

December 1940

Fourth International

France Under Hitler and Petain

MANIFESTO OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Inter-Imperialist Struggle For South America

By QUEBRACHO

AFL and CIO Conventions Farrell Dobbs
Class, Party, and Leadership Leon Trotsky
Milwaukee's Brand of Socialism . James Boulton
New Legislation in Soviet Union . John G. Wright
Engels on Dialectics of Nature . . Wm. F. Warde
Discipline in the American Army . Michael Cort

Twenty Cents

Manager's Column

The FOURTH INTERNATIONAL is still an "international" magazine in circulation. By devious routes, and often at great personal danger, our foreign comrades still receive, read, and then pass on to others each issue of the magazine. The problem of circulation is one that can only be organized by comrades within the individual foreign countries where it is banned.

The great volume of correspondence passing between us two years ago, or even one year ago, has slowly dwindled because of the war conditions. Every now and then, however, we receive a letter that is not only a great source of encouragement, but strengthens our resolve to continue every effort to get the F. I. into war-torn Europe.

Such a letter is one just received from a comrade who finally made his way to South America. It reads in part, "... there were long periods when it was difficult to even see friends, not to mention passing along the F.I. It was even worse after the invasion. I did get one of the issues and it was like a breath of fresh air. It was pretty old and dirty and I don't know how many people had used it before me, but it must have been plenty. Now that I am at this address I should like to receive copies regularly. Thanks very much."

The story of that "old and dirty" magazine is a revolutionary tale that we can only guess. However, we do know that this case history is not an isolated one and that many more copies of the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, worn but still legible, are reaching the hands of European workers.

* * *

This, the December issue, is reaching you only a few weeks after the November number. Due to technical difficulties the magazine has fallen further and further behind its scheduled publication date at the beginning of each month. To remedy this the F.I. will appear every three weeks until we are again back on schedule. This imposes a special task upon all comrades and branches.

All the operating expenses in this office will be telescoped by this plan and it is essential that the branches give us the closest possible cooperation. Don't wait until the end of the month to pay for your bundles; pay for them within two weeks. In this

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Published by the Fourth International Publishing Association

Volume I December 1940 No. 7 (Whole No. 7)

118 University Place, New York, N. Y. Telephone: ALgonquin 4-8547.
Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year; bundles, 14c for 5 copies and up.
Canada and Foreign: \$2.50 per year; bundles 16c for 5 copies and up.
Entered as second-class matter May 20, 1940, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Board:

JAMES P. CANNON JOSEPH HANSEN
ALBERT GOLDMAN FELIX MORROW

WILLIAM F. WARDE

Business Manager:
MICHAEL CORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

France Under Hitler and Petain	
<i>Manifesto of the Fourth International</i>	179
Imperialist Struggle for South America	
	by <i>Quebracho</i> 182
AFL and CIO Conventions	by <i>Farrell Dobbs</i> 187
The Class, the Party and the Leadership	
	by <i>Leon Trotsky</i> 191
Discipline in the American Army	by <i>Michael Cort</i> 195
Milwaukee's Brand of Socialism	By <i>James Boulton</i> 199
Engels on Dialectics of Nature	by <i>Wm. F. Warde</i> 201
Stalin's Regime as Mirrored in Emergency Legislation	by <i>John G. Wright</i> 205
New Ways of War	Review by <i>Joseph Hansen</i> 207

MANAGER'S COLUMN

Inside Front Cover

 267

(Printed in United States of America)

respect Chicago, long the object of this department's inuendos, has forged ahead to a leading position in the country. B. Radlow is the new literature agent and no doubt deserves lion's share of the credit. He not only payed for the complete November bundle one week

after receiving it (the first time in Chicago history), but he also made a substantial payment on the past due balance. Nothing affords us greater pleasure than to salute the renaissance of Chicago.

Another and equally important task facing the branches

this month is obtaining subscription renewals. When the FOURTH INTERNATIONAL was founded, the entire party launched a subscription drive with results that were highly satisfactory. Most of the subs obtained were for six months and the majority of them expire with this issue. Every branch will receive a list of the expirations in its territory. A personal call must be made upon each subscriber in an effort to obtain a renewal. Form letters from New York are not enough; it is the personal call that brings results. This must be number one on the branch agendas this month. And by the way, take along S. A. blanks when making the calls. The combination offer of one year's subscription to both publications for \$3, is an attractive one.

* * *

Paid advertising used to be a small but steady source of income for the revolutionary press. The pressure of bourgeois public opinion has, however, frightened most merchants to the stage where they wouldn't accept a full page ad in the F.I. even if it were free. It was refreshing, to say the least, when a New York bookshop bought the back page of the November F. I. and actually made money on the deal. The Modern Bookshop advertised a special Christmas book combination and made this offer only in this magazine. It was therefore simple to obtain an accurate picture of the pulling power of that ad. If this were a bourgeois publication we would make up a fancy brochure around this incident and mail it to all our potential advertisers. Alas, being a Socialist publication we have no illusions and know full well the inability, or even the desire, of the small merchants to withstand their class pressure. But next time we see a four-color promotion put out by Life, or Collier's, or The Saturday Evening Post, we know that we could tell them a few things about "reader loyalty."

WRITTEN BY TROTSKY

Manifesto of the Fourth International

The Imperialist War

and the

Proletarian World Revolution

A 48-page pamphlet on—

CAUSES OF THE PRESENT WAR

ROLE OF U.S. IMPERIALISM

WHAT NAZI WAR SLOGANS REALLY MEAN

RESPONSIBILITY OF 2nd & 3rd INTERNATIONALS

WHAT TO DO NOW!

A COMPLETE PROGRAM!

A CALL TO ACTION!

3c per copy to all branches of the S.W.P.

5c per single copy

Published by the:

SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

118 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK, N. Y.

If the number on your wrapper reads:

N 49, or F 7,

your subscription expires with this issue. In order to avoid missing a single issue of FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, be sure to send in your renewal order immediately. \$2.00 for one year, \$3.00 for one year in combination with the SOCIALIST APPEAL.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

VOLUME I

DECEMBER 1940

NUMBER 7

France Under Hitler and Petain

Manifesto of the Fourth International

The Fourth International, world party of socialist revolution, addressed itself to the workers last May with a manifesto in which it explained the causes of the war and indicated the tasks facing the working class in this catastrophe.

Since then the military fall of France has occurred and the French bourgeoisie has abandoned the camp of the "democracies" to collaborate with Hitler in the "reconstruction" of Europe. In the face of these events, the Fourth International can say with confidence that the facts have confirmed its analysis of the present capitalist war, have justified its criticism of the traitorous leaders of the working class, have given a new force to our program of socialist revolution.

The Causes of the French Defeat

The military downfall of France is not a "technical" accident, but the clearest expression of the atrophy of bourgeois democracy in France. The whole strategy of the French general staff consisted of passivity and waiting. Its plan of war was to gain time (in reality, to lose it), reclining blindly confident behind the Maginot line, the gigantic extension of the 1914-1918 trench system.

On the diplomatic field the policy of waiting and of retreat culminated in the inability of France to draw into its orbit and prepare a common system of defense with little Belgium, her ally in the First World War.

After the defeat, the world learned about the internal struggles within the French government, especially between Daladier and Reynaud—a very clear symptom of the decline of democracy, powerless even to produce a new Clemenceau and paralyzed by Byzantine quarrels.

The conduct of the French bourgeoisie and its general staff after the Germans broke through at Sedan confirms to the hilt our analysis, in our Manifesto in May, when we declared: "The bourgeoisie never defends the fatherland for the sake of the fatherland. They defend private property, privileges, profits. Whenever these sacred values are threatened, the bourgeoisie immediately takes to the road of defeatism. . . . In order to save their capital, the Spanish bourgeoisie turned to Mussolini and Hitler for military aid against their own people. The Norwegian bourgeoisie aided Hitler's invasion of Norway. Thus it was and always will be."

After the German break-through in the North, the military situation was by no means hopeless, had the French bourgeoisie and its general staff been willing to mobilize all the resources of the country. But the general staff and the bourgeoisie felt, as General Weygand explicitly said, that such a situation would be like that of Russia in 1917. "It must not come to that," said Weygand. Rather than leave open the possibility of the French proletariat coming to power and conducting a revolutionary war against Hitler, the French ruling class preferred to capitulate to Hitler.

The curve of French imperialism has been steadily declining since the "victory" of 1918. Its status in Europe and

in the world as a result of the Versailles Treaty was extremely disproportionate to its real economic strength. It could provide its political vassals in Europe (the little Entente, the Balkan states) with financial aid but was incapable of making them customers for her industry, which could not compete successfully with Germany, England or the United States. The handling of the tremendous French colonial empire was also beyond the power of the industrial apparatus of the metropolis. The French bourgeoisie submitted the colonies to an exploitation that was ferocious but yet netted relatively little, for it was extremely backward in its economic methods.

Before the war of 1914-1918, the development of French capitalism was markedly backward compared to that of Germany and England, not to speak of the United States. The military victory of 1918 could not infuse new life into this relatively backward economy but, on the contrary, engendered many illusions and gave the impression of strength where there was only stagnation and decline.

Those Responsible for the Fascist Advance

The street fighting and demonstrations of February, 1934 signalized the approach of a revolutionary crisis, the polarization of the country into two opposed camps—Fascist and revolutionary. The decomposition of bourgeois democracy was only the fruit of the general decline of the French empire, accelerated by the great economic crisis. This decay of bourgeois democracy was expressed in the rout of its traditional party, the Radical Socialist Party. In June, 1936, the French proletariat occupied the factories, thus placing the country upon the threshold of a revolutionary situation. The socialist revolution then loomed as the only possible road by which the country could come out of its atrophy. But the movement of the French workers was strangled by the apparatus of its own organizations. The treacherous leaders (Jouhaux, Blum, Thorez) did all they could to keep the workers chained to the chariot of decaying parliamentary democracy, in the name of the defense of the "fatherland" and of "democracy."

The proletarian revolution in France would have opened a new future for the country. A soviet France would have immediately shaken the Fascist regime, and changed the face of Europe. The defense of the "fatherland" by the leaders of the workers' parties paralyzed the workers in the struggle for their emancipation, but it could not prevent the triumph of Hitler. The defense of bourgeois "democracy" prevented the creation of proletarian Soviet democracy, but could not prevent the appearance of the Bonapartist dictatorship of Petain. The hollow "anti-Fascism" of the Popular Front thus stifled the proletarian revolution and led to the triumph of Fascism throughout Europe.

If the peoples of Europe have had to enter a new slaughter, if Fascism is pushing its way through the continent, the direct responsibility falls upon the leadership of the official organizations of the proletariat: the Socialist Party, the Com-

unist Party, the C.G.T. (General Confederation of Labor). The Fourth International must explain patiently to the workers the lessons of the last years in the light of recent events, unmask the treacherous role of both the Socialist and Stalinist leaders and win the proletariat to Bolshevism.

The Petain Government

At the time of the fascist insurrection of February 6, 1934, those champions of democracy, Daladier and his friends, found nothing else in their arsenal but flight. In their place there emerged the government of the decrepit Doumergue, ready to replace the parliamentary mechanism by the police and the army.

After the military downfall of last May these valiant defenders of democracy, including Daladier himself, hastened to run like rats into Spain or to Morocco, without ideas, without perspectives, without a program. The swift invasion of the German troops had shattered the administrative system. The only group representing a certain relative solidity were the top ranks of the army. Around them rallied some Anglophobe politicians. This combination was crowned by the octogenarian Petain. The new Bonaparte did not even use cannon against parliament, which decided on its own hook to disappear.

The German army occupied all that part of France which retained some military and economic importance. Hitler then hoped to make a quick end to England. He left to Petain the care of millions of refugees. A French national government, provided it was docile, could decrease the problems of the invasion. Finally, its existence could prevent the immediate passing of the fleet in the colonies into the English camp. The Petain-Laval crew lent itself to docile service in this maneuver.

The war aims of France had been the liberation of Czechoslovakia, the defense of Poland, the destruction of Nazism and the reestablishment of a "free" Europe. It was in the name of these democratic and humanitarian undertakings that the bourgeoisie (aided by its agents in the workers' camp) dragged the French workers and peasants into the fields of battle. After the defeat, the bourgeoisie suddenly concluded that it was not worth the trouble to fight for democracy, that democracy was dying throughout the entire world. Laval concluded an agreement with Hitler to participate in the "reconstruction" of Europe. And, as Hitler would not repulse those who fell flat on their bellies before him, a spokesman of the French bourgeoisie spoke of his "incontestable grandeur." Yesterday the French bourgeoisie wanted to free Czechoslovakia, today it does not wish even to free itself. It leaps into the camp of its "hereditary enemy" and is preparing to aid it against its ally of yesterday. From one day to the next the "national" becomes "anti-national" and vice-versa.

Here is a great lesson for the workers of France and the whole world. The bourgeoisie (and its agents in the workers' camp) everywhere and always curbs, in the name of "national" interests, the struggle of the proletariat for its emancipation. It persecutes revolutionaries for their defeatism and denounces them as agents of the enemy. The experience of France shows once more that "national" considerations serve only to mask the interests of the bourgeoisie which is always ready to change sides when it is a question of preserving its privileges. Let the workers learn a lesson that the bourgeoisie has once again demonstrated!

The Hitlerian "Peace"

Hitler has not as yet succeeded in invading England. The air force can decide nothing without an advance of armies to

occupy territories. But that is not so simple. The war continues and can be protracted. Like a widening spiral, it spreads from continent to continent and tomorrow it will have encircled the earth. The armistice of Rethondes or the "peace" of Petain-Hitler will not protect France from the military vicissitudes of the continuing war.

Laval hopes that England will soon be crushed and he already sees the French bourgeoisie collaborating with Hitler in the "reconstruction" of Europe. Even in the case of a German victory, however, it is doubtful that Hitler can "reconstruct" much in Europe and it is still more doubtful that France can take a great part in this task. Goebbels recently declared to the members of the Hitler youth that after the victory they will remember war as the "golden time." We can believe him. Before the war, European economy had, since the great crisis of 1929, lost all its equilibrium and could find a certain easing of its afflictions only in tremendous armament production. After the war, all the disproportions of a diseased economy will burst into full view, not to speak of national and social struggles. Here is what the "organization of Europe" by Hitler in collaboration with Laval holds out: worse times than the war!

The struggle for democracy under the flag of England (and the United States) will not lead to a noticeably different situation. General De Gaulle struggles against "slavery" at the head of colonial governors, that is to say, of slave masters. In his appeals, this "leader" uses, just like Petain, the royal "we." The defense of democracy is in good hands! If England should install De Gaulle in France tomorrow, his regime would not in the least be distinguished from that of the Bonapartist government of Petain.

Churchill recently refused to discuss the regime of Europe after a British victory. He has, in effect, nothing to propose. The imperialist solution imposed in 1919 led to a new catastrophe twenty years later. Neither Hitler nor Churchill can regenerate capitalism. The whole system is in a blind alley.

The Class Struggle Continues

Hitler has reduced Europe to a vast concentration camp of nations. The struggle for the unity of all Germans has been followed by that for the unity of all non-Germans under the Nazi boot. But history is a sure guarantee that there has never been national oppression without national struggles.

The big French bourgeoisie has already succeeded in arriving at an understanding with Hitler. National resistance is concentrated in the poorer sections of the population, the urban petty-bourgeoisie, the peasants, the workers. But it is the latter which give the most resolute character to the struggle and will know how to connect it with the struggle against French capitalism and the Petain government.

The workers begin their national and class tasks with little danger from French fascism. The Petain government, far from being the fascist regime which panic-stricken democrats label it, has no mass base underneath it, fascist or otherwise. The fascist organizations can have no serious perspective of taking over the government with any support. In the eyes of the masses, including the petty-bourgeoisie, the French fascists cannot but appear as agents or friends of the victorious enemy. Thus neither Hitler nor Petain find a secure foundation in French society. It is noteworthy to add that the same phenomenon has occurred in Norway, Holland and Belgium, the other countries where the Nazis have installed friendly governments. An atmosphere of universal hostility weighs down upon the Nazi victor and his collaborators, serving to demoralize them while it creates a favorable atmosphere for arousing the masses to struggle.

With winter, the blockade, and the war in the Mediterranean, food has become and will become more and more scarce. The burden weighs more heavily on the cities than on the countryside, more heavily on the poor than on the rich. That means that the worst sufferers are the industrial workers and the lowest sections of the urban petty-bourgeoisie. The government has no solution to offer other than bureaucratic control of food distribution. But the rich always find means of escaping administrative control. Instead of governmental regulation, there should be substituted control by the people themselves. Each town, each section of the city, ought to have its food control committee which can control prices and will supervise the allotment. The state functionaries are always powerless in the struggle against profiteers and speculators and are often, indeed, their accomplices. Only control by the people can put an end to those who are ready to starve the people in order to keep up profits.

For the workers, especially in the unoccupied territory, the economic disorganization takes the form of unemployment. It splits the ranks of the workers and erodes their class solidarity. Against this pestilence the Bolshevik-Leninists propose the sliding scale of hours of work. The available work should be divided between all the workers in the factories, with a minimum salary.

The cost of living will rise more and more. Tomorrow inflation can arise. Here also it is the workers who will receive the hardest blows. Their struggle for wage increases will be useless if they do not obtain the rising scale of wages.

Facing the economic difficulties and the menace of famine, regulation and control are necessary. The bureaucratic measures taken by the state are useless or simply are turned to the profit of a handful of capitalists and to the detriment of broad sections of the working populations. Petain is prepared to regulate production of different branches of industry, thanks to the economic "dictators" at the head of each one of them. To this state control, the Bolshevik-Leninists counterpose workers' control by the workers themselves. No one knows better than they the sources of waste and anarchy in production.

To the measures of the Bonapartist dictators imposing everywhere the bourgeois bureaucratic control from above, the workers will impose their control from below, exercised through broad sections of the workers in their capacities as producers and consumers.

After having "regulated" the trade unions with the servile aid of the trade union leaders, the Petain government has now decreed outright dissolution of the C.G.T. It is an elementary class duty of the Bolshevik-Leninists to fight shoulder to shoulder with all workers, whatever their political views, against the government's attacks on the unions. At the same time, however, it is necessary to make the workers understand that the reformist trade unions that they have hitherto known are the product of another epoch, that of bourgeois democracy, and that that kind of trade unionism is dragged along with bourgeois democracy in its decline. The trade unions that the French workers will re-establish will be organs of revolutionary class struggle or they will not be re-established at all. In the coming explosive struggles against the German generals or the Bonapartist ministry, the form that the workers' organization is most likely to take is *factory committees directly elected by the workers*.

A Soviet Union of Europe

The present situation will scarcely last long. Up to now Hitler's successes have been due above all to the weakness

and decline of the democracies. The real test of the Nazi system has only begun.

To the fascist "reconstruction" of Europe, that is to say, to the perpetuation of misery and ruin, we oppose the Soviet United States of Europe, a free federation of the peoples with a socialized economy in which the profit system will be replaced by the cooperation of the workers.

In the face of oppression and dictatorship, the workers will not abandon the struggle for democratic liberties (freedom of the press, of assembly, etc.) but they must understand that this struggle cannot revive the decaying bourgeois democracy which has engendered this very oppression and dictatorship. The only democracy now possible in Europe is proletarian democracy, the system of soviets, the elected organs of the working people.

The French state of Petain-Laval has superseded the Third Republic of Daladier-Reynaud. That has been buried in the past, and nothing can make it live again. To escape out of slavery, oppression and misery, there is but one road, the establishment of a workers' and peasants' government.

The Fourth International

In a Europe which is the prey of social and national oppression, revolts are inevitable. But the essential condition for success is the existence of a revolutionary leadership. Recent events in France are the direct condemnation of the entire policy of the official workers' organizations (the Socialist Party, the Communist Party, the trade union leadership).

