

Fourth International

American Youth and Foreign Policy

By James P. Cannon

Economics of the Atlantic Pact

By Michel Pablo

The Future of the Soviet Union

*By a Recent Revolutionary Refugee
from Stalin's Russia*

First English Publication:

Tolstoy, Poet and Rebel

By Leon Trotsky

May-June 1951

25c

Manager's Column

It's not easy nowadays to build up a comprehensive Marxist library. Many important books have never been translated into English. Others have long been out of print. Browsing around the second-hand book stores in New York, which is one of our secret ways of relaxing, we notice that even some of the outstanding classics like the second and third volumes of *Capital* have become scarce.

One of the reasons for this is that the outfits which used to be the main source of publication no longer supply the market. The Social Democratic press long ago lost professional interest in anything that does not toe the line of the State Dept. propagandists. The Kremlin shot the authors of many valuable works as "fascist mad dogs" and naturally stopped printing their books in order to avoid the inevitable question, "How could such authors, who helped found the Soviet Union, end up before Stalin's firing squads unless they were framed up?"

Pioneer Publishers, operating on a small budget, does its best to provide the works of Leon Trotsky and his adherents, which are of burning importance to the labor movement today, in meeting the great political problems of our time, but is unable to finance a more ambitious publishing program.

Besides the scarcity of supply, however, something else is beginning to operate: the market for Marxist works is widening. Leon Trotsky expected this to happen in America. A year or two before his death, he observed that when the United States finally feels the full impact of the death agony of capitalism as a world system, the American workers will turn to Marxism for an explanation and a program and we can expect to see the popularity of Marxist works grow by leaps and bounds.

Up to now no capitalist publisher has managed to look far enough past his prejudices to see the potential market or even the existing market. That's understandable enough although it is hard to determine whether it's the result of short-sightedness or far-sightedness.

The moral of this is that when a reprint of an old book

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Volume 12 May-June 1951 No. 3 (Whole No. 110)

Published Bimonthly by the
Fourth International Publishing Association

116 University Pl., New York 3, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 5-7460.
Subscription rates: U.S.A. and Latin America \$1.25 for 6 issues; bundles, 20c for 5 copies and up. Foreign and Canada: \$1.50 for 6 issues; bundles 21c for 5 copies and up.

Reentered as second class matter April 4, 1950, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Managing Editor: **GEORGE CLARKE**
Business Manager: **JOSEPH HANSEN**

CONTENTS

WORLD IN REVIEW

MacArthur's Dismissal	67
Labor Leaders Return	68
Bevan's Resignation	70
Latest Stalinist Line	71
Youth and Foreign Policy..By James P. Cannon	72
Future of the USSR	77
Yugoslavia and Shachtmanites	
By George Breitman	84
Economics of Atlantic Pact...By Michel Pablo	85

ARSENAL OF MARXISM

Tolstoy	By Leon Trotsky	90
May Day Manifesto of FI		95

does appear or a new book makes it over the hurdles, you only cut your own throat thinking it doesn't matter if you don't get your copy right away. It's surprising how little time it takes to exhaust an edition. And those who do convert their depreciating money into a Marxist book find they've not only invested in some rich evenings of reading but also salted something away for the future.

All this was driven home to us the other day when a book dealer unlocked one of his cases and brought out one of his precious items, a small paper-bound book by Leon Trotsky, *Germany, What Next?* He wanted \$10 for it. He let us touch a little pamphlet by Trotsky, *Communism and Syndicalism*, now listed at \$2.50. When we offered \$2.25 with the idea of making a quarter, he put it back like

he'd been insulted, and he's the kind that doesn't insult easy.

Thinking it over, we didn't wait another day. We lined up with the "wise" money and bought two copies of *The Jewish Question* by A. Leon which has just been released by Pioneer Publishers. The one copy is for our own library, the other for sale when Pioneer Publishers exhausts the first edition and the collectors move in for the kill. This should be enough of a tip-off. The paper edition is only \$1, cloth \$1.50. The address is 116 University Place, New York 3.

While you're making out the money order you might as well get your copy of the 1948-49 bound *Fourth International*. This item is still only \$5, which is a bargain as it includes all the issues for two years bound together with an index. That's more than 600 pages of articles by the world's leading Marxists, a real mine of information on politics, economics, history, trade union problems, the struggle for Negro equality, Wall Street's war drive, and the Socialist solution to the problem of peace.

Earlier volumes are available as far back as 1938 although some of them are now pretty scarce. Here are the prices: 1947, \$4.50; 1946, \$5; 1945, \$5; 1944, \$7; 1943, \$8; 1942, \$8; 1940-41, \$15; 1939, \$15; 1938, \$15. These volumes are one of the major sources in English for the rare and important shorter writings of Leon Trotsky and other prominent figures of the revolutionary socialist movement.

* * *

Fourth International has a broad circle of readers in America who fully realize the important function it fills in expounding and developing Marxist theory. They are its ardent partisans. But we often think that perhaps the theoretical magazine of American Trotskyism is appreciated even more abroad. That's the impression we get at least from letters like the following one from Edinburgh, Scotland:

"The *Fourth International's* analysis of international affairs and current events is the best and soundest I have yet read and the material contained in the pamphlets is most interesting and illuminating. I find myself becoming more and more interested in Trotskyism."

Subscribe

Keep up with the Marxist interpretation of the big events shaping our world by reading *Fourth International* regularly. To make sure you don't miss a single copy, fill out the coupon and mail it in today.

Fourth International
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

I want to subscribe to *Fourth International*. Enclosed is \$1.25 for six issues; \$2.50 for 12 issues.

Name

Street

City

State Zone

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME XII

MAY-JUNE 1951

NUMBER 3

WORLD IN REVIEW

MacArthur's Dismissal and Its Real Significance -- The Labor Leaders' Return to the Defense Agencies -- Aneurin Bevan's Resignation from the British Labor Government -- Togliatti and the Latest Stalinist Line

MacArthur's Dismissal and Its Real Significance

A Senate committee has spent more than a month investigating the reasons for MacArthur's sensational dismissal. The investigation is still going strong and hundreds of thousands of words giving verbatim reports of the hearing, including the testimony of MacArthur himself, of General Marshall, of General Bradley, etc., are filling the pages of the daily press. The senators are discovering what any attentive observer already knows. The main reason for his removal as American pro-consul in the Far East is that his bluntness and rashness threatened the entire skein of U.S. foreign policy, the loss of all allies vital to its plans for war against the USSR and the "communist world."

The sweep of the Chinese revolution, that drove Chiang Kai-shek off to Formosa despite the billions of dollars of help he got from Washington, rallied the masses of Asia to the new China's side. The old European powers have had to take this fact into account if they wanted to retain the slightest economic fruits of their age-long colonial hold over that continent. These same powers have had to face wide-spread sympathy among their own working classes with the revolutionary aspirations of the Asian masses, as well as resistance to being dragged into atomic war.

MacArthur's dismissal is thus in a very real sense a product of this world-wide resistance to imperialism. The former satrap refused to take this sentiment into account in his splendid isolation at the Dai Ichi. The hard-headed war planners in the Pentagon and the State Department diplomats could not avoid facing it every day.

The course of the Senate hearings, however, has revealed that, so far as the main practical aspects of foreign

policy and military strategy in the Far East are concerned the differences between MacArthur and the administration are small and dwindling. General Marshall has come out as strongly for keeping Formosa out of China's hands as the partisans of MacArthur could have desired. Both he and the State Department's Mr. Rusk have made it plain that the United States does not countenance recognizing the Peiping Government or tolerating its admission into the U.N. And even as the hearings were unfolding, an American military mission was stepping up aid in equipping the forces of Chiang Kai-shek. The economic blockade of China has been pushed through the U. N. Their whole argument boils down to the question: Is the bombing of Manchuria and the *naval* blockade of China's coast advisable at present?

It appears that what the Pentagon and the White House objected to in MacArthur's policy was not so much its essence as its *timing*. MacArthur, as General Bradley put it, wanted "the wrong war, with the wrong enemy, in the wrong place, at the wrong *time*."

The key to an understanding of the administration's diplomacy in contrast to MacArthur's sabre-rattling was furnished by General Marshall when he explained to the Senators at the hearings why he had sponsored a coalition between Chiang and Mao Tze-tung during his mission to China in 1946. It was a "*temporizing* proposal," Marshall said, to save an "impossible situation"—a situation in which "a military power" (Chiang's army) was being rapidly chewed up by an irresistible revolution.

In other words, the projected coalition was a maneuver to cheat a revolution which at the time could not be defeated head-on. All of the U.S.-backed "peace" proposals in the U.N. throughout the Korean war have to be understood in this same light. Namely, as proposals to give the imperialists more time to mount their "Operations Killer." Indeed, that is how the entire foreign policy,

the entire scheme of war preparations at home as well as abroad has to be understood.

It has also become clear that the Marshall Plan "for the rehabilitation of Europe," the Point Four program "for economically backward countries," even the "Fair Deal" platform at home have been part of this same smoke-screen for militarization. Under its cover the men of Big Business and their generals aimed to gain time to hatch their plans of world conquest. All these fine plans, programs and platforms were designed from the first to trick the peoples, whom they were alleged to aid, into support of the military aims of U.S. capitalism.

The Korean war, and the head-on challenge of the Asian peoples linked up with that war, have revealed the true face of U.S. imperialism to a considerable extent. The armaments program has come out into the open, the pace of war mobilization has been stepped up. But the policy of "temporizing" expressed in Washington's program of "containment" has not been altogether abandoned. That is the meaning of the MacArthur dismissal made evident by the Senate hearings.

To be sure, instead of proposing coalitions, Marshall and his friends now propose to gain time by means of a "limited" war in Korea which has already cost several million lives and the destruction of most of that country in less than a year. They consider Western Europe, not the Far East, as the main theatre of military preparations and operations and want to concentrate their forces there. They want to avoid an immediate outbreak of World War III, which the Generals testify cannot fail to bring atomic destruction to the heart of the U.S.A. itself. They want time to prepare the industrial machine for full war production capacity.

What hope do they hold out for averting global war? Here is the best prospect that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, could give the senators in arguing for this policy: ". . . Maybe the man following Stalin will have a falling out with somebody else and by some kind of turnover we will have a condition where they will abandon their presently announced intention." (Naturally, in Bradley's opinion, that intention is to "rule the world.")

This bit of wisdom is borrowed from the fountainhead of ruling class policy these days, from Winston Churchill, who has repeated it on a number of occasions. All their hopes for averting war are concentrated on an accident in the Kremlin. And this is a measure of the dilemma of the Western imperialists. They want to rally the masses of the world behind them against the totalitarian bureaucracy in Moscow. But the masses, as in China, have their own solutions which do not at all coincide with Washington's plans and schemes (any more than with Moscow's). Their revolutionary aspirations and independent actions upset these schemes and undermine the whole system of imperialism.

Hence the imperialists' only real faith is placed on some change of personnel, some shake-up in the Stalinist bureaucracy. Some such miracle, they hope, will give them a new lease on life, a means to curb the spreading anti-

imperialist upsurge and to fasten their domination on the world once more while sparing them the maximum risk—the risk of their own skins that all-out war with atomic weapons entails.

To the increasingly restive public, such speculations are hardly calculated to inspire confidence. On the contrary. The MacArthur hearings have not halted the growing distrust of the American people for the administration's foreign policy or lessened the unpopularity of the Korean slaughter. Every poll taken continues to show a rising demand for peace. As the first steps for positive action in this direction, the Socialist Workers' Party has out forward the following program:

1. Stop the war now. Don't let it spread!
2. Withdraw all American troops from Korea!
3. Recognize the government of the new China!
4. Let the American people vote on the issue of war and peace in a national referendum!

Labor Leaders' Return to Washington Window-Dressing

When the labor leaders walked out of Truman's mobilization setup on Feb. 28, they vowed never again to serve as "window dressing" for the "Big Business dominated" war program. But by April 30 they had accepted a rotten compromise and were back in the fold.

Even in the statement issued by the United Labor Policy Committee announcing their return to the government agencies, there is little to justify their decision to make peace with the administration.

"In the two months since labor withdrew from defense posts, a significant change of attitudes has taken place in Washington. Considerable progress has been made in correcting unjust and unworkable procedures, but much remains to be done," the statement reads.

The ULPC hastens to add, "We do not want to give the impression that the United Labor Policy Committee is now satisfied with all defense policies or programs. On the contrary, further fundamental improvements are imperative. The cards are still stacked against the consuming public."

The major demands made on Feb. 28 by the ULPC as the basis for the return of the union leaders to government posts were these:

1. Genuine price control.
2. An end to the wage-freeze.
3. Tax the rich instead of the poor.
4. Stop runaway rents.
5. An adequate low-cost housing program.
6. Stop control of Washington government agencies by Big Business.
7. Check profiteering.
8. A strong Federal FEPC law.
9. Participation of labor in the mobilization program as "full partners."
10. A wage stabilization board that could handle labor disputes as well as economic matters.

All the labor spokesmen gave far more weight to the

first 8 points than to the last two. And their union publications laid more stress on the economic demands than upon the organizational demands.

But they finally settled for nothing more than some meager concessions on the last two points.

The April 30 statement of the ULPC read, "The creation of the National Advisory Board on Mobilization Policy has made it possible for representatives of the general public, labor and agriculture — as well as business — to participate in major policy-making at the top level. . ."

They neglected to point out that this newly constituted board is headed by the same Big Business chief Charles E. Wilson, whose domineering attitude toward the labor leaders and open support of the interests of the big corporations was one of the major grievances of the union heads in their split from the government agencies.

The truth is that the new mobilization board differs from its predecessor in only one respect; it is empowered to report directly to Truman. Thus the basic change in the powers of the labor leaders was that they are now "granted" an audience by Truman, whereas before the revolt they couldn't get his ear. They can now "advise" at will. But this is a far cry from their demand to be treated as "full partners."

On the question of the authority of the Wage Stabilization Board, the ULPC got another "concession." They had demanded that the board be empowered to handle and make binding decisions on all matters of "contractual relations." This would enable the labor movement to force through a policy at the level of the top administration to authorize and enforce union shop, check-off contracts in all basic industry and to place matters of union security and stability before a Truman-appointed body for decision.

This, they hoped, would bring a return to the Roosevelt War Labor Board days when check-off agreements were ordered by the WLB, as a sop to the union bureaucrats in exchange for their consent to the wage-freeze.

But the new WSB has no real power to order union security in contracts. It can only "advise" on matters involving labor disputes. This slight concession, agreed to by Truman, is all the ULPC got. Everything else remains as before.

Why did the labor bureaucracy settle for such insignificant handouts?

The miserable compromise serves to clarify the original motives behind the union leaders' angry walkout.

It is now clear that the labor leadership was strongly impelled to fight for more recognition and reward for their services in supporting the administration as the representatives of 16,000,000 organized workers. They have become far more conscious of their political power, especially since the 1948 presidential election in which labor's vote was decisive. These men who felt they were entitled to play an important role in government, were treated too much like flunkies. Their protest was not directed toward an independent course, but toward fuller, more formal acceptance in the coalition with the Democratic administration.

To a labor bureaucracy which has begun to understand the power of the organizations upon which they rest, "recognition" of this type is of prime importance. They

want to be "accepted" as men of stature, as "statesmen," politically and socially equal to the capitalist masters who actually run the government.

Yet they have not achieved even this limited objective through the compromise. They now have the right to talk to Truman directly as members of the National Mobilization Advisory Board. But they have been given no additional powers, and the board itself is still dominated by Big Business.

In order to fulfill their ambition to rise as national political figures, the labor bureaucrats must maintain the union base from which they draw their power. That was the basic motive behind their demand that the WSB handle contractual matters and lay the groundwork for a government policy insuring the existence and opportunity for growth of the union movement. But they received little but a gesture on this demand.

This two-month revolt, ending in an abject capitulation, adds to an understanding of the U.S. labor bureaucracy. It wants more political power and it wants to safeguard the union base; but it is politically stultified and still strongly tied to the capitalist political machines.

However, things are not quite the same as before the walkout. The sharp break with Truman's domestic policies, and the heated statements and publicity going with them, have left an indelible mark on the labor movement and upon the American political scene. The walkout undoubtedly served to further undermine the workers' confidence (if you can any longer call it that) in the Truman administration, already badly shaken by the anti-war sentiments brought on by the Korean debacle.

Some union bureaucrats, especially the social-democratic types around David Dubinsky, head of the International Ladies Garment Workers, and Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, are speaking more and more about a labor party. The sentiment for independent labor political action is simmering throughout the labor movement. This was clearly shown at the CIO-United Automobile Workers convention of April 1 to 6, where even President Walter Reuther, in the act of sidetracking a labor party resolution, had to pay lip service to the labor party proposal demanded by the most forward-looking delegates.

The labor leaders had a choice between two roads after Feb. 28. They could move either toward independent politics along labor party lines or back into the coalition with Truman as "window dressing." Given two minor concessions, aimed at appeasing their bureaucratic aspirations but shunting aside the needs of the workers, they chose the road of retreat.

As the heavy costs of the military program, imposed upon the low income layers of the population, begin to make their full effects felt, these labor party sentiments now simmering will come to a boil. Neither the workers' dissatisfaction with the increasing economic burdens of the war program, nor the impulsion of the union bureaucrats toward more political power, will be halted by the surrender of the labor leadership on April 30. All signs point toward the development of a deeper and far more explosive labor crisis in the not too distant future.

