

O. K U U S I N E N



THE RIGHT-WING  
SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS  
TODAY



FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE  
Moscow 1948



O. KUUSINEN

**THE RIGHT-WING  
SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS  
TODAY**



**FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE**

Moscow 1948

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

---

---

I

THE MAIN FUNCTION OF THE  
RIGHT-WING SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

The main political function of the Right-wing Social-Democrats today does not differ in principle from the role of the Social-Democratic reformists whom our great teacher Vladimir Ilyich Lenin criticized and denounced in his day. What was Lenin's description of their main political function in bourgeois society? Here, for example, is what he wrote in 1919 in an article revealing, in particular, the treacherous position of Ramsay MacDonald, the British Labour leader:

"The bourgeoisie *needs* lackeys whom a section of the working class would trust, who would paint in fine colours, embellish the bourgeoisie with talk about the possibility of a reformist path, who would throw dust in the eyes of the people by this talk, who would *divert* the people from revolution by depicting in glowing colours the charms and the possibilities of the reformist path."\*

There is much in common between this role of the Social-Democratic reformists and the ambitions of the still earlier "socialists" whom Marx and Engels described in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* as bourgeois socialists.

"The socialistic bourgeois," wrote Marx and Engels, "want all the advantages of modern [bourgeois.—O.K.]

---

\* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1938, Vol. X, p. 49.

social conditions without the struggles and dangers necessarily resulting therefrom. They desire the existing state of society minus its revolutionary and disintegrating elements."

By preaching small economic or administrative reforms the bourgeois socialists of those times sought "to depreciate every revolutionary movement in the eyes of the working class"; they were "desirous of redressing social grievances, in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society." That was what Marx and Engels wrote.

Lenin in the beginning of 1917 wrote in similar terms of the ambitions of reformists of the type of Turati, Kautsky and other apostles of the Second International. Lenin said of them:

"Bourgeois reformists and pacifists are people who, as a general rule, are *paid*, in one form or another, to strengthen the rule of imperialism by patching it up, to keep the masses of the people quiet and to divert them from the revolutionary struggle."\*

While noting the similarity of the descriptions, we must not, however, overlook an important point of difference. The bourgeois socialists of the times of Marx and Engels were *outside* the working-class organizations, which were then weak and disunited. Half a century later the reformist Social-Democrats against whom Lenin levelled his criticism began to operate inside workers' organizations, adapting themselves more and more to the bourgeois system. For the most part it was such reformists that headed the Social-Democratic parties and trade unions. They adopted the viewpoint of the bourgeoisie, but did not withdraw from the working-class organizations; they remained at their posts and retained the name "socialist," but they betrayed the cause of the working class. They began to subordinate the labour

---

\* Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. XIX, p. 384.

movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie and to do the latter's bidding.

These Social-Democratic reformists may, therefore, be described as a new variety of bourgeois socialists, much more dangerous and malignant than were the bourgeois socialists of the middle of the 19th century.

As mentioned above, Lenin, in speaking of the reformists of the imperialist epoch, emphasized that they are people whom the bourgeoisie pays for their services in one form or another. In another article Lenin wrote of such labour leaders and the upper stratum of bourgeoisified workers that the capitalists "bribe them in a thousand of different ways, direct and indirect, overt and covert." They are, wrote Lenin, "the real agents of the bourgeoisie in the labour movement."<sup>\*</sup>

In connection with the first world war, when capitalism entered the epoch of its general crisis, when the Russian proletariat, led by the Party of Lenin and Stalin, accomplished the Great October Socialist Revolution, and when revolutionary feeling ran high in a number of other European countries, the Social-Democratic reformists used the working-class organizations under their leadership as a dam to stem the tide of the revolutionary movement of the labouring masses. And, as we know, the bourgeoisie, with the aid of the reformists, succeeded at that time in saving the capitalist system in Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy and other European countries.

The Social-Democratic parties began to wage a systematic war against the Communist movement and to conduct a virulent campaign against the Soviet Union. They did everything to convince the bourgeoisie that it could rely upon them as devoted squires in the fight against the Soviet Union, against Communism and against the class struggle of the proletariat.

---

<sup>\*</sup> Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Volume edition, Moscow, 1947, Vol. I, p. 635.

The German Social-Democrats, in particular, endeavoured by their entire policy in the period between 1923 and 1932, when they were in the government, to prove to the financial oligarchy that they, the Social-Democrats, deserved its confidence no less than Hitler's Nazis. However, the rapacious magnates of German monopoly capital preferred in the early 'thirties to mount the fascist horse, Hitler having promised them the complete annihilation of the labour movement and an unprecedented stream of superprofits from war contracts, with the further prospect of conquering vast "Lebensraum" for Germany.

International reaction followed suit. It also pinned its hopes on German fascism. It sought to direct Hitler's aggression against the Soviet Union and to this end rendered him every aid to enable him to prepare for the second world war. But the Munich policy of Britain and France proved an utter failure. Stalin's brilliant foreign policy gave the Land of Socialism an additional year and a half of peace and the opportunity to build up forces to repel fascist Germany. The U.S.S.R. proved to be the principal force in the anti-Hitler coalition of democratic powers.

The second world war, as we know, brought entirely different results from what international reaction hoped for at the time of the Munich deal with Hitler. It resulted not in the strengthening, but in the further weakening of capitalism; far from remedying the shaky position of capitalism, it aggravated its general crisis. Our Soviet Union smashed the main forces of fascist Germany and her accomplices, and on the day of victory our country proved to be the strongest power in the world. The forces of international imperialist reaction, on the other hand, found some of their major stalwarts, such as fascist Germany, Italy and Japan, missing. The new democracies—countries liberated from the German yoke by the Soviet troops—have dropped out of the imperialist sys-



tem. The mood of the broad masses of the people in other European countries is one of rising wrath. The influence of the Communist parties has greatly increased. In some of the colonial countries the peoples are fighting for national liberation from imperialist bondage. All the contradictions of capitalism have become accentuated to the utmost, creating an immediate threat of new destructive economic crises, political conflicts and major collisions between classes.