After the defeat, the Socialist leaders who called upon the workers to shed their blood to defend bourgeois democracy, rallied in the majority to the Petain government, that is to say, collaborated with Hitler. They have demonstrated once more that they are the docile agents of the bourgeoisie.

The shift by Stalin from one camp to another on the eve of the war disclosed what was the reality hidden behind the propaganda of the Communist Party against fascism and for the defense of democracy: this propaganda had the sole aim of assuring Stalin of the aid of French regiments without the least regard for the revolutionary interests of the French workers. Since Stalin's diplomatic change of front, the Comintern has replaced "the struggle against Fascism" with denunciations of the imperialists, above all, the British and French. But the basis of the Comintern's policy remains the same: the subordination of the revolutionary struggle to the interests of the Stalinist oligarchy. In practice, the Stalinist parties now live from day to day on small adventures. In Norway, the Stalinist paper succeeded in maintaining itself for some months under the German occupation, while denouncing English imperialism in the manner of Goebbels. But in the United States, the Communist Party demands the alliance of Moscow and Washington, which is the partner of London. In France, the Stalinists are ready to launch the workers tomorrow into any kind of an adventure that Stalin deems useful to his diplomatic game.

Never forget, workers of France, that the premiership of Blum was not possible without Thorez! The guilt for decapitating the June strikes is shared equally by the Communist Party with the treacherous leaders of the Socialist Party and the trade unions. Today Jouhaux and Blum mean nothing; but their criminal partner of 1936-1938, the Stalinist bureaucracy, can still do terrible damage to the French workers. They constitute today the main danger in the labor movement.

One of the essential tasks of the French Bolshevik-Leninists is to turn toward the duped followers of the agents

of Stalin, turn to the Communist workers and to help them draw the lessons from these recent events.

The unprecedented military defeat and the downfall of the Third Republic have introduced disquiet and ferment into all the old organizations. Now the torpor provoked by the suddenness of the catastrophe is beginning to be dissipated. Discussions will not be lacking, but neither will confusion. Alone of all the big and little organizations, the Fourth International can confidently say that its program has passed the test of facts. That is why it can boldly present it to everyone. This program is the socialist revolution attained by the methods of implacable class struggle.

An entire epoch has been left behind, that of decaying bourgeois democracy. It has carried away with it its bourgeois-democratic parties and leaders, as well as the workers' parties and leaders who had bound their fate to it. We have entered into a new epoch, that of the struggles and the convulsions of the death agony of capitalism. But this new epoch is that of the Fourth International and its triumph!

November, 1940

*International Executive Committee
of the Fourth International*

Inter-Imperialist Struggle For South America

By QUEBRACHO

I. South America, a Coveted Prey

"The struggle for South America grows sharper daily," said Lenin in 1916 in his book "Imperialism: The Last Stage of Capitalism." We can say today that the struggle for South America, one of the most important sources of raw materials and, according to statements of the interested parties, "the world's greatest market," has reached a culminating point which threatens to develop into a real battle between the three or four large imperialist powers.

For several years this struggle has been unfolding throughout the entire continent with increasing intensity. The people of South America see themselves being propagandized from all sides by the contending imperialist gangs. We are constantly visited by open and secret agents who go everywhere, study everything, list and examine, endeavoring in one way or other to manipulate the puppets from behind the scenes of local politics.

Imperialist Methods of Penetration

We listen daily to radio broadcasts transmitted directly from Berlin, London, Paris, Rome or New York, bombarding us with "news" and special programs of propaganda for their respective imperialisms. In all our cities special daily newspapers, serving one or another imperialism, devote themselves to attacking their rivals while other papers of the mercenary press brazenly sell themselves to the highest bidder. There arrive in our countries one after another "special missions" for propaganda work which make use of "good will" aerial squadrons, visits by well-known actors, etc. English, Italian, Japanese, French, German, and American warships follow one another in a series of endless visits to the principal seaports of South America, bringing "greetings" from their respective navies and at the same time studying our coasts minutely in search of better sites to establish shelters and naval bases. The lines of aerial navigation under the control of the various imperialist countries, not only tighten their connections with their respective centers, but also extend as far as they can into the interior of the South American countries in a ferocious competition which has lasted up to the declaration of the new World War. With great publicity, "cultural" commissions of the rival imperialist powers arrive on our shores to give lectures, and invite reciprocal visits from the South American countries with all expenses paid.

All sorts of scholarships are granted to South American students who were never more welcomed.

These are among the gentler methods used by the different imperialist countries to gain possession of our wealth. A war to the death goes on among America, Germany, Italy, England, Japan and France to displace each other's commodities on the South American market and in that brutal struggle all means are made use of. American and European military and police missions come to instruct the armies of the South American countries and to extend the influence of their respective nations. Political parties are financed and even set up in each of the republics of the continent, aiming to obtain power for the purpose of serving their particular imperialist master and without in the least taking into consideration the opinions or desires of the populations of their countries. Boundary disputes are also played up by the imperialists in order to maintain a favorable atmosphere for imperialist penetration. Finally, all kinds of pressure are exerted on the governments in power to obtain concessions, trade treaties, secure zones of influence or obtain privileges which would assure to each imperialist power advantages or preponderance over its competitors in the gigantic battle for the division of the continent.

Until now, perhaps, humanity has never witnessed such a struggle. No other continent has been the theater of such a dramatic spectacle; neither Africa nor China even at the peak of the inter-imperialist struggle. Lenin was correct in predicting that, since all the colonies of the world are distributed, the next struggle of this kind would take place for the conquest of the semi-colonies, among which Latin America is included. We can see how that struggle has come to a head during the last twenty-five years.

2. England's Battle Against the United States

The imperialist war of 1914-18 marks a most important stage in the struggle for South America. Until then English capital was dominant in South America. There were also some smaller French investments. During the last years preceding the war, German competition began to make itself felt, especially in the countries along the Atlantic. But Britain was supreme. Railroads, banks, insurance companies, ports, lines of maritime and river navigation all over the continent; ex-

traction of petroleum in Peru; tin in Bolivia; the nitrate industry in Chile; slaughter houses, ranches, lumbering, water power companies, telephones, trolley-cars in Argentina; coffee in Brazil; electric companies, etc., that is to say, all the keys to Latin American economy, were in the hands of Great Britain, where the greater part of the national, provincial and municipal loans of those countries also had been raised.

But the warlike conflict which brought England face to face with the German peril opened the doors wide to another imperialism, that of the United States, which spread over the continent with dynamic energy, within a few years displacing its British rival from the larger part of our countries.

Yankee imperialism, which came upon the world arena after the Spanish American War of 1898, started to invade Mexico and Central America aggressively at the beginning of the present century under the aegis of "dollar diplomacy" and the "big stick" policy inaugurated by President Theodore Roosevelt. But Yankee imperialist expansion throughout South America started only during and after the first world war as a result of which the United States became a first-class industrial power. The war permitted the United States to capture markets until then in the hands of European countries but which they were compelled to forsake during the conflict. In large part those markets were lost forever. Thus the United States set its feet in South America which, in accord with the Monroe Doctrine, it judged to be a sphere of exclusive influence for itself.

Triumph of the Almighty Dollar

In the years following the war the United States seized, one after another, the principal sources of South America's wealth. The United States obtained enormous petroleum concessions in Venezuela, Bolivia and Peru; the copper mines of Chile and Peru began to be exploited on a tremendous scale; control of the Chilean nitrate industry was acquired from English hands; competition for the industrialization of the meat industry began in Argentina and Uruguay; coffee plantations were financed in Colombia; tanneries were established in Paraguay; the larger part of the continent's sources of electric industry were seized; enormous concessions for rubber exploitation were obtained in Brazil. Yankee corporations acquired the interests of British telephone companies in some of our countries; automobiles and busses which competed with English railroads invaded the South American market; industrial plants, subsidiaries of those in the United States, were built; maritime navigation lines were established and an extensive network of aerial communications spanning the entire continent were extended; branches of leading United States banks were established.

The United States also became the principal exporter to this continent and the greater part of South American loans was raised in New York. The amount of American capital in South America increased by 1200% from 1919 to 1930, while English capital remained stationary. The South American countries, one after another, were falling under the control of Wall Street.

In 1928, before assuming office, the newly-elected President Hoover took a trip around South America to visit the principal "sphere of influence" of the United States. And two years later, at the beginning of the 1929-34 world crisis, Yankee influence reached its summit as a result of General Uriburu's *coup d'etat* in Argentina and Getulio Vargas' subversive movement in Brazil, which removed from power in those two large countries executives tied to the European rival of American imperialism—England. With that, Yankee im-

perialism's domination of the South American continent was almost complete.

3. England Bases Herself in Argentina

But that situation did not last long. The fall of the Chilean dictator Ibanez, in 1931, was a blow against Yankee control in that country. And English imperialism regained its positions in 1932 as a result of a change in the government in Argentina. England rooted herself firmly in that country from where she tried to drive back the advance of the United States and regain her lost positions on the continent.

The Argentine republic is the most important South American market. There is also more foreign capital invested in Argentina than in any other South American country. In order to control that market and obtain special concessions, American enterprises, primarily Standard Oil, financially aided and collaborated in the coup of General Uriburu, who overthrew president Yrigoyen, notorious anti-Yankee and friend of England. But within a short time Uriburu had to yield power to General Justo through whose government England regained her predominance in Argentina. The latter fact was notably accentuated because the Argentine cattle-raising bourgeoisie, who control the country, after being excluded from the English market as a result of the Ottawa convention of 1932, signed the following year the Roca-Runciman treaty with Great Britain. In compensation for the maintenance of the British market for their frozen meats, this treaty granted concessions to England which signified the almost complete subjection of Argentine economy to British imperialism.

The concessions consisted, principally, in the "favorable treatment" of English capital invested in Argentina, which reached the sum of 450 million pounds sterling. As an expression of those concessions, British capital, which for the most part is invested in tramways and railroads, was aided by the Coordination of Transports Law which helped that capital earn great interest by freeing it from the competition of automotive transport. Also, the pound was exchanged for 15 Argentine pesos to pay off the interest on that capital while the official rate fixed the pound at 19 or 20 pesos. That was brought about by the establishment of exchange control which favored the importation of English commodities and assured at the same time punctual payment of interest on the external debt held by England. The establishment of the Central Bank completed the financial control.

Britain Counter-Attacks Elsewhere Too

English imperialism in Chile regained some of her influence, without attaining dominance, when President Alessandri took office in 1932. Ross Scrutamaria, Alessandri's minister of finance and later a candidate for the presidency, had old connections with London.

The year 1932 also witnessed another British counter-attack. The Sao Paulo coffee oligarchy, tied to English capital, which for many long years had dominated the country until they were thrown out of power by Vargas in 1930, rose against the latter, trying to regain their old preponderance. They did not succeed, being smashed by the pro-Yankee government.

But the clash was most violent and tragic in the Chaco territory which was disputed between Bolivia and Paraguay. Under pressure of American petroleum companies who needed an outlet in eastern Bolivia for the production of their wells, the latter country rose, arms in hand, to conquer the disputed territory and extend its territory as far as the Paraguay River, and thus obtain a port with an outlet to the Atlantic. Those aims were resisted by Paraguay, prodded on by Anglo-Argen-

tine interests controlling that country's economy. Paraguay held back the Bolivian advance and seized the disputed territory.

In the meanwhile, English control increased in Argentina and gave Great Britain the opportunity to attack and injure in many ways her rival, the United States. The results of that counter-attack were soon easily visible: Argentina re-entered the League of Nations while at Pan-American conferences it took up a belligerent attitude toward the United States. So far as commercial matters were concerned still greater favoritism was displayed towards English commodities, through the control of exchange under the pretext of "buying from those who buy from us."

On the other hand, all sorts of hindrances and custom duties on American commodities were closing our markets to imports coming from the United States. The outstanding case concerned the importation of automobiles from the United States, which became so difficult that there arose what was called the "demotorization" of Argentina. Despite the construction of an extensive network of concrete roads throughout the country, the number of automobiles in Argentina in 1938 was much less than the number in the country ten years earlier, when Argentina had been among the leading vehicle-possessing nations.

As a result of these and other measures against American interests in Argentina, capital invested by the United States in that country diminished, according to data in the Bulletin of the Pan-American Union, from 700 millions of dollars in 1931 to 380 millions in 1938. The offensive against American companies in Argentina was so great that in 1937 the Standard Oil properties were sold to the Argentine government. The sale, however, did not go through. That entire situation aggravated economic relations with the United States and led to the breakdown of attempts to sign a commercial treaty.

4. The Totalitarian States Come On the Scene

At the height of the 1929-34 world crisis, while Yankee imperialism was reaching the pinnacle of its influence and Great Britain was preparing for her counter-attack, a new and unexpected competitor appeared on the South American scene: Japan, which began to flood the continent with cheap commodities, and began to increase in geometrical proportion its commerce with our countries. At that time Italian commerce was insignificant and Germany had not yet fallen under the heel of Hitler. Japan was the first of the totalitarian nations which appeared in South America.

Japan not only invaded South America with cheap commodities but also obtained concessions in Brazil (in the southern states and Amazon territory) where Japan sent large contingents of immigrants. The Asiatic Empire also increased its influence on the western coast of the continent, especially in Peru.

When Japanese commercial penetration reached its height and gave rise to considerable alarm among English and American competitors, Hitlerite Germany pitched into the struggle and very shortly supplanted the Japanese threat, appearing as a much more powerful and serious rival. That happened in 1934.

Germany's Commercial Drive

Germany and Brazil signed a commercial treaty in 1935 by which the former bought products, especially cotton, which would be paid for, not in international exchange but with so-called "compensated marks" which could only be used to acquire commodities from Germany. This treaty was the be-

ginning of the formidable German commercial offensive in South America which lasted until the outbreak of the present imperialist war.

As a result of that treaty, Brazil's trade balance was in Germany's favor and Germany displaced the United States as the leading exporter to Brazil in 1936 and 1937. Through treaties based on the "compensated mark" or barter, that offensive extended over the rest of Latin America.

With this trade, Germany acquired at low prices large quantities of indispensable raw materials, which were not totally consumed but resold in other European markets with the aim of obtaining necessary international exchange to purchase other commodities abroad. The South American countries unburdened themselves of large stocks of products, receiving in exchange German merchandise which replaced the products of other countries.

Germany thus acquired the coffee and cotton crop in Brazil, wool in Uruguay, etc. German commerce in 1936 dislodged the United States from first place in Chile. One after another, the Latin American countries fell under the lure of German trade which continued its penetration by means of barter operations: machinery for cereals in Argentina; for petroleum in Bolivia. Germany did the same with Mexico.

The Scope of German Expansion

The Nazi-fascist offensive was not simply satisfied with the conquest of South American markets. Nazi penetration was also advanced by all kinds of propaganda, organizing German residents, educating the youth by Nazi methods, forming important sections of the Nazi Party, financing and directing the formation of political parties, such as the "Integralist" in Brazil, the Nazi party in Chile and the so-called "Nationalists" in Argentina.

But the ambitions of the Nazis extended still farther, embracing such large-scale projects in the different countries of the continent as the construction of a gigantic hydroelectric plant in Uruguay, the lease of the entire Acre territory in Brazil for the exploitation of rubber, the construction of an extensive pipeline through the Chaco territory to convey Bolivian oil to the Paraguay River. It even appears that plans were drawn up for the seizure of Patagonia. German air lines began to traverse the entire continent.

Nazi influence was unmistakable in President Vargas' *coup d'etat* in Brazil in 1937. Knowing that he could rely on the support of the Integralistas, Vargas proclaimed the establishment of a totalitarian government. President Busch of Bolivia also revealed sympathies for Germany in the struggle he carried on against Anglo-American mining and petroleum companies until his suicide in 1939. The outbreak of the present war which separated Germany from South America as a result of the British blockade, has paralyzed but not killed the Nazi imperialist plan of expansion. It lies hidden in the shadows, awaiting the turn of European events.

5. Yankee Imperialism Removes the "Good Neighbor" Disguise

Upon first assuming office, Roosevelt said in his inaugural address: "I wish to dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and because he does so, respects the rights of others—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors." Thus was laid the keystone of a new foreign policy for the United States, the policy of the "good neighbor" through which a new era was to be initiated, especially in relations with the republics south of the Rio Grande.

The marines who for many years kept a close watch on American interests in Nicaragua and Haiti were withdrawn immediately. Guarantees were given that the United States would not intervene in Cuba and, a few months later, even the Platt Amendment which gave the United States that right was erased from the Cuban constitution.

It was easy to see that the new American attitude was nothing more than a change of front, the adoption of more refined methods, abandoning those barbarous and primitive methods introduced by Theodore Roosevelt. Confronted with a developing inter-imperialist battle in South America, the United States changed its methods in order to fight more effectively against European and Asiatic rivals. The former crude American policy had given rise to enormous resistance upon the part of the Latin American countries, creating an anti-American atmosphere, unfavorable to Wall Street interests and which was utilized by imperialist antagonists.

The "good neighbor" policy found praise in Latin America. For many "statesmen" of the old school, the United States had at last comprehended what its true attitude should be. The United States was now assuming the role corresponding to its size, that of a big brother; Yankee imperialism no longer existed and must henceforth be considered a closed chapter of history. And there were still others who affirmed that in the United States, Latin America had its best friend in case of attacks from other imperialist countries.

The "Good Neighbor" in Action

Nevertheless, under cover of the "good neighbor" policy, the United States was looking for the best way to struggle against European and Asiatic rivals and to expel them from the continent, and accordingly intensified its efforts to penetrate into Latin America. With that end in view, the United States raised the watchword of the "struggle for democracy" against fascism, endeavoring to appear as a champion of peace and racial tolerance.

Sheltered behind such ideals of unity and brotherhood, Washington made a formidable attempt to assure Wall Street's total and exclusive domination of Latin America. Bilateral treaties were signed, like the one with Brazil, which granted special concessions at the expense of imperialist rivals, in order to combat German barter; credits were extended to South American countries to make it easier for them to purchase American commodities; military missions were dispatched to instruct the armies of the various Latin American countries; obsolete warships were offered on lease to defend, so it was said, the coasts of South America; aerial squadrons, such as the "flying fortresses," were sent out on spectacular propaganda raids all over the continent. Traffic with our countries was increased by means of maritime lines called "good neighbor fleets"; the world's most extensive network of aerial communications was extended over the whole of Latin America; pressure was exerted against several Latin American governments to compel them to take measures against imperialist competitors of the United States (this happened in Brazil where concessions to the Japanese were revoked); special loans were granted (to Paraguay after the election of President Estigarribia, ex-ambassador to Washington) to build highways which would compete with English railroads, etc.

The Pan-American Parleys

But the principal arm brandished by the United States in its penetration of Latin America was the spectre of war and the totalitarian threat. Under that guise a series of Pan-American conferences, with shorter and shorter intervals be-

tween them, have taken place, whose sole purpose was to legalize and obtain the consent of the Latin American governments for the vast plans of Yankee imperialism to transform Latin America into the exclusive sphere of influence of Wall Street interests.

The United States accomplished little in that direction at the 1933 Montevideo Conference because the "good neighbor" policy was something new and the Chaco War was an open wound which for the time being hindered all attempts to attain continental unity.

Therefore the first serious attempt to line up the Latin American nations into a bloc under the hegemony of the United States was the so-called Buenos Aires Peace Conference in 1936 attended by President Roosevelt. At that conference, under the pretext of safeguarding peace, Yankee imperialism prepared for war, aspiring moreover to separate all the Latin American countries from any kind of extra-continental imperialist influence, whether it came from Europe or Asia. The United States also drew up a "customs truce" which would favor the introduction of its commodities in Latin America. However, the aim desired by the United States came to naught because of the attitude of Argentina, which was of course impelled by England.

