

DISARMAMENT and the UNITED STATES

Continued from Page 1
not directed against America, that is, that the relation of forces does not change to its disadvantage.

The semi-official organ of MacDonald, the *Daily Herald*, wrote on September 10 that the idea of the United States of Europe was "grotesque" and even a provocation. If this fantasy were realizable, Europe would erect an enormous customs wall against America and the result would be that Great Britain would find itself between the vice chaps of the two continents. That is how the *Daily Herald* argued, asking, in addition, how it would be possible to obtain aid from America under such conditions. "To act in this way would be insanity or worse." That is frank enough.

Practically, no one knows just what the United States of Europe means exactly. For Stresemann, it is reduced to a unification of money . . . and postage stamps. That's a bit thin. Briand proposes to "study" the problem, though what it consists of no one knows exactly.

The fundamental program of unification must have an economic character, not only commercial but also involving production. It would be necessary so that artificial barriers no longer separate from coal; the system of electrification needs to be given the possibility of developing in conformity with natural and economic conditions and not within the frontiers of the Versailles treaty; all the railway lines of Europe must be united into a single system, etc. All this would be unthinkable without the previous suppression of customs frontiers within Europe and that would mean further a European customs union against America.

There can be no doubt that if the customs barriers were battered down, capitalist Europe, after a period of crises of regrouping and adaptation, would attain a higher level on a new basis of the redivision of productive forces, just as big enterprises, thanks to certain economic conditions, have the advantage over smaller ones. But what we have yet to see is the small entrepreneur giving up his place voluntarily. To make himself master of the market, the big capitalist must first of all ruin the small one. It is the same thing with states. Customs barriers are raised only because they are advantageous and necessary for one national bourgeoisie to the detriment of another, regardless of the fact that the development of industry as a whole is retarded.

Since the time of the convocation by the League of Nations of an economic conference that was to have established the reign of free trade in Europe, customs tariffs have been steadily raised. Today, the English government proposes a two year "customs vacation", that is for the next two years the existing tariffs may not be increased. Such would be the modest guarantees of the United States of Europe. But even that is still only a project.

To defend these constantly heightened customs walls, there stand ready national armies that have also been increased in comparison with the pre-war level.*

The general expenditures of militarism (land, naval and aerial) by the five greatest powers have grown in the last three years from \$2,170,000,000 to \$2,292,000,000. These figures suffice to show what value each national bourgeoisie of the thirty countries of Europe sets by its customs wall. If a big capitalist must ruin a smaller one, then a nation must crush a weaker one in order to tear down the tariff wall that protects it.

By comparing present-day Europe with the old Germany—where dozens of principalities had their customs frontiers—Stresemann endeavored to find in the unification of Germany the symbol of the economic federation of Europe and the world. It is not a bad analogy. But Stresemann only forgot to add that in order to be unified on a national basis, Germany was compelled to go through a revolution (1848) and three wars (1864, 1866 and 1870)—without counting the wars of the Reformation. In addition, even now, after the "republican" revolution of 1918, German Austria remains outside of Germany. Under such circumstances, it is hard to believe that a few diplomatic

*Before the war, Great Britain spent \$237,000,000 on its fleet. Today it spends \$270,000,000. The fleet of the United States cost \$130,000,000 in 1913. Today: \$364,000,000. For Japan, the same expenditure has risen from \$48,000,000 to \$127,000,000, that is, almost trebled. It is understandable that the Ministers of Finance begin to feel seasick in this flood.

breakfasts will be enough for the economic unification of all the nations of Europe.

2. Disarmament a la American

Alongside the problem of unifying Europe, that of the reduction of armaments has just been put on the order of the day. MacDonald has declared that the road of gradual disarmament is the surest way of guaranteeing eternal peace. That is how a pacifist confutes us. If all the countries disarmed, it would obviously be a serious guarantee for peace. But such disarmament is excluded in the same way as the voluntary destruction of the customs walls. At the present time, there is only one great power in Europe that is really disarmed. But its disarmament was accomplished only as a result of a war by which Germany also tried to "unify Europe" under its domination.

The question of "gradual disarmament," if it is examined closely, assumes the aspect of a tragic farce. In place of disarmament, the cessation of armaments is first substituted, in order to end finally in parity of the fleets of the United States and England. At present, this "aim" seems bound to be the great guarantee of peace. That amounts to saying that the regulating of revolvers is the surest way to suppress dueling. To decide the matter, it would rather be necessary to view it in the opposite sense. The fact that the two greatest naval powers haggle so furiously for a few thousand tons, clearly shows that each of them is trying to assure itself in advance, by diplomatic means, the most advantageous position in the coming military conflict.