Under these circumstances the bourgeoisie of the West-European countries could not do without the services of the Right-wing Socialists. It needs them now, not less, but more than before the second world war. Who is better fitted than the Social-Democratic reformists to counteract the growing political activity of the working class and the lower middle class and thus protect the interests of the big bourgeoisie? In view of the rising revolutionary anger of the masses against the avaricious robbers who preside over the big banks, trusts and concerns, the Right-wing Social-Democrats are working extra hard to spread reformist illusions, to deceive the masses and to corrupt them politically. To counterbalance the widespread sympathies for the Soviet Union among the labouring masses, they resort to unscrupulous slanders and all sorts of fabrications about our Socialist country. To offset the influence of the Communist parties they are everywhere carrying on a venomous campaign against the Communists and all honest Socialists who co-operate with them.

The capitalists cannot themselves keep the workers from fighting for higher wages and better working conditions; they need the help of Social-Democratic agents in leading positions in trade union bodies and other labour organizations or holding, say, ministerial posts.

The urge for unity in the ranks of the working class, which was greatly stimulated during the war, aroused grave apprehension among the reactionary bourgeoisie.

But with the help of the Right-wing Socialists the bourgeoisie in Western Europe have so far succeeded nearly everywhere in preventing the Socialist workers from combining with the Communists for the fight against reaction. The leadership of the British Labour Party worked particularly hard to prevent, wherever possible, the establishment of a proletarian united front.

It is worth while noting that the Labour Professor Harold Laski is doing a great deal of traveling on the European continent in the capacity of chief promoter of division in the labour movement—the selfsame Professor Harold Laski who during the war quite eloquently explained to the workers the harm of division in the ranks of the labour movement and the need for concerted, joint action after the war was over. At that time he deprecated (in the January 1943 issue of *Left News*) the disunity of the working class, the ideological differences dividing Socialists and Communists. He warned that, unless the workers were ready for action, the hour of victory might prove an hour of danger; that if the fratricidal strife which had been instrumental in bringing about the destruction of the labour movement in Germany and in Italy and in sapping its strength in other countries persisted after the war, the war for freedom might bring still worse slavery.

As we see from this, Harold Laski, as well as other Labour leaders, was well aware what unity of the labour movement meant for the cause of the working class. But just because the Labour leaders were so well aware of this they resolutely bent their efforts after the war to keep the labour movement divided, and not only in Britain but in other countries too. The interests of the bourgeoisie—the master whom they are serving—demanded that they should betray the cause of the working class.

By maintaining and widening the rift in the ranks of the working class, the British Labour Party leaders, along with the Right-wing Socialists of France, are seek-

ing to perpetuate in Western and Central Europe a state of affairs which should make it impossible for the proletariat, even in the event of an acute revolutionary situation, to unite for concerted action dangerous to the bourgeois system. At the same time the Social-Democratic splitters are working systematically to weaken the *will* of the workers for militant action, spreading disbelief in the strength of the working class, threatening proletarians with the wrath of god and capital, and poisoning their minds with the venom of anti-communism.

The party machine of the present-day Right-wing Social-Democrats thus serves the ruling bourgeoisie as an agency for insurance against workers' unrest, or as a sort of office for the political suppression of the rebellious spirit of the masses still under their influence.

Léon Blum, the French Socialist Party leader, who is regarded as the ideological head of the contemporary social reformists, tells them quite bluntly that, wherever they are members of the government in capitalist society they must act as "loyal and true business managers" of that society. Even when they have an absolute majority in parliament, he said at his party's congress in 1946, they must bend all their efforts to render good service as true "ruling representatives of the capitalist society." However, Blum is not in the least concerned about loyalty and honesty with regard to the cause of the working class.

In performing their habitual services for the bourgeoisie, in fighting to maintain the capitalist regime, the Right-wing Social-Democrats are fighting to maintain their positions, their soft jobs (as flunkys), their thirty pieces of silver. The fate of the contemporary Right-wing Socialists is entirely bound up with the fate of the bourgeoisie, primarily Big Business, on whose position and strength, in the main, depends their influence too.

This has been most graphically revealed in the popular democracies—Yugoslavia, Poland, etc. No sooner did

the big bourgeoisie in those countries lose their dominating positions and their enterprises, and the landlords their estates, than the Right-wing Socialists lost their former influence among the masses. Some of these servants of the bourgeoisie are now nothing but living corpses, others still offer the spectacle of incorrigible but cowardly intriguers, while still others have joined bandit gangs and live on what they get from foreign imperialists.

## II

### WHAT SORT OF SOCIALISTS ARE THEY?

It would be impossible for the Social-Democratic reformists to do their job as servants of the bourgeoisie successfully if they did not at the same time take care to retain the confidence of the workers who still follow them. That is why they use the flag of Socialism.

But they hate true Socialism, like the Socialism established in the Soviet Union, where there is not a single enterprise belonging to capitalists, where there are no exploiters and no exploitation of man by man. It goes without saying that real Socialism cannot be established in any other form. And the Right-wing Social-Democrats know this. But they also know that wherever real Socialism is established—that is to say, Socialism without capitalists, without a bourgeoisie—no room will be left for bourgeois socialists either. Hence their hatred of genuine Socialism, a hatred as natural and vicious as that felt by the bourgeoisie itself.