Aneurin Bevan's Resignation From the Attlee Government

Aneurin Bevan's resignation from the British Labor government created no less a sensation than MacArthur's dismissal from his Far East command. The root causes of both events are the same — the undiminishing resistance of the world's masses to the impending imperialist war and their growing challenge to the whole capitalist order. In this sense, Bevan's move in England came as if to emphasize that MacArthur's removal was the *least* that the ruling circles could do in America.

The former Minister of Health's break with the Attlee cabinet came over the new government budget, because it provided a partial charge for false teeth and eyeglasses which had previously been furnished gratis under the "cradle to grave" social insurance law. In reality, this was only the immediate spur. For the cut in the health grant, although relatively insignificant in itself, was undertaken flagrantly to balance the outlay for war preparations. In his resignation speech to the House of Commons Bevan bluntly charged that the Chancellor of the Exchequer "stole 100,000,000 pounds a year from the National Insurance Fund. So that the rearmament of Great Britain is financed out of the contributions that the workers have paid into the fund." This was being done by "a Socialist Chancellor of the Exchequer," he protested, "at a time when there were still untouched sources of wealth in Great Britain." To those who had been saying that he was "quarreling about trivialities," he retorted sharply: "I remember the triviality that started the avalanche of 1931."

In other words, Bevan was announcing to the world that in his opinion the Labor government was undertaking a rearmament program at the expense of the workers and which left the wealth of the capitalists virtually untouched—a course similar to that of the Ramsay MacDonald government in the economic crisis of 1931, which has become engraved in the memory of British labor as The Great Betrayal.

The former Minister did not directly reject the armaments program as such, or the foreign policy of alliance with American imperialism as such. Together with his cabinet colleagues, he had been committed to these government policies step by step since 1946. But in this same speech he revealed the insoluble dilemma in coupling these policies with any kind of economic planning of benefit to the mass of the people, indeed, even with the program of social reformism itself.

"It is now perfectly clear to anyone who examines the matter objectively," he said, "—the lurchings of the American economy, the extravagance and unpredictable behavior of the production machine . . . has already caused a vast inflation of prices all over the world. It has disturbed the economy of the Western world to such an extent that if it goes on *more damage will be done by this unrestrained behavior than by the behavior of the nation the arms are intended to restrain.*"

He warned that American stock-piling was already creating world shortages of raw materials essential to

production; that it was making all planning figures obsolete because of the incessant inflation that is its consequence; that this means mass unemployment ("we have already in Great Britain under-employment"); that the pace of the armaments race was such, "the foundations of political liberty and parliamentary democracy will not be able to sustain the shock." His conclusion was equally sharp even if it lacked a positive counter-program:

"We have allowed ourselves to be dragged too far behind the wheels of American diplomacy. This great nation has a message for the world which is distinct from that of America or the Soviet Union. . . . It is from here that we can tell the world where to go, but not to follow behind American capitalism, unable to restrain itself at all. . . ."

Bevan thus put his finger on the chief running sore in the world today: the "unrestrained and unpredictable behavior of the production machine of American capitalism" with its insatiable thirst for markets and sources of raw materials that underlies the rapacious politics of world conquest conducted from Washington. He went along, perhaps grudgingly, so long as this affected only the masses of Asia, ominously stormy in their post-war upsurge. When the course of U.S. capitalism began to undermine directly the program for the masses of Great Britain, upon which the existence of the Labor Party rests, Bevan demurred.

"I have always said that the defense program must always be sustained (a) with the maintenance of the standards of life of the British people and (b) with the maintenance of the social services. Since it became clear that we have engaged upon an arms program inconsistent with these considerations, I could no longer remain a member of the Government."

Bevan, in thus resigning, and Attlee, in accepting the resignation, make evident the ultimate bankruptcy of the vaunted Social Democratic "road to socialism." No one can deny that in England this solution—of gradually transforming the social system by agreement with the capitalist class—had an unprecedented, if not ideal, opportunity. The Labor Party won complete majorities in two elections, an overwhelming one in 1945 and a slim but still adequate one in 1950. It has moved unhampered to the nationalization of 20 per cent of industry and established a social security service more rounded than any hitherto known.

But in the rearmament crisis its ties to capitalism prove no less strong and no less decisive than those of the minority Labor government of MacDonald in the economic crisis of 1931 or those of the many other Social Democratic governments on the European continent in the recurring crises after the first world war. The whole trend of "gradualism" is being sharply reversed. That is the unmistakable significance of the latest government budget in London. Bevan is incontrovertibly right in pointing out the fact.

It is highly doubtful that Bevan's break is motivated by a conscious realization of this dilemma or that he personally will draw the full logical consequences from it in

a revolutionary socialist direction. But his resignation is symptomatic of the maturing crisis in the broad British labor movement. There was a full scale revolt against the leadership at the Trade Union Congress last September which overthrew the wage freeze that had been in force since the last war. There was incipient revolt against the Government's foreign policy and pressing demands for workers' control of the nationalized industries as well as for sharper inroads on capitalist profits at the last Labor Party conference in October. Mass demonstrations of tens of thousands day after day before the court house brought about the acquittal of the leaders of the wild cat dock workers' strikes, whom the Labor government sought to incarcerate for illegal conspiracy. The anti-war feeling, directed at American capitalism, was made evident at a number of informal conferences of Labor Party and trade union bodies called by the left wing "Socialist Fellowship."

All these indications of a brewing storm could not have been lost on Aneurin Bevan, whose background as a militant Welsh miner and "Left Wing" member of parliament has long made him one of the most popular figures in the working class. Bevan realized that the Attlee government's attack on the social gains made by the workers meant the risk of a break with the mass base of the Labor Party. His resignation shows that he has decided not to risk that break.

Within the British working class, Bevan's resignation has called forth considerable support despite the organized hue and cry of the Labor leadership against the "splitters." Bevan himself has received what amounts to triumphal acclamation from the miners throughout Wales, which he is touring. While the Scottish leadership of the trade unions revoked an invitation to him to speak at their congress in May, the congress itself rejected the leaders' support of the government budget and backed the policies espoused by Bevan by an overwhelming majority. It is clear that the Bevan resignation is the prelude to a struggle for leadership and a change of course in the Labor Party whose repercussions will be world-wide in their effect.

Togliatti and the Latest Line of the Stalinists

Simultaneously with the Paris conference of the Deputy Foreign Ministers of the Big Four powers, the leaders of several Communist Parties have indicated a willingness to change their oppositional attitudes toward the capitalist regimes in Western Europe.

Most significant was the declaration made by Palmiro Togliatti, chief of the Italian Communist Party. At the 7th congress of his party at Milan in April, Togliatti said that the Italian Stalinists "were ready to give up opposition in this country and in Parliament to any government which would radically modify Italy's foreign policy so that Italy shall not be swept into the whirlwind of a new war." He justified this offer by stating that the world situation today is analogous to the 1939-1940 period when the Italian

CP offered to collaborate with Mussolini's fascist government on the same terms.

This statement was issued shortly after Togliatti's return from Moscow. It is clear that the Kremlin is using this mouthpiece to tell the bourgeois rulers of Western Europe that it is ready to negotiate a diplomatic agreement along the following lines. If these governments will detach themselves from the U.S. military machine, withdraw from the Atlantic alliance, and show a more friendly, or at least neutral, attitude toward the Soviet bloc, the Stalinists in return will abandon further struggles against the reactionary policies of these regimes and even accord them support.

Such an offer bodes no good for the labor movement in these countries. For, if the deal should go through, the Communist parties will be fully placed at the service of the capitalist politicians and the industrialists and, once again as from 1945 to 1947, participate in their drives for production speedup, profiteering at the expense of labor's living standards, inflation, etc. The Stalinist leaders would ignore the demands and muffle the protests of the exploited, and, where the grievances of the workers did burst forth in action, would try to repress them in the name of national harmony and international peace.

Togliatti's olive branch has been tendered to the clerical-capitalist regime because of the imperative needs of Moscow's foreign policy.

Washington has sent Eisenhower to speed the military reorganization of its North Atlantic partners. The Kremlin is anxious to delay and disrupt the imperialist war preparations there. It is banking upon the strong "neutralist" sentiments among the ruling circles throughout Western Europe and the revulsion against another war among the masses to secure a favorable reception to its proposed deal.

Some commentators are inclined to discount Togliatti's trial balloon as nothing but a ruse to sow confusion in the West. But there is no reason for supposing that this offer was not seriously intended. However much it may run counter to the caricature of the Kremlin's intentions drawn by American propagandists, a deal of this type completely conforms to Stalin's traditions and outlook.

The "Voice of America" depicts the Kremlin as a boundlessly aggressive and expansive force, arming to the teeth, conniving to snatch power throughout Europe and Asia, fomenting revolutionary uprisings everywhere, and bent upon marching in all directions at the opportune moment to conquer the world. This is more like a distorted reflection of imperialism's own image than an accurate representation of the Kremlin's real aims and plans.

What the Kremlin really wants, and what its diplomacy aims at, is not world domination through another world war or a world revolution, but class peace through another division of spheres of influence with the United States. Stalin would like nothing better than a return to his collaboration with the Western imperialists on the model of Yalta, Teheran and Potsdam.

It should not be forgotten that up to 1948, in compliance with Moscow's line, the Communist Parties beyond the Soviet Union were pursuing a policy of submission to the capitalists, fulfilling their bargain in good faith as

agents of the imperialists within the labor movement. In France and Italy they entered coalition cabinets and helped revitalize the paralyzed capitalist regimes by calling for "production first, no strikes." In Italy the CP went so far as to approve a shameful agreement with the Vatican.

Matters have taken a different turn since 1948, not because the Kremlin decided to drop its alleged mask and reveal a revolutionary face, but because the U.S. strategists began to tighten their containment of the Soviet domain and step up their military program. The Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and other features of the "cold war" compelled the Kremlin and its agencies to devise counter moves against the greater aggressiveness shown by Washington.

This reflex to the increased belligerence of the imperialists has been largely responsible for the oppositional policies and encouragement of strikes by the Communist Parties in Western Europe. But this recent leftward turn imposed upon the Stalinists does not mean that the Kremlin has given up all hopes of another bargain with Western imperialism.

The gist of the "peace program" put forward through the Stockholm appeal and at the Warsaw Conference and chanted in all keys by Stalinist spokesmen is the compatibility of what they call the "socialist sector" of the world centered at Moscow with the surrounding capitalist system. The British CP recently came forward with a promise to back the Labor government if it would accept the program of harmonious "co-existence" of British capitalism with the Soviet Union. The "peace" movements

sponsored by the Stalinists here in the United States have the same aim of pressuring or persuading the Truman administration to enter negotiations with Moscow.

In this way the Kremlin is telling the capitalist powers: "Make a deal with us, let there be a status quo, call off the dogs of war — and we will guarantee you through the medium of our parties no more troubles with the workers, no revolutionary disturbances for a period of years."

The big hitch in any such resumption of the coalition with the "democratic" imperialists is Washington's unwillingness to make terms and grant concessions to which the Kremlin can accommodate itself. Since it cannot now make a global deal with the United States, the Kremlin bureaucracy must do what it can to interpose obstacles to the menacing advance of its enemy. In Eastern Europe it has squeezed out the bourgeois elements and their representatives and integrated these countries more and more strictly into its orbit. In Asia it is utilizing the national revolutions to bleed the U.S. forces and impede their military plans.

In Western Europe Stalin seeks to woo the ruling classes who are frightened by the prospects of a new war, doubtful of America's abilities to protect their interests, and eager for aid to hold down the unrest among their working people. If a lesser deal with them could be consummated, it would not only serve the Kremlin as a temporary bulwark against the United States but as a means of pressure upon Washington as well as a sign of good faith that Moscow's promises to sustain the tottering capitalist structures in these countries can be relied upon.

Youth and Foreign Policy

By JAMES P. CANNON

(A Speech to Students of New York University, April 25, 1951. Transcribed from tape recording.)

The subject of our discussion today, the foreign policy of the United States, is now recognized on every side as the burning question of the day. It monopolizes the attention of the statesmen, the generals and the diplomats. It is a sign of the times that the specialists in the art of propaganda, true and false—mostly false—concentrate on this subject nowadays, each from his own point of view and special interest. Through this poisonous fog of slanted propaganda the truth has a hard time making its way.

The people of America, as distinguished from their rulers and misleaders, in their great majority have been traditionally peace-loving, nationally exclusive and self-sufficient, even isolationist, in their sentiments. But they have long since been convinced by the course of events that foreign policy is their greatest concern today and the source of their greatest fears. For they know in their bones, no matter what the statesmen and the propagandists say,

that U.S. foreign policy is driving not toward peace but toward war.

Not An Academic Question for Youth

And I believe that of all the elements and age-brackets in the population of the country, those who are most acutely sensitive to this relationship of foreign policy and war are the youth; that is, those who will have to do the fighting and the dying in the ultimate execution of our foreign policy as it is directed today. For the young people foreign policy is no academic disquisition, but a question of life and death.

Therefore, I am glad of the opportunity you have given me to speak to an audience of young university people on this subject today. First of all, I wish to express my appreciation of the spirit of fair play and free speech which has been manifested on so many sides, especially in the student body, and I assume also in the administrative staff, which has made my discussion with you possible.

I believe in free speech. I have fought for it a long time, for others as well as for myself. Free speech is a necessary

instrumentality for the dissemination of full information and the clarification of ideas which can lead to correct decisions. In the early days of the pioneer socialist movement in this country and the IWW, with which I was affiliated, we put up many battles, not without hazards and penalties for some of us, for the right of free speech. I first came into collision, and eventually to an irrevocable break, with the Communist Party over this question—over the attempt to suppress the rights of a minority faction to which I belonged to present their views and defend them in fair debate. For forty years I have been mixed up one way or another in the fight for free speech, either as a defendant under prosecution defending my own rights, or as an active participant in organizations and committees defending the rights of others. I know all about free speech.

“Great Debate” Only Over Tactics

I speak here today on the subject of foreign policy from the viewpoint of Marxist socialism, the socialism of the class struggle. I have lived to see the United States take part in two world wars. As a socialist I opposed them both, and I am opposed now to the American intervention in Korea and the program of spreading it into a Third World War. As a socialist I know that capitalist wars are waged not for high moral principles, as the lying propagandists say, but for profits and plunder, for territories, for markets and fields of investment. I cannot conceive of a more disgraceful act of self-repudiation for a socialist than to support a capitalist war.

The great debate, so-called, which is proceeding with feverish intensity today in the halls of Congress and in the press, on radio and television, in forums, on platforms and in pulpits, does not in my opinion touch the real problem of war and peace. The differences of Truman and MacArthur, the two protagonists in the debate as it is presently unfolding, are only tactical and strategic, not fundamental. They differ on where to begin, and when to begin, to drop the atom bomb and start the Third World War. But both policies, the policies of Truman and the policies of MacArthur, are imperialistic. They both aim at war and hope to solve the economic problems of the United States by means of war.

Hoover is rather on the side-lines, a third party in the discussion whose influence is declining. The Hoover policy is imperialistic also, but in too limited a way to serve the economic requirements of American capitalism. His conception of a western hemisphere fortress is too small for the present-day world. The *New York Times*, in my opinion, correctly disposed of the Hoover thesis from the point of view of big finance, with the editorial observation that his program would signify “economic strangulation” for the United States—as a capitalist nation, that is.

Dilemma of American Capitalism

In the last analysis, the same thing holds true for the programs of Truman and MacArthur and ultimately condemns them both to bankruptcy. The dilemma of United States capitalism arises from the fact that it has come to

the apex of its riches and its power, as the heir of bankrupt Europe, in a world that has no room for expanding capitalism, as it still had half a century ago. It is not only the western hemisphere that is too small. Europe and Asia are also too small. In fact, the whole world is too small to meet the demands and needs of American capitalism with its ever-accumulating surpluses of capital and manufactured goods, which cannot be absorbed at home on a capitalist basis.

The Soviet Union, one-sixth of the world's surface, is closed off to the capitalist world as a market and field of profitable investment. Eastern Europe in the recent period has been closed off. And now China, the great object of the war in the Pacific, the prize for which the war against Japan was waged, has not only been wrested from the control of Japanese imperialism. In the process of war and revolution China has torn itself out of the orbit of capitalist exploitation. And the colonial revolutions have just begun. The world open to capitalist exploitation is narrowing down, while the demands of American imperialism for markets and fields of investment grow ever more rapacious and insatiable. That is the dilemma of a bankrupt social system which “foreign policy” cannot conjure out of existence.

Economic Root of Imperialist Policy

The bankruptcy of capitalism is registered in terms of human poverty and misery for which it is the primary cause. As we here today discuss the question of American foreign policy and the dilemma of American imperialism, just let one simple fact have the floor. There are two billion people in the world which capitalism has ruled so long, and more than one-half of these people never get enough to eat all their lives. This is an established fact, undisputed by anybody. It is a matter of common knowledge.

These hungry people don't want propaganda. It is the biggest illusion and delusion to imagine that hungry people who number more than a billion are just waiting for somebody to give them the low-down in learned professorial essays. They know what they want. They want bread, and land, and national independence. Capitalism cannot supply them, and has not supplied them. That is the nub of the problem of the world today. Neither Truman nor MacArthur can bomb it out of existence, although that is what their “foreign policy” stupidly aims to accomplish.

The terrible contradictions of American capitalism forbid and exclude a humane and peaceful foreign policy. The narrowing fields for capitalist exploitation on the one hand, and the constantly growing surpluses of capital and goods produced in the United States—this is the economic circumstance determining the imperialist foreign policy of the United States. It is not a matter of bad will or ignorance on the part of one statesman or another, although God knows there is plenty of that. It is an ineluctable contradiction of an economic nature. That is what determines the imperialist foreign policy of the United States and drives it to militarization and to war.

