this in mind, let us skip from July, 1789, to December 2nd, 1804. Many of the actors of that pregnantly predictive scene of 1789 are no more. Many of those armed thousands of that year have died as heroes and revolutionaries, martyrs on the streets of Paris and on the field at Valmy, or else they have died on foreign battle fields. Most of the leaders, too, whom these armed thousands erected on their shoulders, are gone. Some are temporarily forgotten. The very memory of some is still hated, and excoriated. Some of the living who were active spirits of that day are hunted by police, controlled by the ex-Jacobin and regicide, Fouché. The Marquis de La Fayette, that transitional man on horseback, sulks in exile: his fate was to be born too soon and too well. With new actors,

that picture is composed. The pieces are fitted together. The wills are "combined." The proper composition, in formal fact, occurs on the afternoon and evening of December 2nd, 1804.

France was tremendously prosperous. Her armies, forged from the Revolution, had inspired fear in all the feudal courts of Europe. The party of Order had triumphed and it had found the man who sealed this triumph, Napoleon Bonaparte. It had even partially restored the land of the aristocrats; and it had reactivated the church, using it as an agency or instrument of government. The French bourgeoisie was, in passing, more lavish with its distribution of the immaterial goods of life than it was with the material goods. It reserved most of the latter for itself. It, however, was generous in its distribution of these immaterial goods, and wished to reserve merely the privileges of atheism for itself. It had gained control of all of the instruments which affected and influenced the will of the nation: thus, it had managed to equate that will with its own interests and aims. In 1789 and again in periods until Thermidor, the men and women of Paris had expressed the will of the nation, not only in words, but in the streets with arms in hand: that will had been listened to, heeded. Now, even private correspondence was opened. The police agents of Fouché were ubiquitous. Celebrations of Bastille Day, great national festivals in honor of the nation, these were no longer wanted. No more was the red cockade worn. The Party of Order was now ready to permit the final act in the achievement of its political forms.

#### **Napoleon, Self-Crowned Emperor**

Napoleon Bonaparte called the Pope of Rome to Paris so that His Holiness might place on Napoleon's head the crown of Charlemagne. He waited for the arrival of the Pope with impatience. On the 25th of November, 1804, he wrote to Cardinal Fesch: "It is absolutely necessary for the Pope to accelerate his journey . . . the 2nd of December is my last possible date. If the Pope is not here by then, the coronation will take place, and the consecration will be deferred." The Pope came. Napoleon rode out to Fontainebleau to meet him, dressed in a hunting costume, surrounded by dogs and huntsmen. The Pope got out of his carriage, crossed the road and entered the carriage of Napoleon. Once installed in Paris, the Pope sometimes appeared alone on the balcony of the Tuileries, sometimes with Napoleon. When the latter was present, applause was always loudest. Meneval, the young man who succeeded Bourrienne as Bonaparte's secretary, tells us of those days in his *Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte*. When the Pope dined with Bonaparte, "Napoleon kept constantly giving him his hand." On December 2nd, the Pope went first to the grand cathedral of Notre Dame. He was, says, Meneval, "accompanied by a large retinue of priests and prelates, in magnificent robes, preceded by his cross-bearer, who was mounted on a richly caparisoned donkey. This monk, who wore on his head a broad-brimmed hat of a rounded form, carried a large gilt cross in his hands." Yes, how different this was from the spectacles of the early Revolution, for instance, from the festival in honor of the Supreme Being. And let us note: "It was three hours later that the Emperor followed the Pope . . . driving in a stage carriage glittering with plate glass and gilding, and laden with pages, who hung on the door, and before and behind. The pomp of the procession was in harmony with the grandeur of the occasion."

Many re-touches had been necessary before the picture of 1789 was, hereby, properly and finally composed. Now, the populace gazes awed, bewildered, amazed, seeing a spectacle

that was novel. The medievalism which it set out to destroy in 1789 was restored, but only formally. The spectacle was grand, but empty. And watching it, what different populace! No more do we see the nation with arms in hands. For now, the man on horseback and the man in the carriage had become one. His rule is secured.

And then, the solemn moment arrives inside of the Cathedral. The Pope of Rome holds the crown of Charlemagne in his hands. And the man who is to be crowned reaches out, takes the crown, places it on his own head. Bonaparte makes himself Napoleon I. "The Pope was reduced to the rôle of a mere spectator," commented Meneval. Next, Josephine knelt before her husband, and *he* placed a smaller crown upon her head. Tarlé, the Russian historian, speaks of this scene in his excellent biography, *Bonaparte*: "This gesture of placing the crown . . . upon his head with his own hands had a symbolic significance. He did not desire that undue importance should be attached to the Papal 'blessing.' The victorious soldier, born of the French Revolution, could not bring himself to accept the crown from anyone's hands but his own. . . ." This remark far from exhausts the symbolic significance of the scene. Napoleon was a new kind of Emperor—a bourgeois Emperor. The triumphant bourgeoisie—the class which had achieved its revolution, which knew what it wanted, the new master of society—it needed no Pope to bless its own authority. It merely needed a Pope as a spectator, as an appendage: it needed a Pope to console, to impress, to awe the sons and daughters of those men and women who had lined the streets in July, 1789, and who had stormed the Tuileries in August, 1792.

The snatching of the crown out of the hands of the legendary successor of Saint Peter had a still further significance. The

richest, the most powerful bourgeoisie of Europe, with its goods selling all over the continent, its armies knowing what it means to march in the capitals of the old world as conquerors, its art galleries and homes filled with the loot of Europe—what need had it to be given anything? It could take: it had taken. The man who represented this victory, this power, who represented a confident hope for the future—what need had he, either, to be given anything? He, too, could take.

And in Notre Dame—the very cathedral no longer belonged to the Pope and his hierarchy, but to the French state—Napoleon, self-crowned Emperor of bourgeois France, said: "I swear that I will govern with the sole purpose of securing the interests, the happiness and the glory of the French people."

According to Tarlé, there is a legendary story which tells us that, in the midst of all this pomp and glory, "Napoleon asked an old soldier of Republican convictions how he liked the celebration and received the startling answer: 'Excellently, Your Majesty. But it is a pity that there are lacking today 300,000 persons willing to lay down their heads to make similar ceremonies impossible.'"

Those willing to give their heads had sacrificed them: these heads had secured the Revolution. This new combination of wills—to revert to Tolstoy's language—could only come after these heads had fallen. The wills of the bourgeoisie of 1789 had envisaged one state of affairs: that of the masses of the people another. In essence, the wills of the bourgeoisie had been attained, practically, and then, formally. And with this composition of the picture, the new and self-crowned Prince of Glory established himself: the era of *la gloire* gave formal and public recognition to itself.

JAMES T. FARRELL.

(To be continued)

# Negroes in the Revolution

## The Significance of Their Independent Struggles

(The January, 1945, number of the NEW INTERNATIONAL carried the resolution of the National Committee of the Workers Party and the resolution of the minority of the committee on "Negroes and the Revolution." The following article is a discussion article on this question which is now being discussed in the Workers Party.—The Editor.)

