

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

Bulletin of the Provisional International Contact Commission

Volume 7 No. 10

10 cents

CONTENTS

**N
O
V
.
1
9
4
5**

**Germany & Japan Under
American Imperialism**

U.S. Farmer and Revolution

Stalinism and Eastern Europe

**Labor Party Defends Imperialism
(REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS ASSOC. ANALYSIS)**

AMENDMENTS TO RUSSIAN QUESTION

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

Affiliates

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS ASSOCIATION OF GREAT BRITAIN

Central Committee of the Red Front of Greater Germany

Revolutionary Workers League of the U. S.

Mail address of publishers

DEMOS PRESS

708 N. CLARK STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Labor Donated

STALINISM AND EASTERN EUROPE

The end of the military phase of the imperialist war has brought out openly and sharply the struggles and disagreements that have existed between United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. The pronouncements of "allied unity" at the Teheran and Yalta conferences were later exposed by the open and bitter struggles between Stalinism and the Imperialist powers at San Francisco, Potsdam and London. The defeat of Germany and Japan and the elimination of these as first rate imperialist powers has only increased and has more sharply posed the antagonisms which have always existed between the world proletariat plus the Soviet Union and world Imperialism. This is a decisive period. Decisive solutions are being posed and must be solved.

The Imperialist war marked the attempt of the strongest imperialists to get rid of their major competitors on the world market. The United States and Britain sought to eliminate Germany and Japan while at the same time Britain was forced into greater and greater subordination and debt to Uncle Sam. The United States moved more and more into a position of economically "capturing" the British Empire. During this period the United States made great economic penetrations into Canada, Australia, and especially India and the Middle East.

After twenty years of power politics and status quo maneuvering under Stalinism the Soviet Union on the contrary was forced into the war by the attack of the German Imperialist Armies. Throughout the war the struggle of the U.S.S.R., (despite the role of Stalinism) was one of defense from the then immediate and now future attacks of imperialism. The repelling of the German Imperialist Armies at the gates of Moscow and the onslaught of the Red Armies to Berlin, the occupation of Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Finland, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and part of Germany itself, was carried through with the aim of establishing buffer areas and the hope of integrating them with Soviet economy as time went on. The main idea in conquering these areas was for future defense against the imperialists powers. The Soviet moves and last minute entrance into the war against Japan were carried through with the same idea of spreading and establishing control in Asiatic areas as well for protection against future attacks by the U. S. and Britain. The presence of American armies in China and Japan and the growing consolidation of the power of American Imperialism in Asia increases the antagonisms between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The world is today divided into power blocs and spheres of influence, on the one hand the bloc of imperialist powers and their satellites, and on the other the Soviet Union and its Eastern bloc of buffers and satellites.

The methods which are used by the Stalinists to form an Eastern bloc of buffers and "spheres of influence" bring out clearly the contradictions existing within the Soviet Union--the role of Stalinism, and the growing forces of counter-revolution in the U.S.S.R.

It has become crystal clear that if the Soviet Union did not have the cancerous growth of Stalinism and had not followed a policy of maintaining the world status quo of capitalism against the proletarian revolution, neither the working class nor the Soviet Union would be in the position it is today. Nor would it have been likely that the Imperialist War would have taken place. Unfortunately, this has happened and we must face the facts.

Stalinism has again betrayed the proletariat, this time worse than ever before. When the Red Armies marched into Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Poland they were faced with rebellions by the working class and peasants in these countries. The only solution to their problems could be Workers Council Governments. Hundreds of councils were actually established. But for Stalinism any change in the status quo and any successful revolution in these countries would have meant the elimination of itself as a power within the Soviet Union. Stalinism has roots in the proletariat and uses the proletariat for its own ends against the interests of the proletariat. Hence, when the Red Armies moved into these countries it beheaded, thwarted, and openly liquidated the working class revolts. Where "Communist" parties of these countries could not be elected to power, open bourgeois counter-revolutionaries were used. To have permitted the revolution to develop would have meant the liquidation of Stalinism itself.

Stalinism is in this contradiction--in order to defend itself and its position in the Soviet Union it must maintain the status quo; to maintain the status quo means to work against the interests of the working class from which it derives its power. But in the process of doing this it is forced to capitulate more and more to the pressures of the Imperialist powers and the Bourgeois elements within the Soviet Union. The Imperialist powers press more and more for a frontal attack and the Bourgeois elements within the Soviet Union, the petty accumulators, the generals and the rising officer caste, the Church, etc. press more and more for greater and greater power. If Stalinism is even temporarily to maintain itself it must make concessions to these elements, but thereby it undermines its own power and lays the base for the counter-revolution.

In order to prepare against the future frontal attack of the Imperialist powers Stalinism is forced to build a series of buffers around it (the Eastern European bloc). The only effective way these buffers could be utilized would be to integrate them into the transition economy in the Soviet Union itself. Stalinism is attempting and will further attempt to do this but cannot complete it because it must continue to capitulate to the Allied Capitalists. Hence, instead of units of transition economy, existing within these countries, Stalinism establishes or works with military capitalist dictatorships, Tito in Yugoslavia, Broza in Rumania, or Bourgeois Republicans as Benes in Czechoslovakia, Renner in Austria, the Warsaw Government in Poland. Because of such contradictions the use of these buffers is exceedingly limited. The Stalinists may attempt to keep the Imperialists and their agents, such as the U.N.R.R.A., newspaper reporters, investigators and the like out of these countries but nevertheless the Bourgeoisie operate freely in these countries and won't surrender footholds in such important economic areas without a struggle.