Talk About Peace Is Cheap

These facts are well-known to the decisive ruling circles of this country, those circles who represent the great accumulations of capital for whom the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune* speak most authoritatively. They know these facts and that is why they will not listen to any talk of isolationism; or of limitation to the western hemisphere; or of making peace with China and Russia. Not at all. Such proposals do not fit into their policy in any way whatever, except as propaganda to deceive the people. To be sure, they all blandly deny any imperialist aims. They all talk for peace. But talk is cheap. That is the first lesson in politics I would recommend to you young men and women, if by any chance you are studying political science in some class or other. Talk is cheap, but facts speak louder. All this talk of peace and denial of imperialist aims is just routine propaganda, belied by deeds everywhere.

The "theoretical justification" for this phony "non-imperialist" and "peace" propaganda of the masters of America has been undertaken by some people, including your professor of philosophy, Sidney Hook, who call themselves "democratic socialists." They correspond in my opinion—you will forgive me if I unintentionally offend your religious sensibilities—they correspond to the missionaries who were sent out to soften up the native peoples in the colonies for subjugation and exploitation by the great powers in the past.

Shoddy "Theory" of the Neo-Missionaries

I have here a few quotations as samples of this theoretical missionary work, this shoddy attempt to prove on a theoretical basis, the non-imperialist and peace-loving character of the most rapacious imperialist power that ever existed in the world. Here is a quotation from a published document entitled, "To Our Friends In Europe and Asia":

"The development of American capitalism has not led to imperialism; it does not fulfill Lenin's theory of imperialism as the inevitable last stage of capitalism."

Another quotation from the same document, a denial, "that American capitalism depends on imperialist expansion for its very life."

And a third quotation:

"The U.S. had a great internal free trade market and such enormous natural resources that today she is an exporter of raw materials as well as of manufactured goods. The economic facts of life in America were and are very different from the facts in Europe which led Lenin to formulate his theory of imperialism."

The signers of this document—among them Lewis Corey, James T. Farrell, Sidney Hook, Upton Sinclair and Norman Thomas—attempt to convince the people of Europe and Asia that the economic laws determining the imperialist character of the old Europe, about which Lenin wrote, do not apply to its successor to the domination of the world, the beneficent United States of America.

The best I can say for this "theoretical" exercise is that it must have been written on the assumption that nobody will read it who ever read Lenin. While it is true that there were certain differences between the line of development of American capitalism into imperialism and a similar development in Europe, the differences all accentuate the imperialist drive of the United States. It is true that American capitalism had, and still has, a great internal market. It had a whole continent to exploit, in contra-distinction to the hemmed-in countries of Europe. The development and exploitation of this vast territory provided an expanding internal market for a long time. It also opened up a widening field for the continuous investment and re-investment not only of the profits of American capitalism itself, but also of billions and billions of dollars imported from Europe in the development of this country. That was the case up to the time of the First World War.

Reality of U.S. Economic Development

Then the situation and the relationship of Europe and America began to change fundamentally. America, which was a debtor nation at the beginning of the First World War has become the richest capitalist nation in the world, and the creditor of the whole world. Meanwhile, the internal market, great as it was and still is, proved in the crisis of the 30's that it could no longer absorb the products of American industry on a capitalist basis. A slight decline in exports was sufficient to plunge American economy into the most devastating crisis the world ever saw, a crisis which lasted ten years and even then was only temporarily and artificially overcome by war expenditures.

Our theoretical justifiers say that America exports raw materials in contra-distinction to some of the older European countries analyzed by Lenin, and therefore cannot be imperialist by Lenin's law. That argument wouldn't even convince Governor Thomas E. Dewey. Did you read Dewey's speech in answer to Hoover? Dewey's speech lists, one after another, the strategic raw materials which America needs from foreign sources for its industries and for its armament, including uranium. He points out the various spots around the world where they are located and cannot be had and incorporated into the American industrial process without the sources being controlled by the United States or its allies.

Facts That Refute Hook and Co.

America exports wheat and cotton, but a great number of strategic raw materials, absolutely necessary for its industry and its war machine, have to be imported at any cost, even at the cost of war. And so great is the power of America over this supply of raw materials, it caused an explosion in the British cabinet just the other day. One of the main reasons for the resignation of Bevan from the cabinet of the Labor Government was that America is cornering the raw material supplies of the world, stimulating inflation in Europe and endangering British economy.

Lenin said the epoch of capitalist imperialism, as distinguished from the epoch of free competition, is characterized mainly by the export of capital. The development of home industry reaches the point where it can no longer absorb the accumulations of profits piled up by the capitalist investors. In addition to the export of manufactured goods they have to find foreign fields where this surplus capital can be invested at a high rate of profit under conditions of political security for the investment.

Urgency of Investment Drive

How does that apply to America? Why, I think it applies a hundred times more than it ever did to England, France and Germany, which were the great imperialist powers before the First World War. All you have to do is look at the figures of the accumulation of capital and the rate and volume of its exportation by America since the beginning of the First World War. These figures do not lie and cannot be lied away. To bring forward the "non-imperialist" argument at the present time, when the bulk of the surplus capital of the entire world is held here in the United States; to say that this country, which has the virtual monopoly of world capital, is not confronted by the imperialistic problem of investing outside its own borders—that is to make a mockery of facts as well as of theory.

Our theoretical missionaries mention the gifts dispensed by the American Santa Claus, the loans and the donations for military purposes to foreign governments, including Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, Franco and all the other representatives of "freedom and democracy." What is all this largesse designed for? It is represented in the document I have quoted here as a sign of the beneficence and peace-loving character of the American capitalist government.

Real Aim of American Largesse

Cutting out the buncombe and getting down to brass tacks, permit me to give you another interpretation. These loans and donations are primarily designed to prop up the shaky capitalist structures and create the political conditions for profitable investments. Not even the free-spending United States capitalists want to pour out billions of dollars in investments for the development of backward foreign countries without guarantees that their investments will be secured and pay off. What is necessary for the security of their investments? "Stable political conditions." And these stable political conditions, as they are understood in Washington and Wall Street, require puppet governments which can suppress revolutions and colonial uprisings and guarantee at all costs that the profits of the investors will be secured regardless of the interests of the exploited people.

There is a second reason why they dole out money so freely. The Marshall Plan, etc. came at a convenient time, when America was threatened with an economic crisis which was due to the overproduction of goods that the domestic market could not absorb. The huge expenditures, creating an artificial market, alleviated and post-

poned the crisis. Benevolence here was happily married to expediency.

We Marxists interpret the foreign policy of the United States government from economic facts. The capitalists who own the government need foreign markets for their surplus goods. They need secure political conditions for profitable investment in foreign lands. Their demands are insatiable and cannot be restrained. Loans and investments in Russia, Eastern Europe, and now China, are considered unsafe. The policy is not to "contain" the Soviet Union in Russia and Eastern Europe. No, that is only a temporizing tactic. The ultimate aim and imperious necessity is to overthrow the governments in these countries; to open them up as markets and fields of investment under secure political conditions. This is the real goal of American foreign policy, which spells in the final analysis the drive to dominate the entire world. They select their allies to serve that end; "benevolence" and "democracy" have nothing to do with it.

Explains Support of Reaction Everywhere

Just ask yourselves a question, friends. How does it happen that the United States government, implementing its foreign policy, which the priests of spurious theory tell us is so peaceful and so beneficent and concerned so purely with the welfare of the human race—which includes, we presume, the half billion people who never get enough to eat—how does it happen that everywhere American foreign policy, backed up by American military force, supports the capitalists, the landlords, the usurers, the kings and the fascist gangs against the people?

In China they support Chiang Kai-shek whose regime was so corrupt and reactionary that the people rose up en masse to drive him out. America takes sides against the people everywhere: In Spain with its fascist butcher, Franco; in Greece with its monarcho-fascist regime; in Korea with its Syngman Rhee; in Indo-China where the people are struggling for independence against French imperialism and have to fight against the overwhelming might of American financial help and military supplies; in Malaya and the Philippines; in Portugal, Turkey and South America. All over the world, wherever the hungry people are rising in a struggle for land, and bread, and national independence, they confront the United States of America with its money and its bombs.

The people everywhere know these facts because they bring down upon them death and destruction all the time. And because they know these facts, they are not apt to be taken in by the theory of Professor Hook, elucidated in an article in the *New York Times Magazine*, that the real need of America is a "propaganda offensive." When people know the facts, it is pretty hard to deceive them by words, especially when they feel the facts on their bodies and bones, in blows and bloody attacks.

The more practical artificers of American foreign policy, as distinguished from their professorial advisors, know that it is a waste of money to try to convince these half-billion people throughout the world by propaganda that America is their friend. The hard-headed statesmen gave

an ironic answer to Sidney Hook and his propaganda theory the other day in Congress when they voted to cut the appropriations for the "Voice of America" by 90%. It was a big surprise to many people. But these realistic politicians in Washington have more faith in their guns and their bombs to make the people of the world love them, than in propaganda which belies all facts.

Is Imperialist Policy Realizable

Now a question we should ask ourselves is this: Can our life purpose be committed to the fate of this American imperialist power? Disregarding all moral considerations and all concern for the human race except ourselves and our families, our little circle, can we say, well, America is bound to dominate the world anyway and we might as well go along and serve it and save ourselves? I would say, even from that narrow and morally impermissible standpoint the question does not have an easy and facile answer.

Is the United States of America as it is now constituted on a capitalist basis all-powerful? Can she lick the world with guns and atom bombs and impose her will by force everywhere, as some ignorant braggarts and narrow-minded militarists like to say? Can she enslave and exploit the whole world and make good conditions for us, the favored few, within her borders? In my opinion, an objective examination of the real facts of the world situation can only raise the gravest doubts of the capacity of American capitalism to carry out even a small part of the global designs implied in its foreign policy.

Capitalism is an outworn social system. The First World War was the sign of its bankruptcy as a world order. Prior to that, for half a century capitalism had grown and expanded. It had maintained an uneasy peace in the world, except for numerous local wars and colonial expeditions, by which the great powers divided up the world. But things have changed since then. Just consider for a moment how much they have changed, in thirty-seven years since the first shots were fired in 1914. Two world wars, devouring the lives of tens of millions of people, and wounding nobody knows how many more, and destroying so much of the material culture of the world. Two destructive world wars and a terrible world-wide depression with its unmeasured toll of misery and death. And now the mad armaments race toward another world war, the end of which no one can see or prophesy.

Peoples of World Rising Against U.S.

These are the achievements of capitalism in the last third of a century. This system, I say, is bankrupt. This system is in the twilight period of its decline and its decay. The peoples of the world are rising up against it, and especially against its chief representative, the United States of America. The rest of the capitalist world would fall of its own weight without American money and American arms. There isn't a country in Europe where a capitalist government could stand up for many months without American power and support. That applies to all of them from Greece to Franco's Spain, to Italy, to France and all

the others, except possibly England, and England too would soon follow the others.

The peoples of the Orient, who have thrown off the shackles of the old colonialism, show no disposition to wear new ones. They are not asking to be taken into America's sphere of influence and exploitation. On the contrary, they are fighting against it with all of their strength and passion.

The victims of Stalinism in Russia and Eastern Europe badly need a political revolution; but they don't want any "liberation" by the arms and bombs of the United States, and the consequent restoration of the capitalists and landlords, and the splitting up of their countries into colonies for American exploitation.

The workers of Europe, and particularly the workers of Germany, have made it perfectly clear in this last year that they don't intend to fight the battles of United States imperialism in another war. An expression of that attitude has come like a lightning flash from England this week. The resignation of Bevan from the cabinet throws the Labor government into a crisis and raises the question of the Atlantic Pact, and all the other war plans of the United States. This is a direct expression of the unwillingness of the people of England to be tied, as Bevan said, to the chariot of America. A dispatch from Paris in the *Times* this morning says that the sentiments of Bevan are echoed in socialist and labor circles all over Europe.

U.S. Labor Will Have Its Say

And finally, the workers of the United States haven't said their last word yet by a long shot. The foreign policy of American capitalism is united with its domestic policy. The war program carries with it the program of militarizing and regimenting the country, already under way; of stamping out liberties, which is in the design; and of driving down the living standards of the workers, which is in progress with the wage freeze on the one side and skyrocketing inflation on the other. All this in my opinion will meet resistance in the United States. The crisis in the Labor Mobilization Board may already be a sign of the coming storm.

So I wouldn't advise young people to bet their heads on the victory of American imperialism.

There is an alternative. In my opinion this alternative is to recognize the social reality of our time, to see capitalism as a world system in its death agony, completely reactionary, and beyond salvation by any means. The alternative to support of this doomed social system is to ally oneself with the future; with the socialist and labor movement, and with the great colonial revolutions in process and still growing. The alternative is to work for a union of the world's workers and the colonial peoples, to put an end to imperialism and open the way for the socialist society of the free and equal. That is the way to secure peace and progress and a good life for all.

Friends, I recommend this alternative program to you. It is better. For it offers you something worth fighting for, with the prospect of victory at the end, a victory for all humanity in which you and your generation will share.

The Future of the Soviet Union

(As the Capitalist Leaders of America See It -- and as a Revolutionary Refugee From the USSR Sees It)

By W. WILNY

INTRODUCTION

The author of the following article is a recent revolutionary emigrant from the Soviet Union. He is twenty-five years old and now lives in Great Britain. He is not a Trotskyist because, as he himself says in a note to us, "being a representative of the youngest generation of the Soviet people" he has not had a chance to learn what Trotskyism "is like in reality." His point of view is, however, precisely for that very reason of particular interest to readers of our magazine. For in it is embodied the critical thought of those young revolutionists who form part of that whole generation which has grown up under Stalinism, and learned to struggle against it on its home grounds. For obvious reasons the author's real name cannot be disclosed.—Ed.

I.

This past year there has been a good deal of frank talk among the ruling circles of the United States on the subject: "What sort of Russia would we like to see in the future?" It is clear that the "future Russia" they have in mind is not the Stalinist Soviet Union but something new and different. The starting point for the construction of their political concept is the wish-fulfillment idea that the Stalinist USSR will be destroyed through their victory in war and cease to exist.

Two Programs "Made-in-U.S.A."

What is the program of that "future Russia" as made-in-America? Let us summarize here two different points of view recently published. The first is that of Mr. George F. Kennan, former head of the State Department Policy Planning Staff and Counsellor of the U.S. Embassy at Moscow. In his article, "America and the Russian Future," which appeared in *Foreign Affairs* of April 1951, Kennan states the following:

1. In approaching internal questions of a future Russia we should be very careful and elastic. 2. The future Russia should be a liberal-democratic republic. 3. Because the liberal-democratic forces in present Russia are very weak we should help them develop very slowly and in evolutionary fashion. 4. The liberal-democratic forces in Russia now exist among the peasantry and, therefore, we should support them, granting the restoration of private property on the land. 5. Though industry unfortunately must remain in the hands of the government, we should support the appearance of free private competition in the whole economy. 6. To the non-Russian nationalities of the present USSR should be granted cultural and linguistic autonomy.

The other view is that of Mr. Harold E. Stassen, former governor of Minnesota, an unsuccessful candidate for the presidency, at present president of the University of

Pennsylvania and a well-known political tourist. His program was presented in an article entitled "The Coming Collapse of Communism" in the *Ladies' Home Journal* of April 1951, and in several radio broadcasts. He stated:

"For the liberation and upward climb of mankind" we should support the counter-revolution in the USSR. Its program should be: 1. The restoration of private property on the land. 2. Restoration of free religious life. 3. Liberation of all prisoners of Russian concentration camps. 4. Establishment of sovereign national states in the Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bielo-Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Turkestan. 5. We should support the "counter-revolutionary movements" of the emigrants from Eastern Europe.

As can be seen from these summaries, the two points of view on the reconstruction of Russia do not vary greatly: both arise from the same wish-fulfillment basis — the restoration of a private capitalist system in the present USSR. One difference lies in the method of carrying out the program — in a slow, evolutionary fashion as proposed by the not so emotional Mr. Kennan, or in the drastic "counter-revolutionary" fashion proposed by Stassen; the other—over the question of the future of the non-Russian nationalities. The latter difference is, in our conviction, the result of differing sources of information only and plays a secondary role in both programs.

Though expressed by semi-official persons, both programs conform to the actual U.S. government policy. There is a great deal of evidence for that: in the propaganda of the "Voice of America," in discussions on the appeal "to the Russian people" in Congress, in recent speeches by Dean Acheson and his assistant Jack M. McFall and in the activities of U.S. Army officials among Russian DP's in Western Europe. Moreover, there is no evidence of any different U.S. policy on this question.

II.

What is most important about this American program for a "future Russia" is that its advocates seek to convince the American people that it is a genuinely just and progressive program and that the Russian people desire its realization. To prove this they point to Russian refugees and DP's. Mr. Stassen says frankly: "These escapees . . . are the messengers of the coming collapse of Communism."

Who Are the Russian Sponsors of This Program?

Consequently, before considering the possibilities of realizing the American program inside the USSR, let us

first consider these "messengers" and "counter-revolutionary movements" (Mr. Stassen certainly called them by their right name). Who are these refugees from the Soviet Union?