The whole argument on the Negro Question revolves around our relationship to the independent struggles of the Negro masses. Com. Johnson in his resolution states:

The ideal situation is that the struggle of the minority group should be organized and led by the proletariat. But to make this a precondition of supporting the struggle of the non-proletarian, semi-proletarian or non-class-conscious groups is a repudiation of Marxist theory and practice. *Thus it is utterly false to draw the conclusion that the independent struggle of the Negro masses for their democratic rights is to be looked upon merely as a preliminary stage to a recognition by the Negroes that the real struggle is the struggle for socialism* (p. 16, col. 1).

Except for some vague phrases about the revolutionary

potentialities of the Negro masses, there is nowhere in Com. Coolidge, hemmed in by "narrow confines." He displays a dis-Negro mass struggle to the struggle of the whole proletariat. Com. Coolidge is most insistent upon the fact that

While even violent struggles may take place around such issues (equality), the aim of the WP must be to lead the struggle for democratic rights out of these *narrow confines*" (p. 9, col. 2. My emphasis.—F. F.).

Not only are these democratic struggles, according to Com. Coolidge, hemmed in by "narrow confines," he displays a disregard of their significance except to the degree that they are integrated into the general class struggle. It is his conception that:

The struggle for democratic rights must become and remain an integral part of the class struggle in the U. S. Negroes can attain the strength and confidence to break through the thick walls of Jim Crow to the degree that they are supported by and integrated into the working class and its organizations (p. 10, col. 2. My emphasis.—F. F.).

Are the tremendous struggles that the Negroes are carrying on today, despite the "national unity" called forth by the imperialist war, to be looked down upon because of the "narrow

confines"? Aren't the narrow confines in actuality the confines of the capitalist state from which the Negro masses will never break out except through breaking that state? In this struggle do they have a decisive role to play or can they not get to first base except as an integral part of the general class struggle?

The question of the effect of independent struggles of minority groups is not without a past, although Com. Coolidge seems to disregard that past. Here is what Lenin wrote:

The dialectic of history is such that small nations, powerless as an *independent* factor in the struggle against imperialism, play a part as one of the bacilli, which help the *real* power against imperialism to come on the scene, namely, the *socialist* proletariat.

Does or does not Com. Coolidge think that the Negro struggles in America are just such bacilli as Lenin refers to? What does he think brought about Executive Order 8802, the FEPC, the Ives-Quinn Bill? Doesn't *Labor Action*, week in and week out, stress the fact that it is the activity of the Negroes, their refusal to subordinate their demand for democratic rights to "national unity," their demonstrated hostility to this imperialist war, that forced these sops out of the capitalist state? What stimulated both the CIO and AFL to fight for the passage of the Ives-Quinn Bill? Here, too, wasn't it the activity of the Negro masses that brought about the united front between labor and the Negro? I should like to know from Com. Coolidge: does he or does he not accept Lenin's analysis of the significance of the struggles of minority groups? His Resolution is a veiled polemic against Lenin's views.

### "The Trade Unions or the WP"?

Here is how Com. Coolidge defines our task:

The WP does not consider the struggle for democratic rights *an end in itself*. The party does not look upon the Negro or mixed organizations formed for leading this struggle as *ends in themselves* to be *permanently* maintained and useful in all situations and in all circumstances" (p. 9, col. 1. My emphasis.—F. F.).

Whoever considered any struggle "an end in itself"? Why should any one wish to maintain any organization "permanently"? Com. Coolidge considers the "ordeal of agitation for democratic rights and the economic struggle" justified because it is the best means of bringing the workers "into class struggle and class consciousness." (p. 9, col. 1) Does he then consider the class struggle "an end in itself"? The final struggle against capitalism is not an "end in itself" but a struggle for socialism. What is an "end in itself"? Against whom is he arguing? He continues, as follows:

The masses of the Negroes today are triply deluded. They are beguiled by white politicians, traduced by the industrial overlords and misled by the Negro leaders, lieutenants of the politico-economic general staff of the bourgeoisie. Herein lies the danger of *uncritical support* of organizations, even the best of them, fighting for democratic rights. *The program of this leadership* does not include a struggle against capitalism, now or in the future" (p. 9, col. 2. My emphasis).

I should like to ask Com. Coolidge: what revolutionist ever gave *any* organization, not to speak of a non-Marxist one, its "uncritical support"? I should like to ask further: does the program of the trade union leadership envisage such a struggle against capitalism? And we do, don't we, enthusiastically support trade union struggle for immediate demands?

It is all the more impossible to make out what Com. Coolidge means since he does not carry the critical attitude that he has toward Negro organizations over to the trade unions. On the contrary. Here is what he writes:

The strategy and tactics of the revolutionists must be to liquidate the ideological influence of the present Negro and white leadership of the Negro masses and to replace this leadership with a militant leadership at least moving in the direction of class consciousness. Concretely, this could only be a leadership supplied from the *trade unions or the WP* (p. 9, col. 2. My emphasis—F. F.)

Now, why—to borrow an expression from Com. Coolidge—so "exalt" the trade unions as to elevate them to an equal plane with a *revolutionary Marxist political party, the WP*? A trade union is not a political party; its field is generally limited to economic struggles of an immediate nature, struggles that are hemmed in—to borrow another expression from Com. Coolidge—by "narrow confines." At the moment it has a class-collaborationist, pro-imperialist war leadership—all the attributes which make Coolidge distrust the Negro organizations. What, I repeat, causes the distinction in attitudes nevertheless?

Com. Coolidge is betrayed into this false position by the motive which drives him all through the Resolution to wipe away any significance that can be attached to the independent Negro struggle. We support the trade union struggle for immediate demands because, due to the workers' role in the process of production, this struggle leads them to a struggle against capitalism, despite the class-collaborationist program of their leadership. Likewise, the logic of the Negro struggle for immediate democratic rights will lead them to a struggle against capital and the state. The MOW, for instance, was a movement directed against the capitalist state. The Negroes were prepared to march on Washington. That is where they have to begin. In 1905 the Russian proletariat under the leadership of a priest marched to the Czar; that was the beginning of their wisdom. Com. Coolidge, however, plays down the role of the MOW, while at the same time exalting the trade unionist part of the leadership whose *program* is indistinguishable from that of the petty bourgeois leadership and whose *action* has bound the masses to the chariot of the capitalist state. Here is what he writes:

The MOW was at first visualized and advertised as a militant mass movement of protest against Jim Crow and discrimination. . . . The leaders of the MOW, however, *with the exception of Randolph*, being from Negro and Negro-white petty bourgeois organizations, with jobs to protect, soon turned the movement away from its militant beginnings into a sort of pacifist do-nothing organization. *Before* this stage was reached, however, most of the original Negro leadership in the MOW had withdrawn. (P. 10, col. 1. My emphasis—F. F.)

If, as is true, the petty bourgeois leadership had withdrawn *before* even it became a do-nothing organization, who then led it to the do-nothing stage? Com. Coolidge, in one breath, admits that the trade-unionist Randolph who remained the leader of the organization led it to this stage, and, in the next breath, writes "if it (a militant Negro organization) is to serve the interests of the masses of Negroes, such an organization *will have to be led* by militant Negro workers of the *trade union movement*." (p. 10, col. 1, my emphasis F. F.) Once again: why so exalt the trade union leadership? Isn't this the political consequence of belittling the *mass* activities of the Negroes?