The Lima Conference in December, 1938, met in full view of German commercial penetration. The Roosevelt government which now spoke insistently about the Monroe Doctrine again proposed the formation of a bloc, which, more precisely speaking, had certain characteristics of an inter-American alliance, instead of the American League of Nations advocated by Columbia and the Dominican Republic. That effort failed again because of the Argentine attitude. The latter country, however, signed the "Declaration of Lima" which established consultation among the American governments. Little by little, the bloc or alliance was approached, the alliance between wolf and sheep which Yankee imperialism desired in order to attain for exclusive use the fruits of Latin American exploitation and also to make certain that these countries would be dragged into the next war.

The next conference in Panama in 1939, convoked because of the outbreak of war in Europe, established the so-called "security zone." Little was added to the accomplishments of former conferences except for the intensification by the United States of the campaign to create a favorable atmosphere for inter-American collaboration.

6. The War Favors the United States

The second world war broke out in Europe when the inter-imperialist struggle for South America was at its height. And, as was to be expected, the war brought profound changes in the relationship of forces between the powers, producing new situations favorable for the United States.

In the first place, German trade, which had provoked so much alarm, was eradicated completely from the South American market by the British blockade. The war meant, too, that England could not very well supply the imports needed by the South American nations. And, on the other hand, since the beginning of the war with China in 1937, Japanese trade with Latin America had fallen considerably. All those circumstances directly favored the United States, which filled the space left vacant by Germany in the total of South America's imports. The trade of England (before the war that country also had begun to resort to barter) remained stationary.

At the same time, the South American countries have seen almost the entire continent of Europe closed as a market for their exports. Even more: they confront the perspective of

losing the entire European market if Hitler occupies England. And if the world war spreads to the Far East, trade with Japan would very probably cease. The United States would remain as the absolute master of South American commerce. Such are the actual perspectives towards which we are being carried.

The Yankees Stake Their Claims

Confronted with such contingencies and possibilities, the United States is preparing to exploit the situation and attain its old aim of complete and exclusive domination of Latin America and the entire western hemisphere. As a new step in that direction, the United States recently decreed that European possessions on this continent cannot change ownership, that is to say, if the present owners should no longer rule, only the United States can take over those possessions. Any other expedient that may be adopted to dissimulate this fact, such as the establishment of "Pan American Mandates," spoken of lately, will be nothing but attempts to mask the real possession of those territories by the United States.

Even should Hitler be defeated and the European colonial powers regain their old position, the United States undoubtedly would continue to hold their possessions in this hemisphere either as a result of purchase or payment for war debts. The same will be the fate of British, Belgium, French, Dutch and Scandinavian interests in our countries.

The decline of England is particularly rapid and the indications are that, whether she wins or loses the present war, Great Britain will disappear completely as a decisive factor from the inter-imperialist struggles in Latin America. Nevertheless, Britain has not yet surrendered and her influence still persists in the Rio de la Plata zone, although it decreases daily and the Argentine bourgeoisie is more and more disposed to throw in its lot with the United States in the Western hemisphere.

Although Hitlerite Germany is at the present time cut off from relations with South America, she maintains groups and organizations which in some countries are of real importance, the so-called "fifth columns," which await favorable circumstances in the development of European events which will allow them to dispute with the United States for domination of the continent.

In the meanwhile, the United States actively utilizes the present situation to increase its economic, political and military domination over Latin-America. Through schemes which in part were presented at the Havana conference, such as the creation of an Inter-American Bank, the establishment of an American economic cartel and plans for "continental defense," including the cessions of naval and aerial bases in the principal strategic points of Latin America, the United States strives toward that goal. Then again, the United States surely will re-introduce those projects for the formation of an American "customs union," proposed at the first Pan-American conference which gathered in Washington in 1889.

To make certain that the Wall Street bankers earn their super-profits American imperialism will also work out joint plans with the parasitical and sychophantic bourgeoisie of our countries to smash all rebellions and liberation movements of the continent's exploited and oppressed masses. With such a goal in mind, Yankee imperialism at the moment it considers proper, will hurl against our countries the entire gigantic military apparatus which is being built today to confront robber rivals from other continents. Moreover, the multi-lateral Monroe Doctrine advocated by President Roosevelt endeavors to chain Latin America to the war machine of the United States and will be used to drag those same exploited

masses into the struggle to serve as cannon fodder in the imperialist war.

7. Whither Latin America?

The world is on the point of being divided into three gigantic zones of influence between the large imperialist powers. Europe for the Europeans says Hitler; Asia for the Asiatics shouts Japan; America for Americans, the United States repeats once again. Each of those powers proclaims its regional Monroe Doctrine which in reality signifies: Europe for the Germans, Asia for the Japanese and America for the Yankees. After they are transformed into continental masters, each of those powers will aspire to become the world master, unless their plans are disrupted by the socialist revolution which may break out at any moment in Europe or Asia.

But the methods each uses to attain domination are distinctive. Japan invaded China with the pretext of "defending" her from communism. Germany invaded several European nations to "defend" their neutrality threatened by England. The United States takes possession of Latin America with the fable of "defending" it from fascism.

But while Japan and Germany were compelled to resort to arms to carry out their conquests, the United States is acquiring its conquests peacefully, at least for the time being. American penetration, better concealed and more artful, is hardly noticed by the Latin American people deceived by their principal leaders who by selling themselves to imperialism betray their interests.

New Betrayers

It is not only a question now of the Latin American rulers who are old tools for imperialism's oppression and domination. The very leaders who claim to lead the masses, even such parties as the Aprista which formerly attacked Yankee imperialism, today praise the United States and open the doors so that it may enter "to defend us from totalitarianism." Recently when the activities of the Nazi-fascist "fifth column" in Uruguay were revealed in the sensationalistic form which serves the United States, several leaders of the popular masses requested that the American cruisers in Uruguayan ports prolong their stay, especially because of those circumstances. Rarely has one witnessed greater betrayal and worse crimes which aim at delivering our countries into the clutches of their worst enemy.

There remains, too, the discredited voice of Stalinism which is now attached to the Nazi "fifth column" and tomorrow will change face and transform itself again into a surrender brigade. Other pseudo-leftists are of the opinion that the only way to oppose American penetration is to deliver themselves to Nazi imperialism.

Only the small forces of the Fourth International remain to prepare and lead the South American proletariat in the struggle of our countries to liberate themselves from the claws of all imperialisms.

Some Perspectives

For the time being all indications are that the United States, which has spoken of extending the Monroe Doctrine to Antarctica, Greenland, Iceland, Canary and Azores Islands and even the Dutch East Indies, will become the exclusive master and sole heir to the interests of the extra-continental powers in South America.

The collapse of the British Empire within a short time will mean the disappearance of England as an imperialist competitor. And in one way or another, with or without battle, so-called "fifth columns," German, Japanese or Italian, will

soon be definitely smashed, leaving Wall Street as the exclusive owner of the Western hemisphere. It is easy to anticipate that before that goal is reached Yankee imperialism will remove the mask as a defender of liberty and appear in its true aspect, that is to say, as one of the most brutal and bloody of imperialisms.

Confronted with this perspective, the revolutionary van-

guard of the South American proletariat extends a cordial hand to the working class of the United States, its ally in the struggle against their common oppressors. Through our comrades of the Socialist Workers Party, we send a cordial greeting of hope and understanding to the American proletariat.

Buenos Aires, July 22, 1940

Translated by Bernard Ross

AFL and CIO Conventions

By FARRELL DOBBS

As the delegates from the unions of the AFL and CIO gathered in separate national conventions on November 18th, Roosevelt's War Deal was rapidly unfolding in all its ugly reality. The aims of American imperialism in the present world conflict, and Wall Street's program for the regimentation of the workers in the war machine had been made abundantly clear. These circumstances must serve as a point of departure in analyzing the decisions of the AFL at New Orleans and the CIO at Atlantic City.

To all practical intents and purposes, the United States is already in the war. Its alleged neutrality is a pure myth. True, Congress has not yet declared war, but that formal system of international conflict has become generally outmoded in 1940. The United States is giving wholesale aid to Great Britain against Germany and Italy and in an increasingly open and unconcealed manner. Diplomatic relations with Japan are constantly strained almost to the breaking point. Thinly veiled maneuvers are being carried out to assure the dominance of United States imperialism over the Latin-American countries. All that remains to make this country's participation in the war open and complete is the actual outbreak of hostilities which can occur anytime in any one of several places. The "peacetime" conscript army is being mobilized for war and for no other purpose. The same is true of the gigantic armaments program.

When the huge armament appropriations were cleared through Congress, the Administration prepared to offer production contracts to the industrialists. But they found very few capitalists ready to accept their offers. The corporations, backed up by the big bankers, refused to accept the contracts until they were given full guarantees of super-profits from the production of war materials. Congressmen and Administration officials, alike, were quick to champion the cause of big business. Only a few isolated voices in the apparatus of government were raised against the demands of the capitalists. The reaping of huge profits by the industrialists and the bankers was fervently defended as the "American way." Insinuations of "pro-Nazi tendencies" were raised against those few in the governmental apparatus who half-heartedly opposed the bosses' demands. An understanding was reached between the government and the industrialists on the terms laid down by big business. Then, and only then, did the corporations agree to accept the war contracts.

Now Comes the Anti-Labor Drive

Now that the bosses are ready to begin production, all efforts of the workers to fight for the preservation and improvement of their living standards in the face of the war program are labelled "sabotage." The boss-defined "American way" now calls for the dragooning of the workers into the capitalist-controlled armed forces and the war industries. Big business has sounded the keynote for the attitude of the Ad-

ministration toward labor. C. E. Wilson, who succeeded Knudsen as president of General Motors, advises the workers that they must be prepared to sacrifice some material standard of living or some of their leisure. Knudsen, now heading the "National Defense Advisory Commission," acting from inside the Administration apparatus, has successfully led big business's fight for its super-profits.

Alfred P. Sloan, chairman of the board of General Motors, has spoken much more bluntly about the attitude of capitalism toward labor and the war. He demands the revival of the six-day week and advises against increases in the workers' wages, stating that wages must lag behind prices. If this advice is not followed, says Sloan, there will be danger of inflation. This clap-trap which is palmed off on the workers as profound economic theory is coupled with an appeal for the workers to show their "patriotism" by keeping the war industries in operation.

The boss-controlled daily press has taken its cue from the Wilsons and the Sloans. Elaborate editorials appear in almost every issue, propagandizing the bosses' line. Headlines in the newspapers smear the striking workers. Almost every strike action is depicted as against the armaments program. This hue and cry against trade union action reached violent proportions upon the outbreak of the Vultee strike in California.

The Government Joins the Drive

The stooges of the bosses in the House of Representatives were also quick to pick up the cue, using the boss press as their forum. "Treason, sabotage," they shouted against the Vultee strikers, "You are hijacking the government." They took up the infamous Roosevelt slogan: "You can't strike against the government," and are attempting to apply it against the striking workers in the war industries. They demand that such strikes be outlawed. "The strikes are the program of communism by the CIO," shouts Representative Ford of California. Hoffman of Michigan sees in the CIO Ford campaign, "further subversive activity." Summers of Texas, Chairman of the powerful House Judiciary Committee, has this advice to offer: "Give the strike leaders a double dose of the kind of violence they understand."

When the Dies Committee announced that it would investigate the Vultee strike, Attorney General Jackson rushed into print to inform the waiting world that the FBI had already investigated and found that "Communist influence caused and prolonged the strike." The Dies Committee charges that the National Labor Relations Board is helping the "campaign of sabotage" by blocking the bosses from firing suspected workers. The Committee urges the bosses to use its files to prepare black-lists against the workers.

The AFL Convention passed a resolution protesting against the prosecution of trade unions under the anti-trust

laws. Thurman Arnold, in charge of that division of the Department of Justice, replied that he was "not influenced by the resolutions of any special group."

The Gallup Survey reports that 60% of the population wants more regulation of the trade unions. This announcement was given a big play in the press. The capitulatory attitude of the trade union officialdom on the war question has, no doubt, confused the minds of many members and sympathizers of the trade union movement. This would be reflected in such a survey. But even under such circumstances the accuracy of this reported finding is highly dubious. In any event, it is certain that if the trade union leadership took a clear-cut class position on the question of the workers and the war the entire working class, with the exception of an occasional fink, would be solidly lined up behind a program of independent working class policy and against regimentation of the trade unions. The Gallup survey undoubtedly raised the question as a trial balloon on behalf of the forces seeking government regulation of the unions.

Representatives Hoffman of Michigan and Smith of Virginia have prepared new bills for rigid control of the unions. They would impose compulsory arbitration upon the workers and brand picketing or delay of production as an "oppressive labor practice." They would revive and extend the system of individual yellow-dog contracts between the workers and the bosses. They demand life imprisonment for "sabotage." The workers are not saboteurs, and these philistines know it. They intend this provision as a medium for the preparation of frame-ups against the workers. And to doubly guarantee the throttling of the unions they would prohibit the soliciting of union membership in the war industries.

NLRB As an Anti-Labor Weapon

An "informal" statement has emanated from the conference room of the House Judiciary Committee to the effect that the enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act in the war industries is "at variance with the declared policy of Congress." This Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative Sumners, who wants to give strike leaders "a double dose of violence," is also working on a measure whereby the workers would automatically lose deferment from military service if they go on strike.

The appointment of Dr. Harry A. Millis to the National Labor Relations Board signalizes a turn to the right for this government agency. William Green is reported to be "enthusiastic" about the Millis appointment. So is the Wall Street Journal. And with good reason. The new policy of the NLRB has been outlined by a Washington correspondent of the *New York Post*. "Conciliation" will be substituted for enforcement of the Wagner Act, which is now to be construed as an instrument for avoiding labor disputes, rather than a means to protect the rights of organized labor. The Board will now attempt to "settle" disputes without issuing complaints against the bosses, considering that its "first duty" is to "avoid production delay." This means that the NLRB, which was originally declared to be an agency for the enforcement of the workers' right to organize and bargain collectively, is now switching over to a policy of outright strike-breaking.

Roosevelt, on his part, warns that "labor must make sacrifices." He has stated plainly that he "intends to keep the war industries running." This threat, not made against the corporations when they were holding up his war program over their demand for guarantees of huge profits, is directed at the trade union workers. Roosevelt says that he has no new plan for labor legislation, "as of today." He will first give the

class-collaborationist trade union officialdom a chance to whip the workers into line. If this is not done to his satisfaction, he will not hesitate to resort to drastic measures in his efforts to regiment the workers in the war machine.

Citrine Peddles the Bosses, Line

Sir Walter Citrine, Secretary of the British Trade Union Congress, came to New Orleans to address the AFL Convention and the American workers over a nation-wide radio hook-up. This gladiator, knighted by the crown for his treachery to the British workers, came to the United States to do double duty, to serve the interests of the British bosses and the interests of the American bosses. He did not come in the interests of the American workers or the British workers. Sir Walter proudly related how the British trade union leadership had agreed "without haggling" to submit the British workers to the "war sacrifices" demanded of them by the British bosses. He told how the British workers had "voluntarily" given up their right to strike; how they had "accepted" longer hours of work. "We" insisted, he said, that these rights were not to be taken away "without labor's consent." In other words, Citrine and his ilk were demanding the democratic right to give away the workers' gains. Labor yielded these rights, he said, on the condition that "the sacrifices would be temporary." What guarantees did the Citrines demand? That the British trade union leaders have "a full voice in all questions of policy." What policies? Nothing more nor less than the war policies of British imperialism. Citrine explained all this to lead up to his main point: "The American workshops are the first line of defense for world democracy." This explains why Sir Walter was sent here. He is trying to shove the class-collaborationist war program of the British trade union leaders down the throats of the American working class.

"British society," said Sir Walter, "is no longer divided into classes. Look at my own case. I left school at twelve and went to work. Now I am a member of the Privy Council." What about the British workers who are not on the Privy Council and who have not had the dubious benefits of rubbing shoulders with the flower of knighthood? They are constantly reminded by their miserable conditions of existence that there are two classes in British society and that there is a class struggle. Four million workers in British industry are today pushing demands for wage increases. Pressure for strike action against the bosses is becoming quite strong in several sections of the British trade union movement. The Citrines and the Ernest Bevins are striving desperately to head off this movement.

It is only in the light of this background of events—the role of the United States in the war, the rising tide of reaction against the trade union movement, the rapid shift in policy by the Administration, the increasingly violent campaign for the regimentation of labor in the war machine—that the significance of the convention actions of the two great sections of the trade union movement can be properly understood.

Green Takes Citrine's Cue

William Green, comfortably ensconced in the AFL presidency at a salary of \$20,000 per year, was visibly moved by the oratory of Sir Walter Citrine and the pleadings of the long list of government and employer representatives who addressed the New Orleans gathering. He heard only Citrine, and not the voice of the struggling British workers. Nor did he show the slightest sign of understanding the vital problems of the more than four million AFL workers whom he is supposed to represent.

Green informed the workers that to furnish aid to Britain

is their *primary* responsibility. There will be no production stoppages in American industry, he said, "for trivial reasons." And then, as if to give double assurance to the capitalist overlords, he added, "or for any reason." It is Green's stated opinion that arbitration tribunals can satisfactorily adjust all of the workers' grievances. Holding that the question of longer hours of work can be taken up "when the situation requires," Green expressed the opinion that the payment of time and a half for overtime over 40 hours "will meet the present needs." He hastened to add that the cost of such overtime would be "insignificant," so that the bosses would understand that he was not making any harsh demands upon them. The question of the 30 hour week, said Green, can be taken up after the war is over to serve as a cushion against unemployment. The essence of this program outlined by Green was subsequently adopted by the Convention.

This brief examination of the policy of the AFL leadership is necessary in approaching the question of unity between the AFL and CIO. Unity on AFL terms would place the mass production workers, who are most completely involved in the war industries, under the complete dominance of such a thoroughly capitulationist leadership.

The Key Question: Industrial Unionism

And this is only half of the question. What about the preservation of the industrial form of organization in the mass production industries? A clear example of the present AFL attitude on this question is to be found in the action taken against the Federal locals of the AFL at the New Orleans Convention. The Federal locals, which are chartered under the direct supervision of the AFL Executive Council, were used as a stop-gap measure when the fight for industrial unionism was first breaking into the open inside the AFL. After the split, out of which the CIO was formed, the AFL Executive Council continued the use of the Federal locals as an instrument for its organizational struggle against the CIO. There are today a number of such local unions in the AFL, having a quasi-industrial jurisdiction.

A resolution was passed at New Orleans which authorizes the craft international unions to make immediate jurisdictional raids upon the Federal locals. The delegates from the Federal locals protested strongly against this resolution. The *Electrical Union World*, official organ of Local No. 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, quotes from a protest speech made by a Federal union delegate from Philadelphia: "Please leave us alone," said this delegate, "We are O.K. and better than a whole lot that are regimented into craft unions." Green sought to smother the debate by stating that the recommendation was "not mandatory." This statement is nothing more nor less than utter duplicity and Green knows it. The craft internationals are not forced by the resolution to make jurisdictional demands upon the Federal locals, but the action makes it mandatory upon the Federal locals to yield up their members to the craft internationals on demand. And the demand will be made or the resolution would not have been introduced and adopted by the craft internationals. This is the kind of "unity" that the craft union hierarchy on the AFL Executive Council has in mind for the industrial unions.

A second example of the AFL's unchanged attitude on the question of industrial unionism is contained in its proposition for amendments to the Wagner Act. It demands that the Act be changed to permit the recognition of craft units as bargaining agencies in the industrial plants. These craft units would be carved out of the existing industrial unions. The AFL wants the Wagner Act changed to provide for direct

court appeals by the unions against the decisions of the NLRB. The craft unionists want to go to court against the industrial unions. Guarantees are demanded for the preservation of craft agreements. This demand arises from the action of the NLRB in outlawing some craft union contracts in industrial plants. The Board contended, in handing down its decision, that these contracts had been secured through collusion between the craft union officialdom and the corporation management.