The following countries can at present be considered the Eastern bloc of powers under the influence or domination of Stalinism--Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Czechoslovakia, and possibly

Austria.

Despite the fact that Europe had been divided by numerous national boundaries, tariff walls, etc., it has had a semblance of economic unity. Eastern Europe even though it is a backward and agricultural area exported its food surpluses and raw materials to industrial countries of Western Europe and took their manufactured goods in return. In 1938, Czechoslovakia sold 50% of its exports to Western countries, the Balkans sold 63% and Poland 72%. The economic control of the Western powers in these countries can be understood by the fact that such countries as Yugoslavia had 60% of its industry under foreign control, Rumania 85%, Poland 40%. So large were the foreign held government debts that on the average 20% of the national budget was devoted to the payment of interest and capital on the foreign debt of these countries. Twenty per cent of American European private investments were within the eastern sphere. The western powers have \$5,000,000,000 of unpaid debts coming to them from these countries and American firms and individuals have properties valued at \$755,000,000. Other Western powers may hold investments of an equal magnitude.

The importance of this area economically is further revealed by the fact that it holds 38% of the arable land, 25% of Europe's coal and lignite, 20% of the water-power potential, 5% of the iron and 50% of the bauxite. In the Silesia, Austrian, Czechoslovakian area 15% of Europe's coke and steel was produced. It has been pointed out that if the potential electric power of the Danube were harnessed into a Dniepestoproject to build an aluminum industry based on the bauxite deposits in Hungary and Yugoslavia, it could revolutionize the Balkans.

On the basis of these facts it can be seen how great are the economic potentialities of this area and the stakes the Imperialists have invested. If the imperialists don't openly attack the Soviet Union for another five or ten years there will at least be a violent economic struggle in this area.

In the long run however, the surpluses of Eastern Europe are non-complimentary with the needs of the U.S.S.R. The Ukraine and the White Russian republics when they have been built back to their former economic position will duplicate this area. Hence there is the possibility that Stalinism may use these areas as a trading bloc against Western Europe. The U.S.S.R. could supply machinery to the Eastern European countries which in turn would supply agricultural and raw materials to Western Europe. They would in turn give the U.S.S.R. heavy capital equipment which it is now unable to make.

Already Rumania has signed an agreement with Russia calling for the exchange of Soviet machinery for Rumanian foodstuffs and metals.

However, the above variant depends on the ability of the Allied Imperialists together with Stalinism to stem the tide of Proletarian revolt this winter and next spring. The "liberation" of Europe from German Fascism has only accentuated the sufferings of the masses that existed during that war. Only the proletarian revolution in Europe can solve this problem. The horrible stories of Stalinist forced labor armies, cooperation with the reactionary and counter-revolutionary forces in the "Russian" sphere of influence can only contribute to the forces working for the proletarian revolution. Stalinism must be eliminated as a political factor if the proletariat is to march ahead.

Hunger is the main problem facing Europe this winter and next spring. The destruction of many factories, the chaos in the transportation systems, the anarchy of Europe's production system wrought by capitalism and its Imperialist war has created a condition for the masses in Europe unequalled for many generations.

The Allied imperialist attempt to counteract this "danger" of revolution through U.N.R.R.A. and other such agencies. They are attempting to bribe and demoralize any such movement through their relief program.

The problem of hunger and the elementary needs of the masses in Europe only increases the problems facing Stalinism if it is to mobilize an Eastern European bloc. For in order to mobilize such a bloc it must solve the needs of the masses and at the same time must keep the Imperialist relief agency out of these areas; it must keep the Imperialists from further extending their influence and domination.

To some extent Stalinism has attempted to remedy this situation by calling for and carrying through mild land reforms. In many areas it has divided the land and liquidated the large landholders. But at a time when only the Proletarian Revolution can settle the needs of the masses bourgeois-democratic reforms solve nothing.

Newspaper reports tell of the extensive stripping and "looting" of these countries by the Red Army and of the shipment back into the Soviet Union of anything and everything that can be moved. This gives an indication to what degree the U.S.S.R. has been weakened by the war. In order to rebuild the Soviet Union Stalinism is forced to strip these countries it has invaded of anything of economic value. In so doing it only contributes to an aggravation of its problems, since, if it is to alleviate the hunger of the masses, it must export materials into Central Europe instead of importing them into Russia. However if it permitted such imports Stalinism would be forced all the more to cut down the repairs needed for the economy of the Soviet Union.

It would be wrong to state that an Eastern European bloc under the control of Stalinism already exists. It is a fact that the Red Armies occupy these countries. It is also a fact that Stalinists or Stalinist agents are at the head of some of these Governments and that the Communist Party dictates policy. But it is also a fact that capitalism remains in those countries. As long as Transition economy is not established then Stalinism cannot effectively use them as buffers nor consider itself as having a solid bloc in its support. On the contrary as long as capitalism remains free and rampant they can be used as dagger points by the Allied Imperialists for future attack against the Soviet Union.