However, to retain the confidence of the Socialist workers, the Right-wing Social-Democrats must advocate some sort of sham that might be palmed off as socialism, some ersatz-socialism. They need it particularly badly today, for during the war of liberation against fascist Germany Socialist ideas immensely increased their hold upon

masses of workers in Britain, France and many other countries. In the face of this leftward trend of the workers, even the leadership of the British Labour Party began to wave the flag of Socialism in 1943. In its 1945 election platform the leadership of the Labour Party promised that in the event of victory in the General Election it would convert a large part of British industry into public property, place monopolies and cartels under public supervision, establish control over production and prices, and much more. To popularize this platform, the spokesmen of the Labour Party (Prof. Laski, for example) promised to undertake "to build the foundations of socialism within the structure of a society dominated by a capitalist economy, to achieve the socialist revolution by consent."

Its victory in the General Election provided the Labour Party with the opportunity to carry out its entire election platform. But the Labour government decided to put into effect only such measures as did not meet with objections from the capitalists. The shareholders of the Bank of England, for instance, willingly consented to let the state have their shares in return for a generous compensation, which guaranteed them their income of 12 per cent per annum. The nationalization of the coal industry likewise benefited the mineowners, because they themselves could not possibly go on operating their technically backward mines at a profit. The Labour government paid the mineowners huge sums in compensation. Shinwell, the Minister of Fuel and Power at the time, who knew the sentiments of the mineowners on the matter, said of their attitude toward the plan to nationalize the coal industry that they would hail it with enthusiasm. For the coal industry was in a bad way, and many would be glad to get rid of their mines.

On the basis of such measures Labour Party propagandists are loudly claiming that something in the nature of socialist construction has begun in Britain. That is all nonsense, of course. In many other bourgeois coun-

tries railways and central banks functioning as state banks have long been the property, not of private shareholders, but of the state. There is not a grain of socialism in the fact that the Bank of England has now been nationalized, since it has merely been perfected organizationally as an enterprise of state-monopoly capitalism.

The Right-wing Social-Democrats often insist that the nationalization of the coal industry in Britain is, in principle, the same as the nationalization of large-scale industries in the popular democracies. In fact, however, these are entirely different things. In the first case, in Britain, the nationalization of the coal industry has been carried out fully in accord with the evolution of contemporary capitalism. In the second case, in the popular democracies, the nationalization of industry has actually meant the abandonment of modern capitalism for a road which leads to Socialism.

There is a difference in principle here, determined above all by the class character of the state which carries out the nationalization. It is one thing if a bourgeois state, based on modern monopoly capitalism, buys out an industry; and it is an entirely different thing if a state which is ruled, not by the bourgeoisie, but by the working people, takes over all large-scale industries. In the first case the domination of private capitalist monopolies remains unrestricted; if anything, the enterprises that have come under state ownership, as well as all the other economic organizations of the state, will become inter-linked with the system of private capitalist monopolies and subordinated to the interests of the latter. In the second case, however, the nationalization of large-scale industries puts an end to the entire system of monopoly capitalism.

The composition of the directing body of the nationalized coal industry in Britain is also such as to ensure that the first of the two tendencies mentioned above will

prevail. It is former mineowners and former directors of coal companies who set the tune in the National Coal Board. Besides, as *The Times* remarked on December 21, 1945, "the Constitution of the board will provide the necessary guarantee that the functions of industrial management and commercial organization will not be made dependent on a political authority." Consequently, they will only depend on the interests and the instructions of Britain's financial oligarchy. As for the Bank of England, its former Governor, Lord Catto, retained his post. The *Financial Times*, organ of financial circles in Britain, reported that the status of the Bank after its nationalization remained unchanged and that the situation was quite satisfactory to the City.

The most important reforms promised in the Labour Party's election platform have remained on paper. The Labour government falsely pleads in justification that it must abide by "democracy," that the tradition of English democracy does not permit it to "coerce" the people to accept something they do not want; for it transpires that it is not the people but a handful of capitalists who are resisting reforms. As a matter of fact, the people are demanding the honest and immediate implementation of the promise to nationalize the steel industry and of all the other promised reforms, but the Labour government renounces reforms that do not please the big capitalists.

In an *Economic Survey* the British government explained that the plans for the development of industry and of economic life as a whole can be carried out only when "both sides of industry" and the nation agree as to the objectives and then work together for their attainment. But since the capitalist "side of industry" only agrees to reforms whose purpose it is to perpetuate capitalism the Labour government carries out only such reforms.

Some of these reforms involve certain concessions to the workers too. After all, the capitalists themselves realize that in a country like England, where the exploited

workers constitute the overwhelming majority of the population, it is essential, in the interests of capitalism to make some minor concessions to their slaves, so as to divert them as far as possible from the class struggle. But the reforms which represent large advantages for the capitalists and small concessions to the workers are advertised by the Labour Party as measures for the attainment of "socialism." On behalf of what they refer to as "democratic socialism," Attlee and other Labour Party leaders are calling upon the workers to maintain forever the system of bourgeois parliamentarism and the present bourgeois state which they describe as standing above classes. Under the guise of maintaining "individual liberties" they are stealthily smuggling into their fictitious "socialist society" all the liberties which the bourgeoisie enjoys in capitalist society, that is to say, the liberty to exploit the workers, the liberty to profiteer, the liberty to raise prices, the liberty to speculate on the stock exchange, etc., including full liberty for fascists. The socialist society which the Labour Party leaders claim they are working to establish is in fact nothing but contemporary bourgeois society, touched up a bit to make it look like "socialism."

A similar desire to perpetuate bourgeois society under the guise of establishing a socialist system was characteristic of the bourgeois socialism of the 19th century, too.

"In requiring the proletariat to carry out such a system," wrote Marx and Engels, "... it [bourgeois socialism. —O.K.] but requires in reality that the proletariat should remain within the bounds of existing society, but should cast away all its hateful ideas concerning the bourgeoisie."