The craft unionists want to carve up the industrial unions by whatever means they find at hand. In pressing these demands, the AFL is blinded by the motivations of petty craft and personal interests. In their desire to strike at the CIO, the craft unionists would jeopardize the few remaining beneficial provisions of the Wagner Act, in the face of the rising tide of reaction and the sharp turn to the right on the part of the administration which is responsible for the enforcement of the Act.

Industrial Unionism Must Predominate

Unity of the trade union movement is highly desirable in the interests of the workers. But the CIO cannot unite with the AFL until it is given *full guarantees for the preservation and extension of the industrial form of organization*. Despite the wishes of a broad section of the rank and file, the official hierarchy in the AFL is obviously not prepared to give any such guarantees. Nor will they be prepared to yield on this fundamental point until the CIO is much stronger than it is today. Even then, it is not assured in advance that the craft unionists will yield.

The co-existence of craft unionism and industrial unionism in a united organization is not at all a 50-50 proposition. It is conceivable that the craft unions and industrial unions can live side by side without internecine conflict. But the very nature of the present-day methods of production makes it mandatory that industrial unionism must be the dominating factor in the trade union movement. Craft unionism can play only a secondary role.

The Whining of the deserters, Dubinsky and Zaritsky, who call upon the industrial unions to "come back to the AFL"; and the shallow arguments of the Hillmanites, who plead for an exploration of the minds of the craft union leaders, cannot in any way alter these facts. It is this fundamental issue in the AFL-CIO conflict which gave Phillip Murray, the CIO President, the courage to make a "mild protest" to Roosevelt against any "shotgun unity" with the AFL.

The Conflict Will Continue

It is clear that the internal conflict in the trade union movement will continue and grow sharper. The action of the AFL, in rescinding the special one cent tax originally imposed for the declared purpose of fighting the CIO, was a phoney peace gesture, calculated mainly to save face for Dubinsky. By increasing the regular per capita tax from one cent to two cents, the AFL retains its special fund with which to fight the CIO. One of the reasons why the AFL leaders prostrated themselves so brazenly before the capitalist war mongers was an attempt to gain a cloak of "respectability" which they hope will aid them in their fight against the industrial unions.

The CIO is increasing its organization staff and appropriating special funds for an organization campaign right in the heart of the war industries—in steel, Ford, aircraft, rubber, aluminum, chemicals and shipbuilding. The CIO victory in the Vultee strike will give strong impetus to this drive. Although the Vultee strikers made heavy compromises from their original demands, it must be recognized that in the face

of the great pressure brought to bear upon the strikers and upon the class-collaborationist leadership of the CIO, the workers achieved definite gains. The success of the strike is emphatically demonstrated by the fact that it has forced "voluntary" wage increases for the workers in the Douglas, North American, Lockheed and other aircraft plants. The *CIO News* now carries the slogan, "No matter what you do, there is a CIO union for you." This indicates an orientation toward war with the AFL on all fronts. However, the main CIO drive will be concentrated in the basic industries.

CIO Is More Dynamic

The AFL reports a membership of 4,247,443, which is the highest in AFL history. The CIO indicates that it has a membership of about 4,000,000; however, no exact official figures have been given. The CIO may be somewhat weaker than the AFL in the number of paid members, but it is much more dynamic than the AFL and that is what is decisive. The press coverage at the two conventions reflects this contrast between the two organizations. 105 newsmen covered the CIO Convention at Atlantic City, and a London correspondent filed 1,000 words a day to his paper on the news of the CIO deliberations. On the other hand, fewer newsmen were sent to cover the New Orleans convention and, in general, the second-string men were sent to the AFL gathering, while the first-string men covered the sessions of the CIO. There was a continuous parade of stuffed-shirts before the AFL delegates at New Orleans. But this was not true at Atlantic City where trade unionists did the speaking. Good, bad or indifferent, they were trade unionists and that is an important point.

The qualitative difference between the AFL and the CIO was graphically reflected on the Negro question. A. Phillips Randolph, the president of the Sleeping Car Porters, introduced a resolution at New Orleans asking for the creation of an inter-racial committee to end racial discrimination in the AFL. The Resolutions Committee sidestepped the issue, bringing in a recommendation that the international unions give "most sincere consideration" to the problem. Speaking against the report of the Committee, Randolph made a forty minute plea to the Convention, urging the delegates to show courage and face the issue. He cited, as an example, a case in a Tampa, Florida shipyard where, upon the signing of an AFL closed shop contract, all the Negro workers were fired and replaced by white workers. He told how, when the Negro workers attempted to organize a protest, the local AFL leaders aligned themselves with the Ku Klux Klan in opposition to the Negroes. "The trade unions," said Randolph, "have taken over the capitalistic, imperialistic idea of inferior races." When Randolph had finished speaking, Matthew Woll moved the previous question, shutting off debate.

The New Orleans AFL Central Labor Council was in charge of Convention arrangements. The various local unions in New Orleans, including the Negro locals of longshoremen, made contributions toward a fund for the entertainment of the delegates. The Central Labor Council gave a check to the Negro locals and suggested that they arrange a separate program of entertainment for the Negro delegates to the Convention. This proposition was rejected by the Negro trade unionists. "We may not participate in the entertainment of the other delegates," said Randolph, "but we won't accept any Jim Crow program."

Negroes Feel at Home in CIO

The reception accorded the Negro delegates in the CIO Convention stood in sharp contrast to the AFL attitude. There was no sign of the customary—in the AFL—ripple of

laughter when a Negro delegate rose to speak. It was not considered a light moment in the meeting, as is so often true in those craft unions which do permit Negroes in their ranks. The Negro delegates at Atlantic City spoke without any feeling of constraint. They did not display that attitude of subservience often seen in an AFL union. They evidenced a belief that the CIO is really their union, that the convention was their convention. And, as they spoke, they poured forth the pent-up wrath of their persecuted race. They were equals among the delegates and their remarks were seriously received. This bond of solidarity between the Negro workers and the white workers reflects the great strength of the industrial union movement.

Green Swears by Capitalism

A select group of AFL officials, with Green as their spokesman, gave a special interview to the press in which they declared that they "support capitalism as vigorously as they support the trade unions and the right to organize and bargain collectively." They appealed to big business to understand Roosevelt. And on numerous occasions the AFL officials expressed the opinion that the class-conscious militants are opposed to the industrial unions capitulating to the AFL craft unionists because "the left wing fears loss of authority in a united movement." Having declared their undying allegiance to capitalism, this was the AFL officials' way of serving notice that they want no critics of capitalism in their ranks.

The CIO passed a resolution on political action in which the executive officers and executive board were instructed to "look towards the formulation of a program to assure an independent role for labor." Ambiguous as this statement is, as little meaning as it will have if not followed up by a militant program of action, it stands in sharp contrast to the pronouncement of the AFL hierarchy. Green saw in the defeat of Willkie after his endorsement by John L. Lewis the "vindication of the traditional non-partisan policy of the AFL." Disregarding the fact that the real meaning of Lewis's action was a desertion of the interests of the workers whom he is supposed to represent, which, of course, Green does not understand, Green read into the results of Lewis's performance a justification for his own peculiar method of tying the workers to the political leadership of their class enemy.

Stalinists Vote to Condemn Communism

A comparison of the attitude of the two organizations towards radical tendencies in the trade union movement is evidenced by their action on the question of the Communist Party. The AFL bans members of the Communist Party from membership, and it passed a resolution at New Orleans, requesting the government to outlaw the Communist Party. The CIO Convention passed a resolution condemning "communism," *for which the Stalinist delegates voted*. The resolution added, however, that there is "room for all of us" in the CIO. At least a part of the top strata of the CIO leadership is in full accord with the AFL attitude toward radicals generally. But they are not in a position to indulge in any large-scale campaign of red-baiting. This is partly due to the exigencies of the fight with the AFL but also, in no small measure, a result of the pressure from the CIO rank and file which is by and large more class-conscious than the membership of the AFL.

Green and the Secretary-Treasurer George Meany got huge raises from the AFL Convention. This question was not on the agenda at Atlantic City. The high-salaried CIO officials are paid by their own unions. The wages of the CIO

staff men are generally low by comparison with the AFL standard. The CIO has in the course of its existence found many willing workers ready to do everything they could to promote the welfare of the organization for "coffee and." This is always true of a dynamic movement. The top layer of the CIO staff men dream of better days with higher salaries but a well-knit machine leadership is necessary before this dream can be translated into reality.

Such a machine is attempting to form itself in the new CIO unions. However, machine leadership is well entrenched only in the older unions of the CIO, such as the United Mine Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. The pie-card artists who covet large salaries may never realize their desires in the CIO. They are preparing a start in that direction as evidenced by the phoney demonstrations put on for the leaders at the Atlantic City convention. But these demonstrations were largely hollow.

Why CIO Is More Progressive

The sharp and continuous struggle between the workers and the big corporations in the mass production industries maintains a heavy and healthy pressure on the leadership of the CIO. The big corporations are not willing to hand out even the small crumbs that class-collaborationist methods can obtain for the more privileged sections of the craft union organizations. Therefore the CIO leadership is forced to support policies that are somewhat more progressive than those of the AFL officialdom. Yet the program of the AFL and the CIO is basically the same on many fundamental questions. This flows from the fact that the top officialdom in both organizations has the same class-collaborationist ideology. Both groups are supporters of the capitalist system and the war program of American imperialism.

The AFL, as well as the CIO, has raised a demand for the

enforcement of labor legislation in the war industries. But both sets of leaders also agree on a policy of collaboration with the bosses' government. They urge "union-management cooperation" as against trade union action. Neither group has learned anything from Hillman's role in the "Defense Commission." His feeble efforts to get a crumb for the workers from the table where the big industrialists were cutting up the fat war profits was an inglorious failure. He stood unmercifully exposed as a "representative of labor" sitting in the camp of the workers' enemy. But he stays there. Hillman can do this because, as he very bluntly admits, *above all else* he is out to promote the "defense program." The AFL and CIO leaders completely ignore the significance of this experience. Instead, they demand more boards, one for each industry, a board of review above each of these boards and a super-board at the top on which, as Murray put it, the president might sit. And they reaffirm their loyalty to capitalism.

As the war crisis sharpens, capitalism will make increasingly heavy demands upon the officials in the hierarchy of the AFL and CIO. They, in turn, will yield repeatedly before this pressure. They will serve the bosses more and more, the workers less and less. The already big gap between the officialdom and the membership will grow increasingly wide. The workers will begin to look for new methods of struggle. They will feel the need for a new leadership, a fighting leadership.

The class-conscious militants must be prepared to step into this gap, to give the workers a class-struggle program, to lead them in the fight to preserve their industrial unions, to show them the way onto the road of independent working class political action, to give them leadership in the class war to end imperialist war and exploitation forever, to show them how, as the vanguard class of society, to fight for the emancipation of the human race.

The Class, the Party, and the Leadership

Why Was the Spanish Proletariat Defeated?

[Questions of Marxist Theory]

By LEON TROTSKY

EDITORIAL NOTE: Among comrade Trotsky's archives were found a rough draft and fragmentary notes which we now publish in the form of an unfinished article.

The extent to which the working class movement has been thrown backward may be gauged not only by the condition of the mass organizations but by ideological groupings and those theoretical inquiries in which so many groups are engaged. In Paris there is published a periodical *Que Faire* (What To Do) which for some reason considers itself Marxist but in reality remains completely within the framework of the empiricism of the left bourgeois intellectuals and those isolated workers who have assimilated all the vices of the intellectuals.

Like all groups lacking a scientific foundation, without a program and without any tradition this little periodical tried to hang on to the coat-tails of the POUM—which seemed to open the shortest avenue to the masses and to victory. But the result of these ties with the Spanish revolution seems at first entirely unexpected: The periodical did not advance but on the contrary retrogressed. As a matter of

fact, this is wholly in the nature of things. The contradictions between the petty bourgeoisie, conservatism and the needs of the proletarian revolution have developed in the extreme. It is only natural that the defenders and interpreters of the policies of the POUM found themselves thrown far back both in political and theoretical fields.

The periodical *Que Faire* is in and of itself of no importance whatever. But it is of symptomatic interest. That is why we think it profitable to dwell upon this periodical's appraisal of the causes for the collapse of the Spanish revolution, inasmuch as this appraisal discloses very graphically the fundamental features now prevailing in the left flank of pseudo-Marxism.

"Que Faire" Explains

We begin with a verbatim quotation from a review of the pamphlet *Spain Betrayed* by comrade Casanova: "Why was the revolution crushed? Because, replies the author (Casanova), the Communist Party conducted a false policy which was unfortunately followed by the revolutionary masses. But why, in the devil's name, did the revolutionary masses who

left their former leaders rally to the banner of the Communist Party? 'Because there was no genuinely revolutionary party.' We are presented with a pure tautology. A false policy of the masses; an immature party either manifests a certain condition of social forces (immaturity of the working class, lack of independence of the peasantry) which must be explained by proceeding from facts, presented among others by Casanova himself; or it is the product of the actions of certain malicious individuals or groups of individuals, actions which do not correspond to the efforts of 'sincere individuals' alone capable of saving the revolution. After groping for the first and Marxist road, Casanova takes the second. We are ushered into the domain of pure demonology; the criminal responsible for the defeat is the chief Devil, Stalin, abetted by the anarchists and all the other little devils; the God of revolutionists unfortunately did not send a Lenin or a Trotsky to Spain as He did in Russia in 1917."

The conclusion then follows: "This is what comes of seeking at any cost to force the ossified orthodoxy of a chapel upon facts." This theoretical haughtiness is made all the more magnificent by the fact that it is hard to imagine how so great a number of banalities, vulgarisms and mistakes quite specifically of conservative philistine type could be compressed into so few lines.

The author of the above quotation avoids giving any explanation for the defeat of the Spanish revolution; he only indicates that profound explanations, like the "condition of social forces" are necessary. The evasion of any explanation is not accidental. These critics of Bolshevism are all theoretical cowards, for the simple reason that they have nothing solid under their feet. In order not to reveal their own bankruptcy they juggle facts and prowl around the opinions of others. They confine themselves to hints and half-thoughts as if they just haven't the time to delineate their full wisdom. As a matter of fact they possess no wisdom at all. Their haughtiness is lined with intellectual charlatanism.

Let us analyze step by step the hints and half-thoughts of our author. According to him a false policy of the masses can be explained only as it "manifests a certain condition of social forces," namely, the immaturity of the working class and the lack of independence of the peasantry. Anyone searching for tautologies couldn't find in general a flatter one. A "false policy of the masses" is explained by the "immaturity" of the masses. But what is "immaturity" of the masses? Obviously, their predisposition to false policies. Just what the false policy consisted of, and who were its initiators: the masses or the leaders—that is passed over in silence by our author. By means of a tautology he unloads the responsibility on the masses. This classical trick of all traitors, deserters and their attorneys is especially revolting in connection with the Spanish proletariat.

Sophistry of the Betrayers

In July 1936—not to refer to an earlier period—the Spanish workers repelled the assault of the officers who had prepared their conspiracy under the protection of the People's Front. The masses improvised militias and created workers' committees, the strongholds of their future dictatorship. The leading organizations of the proletariat on the other hand helped the bourgeoisie to destroy these committees, to liquidate the assaults of the workers on private property and to subordinate the workers' militias to the command of the bourgeoisie, with the POUM moreover participating in the government and assuming direct responsibility for this work proletariat signify in this case? Self-evidently only this, that of the counter-revolution. What does "immaturity" of the

despite the correct political line chosen by the masses, the later were unable to smash the coalition of socialists, Stalinists, anarchists and the POUM with the bourgeoisie. This piece of sophistry takes as its starting point a concept of some absolute maturity, i.e. a perfect condition of the masses in which they no not require a correct leadership, and, more than that, are capable of conquering against their own leadership. There is not and there cannot be such maturity.

But why should workers who show such correct revolutionary instinct and such superior fighting qualities submit to treacherous leadership? object our sages. Our answer is: There wasn't even a hint of mere subordination. The workers' line of march at all times cut a certain angle to the line of the leadership. And at the most critical moments this angle became 180 degrees. The leadership then helped directly or indirectly to subdue the workers by armed force.

In May 1937 the workers of Catalonia rose not only without their own leadership but against it. The anarchist leaders—pathetic and contemptible bourgeois masquerading cheaply as revolutionists—have repeated hundreds of times in their press that had the CNT wanted to take power and set up their dictatorship in May, they could have done so without any difficulty. This time the anarchist leaders speak the unadulterated truth. The POUM leadership actually dragged at the tail of the CNT, only they covered up their policy with a different phraseology. It was thanks to this and this alone that the bourgeoisie succeeded in crushing the May uprising of the "immature" proletariat. One must understand exactly nothing in the sphere of the inter-relationships between the class and the party, between the masses and the leaders in order to repeat the hollow statement that the Spanish masses merely followed their leaders. The only thing that can be said is that the masses who sought at all times to blast their way to the correct road found it beyond their strength to produce in the very fire of battle a new leadership corresponding to the demands of the revolution. Before us is a profoundly dynamic process, with the various stages of the revolution shifting swiftly, with the leadership or various sections of the leadership quickly deserting to the side of the class enemy, and our sages engage in a purely static discussion: Why did the working class as a whole follow a bad leadership?

The Dialectic Approach

There is an ancient, evolutionary-liberal epigram: Every people gets the government it deserves. History, however, shows that one and the same people may in the course of a comparatively brief epoch get very different governments (Russia, Italy, Germany, Spain, etc.) and furthermore that the order of these governments doesn't at all proceed in one and the same direction: from despotism—to freedom as was imagined by the evolutionists liberals. The secret is this, that a people is comprised of hostile classes, and the classes themselves are comprised of different and in part antagonistic layers which fall under different leadership; furthermore every people falls under the influence of other peoples who are likewise comprised of classes. Governments do not express the systematically growing "maturity" of a "people" but are the product of the struggle between different classes and the different layers within one and the same class, and, finally, the action of external forces—alliances, conflicts, wars and so on. To this should be added that a government, once it has established itself, may endure much longer than the relationship of forces which produced it. It is precisely out of this historical contradiction that revolutions, *coup d'etats*, counter-revolutions, etc. arise.

The very same dialectic approach is necessary in dealing with the question of the leadership of a class. Imitating the liberals our sages tacitly accept the axiom that every class gets the leadership it deserves. In reality leadership is not at all a mere "reflection" of a class or the product of its own free creativeness. A leadership is shaped in the process of clashes between the different classes or the friction between the different layers within a given class. Having once arisen, the leadership invariably arises above its class and thereby becomes predisposed to the pressure and influence of other classes. The proletariat may "tolerate" for a long time a leadership that has already suffered a complete inner degeneration but has not as yet had the opportunity to express this degeneration amid great events. A great historic shock is necessary to reveal sharply the contradiction between the leadership and the class. The mightiest historical shocks are wars and revolutions. Precisely for this reason the working class is often caught unawares by war and revolution. But even in cases where the old leadership has revealed its internal corruption, the class cannot improvise immediately a new leadership, especially if it has not inherited from the previous period strong revolutionary cadres capable of utilizing the collapse of the old leading party. The Marxist, i.e. dialectic and not scholastic interpretation of the inter-relationship between a class and its leadership does not leave a single stone unturned of our author's legalistic sophistry.

How the Russian Workers Matured

He conceives of the proletariat's maturity as something purely static. Yet during a revolution the consciousness of a class is the most dynamic process directly determining the course of the revolution. Was it possible in January 1917 or even in March, after the overthrow of Czarism, to give an answer to the question whether the Russian proletariat had sufficiently "matured" for the conquest of power in eight to nine months? The working class was at that time extremely heterogeneous socially and politically. During the years of the war it had been renewed by 30-40 percent from the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie, often reactionary, at the expense of backward peasants, at the expense of women and youth. The Bolshevik party in March 1917 was followed by an insignificant minority of the working class and furthermore there was discord within the party itself. The overwhelming majority of the workers supported the Mensheviks and the "Socialists-Revolutionists" i.e., conservative social-patriots. The situation was even less favorable with regard to the army and the peasantry. We must add to this: the general low level of culture in the country, the lack of political experience among the broadest layers of the proletariat, especially in the provinces, let alone the peasants and soldiers.