### An Appeal to the Trade Unions or Fight Against the Bourgeoisie?

The crux of the matter lies in this: Com. Coolidge conceives of the struggle for democratic rights not as a *fight against* the bourgeoisie but as an *appeal to* the trade union movement. Here is how he expresses it:



The demand of the WP for social, political and economic equality for Negroes is not directed primarily at the bourgeoisie... The slogan is addressed directly to the white proletariat: to the white workers in the organized labor movement. (P. 10, col. 2.)

Who oppresses the Negro: is it the bourgeoisie or is it the white workingclass? Who deprives him of social and political equality? Is it the capitalist state? Or is it the organized labor movement?

It is true that there is a distinction *within* the ranks of the proletariat. It is this which motivated Trotsky to say that *to the Negro worker* the white worker appears as an oppressor. A revolutionary party, he counselled, should take that into consideration; it is one of the elements which makes of the Negro problem a special problem that cannot be merely "integrated" into the general class struggle. It is true, further, that the distinction within the proletarian ranks motivated Lenin to espouse a "duality of propaganda," one addressed to the proletariat of the *oppressing* nation which gains from the special oppression by its bourgeoisie of the *workers of the oppressed nation*, and the other addressed to the proletariat of the oppressed nation which suffered from a dual oppression. Education of the proletariat of the oppressing nation proceeds at all times, but at no time is the fact lost sight of that this consists not merely of an appeal to the proletariat but a struggle against capitalism and the state.

### The Negroes and the Trade Unions

Since World War I the Negro has experienced a phenomenal proletarianization and urbanization. In addition to this, he has, since the organization of the CIO, experienced a tremendous unionization. This, however, has not solved the Negro problem because the more integrated into the trade union movement, the more the Negro resents and struggles against his segregation outside of it. This is an organic part of the Leninist conception of the National Question. Com. Johnson has drawn from this the following conclusion:

*This dual movement is the key to the Marxist analysis of the Negro question in the U. S. A.* (P. 13, col. 1.)

For Com. Coolidge, on the other hand, this integration into the trade union movement is the straight road to the solution of the Negro problem, and he counsels:

The Negroes in the United States must lay their case before the trade unions. Not as outsiders seeking a united front, but from the inside as an integral and integrated part of the labor movement. (P. 10, col. 2.)

It is a fact, however, isn't it, that in Detroit, where the Negroes are most integrated into the trade union movement, the riots occurred? Precisely because the significance of this escapes Com. Coolidge, he falls into subjectivism. Duality of propaganda in his hands becomes a duality of blame. Where he does not blame the bourgeoisie for its "plots," he blames the Negro working class for its "delusion" and he appeals to the white proletariat "to wipe out the blot placed on labor's escutcheon by the shabby and shameful treatment labor has accorded the Negro since emancipation." (P. 10, col. 2) The greatness of the Bolshevik solution lies precisely in knowing *how* to meet the danger of the division in the labor movement. We go to meet it by class struggle, and by stimulating the independent mass activity of the Negroes and turning it against the bourgeoisie. There is no other way of avoiding a divided labor movement. Didn't the independent activity of the Negroes stimulate the UAW to fight for Negro housing in Detroit and have a united front with labor in the elections?

Independent mass activity of the Negroes is the best instrument for educating both white and Negro workers and mobilizing the white workers in the fight for Negro emancipation.

### The Party Policy

Com. Coolidge writes:

While the party is *positive and sincere* in its demands for Negro equality, urging Negroes to carry on the fight ceaselessly and relentlessly, the party has its own correct Marxian outlook and aims, the consolidation of the whole proletariat, irrespective of race, color or nationality. (P. 9, col. 1. My emphasis—F. F.)

Why, in a political resolution, is there need to offer assurances of the party's "sincerity" in the fight for democratic rights unless implicit in that resolution was a distrust of these struggles? Implicit, because our condescending attitude to these struggles, which we consider an "ordeal," is positively protruding through the assurances? Implicit, because Com. Coolidge gives with one hand and takes away with the other. Although he has stated that only "one totally ignorant of the dual disability of the American Negro" would wish to submerge the struggle for democratic rights in the general class struggle, he has also written:

We have said that *not even* the struggle for democratic rights can be divorced or separated from the class struggle. (P. 11, col. 2. My emphasis—F. F.)

Why then does there exist a special Negro problem and what is our attitude to the Negro organizations that try to deal with that problem? Com. Coolidge explains:

The WP will approach Negroes and Negro organizations with an appeal directed primarily to the proletarians. Our aim is to break the wage earners away from the stultifying, defeatist, class-collaborationist Negro leadership. This is the *first* step in creating a class rupture between the proletarians and the Negro leader clique, servitors of the white bourgeoisie. (P. 9, col. 2. My emphasis—F. F.)

The *first* step ought to be *to fight*. If the first step is not to fight, but to create a class rupture in these organizations, does or does not such a statement mean a declaration of war against these organizations? This is not a theoretical question, but one concerning practical action. Do we propose to make these organizations appendages to the revolutionary party? If that can be done, then why shouldn't they become an integral part of the revolutionary party? To maintain a separate existence under the circumstances that they are proletarian organizations and have adopted a revolutionary program would indeed be reactionary. If the *first* step in entering the organizations that fight for democratic rights of the Negro people is the creating of a class rupture between the proletarian Negroes and the "leader clique," then, of necessity, the party in actuality is demanding that these organizations accept our program as a *condition* for our support.

### The Negro Question as a National Question

The failure to recognize the objective validity of the Negro mass struggle; or recognize it in one paragraph and deny it in the next compels Comrade Coolidge to slip into an idealistic approach to the Negro question. He writes:

Two and a half centuries of bondage place a *stigma* on the Negro which even after several decades of freedom he has not been able to wipe away. (P. 7, col. 1. My emphasis—F. F.)

But what, Comrade Coolidge, is the *economic* root of this stigma? Isn't it true that for a "stigma" to be so persistent it must feed and nourish itself in economic roots deeply im-

bedded in the community? Could the "stigma" have persisted so long if the economic remains of slavery had not persisted? Of the thirteen million Negroes in America, nine and a half million are still in the South and the majority of these are sharecroppers. Lenin thought that *within the economic remains of slavery resided the economic roots of the Negro question*. In his study of *Capitalism and Agriculture in the United States*, Lenin found a "striking similarity" between the economic position of the American Negro and the Russian serf. Lenin stressed the fact that the Negro is "conditioned and developed by special economic relations" which follow him wherever he goes, whether on the plantation or in the factory, in the North or in the South. It is this in fact which motivated Lenin in his *Theses on the National Question* to single out the Irish and the American Negroes as examples of special oppression that required special methods of handling outside of the general struggle. It is the special oppression which has persisted through the industrialization and urbanization of the Negro and which has made the Negro conscious of his being a special "group" in the community that motivated Trotsky in 1939 to place the Negro question in the category of the National Question. Does Comrade Coolidge accept this interpretation?