Since then, however, bourgeois society has undergone certain alterations, which have found their corresponding reflection in the doctrine of a fictitious socialism. When the capitalism which was typical of the 19th century was



succeeded by capitalism in its monopoly stage, many reformists began to assert that "monopoly capitalism or state-monopoly capitalism is *no longer* capitalism, but can already be termed 'state socialism' or something of that sort."\* When, in connection with the first world war and the Great October Socialist Revolution, capitalism entered the epoch of its general crisis, the Social-Democratic defenders of capitalism began to spread the illusion that the monopolistic combinations are capable of creating a strong and monolithic "organized capitalism" to take the place of the former anarchy. And the "socialism" of those Social-Democrats became as indistinguishable from "organized capitalism" as one hen's egg from another. However, the world economic crisis of 1929-33, which soon followed, demolished the entire foundation of the theory of "organized capitalism."

As a result of the second world war the foundations of capitalism have been still further shaken. In view of the drastic accentuation of all the contradictions of the capitalist system, the financial oligarchies of the big capitalist countries are obviously hankering after a still stronger state machine and its coalescence with the giant capitalist monopolies. This involves also a certain extension of the economic functions of the capitalist state—only not, of course, in order to counterbalance the omnipotence of the private capitalist monopolies, but, on the contrary, in order to enable the leading cliques of finance capital to use the entire power of the state as a direct instrument in the fight for their predatory objectives both in their own countries and in the international arena.

The Social-Democrats have also adapted themselves to these present-day ambitions of monopoly capital. Under the guise of a "socialist" policy, the Labour Ministers

---

\* Lenin, *Selected Works*, Two-Volume edition, Moscow, 1947, Vol. II, p. 186.

in Britain and the Right-wing Social-Democratic reformists in other countries are doing their best to meet, first and foremost, the requirements of monopoly capital, in which bourgeois society is nowadays most interested.

Hence, the fictitious socialism of the Social-Democratic reformists is—as it always has been—a mirror-like reflection of bourgeois society at the given stage of development, a reflection sufficiently dim to obscure all the contradictions and ulcers of this society, all the symptoms of its approaching doom.

### III

#### WHAT SORT OF DEMOCRATS ARE THEY?

In passing on to an examination of the domestic and foreign policies of the contemporary Right-wing Social-Democrats, we must pay special attention to the contradiction between their words and their deeds. The behaviour of the Right-wing Social-Democrats is based on complete divergence between words and deeds. And we must pay due attention to this fact if we want to understand their policies. Their actions must be watched most closely. For it is not what they say that counts, but what they do.

In words, they are democrats. Democracy, they claim, is the cornerstone of their home policy. But there are various kinds of "democrats," just as there are various kinds of "socialists." Even the Hitlerites called themselves socialists—"National-Socialists." In the United States, as we know, a half of all the reactionaries and imperialists call themselves officially "democrats," and the other half are likewise fond of holding forth against a background of democratic window dressing. That is why we must take a closer view at the Right-wing Socialists to ascertain what sort of democrats they are.

In France, where in the spring of 1947 the representatives of the Communist Party, the biggest party of the working people, were excluded from the government, the Socialists, in coalition with the bourgeois parties, have steered the government policy along an obviously reactionary course. That is evidenced, for example, by the steep rise in prices and the sharp decline of real wages, on the one hand, and, on the other, by the recent monstrous legislation restricting the rights of trade unions and providing for the protection of strike breaking—legislation fully as hostile to the trade unions as the notorious Taft-Hartley anti-labour law in the United States.

Furthermore, the new French government and particularly its "socialist" Minister of Home Affairs, Jules Moch, have already beaten all the records of French reactionaries in suppressing strike movements of workers by force. It will be remembered that in the latter part of November 1947 a widespread strike movement broke out in France, involving over three million workers. All the means at the disposal of reaction were employed against the strikers. The entire government machinery was mobilized to break the resistance of the workers. Police and troops were sent against them, and 80,000 reservists were called up additionally. Firearms were used, with the result that casualties among the French workers ran into thousands.

What were those savage reprisals but evidence of rabid reaction? And it was not only M. Moch and the other "socialist" ministers that were responsible for the reactionary course taken by the government. Their party, too, was responsible. The Right-wing Socialists organized strikebreakers, and the Socialist Party unreservedly supported the government's terrorism. And anyone who thinks that the Labour Party in Britain or the Socialist parties of Belgium, Holland and other West-European countries publicly voiced their indignation and disasso-

ciated themselves from the French Socialists in their policy of resorting to police violence is deeply mistaken. On the contrary, their press expressed solidarity with the criminal policy of the Right-wing Socialists in France.

These disgusting facts throw glaring light on the depths of betrayal to which the Blum-Moch clique has sunk—depths unparalleled in the history of the French labour movement. This is no accident, of course; it is closely related to the degeneration of bourgeois democracy in the present period.

Bourgeois democracy has always represented the political form of the domination of capital. In previous epochs, too, it was therefore not democracy for the working masses, but the guarantee of freedom for the capitalists and landlords to exploit the working people. But in the present epoch, when the general crisis of capitalism is growing in severity, bourgeois democracy is adapting itself more and more to the new, anti-democratic and predatory ambitions of monopoly capital. Among the features of this process are the continuing coalescence of the state apparatus with the capitalist monopolies, the growth of corruption at all levels, the bankruptcy of parliamentarism, the growth of militarism and the spread of fascist banditism.