They are: the officers of the counter-revolutionary armies from the civil war of 1917-1922; state ministers and party leaders of the counter-revolutionary governments of the time of the revolution; former merchants, businessmen, and landlords. Among them are even monarchs and princes, dukes and counts. It is quite natural for them to want to restore all "their" possessions lost thirty years ago as a result of the revolution. But it should not be forgotten that these people, though they are Russians, have never been in the USSR. All these people constitute a very important part of the politically active emigrants from Russia and their appointees, like Mr. Alexander Kerensky, play a not inconsiderable role in shaping up the American program for a "future Russia." These are the "liberals" Mr. Kennan talks about.

The Case of the "Kulaks"

Still another part of the emigration has really come out of the Soviet Union during World War II. The majority of them are children or relatives of the first category of people mentioned above. It is also natural for them to want to restore the possessions of their parents.

Another section of these real emigrants from the USSR are the so-called "kulaks," the farmers who during the years of the collectivization of agriculture did not want to join the collective farms — the kolkhozes — and therefore were persecuted by the Kremlin. It is twenty years since they lost their land, but they nevertheless wish to see their property restored. All of them collaborated with Hitler's regime in the occupied territories of the USSR during World War II. When they say they were forced by the Germans to leave the country, that is an obvious falsehood. They escaped the country together with the Germans, because of their fear of punishment at the hands of the Red Army. During the German occupation they worked in the police, the administrative and economic apparatus of the Germans and everybody in the Soviet Union knows that they shot Jews, hung anti-German resistance fighters (even though these partisans very often also were anti-Stalinists, like the members of the Ukrainian People's Army), made up lists of candidates for deportation to the forced labor camps in Germany. They also constituted the bulk of the so-called "Russian Liberation Army" of General Vlassov.

To be objective, it is necessary to say that most of these people probably became what they are because of Stalinism; that is, Stalinism made counter-revolutionaries of these people by its cruel terrorist methods of collectivization of agriculture. They were persecuted and baited during most of their lives because they were backward in their consciousness and did not want to join the collective farms. In our opinion they were not the real "enemies of the people" because they were mostly poor and backward peasants and not really kulaks or landlords of pre-revolutionary times. But, because of the persecutions, they lost their moral judgment — they wanted revenge and so, during the Ger-

man occupation, they went to serve the Germans and thus became real enemies of the people.

Then the emigrants from Eastern Europe include many people whose former homelands are now part of the Soviet Union. These are Ukrainians and Byelo-Russians from the Western Ukraine and Western Byelo-Russia, which before the war were occupied by Poland. They are mostly de-classed intelligentsia and some clergy. They also have never lived inside the Soviet Union.

These various groups of emigrants from territories now part of the Soviet Union constitute the absolute majority of the politically active part of the emigration. The creators of the American program for a "future Russia" point to them when they want to prove the justice and correctness of their program.

The "Reichsamericans"

But there is yet another group that has some influence in shaping the American program. These are the American citizens of Eastern European origin, particularly of Russian and Ukrainian origin. They have some powerful organizations in the United States and, being American citizens, appear very often before public opinion with statements and appeals setting forth "what *our* government should do" on this or that policy. The recent behavior of these people has become particularly impudent and is comparable to the behavior of the so-called "Volksdeutsche" or "Reichsdeutsche" of Nazi Germany, who also pretended to speak for the people of the countries of their origin. For an example of such activities of these "Reichsamericans," we quote from an editorial of Americans of Ukrainian origin in their organ *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 1, Winter 1951.

"Everyone of the Ukrainian people knows that without the destruction (by atomic bombs) of the Ukrainian Donbas and the Kriviy Rog (two industrial centers of the Soviet Ukraine — author) . . . there will be no decision. Yet they would be willing to have it so. . . . That is the general mood in the nations oppressed by the Soviet Union."

Clash on the Question of Nationalities

This kind of representation of the "general mood" of the peoples of the Soviet Union evidently influences the Stassens, Kennans and other American policy-makers. It need only be added that while such a "general mood" undoubtedly exists among the exiled politicians, it most probably does not among the Soviet people. . . .

To get the proper perspective in judging the emigrants and DP's who try to represent the "mood" of the inhabitants of the USSR, it is necessary to recall historical experience. These are the same kind of people as those who escaped the France of the Great Revolution and played a very important role in the organization of military alliances and coalitions in Britain, Austria and Prussia against revolutionary France. They are the same kind of people as those who during the Great American Revolution escaped from Boston to Halifax in Canada, under the British crown, and from there carried on counter-revolutionary propaganda and activity against the revolutionary U.S.A. They are genuine counter-revolutionaries, and they are the kind of people Stassen and Kennan want to support.

But although this counter-revolutionary movement of the emigrants from the USSR is closely united upon the single social-political program of restoring capitalism, they are nevertheless disunited on the question of nationalities. The non-Russian nationalities of the USSR constitute a majority of the population. The same ratio exists in exile too. The emigration from the Soviet Union is consequently divided into two big camps; that of the Great Russians and that of the emigrants of the non-Russian nationalities. Between both camps there goes on a permanent and sharp struggle over the status of nationalities in a "future Russia"; the Great Russians stand for the restoration of the old Russian empire and do not recognize any right of self-determination or of separation from Russia of the non-Russian nationalities. The non-Russian emigrants have the opposite viewpoint — they are uncompromisingly for the division of Russia into independent national states. This is the source of the difference in the program on the question of nationalities between Mr. Kennan and Mr. Stassen.

Mr. Kennan evidently has been informed and influenced by the Great Russians who have convinced him that "the Ukraine economically is as much a part of Russia as Pennsylvania is part of the United States." He probably knows very little about the economic geography of the Soviet Ukraine and has forgotten that Indonesia was also not long ago a part of the Dutch empire or that the United States at one time was also an economic part of Britain. Mr. Stassen, on the other hand, during his travels in Europe, has most probably been influenced by the so-called Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), an extreme nationalist organization, a sort of carbon copy of Hitler's "Anti-Comintern."

What's True and What's False

However, we would not like to be accused of lack of objectivity in thus characterizing the informers of Messrs. Kennan and Stassen. Some of these people really came from the Soviet Union (although as long as 7 to 10 years ago) and undoubtedly know the truth about the Stalinist empire. When these people talk about concentration camps and prisons, about famine and the exploitation of workers, about the terror of the GPU-MGB and the lack of freedom in that country, all this sounds true. The emigrants speak the truth also when they repeat over and over again that the peoples of the Soviet Union hate the Stalinist regime, want to overthrow it, and as a result of that hatred there exists in the USSR permanent resistance in all forms to that regime. In all this, they are quite objective.

But when they touch upon the question of program, that is, what the Soviet peoples want in place of Stalinism, then the emigrants begin to speak subjectively: they talk about what *they* want. In order to be objective one must consequently consider the social origin of those who propose the given program. Any thinking person can understand that neither the White Guardist nor the Vlassov officers, the businessmen, landlords or clergy, nor even the "kulaks" ever constituted a majority of the people in the Soviet Union. Moreover it has to be borne in mind that all these people, even those who lived inside the Soviet Union before

World War II, ceased playing an important role in Soviet society at least as far back as the early thirties. During the last 20 years an entirely new generation of people has grown up in the USSR, as Mr. Kennan correctly remarks. It must be added that this new generation which has learned about the pre-revolutionary and Western world only from Stalinist textbooks, is hardly represented in the emigration. But this new generation is not at all pro-Stalinist.

Extravagant Talk About Resistance in Russia

It is also worth noting that when the emigrants begin to talk about resistance movements in the Soviet Union, they are concerned about playing up the value of their own shares in the political stock market. When, for example, Mr. Alexander Kerensky in one of his articles in the *Saturday Evening Post* says that through "underground channels" his article will be known inside of one week to all the people inside the Soviet Union, that is nothing but a fairy tale.

Numerous other examples of feverish competition among the charlatans of the emigration could be cited. But what is interesting is the fact that they evidently exert influence on American policy with regard to Russia.

III.

Now let us consider the real perspectives and possible results of carrying out such a program. Let us begin with a brief consideration of the program of the underground resistance movement that really exists today in the USSR. There is the so-called Ukrainian People's Army (UPA). There can be doubt about the strength of that movement, but there is no doubt whatsoever about its actual existence. It is only necessary first of all to note the feverish speculations among the emigrants around this movement. But there are other sources which confirm its existence. The official Soviet press and radio in the course of recent years has mentioned the struggle against "bands in the Carpathians" a number of times. Public trials have been held of members of the UPA in Warsaw and Prague, when UPA members were caught by Stalinist police during reconnaissance raids in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Extent of Genuine Resistance in USSR

In trials of Polish socialists and Slovak clergy, there were accusations by the Stalinists, among other things, of connections with the UPA. The constant crossing of couriers of the UPA over the Czech and German frontiers when they arrive from the Ukraine to inform their exiled Ukrainian comrades in Western Germany about the situation behind the Iron Curtain is probably well known to the U.S. military authorities stationed in occupied Germany. In 1947-1948 several units of the UPA crossed the German frontier coming from the Ukraine and were interned on orders from General Clay at the American camp in Degendorf, Bavaria. The military police cross-examined these UPA soldiers. UPA couriers have brought and continue to bring documents on the basis of which we can judge the program of that movement as well as the real "mood" of the people in the USSR. Among these documents are

several publications issued by the UPA in the USSR as propaganda material against Stalinism.

Program of the Resistance Movement

These documents reveal that the UPA movement is a Ukrainian nationalist underground organization with a very leftist — one could even say, a revolutionary socialist — program. It stands for a revolution in the USSR “for the destruction of the last class of exploiters — the Stalinist bureaucracy,” as they put it. It is opposed to the restoration of capitalism. It is for the construction of independent national states of the peoples in the USSR in a “real classless society based on the socialization of the means of production and genuine political democracy.”

Perhaps the most interesting thing about this movement is the fact that, while it is a nationalist movement, it penetrated the USSR from the outside and adopted its *socialist* program after it spread into the USSR. The movement originated as a purely *nationalist* one in the Western Ukraine, which before 1939 was under Polish occupation, and then became part of the Soviet Union. Although this movement came into the USSR from the Western or bourgeois world, it was nevertheless able to fortify its positions in Soviet society and has managed to exist there for several years. Obviously it has found support among the people. Why? The answer is clear: because it has adopted a program which corresponds to the “moods” of the Soviet people. Far be it from us to idealize this movement, but it is plain that its program is the direct opposite of the programs of Kennan, Stassen and their emigre proteges.

It is worthwhile quoting some programmatic statements of the UPA.

As far back as July 1945 we can read in the UPA underground magazine *Propagandist*, whose objective is political training for members of the underground, the following:

“We must give the masses a solution of the social and national problem as a whole. It is evident that this solution cannot be a return to the past, because the masses would not follow such a solution. We cannot propagate a Western European system of class society. Such a system is a step backward from the classless society. We cannot tell the workers and the peasants that the capitalists and landlords will come back, because they would never accept such a system. We cannot hold up life among the Western peoples as an example, because that is just where the peasant sees the landlords and the worker the capitalists and unemployment and misery. Our solution cannot be copied after the class societies because that would be unacceptable to our people. At the same time we must throw out all that is rotten in the system of Bolshevism,* that is, destroy national oppression and terror. We must go forward, further on the road to a really free, really classless society.”

This was the beginning of the formulation of a program by the UPA. They were not Marxists. They did not approach the situation from the standpoint of any complete

* The primitive, groping political character of this movement is evident from its terminology which makes little distinction between Bolshevism or Communism and Stalinism.

doctrine. That is probably their greatest weakness, because a revolutionary party or organization cannot be successful without a scientific doctrine. But in any case, they proceeded in the formulation of their program from the reality of Soviet society, from the real “mood” of the people.

Later in their development, the UPA leaders came to the theoretical negation of the existence of socialism in the USSR. Their young theoretician, O. Hornovy, basing himself on the works of Karl Marx, brilliantly demolished in the UPA underground publications the Stalinist theory and propaganda of the existence of a socialist society in the Soviet Union. He ridiculed their propaganda about the building of Communism “because socialism does not as yet exist in the USSR.” In Hornovy’s opinion what exists in the USSR is state capitalism.

Even Nationalists Reject Capitalism

But there are other direct refutations of the American program for a “future Russia.” In August 1950, one of the nationalist* theoreticians of the UPA, P. Poltava, wrote from the USSR an open letter to the “Voice of America” criticizing its propaganda. This letter, it is known, was delivered directly by the Ukrainian emigrant M. Lebid to the Undersecretary of State, Mr. E. Barrett. The State Department has not published this unique original document of a listener of American propaganda in the USSR. But it was published by a Ukrainian paper in Munich called *Suchasna Ukraina*. There we read:

“The Soviet masses hate the Bolshevik system, Bolshevik ‘socialism.’ But that does not mean that the Soviet peoples are longing for capitalism which was destroyed on the territory of the present USSR back in 1917-20. The Soviet people in their absolute majority are clearly against the restoration of capitalism. That is the result of the revolution of 1917-20. . . . We, the participants in the liberation struggle in the Ukraine, who are inside the Soviet Union and have connections with the broad Soviet mass, know only too well that the Soviet people have no admiration for capitalism — neither the old European kind nor the contemporary American kind. . . .”

Innumerable similar quotations can be cited. We repeat, we do not want to idealize the UPA, because it is not a direct representative of the generation that grew up in a society under Stalinism and still has a good many ideological gaps which are not typical of the Soviet people. Nevertheless, what they say furnishes us with solid proof that the “mood” of the Soviet peoples is just the opposite of the American wish-fulfillment program for a “future Russia.”

We are sure that neither Mr. Kerensky, nor Mr. Kennan, nor Mr. Stassen, nor the U.S. State Department can show the world anything as substantial as these publications of a really existing underground movement in the USSR, to prove their point of view. All they can do is point to the emigrants’ political merry-go-round.

* There are now developing two wings inside the UPA— one oriented toward Marxism and the other which, while accepting socialism, emphasizes nationalism.

Real Mood of the People

The real mood of the people under Stalinism can be summed up as follows:

1. *The absolute majority of the population of the USSR does not want the restoration of capitalism. It does want the destruction of the totalitarian rule of the Stalinist bureaucracy by means of a new revolution. Its goal is: to establish in the present USSR a real classless society based on the socialized means of production, planned economy, and a real classless democracy in political life.* In other words, the very opposite of the American program for a "future Russia."

2. *All the nationalities in the present USSR want to destroy all semblance of a Russian empire (of either the Stalin or the Kerensky kind). They want to live their own lives, to develop freely their cultures and civilizations without any protectorate from the "big brothers" — the Russians.* This can be achieved only through the national independence of the republics of the USSR. That too, is just the opposite of what is proposed by the American statesmen.

3. *The absolute majority of the people of the USSR have not the slightest confidence in the counter-revolutionary movements of the emigrants which are backed by Mr. Stassen, nor in the exiled "liberals" supported by Mr. Kennan, nor in the "foreign legions" of the type of the German Vlassov movement sponsored by General Eisenhower.*

4. *Another general and instructive conclusion: though the peoples of the USSR hate Stalinist tyranny and carry on a permanent struggle against it, that does not at all mean that their "mood" is pro-American. It is rather the opposite, in our opinion.*

IV.

We have mentioned above the principles of a real and just people's program of struggle against Stalinism in the USSR. We should now like to explain briefly how and why the people in the USSR came to such principles. For that, it is first necessary to judge the internal social situation in that country objectively. We shall not consider here the question as to how and why the Soviet people in their ideas and in their "moods," came to oppose the Stalinist regime because, we hope, this question is clear and evident to everybody. We shall rather confine ourselves to a consideration of how and why the Soviet people came to oppose Stalinism from *anti-capitalist* and *anti-restorationist* positions.

Why the Resistance Is Anti-Capitalist

Thirty-four years have passed since the October Revolution. In the course of that time within the USSR (1) the private capitalist system, private property in the means of production, has been totally liquidated; (2) all the old capitalist, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois classes have been totally abolished and extirpated, in the sense that they are excluded from social life and placed outside of society as such; (3) the collectivization of agriculture has been completed, private individual utilization of the land has

been totally liquidated, in other words, the existence of the petty-bourgeois class of the peasantry has been liquidated or at least thoroughly undermined; (4) at the same time a vast industrialization of the country has been achieved and, consequently, a tremendous increase in the numbers and social weight of the class of industrial workers has taken place; (5) the cadres of the old intelligentsia have ceased to exist and their place has been occupied by young people educated in Soviet schools; (6) a completely new generation of people — the Soviet youth — has grown up in the country which does not even know anything about the NEP (New Economic Policy — inaugurated in 1921 as a controlled retreat to permit the revival of small scale capitalist enterprise, so proclaimed at the time by Lenin, which lasted to the end of the Twenties — Ed.); (7) as a result of the specific propaganda policy and education the social class consciousness of every person under Stalinism has grown to be very sharp.

Higher Degree of Social Development In Soviet Individual

From these facts it can be seen clearly that society in the Soviet Union is quite different from the rest of the world. Starting out from the existing reality (and not from any yearning for the past) the Soviet individual develops an opposition to Stalinism unique to him. It represents a higher degree of social-historical development. The Soviet individual cannot orient himself toward a restoration of the old social regime because (1) there exists no basis for restoration, since neither private property nor the classes that supported it exist any longer; (2) the Soviet individual knows about the old capitalist social order only from theory and is genuinely convinced that capitalism means permanent crises, unemployment, unconcealed exploitation of labor, constant imperialist wars, etc.; (3) he believes and knows that the capitalist world on the outside wants to restore capitalism in his country.