What was the "active" of Bolshevism? A clear and thoroughly thought out revolutionary conception at the beginning of the revolution was held only by Lenin. The Russian cadres of the party were scattered and to a considerable degree bewildered. But the party had authority among the advanced workers. Lenin had great authority with the party cadres. Lenin's political conception corresponded to the actual development of the revolution and was reinforced by each new event. These elements of the "active" worked wonders in a revolutionary situation, that is, in conditions of bitter class struggle. The party quickly aligned its policy to correspond with Lenin's conception, to correspond that is with the actual course of the revolution. Thanks to this it met with firm sup-

port among tens of thousands of advanced workers. Within a few months, by basing itself upon the development of the revolution the party was able to convince the majority of the workers of the correctness of its slogans. This majority organized into Soviets was able in its turn to attract the soldiers and peasants. How can this dynamic, dialectic process be exhausted by a formula of the maturity or immaturity of the proletariat? A colossal factor in the maturity of the Russian proletariat in February or March 1917 was Lenin. He did not fall from the skies. He personified the revolutionary tradition of the working class. For Lenin's slogans to find their way to the masses there had to exist cadres, even though numerically small at the beginning; there had to exist the confidence of the cadres in the leadership, a confidence based on the entire experience of the past. To cancel these elements from one's calculations is simply to ignore the living revolution, to substitute for it an abstraction, the "relationship of forces," because the development of the revolution precisely consists of this, that the relationship of forces keeps incessantly and rapidly changing under the impact of the changes in the consciousness of the proletariat, the attraction of backward layers to the advanced, the growing assurance of the class in its own strength. The vital mainspring in this process is the party, just as the vital mainspring in the mechanism of the party is its leadership. The role and the responsibility of the leadership in a revolutionary epoch is colossal.

Relativity of "Maturity"

The October victory is a serious testimonial of the "maturity" of the proletariat. But this maturity is relative. A few years later the very same proletariat permitted the revolution to be strangled by a bureaucracy which rose from its ranks. Victory is not at all the ripe fruit of the proletariat's "maturity." Victory is a strategic task. It is necessary to utilize the favorable conditions of a revolutionary crisis in order to mobilize the masses; taking as a starting point the given level of their "maturity" it is necessary to propel them forward, teach them to understand that the enemy is by no means omnipotent, that it is torn asunder with contradictions, that behind the imposing facade panic prevails. Had the Bolshevik party failed to carry out this work, there couldn't even be talk of the victory of the proletarian revolution. The Soviets would have been crushed by the counter-revolution and the little sages of all countries would have written articles and books on the keynote that only uprooted visionaries could dream in Russia of the dictatorship of the proletariat, so small numerically and so immature.

Auxiliary Role of Peasants

Equally abstract, pedantic and false is the reference to the "lack of independence" of the peasantry. When and where did our sage ever observe in capitalist society a peasantry with an independent revolutionary program or a capacity for independent revolutionary initiative? The peasantry can play a very great role in the revolution, but only an auxiliary role.

In many instances the Spanish peasants acted boldly and fought courageously. But to rouse the entire mass of the peasantry, the proletariat had to set an example of a decisive uprising against the bourgeoisie and inspire the peasants with faith in the possibility of victory. In the meantime the revolutionary initiative of the proletariat itself was paralyzed at every step by its own organizations.

The "immaturity" of the proletariat, the "lack of independence" of the peasantry are neither final nor basic factors in historical events. Underlying the consciousness of the classes are the classes themselves, their numerical strength, their

*Untranslatable term, which means in part "liquid assets."—Trans.

role in economic life. Underlying the classes is a specific system of production which is determined in its turn by the level of the development of productive forces. Why not then say that the defeat of the Spanish proletariat was determined by the low level of technology?

The Role of Personality

Our author substitutes mechanistic determinism for the dialectic conditioning of the historical process. Hence the cheap jibes about the role of individuals, good and bad. History is a process of the class struggle. But classes do not bring their full weight to bear automatically and simultaneously. In the process of struggle the classes create various organs which play an important and independent role and are subject to deformations. This also provides the basis for the role of personalities in history. There are naturally great objective causes which created the autocratic rule of Hitler but only dull-witted pedants of "determinism" could deny today the enormous historic role of Hitler. The arrival of Lenin in Petrograd on April 3, 1917 turned the Bolshevik party in time and enabled the party to lead the revolution to victory. Our sages might say that had Lenin died abroad at the beginning of 1917, the October revolution would have taken place "just the same." But that is not so. Lenin represented one of the living elements of the historical process. He personified the experience and the perspicacity of the most active section of the proletariat. His timely appearance on the arena of the revolution was necessary in order to mobilize the vanguard and provide it with an opportunity to rally the working class and the peasant masses. Political leadership in the crucial moments of historical turns can become just as decisive a factor as is the role of the chief command during the critical moments of war. History is not an automatic process. Otherwise, why leaders? why parties? why programs? why theoretical struggles?

Stalinism in Spain

"But why, in the devil's name," asks the author as we have already heard, "did the revolutionary masses who left their former leaders, rally to the banner of the Communist Party?" The question is falsely posed. It is not true that the revolutionary masses left all of their former leaders. The workers who were previously connected with specific organizations continued to cling to them, while they observed and checked. Workers in general do not easily break with the party that awakens them to conscious life. Moreover the existence of mutual protection within the People's Front lulled them: Since everybody agreed, everything must be all right. The new and fresh masses naturally turned to the Comintern as the party which had accomplished the only victorious proletarian revolution and which, it was hoped, was capable of assuring arms to Spain. Furthermore the Comintern was the most zealous champion of the idea of the People's Front; this inspired confidence among the inexperienced layers of workers. Within the People's Front the Comintern was the most zealous champion of the bourgeois character of the revolution; this inspired the confidence of the petty and in part the middle bourgeoisie. That is why the masses "rallied to the banner of the Communist Party."

Our author depicts the matter as if the proletariat were in a well-stocked shoe store, selecting a new pair of boots. Even this simple operation, as is well known, does not always prove successful. As regards new leadership, the choice is very limited. Only gradually, only on the basis of their own experience through several stages can the broad layers of the masses become convinced that a new leadership is firmer, more reliable, more loyal than the old. To be sure, during a

revolution, i.e., when events move swiftly, a weak party can quickly grow into a mighty one provided it lucidly understands the course of the revolution and possesses staunch cadres that do not become intoxicated with phrases and are not terrorized by persecution. But such a party must be available prior to the revolution inasmuch as the process of educating the cadres requires a considerable period of time and the revolution does not afford this time.

Treachery of the POUM

To the left of all the other parties in Spain stood the POUM, which undoubtedly embraced revolutionary proletarian elements not previously firmly tied to anarchism. But it was precisely this party that played a fatal role in the development of the Spanish revolution. It could not become a mass party because in order to do so it was first necessary to overthrow the old parties and it was possible to overthrow them only by an irreconcilable struggle, by a merciless exposure of their bourgeois character. Yet the POUM while criticizing the old parties subordinated itself to them on all fundamental questions. It participated in the "People's" election bloc; entered the government which liquidated workers' committees; engaged in a struggle to reconstitute this governmental coalition; capitulated time and again to the anarchist leadership; conducted, in connection with this, a false trade union policy; took a vacillating and non-revolutionary attitude toward the May 1937 uprising. From the standpoint of determinism in general it is possible of course to recognize that the policy of the POUM was not accidental. Everything in this world has its cause. However, the series of causes engendering the Centrism of the POUM are by no means a mere reflection of condition of the Spanish or Catalonian proletariat. Two causalities moved toward each other at an angle and at a certain moment they came into hostile conflict. It is possible by taking into account previous international experience, Moscow's influence, the influence of a number of defeats, etc. to explain politically and psychologically why the POUM unfolded as a centrist party. But this does not alter its centrist character, nor does it alter the fact that a centrist party invariably acts as a brake upon the revolution, must each time smash its own head, and may bring about the collapse of the revolution. It does not alter the fact that the Catalonian masses were far more revolutionary than the POUM, which in turn was more revolutionary than its leadership. In these conditions to unload the responsibility for false policies on the "immaturity" of the masses is to engage in sheer charlatanism frequently resorted to by political bankrupts.

Responsibility of Leadership

The historical falsification consists in this, that the responsibility for the defeat of the Spanish masses is unloaded on the working masses and not those parties which paralyzed or simply crushed the revolutionary movement of the masses. The attorneys of the POUM simply deny the responsibility of the leaders, in order thus to escape shouldering their own responsibility. This impotent philosophy, which seeks to reconcile defeats as a necessary link in the chain of cosmic developments, is completely incapable of posing and refuses to pose the question of such concrete factors as programs, parties, personalities that were the organizers of defeat. This philosophy of fatalism and prostration is diametrically opposed to Marxism as the theory of revolutionary action.

Civil war is a process wherein political tasks are solved by military means. Were the outcome of this war determined by the "condition of class forces," the war itself would not be

necessary. War has its own organization, its own policies, its own methods, its own leadership by which its fate is directly determined. Naturally, the "condition of class forces" supplies the foundation for all other political factors; but just as the foundation of a building does not reduce the importance of walls, windows, doors, roofs, so the "condition of classes" does not invalidate the importance of parties, their strategy, their leadership. By dissolving the concrete in the abstract, our sages really halted midway. The most "profound" solution of the problem would have been to declare the defeat of the Spanish proletariat as due to the inadequate development of productive forces. Such a key is accessible to any fool.

By reducing to zero the significance of the party and of the leadership these sages deny in general the possibility of revolutionary victory. Because there are not the least grounds for expecting conditions more favorable. Capitalism has ceased to advance, the proletariat does not grow numerically, on the contrary it is the army of unemployed that grows, which does not increase but reduces the fighting force of the proletariat and has a negative effect also upon its consciousness. There are similarly no grounds for believing that under the regime of capitalism the peasantry is capable of attaining a higher revolutionary consciousness. The conclusion from the analysis of our author is thus complete pessimism, a sliding away from revolutionary perspectives. It must be said—to do them justice—that they do not themselves understand what they say.

As a matter of fact, the demands they make upon the consciousness of the masses are utterly fantastic. The Spanish workers, as well as the Spanish peasants gave the maximum of what these classes are able to give in a revolutionary situation. We have in mind precisely the class of millions and tens of millions.

Que Faire represents merely one of these little schools, or churches or chapels who frightened by the course of the class struggle and the onset of reaction publish their little journals and their theoretical etudes in a corner, on the sidelines away from the actual developments of revolutionary thought, let alone the movement of the masses.

Repression of Spanish Revolution

The Spanish proletariat fell the victim of a coalition composed of imperialists, Spanish republicans, socialists, anarchists, Stalinists, and on the left flank, the POUM. They all paralyzed the socialist revolution which the Spanish proletariat had actually begun to realize. It is not easy to dispose of the socialist revolution. No one has yet devised other methods than ruthless repressions, massacre of the vanguard, execution of the leaders, etc. The POUM of course did not want this. It wanted on the one hand to participate in the Republican government and to enter as a loyal peace-loving opposition into the general bloc of ruling parties; and on the other hand to achieve peaceful comradely relations at a time

when it was a question of implacable civil war. For this very reason the POUM fell victim to the contradictions of its own policy. The most consistent policy in the ruling bloc was pursued by the Stalinists. They were the fighting vanguard of the bourgeois-republican counter-revolution. They wanted to eliminate the need of Fascism by proving to the Spanish and world bourgeoisie that they were themselves capable of strangling the proletarian revolution under the banner of "democracy." This was the gist of their policies. The bankrupts of the Spanish People's Front are today trying to unload the blame on the GPU. I trust that we cannot be suspected of leniency toward the crimes of the GPU. But we see clearly and we tell the workers that the GPU acted in this instance only as the most resolute detachment in the service of the People's Front. Therein was the strength of the GPU, therein was the historic role of Stalin. Only ignorant philistines can wave this aside with stupid little jokes about the Chief Devil.

These gentlemen do not even bother with the question of the social character of the revolution. Moscow's lackeys, for the benefit of England and France, proclaimed the Spanish revolution as bourgeois. Upon this fraud were erected the perfidious policies of the People's Front, policies which would have been completely false even if the Spanish revolution had really been bourgeois. But from the very beginning the revolution expressed much more graphically the proletarian character than did the revolution of 1917 in Russia. In the leadership of the POUM gentlemen sit today who consider that the policy of Andres Nin was too "leftist," that the really correct thing was to have remained the left flank of the People's Front. The real misfortune was that Nin, covering himself with the authority of Lenin and the October revolution, could not make up his mind to break with the People's Front. Victor Serge who is in a hurry to compromise himself by a frivolous attitude toward serious questions writes that Nin did not wish to submit to commands from Oslo or Coyocan. Can a serious man really be capable of reducing to petty gossip the problem of the class content of a revolution? The sages of *Que Faire* have no answer whatever to this question. They do not understand the question itself. Of what significance indeed is the fact that the "immature" proletariat founded its own organs of power, seized enterprises, sought to regulate production while the POUM tried with all its might to keep from breaking with bourgeois anarchists who in an alliance with the bourgeois republicans and the no less bourgeois socialists and Stalinists assaulted and strangled the proletarian revolution! Such "trifles" are obviously of interest only to representatives of "ossified orthodoxy." The sages of *Que Faire* possess instead a special apparatus which measures the maturity of the proletariat and the relationship of forces independently of all questions of revolutionary class strategy....

Discipline in the American Army

By MICHAEL CORT

An army is the concentrated image of the society it serves. While societies clothe themselves with lip-service to moral and spiritual abstractions, by looking at their armies you will discover all the compulsions they have so carefully camouflaged. For an army has no place for evasion or subterfuge. It must strip clean all impediments that hinder the realization of the

political and social goals of the class it serves. If proof were needed that we in America live in a coercive society, that the aims and interests of our antagonistic classes are mutually exclusive, and that the entire state apparatus is an instrument of exploitation, one need only look at the United States Army.

Three months ago Congress gave the hierarchy of the

Army that for which it has clamoured these past twenty years . . . a conscripted citizen army. A few meager limitations were imposed—only 800,000 conscripts at a time and for one year at a time. But there was no compromise on the method of training and handling these conscripts. These men are to fight for “democracy” and for this purpose are to be sweated and browbeaten into unthinking robots.

The goal, one year from now, is 800,000 men with guts sucked in, who will march and wheel and fire and who will ask no questions, voice no hopes or fears; 800,000 men who will obey blindly, unreasoningly, automatically.

During the past year, when the Army hierarchy and a high-powered propaganda machine representing big finance capital were engaged in selling the country on the necessity of conscription, much was said about the formation of a “democratic army.” Implication was that the workers were not to lose their fundamental civil rights, and in fact all human dignity, once they donned khaki. “We will welcome suggestions from the ranks regarding army efficiency,” a member of the General Staff said recently in a public address. “The American method of training men is not the European. Ours is a democratic army of free men banded together to see that freedom and justice shall not disappear from this earth.” This speech, needless to add, was delivered before conscription had been enacted. There is less coddling of democratic sensibilities now. Discipline and obedience have become the key words today and behind those words lie all the ugliness and corruption of the army caste system.

The Military Caste and Its Regime

Eight hundred thousand untouchables are to be turned over to the tender ministrations of drill masters whose viciousness is deliberately fostered by the military bureaucracy. And the American military bureaucracy is notoriously zealous in establishing its prerogatives. In the most heavily over-officered army in the world (only in a comic-opera could one find a parallel), these martinets have been known to sacrifice men, materials and even jeopardize the country for the maintenance of their caste system. They are the custodians of our own Nuremberg laws. All the gradations of rank, the written and unwritten laws, the Army system of jurisprudence, are nothing but an elaborate apparatus for the protection of the hierarchy. Whatever has been recently promised in the press regarding reforms, the United States Army is and will remain the image of its master . . . decadent capitalism.

When a worker leaves his home and job to enter the imperialist war machine just what sort of an existence faces him? What are his rights and privileges? When is discipline relaxed? When is he able to speak his mind, do as he pleases and function as a normal human being?

Eighty percent of the soldier's waking hours are devoted to training of one type or another; the remaining twenty percent of his time is just as stringently supervised and regulated, although indirectly, as his drill period. From reveille at 5:30 until taps at 11 there is hardly a moment when the conscript is free of supervision and discipline. How his bed is made, the angle of his hat, the knot in his tie, what he eats and how much, when he marches, when he plays and what games, what movies he sees and what books he reads . . . these are no longer of his own choosing.

Baron von Steuben, first Inspector General of the United States Army, implanted German military conceptions on this continent during the war for independence. His basic philosophy still guides our General Staff, and the Baron was no man to overlook details. Every moment of a soldier's day was analyzed and regulated. Standing at attention sounds like a

comparatively simple maneuver . . . but not to the Baron, and therefore, not to our contemporary subalterns. Writing in “The Military Companion,” the Baron instructed: “When under arms the soldier must stand straight and firm, with heels on a line two inches apart, the shoulders square to the front and kept back, the right hand hanging down the side with the palm close to the thigh, the body kept still and as little constrained as possible; the piece on the left shoulder, with the elbow turned in close to the body, the guard just under the left breast, the forefinger and thumb before the swell of the butt, the three left fingers under the butt, the flat of the butt against the hip bone, and pressed so as the piece may be felt against the left side, and stand before the hollow of the shoulder, neither leaning towards the head nor away from it, the barrel almost perpendicular. When exercising, he is to be exact and measure a second of time between each motion.” No fascist despot ever conceived a mold more confining than that into which the American conscript is forced.

“Recreation” Regulated by Lynch Law

Even recreation periods serve the war machine, for here the non-conforming worker is subject to the full pressure of Army opinion. In competition men are pitted against men, squad against squad, and company against company. In these games, as well as in the drills, the squads are imbued with the competitive spirit and urged to create “outstanding records.” Extra privileges and time off are the bribes. More than that, the men are subtly urged to take discipline into their own hands and deal with any comrade who, in the opinion of the officers, mars that record. This encouragement of lynch law was emphasized in a book written by Prof. Joseph Peterson, University of Minnesota, and distributed to all newly commissioned officers during the first world war. Prof. Peterson urged the new officers to set rigid standards of conduct and to penalize the entire company when an infraction was committed by one man. This, he pointed out, will encourage the men to discipline their own comrades. In citing such a case history, he wrote, “A certain man was turned off guard for being dirty. The most worthless man in the troop undertook to, and did, thrash him with a watering bridle for disgracing the organization. This occurred in a troop that had been in existence for only four months and but one man in it had ever soldiered before. The pride of organization came to it early.”

Here then, is a simple and “clean” method of dealing with the more militant conscripts. Through this method of discipline the long arm of “company honor” is ever upon the backs of the men. The biology and psychology of competition is perverted to the ends of terror.

This method will probably be extensively employed during the coming year for, as Prof. Peterson pointed out, “a drafted army is more difficult to handle than a professional one.” Trade unionists and class-conscious workers are in a drafted army and it is not always easy for a shave-tail, fresh and starched from West Point, to handle them.