The Social-Democratic parties in the bourgeois democracies are also adapting themselves to these conditions of degenerating bourgeois society. While it is true, as we stated in the beginning, that the role of the present-day Right-wing Socialists does not differ in principle from the role of the Right-wing Social-Democratic reformists in the first quarter of the 20th century, it does not at all mean that there is no difference between their policies today and then. No, they have gone far along the road of betrayal since then. They were in the service of the bourgeoisie a quarter of a century ago too, but under the present conditions this service requires an even

more infamous policy on their part. Today, it is not only the general class interests of the bourgeoisie that they are expected to defend, but, first and foremost, the interests of the monopoly capital marauders. Today they are the tools, not of bourgeois liberalism, but of aggressive black reaction. And the principal task which reaction in most bourgeois countries today assigns to the Right-wing Socialists in the sphere of home policy is to employ all possible means of political deceit, slander, provocation and violence to paralyse the labour movement and prevent the masses of the working people from fighting to cast off the yoke of the capitalist monopolies.

The Right-wing Socialists in France, once they set out to fulfil the task assigned to them by the reactionary bourgeoisie, drew an entirely logical conclusion from Léon Blum's instruction that they must be loyal "business managers of capitalism" to the end. If that is the line, they said to themselves, they need not be perturbed if they have to imbrue their hands in workers' blood.

In Britain the situation today is somewhat different. But is not the Labour government doing the same thing in Greece, where its armed forces are helping a gang of its henchmen to torment and exterminate the true representatives of the Greek people, the finest champions of its freedom? In Britain itself the Labour government is doing all it can to swell the profits of the big capitalists at the expense of the vital interests of the workers.

It is raising direct and indirect taxes that are a burden on the working people, promoting the growth of inflation, price increases and the continuous lowering of real wages. It is not only maintaining but has even extended the wartime rationing of consumer goods and food products. All these facts go to show that the Labour government is now carrying out the principal economic demand of the avaricious British and

American monopolists, which is to enforce a general drastic decline in the standard of life of the British working class. This unprecedented attack upon the standard of life of the working people would have met with widespread resistance but for the fact that, in anticipation of such a possibility, the Labour government had taken care to retain the worst wartime law—namely, the national Arbitration Act, which actually bans strikes, since it makes the legality of all strikes dependent on the arbitrary judgment of the Minister of Labour. Furthermore, in October 1947 regulations providing for the compulsory direction of man power entered into force, whereby the majority of wage earners are forbidden to change their places of work at will. The Minister of Labour, Isaacs, threatened that he would not hesitate to use his wartime powers to conscript man power. Lastly, the Labour Party leadership has inaugurated a provocative campaign designed to split the British trade unions, because it fears that united trade unions will effectively defend the interests of the workers.

The fascist elements in England have been given a free hand by the government to organize and strengthen their movement. In France, General de Gaulle and his clique are openly organizing terroristic bands to seize power; but the Socialist Party, which is represented in the government, posing as "the third force," is actually doing nothing to interfere with de Gaulle's preparations to carry out his sinister designs.

The Socialists of all countries are, of course, well acquainted with the experience of the German Social-Democratic Party which cleared the way for the Hitler tyranny by exactly the same policy. From that bitter experience sincere Socialists in a number of countries have drawn the only correct conclusion that they must join hands with the Communists and other defenders of democracy to offer determined resistance to the forces

of fascism and reaction which are preparing to take the offensive. But the Right-wing Socialists are doing nothing to obstruct the fascists today either. And the reason is obvious: They, the Right-wing Social-Democrats, and the fascists serve one master. They are the two arms of the parasitic, reactionary bourgeoisie, which is determined to keep the working people in slavery forever and is therefore fighting savagely, using both arms, against the growing forces of true democracy and Socialism.

#### IV

### VEHICLES OF AN ANTI-DEMOCRATIC FOREIGN POLICY

An examination of the facts pertaining to the behaviour of the present-day Right-wing Social-Democrats in regard to foreign relations shows that in this sphere too they have become the vehicles of the policy and schemes of the most reactionary and aggressive circles of the international bourgeoisie.

The policy of international reaction has taken various forms in recent years, but the following may be regarded as its main aspects:

a) Anglo-American interference in the internal affairs of the popular democracies and other countries;

b) The use of force to suppress the national liberation struggle in a number of colonial and dependent countries;

c) The policy of a deal between the reactionary bourgeoisie of European countries and American imperialism which is striving for world hegemony;

d) The policy of undermining international peace and of preparing for new aggression.

Let us take the first of these aspects. The numerous attempts at Anglo-American interference in the internal affairs of the popular democracies are universally known.

Members of the Labour government may interpret these facts as they wish, but they cannot expunge them. They may give one explanation or another for the attempts made by British diplomacy, along with American, to interfere in the internal affairs of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and the efforts to exert pressure in the interests of a handful of reactionary enemies of the people—the fact remains that such persistent attempts at British interference did take place.

Yet in their speeches on formal occasions the Labour Party leaders have always upheld the right of each nation to self-determination, without any outside interference. For example, Attlee, speaking at the British trade union congress on October 24, 1946, claimed that the Labour Party's policy was based on "belief in freedom and democracy and the right of nations to decide freely for themselves the kind of government and society they desired."

Apropos of such claims the nations of Eastern and Southeastern Europe might ask the Labour Ministers: "Why, then, are you preventing—or why have you tried to prevent—us from freely ordering our affairs, in accordance with our own wishes? Your actions in dealing with us are diametrically opposed to the principle which, in words, you too recognize as a principle of elementary democracy."

•The anti-democratic, imperialist character of the British policy of interference in the internal affairs of the popular democracies stands out most glaringly when we turn to the highhanded methods employed by British emissaries in their underground, conspiratorial activities in these countries. The sinister actions of such emissaries, among whom there were some diplomats too, came to light in the autumn of 1947 at public trials of political criminals in Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania. Here are some instances culled from the court materials published in the press.



In Poland, at the Cracow trial of the bandit organization known as WIN (Wolność i Niepodległość) and the agents provocateurs and spies of the PSL (Mikolajczyk's party), it was revealed that the leaders of that gang, which assassinated thousands of Polish democrats over a period of two years, had close connections in London.