What, however, does the creation of "equality" between the American and English fleets represent from the point of view

of the International situation? It means the establishment of a great "inequality" between them—in America's favor. And that is understood perfectly by all the serious participants in this game, above all by the Admiralties of London and Washington. If they preserve silence on these matters, it is only out of diplomatic timidity. But we have no reason to imitate them.

After the experience of the last war, there is no one who does not understand that the next war to set the titans of the world by the ears will be at once long in preparation and in duration and not lightning like. The issue will be determined by the respective powers of production of the two camps. This means that the war fleets of the powers will not only be supplemented and renewed, but in great measure, created in the very course of the war.

We have seen the extraordinary place occupied by the German submarines in the military operations during the third year of the war. We have seen how England and America, in the very course of the war, created gigantic new armies and armaments, infinitely superior to the old armies of the European continent. It follows that the soldiers, sailors, cruisers, cannons, tanks and airplanes existing at the outbreak of hostilities only constitute a point of departure. The decisive problem will depend upon the measure in which the given country will be able to create, under the enemy's fire, cruisers, cannons, soldiers and sailors. Even the czarist government was able to prepare, at the beginning of the war, a certain reserve. But what was above its power was to create a new one in the battle.

For England, in case of war with America, there is but one theoretical condition of success: That it be capable of assuring, before the outbreak of war, a

technico-military preponderance in order to balance off to a certain extent the incomparable technical and economic preponderance of the United States. The equalization of the two fleets before the war means that from the very first months of the war, America will have an incontestable advantage. Not for nothing did America threaten a few years ago to turn out cruisers in an emergency like so many pancakes.

In the negotiations of Hoover and MacDonald, it is not a question of disarmament or even the limitation of naval armaments: It is solely a question of rationally preparing the preparation of war. The type of ships is becoming obsolete. At present, when the great experience of the war and the flood of inventions it let loose are improved only for military needs and usage, the delay in eliminating various kinds of arms of military technique will be infinitely briefer than before 1914. Consequently, the main part of the fleet can be revealed to be obsolete even before it has been put into action. Under such conditions, is there any sense in accumulating ships in advance? Rationalization in this matter requires having such a fleet as is necessary in the first period of the war and which, up to that point, can serve as a laboratory for testing and experimenting with new inventions and discoveries, in view of the fact that in the period of war it would be necessary to pass over to standardized construction and production in series. All the great powers feel more or less interested in the "regulation" of armaments, especially the very costly naval armaments. But destiny has transformed this "regulation" into the greatest prerogative of the economically strongest country.

During these last years, the war and navy departments of the United States have applied themselves to adapting the entire American industry to the needs of the coming war. Schwab, one of the magnates of maritime war industry, concluded his speech to the War College a short time ago with the following words: "It must be made clear to you that war in the present period must be compared with a great big industrial enterprise."

The French imperialist press, naturally, is doing all it can to incite America against England. In an article devoted to the naval accord, *Le Temps* writes that parity of the fleets by no means signifies the equalization of sea power, since America cannot even dream of securing naval bases comparable to those which England has held for centuries. The British naval bases give it an incontestable advantage. But the accord on the parity of the two fleets, in case it is concluded, will not be the last word of the United States. Its first demand is "freedom of the seas", that is, a regime that will appreciably limit Great Britain's utilization of its naval bases. The second: "The open door", is of no less importance; under this slogan, America will raise not only China but also India and Egypt against British domination. America will conduct its expedition against the British bases not on sea but on land, that is, across the colonies and dominions of Great Britain. America will put its war fleet into action when the situation is ripe enough for it. Of course all this is music of the future. But this future is not separated from us by centuries, nor even by decades. *Le Temps* need not be uneasy. The United States will take over piece-meal all that can be taken in morsels, changing the relation of forces in all fields—technical, commercial, financial, military—to the disadvantage of its principal rival, and it will not lose sight of the latter's exceptional naval bases for a single instant.

The American press has spoken scornfully of the British acclaim of Snowden when he wrested twenty million dollars at the Hague Conference to England's profit, that is, a sum that the American tourists spend for their cigars. Is Snowden the victor? asked the *New York Times*? "No! The real victor is the Young Plan." that is, American finance capital. Thanks to the Bank of International Settlements, the Young Plan gives America the possibility of holding its hand firmly on the golden pulse of Europe. From the financial irons forged on Germany's feet, there extend strong chains which fetter the hands of France, the feet of Italy, and the neck of Britain. MacDonald, who is now fulfilling the duties of keeper to the British lion, points with pride to the collar and calls it the best instrument of peace. Just think: To attain this aim, it was enough for America to give its "magnanimous aid" to Europe so that it might liquidate the war and to consent to equalize its fleet with that of the weaker Britain.