Not so long ago the Soviet people had a very impressive experience with the Western world. We refer to the German invasion of the USSR. There are now a good many theories and explanations of the German-Soviet war and the behavior of the Soviet people in that war. There are numerous studies of "Hitler's political mistakes in the East." We know that the American general staffs are working on these studies. The German archives are dug up over and over again. But nobody looks at the experience of that war from the point of view of the Soviet people.

Lessons of Hitler's Invasion and Defeat

What happened in reality? Why was Hitler beaten?

We leave aside consideration of a comparison between the economic systems of Germany and the USSR, and will confine ourselves to the factor of the psychology of the Soviet masses, the reasons for the *psychological* "Stalin-grad."

It is absolutely true that at the beginning of the German invasion in 1941 the population of the occupied Soviet areas greeted the advancing German armies as their liberators. It is indisputably true that in 1941 millions of soldiers and officers of the Red Army freely surrendered

to the Germans and willingly became prisoners of war. There were two reasons for this: (1) The Soviet people hated Stalinism and did not want to defend the "motherland." (2) Because they hated Stalinism they did not believe Stalinist propaganda about Fascist Germany. The people believed that the Germans were "Westerners," Europeans, a civilized and highly cultured nation that was really going to liberate them from Stalin's yoke.

But what happened later on? The people soon realized that insofar as the Germans were concerned Stalin's propaganda was right. They experienced what these Western liberators were like. That's where the psychological "Stalin-grad" began: the whole people underwent a great disillusionment. It was this disillusionment that prepared the military Stalingrad.

The logical question now arises: why should the Soviet people once again trust in "Western liberation" — this time by the Americans? Why shouldn't they believe Stalinist propaganda on this score, when such Stalinist propaganda once was proven right upon their own flesh and blood? Those who are preparing the "liberation" ought to think this over very carefully.

But to return to the past for the moment: what in particular disillusioned the Soviet people in the German "liberators"? The commonly accepted answer is: the German terror and atrocities. But such an answer can be given only by those who are unfamiliar with the real situation in the German-occupied areas of the USSR. The German terror was of course a cause for disillusionment, but not the basic cause. The counter-revolutionary emigrants around Kerensky, Bandera, Boldyrev and the like would like to have it that the reason for the disillusionment was the refusal of the Germans to restore the land to the peasants and to bring to power the emigre liberals. But there is only one real objective answer: the main cause for the disillusionment of the Soviet people in the Germans, and therefore for the psychological and political defeat of the Germans was *the attempt of the Germans to restore capitalism.*

Main Cause of German Defeat

Here are proofs. In the occupied territories the Germans declared all industry, transport, finances, and the state collective farms (Sovkhoses) their private property. The Kolkhozes (farm cooperatives) remained approximately in the same status as under Stalinism. What did the Soviet people expect of their "liberators"? They thought that industry and the entire economy would be turned over to their ownership, to be the collective property of the people; that production would be under their own control and that the product would be justly distributed among the producers. Instead came the German "Wirtschaftsfuehrers" and "Sonderfuehrers," the Krupps and their slave-drivers.

The most instructive changes took place in agriculture. The emigrants of the type mentioned above claim that the people wanted to divide the Kolkhoz land into small privately owned plots, and that the Germans did not want to carry that out. *This is an absolute lie.* The former kulak emigrants who were home again demanded the restoration

of private property on the land and *were granted that demand by the Germans.*

It is quite true that in *some* villages of the Ukraine the Kolkhoz-men burnt down and plundered the Kolkhozes. But these were exceptions rather than the general case. Quite understandably, the Kolkhoz-men hate the Kolkhoz system because, in the present state of affairs, it is a most exploitative system in agriculture. But that does not at all mean that they want to go back to small and technically backward private agricultural enterprises. To the claims of the emigrants that there is a general desire for return to small, privately owned agriculture, by means of which they have impressed the Americans that there is hope of a restoration of capitalism in the USSR, we would like to counterpose a question: *Was there any agricultural overturn in the USSR when the Germans advanced?* There was some burning and plundering of Kolkhozes, granted. But was there a spontaneous uprising for the division of the land? Did the Kolkhoz-men divide the land when they burned down the Kolkhozes? Was there something like the rising of the peasantry against the landlords in 1917-19?

No Overturn of Collectivized Property

The emigrants reply: the Kolkhoz-men did not divide the land because they were afraid that the Red Army would come back. But were not the peasants of 1917-19 afraid when Denikin's army marched triumphantly against them? They divided the land at that time! They created armed resistance against the White Guardists, didn't they? Furthermore, weren't the peasants also afraid of the Red Army when they burned down the Kolkhozes? There is a hitch somewhere in the reasoning of these emigrants that their American sponsors ought to pay attention to.

There was no agrarian revolution — or more correctly, no agrarian counter-revolution, in the USSR when the Germans advanced. The Kolkhoz-men did not want to restore private property on the land. The struggle was going on in the Kolkhozes for the ownership of the product of their labor and not for ownership of the means of production. This struggle continues in the Soviet Kolkhozes even at present. The Germans did not give the product of the Kolkhoz-man's labor to him, they did not transfer the Kolkhozes to the control of the producers, they did not satisfy the wants and needs of the Kolkhoz-man. That was the cause for the disillusionment.

German Restoration of Private Property Failed

Now, as to the question whether the Germans divided the land or not. In the regions of Kharkov, Sumy, Poltava, Chernikov and Voroshilovgrad in the Eastern Ukraine the land *was* divided by the German occupation authorities and private property there *was* restored. This took place in 1942-43 under pressure of the returning kulaks. When the Germans occupied these territories, the kulaks and their children came back to their villages from various regions of the USSR, particularly from the Donbas coal mining regions, where they worked after they were banished from their villages in the purge of 1929-32. These people immediately began to work with the German administration.

The greatest number of them escaped the country later on, in 1943-44 together with the retreating Germans and are now in the emigration.

The Germans returned to the kulaks "their" land, "their" houses, agricultural buildings, and even mills. In return the kulaks served the Germans. Both were satisfied. The people who inhabited the kulaks' houses were thrown out in the midst of winter. That is the real story of the division of the land. The very power given to the kulaks was an additional element in causing the defeat of the Germans.

Effect of Present Land Reform

The present situation in Soviet agriculture is even more advanced than it was in those years. Most of the remaining kulaks have fled the country. The number of potential restorationists in the villages has thus become negligible to the vanishing point. Moreover, the present Stalinist reorganization of agriculture, that is, the consolidation of the small Kolkhozes into large agricultural enterprises, and the simultaneous liquidation of the small plots of land that previously remained in the possession of the Kolkhoz-men, the replacement of the small villages by big agro-cities means nothing else but the liquidation once and for all of the roots of any possible restoration of private property in agriculture. The regrets and moans of people like Harry Schwartz or Cyrus Sulzberger of the *New York Times* on this score are quite understandable, as are the lamentations of their emigre friends. Their hopes of restoration are being blown up with this reform.

Again, let us repeat: We do not justify for one moment the Stalinist terror in executing this reorganization. Nor do we favor this reform insofar as it is not at all carried out in the interest of the Kolkhoz-men. But the very fact of the liquidation of the roots of a possible restoration nevertheless remains a fact. And it does not augur well for the American program of a "future Russia."

V.

Is there really no way out, then, for these American "friends" of the Russian people? Is the restoration of capitalism in the USSR really impossible? We can reassure them: *It is possible, but only against the will of the Soviet people.*

How the American Program Can Work

It is possible, for instance, to destroy with atomic bombs a good part of Soviet industry, to occupy the country or at least sections of it, with military forces; to put in power puppets from among the emigres for instance; to give them some kind of "Marshall Plan" and the problem would be solved. . . . That this would entail facing permanent guerilla warfare in the rear of the army of occupation, that hundreds and thousands of soldiers will be killed by the revolting people, that in this "free" Russia there would have to exist a Fascist regime based on tremendous police forces (because only such a regime would be able to maintain order necessary for the restoration of capitalism) — all this is another matter. In any case, such a program of a "future Russia" would be fulfilled. . . .

The domestic forces that would deliberately support such a program are, however, misjudged by the Americans. Or rather, they are looking for them where they are not to be found. The emigrants and the rest of the demolished ruling classes are really too pitifully weak to be of service to them. But there is a force that could be enlisted to support this American program. *This force is in the Stalinist bureaucracy itself.*

Bureaucracy Main Source of Internal Support

The Hearst paper, the *New York Journal-American*, was quite right, as a matter of fact, when it placed its hope in the issue of November 28, 1950, on a possible internal struggle between the powerful police (GPU-NKVD-MGB) and the caste of officers in the Soviet army in case of a shakeup of Stalinism. (That paper was considering the eventualities of Stalin's death.) Both groups, if supported by the U.S.A., can establish a Fascist regime in the country. When it sees the current system about to collapse, the ruling bureaucracy would be quite willing to maintain its social and political privileges in that way. The restoration of private property would as a matter of fact be greeted with great joy by the bureaucracy, provided that this form of private property assures its continued rule. The mind of the Soviet bureaucracy is embodied in such people as the late General Vlassov and Victor Kravchenko. The Americans have really not been very consistent in drawing conclusions from experiences with such people.

We repeat: capitalism can be restored in the Soviet Union, but only against the will of the people, by the use of external force which rests on reactionary remnants of the old classes hostile to the people as well as on the present Stalinist bureaucracy which is no less hostile to the people. In that case, the people will rise up against these restorationists as they did against Adolf Hitler.

To sum up: the American program for a "future Russia" is the most reactionary and hostile attack against the needs and desires of the exploited and oppressed Soviet peoples. The realization of that program would mean not liberation but a change of oppressors. Which of the two oppressors is worse and which better is not for us to judge. The people will judge for themselves. The worst will be beaten first. That is what happened before, six years ago.

Aim of This Article

Stalinists commenting on our views will probably cry out with glee: "He is helping out the American imperialists, showing them their mistakes, directing them to a more correct and more solid road of oppression of the Soviet people. He is recommending to them support of a Fascist regime in order to restore capitalism in the USSR!" We know beforehand what a hue and cry the Stalinists are capable of. But any objective person will understand this article for just what it is. Although we have taken up in detail all the fallacies in the reasoning of Kennan, Stassen and the others, we have not the slightest idea of convincing them. "A hunch-back can be straightened out only in the grave," says a Russian proverb. That is the way it is with the American imperialists as well.

The aim of this article is not to convince a Kennan or a Stassen, but to indicate to the American workers where they are being led by the Kennans and Stassens. We are not interested in warning the imperialist leaders of the U.S.A. about the mistakes they are making — we are anxious to warn the American people that the road of their "program for a future Russia" is the same road along which Hitler led the unfortunate German people.

The Soviet peoples are exploited and oppressed by Stalinism. They are carrying on a struggle against Stalinism. They do need help and support in that struggle. But

the capitalist world, capitalist America cannot give them the help and support they need. They know that. The only help which can really and effectively be given the Soviet people can come only from the workers in the Western world, when they abolish with their own forces the whole structure of rotten capitalism in their own countries. The abolition of capitalism in the Western world by the workers and the establishment of workers' power will immediately deprive Stalinism of all strength and ease the way for the new revolution in the USSR.

Yugoslavia and the Shachtmanites

By **GEORGE BREITMAN**

For two and a-half years the scribes of the Independent Socialist League, formerly the Workers Party (Shachtmanites), wrote scores of articles to demonstrate that "Titoism" is only another form of Stalinism, and just as reactionary. Simultaneously, they hysterically denounced the Socialist Workers Party and the Fourth International for approaching the Yugoslav Communist Party sympathetically and trying to influence its development in a revolutionary Marxist direction.

Now, however, judging from an article by Henry Judd in the March-April issue of the *New Internationalist*, the ISL line seems in process of change. Judd was one of the noisiest critics of our policy on Yugoslavia; only four months before the present article his summation of the entire Yugoslav development since the split with the Kremlin was that "the direction in Yugoslavia is away from socialism and Workers' Statism." Now—after throwing up the smokescreen that "all" parties suffered from "short-sightedness, superficiality and a failure to grasp the full significance of this [Yugoslav] development," with the Trotskyists "of course" being the "outstanding example of this"—he declares:

"Titoism must now be redefined as a legitimate and serious international tendency, politically and ideologically, within the revolutionary movement; it must be recognized as the first of many other similar developments which, springing out of the world of Stalinism, must be accepted as harbingers of new, hitherto unknown, ideological currents with which socialists must sympathetically collaborate."

This is the position that we have taken, both in words and actions, ever since the Tito-Stalin split three years ago. And this is the position that Judd and the ISL kept denouncing not only as shortsighted, ignorant, etc., but as a capitulation to Stalinism.

How account for this sudden turnabout? Judd tries to explain it away (even while apologizing for the old ISL line in the past) in the following manner:

"The real fact of the matter is that both in terms of internal political ideology and international politics, Titoism has already passed beyond its early characteristics

which permitted it to be defined more or less correctly, if abstractly, as a Stalinist movement, or a bureaucratic clique seeking to retain power by a neutralist position in a divided world."

Judd does not explicitly indicate what "early characteristics" he is referring to, and he remains very vague about when it was that Titoism passed beyond them. But because this is the central issue, we ourselves must stress that the policies of the Yugoslav leaders have undergone important shifts since 1948, and show both what these shifts were and when they took place.

1. From the middle of 1948 to about the middle of 1949. This was the period when the Yugoslav CP leaders tried to minimize their differences with the Kremlin, withheld from the workers the full details and history of the split, refused to engage in any criticism of Stalin and Stalinism, and in general left the way open for a reconciliation.

2. From the middle of 1949 to the late summer or fall of 1950. Now the Yugoslav leaders, faced with a tightening Cominform blockade and openly designated as targets for assassination by the GPU, took a decided turn to the left. They began to re-examine some of the fundamental theories of Stalinism, the nature of the Soviet bureaucracy, etc., and to move toward conclusions in accord with those of Marxism. They disclosed the full history of their dispute with the Kremlin, called on the workers of the world to return to Leninism, and undertook a number of democratic reforms within their own country. At the same time they proclaimed a foreign policy of independence from both Washington and Moscow, although this policy even then was not without serious faults.

3. From the fall of 1950 to the present time. The outbreak of the war in Korea brought an increased danger of a Kremlin-directed assault on Yugoslavia together with increased pressure from Washington for concessions from Belgrade in return for material aid to combat the famine threatening the country. The Yugoslav leaders drew back, especially in their foreign policy, endorsed the UN policy on Korea, promised to go to war on the side of the UN

anywhere in Europe, and began to make compromising advances to the international Social Democracy.

When was it, according to Judd, that Titoism changed from "a Stalinist movement" into "a legitimate and serious international tendency, politically and ideologically, within the revolutionary movement?" Was it in 1949, when the Yugoslav leaders were moving to the left? Or was it at the end of 1950, when they were unmistakably moving to the right and collaboration with U.S. imperialism?

Judd evades a direct answer. But it sticks out all over his article—in the timing of his decision that a "redefinition" of Titoism is in order, in the way he denounces us for criticizing the present anti-internationalist foreign policy of the Yugoslav regime, and above all in his insistence that "Titoism is clearly deepening the gap between itself and Stalinism."

What does Judd mean by this? A year ago Titoism was engaging in a furious ideological struggle against Stalinism and dealing the Kremlin damaging blows that reverberated all over Eastern and Western Europe—and from the left. But nothing Titò did then could produce the slightest expression of support from the ISL. What new thing has been added that persuades Judd a genuine change for the better has taken place within Titoism? Only one thing—Tito has abandoned his hesitant moves to the left in the international field, submitted to the pressure of Washington and apparently decided that his future is linked with the camp of U.S. imperialism.

From the viewpoint of Marxism, Titò is actually less anti-Stalinist today than he was a year ago, for now he has completely reverted to the kind of foreign policy he learned in the Kremlin school—collaboration with imperialism, apologetics for the imperialist powers he hopes will aid him as allies, dependence on the UN, and so on. In other words, the very changes in Tito's policy which endanger the revolutionary future of Yugoslavia and merit the sharpest criticism of revolutionary socialists are just the ones that have earned Judd's admiration and endorsement.

Thus the thinking that underlies Judd's revision is far more revealing than the revision itself—thinking that Judd shares with most of his fellow ISL leaders, including some

who are not yet ready to subscribe to his new position on Yugoslavia.

The fashion on Titoism, so far as American petty bourgeois radicals and Stalinophobes are concerned, is set in Washington. Judd may not be aware of this, but he reacts to it instinctively; that is why he is the most reliable weathervane of the ISL leadership. Proceeding in the belief that his policy of both yesterday and today contributes to the struggle against Stalinism, which the ISL regards as its No. 1 enemy, he is actually twisted and turned by the pressure of the tail-end of American imperialism.

The Shachtmanites don't know where they are going, but almost everyone else does. Long before Judd began his "redefinition," it was predicted by our movement. As Murry Weiss put it in his political report on the Yugoslav question at the SWP Convention last November: "The Social Democrats and centrists, who belatedly recognized the importance of the Yugoslav affair, are attracted to the worst features of the Yugoslav Communist Party and its policies. They are 'Titoist' whenever there is any indication of a swing to the right [on the part of the Yugoslav leaders]. . . . As for the Shachtmanites—they are not in our class camp but are simply a special case of left Social Democracy."

A special case of left Social Democracy, but one which is steadily losing its special traits. This is manifested not only by their policy on Yugoslavia, but by their advocacy that labor participate in capitalist party primaries, their unceasing internal dispute over whether or not to support U.S. imperialism in Korea and the next world war, the increasing concessions which the openly social-patriotic and pro-war wing of the organization wrings from its opponents.