In Yugoslavia, at the trial of Dragoljub Iovanović and Franjo Gaži, the latter told the court that as far back as 1942, during his sojourn abroad, he had been enlisted in the British Intelligence Service, and that after his return from London to Yugoslavia in 1945 he had taken part in Iovanović's crimes on the instruction of the British Press Attaché in Belgrade, Clissold.

In Bulgaria, Petkov, the ringleader of a gang of conspirators who plotted a coup d'état, admitted in a letter written in prison after he had been sentenced to death that his entire activity for two years "served reaction, both external and internal, and was inspired in the course of the talks I had with the representatives of imperialist states, Barnes and Boswell."

In Albania, at the trial of the wreckers and saboteurs who belonged to the bandit organizations "Ballu Kombëtare" and "Legalitet," in September 1947, it was fully revealed that their activities had been directed by the official British and U.S. missions in Tirana.

In none of these cases did the Labour government or the Labour press disavow the machinations of those emissaries, and the Right-wing Social-Democrats of other countries and their press systematically defended Anglo-American interference and spread falsehoods and insinuations designed to discredit the governments of the popular democracies.

As for Greece, the very stones there cry out against Anglo-American interference. In spite of repeated protests voiced by many British trade unions, the Labour government persists in maintaining armed forces in Greece, bolstering up the bestial regime of a puppet ruling clique,

the royalist-fascist gang, which is so hateful to the overwhelming majority of the Greek people that it could not maintain itself in power a single day without foreign support.

The British Labour Party leaders and the French Right-wing Socialists have also gained distinction for the bloody suppression of the national liberation struggle in a number of *colonial countries*—the former, mainly in Indonesia; the latter, in Indo-China.

No sooner did the great Indonesian people attain its liberation from the Dutch colonial yoke than the British government sent armed forces against it and at the same time armed Dutch expeditionary troops for more bloodshed in Indonesia. And what do you think this infamous procedure is called in the language of the Labour Party leaders? In the Labour Party's well-known pamphlet, *Cards on the Table*, this is described, word for word, as follows: "We have made an important contribution to Indonesia's fight for freedom."

That is something in the nature of a world record in Jesuitical hypocrisy. But, then, this will not greatly surprise the reader who finds in the same pamphlet the assertion that British imperialism has ceased to exist, as it has been liquidated by the Labourites. . . . In nearly all the British colonies this supposedly non-existent imperialism continues to hold the native peoples in slavery as ruthlessly as heretofore. And in India, where British imperialism was no longer strong enough to maintain the colonial regime in its former shape, the Labour government imposed upon the people the treacherous scheme whereby the country was partitioned into separate British dominions—a scheme which could not but cause sanguinary civil strife on a vast scale between Muslims and Hindus. This bloodshed is expected to promote the further schemes and machinations of British imperialism in India.

## SERVITORS OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

Another aspect of the foreign policy of the British Labourites and the French Socialists is their support of the reactionary policy of a deal with American imperialism.

This policy is often referred to in England as Bevin's "Fulton" policy, since it was first proclaimed by Churchill in his notorious speech at Fulton, in the United States. Bevin followed suit with a speech in the House of Commons (on June 4, 1946) in which he outdid Churchill in the profusion of his attacks upon the Soviet Union and in kowtowing to the American imperialists. Churchill has admitted that there is no difference whatever between his position and Bevin's political course with regard to the major issues of international policy which, from the standpoint of the ambitions of the City and Wall Street, are today decisive.

The purport of the Bevin-Churchill "Fulton" policy is to steer for an aggressive bloc with the United States directed against the Soviet Union and the popular democracies, and against the Communist and democratic movement in every country. The aim of this policy is to establish reactionary regimes (of the Greek type) wherever possible, and with their aid to deprive the peoples of economic independence and national sovereignty, to bring them under the yoke of American imperialism.

It goes without saying that it is primarily the American reactionaries who dictate this international policy. It is urged by their ambition for imperialist expansion—an ambition which knows no bounds and is manifested in all their policies, particularly in the "Truman doctrine" and the "Marshall plan," so called. Everything goes to show that the ruling circles of Britain, France and several other bourgeois countries have already come to

terms with the American reactionaries with a view to taking part in the implementation of these schemes.

The Right-wing Social-Democrats have devoted themselves unreservedly to the promotion of this imperialist policy.

True enough, some Social-Democrats have tried to put forward the "original" idea that the Marshall plan is a good thing whereas the Truman doctrine is not. However, since both have been hatched in the same nest and pursue the same aim, every controversy as to which is the better is just ridiculous. It reminds one too much of the well-known controversy between the scholastics of old as to which devil is better—a blue or a yellow one.

The Social-Democratic reformists everywhere in Western Europe are now carrying on demagogic propaganda in favour of the American plans and ambitions, employing thousands of sophisms to cover up the sordid imperialist character of the plans of dollar diplomacy.

Léon Blum, in an article in the *Populaire*, appealed to the Social-Democrats of all countries to take the lead in starting a widespread movement of public opinion "to orient the American initiative." Social-Democratic newspapers and speakers followed this up with a most revolting display of grovelling before the throne of the American moneybags. Preparations are now under way for a special conference of Socialist parties of West-European countries to approve the Marshall plan.

On the German question the British Labour Ministers and the French Right-wing Socialists are also giving full support to the American plans which are directed against the interests of the European peoples and against the establishment of a democratic peace. They are parties to the violation of the Potsdam decisions concerning the demilitarization of Germany and her reconstruction on democratic lines. They are backing the American reactionaries in their efforts to obtain support for their policy among the selfsame German monopolists who were the

mainstays of the Hitler regime, and to turn Western Germany into a base for the extension of the influence of American imperialism in Europe. And Bevin, for example, in his speech at Morpeth (on July 19, 1947), expressed the hope that the United States would never again abandon Europe. . . .