A Bourgeois Conception of Discipline

While recreation and off-hours discipline is subtle and oblique, the discipline of the drill field is direct and brutal. Drilling is not only an end in itself but, more important, a means to an end. It is on the drill field that a man's spirit is broken and his nerves and muscles conditioned to the point where they become automatic reflexes. Long after the conscript has learned his manual of arms and can do his squads right with true Prussian perfection, he spends hours tramping back and forth, presenting arms, shouldering arms, saluting and obeying blindly and promptly all the involved commands

the drill sergeant can conjure up. It is upon this mechanical repetition day after day, that the army counts for leveling the men. In the *Journal of the Military Service Institute of United States*, Major James Chester wrote, "He (the recruit) is drilled until he knows his drill; then he is drilled until he acquires discipline; then he is drilled to keep from forgetting it. And when he does forget it his memory is revived by punishment. Moreover, when he is not drilling or undergoing punishment, he is being badgered by the non-commissioned officer who insists that when he says 'come,' the recruit shall come. And when he says 'go,' the recruit shall go, and when he says 'do this' the recruit shall promptly and unthinkingly do it."

Philip Wylie and William W. Muir have just written a book intended to popularize the service among the new conscripts. Entitled "The Army Way," the book is much more revealing than the authors, or the military, intended. In one place the authors quote several drill sergeants on the matter of discipline. One of them says, "My system's a little different. I'll take a new man who's doing a lot of fudging and I'll start him in on a mess of chores that don't make sense. He knows they don't make sense. I know it. And he knows I know it. So he thinks I'm riding him. Well, in a way, maybe I am. But I'm doing it to show him that what I say . . . goes! Like that gas-feed . . . (on an automobile). I'm the guy that puts the foot on the pedal. The private's got to know that when I push down, he has to feed the gas in. It's none of his business if the car ain't goin' anywhere. None. He ain't the driver. I am. He's got to get the absolute habit of jumpin' into action when I say so. Then . . . when the time comes . . . if there ever is any action . . . he'll jump and jump quick and jump right. Get it?"

Ingenious sergeants, such as the one just quoted, sometimes evolve long and intricate routines that call for a new command every four paces. Under this badgering the conscripts make mistakes, for the mind will only consciously absorb and transmit to the legs and arms a limited number of commands in a minute's time. Each time a mistake is made the sergeant starts over again. This time a little faster and a little louder. The end isn't accomplished the first hour, or the first day, or even the first week. But after months of this the men will have been reduced to numbed, dazed, unthinking automatons. Their subconscious will have compensated for their conscious failures. They will obey the commands automatically! And consequently, the Army reasons, when they are ordered to charge the "enemy," that command also will be obeyed automatically.

Robots Are a Substitute for Courage

In this connection Prof. Peterson told the West Point graduates of 1918: "Under battle conditions when on the verge of making a charge, the will power of the soldier is likely to desert him; but if his habits are thoroughly established he begins to act along the lines of least resistance. He feels a rifle in his hands; for months he has been trained to run forward and engage the opponent with his bayonet, and as it is the most natural thing to do, he responds to the call of habit."

While the politicians beat the drums of prejudice and hatred and call for a "holy war," the Army General Staff remains singularly objective. They have learned from previous imperialist wars that courage based on moral conviction of the justice of this war is not to be had and that obedience created by mechanical conditioning is a substitute for courage. And however much they may fear, or even dislike, the rival imperialism of Germany, the Prussian military machine

is their model and the object of their envy. Nothing short of "German efficiency" and, of course, all its attendant social implications, will satisfy our military. To quote again from Major Chester and the *Journal of the Military Service Institute of the United States*: "The courage of a company, or any other military organization, is the courage of the commander. It has no reference to the men in the ranks. Their merit, if they have any, is in their discipline. If they fail to follow their leader they are not necessarily cowards. They are only undisciplined." And further, "Government by discipline (army) is akin to the government of the gods . . . it is despotic. There is no room for a town meeting."

The Army's Conception of Punishment

Such is the American military philosophy of discipline as applied to regular training. When it comes to punitive discipline the punishments are more ingenious and based upon all the tortures inherited from the dark ages. It is true that under pressure of public opinion the Army officers have been forced to abandon the "water cure" and the "stretch block" and similar devices once so dear to their hearts. But more "humane" punishments have been devised that are equally effective in breaking a man's spirit and often his mind. As for the list of punishable offenses, part is written and part is unwritten. The unwritten part, of course, gives the bureaucracy the utmost leeway in handling recalcitrants. The written part is headed by espionage and desertion, both of which receive the death penalty. Articles of War 7 to 59 cover the other offenses and include: quarrels or frays, refusing to obey an officer, misbehaving before the enemy, abandoning post, quitting colors, making known the watch word, beginning, exciting or causing any sedition or mutiny, being present at a mutiny and not endeavoring to suppress it, striking a superior officer, enlisting in another regiment without being regularly discharged, advising to desert, selling, losing or spoiling arms or clothing, sentinel sleeping on post, doing violence to any person who brings provisions into camp, forcing a safeguard in foreign parts, relieving the enemy or protecting him, corresponding with the enemy, compelling a commander to surrender, etc., etc.

The pages of the *Journal of the Military Service Institute* are filled with disciplinary suggestions. One of the most succinct bits of advice comes from the pen of Major Chester who made a tour of American penitentiaries and urged the adoption of police methods in the army. In describing the method used in Sing Sing Prison, Major Chester wrote, "The man with a rebellious spirit was easily recognized and selected for drill. The drill was simple enough. The commands were 'open your mouth.' 'Shut it.' 'Open your mouth.' 'Shut it.' . . . ad infinitum. Of course the rebellious spirit, after dozens of repetitions of the absurd command, failed to obey, and punishment followed. So many minutes in the shower bath, after which the drill was resumed and prosecuted to a second disobedience and punishment. Then the drill would be varied by making the prisoner open and shut his eyes at command, or raise and lower his arms, or anything, the absurder the better. The study of penitentiary methods opened my eyes to the true value of much in the military service. The manual of arms, and ordinary barrack-yard drill, after the men are able to execute them perfectly, are the military counter-parts of the discipline drills of our penitentiaries."

Then there is the case of a bright young captain who confined a "trouble maker" to his barracks. The officer stipulated, however, that the soldier had to report to Headquarters every half hour. It happened that Headquarters was such a distance from the barracks that the soldier could cover the

distance in fifteen minutes only by running. A fifteen minute run to Headquarters to report, a fifteen minute run back to the barracks and it was time to set out again for Headquarters. Under this routine the soldier, of course, collapsed long before his period of confinement had been completed. What happened to the soldier after his collapse, and therefore his failure to report, is not recorded.

Long hours in the open with a drill pack is another Army favorite. The officer will stipulate that the prisoner is to drill with a pack of a certain weight. The weight set, of course, is heavier than a regulation pack. To make up the required weight the sergeant loads the prisoner's pockets with heavy rocks and then turns him into the field.

David Spudson, the English writer, reports this incident that occurred during the last world war. A private was sentenced to 18 months hard labor. He was given the alternative, however, of going over the top. He chose the almost certain death of going over the top alone and in face of a concentrated enemy fire. Miraculously he returned alive, albeit without a hand and with a shell in his thigh. He was sent to a hospital and upon recovering was sent to prison to finish out his original sentence. Over the top hadn't broken his spirit and so his commanding officer returned to the longer method.

Theirs Not to Reason Why

This fetish for obedience pyramids right through the Army bureaucracy. No commissioned officer with any ambition would think of questioning an order, however bad. Neither would he, on the other hand, dream of disciplining his subordinate non-commissioned officers in front of the men, however flagrant their abuse of their authority. While some officers like to assume the pose of "father confessor" to their men, and some even go so far as to invite the submission of all complaints directly, they privately believe that the more the non-coms ride the men the better will be the company discipline. In "Leadership," a booklet written by Major Arthur Miller and distributed to commissioned officers, it is stated: "It should always be remembered that the non-commissioned officer is the backbone of discipline. It only breaks the authority and grip of the non-com to have an offender whom he has reported talk himself out of punishment. If you find that a non-com is in the wrong, it is best for discipline not to let it appear in that light before the man he has reported for punishment."

Thus the commissioned officer works through his sergeant to the squads, and the sergeant through the corporal to each of the seven men in the squad and the iron ring is closed. At no time, waking or sleeping, on camp grounds or off, is the conscript a free man in any sense of the word.

There is one recourse left open to a man who finds himself persecuted; he may demand a trial by court-martial. The 104th Article of War reads, "Under such regulation as the President may prescribe and which he may from time to time revoke, alter or add to, the commanding officer of any detachment, company or higher command may, for minor offenses not denied by the accused, impose disciplinary punishments upon persons of his command without intervention of a court-martial, unless the accused demands trial by court-martial."

That last sentence of the 104th Article is a slender thread indeed. Recognizing that courts-martial are presided over by the bureaucracy itself, and that the very act of appeal to the court is a threat to the disciplinary apparatus, it would take a brave man indeed to defy his captain. And you will search in vain for an officer who believes in democracy within the army. Whatever their philosophies before entering West Point, they are soon educated to the Army way.

In advising officers to resort to trials only as the last resort, Major Miller has this to say: "Continued trials and their publicity disrupt organization pride. And are an admission by the officer that he can't control his company. (Furthermore) . . . justice is more apt to be met by officer punishment for he knows his men better than the summary court and knows what form of punishment would be most effective." Note that there is no concern regarding the guilt or innocence of the accused, only the problem of "most effective punishment." In the United States Army's "Manual for Courts-Martial" this is written: ". . . to invoke court martial jurisdiction rather than exercise this power of command . . . is to choose the wrong instrument, disturb unnecessarily military functions, injure rather than maintain discipline, and fail to exercise an authority, the use of which develops and increases the capacity for command." Imagine any shave-tail risking the impression that he is not desirous of developing and increasing his "capacity for command"!

Despite the great pressure from the bureaucracy, however, there has been an increase in the number of demands for trials by courts-martial instead of summary punishment during the past half century. This increase became especially noteworthy when conscription brought militant and developed workers into the Army.

Character of Army Jurisprudence

Army jurisprudence has developed slowly over the years by legislative acts, executive fiats, and judicial opinion. While there was little apparent plan and the entire judicial structure looks like a crazy quilt, it was molded consciously, and subconsciously, to complement the Army philosophy of discipline, and now stands as a model of coercive class rule. There is little similarity between Army and civil courts, between the rights of personal security in civil life and in the war machine. The 5th and 6th amendments to the Constitution of the United States, which protect citizens from punishments without due process of law, are specifically exempted in all trials arising in the land or naval services.

The first Article of War placed all commissioned officers, and the 10th Article placed enlisted and drafted men, under the jurisdiction of courts-martial. The jurisdiction has been enlarged, by judicial opinion, to include all drivers, professors, sutlers, retainers at the camp and all persons serving with the Army, enlisted or not. Any man, or officer, can be remanded for trial by a simple accusation from his superior. Without any investigation into the case he is imprisoned until the court sits. He is seldom given an opportunity to prepare his defense, either by engaging a competent counsel or personal investigation and interviewing of witnesses. When the trial opens there are no rules of evidence and the only requirements are that the court be sworn and the charge made out. The duties of the judge, prosecutor and defense attorney are all performed by the Judge Advocate. In other words, the ranking officer of the court-martial, the prosecutor, acts as defense attorney when he deems it necessary, and passes upon all evidence and points of law.

The accused is allowed to retain a counsel to assist him during the trial, but the counsel is restricted to giving advice and framing questions which are handed by the accused to the Judge Advocate on slips of paper. Any legal objections are also handed on slips of paper to the Judge Advocate. The counsel may not address the court or interfere in any way with the proceedings. Furthermore, the court-martial may refuse to receive any counsel designated by the accused. The general practice is to exclude the accused from the entire trial except, of course, during his testimony and during the ap-

pearance of defense witnesses. As for the verdicts, a crime carrying a death penalty requires two-thirds agreement among the judges; anything less is decided by a simple majority.

An Ideal System for Frame-Ups

While the bureaucracy prefers to conduct a court-martial with the maximum of secrecy, this medieval system of jurisprudence has received public attention and condemnation from time to time. During 1919 public indignation against military justice became so violent that Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, requested the Judge Advocate General to make a personal investigation and prepare a defense which he (Baker) could submit to Congress. Many soldier welfare committees sprang into being and several made exhaustive studies of Army justice. The following is a summary of these committee findings as presented on the floor of Congress in the Spring of 1919.

1. The general treatment of accused soldiers is not according to rigid limitations of law, but according to the arbitrary discretion of the commanding officer.

2. A soldier can be put on trial by an officer, at his discretion, and without any inquiry into probability of the charge.

3. The military criminal code is not modern and enlightened, but entirely archaic.

4. The Judge Advocate combines, incongruously, the functions of prosecutor, judicial adviser of the court, and defender of the accused.

5. Commanding Generals, as reviewing authorities, have sent back for reconsideration judgments of acquittal (such double jeopardy is of course impossible in civil law).

6. The sentences imposed by the courts-martial are excessively severe.

The Army's Social Philosophy Stated

The United States Army at the moment is basking in an unprecedentedly brilliant spot light. All the high-powered forces of press and radio are focused upon the Army, engaged in a mighty campaign to "sell" it to the nation. It goes without saying that the bureaucracy is now on its best behavior. There is still a large and vocal minority in this country and the martinets are not too easy in their shiny boots. But as the avenues of free expression are choked off one by one, as the unions are smashed or emasculated and the workers dragooned by millions into the war machine, America will once more see blossoming the full flower of the Army's social philosophy. This philosophy was expressed more than frankly by General Robert Bullard, writing in the Journal of the Military Service Institute. Bullard, a frank admirer of the Prussian military pattern, listed what he called "The Cardinal

Vices of the American Soldier." Not content with the listing, he analyzed these vices and found their roots in *democracy itself*. Here in the General's own words, are the "vices":

"An abnormal claim...view and development of personal independence...A spirit rebellious and insubordination to authority. On Americans accustomed to American ways, the American soldier's rebelliousness, insubordination and lack of respect toward authority, do not easily impress themselves. It is, however, the first thing noticed by foreign observers of our army, and by ourselves the instant we observe a foreign army. Why is it? It is because of a foolish pride of independence that prevents them from yielding the requisite obedience, discipline and faithful service."

"Excessive and unnecessary wants: wastefulness. A Frenchman can live on what an American wastes. Two Japs or two Chinamen can do likewise. To know our habit we need only look in on the soup kitchen of any troop. They cook great quantities, eat great quantities and waste great quantities, and the commander cannot deny you that more is eaten than is needed."

"A deficient sense of the seriousness of the obligation of the enlistment oath (desertion). The reason for this found in civilian life where men are found quitting on the slightest jar, the least dissatisfaction, any employment. And they indignantly resent any questioning thereof. This condition is growing daily worse."

"Intemperate criticism of superior authority; a loose tongue. Their very great personal liberty, the free discussion and unrestrained expression of opinion on all public men and affairs, the habit of setting themselves in judgment on men and measures, have left the Americans with the idea that there is nothing... they are not at liberty to criticize. The cause of so wretched a vice is idleness. Its cure is therefore simple... work. Give all the military work he can do (nay more), and make him do it."

These words, mind you, are not those of a Keitel or a Graziani, but those of a great American military "hero," a man often referred to as General Pershing's "good right arm," a man who, without question, speaks the mind of the American military. In a word, the class struggle does not cease at the doors of the barracks; on the contrary, as 800,000 Americans, predominantly workers and farmers, will discover for themselves in the coming year, the class struggle reappears in an extremely intensified form—that is what General Bullard's words mean. These workers and farmers come to the Army with the experience of the great strike and farmers' struggles of the last ten years, a far richer experience than the men the Bullards have hitherto faced. We await the outcome with confidence!

Milwaukee's Brand of Socialism

Socialism in One City

By JAMES BOULTON

1. A Tenor Sings Socialism Away

The morning of April 3, 1940, broke dismally in the city of Milwaukee, heralding the defeat of Mayor Daniel W. Hoan and the return to capitalism. Dan, the Socialist mayor toward whom Norman Thomas could point with pride in every speech, the mayor whose treatise on "City Government" has now become a classic, who as City Attorney after the election of 1912 indicted and convicted hundreds of corrupt politi-

cians and thereby ushered into office for over two decades the Milwaukee Socialist Party, its elected and appointed officials, and made the name of Milwaukee a star in international encyclopedias, the mayor, however, whose twenty-four years in office failed to produce any change in the life of Milwaukee's proletariat.

When the final count came in, the beer parties in the wards were already ebbing and the golden haired thrush,

Mayor-elect Carl Zeidler, had decreed the abolition of socialism. The major setback was not felt among the more "stupid" proletariat, but it did forebode ill among the many party Gifte Shoppe, butcher, book, and barber shop, tavern keeper, insurance salesman, and law suite members. Panic reigned in the City Hall and other municipal buildings; and in the offices of the stunned comrades of Norman Thomas there swelled a wave of defeatism that rolled right through the heart of the party convention which took place right afterward.

"What happened in Milwaukee?" was the paramount question put to delegates from the Cream City. Why had the workers cast their ballots for a tenor instead of for Dan?

When the initial delirium subsided, there still lingered a feeling of strength: Police Chief Kluchesky and "the Force" remained firmly entrenched in municipal power. All is not lost so long as comrade Police Chief Kluchesky remains at the head of the Force.

"Klooch," as his comrades of the Socialist Party fondly call him, is expected to persist in waging the fight to liquidate the six mounted policemen, introduced by reactionaries to break the monotony of socialist civic life. Whole elections have been fought on this issue. The mounty funds, contend the Hoan men, could best be used in solving the problem of unemployment. Milwaukee Joe, when he is not busy "settling" strikes, will undoubtedly have something to say on this issue.

2. History and Achievements of Milwaukee Socialism

Pulling through the World War with very little to mar their record except the ride of Dan Hoan at the head of a Preparedness Day parade, the Milwaukee socialists continued on their march toward clean and efficient city government and a bigger and better convention city.

The first political boss of the Milwaukee local of the Socialist Party was Congressman Berger, who shared the job with Hoan until his death. Hoan now shares it with Andy Biemiller, Progressive caucus chairman in the assembly and author of the famous plea: "We must give aid to the Allies, our comrades!" Otto Hauser, ex-preacher and Hoan's secretary to the Mayor, helps manage the dwindling machine, although he is mainly preoccupied with selling real estate.

"Old Vic" Berger merely bossed the party. Joe Kluchesky extended the practice of democracy against the general populace.

Frank Zeidler, State Secretary of the Socialist Party and a Sunday school teacher, readily concedes that nothing much was done in socializing the means of production. Nevertheless by the time Hoan retired to law practice in 1940, Milwaukee was the proud possessor of a socialized sewage disposal plant and many publicly owned streets.

Under the influence of comrade C. B. Whitnall, first elected in 1910 as City Treasurer, great strides were made in expanding the county parks; and today the Socialist county towers above the nation in quantity and quality of sweet-heart's rests.

In the course of this development Ernest Unterman, who reminds everyone that he is the Editor of the Fourth German Edition of *Capital*, was appointed Director of the Washington Park Zoo. Besides painting murals and collecting ostrich eggs, Unterman has also produced a work called "Lenin's Maggot."

In 1935, in a convention with eight other organizations, Milwaukee's socialists gave birth to the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation. The name was changed to Progressive Party Federation at the last convention when Comrade Hoan

suggested that they should not give the impression of existing for farmers and workers alone. As a mass party the FLPP disappointed many. Some found it difficult to draw the line between the SP and the FLPP, the former usually meeting after the latter, often in the same hall or tavern as the case may be. A late comer was often heard questioning: "Is this the meeting of the SP or the FLPP?"

In all fairness to the party it must be added that much has been accomplished in placing 500 salaried election booth clerks, winning aldermanic, supervisory, and assemblymanic seats, appointing many tried and true men to various civic committees, administrative boards, and executive offices.

The achievements of the party culminated in the appointment of Joe Kluchesky and the completion of a really efficient police force, as the workers well may testify.

3. A Socialist Police Chief

Comrade Kluchesky is notable for his unique construing of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and for his view that transients do not vote and consequently are of no value to a crime-free socialist city.