Stalinism is caught in a trap. It must maintain the capitalist status quo to remain in power. It must hold down the proletarian revolution. But it is forced more and more to capitulate to the capitalist elements within its own country. Either Stalinism will use the Eastern Europe as a buffer against the Allied Imperialists as well and utilize its economic potential, or the imperialists will gain control of these areas as springboards for future onslaughts against the Soviet Union.

The addition of these Capitalist areas to the influence of the Soviet Union further increases the antagonisms within Russia itself. The isolation of the U.S.S.R. for over a period of twenty years under the domination of Stalinism, the policy of power politics, world status quo, is culminating in the actual struggle for the counter-revolution to reestablish itself. The changes within the Red Army and the rise of a new officer caste, the adoption of the Constitution of 1936 the legalization of the Russian Orthodox Church, the reactionary changes taken in the school systems, the reinstatement of the bourgeois family relationship, the establishment of voting on a geographical and population basis and the usurpation of workers democracy and Soviets, etc., etc., is a reflection of the inroads and advances the capitalist elements have made. The addition of capitalist sectors to the Soviet economy only allow for the strengthening of these elements and for the counter-revolution to strengthen itself within the Soviet Union. In this connection the reports and rumored struggle occurring between Marshal Zhukov and Molotov for Stalin's position should be noted as an indication of the little known developments taking place.

THE BUFFERS AND MILITARY STRATEGY

One more important point must be borne in mind. Stalinism hopes to use the Eastern European area as a buffer against the Allied Imperialists. However, the development of the atomic bomb, the rocket bombs, fast robot controlled planes, etc., will have decisive effect on military strategy and tactics in the next conflict. A few hundred miles of territory as a buffer may be less important to defense of the "home" territory than it is now considered. In an age of air warfare and the development of the most destructive instruments ever conceived, land distances have become relatively less important and more easily handled. No matter what advances or developments may be made in instruments of destruction if the victor is to conquer and hold the enemy he must use his armies to occupy and administer the vanquished area. The buffer areas are thus of lesser importance for Stalinism because of these technological advances.

Europe today is caught in the vise of Allied Imperialism on the one hand, and the reactionary role of Stalinism on the other. There can be no other solution to the problems of the masses than the proletarian revolution. Regardless of Stalinism's attempt to stem that Revolution the proletarian forces in its own sectors will move towards a solution to their problems. Only a Soviet Europe will fit this need. The minor land reforms of Stalinism in its controlled areas may temporarily check the peasants from taking more militant action. But they together with the proletariat (yes, and the Russian workers and collective farms

as well) will move onward to solve the FUNDAMENTAL problems facing them. Only Communism or Fascism can survive for any length of time in Europe today. The elimination of Stalinism will make Communism possible.

FOR A SOVIET EUROPE - AGAINST THE EASTERN STALINIST BLOC
FOR PROPAGANDA TO RED TROOPS
FOR THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION - DEFEND THE SOVIET UNION DESPITE AND AGAINST STALINISM AND WORLD CAPITALISM

READ AND SUBSCRIBE TO

THE FIGHTING WORKER

Popular Organ of the REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, U. S. A.

Affiliated to the INTERNATIONAL CONTACT COMMISSION

The Fighting Worker contains popular analysis of national and international events; featured articles on economics; and interesting columns of comment

Subscription rates are \$1.00 a year. Single copies 5¢

Bundle orders of 10 or more sent to you postage paid at the rate of 1¢ a copy. SPREAD THE FIGHTING WORKER!

Order from DEMOS PRESS, 708 N. CLARK ST., CHICAGO, ILL.

WHAT OF THE FARMER IN REVOLUTION

(We publish herewith an article by one of our comrades with which we agree in all essentials. We do not regard the farmers as part of our class, nor as equal allies in the struggle to overthrow capitalism. That does not mean, of course, that here and there an individual from the middle or even upper classes--e.g. Engels--may not come over to the revolutionary movement. But as a class that is an impossibility. Nor can there be a government in alliance with this class, except a government that serves the bourgeoisie. However, this does not mean that when forces permit we will do nothing to organize, neutralize, and attempt to win support from those sections of the farmers that are in the process of becoming proletarians, such as the sharecroppers, tenants, etc. This is a tactical consideration which the American Marxist movement must work out carefully and in such a way that it does not degenerate into an opportunist alliance with the farmer.)

"For a workers and Farmers Government" cry the Trotskyites in their feverish ambition to collect votes.

The question of the farmer's role in the class struggle has, for years, faced the Marxist movement in the U.S. Yet, from the hey-days of the old S.P. down to the present time, no "Marxist" party has appeared with the fortitude to propagate the truth, with the exception of the Industrial Workers of the World, a proletarian organization which knew from first hand experience the bourgeois, and reactionary character of the farmer.

