

NT and the UNITED STATES of EUROPE

economic Europe. American unifying of arma-order of that the e surest a. That all the usly be But such ame way e the cus- e, there e that is ent was war by nify Eu- disarm- assumes place of armaments and fin- United at, this at guar- saying is the To de- neces- ase. The ers hag- and tons, s trying plomatic position ation of and Eng- 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 rationalizing 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 partly 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.

3. The Imperialist Dictatorship of America

Since 1923, I had to conduct a struggle to have the leadership of the Communist International consent, finally, to take notice of the existence of the United States and to understand that Anglo-American antagonism constitutes the fundamental line of the groupings and conflicts in the world. This was considered a heresy even at the time of the Fifth Congress of the C. I. (middle of 1924). I was accused of exaggerating, of enlarging the role of America. A legend was conceived according to which I had prophesied the disappearance of European antagonisms in the face of the American peril. Ossinsky, Larin and others smeared up not a little paper in order to "dethrone" powerful America. Radek, following the bourgeois journalist, affirmed that an epoch of Anglo-American collaboration is ahead of us, confusing temporary and episodic relations with the essence of world developments. Little by little, however, America was "recognized" by the official leadership of the Communist International which began to repeat my formulae of yesterday, not falling, of course, to add each time that the Opposition exaggerates the role of America. The correct estimation of America was at that time, as is known, the exclusive prerogative of Pepper and Lovestone. From the moment when the orientation to the Left was established, the reservations disappeared. Now it is obligatory upon the official theoreticians to predict that England and America are moving inevitably towards war. On this subject I wrote, some time in February of last year, to the deported comrades: "The Anglo-American antagonism is at last seriously recognized. It seems that Stalin and Bucharin are beginning to understand what it is all about. Nevertheless, our papers are simplifying the problem too much when they picture the situation as if Anglo-American antagonisms were becoming continuously aggravated and must lead to war right away. There is no doubt that there will still be a few crises in the course of its development. War would be a too dangerous business now for the two rivals. They will still make many efforts to come to an understanding and make peace. But at the end of all this there is a bloody denouement towards which they are proceeding with great strides." The present stage assumes anew the aspect of a military "collaboration" between America and England, and even some French journals fear to see the rise of an Anglo-Saxon dictatorship. It is evident the United States can utilize, and will utilize, their "collaboration" with England to hold Japan and France in check with the same bridle. But all this will be a stage not towards an Anglo-Saxon domination but towards an American dictatorship weighing down on the world, including Great Britain. In this connection, the leaders of the Communist International may repeat that I see no other perspective than the triumph of American capital. The petty bourgeois theoreticians of Populism likewise accused the Marxists of always conjuring up the victory of capitalism. These accusations are worthy of each other. When we say that America is moving towards world domination, it does not at all mean that this domination will be entirely realized in fact, nor that, even should it be realized in one measure or another, it will last for centuries or even decades. It is only a question of the historical tendency which, in reality, will change aspect, find itself outstripped, in order to make way for other historical tendencies. Were the capitalist world able to exist for decades without revolutionary convulsions, then these decades would be incontestable indications of the American world dictatorship. But the matter lies precisely in this: That this process will develop its own contradictions that will be added to all the other contradictions of the capitalist system. America will force Europe to strive towards an even greater rationalization and at the same time it will leave Europe only an ever more reduced part of the world market. A steady aggravation of the difficulties in Europe will result. The competition of the European powers for this reduced part of the world market will become unavoidably keener. At the same time, the European powers, under the pressure of America, will endeavor to coordinate their forces. That is the fun-

damental source of Briand's Whatever the various stages of ment may be, one thing is clear: growing disruption of the international equilibrium in favor of America is the essential source of all the crises, revolutionary convulsions in Europe, coming period. Whoever considers capitalist stabilization is assured for years understands nothing of the situation and will inevitably sink, hair, into the swamp of reformism. If the question is to be viewed in any way it presents itself on the other side of the Ocean, that is, from the standpoint of the fate of the United States, it is that here too the perspectives do not at all resemble a peaceful comedy. Up to the war, the power of the United States grew on the basis of the market, in conformity with a equilibrium between industry and agriculture. The war brought forward a crisis in this development. The United States exports capital and manufactured goods in ever greater proportions. The growth of the world power of the United States means that the whole of American industry and the gigantic capitalist skyscrapers are itself in an increasing degree the foundations of world economy. If the foundation is sapped and the United States continues to sap it day by day, exporting merchandise, capital, by a fleet, by squeezing England, by being up the most important enterprise in Europe, in making a way for it in China and elsewhere, United States finance capital is with its own hands digging cellars under its own foundations where powder and dynamite are accumulating. Where will the light come to the wick? In Asia, in Europe, in South America? or what is most probable in various places at one time. That is ready a secondary question. It is unfortunate that the leadership of the Communist International

Dazzling «Logic»

of the all deviated "gadgets", under has ng about smething asion. he Daily sts have efforts to ring and and the rogram, couple of it, rang- uth the Party of guments laid end d reach e exam- owder's Marx- orker of s "with- enegade itionary ushing" he iden- e other ouflage hat he ifferent of Trot- erica is rman appear But... y or a he pur- g class . When for the interests ness of as that allen to e meta- low the e Trot- with ous to sm that . That does he ag, like tudy of ntions"

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 Stalinites; 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 Foster 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?

A Most Re

The future historian of the mo in thumbing over the numbers of the national Press Correspondence for e will be impressed by this astounding "Trotskyism" has been killed, ha revived, has decayed, was born ag came a corpse and disintegrated, c life again, and went through simi carnations literally dozens of times. It has been alternately chara and condemned as 1. A Right wing tion; 2. A Left wing deviation; 3. rlist deviation; 4. The product of ism 5. The product of impatience; expression of the middle peasantry; expression of the labor aristocracy; result of Kulak pressure; 9. The re of the declassed workers; 10. The of foreign imperialism; 11. A tende wards syndicalism; 12. An inverted reformism; 13. An under-estimat over-estimation) of the middle (or rich) peasantry; and so on ad in In fact there is no tendency or clas tion of a class that has not foun expressed at one time or another, way or another, by so-called Trotsky. So that this corpse of Trotsky which the spirits of every class an tum in society was embodied, has the most remarkable political "cr that history has ever known—that those mutton-heads whose gospel tained in the editorial and news c of the Daily Worker and its repl every country. Announcements of "final decay of Trotskyism" have n come as regular and meaningless official Stalinist press as its proclan of the mass movements organized Party. And this is so because the r integration of so-called Trotskyism mean the disintegration of the foun of the international Communist mo with which it is synonymous. Now comes the Revolutionary (No. 3) with an article by W. F consisting of a fact or two, a few hal and a number of lies patched toge prove that "The Trotskyist movement all o world is in a state of severe crisis. ical confusion reigns everywhere and izational disintegration is already advanced stage...The forces of d ration of the official Trotskyist mo come from two directions...The