The Socialist Party spent \$10,000 for Norman Thomas' New Jersey fight in which he contended handbill ordinances were undemocratic. But in the stronghold of Norman Thomas socialism, not a cent was spent to fight against such a handbill ordinance. As a matter of fact the Milwaukee comrades appreciated the ordinance's value in keeping socialist streets litter-free and were inclined to favor it; so that, when the U. S. Supreme Court invalidated that type of ordinance, comrade Kluchesky dissented and proposed an alternative ordinance to prevent the littering of public streets. The Milwaukee Young People's Socialist League, at the instigation of a group who subsequently became Trotskyists, issued a statement to the press, repudiating the Police Chief's action. The culprits were admonished before the SP's Executive Board by Ed Knappe, who stated plainly: "The point is you cannot attack public officials."

Klooch demonstrated his socialist efficiency during the Allen-Bradley strike. A trade union leader and member of the Socialist Party testified before the Party's County Central that, in a conference with himself, Klooch, and President Bradley of the struck corporation, Klooch said:

"If law and order are not preserved I will have to put the police at the disposal of Mr. Bradley."

Another act for which Hoan's appointee has been criticized by some people was, in reality, not as arbitrary as it may seem, but logically arose from the Kluchesky theory that people ought to at least vote if they would breath Cream City rarefied air. This act took place at the Catholic Worker Family House, a haven for underprivileged transients. On March 23, 1940, a police detail under orders from the Chief raided the house without warrant and arrested seventeen inmates, on charges, substantially, that they were non-voters, unemployed, transient, loiterers, and defiled by their presence the grand beauty of a fair city. During the raid some people were mishandled, insulted, questioned and searched in violation of constitutional rights which apply to transients as well as voters.

When this act was brought (by those who later became Trotskyites) to the attention of the Party County Central with the pointer that under capitalism there is a fundamental antagonism between police and workers, and when the naively indignant complainant vainly pressed for action, an Executive Board member objected to the use of Marxist formulas and windbagging, suggesting ejection of the disrupter.

At present Comrade Kluchesky's force is cooperating

with the FBI in cataloguing Socialist Workers Party street corner speakers and Socialist Appeal salesmen, no doubt crushing Trotskyism before it breeds Stalinism.

Recently there was a solemn ceremony, when 260 party members received "diplomas" for membership in the party

of twenty-five years or more. One of those, grown gray in the service, was Comrade Police Chief Joe Kluchesky.

Believe it or not, some of those old boys who hold those diplomas aren't able to figure out why the party didn't once more this year win the election!

Engels on Dialectics of Nature

By WM. F. WARDE

The ideological development of every social movement has followed the course determined by the material conditions of its existence. The evolution of scientific thought under proletarian auspices has been the opposite of that under bourgeois auspices. This difference in development grew out of the different social necessities which confronted the two revolutionary classes in the first stages of their careers.

The main line of bourgeois thought advanced from the natural to the social sciences. The earliest bourgeois philosophers were primarily concerned with promoting man's knowledge of nature after the long sleep of the middle ages. They had no interest in reforming society along bourgeois lines. They devised new intellectual methods for increasing man's power over nature rather than for decreasing the power of man over man.

Lord Bacon, the progenitor of English empiricism, deliberately turned his back upon the religious controversies, in which great political struggles then first manifested themselves, to investigate the workings of nature. Descartes, the founder of modern rationalism, opposed to the sterile "speculative" philosophy of the schoolmen his own "practical philosophy," which would make mankind "masters and possessors of nature" and enable them to "enjoy without any trouble the fruits of the earth and all its comforts." Newton gave a classical form to physics a century and a half before Ricardo performed the same task for bourgeois economics.

Material Causes of Intellectual Evolution

This order of development was not accidental. The principal task of the bourgeoisie at that period was to augment the productive forces, thereby increasing their own wealth and power. The scientific thought of the proletarian movement, on the other hand, has progressed from the social to the natural sciences. This, too, was not without sufficient reason. The urgent job of the proletariat under capitalist domination was less to increase the productive forces of society, as the bourgeoisie was compelled to do under feudal rule, than to free the already highly developed productive forces from the dead hand of capitalist ownership and control.

This explains why Marxism, the scientific method of the revolutionary proletarian movement, concentrated attention in the first phase of its activity upon the solution of historical, social and economic problems. Practical necessity dictated that the most pressing theoretical problems in the sphere of social phenomena be solved first. Although the theory of dialectical materialism was essentially a universal system of thought, embracing both nature and society, its detailed application to the theoretical problems of the natural sciences had to be postponed for later consideration.

Marx, Engels, and Natural Science

The creators of dialectical materialism were keenly conscious of the gaps in their theoretical work. Marx looked forward to writing a handbook of dialectics after he had completed "Capital." In the latter years of his life Engels made

a comprehensive study of mathematics and the natural sciences with the aid of reconstructing their theoretical foundations with the aid of the materialist dialectics just as he and Marx had previously revolutionized social science.

"Marx and I," he wrote in the second preface to "Anti-Duehring," "were pretty well the only people to rescue conscious dialectics from German idealist philosophy and apply it in the materialist conception of nature and history. But a knowledge of mathematics and natural science is essential to a conception of nature which is dialectical and at the same time materialist. Marx was well versed in mathematics, but we could only partially, intermittently and sporadically keep up with the natural sciences. For this reason, when I retired from business and transferred my home to London, thus enabling myself to give the necessary time to it, I went through as complete as possible a 'moulting,' as Liebig calls it, in mathematics and the natural sciences, and spent the best part of eight years on it."

"Anti-Duehring" was the first fruit of this work; "Dialectics of Nature" the last. While "Anti-Duehring" remains the best exposition of the philosophy of dialectical materialism, the "Dialectics of Nature," despite its fragmentary character, must now be read as its indispensable supplement. Engels could not finish this work owing to the tremendous labor involved in editing and publishing "Capital" (here is direct evidence of the interference of social science with the advancement of natural science!) and to other tasks connected with the revolutionary movement. The present volume* consists of six more or less completed chapters together with a sheaf of disconnected notes and separate articles.

Although it has taken over sixty years for Engels' manuscript to appear in English, it arrives at an opportune moment. Here is one more means for educating those students who have felt the need of delving deeper into the theoretical bases of Marxism and of answering those critics who have demanded to know how the doctrines and methods of dialectical materialism can be applied to the problems of natural science. Doubtless, the new school of petty-bourgeois revisionists, whose disdain for Marxist theory is surpassed only by their ignorance of it, will attach little more positive value to these writings than did their predecessor, Edward Bernstein, who held the manuscript for many decades after Engels' death without seeing any necessity for publishing it. But every serious student of Marxist thought will rejoice that these keys to an understanding of the materialist dialectic have finally become accessible.

What Engels Seeks to Demonstrate

In the "Dialectics of Nature" Engels aimed to demonstrate that the processes of nature obey the same general laws of motion as social and intellectual processes. As he wrote in

*DIALECTICS OF NATURE by Frederick Engels. Translated by C. P. Dutt. Preface and Notes by J. B. S. Haldane, F. R. S. 380 pages. International Publishers, New York, 1940. \$2.50.

"Antf-Duehring," Engels surveyed mathematics and the natural sciences to convince himself "that amid the welter of innumerable changes taking place in nature, the same dialectical laws are in operation as those which in history govern the apparent fortuitousness of events; the same laws as those which similarly form the thread running through the history of the development of human thought and gradually rise to consciousness in the mind of man . . .," and which were first formulated by Hegel in mystical form before Marx and Engels refashioned them into the materialist dialectic.

In the Introduction, Engels presents a critical review of the development of natural science on its theoretical side. He explains how and why this first period in the rebirth of natural knowledge was dominated by the viewpoint of the absolute immutability of nature. The fixed stars and our own solar system, the earth and its fauna and flora were considered to be eternally the same. There was no place in such a scheme of things for the idea of universal evolution.

This outlook, which prevailed in all branches of natural science until well into the 19th century, began to be undermined in one science after another by the internal development of the sciences themselves. In astronomy, by the Kant-Laplace hypothesis of the evolution of the solar system from a nebula; in geology, by Lyell's conception of the successive transformations of the earth's surface; in physics, by the formulation of the mechanical theory of heat and by the law of the conservation of energy; in chemistry, by Mendeleyeff's discovery of the periodic arrangement of the elements; and in biology by Darwin's theory of the origin of species. This series of discoveries gave rise to a new scientific conception of nature, the theory of universal evolution, "the view that the whole of nature, from the smallest element to the greatest, from grains of sand to suns, from protista to men, has its existence in eternal coming into being and passing away, in ceaseless flux, in unresting motion and change."

The full consequences of these revolutionary developments in the separate sciences, which shattered the old picture of an immutable nature, were slow to realize themselves in the conscious thought of individual natural scientists and in general scientific theory. Practising scientists, who accepted the results and pursued the methods of the evolutionary standpoint in their special department of activity, clung to the old metaphysical ways of thinking in other fields of thought and in their general conceptions.

The Dialectical Theory of Evolution

Meanwhile the new and higher stage of natural knowledge demanded a theoretical system and a method of thought appropriate to itself. The old mechanical system of nature with its unchangeable laws and elements and its metaphysical mode of thought operating with inflexible and exclusive categories no longer sufficed.

It was a philosopher rather than a scientist who provided natural science with the intellectual means for its emancipation from the old outlook and for the construction of a new one. Just as Descartes had outlined the mechanical system of nature, so Hegel formulated the first systematic conception of the whole natural, social and spiritual world as a continuous process of development.

In his dialectical logic Hegel attempted to give a rational form and evolve a rational method out of the many-sided, contradictory processes of evolution. The laws of his dialectic are nothing but the most general laws of motion and change in nature, society and human thought. These laws were originally conceived by Hegel in idealist fashion as mere laws of thought. But, as Marx and Engels subsequently demon-

strated in their materialist version of dialectical logic, the dialectical laws are conceptual formulations of objective material realities.

Three Laws of Dialectics

Engels discusses three principal laws of dialectics: the law of the transformation of quantity into quality, and *vice versa*; the law of the interpenetration of opposites; and the law of the negation of the negation. He takes the experimental results of the individual sciences, sifts and synthesizes them, to show that these dialectical laws are really laws of development in nature and therefore valid for theoretical natural science.

The first law signifies that "in nature, in a manner exactly fixed for each individual case, qualitative changes can only occur by the quantitative addition or subtraction of matter or motion (so-called energy)." In the second chapter Engels indicates precisely how this law operates by numerous examples taken from the exact sciences of mechanics, physics, and chemistry where accurately measurable and traceable quantitative variations are directly linked with the production of qualitative differences. In physics, it has since been ascertained, there exists a continuous series of rays from radio to cosmic rays in which quantitative variations in wavelength manifest themselves in determinable qualitative differences. This same law is equally clearly observable in chemistry where the properties of bodies are altered in concordance with their changed quantitative composition. Engels cites the allotropic forms of elements, the nitrogen oxide compounds, the homologous series of carbon compounds, and the periodic arrangement of the elements according to their atomic weights; modern chemists could add many more examples.

The second law of the dialectic asserts that everything has a self-contradictory character, containing within itself its own opposite. The bi-polar essence of all things manifests itself in change, which is a process of *alteration*, or transformation of something from its original state through a series of intermediate variations into its opposite. Engels brings forward this law of the interpenetration of opposites in the third chapter where he investigates the most important of scientific problems, the basic forms of motion.

The Nature of Motion

All natural knowledge is based upon the study of material movement of one kind or another. A correct conception of motion is therefore absolutely indispensable to natural science. What is motion? Motion, says Engels, is a contradictory combination of attraction and repulsion. All the various forms of motion arise out of the interplay between these two opposing phases of its being. Wherever and whenever motion occurs throughout nature, these polar opposites will be found inseparably united. This dialectical definition of motion already implicitly contains the empirically discovered physical law of the conservation of energy. For, if each individual attraction is compensated for by a corresponding repulsion somewhere else, then the sum of all attractions in the universe must be equal to the sum of all repulsions.

Motion consists of the concrete unity of attraction and repulsion. Through their interaction with one another, and their transmutation into one another, the diverse modes of motion in nature are produced. The universal interplay of attraction and repulsion can be seen in the simplest kind of motion, mechanical motion, which consists of a change of place on the part of any body. Since motion is always relative, change of place requires the interaction of at least two bodies to manifest itself. When two bodies act upon each other so

that a change of place of one or both of them results, this change of place can consist only of an approach or separation. But the movement of one body toward another involves the overcoming of the repulsion that separates them, and vice-versa. Moreover, the attraction of one body to another involves its repulsion from a third body. Thus all change of place necessarily entails the reciprocal action of attraction and repulsion and their replacement by one another.

The mechanical movements of masses on the earth's surface can be resolved into the centripetal force of gravitation and counteracting centrifugal forces. The same interpenetration of attraction and repulsion is displayed in the mutual movements of the heavenly bodies, as in the dynamic equilibrium maintained between the earth and sun. If the earth were not bound to the sun by attraction, it would leave the solar system and fly off into space. If the sun, on the other hand, did not exert constant repulsion in the form of radiant energy upon the earth and keep it at a distance, this planet would long ago have fallen into its flaming mass and become absorbed.

Every mode of motion in nature from the lowest to the highest, from simple mechanical motion to complicated organic behavior, embraces and arises out of the simultaneous action and reaction of attraction and repulsion. Motion is in fact nothing but the most general expression for the manifold series of forms in which these polar opposites manifest themselves.

The Dialectical Definition of Motion

Engels employs this dialectical, two-sided, comprehensive definition of motion to criticize and to correct the one-sided conceptions of the nature of motion prevailing in Newtonian physics. The Newtonians erred in making attraction, or gravitation, the fundamental form of motion in nature. They thereby disregarded the equally important role of its opposite, repulsion, overlooking in particular the transformations of the one phase of motion into the other. Engels undertakes an analysis of the concepts of force, energy, and work in the writings of Helmholtz, the great nineteenth-century German physicist, to demonstrate how this neglect of the essentially bipolar character of motion introduced confusion and perpetuated error in physical theory.

Since Engels wrote, the fact that motion embraces both attraction and repulsion has been strikingly verified by the electronic theory of matter, the physical theory of relativity, and, as Haldane points out, by recent developments in the astronomical theory of the spiral nebulae. In the principles of the new "wave mechanics" the dialectical law of the interpenetration of opposites has just scored a great victory over the old mechanical conceptions.

This triumph is all the more definitive because it has been so long and consciously resisted by the physicists themselves. When first they found that electronic phenomena exhibited the properties of both waves and particles, they were profoundly perplexed by this contradiction, which could not be reconciled nor explained by the sundered categories of mechanical theory. Subatomic theory became deadlocked. After much pondering, the most daring physicists have now at last concluded that in the subatomic world waves and particles can no longer be considered absolute opposites; that they can be united in a single entity; that they can possess the same properties; and that, under certain conditions, they can be transformed into one another.

The Negation of the Negation

The law of the negation of the negation, which Hegel used as the fundamental law for the construction of his whole

system of thought, has a far wider sphere of application in the system of nature. This law really expresses the fundamental form of development in nature.

The opposing forces at work in every single thing bring about constant changes in its constitution. These changes accumulate in quantity until, at a certain determinate stage in the process of development, a distinct qualitative transformation or leap occurs. The thing loses its original identity and passes over into its opposite.

But the evolutionary process does not halt at the point of simple negation. The new form of material existence is no less self-contradictory than the old and subject to the same internal restlessness. The first negation in turn undergoes self-differentiation and division until it, too, passes into its own opposite and thereby becomes negated. The final result of this process is called the negation of the negation, a synthetic unity which has discarded the transitional forms but preserved within itself the essential content of both sides of the contradictory whole.

All the transformations of material motion studied by natural science exemplify the working of this law of the negation of the negation in physical reality. Engels employs the law to clarify the interconnections between mechanical and molecular motion, or heat.

Mechanical into Molecular Motion

All the various forms of motion are generated, as we have said, through the interplay of attraction and repulsion and their conversion into one another. But in each specific mode of motion one or the other extreme is predominant. Pure mechanical motion is essentially a form of attraction. Although repulsion is necessarily present in all cases of mechanical motion, it exists in a negative or passive state. The active role is played by attraction.

As a form of attraction, mechanical motion is the negation of repulsion. But it contains within itself the possibility of transformation into its opposite. This dialectical development actually occurs in nature through the contact or collision of one body with another. In the resultant friction or impact, part of the pure mechanical motion of the masses is destroyed and reappears in the form of internal molecular motion, or heat. The heat produced by the application of brakes is an everyday instance of this phenomenon.

Heat, however, which agitates and separates the molecules of solid bodies, is a form of repulsion. In the case of heat, repulsion comes forward as the active, and attraction recedes into the passive, side of the material process. The conversion of mechanical motion into heat is therefore a negation of the negation, a reversion of the material motion to the original state of repulsion, but on a higher level of development.

Dialectics of Scientific Discovery

The law of the negation of the negation is manifested, not only in the physical process of the conversion of mechanical motion into heat, but also in the history of its discovery. Mankind long ago actually converted mechanical motion into heat, first by the instinctive act of rubbing the body with the hands to keep it warm, and then by making fire from friction. But this negation of the original positive form of mechanical motion was only the first step in the dialectics of the process. In order to complete the development, mankind had to reverse the process and convert heat into mechanical motion.

This second stage, the negation of the negation, was realized only after many thousands of years through the in-

vention of the steam-engine, which is an apparatus for converting heat into useable mechanical motion. In this instance historical human practice in the realm of technology provides proof of the logical law of the negation of the negation.

Here also is proof that "the dialectics of the brain is only the reflection of the form of motion of the real world, both in nature and history." The law of the negation of the negation would not have forced its way into conscious thought unless it had already been operative in physical processes and in social life.

Mechanics Versus Dialectics

Yet, as Engels points out, even after the problem of converting mechanical motion into heat and heat back again into mechanical motion had been solved in human practice, natural scientists failed to formulate this fact in a completely correct or comprehensive theoretical fashion. At first they regarded heat, like electricity, as a special kind of imponderable substance rather than as a mode of material motion. Then, when they recognized heat as a mode of motion, both in the restricted law of the mechanical equivalent of heat and in the general law of the conservation of energy, they expressed the inter-relations between these two modes of motion exclusively from the one-sided standpoint of quantity.

But mechanical and molecular motion are not only quantitatively but qualitatively related. They are different forms of the same material motion. Dialectical materialism shows its superiority to the mechanical viewpoint because, in addition to comprehending the quantitative identity between the two forms of motion, formulated by the law of the quantitative equivalence of motion through all its changes of form, it also explains their qualitative diversity and the manner of their mutual metamorphoses.

Dialectical materialism has a different conception of the main task of natural science than the exponents of the mechanical school whose ideas have prevailed in natural scientific thought since Descartes and Newton. The mechanicians, who were preoccupied with studying the laws of the passage of bodies through space, believed that the goal of science was to reduce all other forms of material motion into the elementary form of mechanical motion, to resolve the higher modes of motion into the lower, the more complex into the simple. Thus, in the introduction to his "Principia," Newton wrote: "It would be desirable to deduce from the elements of mechanics the remaining phenomena of nature."

This conception of the ultimate aim of natural science coincided with that relatively primitive level of technology and industry which was principally concerned with utilizing and exploiting machines in which one aspect of mechanical movement (potential energy) was transformed into another (kinetic energy). Scientific thought revolved within the same narrow circle as scientific practice, generalizing the changes within one single simple form of motion, mechanical transposition.

Hand in hand with the tremendous advances in technology and large-scale industry during the past two centuries, scientists have discovered, investigated, and put to work many other kinds of material motion, thermal, electro-magnetical, chemical, and so on. They have especially applied themselves to studying the interconnections and transformations of these modes of motion into one another. Scientists now know that, while these other forms of motion are always bound up with real mechanical motion, they cannot be reduced to it without obliterating their specific characteristics. The laws of physiology, or society, or thought, although based upon the fundamental laws of nature, cannot simply be "deduced from the elements of mechanics," as Newton anticipated.