The blurring of the class line here is as pronounced as it is in the cities where the ambitious centrists seek to emancipate the "Professionals, small business men, and all oppressed toilers," ad nauseum. But the class line is not established by slogans, nor by political orations. Nor will the farmers and proletarians simply flow together automatically by reason of our neglect of a due clarification of the facts. On the contrary. To those who develop the blues and grow cynical over the seeming tardiness of the workers to accept the "revolutionary" program, let it be pointed out that quite possibly the workers possess a keener sense of proportion, and logic in the matter of where the class line lies than do a lot of the book-learned leaders. After all, the class line is a fact resulting from material conditions. The proletarian is a conscious representative of all that exists on the one side of that line and knows from a life time of bitter experience, what and who constitutes the enemy class--this even though he lacks the ability to put his knowledge into words. And, incidentally, for those who have eyes to see, the farmer demonstrates that he too knows on which side of the line he belongs. Only the "revolutionary" leaders commit the rank error of trying to force an irreconcilable contradiction--this side of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The studied selection of the very broad term, Farmer, is only the evidence of an

opportunistic ambition. Technically, the "Farmer" is anything from the share-cropper up to Giannini, the banker who built his vast fortune, in the manner of the absentee owner, by farming. That the small farmers who were his victims held nominal title to the land they worked does not alter the fact that he held controlling ownership through mortgages, if not total ownership of the farms that enriched him. The title, Farmer, fits him as well as any others.

To define "Farmer" in the Marxian sense is to define the producer of commodities for profit; the exploiter of wage slaves in the typical capitalist manner.

In analyzing the land question, Marx had to treat the farmer as a capitalist, his land and equipment as capital, and his workers as wage slaves.

In the farming process we find all the typical conditions to evolving capitalism: the growth of labor saving devices, the concentration of capital, the narrowing of the margin of profit, the interference of the State on behalf of the employer, subsidization of the capitalist, AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE, with the farmer always organized against the workers.

There is a tendency on the part of poorly balanced theoreticians to attempt to inveigle everybody into the revolutionary revolt up through the farmers, petty bourgeoisie, and who knows at what point these Utopian Socialists would eventually draw the line. But the bourgeoisie are the bourgeoisie, large or small. And these are against the proletariat, or we Marxists are all wet. True, the petty bourgeoisie sway forward and backward between the big bourgeoisie and the proletariat, but this only makes them the more treacherous to the workers, given the opportunity. They are the merchandisers who stand eternally ready to sell out the workers interests to the highest bidder. And in these days of fabulous purchasing power in the hands of the top bourgeoisie, such sellouts are obviously the rule. When Capitalism can repeatedly buy off the real proletarian leaders--Harry Bridges, for example--what can it not do with the petty bourgeoisie--an exact duplicate of the shadings to be seen in the cities. And they deport themselves in exactly the same manner, and for material reasons.

The question confronts us; why outrage the proletarian class struggle by so rank a dilution as the futile attempt to lump the workers and farmers together? (The very phrase, Workers and Farmers, exposes the discrepancy--the contradiction.) The answers to this question is to be found in the monstrous error committed by the American Marxist theoreticians: the false answers!

BLIND IMITATION OF RUSSIA

The tendency on the part of American theoreticians to conduct the movement as the Bolsheviks of Russia conducted it, is commendable only in proportion with the real accuracy of this effort. But regarding the Russian "Workers and Peasants" movement, and the American "Workers and Farmers" sloganizing, imitation without true Bolshevik consideration, exposes the weakness of blind imitation. Because the relatively small--and therefore, weak--Russian proletariat could win to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie only with the support of the peasantry, it does not follow that the Powerful, American Proletariat requires the support of the American farmers for the same end. Though the American farmers and the Russian peasants existed side-by-side, they represented two distinct variants in

the uneven development of the historical sweep. By this token (first) they could not be in any sense identical. And by the same token their relationship to the proletariat (or its relationship to them) must be different as the historical periods in which the two nations existed or exist. Lenin never tired of pointing out that conditions in Russia were different. Well, the conditions in America are different, vastly different.

American capitalism is the advanced expression of capitalist development. Its technical equipment represents the last word in efficiency. Its proletariat is therefore, the most highly developed in the world, both numerically, and as to production efficiency. It is a truism that the higher the refinement of industrial technique the more is its bourgeoisie dependent, from moment to moment, upon its smooth functioning; This is to say the higher the refinement of the industrial technique, the greater the power of the workers to control the destinies of society as a whole through their firm hold upon the throttles of national industry. In America EVERYTHING depends with exceptional directness upon the decision of the working class as to what it shall do with the industrial apparatus. Shall they run it for the objectives of the capitalists or shall they refuse further to do so and run it for their own objectives? There is meaning of fundamental importance in the statement that the American proletariat is the most powerful in the world.

As the technical apparatus has grown to peak proportions of intricate refinement; as the largest proportion of the people have become proletarianized; as the capitalist system has developed excessive seams and crevices of decay in its edifice; potential revolutionary power has accumulated in the hands of the proletariat. Over the period of history represented by capitalism, capitalist power has approached dangerously close to the point where it becomes suddenly its opposite, i.e., class impotency. Over the same period proletarian class weakness has, by the same dialectic process become its own potential opposite--overwhelming strength. In both directions, as between the two opposed classes, quantity has become quality. While the one has become the potential weakling, after having been master, the other has become the potential master after having been the slave.

So much so is this today that any idea of rallying aid to the great American proletariat from the fringes of the capitalist class, farmers, small businessmen, professionals, shopkeepers, or what have you, amounts to the rankest of ignorance of the real situation or the rankest of conscious merchandising with the interests of the Revolution--in any case a brake on the movement.