In a Marxist organization like ours Comrade Coolidge should make clear: (1) What is his attitude to the Leninist conception of the Negro Question? (2) What is his attitude to Trotsky's conception of the Negro Question? (3) Does he believe that Lenin and Trotsky thought the Negroes were a nation and that this is the reason for the position they took? (4) Does he believe that they underestimated the rôle of the Negro proletariat and that is why they placed the Negro Question as part of the National Question, as they unmistakably did? (5) Or does he agree that they placed the Negro Question as part of the National Question because of their conception of the Negro struggle as an independent mass struggle? Bolshevism has always known that the avoidance of stating an attitude on these questions is in reality to repudiate them.

Comrade Coolidge's resolution confuses the party as to the significance of the position of Lenin and Trotsky on the National Question and makes impossible any understanding of the continuity of Marxist doctrine and its application to the developing situation.

### Conclusions

How, concretely, do the differences between the Coolidge and Johnson positions express themselves in the politics of today?

Comrade Johnson's resolution attaches enormous significance to the movement of the Negroes in Harlem, in Detroit, etc. It claims that these movements have initiated political activity among the organized proletariat. It claims, further, *that it is along these lines that the Negro struggle must and will develop*. It asserts that the best means of educating the Negro people in the realities of class politics is by means of encouraging organizations of these mass struggles. It states, further, that it is by means of this mass struggle that the organized labor movement, which is predominantly white, will realize that the Negro struggle is not merely a trade union question but one that requires political organization and extra-parliamentary struggles. The Johnson resolution claims that this is the way, both among the white proletarians and among the Negroes, to wipe away the possibility of inter-racial clashes which might disrupt the solidity of the labor move-

ment. It is along these lines that the propaganda and agitation of the party in its education not only of Negroes but of the white proletariat can do its best service.

Read the Coolidge resolution. It does not understand the significance of the mass struggles of the Negro people that excited such enormous interest and forced the bourgeoisie to pass bills, for the most part spurious. These can have value only if the masses of the Negroes continue to demonstrate their hostility to the degradation to which they are subjected. It is this which makes the Negro Question a special question. Without this there would be no need to discuss the Negro Question at all.

The consequence of Comrade Coolidge's resolution is, on the one hand, to foster the impression among the white workers that to the extent the Negroes come into the trade unions the Negro problem is in the course of being settled when in reality the whole problem gets more and more sharpened; and, on the other hand, it encourages among the white workers a disregard of the Negro struggle and its significance, thereby weakening both the Negro and the white proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie. It is this type of attitude which Comrade Trotsky feared when he wrote that, to the Negro, the white worker is an oppressor, and that, furthermore, to think that the Negro problem is not such a special problem as to make it part of the National Question was "a concession to the point of view of American chauvinism." His solution was not to turn the independent mass struggle into an appeal to the white proletariat, but a deepening and widening of that independent struggle.

It is perfectly true, of course, that the Negroes are dependent upon the white proletariat for ultimate victory. It is also perfectly true that the independent mass struggle of the Negroes has a fundamental contribution to make to the struggle of the proletariat and all the oppressed masses for socialism. There is no conception of this in the Coolidge resolution.

Merely to say that labor will "fix" it all is to say nothing. Labor has to "fix" all problems. The proletariat is the only cohesive revolutionary class in present-day society and no fundamental transformation of the social order can occur except under its leadership. But meanwhile the Negroes are in constant activity and organization (NAACP, Urban League, Garvey movement, MOW) on the basis of the fact that they are a nationally oppressed minority. It is up to the revolutionists to recognize that fundamental fact, to see that it is not merely a trade union question, nor even merely a question of grudging support of these democratic struggles, but of support and development of a powerful force, which, when it fights, as it must, leads inevitably to clash with the bourgeoisie and thereby makes it a part of the struggle for socialism.

F. FOREST.

**SUBSCRIBE TO**

**THE NEW INTERNATIONAL**

**\$1.50 PER YEAR**

# Some Questions of Clarification

## Scientific Socialism and the Labor Movement

[Editor's Note: The following discussion article answers criticisms directed at the authors of "Capitalist Barbarism or Socialism." (Supplement to THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, October, 1944.)

A French comrade has recently made the assertion: "The German comrades hold the point of view that the labor movement no longer exists in Europe. On this basis they have, in dealing with the national question, concentrated on the petty bourgeoisie and, so to speak, considered them the heart of the problem. We, on the contrary, have recognized the labor movement as the decisive and living factor, in the first place that section of it influenced by Stalinism. On this basis we orientated ourselves in the direction of the workers and their organizations, in which we saw the main strength. The *fundamental* difference between us and the Germans exists in these two different estimations."

The theme given by this assertion is actually of great importance for the entire movement and deserves clarification. We will, however, save the "fundamental" and other differences for a second article and limit ourselves to the following question: What is meant when the Germans speak of the non-existence of the labor movement?

### An Old Story

It is naturally not our fault if certain uninformed people do not know our point of view or even refuse to understand that which they have seen in black on white with their own eyes. But the fact remains that we have clearly stated what we mean by the "non-existence" of the labor movement ever since the civil war in Spain, when the last illusions about the Stalinist parties disappeared. What is at stake, therefore, is the résumé of an old story or the short, concentrated presentation of a view which has been developed many times in its most varied theoretical and practical aspects.

There is really nothing new in principle in the whole question of the non-existence of the labor movement. The heart of the question consists of nothing else but an insight into the necessity of *combining scientific socialism with the labor movement*. This insight embraces a problem which was not even "new" at the time Lenin made it the axis of his entire political plan and demonstrated its solution in his bitter struggle against the "Economists."

Anyone desiring to give his attention to this problem (and there is nothing more important today) must thoroughly study Lenin's writings of the "Iskra period," of the year 1908, and of 1920 ("infantile disorders"). He will then begin to recognize, in connection with the present difficulties, the striking similarity which exists between the tasks and situation of the Russian labor movement of that time and the tasks and situation of the world labor movement of today. Above all will he realize that the so-called *organization question* is a *thoroughly political question* and is bound up with a specific plan of action. If he then compares Lenin's organization and activity plan (one of the most important constituent parts of which deals with the question of the press) with the experiments in

all the rest of the world, he will further grasp the deep, the really "fundamental" difference which has also, for example, established itself, between bolshevism and . . . the Fourth International. Especially will he definitely note that there is a fixed and extraordinarily important side of political activity, the ignoring of which, in the view of Lenin, makes of all the politics of a working class party a joke, pure phrases, a lie, and—betrayal. If one withdraws from this side of the work (and that is the status of the Fourth) the building of a Bolshevik Party then becomes through this alone *fundamentally impossible*.

### What Was and Is "New"?

The main point of our view on the non-existence of the labor movement is, therefore, the old thesis of the necessity to combine scientific socialism with the labor movement. This thesis itself rests upon the separate existence of the two elements to be united. It states: the politically organized labor movement *as the representative of scientific socialism*—that is one thing. But a completely different thing, on the other hand, is the elementary, spontaneous, trade unionist or (in a word) *bourgeois* labor movement in all its forms. More sharply formulated: scientific socialism arises and exists outside of and independent of the *labor movement* (which is, naturally, something different than arises independent of the proletariat as a *social class*). Only when both are blended in organic unity does the *politically organized labor movement* arise as the conscious bearer of scientific socialism.