On all sides the laws governing mechanical motion are seen to have their limits; they have lost their sovereign status.* The expansion of technical, industrial, and purely scientific practice has widened the theoretical horizon of science far beyond the old mechanical ideal, presenting an immensely broader view of its task which dialectical materialism has not only recognized but best formulated.

The Dialectical Conception of Science

This new conception is epoch-making. In contrast to the mechanical standpoint, dialectical materialism regards the task of science to be, not the reduction of all modes of motion into one, but the study of the main forms of material motion in their natural sequence, dialectical interconnections, and transformations into one another.

The forms of motion range all the way from the crude mechanical motion of masses to the complex activity of thought in the human brain. In the course of material evolution all these different modes of motion, mechanical, molecular, atomic, electronic, chemical, thermal, organic, social, and intellectual, have developed one out of the other through the interplay of attraction and repulsion, the original contradictory essence of motion. They constitute an inter-related, hierarchical series, each one of which is naturally linked with the others, and capable, under proper material conditions, of being converted into one another.

This conception provides for the first time a sound material basis for the systematic classification of the sciences. Each individual science either analyses a separate form of motion (chemistry) or the interconnections between several forms of motion (electro-chemistry). The essential order of the sciences corresponds to the order of the generation of the various forms of motion in nature and their dialectical transition into one another. Thus dialectical materialism introduces a new principle of order to replace the confusion and anarchy which has reigned in scientific thought since the bankruptcy of the old mechanical system. All the diverse departments of human knowledge from astronomy to logic are correlated into one vast synthesis.

Part of the material in the "Dialectics of Nature," as of any treatise on natural knowledge written over sixty years ago, has been rendered obsolete by the subsequent progress of the physical sciences. This is particularly true of the chapter on electricity in which the greatest advances have been made in the past half-century. Yet there is remarkably little chaff in these pages. Engels' observations were pointed in the right direction and have in many instances been confirmed by the further researches of the physical sciences. Each discussion of a specific question is of enduring value as an example of the way to use the concepts of materialist dialectics as instruments of critical thought in the natural as well as in the social sciences.

The Task That Awaits Us

The task of delineating the dialectical character of natural events, which Engels set for himself and failed to finish, still waits to be accomplished. Despite the wealth of materials provided by recent revolutionary developments within the natural sciences, that task stands at approximately the point where Engels left it. The theoreticians of the post-Marxian period—Bernstein, Kautsky, Adler, etc.—possessing the same hostility or indifference toward the philosophy of dialectical

*See, for example, "The Evolution of Physics" by Einstein and Infeld, especially the section on "The Decline of the Mechanical View."

materialism as our contemporary anti-dialecticians, had neither the equipment nor incentive to do anything along this line. Lenin's "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" and his notebooks on Hegel's logic made possible a renaissance of the philosophy of Marxism and cleared a path for the extension of its ideas and methods to the problems confronting physical science.

It was to be hoped that, when the Bolsheviks commanded state power in Russia, their scientific leaders and academies would undertake this task on a collective, as well as an individual, basis. Under Lenin's sponsorship promising beginnings were made. But these were cut short by the reaction. Unalloyed Marxist thought, banished from politics, could hardly be expected to extend its roots into the subsoil of nature or to flourish freely for any length of time under the baneful shadow of Stalin's regime. Consequently, Marxism shrivelled from a vigorously growing ideological movement into a sterile scholasticism.

Stalin's Regime as Mirrored In Emergency Legislation

By JOHN G. WRIGHT

What is going on in the Soviet Union? Accurate information is now practically confined to decrees which emanate from the Kremlin. And even this news arrives in garbled form after weeks and months of delay. The volume of new legislation has assumed proportions almost as monstrous as the content of the laws themselves. Each new decree surpasses the previous one in ferocity, and at the same time reveals the blind-alley in which Stalin's regime has arrived.

The 1940 legislation may be roughly divided into two complementary categories. On the one hand are measures, in essence political, designed to consolidate the ranks of the bureaucracy by granting new immunities and privileges, new ranks and prerogatives: For example, the new income tax legislation, exempting the possessors of medals, orders and decorations. "Heroes of the Soviet Union," "Heroes of Labor" (Stakhanovists), while taxing all wages and salaries of 150 roubles a month and making these taxes deductible at the source; the investment of directors with "sole and indivisible authority" in the enterprises; the further aggrandisement of the officers' corps by restoring the titles of General, Admiral, etc. and reintroducing non-commissioned ranks from corporal to top-sergeant.

On the other hand there are savage totalitarian reprisals against the workers, the peasants and the youth. Chief among these are: The April laws against the peasantry which restore in practice forced collections of foodstuffs and raw materials; the June laws against labor, abolishing the 7-hour day 5-day week, legalizing the 8-hour day, 6-day week, and in reality even longer hours, without any increase in wages, making it a criminal offense to quit one's job, or even come late to work—in short, converting the workers into industrial serfs bound to the factory; the October laws against the youth, driving the children of workers and peasants from schools and universities by instituting tuitions, and making children 14 years of age and over liable to draft in the "labor reserve," i.e., restoring child labor.

It is one thing to pass laws. To enforce them is another. A series of articles dealing with these laws and their sig-

The Stalinists might preserve some relics of past Marxist thought as the medieval schoolmen preserved the writings of Aristotle or as they themselves mummified Lenin's body: to exhibit the decaying glories of the past while violating their spirit in the present. For this reason we owe the publication of "Dialectics of Nature" to them. In science as in society remnants of the heritage of the October Revolution are here and there embedded within Stalinism; some good can still emanate from this abomination: a contradiction which will doubtless horrify the anti-dialecticians. But under Stalinist auspices there cannot be any consistent or fruitful development of the science of dialectical materialism.

In this domain of thought, as in all others, the forces of the Fourth International are obliged to carry forward the tasks left unfinished by their Marxist forerunners. In the philosophical works of Marx and Engels, and now in the "Dialectics of Nature," they will find the main trails already blazed for them.

nificance, and the mass resistance which they are engendering has already appeared in the *Socialist Appeal* for October and November. In this article I propose to deal primarily with two "minor" decrees which serve to throw a glaring light on conditions existing in the Soviet Union.

On August 17 Soviet legislation against theft, already the harshest in modern times, was amended as follows:

"Petty theft, regardless of the amount, committed in institutions and enterprises, is punishable by a term of 1 year in jail, unless a severer penalty is attached to the crime." (*Pravda* August 18. My emphasis.)

Anyone caught with so much as a nail in his or her possession faces jail for one year. Unbelievable? In the columns of *Izvestiya* and *Pravda* are reported sentences of one year's imprisonment in the following cases:

- (1.) A worker caught with a lump of bronze
- (2.) A driver with a few pounds of candy.
- (3.) A woman-worker with '13 meters of burlap."
- (4.) Another with cookies and sugar.
- (5.) A worker with "two English locks."

Downright theft assumes such a mass character only when there is a famine in objects of consumption, and when the cost of necessities rises. The Kremlin's censor may clamp tight the lid on the actual data relating to the worsening conditions of the masses; the truth seeps through in a Kremlin ukase. Speculation, which springs from the same source, likewise reaches new heights. During the purge of the Trade Union apparatus in August, one of the bureaucrats blurted out:

"An investigation conducted by the District Committee has revealed that in the city of Kostroma there is a solid bloc of 1,000 families not one of whom had a job either in a State enterprise or institution; in Yaroslavl, there are 114 families at the textile combine *Krasny Perekop* who inhabit factory homes, who are the first ones to come into possession of scarce articles and commodities, and who engage in trading, and lead a parasitic holiday life."

From time to time, a few speculators are arrested, some

are shot, and the press features the news. Meanwhile, speculation increases. Even the bureaucrats who as a rule occupy "factory homes" find themselves elbowed out by the illicit traders.

The second decree issued on August 17 amends the criminal code on hooliganism as follows:

"Hooligan actions in enterprises, institutions, and public places are punishable by a term of one year in jail, unless there is a severer penalty attached to the crime."

In addition to this emergency amendment, special courts were set up to hear cases of hooliganism, preferably on the same day the arrests are made. No red tape.

The efficiency in applying this law has been little short of breath-taking. A single issue of *Izvestia* for August 27 lists eleven trials of hooligans:

CASE A: Defendant 26 years old, charged with "creating a scandal in a house." Sentence: one year in jail, three years exile.

CASE B: Defendant 19 years of age, used "unprintable language in a trolley car"—one year in jail.

CASE C: Defendant 38 years old, caused a "scandal in an Emergency Ambulance"—one year in jail.

CASE D: Defendant 28 years of age, "drunk in a trolley car"—one year in jail.

CASE E: Defendant 19 years old, caused a disturbance, "engaged in a brawl"—one year in jail, three years exile.

CASE F: Defendant 26 years old, "used profanity on a public thoroughfare"—one year in jail.

CASE G: Defendant 20 years old, brandished a "safety razor blade," "threatened to slash a citizen"—three years jail, four years exile.

CASE H: Defendant 31 years old, bashed "another citizen in the face with a suitcase"—three years jail, four years exile.

CASE I: Defendant 45 years old, charged with "hooliganism on the street"—four years in jail, deprived of civil rights for three years, not permitted to live in eight specified cities for a period of five years.

CASE J: Defendant 22 years old, charged with slugging a citizen and "resisting arrest"—three years jail, deprived of civil rights for three years.

CASE K: Defendant 41 years old, "profanity on a public highway," "resisted arrest"—3 years in jail.

I have a confession to make: I did not see through the intense campaign in the press in preparation for this decree. On July 31, for instance, *Izvestia* declared that hooliganism was increasing; that the authorities were "not coping with the situation"; that four People's Judges and three city magistrates had to be removed from their posts because of leniency toward hooligans; and that this "condition was true not only of Moscow but other cities." I assumed that hooliganism of the ordinary garden variety was involved, and that it was increasing as is undoubtedly the case. My suspicions that something more was involved were aroused first by the text of the ukase which announced in so many words that the arena of hooliganism had extended beyond the public places into the very heart of Soviet industry and trade, the "enterprises and institutions."

But it took the case of a 25 year old worker—*Case L* in *Izvestia's* list—to open my eyes concerning the true identity of the most dangerous "hooligans."

The case follows verbatim:

"The case of I. V. Timonin, born in 1915. On August 23 (the defendant) appeared at a clinic where he demanded that he be issued a doctor's certificate excusing him from work; becoming chagrined because the thermometer indicated only normal temperature

he indulged in debauchery (!), and used unprintable language. Sentenced on August 23 to three years in jail, not permitted to live in nine specified cities of the Soviet Union after the completion of the sentence." (*Izvestia*, August 27.)

Easy on the Bureaucrats

Any factory or office worker who dares in any way to resist, as much as grumble, or engage in any other "debauchery" against the smooth application of the June 26 ukase is immediately guilty as charged: a "hooligan"! One can now fully appreciate the humor of the cartoons and skits against "hooliganism" featured in Stalin's humorous periodical, so aptly named "Krokodil" (crocodile). The intensity of repressions reflects the force of resistance. Despite all the Kremlin censors we learn that the resistance of the Soviet workers is growing!

To round out the picture it is necessary to cite still another trial. This time, the defendants are M. S. Vorobiev, head of the Political Department of the Gorky Railroad and G. I. Romanov, head of passenger traffic of the same railroad. The defendants, we learn immediately, were expelled from the party and "handed over to the courts." The report of the court-proceedings follows:

"In the Gorky railroad loafers and disrupters felt themselves quite privileged. In July and August, 1572 cases of violations (of labor discipline) and 145 cases of self-willed departures were recorded... M. S. Vorobiev did not struggle against the violators of labor discipline, he was too busy arranging for his own personal, family comfort. D. Pavlova, a woman conductor, served as his cook, and he made a valet de chambre out of the secretary of the Political Department. They worked for Vorobiev and continued to draw their pay from the state payroll. The head of the Political Department was imitated by the commanders below him..."

It is not clear just what the charges against Vorobiev are: collusion with the violators of the June 26 ukase, turning his subordinate not only formally but actually into a flunkey, or cheating the state of his servants' wages. The report tries to clarify the issue:

"How dared you, a political leader, to violate the Soviet law so crudely, and set so bad an example to your subordinates?" asks the prosecutor.

"I did not sufficiently grasp the importance of the June 26 ukase of the Praesidium of the Supreme Council," replies the defendant with assumed innocence.

"At the trial," continues *Pravda*, "it was disclosed that Vorobiev's crimes were known to the prosecuting attorney of the Railway, the editor of the Railway newspaper, the head of the Railway, and other people in the service... In court, the defendant G. I. Romanov confessed: 'I behaved like a coward before Vorobiev. I did not want complications. In this lies my mistake.'"

"I did not want complications." This is more than a confession. It is a self-portrait of the bureaucracy.

The court sentenced Vorobiev to—"two years in jail." After all, he was not a "hooligan." His accomplice, G. I. Romanov, was not jailed. He was not even removed from his post but received a sentence of "one year penal labor at place of employment"—as head of the railway!—and "fined 20% of his wages." (*Pravda* September, 24.) The prosecuting attorney and the editor of the Railway, not to mention Vorobiev's subordinates who "imitated his example," were apparently not even arrested.

Pravda need have no fears in publishing this. No Soviet citizen would so much as dare curse under his breath on penalty of going to jail for one year, and maybe for life!

New Ways of War

By JOSEPH HANSEN

NEW WAYS OF WAR; By Tom Wintringham; Penguin Books, Inc., New York City. 128 pp. 25c.

Wintringham analyzes the deadly effect upon defense which bourgeois control of the armed forces entails: outdated concepts of training and army organization with consequent impairment of the intelligence, initiative, and fighting ability of draftees, use of antiquated arms and antiquated combat methods, the placing of defense needs in secondary position to the needs of the profit-makers. He demonstrates from the purely military viewpoint how the German armies, because of their modernization in equipment and organization and tactics, especially the degree of decision left to the individual soldier in the ranks, have been able to sweep over Europe with stunning speed.

The observations of Wintringham as to the paralyzing role of the present officer caste are valid not only for the British and the French but also the American armies. In the last war these officers sacrificed men uselessly by the tens of thousands. Clinging to antiquated concepts of war, the officer caste in 1914 attempted battles of maneuver as if nothing had happened since 1870 whereas the development of armament demanded an entirely different type of warfare. "Whole divisions of British infantry," says Wintringham, "climbed out of the trenches to commit suicide 'dressed by the right.' The official British history says, for example, of the 34th Division at the Somme: 'At zero hour the whole infantry of the division except the head of the second column, rose as one man... In a matter of ten minutes 80 per cent of the men in the leading battalions were casualties.'" Had the men themselves had officers of their own choice, responsive to the experience of the ranks, these useless casualties could have been avoided.

By the end of the war in 1918 new tactics clearly loomed. "It was no longer siege warfare," explains Wintringham, "but war of movement under new conditions, and with a new shape. And here we see how the Blitzkrieg develops directly from its opposite, the stalemate of the trenches." The trench deadlock was broken by the development of the airplane and tank.

But the Allied officer caste is still imbued with ideas of warfare that date back to the pre-Napoleonic era. "... the leaders of a modern army must allow subordinate commanders to use their own judgment. Each of the units of a mechanised striking force must be 'given its head.' But owing to the social structure of Britain in the past, and of the class that rules the army, it is difficult in the British Army for the higher commanders to trust and encourage

their juniors in this way. The leadership that hunts foxes cannot believe that the young officers from civil life... can possibly think for themselves and act for themselves without close and continuous control from above. As for sergeants, corporals, and ordinary men of the ranks, they are unfortunately debarred by birth and income from polo and fox hunting; how can they possibly be given the right and duty to act on their own? In this way class considerations have in the past made it difficult for our army to achieve the form of leadership necessary for modern war."

Wintringham considers it a myth inherited from the dead past that the best officers must come from the upper ranges of society. On the contrary he considers that the best officers come from the working class; moreover, without such officers the army as a whole is bound to greatly increase its mortality rate and the possibility of defeat in modern warfare.

Other "myths" listed by Wintringham are the idea that cavalry plays a serious role in modern war, and that the bayonet is a useful weapon. The bayonet, says Wintringham, has been outdated since the American revolution of 1776. As far back as the Russo-Japanese war, he reports, losses of the Russians from bayonets, swords and spears were only 1.7 percent of their casualties. Against automatic guns, grenades, artillery, the bayonet is ineffective. Nevertheless all the Allied armies spend time drilling with the bayonet.

Wintringham considers the drill which is now forced upon the British trainees to be harmful. "But to take perfectly good young men and give them weeks on end of barrack-square, knocks out of them not only any 'instincts' for fighting they may have, but also their ability to think about all orders received and to use their own judgement. Independence, initiative and intelligence are all ground out of the recruit at the average training depot... Drill teaches men to obey definite, limited immediate orders. In war, at the crucial moments, they will not get such orders. Such orders cannot reach them in time. They have to act and think for themselves."

In Wintringham's opinion football, swimming, sports in general, study of films showing actual warfare together with training in all the various arms is the best sort of drill for modern war.

For defense against invasion he proposes the general arming of the population, the building of a People's Army. He cites examples of People's Wars in the past which succeeded in breaking powerful military machines: the war of the Spanish people against Napoleon, the Italian people under Garibaldi. France fell to the German army, he believes, because "those who feared the

French people had their way. Their way led to capitulation." Arming of the people, workers' control of the armed forces could have stopped the Germans.

Much of the book is devoted to valuable information on concrete ways in which a people can arm itself for a war of defense. Against tanks Wintringham advises the use of hand grenades and even includes detailed instructions together with diagrams for their home production. He indicates methods of making an ordinary shotgun into a deadly weapon at ranges much beyond that ordinarily attributed to the smooth bore gun. He also gives concrete advice on how to fight motorcycle troops, parachutists, artillery and airplanes.

The sections of his book devoted to ways in which the general population can drill and train itself to become an effective fighting force in an invasion by a modern army should be of particular interest to trade unionists. Wintringham indicates group drills that could be organized by any trade union local.

As for reform in the Army, Wintringham advocates besides modernization of tactics and equipment and the utilization of workers for officers, the democratization of the army. "(1) Modern war makes imposed arbitrary and automatic discipline and rigid tactics not only useless but harmful, unsuccessful. (2.) Modern war makes voluntarily, understood and thinking discipline and elastic tactics based on initiative and independence, more valuable than ever before. In the British Army's training there is insistence on the discipline and tactics outlined in 1, and disregard for those outlined in 2. The way to alter that is to inject a large dose of democracy. There is no other way."

His analysis of modern war does not take into consideration the effect of the relative economic weight of Germany in the capitalist chain in comparison with its political position prior to the downfall of France. Nor does his analysis include the role of the Versailles Treaty in modernizing the German armies and holding the Allied armies at their 1918 level. Hence as a treatise on modern war, the book is superficial. On the purely military side his treatment of the role of the navy and aircraft is also inadequate as the author himself admits. Inadequate too are his analyses of the German campaigns as a whole which all the military experts of the world have been studying with sharpest attention whether or not they have revised their drill manuals in the light of what these campaigns reveal. It is also necessary to warn the reader that the author's political views are those of the traditional patriotic British socialist somewhat more than tinged with Stalinism.

READ: *all the labor news*

READ: *letters and news from Workers*

READ: *news of the 4th International*

READ: *analysis of world events that are breathtaking in scope and speed. From Munich to Greece in little more than a single year. Read the only newspaper in the United States that turns the revealing light of Marxism upon current history!*

— READ —

The
SOCIALIST APPEAL

THE ONLY MARXIST LABOR PAPER IN AMERICA

At central newsstands in your city each Thursday

or mail subscription to:

SOCIALIST APPEAL

116 UNIVERSITY PLACE

NEW YORK, N. Y.

(RATES: \$2 PER YEAR; \$3 PER YEAR COMBINED WITH 4th INTERNATIONAL)