It is a safe prediction that so long as the pseudo-revolutionary groups insist upon building out of shoddy materials--upon taking everything in the shape of disgruntled or scared petty bourgeois elements into the so-called vanguard parties just so long will the workers hold aloof from them, and so appear to the undiscerning, "Backward."

The farmer is capitalist to the core. The proletarian knows him to be such. Regardless of the dreams of idealistic theoreticians the farmer will fight desperately on his own side of the line. But in the modern proletariat he, along with his brothers of urban industry will meet the irresistible force. Capitalism in its entirety will be overthrown.

LABOR PARTY DEFENDS IMPERIALISM

(REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS ASSOC. ANALYSIS)

The "Report from Britain" published in the August number of International News was written at the beginning of the election campaign, preceding the General Election. It was as we stated "A very tentative picture of the situation," and events have modified our analysis, in one respect. The Labour Party was able to secure an electoral victory over the Conservative Party, and an electoral majority in the House of Commons without an alliance with the Liberal Party. The Labour Party was therefore able to form a Government with a "majority" of seats in the new Parliament, unlike the Labour Governments of 1924 and 1929, which were "minority" governments, depending upon the support of the Liberal Party. The rest of our analysis stands and has been more than confirmed by the events of the past three months.

GENERAL ELECTION

It was obvious before the General Election that there was a definite leftward swing, as we stated, but no one was able to accurately gauge how this would affect the electoral vote for the various parties, as we have not had a General Election since 1935--and much has happened since then! The general discontent with the policy of the National Government has been expressed negatively in electoral support for the Labour Party. But what is important to remember is that the vote for the Labour Party was not a positive vote for socialism, for the issue "Whether or not capitalism should be abolished" was not posed in the election campaign.

The policy put forward by the Labour Party in its main election pamphlet "Let's Face the Future," was not a socialist programme. One of the main by-products of the General Election, so far as the political parties were concerned, was the virtual elimination of the party of Lloyd George---the Liberal Party. Common Wealth, the centrist social democratic party which came into existence during the war, mainly as a result of winning the left-ward moving "petite-bourgeoisie," the disgruntled members of the Labour Party and other left parties, lost what seats it had, with the exception of one. Its president and founder, the ex-liberal Sir Richard Acland, lost his seat and his deposit. The Communist Party (Stalinists) made a poor show, and of their twenty odd candidates just managed to retain William Gallagher's seat and win one--in Stepney. Large numbers lost their deposits and Harry Pollitt, General Secretary of the Party added one more defeat to his long series. The I.L.P. managed to retain three seats. The R.C.P. (Trotskyists) did not run a single candidate and gave their support to the Labour Party, of course "critically." So much for the electoral results of the General Election.

LABOUR PARTY'S ELECTION PROGRAMME

We have made a short analysis of the Labour Party's programme in "International News - British Supplement" Vol.1.No.2. August, from which the following main conclusions can be drawn:--

- (a) The programme is social reformist in character and assumes a peaceful transition from monopoly capitalism to socialism.
- (b) It ignores completely the class character of the State and the necessity for the working class to abolish the capitalist state and set up the alternative state power of the working class.
- (c) It accepts as its own interests (Labour Party's), the aims of British Imperialism, hence its
- (d) Support for the imperialist war, ignoring the fact that the imperialist war is not in the interests of the working class.
- (e) Its foreign policy (as has already been indicated) is based upon protecting the interests of British imperialism.
- (f) In so far as the European revolution is concerned, notwithstanding the "left" phrases of Harold Laski, it is against the proletarian revolution and therefore supports "Popular Front" governments, Constituent Assemblies etc.
- (g) So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it supports the interests of British Imperialism.
- (h) On the home front its policy is one of "Mond-Turnerism" or collaboration with monopoly capitalism, in the industrial field we are entering a new period of "Conciliation", for increased production and no strikes.
- (i) The policy of "nationalisation" of industry, is a policy of making capitalism work, e.g., the coal industry, and its associated industries, electricity and gas, are to be organised into "state-capitalist" public corporations, necessitated by British monopoly capitalism as a whole, in its attempts to hold on to what world markets are left for British Imperialism's exploitation and to open up the struggle with American Imperialism, in those markets and spheres of interests mortgaged to America during the war.

In brief outline, these are the main points from the Labour Party's programme. How is this programme being implemented by the Labour Government since it became the Government?

LABOUR GOVERNMENT'S POLICY

In our September issue of "International News - British Supplement" Vol.1.No.3. we examine the intentions of the Labour Government presented in the traditional "Kings Speech" made on the 16th August, from which it will be noted that the Labour Party's programme for future parliamentary sessions, closely follows the policy outlined above.

Labour's Foreign Secretary, Mr. Ernest Bavin in his speech on foreign affairs on the 20th August was welcomed by Mr. Anthony Eden, late Foreign Secretary in the National Government.