Bevin's hope is undoubtedly sharply at variance with the wishes of the peoples of Europe. But that does not prevent him in the least from currying the favour of the House of Morgan and other American billionaires who are aspiring to obtain trusteeship over the nations of Europe.

The party of the German chauvinistic Social-Democrats (Schumacher's party) is also offering its services to the Americans. One of the most reactionary leaders of the old German Social-Democracy, Stampfer, who recently returned from the United States, said of the June congress of Schumacher's party that "It was a European congress at which the international Socialists responded to America's appeal for a united Europe with the watchword: 'Here we are!'"

In the beginning of 1930 Stampfer and his colleagues sought to win the good graces of German reaction, trying to show that it needed them as a tool along with fascism; and in exactly the same way the Social-Democratic Munichites of today are going to all lengths to prove to the American imperialists that they are prepared and well-suited to play the role of quislings in their service.

Is it conceivable that the Right-wing Social-Democrats do not understand that American imperialism is today the centre of international reaction? They understand this perfectly well, and that is why they offer it their services. Dread of the growing strength of Socialism and popular democracy, hatred for the Land of Socialism and the Communist workers of all countries drive them into the camp of the most ruthless forces of international reaction.

How far the Right-wing Socialists have already gone in their servility to American imperialism is evident, on the one hand, from their eagerness to force the yoke of American "assistance" upon their countries, accepting any terms imposed by the Wall Street usurers; and, on the other, from the zeal with which the most prominent Social-Democratic leaders are calling upon their countries to give up their national sovereignty.

In the days when bourgeois democracy still represented a progressive movement it knew no loftier idea than national sovereignty. Today, the Belgian Socialist leader, Spaak, goes out of his way to prove that national sovereignty has become "an outmoded idea" which should be discarded like an old shirt and replaced by an American coercive regime.

In France, where American emissaries are already acting as overlords, impudently deciding who is to be in the government and laying their hands on the country's national resources, Léon Blum, one of the foremost champions of American imperialism, deprecates any insistence on the country's economic independence as "nationalism." On behalf of what he calls "socialism" he supports the demand of the American monopolies that France and other European countries should abolish their customs boundaries. He even asserts that this will lead to the setting up of an "international socialist system"—no more, no less. He demands, in the first place, that France should give up her national sovereignty in favour of a foreign authority which he calls, rather vaguely, a "world government" or a "super-state." It is not hard to guess that this appellation is nothing but a convenient alias for the world supremacy of American imperialism.

Such is Léon Blum, the ideological leader of the contemporary Right-wing Socialists, who has now become the bard of national betrayal.

The political meaning of this propaganda of renuncia-

lion of national sovereignty lies primarily in the fact that Blum, Spaak, and their like are thereby encouraging the United States to a policy of increasingly brazen blackmail and extortion in Europe. Any Bullitt may say to any American profiteer whose mouth waters at the sight of the wealth accumulated in the countries of Europe:

"Why stand on ceremony when even the Socialists want us to take complete control!"

The Right-wing Socialists and their press are now conducting a continuous campaign of lies and slander against the Soviet Union and the popular democracies. This is obviously part of their functions as agents of American imperialism.

Naturally, they cannot dispense with at least some sort of camouflage for their hostility to the Soviet Union—the latter's prestige is far too great for that. That is why the Labour Party leaders, for example, often represent the present British government as an "honest intermediary" between capitalist America and the Soviet Union. But in the pamphlet, *Cards on the Table!*, they cast off their mask for a moment, declaring plainly that a British foreign policy independent of the United States was not desirable so far as the Labour government was concerned, and emphasizing their intention to take part in the American machinations against the Soviet Union:

"The idea that we should have extricated ourselves from the quarrel between Russia and the U.S.A. does not make sense."

The activities of the Labour government fully bear out this statement. It faithfully follows the line mapped out by the American expansionists in its foreign policy, which is directed against the interests of the Soviet Union and of all freedom-loving nations.

As for France, the Socialist Ministers there have recently launched even police operations of an anti-Soviet character.

The first of these operations was directed against the Paris workers who on the 28th of October 1947 demonstrated in protest against an attempt of the fascists to hold an anti-Soviet rally in the centre of the city. The government headed by the Socialist Ramadier mobilized thousands of police to protect the fascist provocateurs against the demonstrating workers. More than 300 of the demonstrators were wounded.

The next police operation of the Ramadier government was a direct act of provocation against a foreign state. On November 14, a large police force supported by tanks made a completely unjustified raid upon the Beauregard camp, which had been organized, in accordance with the Franco-Soviet agreement on repatriation, for members of the Soviet armed forces liberated from German captivity and for other Soviet citizens who had been deported as slaves to Germany during the war.

Lastly, towards the end of November—this time under the Schuman government—the following operation was carried out under the direction of the “socialist” Minister of the Interior. In various parts of the country French secret police agents illegally arrested Soviet citizens—participants in the resistance movement during the Nazi occupation. Some of them had even received French military decorations a month before their arrest. After subjecting the arrested to various indignities, the police secretly deported them from France.

In connection with the two latter cases, the government of the Soviet Union, it will be remembered, made firm and strong representations to the French government in its notes of December 8 and 9, 1947. There can hardly be any doubt that the outrageous anti-Soviet provocations of the French authorities were engineered to please the American reactionaries, with the aim of prejudicing Franco-Soviet relations.



## VI

### ACCOMPLICES OF THE INSTIGATORS OF A NEW WAR

The last of the main aspects of the foreign policy of the Right-wing Socialists concerns their complicity in the efforts to undermine international peace and to prepare for new aggression. This aspect is, naturally, closely connected with the previous one.

The Right-wing Socialists assert, of course, that they are fighting "for the cause of peace"—they could not otherwise face the masses.