Browder's Dazzling «Logic»

The specialist, par excellence, of the *Daily Worker* in the exposure of all deviations and the campaign against "renegades", is Earl R. Browder. That Browder has other aims in mind than merely lying about the Opposition in his articles is something that we will leave for another occasion.

As the unfortunate readers of the *Daily Worker* already know, the Stalinists have been making the most grotesque efforts to "prove" that the Lovestone Right wing and the Communist Opposition are one and the same thing, have an identical program, similar aims, and are merely a couple of trenches in the big imperialist front, ranging from Hoover to Trotsky, to crush the mighty ever-growing Communist Party of the United States. The labored arguments made to prove this contention, if laid end to end, or even side by side, would reach from Union Square to the Kremlin.

We will consider here only one example of the dazzling brilliance of Browder's analyses and the profundity of his Marxism and dialectic. In the *Daily Worker* of November 27, 1929, he concludes his "witheringly ironical" article on "The Renegade United Front Against the Revolutionary Unions" with the following "crushing" comment:

"Lovestone does not yet admit the identity of his program with that of the other renegades, but still keeps on his camouflage Cannon admits it, but explains that he stands for the same thing for different motives. One of the rarest gems of Trotskyist casuistry yet produced in America is the result. Through the pen of Sharfman he writes:

"His (Lovestone's) demand may appear superficially to be similar to ours. But . . . when we demand Party democracy or a correct trade union policy it is for the purpose of strengthening the working class Bolshevik elements in the movement. When it is demanded by Lovestone, it is for the purpose of gaining free play for interests alien to the working class.

'Accepting the complete correctness of the description of Lovestone's aim as that of 'gaining free play for interests alien to the working class,' we leave it to the metaphysicians and mystics to explain how the purity of the intentions (!) of the Trotskyists make their common program with that same Lovestone any less injurious to the workers."

It is not metaphysics or mysticism that explains this, but simply Marxism. That Browder cannot fathom it at all—or does he not want to?—is because his training, like that of Foster, consisted in the study of Lester F. Ward instead of Marx.

No, it is not our "purity of intentions"

that distinguishes us from the Right wing, although that too, despite Browder's thin sarcasm, plays its part. The difference lies more deeply rooted than that. The Marxist learns to brush aside all superficial and apparent phenomena and to seek for explanation and analysis in class relations, in class composition of a movement, its class aims and program, its origin and its deeds. All this doesn't exist for Browder. His dialectic is of that over-simplified high school type which argues: Lovestone is for Party democracy; Trotsky says he is for Party democracy; Tammany Hall appears on the ballot as the Democratic Party; therefore, there is no difference between Lovestone, Trotsky and Jimmie Walker. Quod erat demonstratum.

Since "purity of intentions" have nothing to do with the question, we will apply Browder's penetrating logic to other fields.

Mussolini runs a dictatorship in Italy; the Communists run one in Russia; therefore, there is no difference between Fascism and Communism. (The "logic of Kautsky—and Browder.) The German fascists oppose Trotsky's admission to Germany; so do the German Stalinists; therefore, there is no difference between Thaelmann and Hitler. (The "logic" of Hilferding—and Browder.) At a recent meeting of the Party Secretariat, Browder, Johnstone and Dunne demanded that the Party and Left wing policy of staying at work if Schlesinger calls his strike be reversed; the Militant also demanded a reversal of this stupid policy, and Browder, Johnstone and Dunne were accused by Fyster and Bedacht of using the same arguments as the Militant (weren't you, Browder?); therefore, Browder is a counter-revolutionary Trotskyist. (The "logic" of Lovestone, Foster—and Browder.) Browder voted (we hope) against Jimmie Walker for Mayor; Thomas voted against him; La Guardia voted against him; Enright voted against him; Lovestone voted against him; so did we; therefore, says James Browder Walker, there is a conspiracy and a united front against me ranging from Enright-Thomas-LaGuardia through to Browder-Lovestone-Trotsky.

For, does not that tombstone to Marxism, Browder, inform us that "It is true that the renegades all have the same program in essentials, especially on the practical questions. This reflects an underlying unity of theory?"

The mechanical empiricism of Lester Ward is hard to unlearn. We will grant that to Browder. But should not the Party see to it that Marxism is taught its spokesmen instead of inflicting upon us the views of an unregenerate Wardite who argues and makes analyses like a befuddled liberal?