The beginning of an understanding of the question must, therefore, be made with the resolve to accept the Marxist-Leninist theory in the entire range of its significance: The proletariat is of and by itself (regardless of its unification and training in the process of capitalist production) not able to develop a genuine political or socialist consciousness. This consciousness (systematized as theory) must, rather, be injected into the labor movement from without through the practical-political, theoretical, propagandistic, organizational, etc., work of the revolutionary organization.

But the posing of the problem is simultaneously a statement of its permanent character. This means: to unify scientific socialism with the labor movement, to organize, foster and extend this unification, is a task which *always* exists, independent of the special historical conditions, as long as socialism has *not been achieved*. No conscious revolutionary is safeguarded against slipping back into bourgeois and, especially, petty bourgeois, conceptions in the course of revolutionary activity. This factor flows from the circumstances that bourgeois influence is just as enormous as the difficulty of overcoming it. It finds a thousand ways (by virtue of the pressure of surroundings) to daily and hourly influence the consciousness of the best and firmest revolutionists—it must, therefore, be daily and hourly controlled and overcome with regard to the revolutionists themselves. On this basis all revolutionary activity can be reduced to this fundamental demand: to tirelessly and stubbornly press back bourgeois influence both without and within one's own organization. At the same time one must remain aware that bourgeois ideology, on the

whole, will only be completely destroyed when socialism has been achieved.

In its essence, the matter of combining scientific socialism with the labor movement is therefore constantly a *new* task which arises in each concrete situation in a special and concrete way. Conversely, its constant character attests that once the aforesaid combination is established it can also be lost under specific historical conditions. It is exactly at this point that we must search for what is "new" in the objective situation as well as in our conception. We explained:

Given the necessary limitations which are established by the permanent character of the task, the Second and Third Internationals achieved the combination of socialism and the labor movement. This has been historically demonstrated (with the Russian Revolution as its result). But the same consideration shows us today that the Second and Third Internationals have also radically destroyed the same combination and thrown scientific socialism back upon its point of origin. It finds itself in complete isolation from the general labor movement which has just as completely ceased being a politically organized labor movement in the scientific sense. Insofar as it still exists, it is in the whole world *totally* under *bourgeois* and not socialist influence. Were it otherwise, the Fourth International would not have the least justification for existence and would have to (as previously: as a fraction in the Comintern) be content with the "reform" and extension of the existing connection. This, dear friends, is the unexpected and completely "new" result of a long development. The objective situation is historically *new*; the elementary task must be taken hold of *anew*; in the first place, the very consciousness about these facts is already *new*.

### Consequences for the Fourth International

The above has not yet exhausted what is "new" in our point of view. We naturally do not say in any way that an understanding of the actual situation and the resulting tasks is of itself a guarantee of success. But this much is clear: where an understanding of the task is missing, its solution is per se impossible. It is possible to cite a whole series of historical and other causes to explain the past impotence of the Fourth. Nevertheless the central cause can be just as well sought in its insufficient consciousness. This cause is already decisive by itself because it determines the future of the entire Fourth. It is therefore not a question of why the Fourth remained unsuccessful until now. It is rather a matter of explaining why the decisive prerequisites for such success in the future still are missing. The only explanation that suggests itself is the following:

If scientific socialism is forced to start again "from the beginning," then the neglect of the *consciously* proposed task has a grievous result. One no longer risks in the future the danger of losing the connection with the labor movement and sliding back into petty bourgeois utopianism. On the contrary, one is then forced to *make the beginning with a petty bourgeois consciousness*. No ever so correct "political line," no ever so proud program, no ever so fervently sworn principles can alter this. The conception of the "proletarian" revolution, the fundamental concept of a "bolshevik" party itself remains as the next consequence *petty bourgeois through and through*. The entire work assumes, of necessity, once more a thoroughly petty bourgeois and completely utopian character. Utopianism, for its part, is, with all its merits ("good intentions," idealism) and its weaknesses (helplessness, provincial narrow-

mindedness), the arena of petty bourgeois ideology even when in "proletarian" garments.

It should be clearly understood that the program, political analysis, principles, etc., of the Fourth are also correct even when one disputes questions of detail. However, missing consciousness remains responsible for a false fundamental conception (practically: plan of work) and must also inevitably corrupt the Fourth. The main consequence of its past activity therefore exists *in that the gap between scientific socialism and the general workers movement has not been bridged, but rather has been disastrously widened*. It can only do away with this state of affairs and rid itself of its petty bourgeois character through conscious insight and by making a turn. If it proves itself unable to do this then the history of scientific Socialism will have been enriched by one more futile attempt.

### The Reasons

It is simply childish to believe that one can have an "independent" consciousness or one free of class relations. But to believe that a correct consciousness in all relations to bourgeois surroundings is not decisive for the victory of the socialist cause is again and again petty bourgeois utopianism. It is in this circumstance that the colossal and overwhelming significance of the theory is anchored.

It is of extreme importance for a revolutionary organization therefore to also have an understanding of the manner in which correct consciousness comes about. No single individual (even no Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Trotsky) can have a correct understanding "in every instance" in all things. Correct consciousness is rather the result of a constantly progressing and changing process, of a consistent and contradictory movement, in which everything is constantly worn out and renewed without ever losing the general relationship. The correct understanding is accordingly never achieved individually but always collectively. To be sure: one must beware above all not to accept those well known caricatures, especially "proletarian" collectivism (cultivated by the Comintern and the SWP), as even being in any way collectivism. Collectivism has, for example, nothing to do with that grotesque concept that articles, resolutions, or theses must be written by twenty persons. Better in this case to adhere to the proverb: Many cooks spoil the broth. On the other hand, any individual can quietly sit down in his office and compose a resolution and (looking upon the few hundred members of "his" organization) imagine that he has on behalf of the collectivity expressed a collective point of view. The very possibility of such an imagination guarantees from the outset only one thing: the fact that the writer in question is an unusually backward, inexperienced, and uneducated element.<sup>1</sup>

"Proletarian" collectivism as such has only a single specific content. It consists in that a number of individuals putting aside their personal interests voluntarily join together in an organization to work on a common basis for a common cause. This organization strives above all to extend itself and its mutual activities to the entire workingclass and all progressive elements of society until the given objective aim is achieved and thereby every special organization is rendered superfluous. The content of the much misused concept of collectivity is not realized either through the philistine self-deception of

1. We do not here think of the American comrade, Warde, who, as an individual, is in no way unintelligent or uneducated. But we would like to say especially to him: An **individual** can, under certain conditions, write incomparably more correct theses than the head of a presumably "proletarian" organization of 100,000 or more members.

certain organization leaders nor through the gathering of twenty untalented writers around the same desk. It is only and solely realized through what is known in Bolshevik language as the "intellectual life" of the party.