The Shachtmanites are an instructive example of the consequences of Stalinophobia in the present tense world situation. They originally split away from the Socialist Workers Party in 1940, saying they could not remain in one party with advocates of the defense of the Soviet Union against imperialism. Today they feel at home in one party with advocates of support of imperialist war against the Soviet Union. What price Third Camp?

Capitalist Economy and the Atlantic Pact

By MICHEL PABLO

As in the years 1935-38 preceding the Second World War, capitalist economy is again basically oriented towards an *arms economy*, as a step towards its transformation into a real *war economy*.

The specific *economic* causes which produced this orientation at that time were the necessity for all the capitalist countries affected by the great crisis of 1929-33 to compensate for the lack of external markets by the

enlargement of internal markets and thereby avoid a new plunge into depression and crisis.

The *arms economy*, by involving numerous branches of industrial activity in its scope, by requiring a large working force and by providing enhanced possibilities for the investment of capital, is grafted to capitalism in its decline as one of the most important branches of its fundamental economic activity. The economic preparation for war and

the economic function of war itself becomes an essential characteristic of the functioning of the capitalist regime in the imperialist epoch.

Rosa Luxemburg, in her reply to the revisionist criticism of Bernstein, had the occasion to emphasize the economic function of militarism which she considered "the most important type of investment for financial capital as for industrial capital." (*Reform or Revolution*).

However, this parasitic function which could be discerned even before the outbreak of World War I, did not have the colossal scope which it assumed after the last war. Its importance has grown to the degree that the capitalist regime as a whole has plunged into an irremediable and accelerated decadence.

Between 1935-38 the *arms economy* gave rise to a semblance of economic revival in the principal capitalist countries and particularly in Hitlerite Germany. But its inevitable consequences were not long in making themselves felt. Viewed only from the specific reference of the logic of such an economy, it is not difficult to perceive that once the *arms economy* assumes a certain momentum it is no longer possible for capitalism to retreat without the explosion of a crisis, nor is it possible to maintain such an economy indefinitely.

Limits of the Arms Economy

The limits of the arms economy as a method of enlarging the internal market are attained at the moment when demand is "sterilized" by the rise of prices or of taxes, which generally accompanies a more or less rigid freezing of wages. On the other hand, from the time when armament production reaches a certain *optimum* point, it becomes senseless to continue to produce engines of war for an already overequipped army.

The move to the *war economy* proper, which is realized in war itself, then becomes necessary. War alone can consume the products of the arms economy, recreate new needs of all kinds, and consequently new internal as well as external outlets. On the other hand, by war the capitalist powers *redivide* the international market at the expense of the vanquished powers.

In contrast with what occurred in the years 1935-39, the capitalist countries of the present "Atlantic Community" have accelerated their armaments policy at a time when their economy appeared to be expanding and removed from the threat of crisis. But in reality the crisis was already latent, and some capitalist countries, first of all the USA, had no illusions about the real possibilities of expanding, or even of maintaining, their economic activity in a world market from which a large part of its colonial and semi-colonial domain had been amputated following the Asian revolutions and the formation of the Soviet European buffer zone.

During all of 1949 and part of 1950 the American economy operated at lower average levels than those of the preceding years with frequent declines from which it recovered each time only to be deflated again after a certain period.

The economy of the capitalist countries of Western Europe (except for England and Western Germany, each

of which for specific reasons, were able to delay this moment until recently) seemed, thanks to American aid, to have attained a plateau* of world prices, and especially those of the USA, were at their lowest towards the middle of 1949 and resumed a strongly upward curve only following the war in Korea.

It was the "increase of necessary expenses for the strengthening of defense" which "stimulated"*** the American economy in the latter part of the year 1950 and gave it the momentum which has since characterized it. The index of industrial production, which the calculations of the Federal Reserve Board placed at 179 at the end of 1949, passed 215 at the end of 1950, taking a leap of around 16 points between June and October 1950.

The "Stimulating" Effects of Rearmament

The "stimulating" effects of the rearmament of the other capitalist countries must not however be measured in terms of the American example. Specific reasons which account for the scope of the American armaments program, for the capacity of production and the possibility of supplying American industry with raw materials explain the present upward movement of production in the USA.

But as for the other countries, gravitating more and more around this fundamental capitalist mass which the USA now represents, and which therefore are drawn into the same important economic and political movements of this mass, armaments production will rather have the contrary effect on them. Where it doesn't produce a clear decline it will permit at the most the maintenance of an activity neighboring on present levels, but dependent more closely than ever on the USA.***

* Heavy industry especially ran the risk of "saturating" its market, an overproduction of steel having already occurred.

** Bulletin of Economic Information, USA — Jan. 10, 1951.

*** By cornering raw materials at high prices and by stockpiling them, the monopolist economy of the USA exercises a stricter control than ever over the world capitalist economy. Not only does the resulting rise in prices act as a strangling bottleneck on the industry of the other capitalist countries, imposing severe restrictions on them, but the division of certain raw materials doled out at the whim of the USA is such that the continuation of industrial production often really depends on that whim. In the course of 1950, the USA has become for the first time in the history of capitalism, the greatest importing country, surpassing England. It has stockpiled enormous quantities of raw materials like rubber, tin, zinc, other non-ferrous metals, wool, etc., indispensable for the operation of all industry. Following the classic tendency of capitalist economy, it has often acquired exclusive possession over raw materials at their very source. On the other hand, the USA produces a very large number of raw materials on its own soil, over which its present armaments economy has also established a strict monopoly.

The economy of the European countries must content itself with the raw materials the USA chooses to grant them and at the price which monopolist control imposes. Thus, for example, there has recently been in London a shortage of a raw material like sulphur, required for British industry, the USA supplying 90% of the world exports. By reducing the quantities hitherto granted England the USA is capable, through this single raw material, of producing paralysis in a large part of British industry.

Let us however examine what exactly is represented by the present effort of the "Atlantic Community" rearmament, and what it expects from this effort and what can really result therefrom.

Defense Expenditures

The so-called "national defense" expenditures of Western Europe, the USA and Canada remained at the level of 1948-49 up to the middle of 1950, totalling around 16.5 billion dollars. (Bulletin of Oxford University, Institute of Statistics, Nov. 1950). From this total, the expenditures of Western Europe alone are calculated at around 5 billion dollars, a sum much higher than the international American aid granted through the Marshall Plan in 1948-49.

Unencumbered by the burden of armaments and of the so-called "national defense," Western Europe was already on the verge of freeing itself from dependence on America in 1948-49. The Korean war provoked a sharp turn in the economy of the capitalist countries.

In the USA it acted as a powerful catalyst enabling the worst reactionary military and economic forces to set the war machine into motion, which was to immediately revitalize American economy and on the other hand prepare the conquest of a world threatened by the extension of the colonial revolutions that are blocking the constitution of a world market dominated by Washington.

Pressed by the USA, the capitals of the Western European countries soon followed the same movement toward an arms economy. Its progressive extension is illustrated by the following facts:

In the USA, the so-called "national defense" expenditures, to which even in the opinion of the *London Economist* must now be added the Marshall credits, rose from 17.7 billion dollars in 1949-50 to 26.8 billions in 1950-51, and to 52 billions in 1951-52.

In Canada, from 350 million dollars in 1949-50 to 570 millions in 1950-51, to 1.6 billions in 1951-52, and to 3.4 billions in 1952-54.

In Great Britain, from 740 million pounds in 1949-50 to 859 millions in 1950-51, to 1300 millions in 1951-52, to 1600 millions in 1952-53, and 1,800 millions or more in 1953-54. (*The Economist*, Feb. 24, 1951).

In France, from 350 billion francs in 1949-50 to 420 billions in 1950-51, and to 546 billions in 1951-52.

In Italy, from 250 billion lira in 1949-50 to 296 billions in 1950-51, and to 546 billions in 1951-52.

In the Netherlands, from 223 million dollars in 1949-50 to 259 millions in 1950-51 to 400 millions for the following years.

In relation to the national revenue of these countries, the rearmament effort represents the following ascending tendency:

For the USA, 7% to 15% (end of 1951) and from 17% to 20% for the following years; for Canada from 3% in 1949-50 to 10%; for Great Britain, from 7.4% in 1949-50 to more than 12% (end of 1951) and to more than 17% for the following years; for France, from 5% to 10%; for Italy, from 4% to 8%; for the Netherlands, from 6.1% in 1949-50 to 6.7% in 1950-51 and to more than 10% for the following years.

In order to cope with such an effort, the capitalist countries naturally envisage first of all an extension of production, "a corresponding increase of production" in order to "compensate for the new expenditures" imposed by rearmament. (*Etudes et Conjonctures*, Nov.-Dec. 1950. "Economie de rearmament.")

If this solution proves impossible, there remains only "the diversion of a part of production destined either for civil consumption or for capital investment." (Ibid). That would signify a "lowering of the standard of living" and a reduction of the retooling program. On the other hand, even in the event of a possible expansion of economic activity stimulated by arms production and expenditures, it is impossible to avoid the corresponding "inflationary movement" which begins with the rise of prices caused by the quest for, and the excessive stockpiling of raw materials.

Thus, the inflationary movement occurs on the basis of the existing gap — even in the event of an economic expansion and an increase in production — between the increased volume of money in the hands of the workers employed by the arms economy and the volume of consumers' goods, arms production not being commodity production, a production of new values.

In order to limit this inevitable inflationary movement, the capitalist countries then ineluctably resort to taxes and to the more or less rigid wage freeze which accompanies their price policy.

Alternatives for Capitalist Economy

In reality only the USA and Canada have the possibility of combining their arms program with a considerable expansion of economic activity and of production. Charles Wilson, the new director of the *Office of Defense Mobilization* in his speech of Feb. 23, advanced impressive figures which according to him, illustrate the "unlimited" capacities of the "dynamic American economy." As a possible aim of production for this economy in the coming 2-3 years he fixed a surplus of 150 billion dollars for rearmament without injury to the present civilian production. It is however doubtful if such an aim is realizable, even considered from a strictly economic point of view and leaving aside the inevitable reactions of the masses to the American arms program, the intensified taxation and inflation which will accompany this program as its inevitable results. The progressive diminution of the buying power of the masses will thus impede the rise of production to the levels which Wilson hopes to attain.

Such however is not the case for the European countries. None of them can hope to cope with the burden of rearmament by counting principally on a considerable increase of production. By increasing productivity these countries envisage covering a part of the necessary expenditures for rearmament, above all by an intensification of labor, by an enhanced exploitation of their national labor force. For example, England hopes to raise productivity by 4% in 1951-52 and thus to cover 250 million pounds of the 500 million pounds required by rearmament for the same period. But this modest figure is an "optimistic" figure for the *Economist* (Feb. 24) which hastens to add "it is

out of the question that this percentage of increase can be increased to 12% toward 1954."

In the opinion of this same periodical, *more than half* of the expenditures envisaged for rearmament must then be covered by reduction of the re-tooling program (modernization of industry and housing construction) and even more by "a very direct and considerable cut in the standard of living of the people." This conclusion invariably recurs in the reasoning of all European capitalist journals that concern themselves with the question of rearmament. What is still more important, this conclusion is already a fact of life.

The "Price of Freedom": Austerity

The European countries are coping with the needs of rearmament by drastically reducing civilian expenditures, investments in industrial and social equipment — which they are diverting to the production of armaments — and especially by lowering the already reduced standard of living of the masses.*

The Ministers of the British Labor Party are announcing a program of "prolonged and worsening austerity" to the masses who have placed confidence in them to "build socialism in England." This same announcement is repeated in the same solemn tones by all the ministers and responsible statesmen in France, Belgium, Holland, Italy.

This is now the price of "freedom" everywhere in Western Europe.

From England to Holland the slogan is "austerity" which means a more onerous system of taxation, a rigorous wage freeze, additional restrictions on foodstuffs. Before Europe has had the opportunity to really heal its war wounds, it is again beginning a new armaments economy and policy which this time, if pursued, will shake its fragile and only partially rebuilt edifice to its very foundations.

Since the war in Korea, the cost of living has already risen at least from 5-15% in the various countries of the "Atlantic Community" in the following order: France, U.S.A., Italy, Germany, England, Holland, Canada, Belgium. In other countries, close to the "Atlantic Community" like Spain and Greece, this rise already considerably

* The first to suffer in England is the program of housing construction as well as social security, i.e. the principal measures favoring the masses adopted by the Labor Government. In France too the already extremely modest construction program as well as social security will suffer. As for investment in equipment which was already reduced in 1950, a "new, painful choice" is predicted for 1951, i.e. a new reduction is already in operation.

In Belgium it is first of all a question "of public investments. . . through a drastic reduction of the program of public works and private dwellings. Moreover it is necessary to stimulate new and useful investments notably those intended for armaments." (Speech of Maurice Masoin, professor at the University of Louvain on the "economic, financial and monetary aspects of the armaments policy" quoted by *L'Echo de la Bourse* of Brussels, Jan. 19.)

In Holland, the new prime minister W. Drees announced in his "austerity" program the reduction of 150,000,000 guilders of civil expenditures incorporated in the budget, as well as the reduction of public and private investments."

exceeds 15% and for certain consumer goods it has risen to 30% and even 50% in the last months. On the other hand, wages have practically been frozen everywhere in the course of the last year.

However, while the capitalist leaders and their agents find no difficulty in proposing the saving measure of a wage freeze to avoid the precipitation of the inflationary spiral, the masses refuse to accept the crushing and senseless burden of the preparations for a new war.

Without reaction from the masses, American capitalism can dream of producing 216,000 jet-engines and 35,000 tanks a year, as it proposes to do. Its European satellites on their side can stop the construction of housing in their ravaged countries and apply themselves to the task of equipping several divisions which, supposedly, will make a stand successively at the Elbe, at the Rhine, at the Pyrenees against the Soviet "invasion armies."*

Inevitable Reaction of Masses

However, the reaction of the masses, which can checkmate these plans, is *inevitable* and has already assumed considerable scope almost everywhere in the "Atlantic" community. *Impelled by the pressure on their constantly declining standard of living—the new inflationary pressure on prices which accompanies the arms economy—and stimulated by the repercussions of the colonial revolutions in Asia and the defeats suffered there by imperialism, the western proletarian masses are in turn being drawn again into the struggle.*

In the U.S.A., this *new economic and political conjuncture* has already led to the most serious break in 18 years between the reformist bureaucracy, reflecting the pressure of the ranks in a deformed but nonetheless significant way, and the Democratic administration. In the probable eventuality of a widespread inflation which would accompany the implementation of the colossal American armaments plan, the social evolution in the USA could soon take on an especially rapid tempo and crystallize the maturing political consciousness of the American proletariat, for example, in the creation of a *Labor Party* opposed to the two traditional parties of the bourgeoisie. Such a development joined to the possibility of great economic struggles of the American masses which are already in the offing, will have its effects on the capacity of the American bourgeoisie to realize its armaments program as well as on its ability to unleash the war as easily as it now believes possible because of its confidence of controlling the masses.

* In reality, the 'Atlantic' powers have arrived at the conclusion that Western Europe is 'undefendable' and that their 18-odd divisions stationed in Germany will only serve the purpose of a holding operation to permit intervention of the 'strategic' American air force from bases in North Africa and England. This is also the gist of Eisenhower's report to the American Congress.

In practice the whole 'rearmament' effort of Western Europe leads merely to widen the social crisis in these countries, without any serious results in the sphere of an effective 'defense.'

In England, in the last months, the new conjuncture has caused broad industrial unrest, strikes and various demonstrations of dockers, railroad workers, miners, metal workers. These are very often led by "committees" opposed to the treacherous official trade union leaderships and constitute an important step in the formation of a new revolutionary leadership of the British proletariat. This proletariat is at present one of the most advanced in Europe in its profound, conscious opposition to the preparation for and the unleashing of a new war.

Unrest in Europe

In Belgium, the recent strikes have manifested a similar character of *spontaneity, of leadership by the ranks, of combativity, of determination*. This mood now prevailing among the Belgian proletariat in large part determines the opposition role of the Belgian Socialist Party and its unique "leftist" course in contrast with the attitude of the other big European Social Democratic parties.

It was the existing discontent among the Dutch masses which complicated the solution of the last prolonged ministerial crisis, and naturally the new government's program of enhanced "austerity" will not remove the threat of the great wave of struggles in the making in this country as well.

On the other hand, the savagery of the Franco regime was not able to prevent the magnificent Barcelona uprising. The Barcelona proletariat like that of the rest of Spain, has been subjected to a condition of extreme poverty, which will become even more intolerable by the projected inclusion of Spain in the western rearmament program.

Also desirous of making its "modest" contribution to rearmament, Italy is in the process of seeing the precarious stabilization it seems to have attained overwhelmed by an inflationary chaos which will give a new, stormy character to the already existing strike movements and political ferment.

Finally France is moving into the heart of the storm, impelled by the winds of inflation which its leaders, chained to the American chariot and to colonial adventures, have aided mightily in blowing up. From June to December the official index of wholesale prices in this country has risen 18% and the retail price index more than 13%. It is "appropriate to note that the rise in price of international raw materials (26% between June and December 1950) has not yet been completely assimilated" by these prices. (*Banque et Bourse*, Jan. 1951). The March 1951 wave of strikes has only given partial satisfaction to the workers, has led only to a truce which will be smashed by the irresistible inflationary pressure in this country which has been bled by the war in Indochina, by the costs of its enhanced repressive apparatus in the North African colonies and by its contribution to "Atlantic" rearmament.