But here they are confronted by the difficult problem of explaining why they, while posing as champions of peace, are doing nothing to combat the American imperialists who are menacing the cause of peace; why they are not taking up the cudgels on behalf of peace against the notorious American and other instigators of a new world war.

To evade these embarrassing questions, they have to resort to tricky sophisms. Léon Blum invented the trickiest of all. In an article in defence of the Truman doctrine against the criticism voiced by Henry Wallace, then on a visit in Paris, Blum declared that the American imperialists, "if there are any such in existence," cannot be war imperialists, but are "imperialists of peace."

The concept "imperialists of peace" is at odds with the laws of sound logic. It is as paradoxical as to say "gangsters of humanitarianism," for example. But for the sake of defending the American imperialists, Léon Blum is apparently willing to dispense with all the laws of logic.

It is obvious to all that the ambitions and appetites of these American "imperialists of peace" lead them to undermine the foundations of international co-operation and world peace. But without the support of the Labour

government in Britain and the bourgeois-socialist coalition in France, the American imperialist schemes would from the very outset have no chance of success.

The American "imperialists of peace" are fond of threatening other countries with the atom bomb, which is a particularly barbarous weapon of attack and aggression. When the question of prohibiting the atom bomb was discussed, the Socialist delegates of Britain and France in the United Nations bodies had an excellent opportunity to fight for the cause of peace. But did they support the proposal for the immediate prohibition of this weapon of bestial and senseless extermination of the population of large cities? No. At the behest of their Wall Street masters, they fought and are still fighting to delay the prohibition of the production and use of the atomic weapon.

In his articles in the *Populaire* Léon Blum persistently appeals to all "small and medium countries" to rally around the United States of America and support its proposals on the question of atomic energy. This zealous attorney of the American atomists asserts that he adheres to "a doctrine which combines the ideas of Marx with those of Jaurès." This is an obvious profanation, not only of the great name of Marx, but also of the name of Jaurès. Jaurès was undoubtedly an opportunist. But he fought against war. True, he did so as a pacifist, not as a revolutionary; but he fought sincerely. That was why, on the eve of the first world war, the reactionary bourgeoisie poured torrents of abuse upon him and in the end murdered him. He was a reformist in his day. But what a vast distance there is between him and a despicable Jesuit like Léon Blum!

The Right-wing Social-Democrats know as well as anyone that there is direct military collaboration between Britain and the United States. They know that the Anglo-American joint military staff is still in

existence, they know of the agreement for collaboration between the British and the American air forces concluded early in 1947; and they also know that in a number of cases Britain has joined the Americans in their feverish efforts to create military bases and turn whole countries into bridgeheads in preparation for a new war. Do not these facts prove that the Labour Party leaders are making Britain an accomplice of the United States in the policy of preparing for new war ventures and of intimidating other countries by threats of new aggression?

It would seem that for the sake of her own security Britain ought to concentrate all her efforts on averting a new world war. The facts, however, show that the British Labour Ministers are quite willing to take part in the reckless schemes of the shortsighted American strategists. The British Labourites have openly joined in the hue and cry against the Soviet Union. It is not for nothing that the press of the American imperialists warmly praised Attlee and Morrison for their speeches early in January 1948, in which hatred of the Soviet Union was combined with fawning on the United States.

The Right-wing Social-Democrats, far from combating the instigators of a new war are using their press to spread slanderous fabrications with the aim of incitement to aggression against our Soviet Union and the popular democracies.

Now and again the Socialist Ministers deem it proper to utter bellicose threats "on the American model." Bevin, for example, speaking at a dinner given by the American Society in July 1947, called for aggressive action by the United States. He said:

"I beg the great American continent to go on with its great mission. As long as I am Foreign Secretary I will work with you..." And further: "...I say to the United States, 'Now is the settling...'"

This sort of war propaganda, so we know, was denounced in a resolution adopted on the initiative of the Soviet delegation at the last session of the U. N. General Assembly. Fortunately for the champions of this propaganda, that session of the U. N. General Assembly did not pass the Soviet proposal that warmongers should be held criminally liable.

\* \* \*

The actions of the present-day Right-wing Social-Democrats thus leave no room for doubt that they are agents of the anti-democratic, imperialist camp, accomplices of the instigators of an imperialist war. Their policy of betrayal has thus reached its apex.

But these gentlemen obviously overrate the strength of their masters—the reactionary big bourgeoisie whom they serve body and soul; they also overrate the strength of American imperialism. The ulcers and contradictions of contemporary monopoly capitalism have already become fatal. The recklessness of the imperialists, their hankering after new aggression, can only speed up the collapse of the entire edifice of monopoly capitalism, which has lived its day. If the Right-wing Social-Democrats do not see that present-day capitalism is doomed, it is only because, having linked their fate with it, they will not and dare not look into the future with open eyes.

The Communist parties, on the other hand, which have made the great teaching of Marx-Lenin-Stalin their own, are imbued with a profound faith in the strength of the working class and the working people generally in all the countries, in the irresistibly growing forces of Socialism and true democracy. They know that the anti-imperialist, democratic camp is greatly superior in strength to the camp of imperialist reaction.

Comrade Molotov had every ground for saying, as he did, in his speech on the 30th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution:

"If the democratic forces weld themselves together and boldly fight imperialism and its plans for new warlike ventures, this will unite the peoples into a mighty army, the like of which cannot be possessed by imperialism, which denies the democratic rights of peoples, tramples on the sovereignty of nations, and bases its plans on threats and reckless adventures. Uneasiness and alarm are growing in the ranks of the imperialists, for every one can see that the ground is shaking under the feet of imperialism, whereas the forces of democracy and Socialism are growing stronger with every passing day."

In the struggle to speed up this process it is a task of major importance constantly to expose the infamous machinations of the Social-Democratic agents of international reaction. Once they are fully exposed, they lose their influence upon the masses.