Proceeding from the common basis, each individual then carries into the organization and its work that which he possesses in terms of talent, experience, knowledge, social ties, etc., and also in backwardness, prejudices, false concepts, and inevitable bourgeois notions. A wealth of social ties and the knowledge and experiences that flow from them; an universal intellectual life and the ability to continually cover new spheres in its activity and to assimilate new elements—these are the essential prerequisites for success. The entire process of activity presents itself as continuous attraction and rejection, addition and subtraction, generalization and selection, etc. Real collectivity can, above all, only come about where the party in actuality (and not in mere phrases) and consciously steers toward an all-embracing activity, i.e., is firmly determined not to exclude a single sphere of activity. But that is not yet all, for the question of real collectivity is bound up with the question of genuine understanding. An understanding that neglects any social relations cannot be complete and (corresponding to the objective conditions) cannot be correct.

And here is the decisive point: only when all these insights exist to begin with and determine the entire plan of action do the basic evils disappear from which the Fourth International almost hopelessly ails. We mean the petty bourgeois faith that a handful of, at best, well-meaning dilettants would be able, with the help of magic formulas, to overcome the colossus of bourgeois society and take over power. Petty bourgeois utopianism and petty bourgeois methods of work with all of its vices are the constant results of this belief (disguised as "faith in victory"). The thing looks quite different when in place of the socialism of the phrase the actual work in all social spheres appears. Nothing, but nothing is then considered secondary or unimportant.<sup>2</sup> The phrases and the shouting about the inevitable victory of the revolution (the SWP has a passionate love for the revolution . . . in Europe) disappears. Scrupulousness and seriousness replace bureaucratic dishonesty and evasions. The real task is worked at and actually solved in daily practice in detail (naturally under overwhelmingly enormous difficulties, the overcoming of which precisely is the proletarian revolution).<sup>3</sup>

Proceeding from the point of view here sketched, we had to consider factors in Europe which made important additions necessary. In Russia, Italy, and Germany, especially, scientific Socialism was not only separated from the general labor movement, but there Stalinism and Fascism had also *destroyed the general labor movement*. In varying degrees German fascism also accomplished this destruction in those countries which it conquered.<sup>4</sup> While hopeless metaphysicians saw the old labor

movement as good as "intact" in its activity in the form of the illegal remnants, the disorganized circles, the strikes, and, above all, in the activity of the well-financed agents of Stalinism, we saw the destruction of the old labor movement as the essential factor. We thereupon undertook to establish the *qualitative* character of the rising resistance movement, for the participation of the workers in it (no matter how large their number) of and by itself established nothing. The matter appeared to us in this manner: the greater the Stalinist "influence," so much greater the destruction of the general labor movement itself, so much more pressing its re-construction in its primitive form. Out of the total situation we therefore concluded that the resistance movement would be forced to assume the character of a *people's movement* and not a "proletarian" movement. This popular character of the movement was then also belatedly recognized by the metaphysicians of the proletarian revolution (including the SWP and Comrade Logan). To be sure, the force of the facts has until now not enabled them to clear up their confusion and move closer to the fundamental tasks.

### General Conclusions

Our point of view would not be complete without saying the following:

Nothing is more fatal and destructive in practice than the concept that in dealing with the followers of the Second and Third Internationals we are dealing with a following having "socialist" traditions and training. What is extremely important for our practice is the contrary knowledge, that the "socialist desires" of the masses and the same concept of single individuals changes nothing in the least in the *utterly bourgeois* character of this tradition.

It is a piece of the worst naïveté to characterize above all those scoundrels who since 1924 have become the decisive element in the Third International as the representatives of a socialist tradition or of a socialist education of masses or individuals. There may be well meaning and confused elements in large number in the Stalinist parties, but *no one* in those parties can have a "socialist" tradition in the non-bourgeois sense. A Stalinist, and were he a thousand times a "worker," is from the standpoint of political consciousness only an exceptionally backward element or—a gangster. Stalinism and other combinations mutually and radically exclude each other. One must treat this disease not only as bourgeois, but as bourgeois in its most perverted form, as something absolutely base and abject. And that which concerns this much-praised tradition itself: it is to such a degree petty bourgeois and omnipotent that it has to a great extent conquered the Fourth International and lead it to its present stage of impotence.

May the French comrade determine, after this, to oppose to a thought out point of view at least a *half way* thought out point of view.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISTS OF GERMANY.

2. Unimportant are basically only those petty bourgeois thoughts on the art and method by which one expounds the views accepted as correct "as such." It suffices completely for the furtherance of the development that one point of view is sufficiently established. The objections that still emerge can be settled through the "intellectual life" of the party which can only take place through criticisms, examinations, polemics, etc.

3. The petty bourgeois lives with the illusion that he carries the patent solution in his pocket. Classical formulations of the SWP: We have a "bold" program, "firm" cadres, etc. If anything should happen to us, we will "shift" the emphasis. The emphasis dealing with the defense of the European revolution against all its enemies lies ship-shape in drawer No. 2, directly next to the defense of the Soviet Union, to be found in drawer No. 1. Should we be sleepy or in the dark and grab the wrong drawer, it really makes no difference. We have a bold program and can at any time prove that the correct emphasis is to be found in drawer No. 2, directly next. . . .

4. The same applies today to the nations conquered by Stalin.

SUBSCRIBE TO

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

\$1.50 PER YEAR

# CORRESPONDENCE

## LETTER ON YALTA

Dear Editor:

Knowing you as I do, I'm sure you will welcome a bit of criticism of the *NI*. I refer to the appraisal of the Yalta Conference on the March issue.

"Power ruled... naked power... force will decide... force alone decides."

And who has this power? This force? Who is flushed with victory? Who has one trump card and another and still a third? STALIN!

What makes matters worse, to bolster the monotonous litany and deepen the political sin, there is dragged in the empirical profundities of Walter Lippmann and other writers for the *Herald Tribune* and the *Saturday Evening Post*.

Such a simplified pattern of reasoning may be expected from a Philip Simms or a James Wechsler. Should it be parroted by an exponent of "revolutionary Marxism"?

Certainly Stalin's troops may soon be in Berlin. Not so long ago Nazi armies scoured over most of Europe. Today the Nazis are being annihilated. Germany from east to west is a shamles. But Russia's best industrial and agricultural lands also are very thoroughly devastated. Many of the Soviet Union's largest and oldest cities are utter ruins and it will take years to rebuild the destruction wrought by the war.

It is needless to repeat that the Red Armies, to rout the invader, received not only armaments from the United States and Great Britain but food for themselves and the vast civilian population.

The number of Russia's casualties is not known, but it is estimated they exceed the combined total of the other belligerent nations. We must bear in mind, too, that Russia still asks for food from the United States, is getting it and must continue to receive it to prevent a famine that would make the bleak years after the last war seem like a picnic.

These are not idle speculations. They are the "confessions," though in more diplomatic language, of representatives and apologists of the Stalin bureaucracy. What, therefore, is more accurately a pinpoint picture of Russia—a picture shorn of all schematism—of bourgeois hogwash?

Russia is bleeding profusely. As conditions are, the Stalin bureaucracy can look only to Wall Street imperialists for raw materials, machinery, long-term credits, food and other forms of relief to help in the rehabilitation of a ravaged and pillaged country. It must feed 180 hungry millions, among them aged men and women, helpless orphans, incapacitated and incurable veterans by the millions. Trump cards, indeed!