German Workers on Move

As for Western Germany, already threatened with suffocation by the development of its productive forces which cannot be contained within the limits of its home market, it too could only take the road under its capitalist regime

toward an *arms economy* and to an inescapable transformation of the Ruhr into the principal *war arsenal* of all Western Europe.

The social consequences of this will not be unlike those in the other capitalist countries. The German proletariat is making itself heard and putting forward its demands in the economic sphere as well as in the sphere of the economic and political leadership of the country.

The Western bourgeoisie, by taking the orientation toward preparation for war and arms economy, has for all practical purposes interred all its projects and ideas for restoring its economic and social equilibrium and for meeting the threat of revolution by demonstrating the viability of its economic system.

Capitalist or Socialist United Europe?

The Marshall Plan, which they tried to present as having been initially conceived in this spirit and which expires in 13 months, is going to be merged, according to its administrator, William C. Foster, with the *military aid program* and with assistance to inadequately developed areas, *hereafter also to be subordinated* to the purely military objectives of imperialism. ("If the Marshall Plan had as its object the re-establishment of the economies of the European nations which were shaken by the war, the new plan will serve to adapt the economies of these nations to the needs of war production." *UP*, March 19.)

On the other hand, the Schumann Plan, the other project for the "recovery" and "unification" of Europe in "peace," which has just been signed under the pressure of the US, *has also changed its character and will also be subordinated to military needs.**

Finally the only hope now of attaining the "unification" of Europe is through the imperatives of war preparation, the exigencies of the armaments economy and of the united European "army."

As against the aggravation of the social crisis which the insane policy of the bourgeoisie in its historic impasse has provoked in Europe and in the entire "Atlantic community," *the proletariat should more than ever counterpose the perspective of the proletarian socialist revolution, of the Socialist United States of Europe, of the reorganization of the economy freed from the burdens, the waste and the insanities of bourgeois management on the basis of the statification of the means of production and of planning by the masses and for the masses.*

By clinging ever more desperately to the corpse of rotting capitalism, the Social Democracy reveals every day, even in the countries where the masses accord it an active support as in England and Belgium, that it is organically

* "One cannot fail to note that the Schumann plan which was originally conceived as a remedy for the danger of overproduction (of steel and coal — M.P.) enters its first period at the moment when these dangers not only no longer exist (because of rearmament — MP) but when the only question now is that of shortages. In a rearmament economy the plan still has its usefulness, but its purpose is altered." — *Figaro*, March 20.

incapable of giving Europe and the world this chance before the outbreak of the orgy of a new war.

As for the Stalinist leadership of the CP's, subjected to the orders of the Soviet bureaucracy, they content themselves with "neutralizing" Western Europe in order to facilitate, either a compromise with imperialism in the present period, or, in case of war to settle *manu militari* the fate of these countries mainly by the action of the Soviet army and their bureaucratic apparatuses without running the risk of being overwhelmed by the democratically organized revolutionary masses.

From now on it is the duty of the conscious elements of the European proletarian vanguard to raise higher the banner of the European Socialist revolution, of the Socialist United States of Europe. This is the only way to counteract the war preparations of imperialism, the mad and criminal adventure into which they are again inexorably leading humanity, and the plans of the Soviet bureaucracy which cannot envisage a possible move into the heart of Europe except if assured in advance of being able to demoralize the European proletariat and of keeping it firmly under control.

From the Arsenal of Marxism

Tolstoy, Poet and Rebel

(Written on Tolstoy's Eightieth Birthday)

By LEON TROTSKY

(Translated for the first time into English especially for this issue by John G. Wright)

I

Tolstoy has passed his eightieth birthday and now stands before us like an enormous jagged cliff, moss-covered and from a different historical world.

A remarkable thing! Not alone Karl Marx but, to cite a name from a field closer to Tolstoy's, Heinrich Heine as well appear to be contemporaries of ours. But from our great contemporary of Yasnaya Polyana we are already separated by the irreversible flow of time which differentiates all things.

This man was 33 years old when serfdom was abolished in Russia. As the descendant of "ten generations untouched by labor," he matured and was shaped in an atmosphere of the old nobility, among inherited acres, in a spacious manorial home and in the shade of linden-tree alleys, so tranquil and patrician.

A Patrician Domicile

The traditions of landlord rule, its romanticism, its poetry, its whole style of living were irresistibly imbibed by Tolstoy and became an organic part of his spiritual makeup. From the first years of his consciousness he was, as he remains to this very day, an *aristocrat* in the deepest and most secret recesses of his creativeness; and this, despite all his subsequent spiritual crises.

In the ancestral home of the Princes Volkonsky, inherited by the Tolstoy family, the author of *War and Peace* occupies a simple, plainly furnished room in which there hangs a hand-saw, stands a scythe and lies an ax. But on the upper floor of this same dwelling, like stony guardians of its traditions the illustrious ancestors of a whole number of generations keep watch from the walls. In this there is a symbol. We find both of these floors also in the heart of the master of the house, only inverted in order. If on the summits of consciousness a nest has been spun for itself

by the philosophy of the simple life and of self-submergence in the people, then from below, whence well up the emotions, the passions and the will, there look down upon us a long gallery of ancestors.

In the wrath of repentance Tolstoy renounced the false and worldly-vain art of the ruling classes which glorifies their artificially cultivated tastes and envelops their caste prejudices in the flattery of false beauty. But what happened? In his latest major work, *Resurrection*, Tolstoy still places in the center of his artistic attention the one and the same wealthy and well-born Russian landlord, surrounding him just as solicitously with the golden cobweb of aristocratic connections, habits and remembrances as if outside this "worldly-vain" and "false" universe there were nothing of importance or of beauty.

From the landlord's manor there runs a short and narrow path straight to the hut of the peasant. Tolstoy, the poet, was accustomed to make this passage often and lovingly even before Tolstoy, the moralist, turned it into a road of salvation. Even after the abolition of serfdom, he continues to regard the peasant as "his" — an inalienable part of his material and spiritual inventory. From behind Tolstoy's unquestionable "physical love for the genuine toiling people" about which he himself tells us, there looks down upon us just as unquestionably his collective aristocratic ancestor — only illumined by an artist's genius.

An Exclusive Creative Sanctuary

Landlord and moujik — these are in the last analysis the only people whom Tolstoy has wholly accepted into his creative sanctuary. But neither before nor after his spiritual crisis, was he ever able or strove to free himself from the purely patrician contempt, for all those figures who stand between the landlord and the peasant, or those who occupy positions beyond the sacred poles of this ancient order —

the German superintendent, the merchant, the French tutor, the physician, the "intellectual" and, finally, the factory worker with his watch and chain. Tolstoy never feels a need to understand these types, to peer into their souls, or question them about their faith. And they pass before his artist's eye like so many insignificant and largely comical silhouettes. When he does create images of revolutionists of the Seventies or Eighties, as for example in *Resurrection*, he simply adapts his old landlord and peasant types to a new milieu or offers us purely external and humorously painted sketches.

At the beginning of the Sixties when a flood of new European ideas and, what is more important, of new *social relations* swept over Russia, Tolstoy, as I said, had already left a third of a century behind him: psychologically he was already molded.

Needless to recall, Tolstoy did not become an apologist for serfdom as did his intimate friend Fet (Shenshin), landlord and subtle lyric poet, in whose heart a tender receptivity to nature and to love was coupled with adoring prostration before the salutary whiplash of feudalism. But imbued in Tolstoy was a deep hatred for the new social relations, coming in the place of the old. "Personally I fail to see any amelioration of morals," he wrote in 1861, "nor do I propose to take any one's word for it. I do not find, for instance, that the relation between the factory owner and the worker is more humane than that between the landlord and the serf."

A Landed Aristocrat as An Artist

Everywhere and in everything there came hurly-burly and turmoil, there came the decomposition of the old nobility, the disintegration of the peasantry, universal chaos, the rubbish and litter of demolition, the hum and ding-dong of city life, the tavern and cigarette in the village, the factory limerick in place of the folksong — and all this repelled Tolstoy, both as an aristocrat and as an artist. Psychologically he turned his back on this titanic process and forever refused it artistic recognition. He felt no inner urge to defend feudal slavery, but he did remain wholeheartedly on the side of those ties in which he saw wise simplicity and which he was able to unfold into artistically perfected forms.

His whole heart was fixed there where life is reproduced changelessly from one generation to the next, century after century. There where sacred necessity rules over everything; where every single step hinges on the sun, the rain, the wind and the green grass growing. Where nothing comes from one's own reason or from an individual's rebellious volition and, therefore, no personal responsibility exists, either. Everything is predetermined, everything justified in advance, sanctified. Responsible for nothing, thinking nothing, man lives only by *hearing and obeying*, says Uspensky, the remarkable poet of "The Dominion of the Land." And this perpetual hearing and obeying, converted into perpetual toil, is precisely what shapes the *life* which outwardly leads to no results whatever but which has its result in its very self. . . . And lo, a miracle! This convict-labor dependence — without reflection or choice, without errors or pangs of repentance — is what gives

rise to the great moral "ease" of existence under the harsh guardianship of "the ears of rye." Mikula Selyanovich, peasant hero of the folk epic, says of himself: "I am the *beloved* of raw mother earth."

Such is the religious myth of Russian Populism which ruled for decades over the minds of the Russian intellectuals. Stone deaf to its radical tendencies, Tolstoy always remained personally and represented in the Populist movement its aristocratic conservative wing.

Tolstoy was repelled by the new and in order to create artistically Russian life as he knew, understood and loved it, he was compelled to withdraw into the past, back to the very beginnings of the 19th Century. *War and Peace* (written in 1867-69) is his best and unsurpassed work.

The Secret of the "Slavic Soul"

The anonymous massivity of life and its sacred irresponsibility were incarnated by Tolstoy in his character Karatayev, a type least comprehensible to a European reader; at all events, furthest removed from him.

"Karatayev's life, as he himself saw it, had no meaning as an individual life. It had meaning only as a small particle of the great whole, which Karatayev constantly felt. Of attachments, of friendship, and love as Pierre understood them, Karatayev had none. He loved and lovingly lived with everything that life brought him into contact with, and particularly with human beings. . . . Pierre felt that Karatayev, despite all his affectionate tenderness toward him, would not grieve for a moment over their parting."

It is that stage when the spirit, as Hegel put it, has not yet attained inner self-consciousness and therefore manifests itself only as spirit indwelling in nature. Despite his rather rare appearances Karatayev is the philosophical, if not the artistic axis, of *War and Peace*; and Kutuzov whom Tolstoy turns into a national hero is this very same Karatayev, only in the post of commander-in-chief.

In contrast to Napoleon, Kutuzov has no personal plans, no personal ambition. In his semi-conscious tactics, he is not guided by reason but by that which rises above reason — by a dim instinct for physical conditions and by the promptings of the people's spirit. Czar Alexander, in his more lucid moments, as well as the least of Kutuzov's soldiers all stand equally under the dominion of the land. . . . In this moral unity is the pathos of Tolstoy's book.

How miserable, in reality, is this Old Russia with its nobility disinherited by history, without any elegant past of hierarchical estates, without the Crusades, without knightly love or tournaments of Knighthood, without even romantic highway robberies. How poverty-stricken so far as inner beauty is concerned; what a ruthless plunder of the peasant masses amid the general semi-animal existence!

Miracle of Reincarnation

But what a miracle of reincarnation is a genius capable of! From the raw material of this drab and colorless life he extracts its secret multi-colored beauty. With Homeric calm and with Homer's love of children he endows everything and everybody with his attention. Kutuzov, the manorial household servants, the cavalry horse, the

adolescent countess, the moujik, the Czar, a louse on a soldier, the freemason — he gives preference to none among them, deprives none of his due share. Step by step, stroke by stroke he creates a limitless panorama whose parts are all inseparably bound together by an internal bond. In his work Tolstoy is as unhurried as the life he pictures. It is a terrifying thing to say, but he rewrote his colossal book *seven times*. . . Perhaps what is most astounding in this titan creativeness is that the artist permits neither himself nor the reader to become attached to any individual character.

He never puts his heroes on display, as does Turgenev whom Tolstoy disliked, amid bursts of firecrackers and the glare of magnesium flares. He does not seek out situations for them that would set them off to advantage; he hides nothing, suppresses nothing. The restless seeker of truth, Pierre Bezukhov, he shows us at the end as a smug head of a family and a happy landlord; Natasha Rostov, so touching in her semi-childlike sensitiveness, he turns, with godlike mercilessness, into a shallow breeding female, untidy diapers in hand. But from behind this seemingly indifferent attentiveness to individual parts there rises a mighty apotheosis of the whole, where everything breathes the spirit of inner necessity and harmony. It might perhaps be correct to say that this creative effort is permeated with *esthetic pantheism* for which there is neither beauty nor ugliness, neither the great nor the small, because it holds as the great and beautiful only the whole of life itself, in the perpetual circuit of its manifestations. This is an *agricultural esthetic*, mercilessly conservative by nature. And it is this that lends to the epics of Tolstoy kinship with the Pentateuch and the Iliad.

Dwelling in the Recent Past

Tolstoy's two recent attempts to find some room for psychologic images and "beautiful types" to which he feels closest affinity within the framework of a more recent historical past — in the days of Peter the First and of the *Decembrists* of 1825 — have been shattered against the artist's hostility to foreign influences which color both of these periods so sharply. But even where Tolstoy approaches most closely to our own times as in *Anna Karenina* (1873) he remains inwardly alien to the reigning hurly-burly and inflexibly stubborn in his artistic conservatism, scaling down the sweep of his own horizons and singling out of the whole of Russian life only the surviving oases of gentility, with the old ancestral home, ancestral portraits and luxurious linden alleys in whose shade, from one generation to the next, the cycle of birth, love and death changeless in its forms, is repeated.

And Tolstoy delineates the spiritual life of his heroes in accord with the day-to-day life of their motherland: calmly, without haste and with vision unclouded. He never runs ahead of the inner play of emotions, thoughts or the dialogue. He is in no hurry to go anywhere nor is he ever late. His hands hold the strands tying together a host of lives, but he never loses his head. Like the master of an enormous enterprise who keeps an ever-wakeful eye on all its many parts, he mentally keeps an errorless balance-

sheet. All he does, seemingly, is to keep watch while nature itself carries out all the work. He casts a seed upon the soil and like a good husbandman calmly permits it to put out its stalk naturally, and grow full of ears. Why, this is the genial Karatayev with his silent worship of the laws of nature!

He will never seek to touch a bud in order forcibly to unfold its petals; but permits them silently to open in the warmth of the sun. He is both alien and deeply hostile to the esthetic of the big-city culture which, in its self-devouring voracity, violates and torments nature, demanding from it only extracts and essences; and which with convulsively clutching fingers searches on the palette for colors non-existent in a sun-ray's spectrum.

Tolstoy's style is identical with all of his genius: calm, unhurried, frugal, without being miserly or ascetic; it is muscular, on occasion awkward, and rough. It is so simple and always incomparable in its results. (He is just as far removed from Turgenev who is lyrical, flirtatious, scintillating and aware of the beauty of his language as he is from Dostoyevsky's tongue, so sharp, so choked-up and pock-marked.)

Dostoyevsky on Tolstoy

In one of his novels Dostoyevsky — the city dweller without rank or title and the genius with an incurably pincered soul — this voluptuous poet of cruelty and commiseration, counterposes himself profoundly and pointedly, as the artist of the new and "accidental Russian families," to Count Tolstoy, the singer of the perfected forms of the landlord past.

"If I were a Russian novelist and a talented one," says Dostoyevsky, speaking through the lips of one of his characters, "I would unfailingly take my heroes from the well-born Russian nobility, because this is the only type of Russian capable of at least a semblance of beautiful order and beautiful sensations. . . . Saying this, I am not at all joking, although I am not at all a noble myself, which besides, you yourself know. . . . Believe me, it is here that we have everything truly beautiful among us up till now. At any rate, here is everything among us that is in the least perfected. I do not say it because I unreservedly agree with either the correctness or the truth of this beauty; but here, for example, we have already perfected forms of honor and duty which apart from the nobility are not to be found anywhere in Russia let alone perfected but even started. . . . The position of our novelist," continues Dostoyevsky without naming Tolstoy but unquestionably having him in mind, "in such a case would be quite definitive. He would not be able to write in any other way except historically, for the beautiful type no longer exists in our own day, and if there are remnants abroad, then according to the prevailing consensus of opinion, they have not retained any beauties for themselves."

When the "beautiful type" disappeared, there came tumbling down not only the immediate object of artistic creativeness but also the foundations of Tolstoyan moral fatalism and his esthetic pantheism. The sanctified Karatayevism of the Tolstoyan soul was perishing. Everything that had been previously taken for granted as part of an unchallenged whole now became chipped into a sliver and by this token into a problem. What was rational had

become the irrational. And, as always happens, precisely at the moment when being had lost its *old* meaning, Tolstoy started asking himself about the meaning of being in general. In the life not of a youth but of a man 50 years of age there ensued a great spiritual crisis (toward the latter part of the Seventies). Tolstoy returns to God, accepts the teachings of Christ, rejects division of labor and along with it, culture and the state; he becomes the preacher of agricultural labor, of the simple life and of non-resistance to evil by force.

The Gist of the Spiritual Crisis

The deeper was the internal crisis — and by his own admission the fifty-year old artist for a long time contemplated suicide — all the more surprising must it seem that Tolstoy returned, as the end result, to what is essentially his starting point. *Agricultural labor* — isn't this, after all, the basis on which the epoepee of *War and Peace* unfolds? *The simple life*, self-submergence in the elementary people—isn't that where Kutuzov's strength lies? *Non-resistance to evil by force* — isn't the whole of Karatayev contained in fatalistic resignation?