In the realm of domestic affairs the main topic of discussion is the "nationalisation" of the mining industry. The main controversy in the ranks of the Social democrats being "On what basis are we going to compensate the mine owners

when the (capitalist) state takes over?" In preparation for this taking over of the mines, the mineworkers are being ideologically prepared by the National Mineworkers' Union bureaucrats, for more production and no strikes. The N.M.U. is busily engaged in using the Union's money in carrying out a nation wide campaign to get the miners to work harder. The best driver of the mineworkers for higher production is Mr. Arthur Horner, Executive Committee member of the Communist Party (Stalinist), who has been appointed National Production Officer by the Union!

ROLE OF THE CENTRISTS

To the left of the Labour Party, a policy of application for affiliation is being campaigned for. The I.L.P. through Brockway are plugging this as hard as they can, although it is meeting considerable opposition from willy old foxes like James Maxton. The most honest forces opposed to affiliation are centred around F.A. Ridley. Common Wealth is being split from top to bottom on the same issue, the leader and founder, Sir Richard Acland, at a recent National Conference failed to take the whole organization with him into the Labour Party. He has himself resigned from the party he founded and is making application to join the Labour Party. The new leader of the Common Wealth residue is Dr. C. A. Smith, onetime national chairman of the I.L.P. The programme of Common Wealth is of course social democratic. It seems fairly evident that the R.C.P. may be holding a further national conference soon to discuss an application for affiliation to the Labour Party. All these tails are of course hoping to wag the dog.

REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY (TROTSKYISTS)

At the fusion of the Workers International League and the Revolutionary Socialist League, the former was reputed to have about 250 members and the latter about 60. At the second Conference, held on the 4th-6th August, 1945, in London, some 70 members had been lost and about 120 gained. The bulk of the members had been lost from the rank and file of the former R.S.L. Although no organised split took place, the prophecy made in the September, 1944 issue of "International News" (See Editors Note) has been justified. With few exceptions the R.W.L. leadership came to terms with the Haston-Lee caucus, but could not persuade all their followers to toe the line. Although they more or less drifted out they have since taken steps in reorganising the organisation. Their general level is higher than the R.C.P., but they are firmly tied to "work within the Labour Party." This position has prevented them making any open onslaught on the R.C.P. Inside the Labour Party they are well dug in in some local branches and have sent anti-war and anti-vansittart resolutions to Labour Party Conferences and have so far successfully defied Herbert Morrison and his deputies in London. They dream of leading a left split within the Labour Party and do not consider Aneurin Bevan or Harold Laski as serious rivals! I.C.C. literature has been supplied them but their lives have for so many years been politically filled with "Labourism" that little can for the present be hoped for from them. The elements gained by the R.C.P. are for the most part quite new to politics. Other elements joining the R.C.P. are for the most part quite new to politics. Other elements joining the R.C.P. come from the Newcastle area. The I.L.P. federation in this area was firmly controlled by R.C.P. stooges, with the exception of an odd branch or two. The stooges, determined

to make the Newcastle contingent of delegates to the I.L.P. National Conference wholly Trotskyist, carried out some bureaucratic tactic designed to foist their delegates on branches not fully under their control. Naturally the branches protested and John McNair National Secretary of the I.L.P. seized this gratuitous opportunity and suspended the Newcastle Federation. Their expulsion was later confirmed by the I.L.P. Conference.

The R.C.P. Conference in August was a "democratic" affair! No issues of importance were laid before the delegates for discussion. The leadership came to agreement beforehand and presented a unanimous report for endorsement by the Conference. One example was over the "entry tactic". The leadership was divided over this. The old R.S.L.ers were for it being applied, E. Grant (Editor Socialist Appeal) opposed it, while Haston sat on the fence. This need not be taken seriously since Grant is a stooge for Haston. A compromise was effected which kept the organisation independent, while not dispensing altogether with the possibility of a future entry into the Labour Party. This compromise was of course "decided" upon by the Conference.

INDUSTRIAL SITUATION

As we indicated in our last report, average wages are falling, mainly as a result of reductions in hours of work. The peak period was July, 1944. For all workers, the average weekly earnings was 96/8d., in July, 1944, now 93/9d in July 1945. For all workers, percentage decrease between July, 1944 and Jan, 1945, was -3.0. The greatest decrease was in the engineering trades, where it was -5.7.

Unemployment for the same period, July, 1944 to July 1945, has increased from 63,000 to 113,000 exclusive of men classified as unsuitable for ordinary industrial employment.

Industrial disputes, a comparison of the number of days lost is as follows:--
July 1944, 64,000; July 1945, 117,000.

Typical of the many struggles now going on in industry due to layoffs is the case of the Hillington Rolls-Royce Works, Glasgow, which was built in 1939, with several million pounds of public money. It produced 26,000 engines, in addition to repairs and spare parts during the war. On the 16th September, 2,000 workers were dismissed and 7,000 more expected to receive their last pay packets. Due to lack of militant leadership, its thousands of workers who demonstrated through Glasgow under the slogans "No want abundance-not redundancy," have been led to peaceful demonstrations to their Members of Parliament, who have promised to take the matter up with the Labour Government.

Another example is the case of the Mossend, Lanarkshire works of Colvilles. This tremendous steel plant which employed 3,000 workers, now has only 350 employed.

General line of the Labour Party and Trade Union bureaucrats in this situation is---don't embarrass the Labour Government.

GREETINGS

The Revolutionary Workers Association heartily reciprocate greetings of the eighth convention of the Revolutionary Workers League, U.S.A. Your full report on this is eagerly awaited.