Thus the overstrained observation by the *NI* that Stalin will be Eastern Europe's boss upon the close of hostilities and that a deal has been made by the Big Three on that basis is neither convincing nor original. Most of those high-salaried newspaper columnists and radio commentators who offer the "inside of the news" have been edifying their constituents with similar revelations for many months. But anyone who even casually checks their mental excursions knows that they are either fools or plain charlatans and that more often than not the prognostications of these "experts" have no relation to facts.

Would you say that Stalin remained silent while British

machine guns mowed down thousands of his own stooges because he wanted to demonstrate to the world the enormity of his strength? Of course you may say correctly that Stalin is an old and callous hand at slaughtering his comrades, but all such acts of murder are committed as a rule to save the Kremlin despotism. Hence the tragic drama in Greece reflected, if anything, not Stalin's "power," but his weakness.

In Rumania he has a "friendly" régime but he has not dared to tamper with the capitalist political or economic forms of government. And in Bulgaria his Red Army is helping to maintain the supremacy of the land barons over the peasantry and protecting the few remaining industrialists from the wrath of the masses.

As for Yugoslavia, Tito is unquestionably Stalin's flunkey. That is why the situation there is peculiarly interesting. Witness, for example, the recent pronouncement of Dr. Ivan Subastich, the country's Foreign Minister. I do not recall the exact words but the essence was to the effect that he wants for Yugoslavia the kind of government as exists in the United States because, he said, it became the richest and most powerful nation "through its brand of democracy." What is good for the United States is good for Yugoslavia, he concluded. Not only was this a sharp and unqualified slap at Stalinism, but what followed his statement was even more impressive. Tito gave the word to the Stalinists to end their criticism of the government and be quiet. More Stalinist power!

At this point a few words about the late Roosevelt will not be amiss. Not only did he know what was in the best interests of American "democratic" capitalism, but he always placed first and above all the welfare of the ruling class and he was by far its ablest spokesman. Nothing that happened since his death has changed the aspirations of American imperialism and his successor is himself no novice at representing Wall Street's aims. What are these aims?

It would be needless to emphasize here that Wall Street wants economic hegemony over Western Europe and the Pacific areas, as well as the Orient. Yes, and American imperialism seeks financial domination over Eastern Europe, too.

The United States is today the world's only creditor nation and native big business knows that all countries, large and small, look to it for assistance. Grant to American imperialists a monopoly over foreign trade and they are content to let the other powers fret and haggle over territorial boundaries. That always has been and continues to be the rôle of U. S. diplomacy.

The late President had said publicly that he favored extradition of German slave labor for reconstruction projects in Russia. Undoubtedly Truman is of the same view. How would that circumstance affect this country? The more manpower Russia can muster for work, the more raw materials and machinery she would require from the United States.

It should be obvious that Donald Nelson, Eric Johnston and other big business leaders did not visit the Soviet Union for their health or to inspect the Moscow subway.

As an experienced and foresighted politician, Roosevelt patently must have known that Stalin's imported slave-labor program, while a boon to U. S. business, would win for the Kremlin despot the undying hatred of the majority of the German workers and middle class.

There is no denial that it is not the United States which seeks help for survival from Russia, but that the precise opposite happens to be the case. The Soviet Union is the needy borrower, the U. S. the shrewd, cold, calculating lender. Is that

significant and all-important factor another indication of Stalin's "force" and "power"?

### Twilight of the British Empire

But what about Great Britain and Churchill, "who slumps lower in his chair at each succeeding conference"?

According to the *NI*, the decadent British Empire is tottering, is on the verge of collapse, is in the twilight of its existence and what-not. The number of prophets who in the last decade predicted the imminent fadeout of the Empire, mounts to Lend-Lease figures. Yet each time that John Bull seemed to be down for the count, he bounced back to his feet and sent fists flying in all directions.

True, Great Britain is financially bankrupt. However, she was insolvent at the close of the last war. Nevertheless, she managed to annex some German colonies and when, in the 1930's, the crisis seriously dislocated U. S. economy, Britain was forging ahead and enjoying one of the most prosperous periods in her history.

Churchill's words about being appointed not to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire were uttered not for their rhetorical effect.

What he said was a studied forerunner to Foreign Minister Eden's more recent assurance to the House of Commons that the conquered Africa Empire would not be returned to Italy! In that statement reposes much of the question of victors' spoils.

Italian Somaliland and Eritrea are rich in stock-raising, agriculture and the production of oil, gum, hides, kapok and ivory. Somaliland produces half of the world's supply of incense. Large sections of Libya could be made fertile and there is plenty of room for industrial development and exploitation of native labor. Tripoli and Cyrenaica could be sliced up between Britain and France. Britain's troops patrol all these vanquished lands.

Is it any wonder then that Churchill is so magnanimous to Stalin in the case of Poland? The Tory Prime Minister is most willing to drop a crumb into Stalin's hand, while he takes a truckload of loot. Besides, should anyone condemn Britain for another example of imperialistic robbery, Churchill could point an accusing finger at Stalin and exclaim: "He started it!"

In a word, Churchill is not groveling before any of the looters. The only thing that could dismember the British Empire is widespread revolution and the prospects for that are not any too bright. But such an eventuality would also topple the Kremlin bureaucracy.

Ergo, Stalin retains the same power he had before the outbreak of war, to wit: his OGPU still watches, terrorizes and holds in miserable subjection Russia's workers and peasants. And Stalin still hovers on the horizon as the Jehovah of the Browderites and their prototypes abroad. For the rest, all the talk of any newly-gained decisive power by Stalin is just flagrant guesswork.

To conclude, the foregoing is intended only as a reply to certain parts of the *NI* article and should not be construed as an attempt to fashion a complete thesis on Yalta.

J. C.

## REPLY TO LETTER

The editors welcome criticism of the *NEW INTERNATIONAL*. The writer of the above letter says many things that are true, but they are not applicable to the question at issue. Thus it is true that Russia has suffered great economic losses and that the economic power of the United States will, *in the long run*, exercise its influence on Russian aims. But at Yalta, the decisive forces were the positions of the armies. Since the article and the letter were written, what have we seen? The Russian army is actively setting up puppet régimes all over Eastern Europe.

What is it that keeps the Lublin government in possession of Poland? The Russian army. Not only is Stalin in Poland. He shows every intention of staying there. The conferees at Yalta understood all this pretty well. What else ever rules at an imperialist conference but force? Not force in general, however, but the co-relation of forces at a particular place and at a particular time.

Our correspondent says that Stalin has not dared to overturn capitalist relations in Romania. Exactly. Stalin knows his strength and he knows his weakness. It is to be presumed that he would like nothing better than to have one large area incorporating half of Europe directly into his régime. But that would precipitate an infinite amount of trouble from all sides. He carefully refrains from such provocative action.

The internal situation in Yugoslavia or elsewhere is not in question in the *NI* article. That is a separate topic. We dealt specifically with the imperialist intrigues and maneuvers at the Yalta Conference. Tito's adventure (and misadventure) at Trieste shows that the Anglo-American imperialists have clear ideas as to how far they can allow Stalin to go.