But if that is so, then of what does the *crisis* of Tolstoy consist? Of this, that what had previously been secret and subterranean breaks through the crust and passes over into the sphere of consciousness. Inasmuch as the spirituality indwelling in nature disappeared along with that "nature" which incarnated it, the spirit begins striving toward inner self-consciousness. That automatic harmony against which the automatism of life itself had risen must henceforth be preserved by the conscious power of the idea. In this conservative struggle for moral and esthetic self-preservation, the artist summons to his aid the philosopher-moralist.

II

Tolstoy and the Liberals

It would not be easy to determine which of these two Tolstoys — the poet or the moralist — has won greater popularity in Europe. In any case, it is unquestionable that behind the condescending smirk of the bourgeois public at the genius innocence of the Yasnaya Polyana elder, there lurks a peculiar sort of moral satisfaction: a famous poet, a millionaire, one of "our own circle," and an aristocrat to boot, wears out of moral conviction a peasant shirt, walks in bast-shoes, chops wood. It is as if here was a certain redemption of the sins of a whole class, of a whole culture. This does not, of course, prevent every bourgeois ninny from looking down his nose on Tolstoy and even lightly casting doubts about his complete sanity. A case in point is the not unknown Max Nordau, one of the brotherhood who take the philosophy of old and honest Samuel Smiles, spiced with cynicism, and dress it up in a clown's costume for columns on Sunday. With his reference text from Lombroso in hand, Nordau discovers in Tolstoy all the symptoms of degeneration. For all these petty shopkeepers insanity begins at the point where profit ceases.

But whether his bourgeois devotees regard Tolstoy suspiciously, ironically or with favor, he remains for all

of them a psychological enigma. Aside from a couple of his worthless disciples and propagandists—one of them, Menshikov, is now playing the role of a Russian Hammerstein — one would have to say that for the last thirty years of his life, Tolstoy, the moralist, has stood completely alone. (M. O. Menshikov, a 19th century Russian bourgeois publicist, began his career as a humanist, writing idealistic articles chiefly on morality; in the Nineties he became a spokesman for Russian reactionaries and anti-Semites. Baron Wilhelm Hammerstein was a German reactionary, Reichstag deputy and editor of the anti-Semitic *Kreuzzeitung*. — Ed.)

Truly his was the tragic position of a prophet crying in the wilderness. Completely under the dominion of his conservative agricultural sympathies, Tolstoy has unceasingly, tirelessly and triumphantly defended his spiritual world against the dangers threatening it from all sides. He has dug, once and for all, a deep moat between himself and every variety of bourgeois liberalism, and, in the first instance, has cast aside "the superstition of progress universally prevalent in our times."

His Philosophic Negations

"It's all very well," he cries, "to have electricity, telephones, exhibitions and all the gardens of Arcadia with their concerts and performances, along with all the cigars and match boxes, suspenders and motors; but I wish them all at the bottom of the sea. And not only them but also the railroads and all the manufactured cotton and wool cloth in the world. Because to produce them 99 out of every 100 people must be in slavery and perish by the thousands in factories where these items are manufactured."

Aren't our lives adorned and enriched by division of labor? But division of labor maims the living human soul. Let division of labor rot! Art? But *genuine* art must unite all the people in the idea of God and not disunite them. Our art serves only the elite, it sunders people apart and therefore it is a lie. Tolstoy courageously rejects as "false" the art of — Shakespeare, Goethe, himself, Wagner, Boecklin [Swiss landscape painter].

He divests himself of all material cares connected with business and enrichment and dons peasant clothing as if performing a symbolic rite, renouncing culture. But what lurks behind this symbolic act? What does it oppose to the "lie," that is, to the historic process.

After doing some violence to himself, Tolstoy's social philosophy may be summed up, on the basis of his writings, in the following "programmatic theses":

1. — It is not, some kind of iron sociologic laws that produce the enslavement of peoples, but legal codes.
2. — Modern slavery rests on three statutes: those on land, taxes and property.
3. — Not alone the Russian state but every state is an institution for committing, by violence and with impunity the most horrible crimes.
4. — *Genuine social progress is attained only through the religious and moral self-perfection of individuals.*

5. — "To get rid of states it is not necessary to fight against them with external means. All that is needed is not to take part in them and not to support them." That is to say: a) not to assume the calling of either *soldier* or *field marshal*, either *minister* or *village head*, either *juryman* or *member of parliament*; b) not to pay taxes, direct or indirect, to the state voluntarily; c) not to utilize state institutions nor government funds whether for *salaries* or *pensions*; and d) not to safeguard one's property by measures of state violence.

A Conservative Anarchism

If from this schema we were to remove the fourth point — which clearly stands by itself and which concerns religious and moral self-perfection — then we would get a rather rounded anarchist program. First, there is a purely mechanical conception of society as the product of evil legislation. Next, a formal denial of the state and politics generally. And finally, as the method of struggle — a passive general strike and universal boycott. But by removing the religious-moral thesis, we actually remove the single nerve which connects this whole rationalistic structure with its architect: the soul of Lev Tolstoy. For him, owing to all the conditions of his evolution and position, the task does not at all consist in establishing "communist" anarchy in place of the capitalist order. The task is to safeguard the communal-agricultural order against destructive influences "from without."

As in his Populism, so, too, in his "anarchism," Tolstoy represents conservative agricultural interests. Like the early freemasons who sought by ideological means to restore and strengthen in society the caste-guild morality of mutual aid which was falling apart naturally under the blows of economic development, Tolstoy seeks to revive by dint of a religious-moral idea the life under a purely natural economy.

Along this road he becomes a conservative anarchist, because what he requires, first and foremost, is that the state with its whips of militarism and its scorpions of the federal treasury let live in peace the all-saving Karatayev commune. Tolstoy has no inkling whatever of the globe-encompassing struggle between the two worlds — that of the bourgeoisie and that of socialism — on the outcome of which hinges the destiny of mankind. In his eyes socialism always remained a variety of liberalism, of little interest to him. In his eyes Karl Marx as well as Frederick Bastiat [a vulgar French economist, apologist for capitalism] were representatives of one and the same "false principle" of capitalist culture, of landless workers, of state coercion. In general, once mankind has ventured onto a false road, it really matters little how near or how far this road has been travelled. Salvation can come only by turning back.

Tolstoy is at a loss for words contemptuous enough to hurl against that science which maintains that while we shall continue for a very long time to live badly "in accordance with the historic, sociologic and other laws of

progress," our life shall nevertheless "become very good by itself ultimately."

A Great Artist Turns His Back on History

It is necessary to put an end to evil right now; and for this it is enough to understand that evil is evil. All the moral feelings which have historically held the people together and all the moral-religious fictions arising from these ties are reduced by Tolstoy to the most abstract commandments of love, of temperance and of passive resistance. And since these commandments lack any historical content, and are therefore without any content whatever, they seem to him to be applicable at all times and to all peoples.

To history Tolstoy grants no recognition; and this provides the basis for all his thinking. Upon this rests the freedom of his metaphysical negations as well as the practical impotence of all his preachings. The human life which he accepts — the former life of Ural-Cossack farmers in the sparsely populated steppes of Samara province — took place *outside* of history; it constantly reproduced itself like the life of a beehive or ant-heap. What people call history is the product of senselessness, delusions and cruelties which deformed the true soul of humanity. Fearlessly consistent, Tolstoy throws property out of the window, along with history.

Newspapers and magazines are abhorrent to him as documents of current history. With his breast he would beat back all the waves of the global ocean. His historical blindness renders him childishly helpless when it comes to the world of social problems. Tolstoy's philosophy resembles Chinese painting. Ideas of entirely different epochs are not located in perspective but arranged on one and the same plane. Against war he launches arguments of pure logic and to reinforce them adduces the opinions of Epictetus as well as those of Molinari (19th Century Belgian economist of the Manchester school); of Lao Tse (Chinese philosopher of the pre-Confucian era) as well as Friedrich II; of the prophet Isaiah as well as the columnist Hardouin, oracle of the Parisian grocers. In his eyes writers, philosophers and prophets represent not their own epochs but rather eternal moral categories.

With him, Confucius strolls shoulder to shoulder with Harpagus (a minister of the Median King Astyages, 6th Century B.C.); and Schopenhauer finds himself keeping company not alone with Jesus but also Moses. In his tragic single-combat against the dialectic of history to which he opposes his *yes-yes* or *no-no*, Tolstoy falls at every step into hopeless self-contradictions. And from this he draws a conclusion wholly worthy of the stubbornness of this genius. "The incongruity between man's position and man's moral activity," he says, "is the *surest sign* of truth." But this idealistic pride bears within it its own punishment. It would be hard to mention another writer whom history has used so cruelly as she has Tolstoy, against his own will

History's Own Reckoning

Moralist and mystic, foe of politics and revolution, he nourishes with his criticism the confused revolutionary consciousness of many Populist sects.

Denier of all capitalist culture, he meets with benevolent acceptance by the European and American bourgeoisies, who find in his preachments a delineation of their own purposeless humanism along with a psychologic shield against the philosophy of the revolutionary overturn.

Conservative anarchist, mortal enemy of liberalism, Tolstoy finds himself on his eightieth birthday a banner and a vehicle for the noisy and tendentious political manifestation of Russian liberalism.

History has gained a victory over him, but failed to break him. Even now, in his declining years, he has preserved intact his priceless talent for moral indignation.

In the heat of the vilest and most criminal Counter-revolution on record [Trotzky here refers to the reign of terror in Russia after the defeated 1905 revolution] which seeks with its hempen web of gallows to eclipse forever our country's sun; amid the stifling atmosphere of degraded

and cowardly official public opinion, this last apostle of Christian all-forgiving, in whom kindles the wrath of Biblical prophets, has flung his pamphlet *I Cannot Keep Silent* as a curse upon the heads of those who serve as hangmen and a condemnation upon those who stand by in silence.

And though he refuses a sympathetic hearing to our revolutionary objectives, we know it is because history has refused him personally an understanding of her revolutionary pathways. We shall not condemn him. And we shall always value in him, not alone his great genius, which shall never die so long as human art lives on, but also his unbending moral courage which did not permit him tranquilly to remain in the ranks of THEIR hypocritical church, THEIR society and THEIR state but doomed him to remain a solitary among his countless admirers.

September 1908.

May Day Manifesto of the Fourth International

(Reprinted from *La Verite*, Paris)

WORKERS AND PEASANTS OF ALL COUNTRIES!

On this 1st of May, 1951, the great threat of a new world war hangs over mankind, but at the same time the chances for revolution are becoming clearer. In the Far East imperialism is at grips with the colonial revolution which has shaken the peoples of Asia and is undermining the foundations of the capitalist system of exploitation. The recent crisis within the American ruling class provoked by the sacking of MacArthur demonstrates not only the profound disagreements which divide it on the issues of the *time schedule* and the *principal front* of the new war, but also how close we have been to a war with China which could have widened rapidly.

At the bottom of the persistent international tension there is actually the worsening of the general crisis of capitalism which has no way out except that of war preparations and of war itself. A decisive blow was delivered to the equilibrium of capitalism with the loss of the important section of the world market consisting of the countries of Europe and Asia which fell away from capitalist control.

The increasing productivity of its economic apparatus clashes violently with the shrinking of the market and deprives capitalism of all hope of even relative stabilization.

On the contrary, this fundamental crisis is growing sharper, widening the emancipating movement of the colonial people and reaching the metropolitan proletariat.

The armaments program to which imperialism has turned more resolutely since the Korean war, in order to cope with the immediate threat of an economic crisis and in order to prepare for war itself, has worsened its position in the world's industrial centers.

A new wave of inflation has already destroyed whatever shaky stability the capitalist nations of Europe appeared to have reached and, for the first time, has profoundly affected the living standards of the American masses themselves.

Persisting in its armaments program, imperialism will have to count on an ever-increasing inflation which everywhere will unleash struggles even more violent and widespread than those which have recently broken out in almost all the countries of Western Europe. Thus a new wave of proletarian revolution is mounting in Europe, making futile all the desperate attempts of imperialism to impose dictatorial regimes upon the workers. Imperialism is forced to prepare for war under the most unfavorable conditions.

American imperialism, the only decisive, basic force of the capitalist regime, attempts to profit from the relative support of the American masses to step up as quickly as possible its military preparations and to unleash war.

But the chances for a revolution to overthrow the capitalist regime and thereby forever put an end to war, have never been so great, and they are becoming ever stronger. The task of the hour is to organize the forces of the socialist revolution everywhere and to orient them clearly and firmly toward a capture of power without regard to the possible reactions of imperialism.

The colonial peoples who, with weapons in hand, are now leading the struggle against imperialism in Asia, are the advance guard of the only effective struggle against the war of the imperialists, and, by their victory, herald the final collapse of the capitalist system which breeds wars and economic crises.

The proletariat of the metropolitan centers, and above all the advanced proletariat of Western Europe, must participate in this struggle by preparing itself for the

capture of power and the establishment of the Socialist United States of Europe.

The Stalinist leadership of the Communist parties which tries to turn the workers away from this goal and exploits their revolutionary energy supposedly to impose "peace" through a Big Five Conference and the non-militarization of Germany, acts in accordance with the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy.

The Soviet bureaucracy desires a division of the world which will permit it both to increase its power, its income and its privileges, and to maintain its control over the masses. If the status quo were to be broken by unfolding world revolution, the forces unloosed would inevitably provoke the fall of the bureaucracy in the USSR and open up the free development of socialism in that country as well as everywhere else.

WORKERS AND PEASANTS OF ASIA AND ALL THE COLONIAL PEOPLES!

Your current struggle against imperialism avenges the ferocious exploitation to which you have been subjected, a super exploitation which has made possible its stability and its very existence. You are destroying forever the foundations of imperialism, and you are placing ourselves in the forefront of the struggle for the new socialist mankind arising in the world.

Honor and glory to the fighters of Korea, China, Vietnam, Burma, Malaya, the Phillipines, who struggle for the complete independence of their countries!

Long live a united, free and independent Korea!

Long live China and its great revolution!

For the defeat of all imperialist troops fighting against the colonial and semi-colonial peoples!

Long live the revolution in India, the Middle East, North Africa, preparing to storm the last strongholds of colonialism!

WORKERS AND PEASANTS OF WESTERN EUROPE, MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES!

The struggles into which capitalism is constantly forcing you must not result in some government of "democratic union" or of "peace" with bourgeois parties. No alliance can be formed with these or other supposed "democratic" and "pacifist" factions, as Togliatti again advises after his return from Moscow in order to maintain peace and gradually reform the bourgeois state.

The only true aim that can clarify and guide all partial struggles remains the disarmament of the bourgeoisie, which produces war and dictatorship, through the proletarian revolution and the Socialist United States of Europe. Fight ardently to stop the disintegration of Europe, to organize its tremendous productive forces for the benefit of the masses and to build the strongest bulwark against imperialist exploitation and all attempts at bureaucratic police rule by the Soviet ruling caste.

Help the struggle of the German proletariat to achieve the withdrawal of all occupation forces, and a unified, sovereign, free and socialist Germany, the nucleus of the entire European socialist revolution, independent of both imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy.

Long live the heroic fighters of Barcelona and Madrid!

Long live the new Spanish revolution!

Long live the European Socialist revolution!

Long live the Socialist United States of Europe!

WORKERS AND FARMERS OF THE UNITED STATES!

On your struggle against the monstrous economic and military power concentrated in the hands of your capitalist rulers depends whether or not there will be a new war by imperialism against mankind freeing itself from its yoke.

Long live the formation of an independent party of the American proletariat!

Long live the socialist revolution in the United States!

WORKERS AND PEASANTS OF THE USSR AND OF THE "PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACIES"!

Without the regime of looting, without the bureaucratic police control of the Soviet leaders and their puppets in the Communist parties, the new property forms established in your countries on the ruins of capitalism and the nationalized and planned economy could bring about a grandiose upsurge of the productive forces that could far outstrip capitalism with its stagnation, decay and misery.

It is necessary to look forward and forget the past condemned by history once and for all. Fight against the ruling bureaucracy, for the free development of socialist economy and culture!

Long live the defense of the USSR and the "people's democracies" against imperialism!

Long live the struggle against the bureaucracy and for its overthrow by the revolutionary socialist masses!

WORKERS OF THE ENTIRE WORLD!

The decisive battles to assure humanity of its socialist future, to abolish war and misery, are approaching in giant strides. It is up to you to transform the enormous forces utilized by moribund capitalism for destruction into a prodigious upswing of prosperity for all peoples and all human beings.

Organize under the banner of the world socialist revolution, prepare for your victory with confidence.

Capitalism has never been so prostrated as now by its own sharpened contradictions and by the terrible blows dealt it by the revolutionary movement in the colonies and in the metropolitan centers.

The international proletariat, crushing the bourgeoisie with its own forces, will never permit any bureaucracy to wrest the political power from its hands for monstrous privileges. The victory of the world revolution will put an end to all exploitation, all oppression and all violence among mankind.

The dawn of socialism, created by the masses and for the masses, is rising on mankind's horizon. Turn toward it resolutely. Let the socialist dawn inspire the final struggles. In the whole world power will pass into the workers' hands, ending forever all misery, dictatorship and war.

Down with the imperialist war preparations!

Long live the world socialist revolution!

— International Secretariat of the Fourth International