JUST REPUBLISHED! THE PROGRAM OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS LEAGUE, U.S.A.

A BASIC MARXIAN DOCUMENT

57 PAGES

PRICE: 25 CTS. A COPY

Order from:

DEMOS. PRESS
708 North Clark St.
Chicago, Illinois

GERMANY & JAPAN UNDER AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

In May 1945 German Imperialism surrendered to Allied Imperialism and the shooting war was brought to a close in Europe. For thirteen years Germany had attempted to stave off proletarian revolution by building a war machine intended to conquer the world. Hitlerism broke the back of the European working class through open terror and systematic persecution. Through the instrument of Fascism the ruling class was able to lop off the heads of the militant working class who fought against the long decadent Capitalist system of Germany. Their methods were not entirely new but were more intensified. The attempts to smash working class resistance against capitalist exploitation and oppression take different forms in different periods. Fascism in Germany was the most developed form of all.

THE PROPS OF NAZISM

German capitalism in the year 1932 was at such a point of decay that a resolution of the problem could only take place by the working class of Germany establishing the Dictatorship of the Proletariat; or by world capitalism supporting the rise of Nazism in Germany to temporarily stave off Revolution. It must not be forgotten that Hitler had the support of the Capitalist class of England and the United States (including Jewish capitalists) when he rose to power. One of the reasons for that support was that Hitler was prepared to turn German Imperialist guns in the direction of the Soviet Union. But German Imperialism was not satisfied to just play that role. It was likewise interested in world power and domination. But that was not to the interest of "Allied" Imperialism and when Hitler overstepped his bounds the "Allies" set upon him to destroy not only Hitler but all German influence everywhere.

American Imperialism played a very clever role in the European blood bath. Limited Aid was given to both Great Britain and the Soviet Union, but all three Germany, Britain and the Soviet Union were practically bled white before the open Intervention of American Imperialism took place. At the opportune moment the super-forces of the United States war machine were thrown into the European conflict and they were able to come out winner number one and the leading power of world capitalism today.

Now that the war is over comes that dreadful 'peace'. The masses of Europe, glad that the mass murder is over, are finding out that the class war has not come to an end. This holds true especially for the German masses who according to Eisenhower himself are near Revolution.

STARVATION VIA DE-INDUSTRIALIZATION

The German working class is learning a very bitter lesson about the decay stage

of Capitalism. Under the guise of completely dis-arming Germany of her war machine Allied Imperialism is coolly and deliberately wiping out of existence the whole productive machine of Germany.

The word de-industrialization has become a byword in the world's vocabulary. What does it really mean? Anyone with any feelings for humanity would be elated that an imperialist war machine is being destroyed; but does the de-industrialization of Germany mean only the destruction of a war machine, or does it also mean the elimination of German Imperialism in the world economy as competitors of Allied Imperialism?

Certainly the needs of the German working class are not any less great than the day that Hitler came to power. They are dependent on the ability of that country to produce goods and materials for their use. Will they receive those vital necessities through the dominance of American Imperialism? The answer is evident by just a glance at any daily newspaper. It is reported very coldly that it is expected that at least 12 millions of people in Germany will die within the next year from exposure and starvation. Hitler dragged the German workers into war and mass murder. Truman, Atlee and Stalin are forcing on them murder in a different form but murder nevertheless.

The argument given by these arch criminals is that the German working class was just as responsible for the war as Hitler. This is a fallacy which the crowded concentration camps of Germany give evidence to. It is no accident when a man like Patton can't find very much difference between the Republicans and the Democrats and the Nazis; because it is basically true that these parties are representatives of the Decadent Capitalist system with different forms of rule for similar purposes. If they can get away with the cheaper form of bourgeois democracy, as they have done over a period of years in France, England, and the United States, they use it. If there is a greater fear of workers revolt they take off the velvet gloves and use Facism ala Hitler, Franco and Mussolini.

IMPERIALIST NEEDS REMAIN

Unfortunately for Uncle Sam, the policy of American Imperialism to de-industrialize one of its former principal competitors for the world markets runs into many snags. If the U. S. completes the de-industrialization of Germany, the economy of Europe, of which German industry is the main factor would be plunged into chaos.

The Imperialists seek to de-industrialize Europe to eliminate their former competitors but at the same time they dare not take extreme measures because they fear the unrest of the masses, and their movement towards revolution. In the first slaughter the Imperialists were faced with the same problem; from 1920 to 1929 they attempted to solve this problem with the Dawes plan, the Young plan and other plans, which sought to collect reparations from Germany but at the same time tried not to "cripple her economic and social life." American corporations invested millions of dollars in Germany, building factories and investing finance capital in hard bit industries.

An attempt at continuance of this policy today is contained in the Calvin Hoover report to the Allied Control Council in which it argued that: 1) a minimum German

living standard equal to the European average was required (not merely allowed) by the Potsdam terms; 2) in order to maintain this standard, Germany must import food and raw materials and export industrial products; 3) Germany's industrial exports must be in the same categories (steel, chemicals) as her prewar exports. The Council recommends an annual German steel production of 6.8 million tons and later raised to 10 million. The British even propose 11 million tons. A 10 million-ton output would require all existing steel capacity in Germany's west, and some of the destroyed plants would have to be rebuilt.