Our correspondent seems to think that Stalin feels some responsibility for the Stalinists in the various countries and that he allowed thousands to be massacred by Churchill in Greece because of weakness. We do not think so at all. Stalin did not see any necessity for intervening officially in Greece because Greece at the moment was not a vital interest of Russian foreign policy. If it was to his interest to do so he would have joined Churchill in shooting down some more thousands of the brave but misguided Greeks who trusted the Stalinist party. He did it in Spain.

We do not believe in the stability of the British Empire. We do not say that it will collapse tomorrow. What we do say, however, is that, despite its participation in the victory, it has received and is receiving tremendous blows which continually weaken it on the world arena and, therefore, definitely, at home. France too won a great victory in World War I. In the world that followed it could not hold that position. Without United States support, where would Britain be today? And the support of the United States is a strangle-hold.

To conclude. The balance of power in Europe is altered. Russia is the greatest benefactor. Britain is the greatest loser. Yalta sealed that. In the world market in general the United States possesses enormous power. At another stage, this power can be more effective than it was at Yalta. What course will the Japanese war take? There is the all-important question of the revolutionary intervention of the masses. We take up these different aspects at different times but we think that our thesis about Yalta as an imperialist conference was more rather than less correct.—The Editors.

# LABOR ACTION BOOK SERVICE

114 West 14th Street, New York 11, N. Y.

The following books and pamphlets may be ordered from the Book Service prepaid. Prices include postage. Make checks payable to Labor Action.

## KARL MARX

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Capital—three volumes, per volume       | \$3.00 |
| Selected Works, two volumes, per volume | 3.00   |
| Poverty of Philosophy                   | 1.25   |
| Letters to Kugelmann                    | 1.00   |
| Critique of Gotha Program               | 1.00   |
| Critique of Political Economy           | 1.50   |
| Value, Price and Profit                 | .25    |
| Wage Labor and Capital                  | .10    |
| Communist Manifesto                     | .10    |
| Civil War in France                     | .25    |
| Eighteenth Brumaire                     | .60    |
| Revolution and Counter-Revolution       | .60    |
| Founding of the First International     | .50    |

## F. ENGELS

|                                   |                        |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| On Capital                        | 1.25                   |
| Socialism, Utopian and Scientific | Paper .25<br>Cloth .60 |
| Origin of the Family              | .75                    |
| Housing Question                  | .75                    |
| Anti-Duhring                      | 2.50                   |
| Dialectics of Nature              | 2.50                   |
| British Labour Movement           | .15                    |

## MARX AND ENGELS

|                                   |      |
|-----------------------------------|------|
| Correspondence of Marx and Engels | 3.25 |
| Civil War in the United States    | 3.00 |
| Revolution in Spain               | 1.75 |
| Reactionary Prussianism           | .20  |

## N. LENIN

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Selected Works—12 volumes (\$2.75 per vol.)                                      |      |
| Vol. 1—The Prerequisites of the First Russian Revolution                         |      |
| Vol. 2—The Struggle for the Bolshevik Party                                      |      |
| Vol. 3—The Revolution of 1905-07   |      |
| Vol. 4—The Years of Reaction and of the New Revival                              |      |
| Vol. 5—Imperialism and the Imperialist War                                       |      |
| Vol. 6—From the Bourgeois to the Proletarian Revolution                          |      |
| Vol. 7—After the Seizure of Power  |      |
| Vol. 8—The Period of War Communism   |      |
| Vol. 9—New Economic Policy: Socialist Construction                               |      |
| Vol. 10—The Communist International  |      |
| Vol. 11—The Theoretical Principles of Marxism                                    |      |
| Vol. 12—Theory of the Agrarian Question  |      |
| Collected Works—Vol. 19—Writings on the National Question and the Labor Movement | 2.50 |
| What Is to Be Done?  | .50  |
| State and Revolution   | .30  |
| Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky                                      | .30  |
| Religion   | .15  |
| Teachings of Karl Marx   | .15  |
| Imperialism  | .30  |
| Left-Wing Communism  | .25  |
| War and the Second International   | .20  |
| War and the Workers  | .10  |
| Two Tactics  | .30  |
| Paris Commune  | .20  |
| Threatening Catastrophe  | .20  |
| Will Bolsheviks Retain Power?  | .15  |
| Foundation of the Communist International  | .10  |
| Letter to American Workers   | .05  |

## LEON TROTSKY

|                                 |                            |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| The New Course                  | Paper \$1.50<br>Cloth 2.00 |
| Third International After Lenin | 2.00                       |
| Case of Leon Trotsky            | 2.00                       |
| Lessons of October              | 1.00                       |
| Whither France?                 | 1.00                       |
| Their Morals and Ours           | .20                        |
| Stalinism and Bolshevism        | .10                        |
| Leon Sedoff                     | .10                        |
| I Stake My Life                 | .05                        |
| Fascism—Compilation             | .15                        |

## DIETZGEN

|                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| Positive Outcome of Philosophy | 2.00 |
| Philosophical Essays           | 1.50 |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| GATES—Incentive Pay                                  | .05  |
| GORDON—Workers Before and After Lenin                | 1.50 |
| GUERIN—Fascism and Big Business                      | 1.00 |
| HUBERMAN—Labor Spy Racket                            | .25  |
| JUDD—India in Revolt                                 | .25  |
| KAUTSKY—Social Revolution                            | .60  |
| LIEBKNECHT—Memoirs of Karl Marx                      | .60  |
| LUND—Plenty for All                                  | .10  |
| LUXEMBURG—Reform or Revolution                       | .25  |
| MINTON & STUART—Men Who Head Labor                   | .25  |
| MORROW—Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Spain    | .50  |
| NEARING—The American Empire                          | .35  |
| NORTHROP—Organized Labor and the Negro               | 1.75 |
| PANNOKOEK—Marxism and Darwinism                      | .10  |
| PLEKHANOV  |      |
| Anarchism and Socialism                              | .60  |
| Fundamental Problems of Marxism                      | 1.50 |
| Essays in Historical Materialism                     | 1.00 |
| Materialist Conception of History                    | .15  |
| Role of the Individual in History                    | .20  |
| ROCHESTER—Lenin on Agrarian Question                 | 1.75 |
| SERGE—From Lenin to Stalin                           | .50  |
| SHACHTMAN  |      |
| China in World War II                                | .10  |
| For a Cost-Plus Wage                                 | .05  |
| SIMONS—Class Struggle in America                     | .10  |
| VARGA & MENDELSON—New Data for Lenin's "Imperialism" | 1.75 |
| OUTLINE OF ECONOMICS (Plebs)                         | 1.00 |

## FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| War and the Fourth International        | .10 |
| Manifesto to Workers & Peasants (India) | .05 |

## NEW INTERNATIONAL

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Bound Volume, 1942 | 2.50 |
| Bound Volume, 1943 | 2.50 |
| Bound Volume, 1944 | 2.50 |

## LABOR ACTION

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Bound Volume, 1942 | 2.50 |
| Bound Volume, 1943 | 2.50 |
| Bound Volume, 1944 | 2.50 |

The Book Service will also obtain for you at list price all current books in print. Orders should be prepaid.