One important factor in this respect is the existence of the Soviet Union. The imperialists cannot afford to allow a weak German economy to exist alongside one of the greatest potential enemies of the capitalists, the U.S.S.R. Germany has to be rebuilt as a counter-weight for future attack of the degenerated Workers State in the post-war period. The same holds true today. The Imperialists probably will not completely de-industrialize Germany.

The German working class is learning that no matter who is in power in this period of capitalism, their lot is changed very little. They were exasperated with the methods of the Weimar Republic, because of its inability to solve their problems. They suffered through Hitlerism. Now they have Allied rule and certainly the prospect of starvation and misery that faces the German working class proves that the whole capitalist system is unable and unwilling to solve the problems of the masses of Germany or any other country where capitalism prevails. The use of Allied troops in Germany is not to control the Nazis but the growing resentment of the German masses against years of privation which will inevitably force them into revolt. Under a Marxian vanguard such a revolt can lead to real liberation from hunger and war. The only difference today is that instead of only fighting against a Hitler the German workers are forced to fight the Allies too.

THE U. S. IN JAPAN

The position of the United States as the strongest power in the world today brought other spoils too. On V-J day Japanese Imperialism surrendered to American Imperialism and this time America doesn't want to share any of this booty. The current arguments between the United States and Russia prove that there is no harmony in the "Allied" family.

Japanese Imperialism was doomed to destruction as soon as her European Ally Germany was defeated. The Japanese industrial machine could not fight alone. The United States walked into Japan without any land battles because the Japanese hierarchy was fearful of a future revolt of the masses should the uneven struggle continue. They knew that some kind of deal could be made with the war stooges of another capitalist country even if it meant sacrifice of a few individual Japanese capitalists.

In Japan we have a similar example as in Germany but slightly different in form, the de-industrialization of Japan and the destruction of her influence in the East. The Japanese masses have not very much more to look forward to than those of Germany. It is estimated that over three millions are expected to die of starvation in the next year. The fact that over 40% of Japanese industry was destroyed by bombings is only one indication of the coming period.

The Atomic bombs and the slaughter of tens of thousands of people of Japan is another indication of American "Democracy" in action. American Imperialism will no more solve the problems of the Japanese workers than Tojo could.

The masses of Japan just like the German masses must throw off the yoke now, not only of their own bourgeoisie but also of the Allied victors.

Hands off Germany and Japan! Only a Proletarian Revolution can defeat fascism and bring peace and plenty.

NOW AVAILABLE

IN HANDY AND ATTRACTIVE

BOUND VOLUMES:

THE
INTERNATIONAL NEWS
FOR 1944

THESE VOLUMES REPRESENT THE MARXIAN ANALYSIS OF EVERY EVENT OF
NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE THAT OCCURRED DURING 1944

PRICE: \$2.00
Postage paid

Address all orders to: DEMOS PRESS, 708 North Clark St., Chicago, Illinois

8TH CONVENTION AMENDMENTS TO RUSSIAN QUESTION

At the 8th National Convention of the R.W.L. the Russian Question article as published in the May 1945 issue of the INTERNATIONAL NEWS has been amended as follows:

Where it reads on Page 20, under Part 2, first sentence - "It has become fashionable in some circles to say that the differences between Soviet economy and that of the capitalist world are purely academic" the amendment is to add this following material:

The QUALITY of the Soviet Union's dependence on the world market is altogether different from the quality of any capitalist nation's dependence on the world market. For imperialism the problem of raw materials source control is one of competition; the problem of markets for products is fundamental for profit; the problem of markets for CAPITAL EXPORT is absolutely essential for survival. Even the technological skill of the developed imperialist powers is keyed to world economic conditions under capitalism: i.e., to the world market. Every invention is released in accordance with the WORLD needs of the capitalist group controlling that invention. Thus an American chemist may perfect a process and assign all rights to Dupont. Dupont, in turn, may withhold the process on the American market and push it only in foreign spheres, as a way of controlling competition abroad. Imperialism is popularly summed up in the slogan: Export or die!

In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the sole reason for dependence on the world market is the need to import materials from abroad, that is, from capitalist countries. But the ability to import depends on trade balances - in the last analysis on exports. Precisely here is where the world market manifests itself as one of the decisive factors for the existence of the Soviet Union. A world-wide depression intensifies the over-production for the market in capitalist countries. The price of, let us say, wheat drops sharply on the world market. Then the Russian surplus, designed for export, is inadequate in terms of the imports needed for the carrying on of a planned economy. Moreover the capitalists in their economic dealings with the Soviet Union are dealing not merely with a competitor. The class conflict also enters strongly into the picture, e.g., refusal to make any but short term loans, etc.

Where it reads on Page 6 Last sentence: "For twenty years we Marxists have pointed out that the Stalinist theory of 'socialism in one country' is impossible precisely because the imperialists can not permit and will not permit the Soviet Union to develop its economy unhindered." This statement should now read as CHANGED by convention amendment to the following:

The theory of Socialism in one country is unfeasible because the Soviet Union cannot develop its economy isolated from the world economy and world market. Moreover, even if such a thing were theoretically possible, the inevitability of imperialist intervention rules out socialism in one country altogether.